

## **Business Loop Community Improvement District**

### **Board of Directors Annual Meeting Minutes**

601 Business Loop 70 West #128

Thursday, February 15, 2018 8:00 am

#### **Present:**

Paul Land

Lili Vianello

Gary Ennis

Vicki Kemna

James Roark-Gruender

Carrie Gartner

Russ Volmert

John Stafford

Cameron Dunafon

Mark Stevenson

Land opened the meeting. Roark-Gruender moved to accept the amended minutes, Kemna seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Gartner presented the financials and an overview of the first four months of revenues for FY18. We are running 114% of last year's sales tax revenues and are on track with property assessments. Vianello moved to accept the financials, Kemna seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

#### **New Business**

##### **Employee Retirement Program**

Gartner explained that state rules for political subdivisions recently changed and now all employees must vote to approve any retirement plan. Gartner gave a quick overview of the Simple IRA established when she was hired, approved each year as part of the budget. According to the state, this is a formal election: the board calls for it but the state runs a mail-in election. Gartner explained that the election must be held even though there is only 1 employee (see attached documents and resolution). Vianello moved to accept the resolution, Roark-Gruender seconded. Resolution passed unanimously.

##### **Computer Purchase**

Gartner explained that she has been using her personal laptop for the office since starting the job, largely as a cost-saving measure. Gravity has a Mac with a broken screen they can provide to The Loop CID for the cost of the screen replacement, approximately \$400. Purchasing the computer new would be around \$1500. (See attached documents.) Gartner made it clear that Gravity is owned by her boyfriend and wanted to make sure the board was aware of this fact as part of the decision. Kemna asked if the CID had purchased Gartner's laptop or reimbursed her for the use—the answer to both was no. Roark-Gruender commended Gartner for presenting the potential for conflict of interest to the board at a public meeting. The board determined that there was no conflict of interest and that this was an opportunity to purchase a computer at significantly below market value, reserving CID funds for other projects. Roark-Gruender moved to purchase the computer, Vianello seconded. Resolution passed unanimously.

##### **Loop Corridor Plan**

Land set aside regular order to allow members of the public in attendance to comment prior to a formal public comment section.

Roark-Gruender gave an overview of outreach to the property owners at the Garth and Rangeline intersections. While property and businesses owners were concerned about impact and had a number of critical issues to address, when asked they were supportive of moving onto the next step—a discussion of site specifics and implementation options. Gartner outlined the goal of the proposed resolution—specifically, the ability to outline the board's goals of economic vitality, cooperation with business and property owners, flexibility with the concept plan, and so forth.

Stafford explained the first goal should be to do no harm and to increase sales and property values. He expressed concern with roundabouts in general and said that stop lights allow drivers to see businesses better than a continuously moving roundabout. He also expressed concern that a median would block left turns from his driveway (Pepsi Co). Gartner clarified that the current median already blocks left turns from that driveway and a roundabout would allow for easy u-turns. Kemna also pointed out the Boone Electric's concerns about not being able to turn left out of their driveway based due to the dogbone but they have no problems.

Dunafon said a roundabout at Providence would be problematic. The board clarified that a roundabout at that intersection was not part of the plan. Dunafon said roundabouts are fine for destination businesses but will hurt impulse visits.

Land raised questions about the traffic study and why the plan shouldn't be put on hold until MODOT's traffic study is complete. Roark-Gruender explained that the current levels of traffic (as analyzed by CBB) already make the Rangeline intersection problematic and the assumption is that any additional traffic will only worsen that. The final traffic study should be done by summer and that may influence the specifics of any future implementation plan but not the overall need to upgrade the street.

Stevenson pointed out that roundabouts in Europe are a lot more attractive than those in America. He expressed concern that a plan would eliminate all access to his property on Garth. Roark-Gruender clarified that no parcel would have all access points eliminated because that would hurt businesses.

Ennis expressed his opposition to roundabouts and advocated for a left turn lane cut into the median so that customers could access his business (similar to the left turn cut ins on Broadway into Stephens Lake Park). Roark-Gruender explained that the MODOT representatives said that they won't put left turn lanes that close to an intersection for safety concerns—which is why the medians remain in the plan and roundabouts were introduced.

Stafford questioned whether we asked MODOT or the city about this plan. Gartner listed the city and MODOT employees who are on the Planning Committee. Stafford also asked for studies showing that roundabouts will not harm businesses. Gartner said she had data on the benefits of roundabouts, including economic impact, improvements to safety, better traffic management etc. and can make that available.

Vianello pointed out that while the board is discussing the plan as a concept plan with details to be worked through later with the property and business owners, the plan itself has two very specific drawings of roundabouts, making it difficult for the board to communicate the conceptual nature of the plan and their willingness to work with stakeholders on the details. She recommended a more abstract graphic showing the roundabouts but without anything that suggested a final plan.

Roark-Gruender emphasized that the plan was much more than roundabouts, and that it included stormwater management plans, an overlay or zoning changes to help development and more.

Gartner reviewed the plan of action proposed by Vianello and others to gain consensus for next steps:

- replace detailed drawings with abstract ones.
- provide documentation on economic impact of roundabouts.
- provide assurances to priority and business owners that there will be protections and that projects will require their cooperation.
- statement that the board may consider other options if the roundabout proves not to be feasible (based on the traffic study or other issues.)

Land added that the traffic engineer should attend a public meeting and explain his rationale for the roundabouts.

The board discussed the value of abstract v. specific roundabout drawings with the idea that people won't attend a public hearing unless they see a drawing that impacts their property or business. Gartner expressed concern about getting people to attend a public meeting in a manner that misrepresents our intent. Several members agreed that personal phone calls would be a good way to encourage attendance.

Gartner reviewed a second plan of action based on the discussion that included:

- provide documentation on economic impact of roundabouts.
- provide documentation on safety/traffic impact of roundabouts.
- unclear about the roundabout graphics?

Stevenson asked for data that showed what drivers look at when they are at a stop light v. a roundabout. Board members pointed out that this level of data doesn't exist.

Roark-Gruender suggested the Planning Committee gather for one more session to review the issues raised at this meeting.

#### **Director's Report**

Gartner reminded everyone that applications for the board are being accepted and the due date is May. 1.