

**Minutes  
Downtown TIF Advisory Board Meeting  
February 17, 2021, 1:00 p.m.  
Via Zoom Meeting Platform**

**Board Members Present:**

Andy Shirtliff, Chair  
Brian Obert, Vice Chair  
Charlie Carson  
Lori Ladas  
Krys Holmes  
Kali Kind  
Jennifer Deherrera  
Lee Shubert  
Riley Tubbs  
Nathan Bilyeu

**Staff Present:**

Sharon Haugen, Community Development Director  
Ellie Ray, Planner II  
Stefani Reinhardt, Administrative Assistant III

**Non-Board Members:**

Micky Zurcher, BID Director  
Rex Seeley

**Member of the Board Absent:**

Hannah VanHoose  
William Greiner  
Tatum Curtis  
Andrew Chananian

**Call to Order:**

Chair Shirtliff opened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. and roll call was taken with a quorum of nine (9) was noted – Nathan Bilyeu joined after the budget and revenues discussion making the quorum ten (10).

**Discussion Topics: Discussion of Budget and Revenues**

City staff updated the board on the budget and revenues (Attachment A) confirming the URD's current balance was \$225,542.00. This amount will not be replenished until November 1, 2021.

**Discussion Topics: Review and Deliberate All Four (4) DT URD Applications**

1. Consistory Shrine Temple Association - \$25,000 Requested in TIF Funds

Chair Shirtliff opened the floor for discussion on the first application for the Consistory Shrine Temple Association. Since Brian Obert was the point of contact for this application, Director Sharon Haugen reminded him he would have to abstain from both the discussion as a board member and the potential motion that could follow.

Riley Tubbs asked the applicant if there had ever been a feasibility study done to the building in the past. Mr. Obert confirmed there had been a study that looked at the physical and structural durability of the building, however it did not look at it's potential for reuses. Mr. Tubbs expressed hesitation in funding another feasibility study citing these types of studies have been common in the past within the City of Helena but then ultimately get shelved.

Charlie Carson agreed that the Consistory Shrine Temple was an underutilized building within the downtown and asked the applicant if there were any immediate plans for the structure once the feasibility study was completed. Mr. Obert

explained that it was their intention to repurpose the building in a way that would either keep under the care of the masons or sell the property to a private entity who would own the building and push more economic activity through that space.

Krys Holmes informed the group that Kal Poole from Grandstreet Theatre has shown a lot of interest in utilizing this space. Ms. Holmes stated she felt comfortable voting in favor of this application given the applicant's offer to match the contribution by 100% and due to how difficult raising money for a feasibility study can be.

Kali Kind asked the applicant if the current building occupants had funding readily available to pursue potential projects that could emerge as a result from the feasibility study. Mr. Obert confirmed there was not funding available directly from the masons, but MBAC was going to do a Brownfield assessment on the building to record all of its existing blemishes with the motivation being to show the business plan for someone else to own the building.

Ms. Kind followed up by asking if the study included environmental assessments and Mr. Obert explained the study in question does not, but MBAC will get a separate phase I and phase II on the building that will include an environmental assessment.

Riley Tubbs expressed his support for this proposal and stated he believed it would present a good opportunity to bring more business into the downtown area. Mr. Tubbs stated he himself has had projects come up in the past and felt the Consistory Shrine Temple would serve as a great location but was unable to utilize it due to its current limitations.

Nathan Bilyeu asked the group if they knew what the holdup was for the referenced feasibility studies that had been conducted in the past.

Kali Kind stated when it related to the Helena School District, it ultimately comes down to lack of funding. She explained that abatement work as well as demolition costs are very expensive. Mr. Obert also listed timing as a factor. He said that his office and the City generally plan these types of projects out years in advance whereas the public tends to look for activities that can come together over night. So, the shelved studies do tend to get reverted back to, but it tends to be three to five years after the fact.

Rex Seeley, a local member of the public offered some insight from a local developing standpoint. Mr. Seeley stated that when it comes to redeveloping old buildings such as the Consistory Shrine Temple, there are a lot of fees associated with the project. For example, code modifications and plumbing improvements. In conclusion, Mr. Seeley suggested the City form a partnership with local developers to help alleviate the costs associated with updating an older building.

