

**MANTORVILLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY SPECIAL MEETING
PLANNING AND ZONING SPECIAL MEETING **
PARK BOARD SPECIAL MEETING **
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2008
7:00 PM CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

1. **EDA meeting called to Order** – at 7:03 by J Gall. Commissioners present: Nash, Huppler, Olive, Neseth, Swanson
Absent: Jencks

Also attending: Cresta Melcher and Ann Tuma who are members of the Park Board and David Dripps and Jodie Starch, who are members of the Planning and Zoning Commission. This represented a quorum of the Planning and Zoning Commission (Starch, Dripps, Nash), although no action was planned or taken by the P&Z Commission for this meeting.

2. **Approval of Minutes** of July 23, 2008
Motion to approve: Olive/Nash passed by vv

3. **Old Business**

- a) **RFP/Property Committee Report –**

Karl Huppler reported on behalf of the RFP/Property Committee, including the attached presentation. The presentation was worded by the committee as an EDA opinion and the EDA was asked to approve the presentation to go forward to the City Council.

[Secretary note: The following discussion points will make more sense if the attached presentation is reviewed first.]

Discussion was opened to the EDA members:

Swanson: One of Mantorville's strengths is our great parks.

Olive: The country will work its way out of this economic slump and we should be ready when it does.

Gall: I think the package that has been put together is a good one.

Swanson: I'd like to see this work go to a local developer, if possible

Huppler: We need to research the rules under which an EDA can operate, but I think that an EDA might be able to show preference for a local developer under the umbrella of economic development, where an entity like the City would need to allow a completely open bidding process.

Olive: Another thing we can do as an EDA is place a time limit on action by the developer and pull the sale back if the action isn't taken.

Neseth: Yes, we found that out when investigating what could be done with the lots on 4th Street.

Swanson: I like Plan B, but I would prefer to see the bike trail follow the tree line along the east edge

Motion to open discussion to the public (Huppler/Nash)

Motion passed by vv

Melcher: From the perspective of the Park Board, there is no problem with this plan. We need to ensure that the baseball and soccer field spaces are maintained, but there should be plenty of room to do this and work in the proposed trail.

Dripps: The committee has done a good job. I like option B and sharing the proposed new roadway with the trail in the low traffic area. We need something that can increase our property tax base. I'm concerned with the proposal to wait until 2010 for the sale. We need to stimulate the economy now. I also think that the figure of \$40-\$45K per lot, that was mentioned, is too high. We may need to drop the price to get the lots sold.

Olive: That was a ballpark figure. The actual price will be set later in the process.

Huppler: The proposed lots are larger than normal, have a housing district with very large lots immediately to their west and a city park immediately to their south, so they should be priced higher than a standard lot.

Neseth: We can work with a realtor to determine appropriate pricing of properties such as this, based on other properties that have been sold in the area

Dripps: There aren't many building lots in Mantorville to compare to

Starch: There are ways to make adjustments when comparing lots in other communities.

Melcher: We don't want to just give away prime land

Dripps: Some towns do just that

Huppler: There is space for 5 lots, if we want to go with the standard lot size

Tuma: We want to have attractive lot sizes

Swanson: I think the city should pay for part of the survey, since they will keep the park property on the south side

Huppler: That is a motion that we should take at the end of this discussion

Olive: We should just survey the total proposed property and establish the road easements. A developer should survey the individual lots

???: You should also establish the lot lines for the existing homes on that block to make sure there are no surprises for the people who live there. Some of them may have sheds that extend slightly off of their property.

Starch: We can't speak for the entire Planning and Zoning Commission; we can only give individual opinions. The property will need to be surveyed before the Planning and Zoning Commission can give an approval. Personally, I like the trail proposal but not the roadway in Plan B. The P&Z agenda for October 20th is filled with work on the Comprehensive Plan updates. A special meeting would incur a cost of \$280

Huppler: I know that neither the Park Board nor the Planning and Zoning Commission members can give official approval of this proposal, but does anyone have a reason that would prevent us from delivering this to the City Council on October 13th? ["no"s all around]

Motion to close the public discussion (Huppler/Swanson)

Motion passed by vv

Motion (Olive/Swanson) to make the following request of the city:

The Mantorville EDA requests that the city deed land owned by the City between Jefferson and Chestnut streets, bordered on the south by the street easement of 9th Street and on the north side up to 180 feet north of that line. Development of this property will be used in support of future economic development projects in accordance with the EDA charter.

Discussion –

Nash: This is for the 4 lots, but what about the other lots?

Olive: That is part of the next motion.

Huppler: What we will do with the properties will be a part of the next motion.

Nash: From the city's standpoint, what will be done is the important part.

