

## **2006 CITY COUNCIL RETREAT PAPER IMPLEMENTATION OF REDEVELOPMENT PLANS**

### ***Introduction***

Over the past several years, recognizing that the City is approaching the physical build out of the current Longmont Planning Area, the City Council has initiated a variety of efforts directed at redeveloping "targeted" areas of the community. These studies identify major implementation recommendations and numerous strategies needed to be successful in attracting and encouraging infill redevelopment. Council is now faced with identifying which recommendations should be pursued and how they will be resourced or funded. This report will also suggest ways in which the Council may want to evaluate and prioritize the strategies based on "quick victories," available resources, as well as return on investment principles.

While the City has existing staff with experience in administering these programs, the level of effort now required far exceeds available time from these staff. Since the only new resources provided by the City for these programs are for the purpose of hiring an Economic Vitality Coordinator, this person will be heavily relied on to support, complement, assist or even lead specific projects determined to be a priority by City Council and City Manager.

This report will summarize the major recommendations from each of the following plans, the logical next steps to implement each plan and finish with a chart that identifies criteria to assist the Council in determining priorities given the City's limited resources for dealing with the complementary projects.

1. Flour Mill Redevelopment Plan – Approved August 2003
2. Urban Renewal Plan - Blight Study Approved October 2004 – Urban Renewal Plan Scheduled for Public Hearing February 28, 2006
3. FasTracks Transportation Oriented Development Plan – Reviewed March 2005
4. Midtown Redevelopment Plan – Approved December 2005
5. Downtown Revitalization – Mixed Use Parking Structure, Phase 1b – Approved November 2005

## **1. FLOUR MILL REDEVELOPMENT PLAN – Approved August 2003**

As part of its 2002 work program, the Council authorized \$25,000 for a market driven redevelopment plan for the “Flour Mill” property owned by the Grant family. The Buchanon, Yonoschuski Group (BYG) was selected after a competitive bidding process and prepared a redevelopment plan that was approved by the City Council after a public meeting on August 7, 2003. The Grant family owns the Flour Mill property and participated throughout the redevelopment planning process. Everett Stratton of Longmont and Eva Jo Logan of Aurora own two parcels, consisting of 1.2 acres, on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue that provides additional redevelopment opportunities for the 3 acre site and are also supportive of the plan.

The Consultant completed a market analysis that was presented to a community forum/site utilization charette held December 5, 2002. There were 17 citizens and staff attending who broke into groups to create their own vision for the Flour Mill site. The major themes taken by the Consultant and incorporated into a conceptual site plan included:

1. Retain the historic nature of the buildings - pursue adaptive re-use of existing buildings as well as Federal Historic Designation for the Flour Mill and Silo.
2. Mixed Use Development - encourage retail, office and residential land uses.
3. Transit Oriented Development - design the project to take advantage of future FasTracks rail transportation opportunities.

Exhibit I details what was identified by the BYG Consultant Group as a supportable mixed use development for the Flour Mill property as well as a list of incentives that may be necessary to ensure the success of the project. The FasTracks/TOD section of this report also identified a larger mixed use development opportunity thought to be viable at this location.

The Grants and their development partner, Mr. Don Berland, initially believed the BYG plan could be implemented and have been in the process of assembling land from adjacent property owners and preparing conceptual design plans as well as a financial proforma that will indicate what the actual “gap” will be in order to help the Council determine the appropriate level of public assistance. Mr. Berland presented his updated development proposal to the Council at its June 28, 2005 meeting. Since that meeting Mr. Berland has revised his plans and now believes that the initial phase should be non-residential and is finalizing an appraisal as the last piece of information needed to complete his proforma that will indicate the new financial gap that would be eligible for incentives from the City and the LDDA.

