

North Avenue Advisory Committee

January 9, 2013

Old Business

1. Dave Thornton reviewed November 28, 2012 meeting notes. He described the point system and how it was set up.

North Avenue Overlay Zone District & Implementation Tools

1. The committee was asked if the program should include new development and redevelopment or if it should only include new development. Both were preferred by the committee.
 - a. Derek W. suggested giving higher priority to projects that meet the most goals or objectives of the corridor (total points), whether it's new development or redevelopment.
 - b. The group talked about the difference between a grant styled program and a rebate (for costs that have been incurred) program.
 - c. Kevin suggested that Council might want to consider funding the North Avenue program at \$500,000 for the first year (compared to the \$3 million commitment Council made to the downtown area for 2013).
 - d. Ebe asked if a TIF had been created and Sam S. responded that it had not. Council had not received a request to create an Urban Renewal Authority.
 - e. Ebe also asked what would happen if construction wasn't completed on time. He felt there should be a penalty for not finishing or for changing their mind because it ties up funding that someone else could be using. He thought a deposit should be put down on the grant award as an incentive to finish the work.
 - i. Dave suggested that the deposit not be implemented in the first year of the program.
 - ii. Perhaps the grant award could include a commencement date and if work wasn't started by the date, then the grant award would be forfeited for that year and become available for someone else's project.
 - f. Sam S. wanted staff to make a presentation to Council on the proposed point system at their January 11, 2013 retreat. He also wanted to know when John Shaver would help draft the agreements so they would be legally sound.
 - g. Kevin stated that the program would need to be publicized so that property owners could learn about it.
 - h. Poppy asked whose liability it would be if the public was injured on street furniture or features.
 - i. Derek suggested "first in time – first in line" to award the grant funding
 - j. A suggestion was made to use the first half of the year to fund tier one projects. Other lower tier projects would be considered at a later date.
 - k. Another suggestion was to only consider tier one, priority projects the first year. Future years could consider tier two projects.
 - l. Kevin didn't want to reduce the emphasis on lower priority projects because they were also important.
 - m. Ebe suggested allocating funds based on tiers, for example:
 - i. \$350,000 - tier one projects
 - ii. \$150,000 - tier two projects

Renaming North Avenue to University Boulevard Discussion:

1. Levi researched the possibility of changing the name of North Avenue to University Boulevard. He spoke with CDOT who encouraged him but directed him to the City for further direction. He checked with Tim Foster and Derek Wagner from CMU to get their input and feedback. They encouraged him and supported the idea. He also had spoken to approximately 100 people. The Chamber said they would support the change only in the North Avenue Owners Association supported it.
2. Dave explained the process to change the name and stated that the Board of Commissioners would have to change the portion located in Mesa County.
3. The cost of changed signage was also discussed by the group.
4. Committee support for the name change was as follows:
 - a. Yes - 6
 - b. No - 2
 - c. Neutral – 1
5. A suggestion was made that a few months be given to transition to the new name.