Motion passed vv

Three points from the presentation follow:

- The EDA feels there are several good options for the requested land and the space owned by the City that is north of these properties.
 - We propose
 - dividing the requested property into 4 building sites that are approximately 85' X 120' (plus the street easement space),
 - retaining space for a cycle/pedestrian path that would allow off-street communication between Mantor Field and future green space around the water tower and could potentially connect to a future city path system
- The EDA would like to sell all 4 building lots to a General Contractor at the same time.
 - The sale posting would likely be issued early in 2010. We do not feel it prudent to sell these properties in the current market
 - The advantage of a single sale is that the EDA only has to sell once, and the Developer would manage the properties and associated services such as sewer and water
 - The disadvantage is that the EDA might not get as much money because all would be sold at a time when the market could still be depressed
- The EDA would like the City to consider planning and selling the entire city-owned space on this block to a developer (except the property surrounding the water tower)
 - The advantages of this course of action are that it would provide additional funds for the use by the City, the Park Board and the EDA, without straining the tax base of the city, and it should be more attractive to a developer (10-15 lots versus 4)
 - However, this was not a part of the original proposal and it would lock this space into a specific development plan that needs to be considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council

Motion to approve the EDA position on the above points (Swanson/Neseth)

Discussion: This should be presented to the City prior to the first motion

Motion passes by vv with one Nay

Explanation of Nay: I'm not sure that this is something that specifically needs to be presented

Motion to request the City to share cost of survey of Ninth Street between Jefferson and Chestnut. (Nash/Olive)

Motion passed vv

Motion to approve delivery of this package to City Council (Olive/Swanson)

Motion passed vv

b) Budget Discussion

Jen Gall sent a letter to the Council, outlining EDA financial requests and potential expenditures. EDA is currently penciled into the 2009 budget for \$15,000, but this could certainly change. Preliminary City budget must be done by mid December, but the final amount will likely not be decided until late December. EDA can prioritize projects and expenditures, but cannot commit these items until the final budget is known. Jen's letter focused on four main priorities in 2009:

- 1) Exploring partnering with the SE MN Business Development Corporation for future economic development of the city (using new budget funds)
- 2) Pursuing the development of EDA-owned land and land planned to be owned by the EDA in the future (for future development projects, but requires initial investment)

- 3) Development of the tourism industry in Mantorville, including accepting oversight of the Tourism Board (using new budget funds) (proposing partnering with City on 9th St survey, since the immediate south side will be city park and the immediate north side is proposed to be EDA land.)
- 4) Closure on current and new sign projects associated with Mantorville (using existing EDA funds)

Luke Nash mentioned that the City will likely view budget requests more favorably if they can see a plan for where current funds are expected to be allocated.

Karl Huppler suggested that we review the Comprehensive Plan request from the P&Z to ensure that we set our priorities properly. Jen proposed that this be the focus of the October 7th meeting, followed by an additional budget discussion

- c) **Summary of additional items from a September 2, 2008 meeting** that was not accepted as an official meeting of the EDA:

Gems of Mantorville:

Motion to affirm John Olive and Alonzo Edgerton as the current and past Gems of Mantorville, respectively (Gall/Nash) Passed 5-0-1

Discussion of Dodge County EDA forum: Jen will forward a summary to EDA membership and the City for filing.

Sign Committee report (as of September 2):

The MNDoT approval was received on August 19th. To date, no permit has been issued from the city offices. A myriad of questions have been asked and answered, and at this point there are no known issues. One frustration is that many of the questions and requirements (such as hiring an independent engineer to evaluate the strength of the sign, designed by a professional sign company) came up after the process had started, rather than at the beginning, which caused delays in moving the project forward. The mayor has now become involved and hopes are high that a permit will be issued soon. At this point, it is questionable whether the signs, which are complete and ready to install, can be installed by Marigold Days.

Other sign business: Electrical and landscaping work has been deferred to place the highest priority on getting the base signs up. Since electrical work will not be completed by September 30th, a new MNDoT permit is required for the south sign. A&A electric has committed to do this at cost.

Landscaping can be done at any time as long as the berm near the south sign is maintained. MNDoT needs to see plans for any physical planters before they go in, so that portion of the project is also deferred.

Financial Report – As of September 2nd 2008

Jane reported a beginning balance of \$13,187.74 and an end-of-July balance of \$9452.07, which includes debits of \$3136.75 for Precision Signs and \$600 for the Stagecoach Motorcycle Ride, and interest of \$1.08.

We also have a \$20,000 + interest CD that has been maintained at the Citizens State Bank.

We will owe an additional \$3136.75 to Precision Signs once they are installed.