### **Next Steps**

- Determine if it's appropriate to provide incentives sufficient to achieve Flour Mill redevelopment during the next two years to serve as a catalyst project and improve that area several years in advance of a FasTracks station which is not scheduled until 2014.
- If it's determined that an extremely high level of public assistance is necessary to make the project viable, it may be more prudent to delay significant public assistance for the project to when market conditions improve, which may not happen until the FasTracks commuter rail station is closer to happening.
- The City would, in the meantime, support efforts that result in a larger scale project such as assisting the developer in assembling additional property such as the City's old electric/sanitation building on Main Street.
- Consider cost sharing with the developer and LDDA to prepare a more detailed TOD design for an area much larger than the Flour Mill that includes pedestrian connections to Downtown.

## **2. URBAN RENEWAL PLAN – Blight Study Approved October 2004 – Urban Renewal Plan Scheduled for Public Hearing February 28, 2006**

Colorado's Urban Renewal Law allows a wide range of activities and programs in the implementation of an urban renewal plan. It is the intent of the Longmont Urban Renewal Authority (LURA) to provide incentives to stimulate private investment in cooperation with property owners and other affected parties in order to accomplish the objectives of the plan. Public/private partnerships and joint venture development will be key to the Authority's strategy for preventing the spread of blight and eliminating the blighting conditions. Reliance on powers such as eminent domain will only be considered as a final option as determined by the Longmont City Council, to achieve the redevelopment objectives of this plan. Historically, when the use of eminent domain was necessary for public purpose projects such as street, sewer, and water main completion projects, or public buildings (Safety & Justice Center), the City of Longmont compensated property owners based on fair market value. However, the City does not intend to use these powers in the context of implementing this urban renewal plan to benefit private sector developers interested in assembling land for speculative development purposes and unable to pay fair market value for property.

The following incentives are possible for the LURA to undertake as a way to accelerate redevelopment of the area including the Sugar Factory, Flour Mill and the property between the two sites. Exhibit II explains in more detail how these techniques could assist in implementing the Urban Renewal Plan.

- Redevelopment and Rehabilitation Actions
- Redevelopment Agreements
- Tax Increment Financing
- Financing Mechanisms / Structures (e.g. Special Metro Districts)
- Financially Participating in Private Development Projects
- Inter-Agency Cooperation
- Property Acquisition and Land Assemblage
- Relocation Assistance
- Demolition, Clearance, and Site Preparation

### **Plan Administration**

The Authority may employ technical experts, agents, and employees, permanent and temporary, and determine their qualifications, duties and compensation. Until such time as determined by the Authority that administration of the Plan requires the commitment of permanent employee(s), it is intended that the City of Longmont Community Development Department staff will fill the role of Plan administrators, and shall not be compensated above their existing salary or hourly wages as provided by their primary employer, the City of Longmont

The Community Development Department Director of the City of Longmont is authorized by the City Manager to serve in the capacity as Secretary of the Authority (Executive Director), until such time that the Authority determines it is necessary to employ a full time Secretary.

According to the Urban Renewal Law, the Authority may call upon the municipal counsel or chief legal officer of the City for such legal services that it may require, or it may employ its own counsel and legal staff. It is anticipated that the Deputy City Attorney would initially provide legal support to the new LURA.

## **Next Steps**

- Submit Tax Increment Financing Impact Report to Boulder County and St. Vrain Valley School District for review and comments. While the School District is not financially impacted since the State compensates Districts for revenue that they would otherwise receive, Boulder County will be requesting some form of "cost sharing" to address its perceived impact.
- Hold public hearing on Urban Renewal Plan, February 28, 2006, and determine whether to initiate a Tax Increment Financing project or wait until more property is annexed and assist those property owners in the annexation process.
- Determine whether to include Flour Mill/LDDA area in the new Urban Renewal Plan.
- Confirm desire to use existing staff in support of this effort.