Nathan Bilyeu asked the applicant if the feasibility study would identify potential code issues or whether a variance would be necessary for the project. Mr. Obert confirmed it would and described the feasibility study as creating a business plan for potential future uses that would address what would need to be brought up to code in order to accomplish that use.

Chair Shirtliff added that like the feasibility study, the Montana Economic Developers Association does a similar assessment that takes into account the community's future wants/needs and then determines a price point to achieve those goals.

No further discussion about this application.

2. Seeley Building LLC - \$53,592.00 Requested in TIF Funds

Chair Shirtliff opened the floor for discussion on the second application for the Seeley Building. The application is proposing improved sidewalks/pathways, added multi-family dwellings within the district, and will include a healthcare facility on the main floor.

Vice Chair Obert stated the application addressed every established downtown plan in some form and that this type of application is what the board set out looking for in terms of encouraging further development in the area.

Chair Shirtliff asked Vice Chair Obert if there had been further interest by investors now that the Seeley building had begun construction. Vice Chair Obert confirmed there had been additional interest in the area such as the old Independent Record building and stated it was common to see an increase of other interested developers once large projects began to occur.

Charlie Carson asked Vice Chair Obert if he knew whether the interested parties were local or out of state developers. Vice Chair Obert stated he knew of two local developers, one out of Bozeman, and one out of state.

The applicant, Rex Seeley further explained his application. He stated there has been some questions on whether they would be successful in their effort, however confirmed all units have been leased once construction concludes. Mr. Seeley stated there were other developers watching their project closely due to it adhering to both the Master Downtown plan and the new Downtown zoning standards of which he spoke in support of. In addition to putting in the standard sidewalks, curb cuts and gutters, Mr. Seeley added they will also be adding landscape such trees, walkway lighting, a bus shelter, and paving the back alley that will include drainage.

Lee Shubert spoke in support of the project citing it was a positive signal to other developers that the City would be in support of new development in the Downtown urban area. Mr. Shubert cautioned that if there was not support for the project, then it could result in a negative signal.

Lori Ladas spoke in support of the proposal citing access to PureView in this area was a positive contribution to the community.

Riley Tubbs concurred with the previous statements and added this update will also draw more activity from the highway to the downtown corridor.

Chair Shirtliff also agreed with the previous statements and added that he believed in "growing from within" citing if the City was going to grow, then the downtown was the area they should be growing. Referring back to Mr. Shubert's comments about sending a positive signal to other business owners, Chair Shirtliff added this would also help cast Helena as a business friendly city. Chair Shirtliff also agreed

with Mr. Tubbs statements that it would inspire more people to visit and stay in Downtown Helena.

3. Placer Building - \$77,800 Requested in TIF Funds

Chair Shirliff opened the floor for discussion on the first application for the Placer Building. Since Lee Shubert was the point of contact for this application, he had to abstain from both the discussion as a board member and the potential motion that could follow.

Jennifer Deherrera asked the applicant if there was a way to only fund a certain number of doors now, and then when more funding becomes available the TIF could consider funding the remaining doors. The applicant, Lee Shubert directed the board to the match waiver request included in his application that explained due to the building having approximately \$700,000 in restoration costs, in addition to them still paying off a previous restoration project from 2016 for the building's cornis, they simply do not have the funding available. Though Mr. Shubert confirmed that yes, they could only do a set number of doors to begin with and confirmed that if TIF funding was not approved for this project then that would likely be the next plan of action. However, Mr. Shubert said it would take roughly 16 years to complete the project due to their current sources of income and level of resources. Mr. Shubert went on to say they fully anticipated they would not be able to obtain the required funding to restore the inter-atrium decks that form the means of ingress and egress for the condominium units on floors 3-7. In conclusion, Mr. Shubert stated it was a question of whether the building's appearance on the pedestrian walking mall was something of importance to the Downtown Urban Renewal District.

Chair Shirliff asked the applicant how they were able to acquire the necessary funding to restore the building's cornis in 2016. Mr. Shubert confirmed roughly \$250,000 was borrowed from Rocky Mountain Bank and the building board has been paying it off with roughly three years remaining on the loan.