It was noted that neither the EDA nor the MRA were recognized as sponsors for the Stagecoach Ride. A question was asked whether the Stagecoach Ride was expected to return the funds provided by the EDA. The motion passed in May 2008 to provide funding stipulated that the EDA expected repayment of \$100 for each \$1000 "after-expense" funds earned by the event, up to a maximum repayment of \$300 of the \$600 total that was provided by the EDA.

Motion to approve the Financial Report (Huppler/Gall)

Motion passed vv

Additional Budget Discussion: The following discussion took place on September 2nd and was reviewed at the September 29th meeting. No action was taken on the discussion:

Recognizing that the 2009 budget has not been set, there is an indication that current budget proposals include the potential for \$15,000 for the EDA in 2009. It is possible that this will be contingent on the assumption that the EDA take over the responsibilities of the Mantorville City Tourism Board – a function that has been approved by the City Council since last year, but is not staffed.

Jane mentioned that Mantorville does not intend to take the community development route of other communities (light manufacturing, heavy manufacturing, major housing expansion, agribusiness). This has been expressed in several surveys of community members and leaders. Mantorville's industry is tourism. It might be an appropriate role of the EDA to take on the Tourism Bureau responsibilities and to use City budget funds and monies obtained through sale of EDA-owned land to focus on that role.

Other suggestions for EDA priorities were brought forward by Jamie. A suggestion was for a rotating loan fund that would help spruce up buildings in town. There could also be a possibility of designing the fund in such a way that part of the loan could be forgiven over time. A part of this could be to help the businesses with signage to improve the overall town image.

Possibilities for a tourism function are:

- 1) hiring a part time person to focus on tourism
- 2) hiring a part time person with the job description to recruit volunteer and academic workers and coordinate their time to improve Mantorville's focus on tourism
- 3) creating a community board that is overseen by the EDA, but takes action on their own
- 4) some combination of the above

An advantage of the EDA taking this role is that we would be in control of the expenditures of money spent on behalf of tourism in Mantorville. Another advantage would be to set definite expectations in other groups for what services can be received from the EDA and what services won't be possible.

Another point made was that a "Tourism Bureau" needs to have a place to call home. It needs to have a strong relationship with the Welcome Center and other groups in the city.

Karl mentioned that before we take on these responsibilities, we need to ensure that they are within the boundaries of the EDA's charter and authority. By all appearances, this should be the case, but we need to make sure.

Additional budget and tourism discussion from September 29th

Need to have someone who can take charge of things like bus groups that come to town and who want to tour the town

Question: Is anyone concerned with the formation of yet another group, since the same people tend to volunteer for everything?

Answer: The City already formed it; This is a discussion of how to make it happen.

Question: Is it best organized through the EDA? Or through another organization with financial support of the EDA.

Answers – subcommittee oversight, paid employee,

Comment – Is it oversight or overkill? Need to strike that balance. Could not have oversight from all involved, need to focus employer/employee relationship.

Question: Can the EDA have employees? Need to research, but probably.

4. New Business

a) Requirements from City Council for EDA operating procedures

Jen Gall reported on this topic:

Agendas need to be posted by the Friday prior to each meeting. Meetings have to be publicized three full days ahead of time. Meetings are scheduled for the first Tuesday of the month at 7:00. Our bylaws state that EDA Commissioners must notify the President if they are not available for a meeting.

Subset discussion: The reason we shifted from 2 meetings a month to 1 meeting was the idea that each Commissioner and community volunteers would also spend time in subcommittee. Current subcommittees are (including new assignments for some members):

- i. Property/RFP (Karl with Jane and Jamie)
- ii. Signage (Jane with Jamie and Karl and a host of community people)
- iii. Planning (Jen with Jane and Tammy)
- iv. Welcome Packet (Jamie with Don)

Tammy asked if we should form a Tourism research committee. Jen suggested that this should be wrapped into the planning committee work until a firm decision is made for the EDA to become actively involved as the focal point for the Tourism Bureau

b) EDA Commissioner Appointments, for review

We need to continue to think about others in the community who would be good candidates for the EDA. Jen Gall's term expires in April and it is her intention not to request a new term. Jane mentioned that it would be good to have someone from the banking industry. Luke mentioned that the mandatory criterion needs to be someone who can come to the meetings and actively participate. Tammy mentioned that we all want to help the city, but we have to realize that we may respectfully disagree, at times.

Jen's term expires April 2009

Karl's April 2010

Tammy's April 2011

Don's April 2013
Jane's April 2014
Luke and Jamie are EDA representatives from the City

5. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn (Huppler/Gall) passed vv at 9:20PM

***** The EDA has invited Planning and Zoning and the Park Board to this meeting for land discussions. This notice provides for a possible quorum of that committee.***

Attachment: Ninth Street Property Proposal 092908.pdf