### **3. FASTRACKS TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PLAN – Reviewed March 2005**

In November 2004, voters approved the FasTracks initiative to increase sales tax in the Regional Transportation District (RTD) to fund rapid transit corridors throughout the region. Part of FasTracks includes the US-36/SH-119 corridor from Denver, through Boulder, to Longmont with an end-of-line station located at Hover Road and Ken Pratt Boulevard. As a result of concerns over that location, the RTD and the City of Longmont agreed to fund a feasibility study for commuter rail within the Diagonal Corridor (SH-119) from Boulder to Longmont. As part of the study, the City of Longmont requested that Transit Oriented Development (TOD) be considered with the selection of station locations.

Part of the purpose for the Longmont Diagonal Rail Feasibility Study was to analyze candidate station locations and their Transit Oriented Development (TOD) potential for station sites in the City of Longmont. This analysis was conducted as part of the Regional Transportation District's Longmont Diagonal Rail Feasibility Study (final report completed in May 2005). The City of Longmont contributed financially to that report to allow more detailed analysis to be conducted of station locations and TOD possibilities at those locations within the City.

In early March 2005, a presentation regarding station location and TOD potential was given to City Council. Although the Council supported the findings presented at the meeting, it has not yet taken formal action on the Longmont Diagonal Feasibility Study or TOD Analysis.

#### **STATION MARKET POTENTIAL**

This section addresses market and development potential at each station location as an input to the conceptual land use plan. The development potential is determined based on:

- Overall market conditions and potential as part of the Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan Update in 2003;
- Existing land use and zoning surrounding each station;
- Property owner development interests; and
- Consideration of the impact of the rail station on future development opportunities.

Because the rail line and stations are not expected to be in place until approximately 2015, the development analyses are relatively broad and consider the type and density of surrounding development, but place less emphasis on current real estate values, rents, and vacancies.

#### **1st/Terry Street (Downtown) Station**

The proposed downtown station is located at the southern edge of the City's historic central business district on the west side of Main Street on 1st Avenue just south of the Flour Mill property. The station facilities are proposed to be located on a 10-acre infill site with several land owners and several existing uses on site.

The surrounding land uses include the vacant Golden West Flour Mill property, the electric substation immediately north of the rail line, a mix of industrial and commercial uses to the east, a mobile home park and commercial/industrial uses to the south, and an industrial area west of Pratt Parkway.

The station area is zoned Mixed Industrial (MI), which allows for primarily light industrial uses at 0.23 Flood Area Ratio (FAR). MI Zoning allows for a modest amount of vertically integrated mix of uses (25% of the total non-residential space can be used for residential units and no more than 25 dwelling units per acre). The land use and zoning would need to be amended for development blocks with pure residential buildings as well as vertically integrated buildings, which have up to 50% of nonresidential space. The Flour Mill Redevelopment Plan recommended Mixed Use rezoning.

## **Sugar Mill Station**

The proposed Sugar Mill station is located on the eastern edge of the City near the intersection of 119th Street and the recently completed Ken Pratt Boulevard (SH 119). The station is located on a 3-acre redevelopment site owned by a single landowner. The site contains vacant three- and six-story brick warehouse industrial buildings associated with the former Great Western Sugar processing facility. There is also a metal storage building currently being used by a recycling business. The surrounding property is largely vacant with the exception of the Hilleshog research facility on the southeast corner of Rogers Road and 119<sup>th</sup> Street.

The surrounding land uses include a mix of industrial and commercial uses to the north, vacant land to the east and south, and a mix of industrial and commercial uses, including the City's wastewater treatment plant, to the west. Although a mixed-use development is proposed for the Sugar Mill station site, planning for the site will adhere to the City's desire to protect its investment in its wastewater treatment plant with the promotion of land uses and activities in its proximity that are compatible with it. The station area is currently zoned General Industrial (GI) and Business/Light Industrial (BLI). The land use and zoning classification would need to be amended to accommodate the types of uses proposed in the development concept, or the land use and zoning would need to be changed to a compatible classification.

