



Meeting Minutes: July 6, 2023, 7:30 a.m.

City of Moscow Council Chambers • 206 E 3rd Street • Moscow, ID 83843

Commissioners Present	Staff in Attendance
Steve McGeehan, Chair	Cody Riddle, Executive Director
Mark Beauchamp	Jennifer Fleischman, Clerk
Sandra Kelly	
Maureen Laflin	
Tom Lamar	
Alison Tompkins	
Nancy Tribble	

McGeehan called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

1. Consent Agenda (A)

Any item will be removed from the consent agenda at the request of any member of the Board and that item will be considered separately later.

A. Minutes from June 15, 2023

Tompkins moved for approval of the consent agenda as written, seconded by Lamar. Roll Call Vote; Ayes: Unanimous (7). Nays: None. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

2. Public Comment

Members of the public may speak to the Board regarding matters NOT on the Agenda nor currently pending before the Moscow Urban Renewal Agency. Please state your name and resident city for the record and limit your remarks to three minutes.

None.

3. Legacy Crossing Development Proposal Presentations (A)

The two development teams that submitted responses to the recent Request for Proposals will present their designs, market analysis, and project pro forma to the Board for consideration and scoring.

Riddle informed the Board that one of the applicants, Aaron Wrench, has withdrawn his proposal for consideration and there would only be one presentation. The Chair reminded the Public that discussion and comments regarding the presentation is limited to Board members only, as this is not a Public Hearing.

Carly Lilly and George Skandalos introduced themselves and provided a brief review of their presentation materials, including some additional images that were not in the original submission packet. There was more information provided about their proposed low-income housing and the office spaces on the second floor. The Board and respondents discussed the lease arrangements for offices and conference rooms.

The residential units would be rentals and not condominiums. The respondents would be agreeable to having terms in a contract to require a certain number of low-income housing units for a set number of years. The reduced residential rental income was already calculated into the provided pro forma. There would be elevators in the building, but who would have access to the terrace is still under consideration, depending on how the plans are finalized.

Lilly and Skandalos proposed an option that allowed for more parking to meet the requirements, which would eliminate some of the public open space. The Board agreed that maximizing open space was ideal, and would rather the developers provide the missing six parking spaces off-site near US Bank, of which the respondents own 25 parking spaces. It was asked if the respondents have considered adding electric charging stations and/or parking spaces for the residential units. The bicycle racks will be solar-powered and wired to charge e-bikes. Staff reiterated that any reduction in parking would require City approval, and that if denied, the project would need to be modified to fully comply with ordinance standards.

The respondents did not add balconies to the residential units because they tend to be used as unsightly storage space for the tenants, and they want to keep the exterior of the building pleasant for passers-by. Most of the windows will be operable, however, to create a more dynamic and accessible exterior. The developers would prefer to have ingredients grown on-site for the restaurant, but that would depend on the feasibility of the plans as the space is developed. Lilly and Skandalos will be exploring the possibility of adding a basement for storage or other uses, but it would depend on the engineering for the property, since it used to be in a floodplain.

The respondents talked about their contingency plans and the costs of the work they have put into their designs, as well as why they work with their current development company. As far as the proposed timeline, they are ready to proceed immediately and want to get the contract signed. The meeting on July 20th would hold a vote on acceptance of the proposal and the Board could then direct staff to draft the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement. The Board discussed the possibility of voting on the proposal today, which would make the process that much further along. There was a lengthy conversation regarding the established timeline and whether the Board should make a vote on the proposal or wait until the second meeting in July.

Tompkins moved for acceptance of the Lilly/Skandalos proposal and directed staff to prepare the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA). The motion was seconded by Laflin. Some of the Board still had concerns about approving the proposal ahead of schedule, without another meeting for discussion and review. Riddle provided a brief outline of the agreement timeline and the process that would still need to be followed. Roll Call Vote; Ayes: Kelly, Laflin, Lamar, McGeehan, Tompkins, Tribble (6). Nays: None. Abstentions: Beauchamp (1). Motion carried.

4. General Agency Updates – Cody Riddle

- *General Agency business*

None.

McGeehan declared the meeting adjourned at 8:47 a.m.



Steve McGeehan, Agency Chair



Date