Krys Holmes stated that if the board took into account all the building owner's investment in the Placer to date, there is a huge match. Ms. Holmes acknowledges they were asking to waive the match requirement for the proposed door restoration project, but they are also investing a huge amount of money into the building. Ms. Holmes also reminded the board that not only was it a historical restoration issue, but it was also a public safety issue.

Riley Tubbs spoke in opposition to the proposal citing he was having a difficult time justifying this type of project with the standards that the TIF has established for eligible TIF projects. Mr. Tubbs said he looks at each project as a potential headline in the local newspaper and what the TIF is funding. Though he loves Helena's historical buildings, he views this proposal as an HOA issue. Mr. Tubbs stated there was funding available through the banks to get this project completed and added that since the individual office spaces are privately owned, then it they could be privately funded updates.

Lee Shubert explained that the individual office spaces were not privately owned but are actually owned by the building under the Placer Commercial LLC. Mr.

Shubert added that the condominium homeowners have solely been undertaking this expense on their own. Mr. Shubert addressed Mr. Tubbs first point as well by clarifying that there is no provision in the TIF statute for historic restoration and was advised that there have been a number of grants funded by TIF funding in the past for historic restoration projects.

Director Haugen clarified that most of the restoration on historical buildings have been done based on public health and safety with regard to TIF funds.

Riley Tubbs acknowledged Director Haugen's statement and added that his interpretation was that TIF funds were used for historical restoration projects that address public safety and he did not see a public safety hazard with the windows in this proposal.

Chair Shirliff asked Krys Holmes to elaborate on her earlier statements regarding public safety. Ms. Holmes reminded the board that there was no emergency egress through those 2<sup>nd</sup> floor doors if they are not operatable, and that was part of the rationale for wanting to replace these doors. Ms. Holmes offered a scenario of the building being on fire and occupants having to escape the building by means of those 2<sup>nd</sup> story doors. Ms. Holmes also addressed the potential negative effects if the windows and doors were replaced with something more modern and metal, citing:

- it would not add anything to the downtown and could even detract from the downtown's attractiveness;
- reduce the property owner's ability to lease those office spaces; and
- could also result in the removal of the Placer Building from the National Historic Register.

Nathan Bilyeu acknowledged it was a good project but recognized Mr. Tubb's stance as important for the board to recognize "what latitude" they must recommend these particular projects and then ultimately let the City Attorney determine if the project fell within the board's eligible activities. Mr. Bilyeu directed the board to item number 5 under their eligible activities which states cost incurred in connection with the redevelopment activities allowed under 7-15-4233, MCA – under subsection 1.d includes costs to undertake and carryout urban renewal projects as required by the local governing body. Mr. Bilyeu assumed the reference to a "local governing body" referred to the adoption of an urban renewal plan and then, historical restoration could be an improvement contemplated under it. Mr. Bilyeu stated he believed "this gets most of the way there with it being an urban renewal project which is one of the things that is contemplated under the TIF funding. We do have an urban renewal plan, we have an urban renewal district... but as required by the local governing body, I do not know exactly what that means. But I think if we wanted to do the project, we could at least recommend it subject to our understanding that it is an allowable cost." Mr. Bilyeu concluded by stating whatever they recommend, it will ultimately be reviewed by the City Commission and/or the City Attorney.

Krys Holmes asked the applicant if all the offices located on the second story were rented citing one of the Goals of the Downtown URD was bringing new business to the

downtown, and these restorations could enhance the desirability of renting those units. Mr. Shubert confirmed all the offices were presently rented. Ms. Holmes went on to point out that additional item's goals being met were:

- Encourage the update and adaptive re-use of buildings for 21<sup>st</sup> century needs, such as open Interiors, Improvements to broadband, and for safety and market competitiveness; and
- Facilitate façade improvements.

Krys Holmes spoke in support of recommending this project and said the project did set a positive precedent for activating downtown office space as well as economic activity. In conclusion, Ms. Holmes stated she did not feel this project fell outside of the scope of the Boards list of eligible activities.