The Sugar Mill site's development potential has already been greatly enhanced by the recently completed Ken Pratt Boulevard south of downtown. The City's comprehensive plan also designates the area immediately east at County Line Road and SH 119 for regional retail development. As a result, the development potential of the Sugar Mill property has already been enhanced. If a rail station were constructed at this location, there would be an opportunity for a substantial amount of TOD residential development. The site's overall development potential, in addition to its regional access, also supports a mixed use commercial town center.

See Exhibit III for more detailed analysis of the development potential for the two TOD sites.

## **Findings and Conclusions**

- **Zoning** - Both sites would require a rezoning of the property to accommodate the intended development. The City of Longmont may want to consider approval of a special TOD zoning category to accommodate such future rezoning proposals.
- **Land Assembly** - The 1st/Terry Street (Downtown) station would require aggregation of 24 parcels for development, while the Sugar Mill site would only require six parcels.
- **Relocations** - Similar to land assembly, the 1st/Terry Street (Downtown) station would require the greatest number of relocations, including 10 to 15 residential and 20 to 25 non-residential buildings. The Sugar Mill station has primarily vacant land or unoccupied buildings and would require the relocation of two non-residential buildings at the Sugar Mill.
- **Public Improvements** - Both stations would require public improvements to roadways and intersections serving the stations. The 1st/Terry Street (Downtown) station would require signalization of the Pratt Parkway and Boston Avenue intersection, as well as a new access road from Boston north to the station location on 1st Avenue. The Sugar Mill site would require improvements to 119th Street as well as a new access road from 119th to the proposed station location one block to the west. Another factor affecting TOD potential is the future plans for the site (as reflected in the Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan) and the level of support from the City. The existing lower value uses in the station area and the City's desire for revitalization would provide a favorable environment for a catalyst TOD project to anchor the southern entrance into Downtown. The Sugar Mill station site is currently designated for

industrial/economic development uses in the Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan. The Plan recommends future regional retail development at the intersection of County Line Road and SH 119 just ½ mile to the east. This recent change in the Plan, as well as the completion of the Ken Pratt Boulevard, improves the potential of the Sugar Mill site for higher value commercial and mixed-use development. This site is also part of the Urban Renewal planning area and will be studied for future TOD redevelopment opportunities.

### **Next Steps**

- RTD needs to complete its environmental analysis and formally amend the FasTracks plan to include both Longmont sites (eliminate Hover/Ken Pratt Boulevard?). This is scheduled for July 2006.
- Council takes formal action to approve the TOD plan and communicate support to RTD.
- Plan and coordinate the infrastructure (including utilities, vehicle access, alternative mode access) to the station sites.
- City initiates TOD – mixed use rezoning of both areas.
- City assists private sector in assembling land (including City-owned property) to facilitate redevelopment program.
- Identify ongoing staff/consultant resources needed to support this effort.

#### **4. MIDTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN – Approved December 2005**

Together, the public and private sectors face the challenge of revitalizing the Midtown study area described as one block on either side of Main Street from Longs Peak Avenue to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Before moving forward, the City must accept that its competitive position will continue to be eroded unless there is a significant repositioning of its role in the market; restructuring of its physical layout; recognition of the economic challenges inherent in infill and corridor redevelopment; and, aggressive recruitment of niche opportunities. The City and its leadership must further accept that infill, and particularly corridor areas, are at a distinct economic, social and market disadvantage compared to vacant “greenfield” sites. To that end, it is their responsibility to “level the investment and regulatory playing field.” Private investment alone will not fill the financial “gap,” rather, it will move elsewhere. There are several opportunities along the corridor where these types of “leveraged” investments can be made. The purpose of these “catalyst investment areas” in advancing the plan is described below.

