

LDDA Board Communication

Meeting Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2021

Current Incentive Fund Availability:

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Retail Conversion: \$46,676 | Signage: \$21,582 | DIP: \$114,156 | Alleyscape: \$11,089 |
| Residential: \$34,749 | Safe Re-opening: \$6,175 | TIF: \$2,985,665 (net projected available) | |

Agenda Item: Moe’s Broadway Bagels (225 Main St) Façade/DIP and Retail Conversion Grants

Executive Summary: The owners of Moe’s Broadway Bagels purchased the vacant property at 225 Main St. The space had been vacant since 2015. They are renovating the building interior and façade and the entire lot with new landscaping, parking and outside seating. Their total project cost is \$1.1m. They are applying for the Façade/DIP and the Retail Conversion Grants. Their total Façade/DIP cost is \$66,847 plus an addition \$30,000 for a hood. Their total Retail Conversion cost is \$188,720. They are asking for the maximum for both grants, \$10,000 for Façade/DIP and \$15,000 for the Retail Conversion. They are requesting a lift of the \$10,000 Façade/DIP cap to help fund the hood.

Board Action Needed: Approve the Façade/DIP Grant for \$10,000, plus 25% of the hood cost (\$7000) for a total of \$17,000 and the Retail Conversion Grant for \$15,000.

Agenda Item: Equitable Carbon-Free Transportation Roadmap

Executive Summary: The purpose of the Equitable Carbon-Free Transportation Roadmap (ECFTR) is to pull together the different City equity and carbon-free plans in relation to the transportation sector to create one coordinated action plan that has expanded steps to reach the City’s adopted goals. This Roadmap provides direction to achieve the City’s (and, more recently, the State’s) greenhouse gas goals and create a healthy living environment that effectively engages all members of our community to create diverse, innovative solutions. In the packet, please find the plan.

Recommended Motion: Support this plan and encourage its adoption by Longmont City Council.

Agenda Item: Main Street Closure/Parklets

Executive Summary: LDDA and City of Longmont staff have been exploring options for additional outdoor space for Spring/Summer/Fall. After meeting, we outlined three options to present to businesses before we approached CDOT with solutions. Those solutions included:

1. Keep the closure similar to last year - but focus exclusively on 3rd - 6th.
2. Keep the closure similar to last year, but explore having a “frontage road-type access” to allow for cars to access parking in areas where there are not businesses utilizing the space
3. Keep both lanes of traffic open and utilize parking with “parklets” in front of businesses that can utilize the space.
4. Exclusively use alleys and close on the weekends Friday - Sunday. Provide tables and set up on a weekly basis.

Staff got pricing for pre-made parklets and reached out to a local company for design options and prices. Although many communities have been able to build wooden parklets, those would not be adequate for a state highway with the volumes and speeds of Hwy 287. Also, with the investment that is needed, using materials that are durable can allow a long life span.

Staff would like to discuss these options and discuss needs for funding.

Agenda Item: Website Accessibility Statement

Executive Summary: Website accessibility has become increasingly important over the past several years. Some high-profile lawsuits regarding website accessibility have underscored the importance of ensuring that we are taking necessary steps ensure that our website is accessible and ADA-compliant. Our new Downtown Longmont website launched in October 2020 uses up-to-date technology and was a major step to increasing our web accessibility and bringing our website into compliance. We have also installed a UserWay accessibility widget on the site which provides built-in tools to make our site more accessible for those who need it.

An additional step we would like to take is publishing an accessibility statement on our site to show that we take accessibility seriously, list the steps we've taken to improve accessibility in our website, and acknowledge accessibility shortcomings that we are aware of and will work to improve in the future. This statement was generated by using a template from the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)'s Web Accessibility Initiative, and has been vetted by our legal team.

Recommended Motion: Adopt Accessibility Statement post on website

Agenda Item: LDDA TIF policy & documents

Staff has been working on updating the TIF policy documents and scoring matrix. Based on Board feedback from the retreat, the Board will use the updated scoring matrix to score a new, test project. Before we complete this exercise, staff would like to address the following questions/concerns.

Questions:

- From time to time, the exercise of securing two bids becomes a challenge. Is the Board willing to have an exception request form if there is only one bid that can be approved by the Finance Committee?
- At the retreat, the Board asked to have the scoring matrix align with DDA values. Staff integrated items from the Downtown Master Plan of Development to align with the Boards values. Staff also integrated information from several adopted plans and policies, including affordable housing, sustainability and crime prevention through environmental design standards of the City of Longmont. Does the Board feel this new document has adequately addressed DDA values?
- Within the scoring matrix, there are a series of questions on how we quantify certain line items such as:
 - Number of for sale housing units or market rate units in a project (1? 5? More?)
 - Number of public parking spaces and/or private parking spaces added into the district (5? 10? More?)
 - How much office or retail storefront space should be added (2,000 sq feet?)
 - How many jobs should be retained (5? 10?)
- Staff added some stretch goals (additional points if higher threshold is met). Would the Board like to include any additional stretch goals to other line items?
- Would the Board like to have funding caps be 25% of residential projects and 50% of commercial projects, if projects do not meet the threshold on the scoring matrix to lift the cap?
- At what score and/or threshold does the Board consider lifting the cap on funding and contributing additional DIP funds and/or including a higher percentage of the TIF?