Riley Tubbs asked staff for further clarification citing that though the project met some of the Goals of the Downtown URD, it did not necessarily meet the Eligible Activities under TIF that are mandated by the City. Mr. Tubbs asked staff to further examine if this was a public safety hazard and suggested there be some form of proof included. Mr. Tubbs went on to say, "right now, we are just going off the idea that they can't open their windows which I have not heard the functionality of the windows is deteriorating. I have heard the aesthetics of the windows are deteriorating. But I could be wrong." In addition, Mr. Tubbs addressed the applicant's earlier statement of the office spaces not being privately owned but rather owned by the Placer Commercial LLC, and argued that if they are owned by an LLC, that would still mean they are privately owned.

The applicant addressed Mr. Tubbs and stated that he thought he was insinuating the office spaces were owned by the occupants themselves. Mr. Shubert confirmed the office spaces were not privately owned by the occupants but were leased out to them.

Mr. Tubbs apologized and clarified he was suggesting the office spaces were privately owned by an entity other than the building.

Nathan Bilyeu commented that this may not be the last application the board could receive where further research may be needed to determine if it meets every statute. Mr. Bilyeu stated he did not feel comfortable making a determination without doing further legal research in order to qualify as eligible TIF spending, which he felt was not the boards position to look into. He said, "my first glance impression is that it does and this would qualify. But, for this project and any others which in the future we're excited about but aren't comfortable that we have an authoritative final decision of whether it can legally be financed." Mr. Bilyeu asked staff if it would be appropriate to make a motion to recommend the project subject to a determination by the City Attorney's Office for review of eligibility.

Director Haugen confirmed the board could certainly add that as a condition to the motion.

Nathan Bilyeu stated he would be very interested to hear City Attorney, Thomas Jodoin's opinion regarding specifically subsection number 5 citing it seemed to be the one with the most "open ended." Mr. Bilyeu suggested the City Attorney either draft a memo that outlines the scope of projects that can be financed as represented by subsection number 5 or confirm if his office will always review any referral made by the board to ensure it meets the legal requirements.

Director Haugen explained that an email outlining the request could be sent to her and then she can route it to the City Attorney's office and provide an update at the next meeting. She confirmed the City Attorney has been reviewing the TIF applications that have been recommended in the past on a case-by-case basis.

Nathan Bilyeu thanked Director Haugen and stated it would be a shame for the board to deny the application because they do not know if they have the authority to only find out the City Attorney determines it to be acceptable.

Director Haugen suggested the board members voting today do so on the merits and values of the applications and stated "the reality is you have a tough decision where you got more requests than you have money. So, I think that is the tougher part of your job today."

Chair Shirtliff thanked Mr. Bilyeu for his suggestions and concurred it would be nice to have some guidance regardless of how they vote today. The Chair returned to Krys Holmes' earlier comments about egress concerning public safety and asked the applicant if there was a current concern for public safety that may not meet fire code.

The applicant explained he "could not specifically address the fire code, but there are doors among the façade that do not work and you would have to break them open. I suspect the Fire Marshall may have some issues with that. It has never been raised at this point. But like anything else the doors are glass and if you had to you could put a chair through the doors to get out. But the ability to open the doors is not necessarily totally functional at this juncture."

Director Haugen informed the board that since this determination was regarding the spending of public money, the Fire Marshall would certainly be inspecting and then followed up by saying he would be inspecting regardless.

Riley Tubbs asked the applicant if any of the subject doors were deemed fire exits or were there stair ways leading off of the balcony.

The applicant confirmed there were not stair ways leading off the balconies, however several are on street level.

Riley Tubbs stated that he would think that if the City approved the Placer as a building with fire exits then they'd be its main exits.

Director Haugen confirmed staff could certainly check with the Fire Marshall and see when the building was last inspected.

Chair Shirtliff inquired if the balconies were indeed useable and capable of holding people on them.

The applicant directed the board to a photo of the building included in their application that showed several balconies with HVAC units sitting atop them.

Addressing the same photo, Riley Tubbs stated "if these are not fire escapes, it still makes it harder for me to understand how this is a public safety hazard, and I am sorry to be the bearer of bad news. But this one is hard for me. I'm sorry."

Krys Holmes stated she understood the concerns about precedent and making sure the board is funding project within their scope. However, she stated she "would be very disappointed if the board turned out to be a sidewalk and concrete wall funding organization if we are not going to help tangible downtown assets flourish and blossom that do contribute to our downtown economic vitality. I'm just really hoping we can get these questions answered to support this kind of a project."