##### **Framework**

Following are elements of the implementation framework for the Midtown Redevelopment Plan:

- City maintains pro-business attitude towards redevelopment
- Underdeveloped properties are put into productive use
- Commitment is made to remedy existing problems and prevent future ones
- Higher-density infill projects will be encouraged
- Public commitment will be long-term
- “Bones” before beautification
- Physical environment will balance the role of the vehicle
- Advocacy entities will be identified and empowered
- Catalyst projects will be expected to leverage a financial return
- Creative reinvestment strategies and “tools” will be diverse
- Awareness will be heightened
- Study findings and strategies will be enforced and supported
- Area will have a distinct set of standards, regulations and incentives

##### **Potential Catalyst Sites**

The strategy for revitalization of the Midtown Corridor is based on redevelopment and targeted investment in key nodes, or “catalyst areas”, which hold investment potential despite, select economic and physical redevelopment challenges. These nodes are defined as: urbanized places with concentration of jobs, housing units, commercial uses, public spaces, public transportation, pedestrian activity and/or a sense of place. The mix of uses in the node is located in developments with minimal setbacks, reduced parking requirements, and taller structures, all in an effort to achieve higher densities necessary to support pedestrian activity, private investment and a sense of place. A node serves as a catalyst for public and private investment and economic activity, effectively building off the strengths of the surrounding area and connecting to adjacent neighborhoods.

As markets change, the physical realm must change with them. Therefore, while these nodes have been identified today as offering potential for leveraged investment, the concepts will provide the City with the tools to evaluate future projects which might occur outside the identified areas, and which are still consistent with the vision for the study area.

Site 1: 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Gateway – Main Street between 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup>

Site 2: Consolidated Parking/Shared Drive – Main Street between Mountain View and 11<sup>th</sup>

Site 3: Amory/Service Station – NE corner of Main and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave

- Site 4: Mercado/Public Plaza – NE corner of Main and 9<sup>th</sup> Ave
- Site 5: Redevelopment site(s) – various sites in the Midtown area
- Site 6: 8<sup>th</sup> Street Plaza – Main Street between Longs Peak and 8<sup>th</sup> Ave
- Site 7: Former Hajek Chevrolet – 1400 block of Main Street
- Site 8: Courthouse Parking Structure – NE corner of Main Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Ave
- Site 9: Streetscape/Mid-Block Nodes – Main Street between Longs Peak and 17<sup>th</sup> Ave

The *Longmont Midtown Redevelopment Plan 2005* is the roadmap to move the City's and stakeholders' vision towards reality and to ensure that redevelopment of the area is accomplished in a way that balances private investment objectives with community sustainability. The attached series of actions and strategies will capitalize on market opportunities and overcome barriers to investment. Ultimately, the City of Longmont, its Council, staff and citizenry will have to select a final course of action for change. The information presented here is designed to provide a range of actions for consideration and sound decision-making.

### **Strategies (not in any priority order)**

1. Formalize an advocacy entity (or modify an existing one – LDDA, BID, CDC) to champion implementation of the plan over the near- and long-term. Note: The advocate can be public or private or a combination of both, but their primary function will be to advance the actions of the plan, keep stakeholders involved in the process and promote consensus.
2. Use the catalyst areas map prepared for the Main Street Redevelopment Plan as a guide for directing future public investment and assisting projects based on their contribution to the vision. Where properties have not been identified, but where their program is consistent with the vision for Midtown, assist and advance them.
3. Establish an urban renewal district with the study area so that financing tools such as Tax Increment Financing (TIF) can be used to off-set above market property asking prices.
4. Working with local representatives for the Latino/Hispanic community to build the ethnic diversity of the area through creation of a district for destination uses with an ethnic theme.
5. Based on the market findings provided for in the Redevelopment Plan, identify appropriate locations for additional ethnic retailers.
6. Provide regulatory assistance to business, property owners and developers to help them easily and quickly establish outdoor dining facilities.
7. Establish regulating limits on big-box stores in the study area over 100,000 square feet – require that they be multiple stories tall and provide a garage, on-street and/or parking in the rear of their buildings. Subject Big Boxes to additional oversight by the City and/or advocacy entity.
8. Keep property and business owners apprised of market opportunities (host property and business owner roundtables) and facilitate discussions among potential partners.
9. Promote mixed-use development within nodes along the corridor and in catalyst areas – allowing for a market responsive mix of uses.
10. Encourage the introduction of residential development within catalyst areas and at key locations in the corridor, fill financial gaps and support demonstration projects.
11. Where necessary, assist with assembling properties to accommodate a range of product types. Long-term, work with advocacy entity to acquire and assemble properties.
12. Identify benchmarks to monitor market conditions which indicate need for inclusionary zoning. When necessary, do not enforce this regulation without compensatory density bonuses