Nathan Bilyeu informed Director Haugen that he was drafting an email that could be sent to the City Attorney. Mr. Bilyeu said he "would expect that this would qualify under subsection 5 which says, costs incurred in connection with the redevelopment activities under 7-15-4233 (MCA) which includes then Urban Renewal Projects." Per the "as required by the local governing body," Mr. Bilyeu believed that would mean as identified as needing improvements in the Urban Renewal Plan. Mr. Bilyeu said, "because almost never are you going to have an Urban Renewal Project that is required by law that you are considering. It is more like an ordinance or non-compliance issue. So, I would suspect that this fits. This is sort of right in the heart of the kind of project that subsection 5 of the statute on what we can finance is envisioning." Mr. Bilyeu said he would still send the email but suggested those who are in favor of the proposal still vote and should it pass, then condition the motion to have the City Attorney conduct an independent analysis to verify if this project falls within the board's scope of eligible activities. Should the City Attorney decide this project does not meet the criteria for approval of TIF funds, Mr. Bilyeu suggested reallocating the potential \$6,000 in funding that was not awarded, then be awarded to whichever application did not receive their full asking amount.

Director Haugen concurred with Mr. Bilyeu's suggestions and stated the real issue before this board is, they have a set amount of money and "you've got more project than you've got money." Director Haugen confirmed staff could certainly get clarification, however the real question for the board would ultimately be how to allocate the funds they do have.

Chair Shirtliff addressed Ms. Holmes' earlier statement regarding sidewalks and concrete walls, he concurred that was a concern of his as well. The Chair expressed his support in maintaining and growing the downtown's economy as well as encouraging development in the downtown. He stated, "the Placer Building is absolutely historic. It is one hundred and four or five years old. President John F. Kennedy stayed there in the 60s. I know there are a lot of businesses I've been in up there on the second floor and



I've always looked at those windows and wondered why I never see people out there." The Chair spoke in appreciation for the banks being utilized in the building's previous restoration projects, the fact that it was a historic building, and how the façade improvements could positively impact the businesses within. The Chair went on to say, "if this was something where there was an emergency where businesses were pulling up stakes and saying we won't leave unless you fix these doors. That was one consideration if that were the case, but we are not hearing that. But then you look at the interior, the first and second floor of the mezzanine and that beautiful space. I don't know if that is rented out or if people can just call up the condo association or commercial business and say we would like to hold an event there. Because you look at old photos and that is a beautiful spot that use to bring people together and there have been businesses in there. That would have been something that would have really helped the economic vitality of the Downtown and the building. But I hear about the bank and wonder about national historic restoration funds. I looked and somewhere they will give you between \$500 - \$500,000 and there is also fundraising that could be done." The Chair suggested putting together a sort of funding package that might include fundraising, bank loans and matched funds.

Jennifer Deherrera questioned whether the Placer could front the money and then the TIF could reimburse them. If so, then Ms. Deherrera asked the applicant how they would pay for it if the TIF funds reimbursed them. Mr. Shubert confirmed they would have to do it in small increments between \$3,000 - \$5,000 so long as they get reimbursed. Mr. Shubert also stated that he believed their contractor, Joshua Tree would be open to submitting an invoice for a couple doors at a time and then the building could submit for an increment of reimbursement from the City.

No further discussion by the board.

4. 734 N. Last Chance Gulch - \$75,000 Requested in TIF Funds

Chair Shirtliff opened the floor for discussion on the fourth application for the property located at 734 N. Last Chance Gulch. The Chair reminded the board that this project would remodel of the Danzer's Paint Store that will become the future Dowling Architects Office. The remodel will provide space for up to ten (10) employees both within the architectural office and an adjacent 1,100 s.f. lease space, as well as a three bedroom apartment on the second floor.

Riley Tubbs expressed his support for the project citing it was a really good continuation the corridor from the highway to the downtown. Mr. Tubbs stated the TIF funds would be helping fund a façade, sidewalk and landscaping as well.

Vice Chair Obert expressed his support for the proposal and stated the board could use the same reasoning that was used for the Seeley Building project. The Vice Chair acknowledged that though not as much money would be funded, it would still make a huge improvement to the visual aspect of that area of town.