otherwise development economics might be such that they preclude quality development which adequately addresses the needs and profile of the market.

13. Use the resources of an improvement district to provide a heightened level of code enforcement, crime monitoring and clean-up programs.
14. Use Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) dollars for land assembly and redevelopment  
Note: The amount of CDBG dollars available to Longmont has been reduced over the past several years, therefore any funding from this program would probably have to be phased (funded over several years) or use of a Section 108 loan or application for EDI/BEDI funding may be need to be considered.
15. Until codes and regulations are brought in line with the commercial design guidelines, allow staff flexibility in their interpretation relative to the intent of the Main Street Redevelopment Plan.
16. Refine landscape/streetscape design guidelines, including minimum requirements for landscaping surface parking lots to property owners, local designers and builders as well as place standards on City's website.
17. Establish policies which support infill development and redevelopment, and which acknowledge the inequities of investing in these environments.
18. Work with local design/development professionals to complete a regulatory diagnosis amending existing regulatory documents to be responsive to market conditions – including policies to encourage redevelopment and infill development.
19. Eliminate all regulatory barriers to reinvestment and investment in the study area, beginning with zoning obstacles.
20. Complete Economic Development Administration (EDA) grant applications (including pre-development) which administer dollars for economic diversity and sustainability.

### **Next Steps**

- Identify a formal advocacy group to monitor implementation of the Plan.
- Determine whether to prepare an Urban Renewal Plan and use of Tax Increment Financing that would provide an incentive for redevelopment.
- Prioritize the strategies listed above based on quick “victories” or City “return on investment” (i.e. increased taxes and/or stimulating new redevelopment).
- Determine whether to offer City property at 11<sup>th</sup>/Terry as an incentive for redevelopment or keep as future Fire Station location.
- Identify staff/consultant resources needed to support this effort.

## **5. DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION – MIXED USE PARKING STRUCTURE, PHASE 1B – Approved November 2005**

The City of Longmont and Longmont Downtown Development Authority (LDDA) are studying the viability, location(s) and cost of building a mixed-use parking structure in the downtown area. This area has a history of high demand for adequate, convenient parking, but is faced with the physical limitation of its current supply of on-street and surface lot parking.

The City hired the architectural firm, Newman, Cavender & Doane, to study the available sites in downtown that could support a 400 car parking structure. In addition to identifying the best garage site, the consultant team is evaluating each site's capability of incorporating mixed-uses, such as retail, housing or office.

Phase 1 of the study concluded with the issuance of a Preliminary Assessment Report dated July 29, 2005, which documented the consultant team's initial design work product, established physical and economic site selection criteria used for evaluating the sites, and ranked each site according to those criteria and led to the elimination of the 300 Coffman site from further consideration. In Phase 1B, the consultant team prepared concept-level site and building plans for each of four sites: 300 Kimbark, 400 Kimbark, 500 Kimbark, and 500 Coffman. The City of Longmont also asked the consultant team to study the incorporation of significant public open space into the sites, where possible. It is important to note that the 500 Coffman site is being considered assuming that the adjacent Cotton Burden property can be acquired. A second 500 Coffman site option looked at placing a structure on the entire half-block of 500 Coffman, assuming that, in addition to the Cotton Burden property, the existing Church property could be successfully acquired by the City.

Significant findings contained in the draft reports include the following:

- All four of the LDDA operated public parking lots currently under consideration can be adequately accessed by the existing street grid without causing significant traffic or neighborhood impacts. The Council and LDDA have narrowed those sites to three for further consideration: 1) 300 Kimbark; 2) 400 Kimbark; and 3) 500 Coffman.
- Market support for additional retail development in downtown is moderate. Leasing activity, while not strong, has been consistent. An evaluation of downtown retail tenants shows a net positive absorption of approximately 9,000 square feet annually for the past three years. The figure suggests that a modest retail development could be supported, assuming an extended absorption period is factored into the analysis. To help the City gauge its potential financial exposure and level of risk, the financial performance of the project has been modeled. It shows deficits in Years 1 and 2 and surpluses beginning in Year 3 assuming the project begins in 2007.
- The demand for condominium and townhouse product in Longmont is growing, both in absolute terms and as proportion of total market development. When all factors are considered, the condominium/townhome market data show a consistent record of demand. Trends indicate that the market would support a reasonably sized condominium project, 12 to 24 units, in downtown Longmont. Because the private sector is likely to respond to the merging market opportunity, the City may be more effective in its larger goals of stimulating the downtown economy by using the available resources to provide the maximum number of parking spaces.
- If the City's highest priority is economic stimulation, then the best Alternative Site option is 300 Kimbark, notwithstanding its high cost. If the City's highest priority is consideration of cost, then there are three sites clustered together that provide the best value (based on net cost per net space).

- 400 Kimbark (\$21,200 of net cost per net space) provides good value, reasonable economic development benefits, and does not require land negotiations.
- 500 Coffman (\$20,900 of net cost per net space) provides comparable value, reasonable retail and economic development potentials, and is a good option for the City if it is willing to sell its land.
- The third option is the split structure, two 200-car garages on the east and west sides of Main Street (\$21,900 of net cost per net space). While the costs are low, it does not provide any retail potentials or benefits from mixed use.
- Of the (3) options for new public open space on the Alternative sites, the 300 Kimbark site is the best location for a new outdoor public open space plaza.
- All sites include some below-grade parking in order to reach the required minimum 400 car threshold. The 300 Kimbark site includes significant at-grade public open space and therefore has parking situated fully below grade.
- The 212.5' long 500 Coffman (Option 1) site is less efficient for parking layout than the more optimum 248' long 400 Kimbark site, or the other two Kimbark sites. The 500 Coffman (Option 2) site has a 244' long structure rather than 212.5' and is accordingly more efficient.

After reviewing this information, the Council and the LDDA agreed to eliminate the 500 Kimbark site from further consideration and asked the consultants for the following information.

1. To prepare a Request for Proposals from the private sector to see what interest there is in a joint public/private project for either the 300 or 400 Kimbark or 500 Coffman sites.
2. To further analyze the 300 Kimbark site to see how it would accommodate the 400 Kimbark mixed use program and what the resulting costs would be.

### **Next Steps**

- Determine which sites should be subject to the RFP that solicits private sector interest in a joint project with the City and LDDA.
- Determine the level of City financial participation and where the funds will come from.

## **CONCLUSION**

As stated at the beginning of this report, the primary purpose is to provide the Council with information to assist in determining how to allocate resources towards the implementation of the five redevelopment efforts currently underway. The following chart was developed for the Council to see if priorities emerge based on timing and benefits of the proposed redevelopment projects. If this information is viewed as incomplete or based on several assumptions, an appropriate next step may be to seek advice from those in the private sector, citizens at large, members of the Chamber and LAEC as part of a special Task Force to help determine "community" priorities.

While all of these projects could continue on concurrent paths, priorities may be able to be established given the different partners associated with each project as well as determined by private sector initiative in any of the areas or as a result of a response to an RFP for the Downtown Parking Structure.

### **Questions to Consider:**

1. With limited staff and financial resources, which projects should be pursued first?
2. Should the focus be on projects expected to occur sooner?
3. What additional information is needed to be able to prioritize these projects?