Chair Shirtliff stated this type of project could also serve as a signal for other businesses to start investing in the downtown. The Chair also concurred with Mr. Tubbs statements,

that it would improve the entrance to the downtown as well as the Great Northern Town center.

As a point of discussion, Krys Holmes compared the investments in the Seeley Building to that of the Dowling building, and then compared the different request amounts in TIF funding. Ms. Holmes stated she "was wondering if we wanted to hold back some of our funds and not grant everything right now," and suggested saving a portion of funds for later in the year and fund this particular request in a manner similar to that of the Seeley Building. Ms. Holmes confirmed she didn't know what this delay might do to the project, but it might give the board more flexibility to grant something before November 2021.

Nathan Bilyeu concurred in part with Ms. Holmes' statement and suggested the board reduce the granted amount to what they currently have available in funds rather than the full asking amounts. Mr. Bilyeu stated out of the four projects, this project was the one he was considering lessening the granted amount by approximately \$6,000 to prevent the board's account from going into the negative. Mr. Bilyeu justified his decision by stating even if they decided to reduce the asking amount from \$75,000 to approximately \$69,000, it would still be in excess to the funding amount being asked for on the Seeley Building.

Riley Tubbs spoke in support for the project and referred back to Lee Shubert's earlier statement about signaling to other businesses to develop in the downtown area citing this proposal as another good "signal" for the area. Mr. Tubbs described this project as benefitting the Last Chance corridor such as making it more inviting. He credited the current owners for taking on the project after the previous owner had troubles that resulted in the sale of the building. Mr. Tubbs acknowledged this project as already being started with the intent to continue development. However, he did not know what a delay in TIF funding might mean for the project's progress.

Nathan Bilyeu suggested the board awarded this project at least \$68,950 rather than the full asking amount of \$75,000 so account for the boards approximate \$6,000 deficit. Mr. Bilyeu also acknowledged there were delinquent taxes that are still expected to come in that could make up the -\$6,000, and the board could condition the motion to have the City award the additional \$6,000 when the funds become available.

Jennifer Deherrera agreed with Mr. Tubb's earlier statements that a delay in funds could result in them not being able to finish everything they set out to do.

Micky Zurcher reminded the board that the applicant also received a façade grant from the BID last year.

Krys Holmes asked Ms. Zurcher how much the façade grant was for and Ms. Zurcher confirmed it was for approximately \$2,500.

No further discussion by the board.

**Motion: Consistory Shrine Temple Association - \$25,000 Requested in TIF Funds**

Chair Shirtliff welcomed a motion to approve or deny a request of \$25,000 in TIF funds for the Consistory Shrine Temple Association for the purpose of funding a feasibility study.

Charlie Carson made a motion to approve a request of \$25,000 in TIF funds for the Consistory Shrine Temple Association for the purpose of funding a feasibility study.

Krys Holmes seconded the motion.

The motion passed with nine (9) votes with Brian Obert abstaining from the vote.

**Motion: Seeley Building LLC - \$53,592.00 Requested in TIF Funds**

Chair Shirtliff welcomed a motion to approve or deny a request of \$53,592 in TIF funds for the Seeley Building LLC for the purpose of funding sidewalk and pathway development.

Vice Chair Obert made a motion to approve a request of \$53,592 in TIF funds for the Seeley Building LLC for the purpose of funding sidewalk and pathway development.

Lee Shubert seconded the motion.

Charlie Carson proposed an amendment to the motion to reduce the awarded amount by \$2,925 (half of the funds currently not available in the TIF account to cover all four application requests), for a new total awarded amount of \$50,667. Mr. Carson also proposed to reduce the request of the fourth application, 734 N. Last Chance Gulch by the same amount of \$2,925.

The motion passed unanimously with ten (10) votes.

**Motion: Placer Building - \$77,800 Requested in TIF Funds**

Chair Shirtliff welcomed a motion to approve or deny a request of \$77,800 in TIF funds for the Placer Building for the purpose of historical restoration to replace doors on the second story of the building.

Krys Holmes made a motion to approve a request of \$77,800 in TIF funds for the Placer Building for the purpose of historical restoration to replace doors on the second story of the building.

Charlie Carson seconded the motion.

The motion passed with eight (8) votes with Lee Shubert abstaining from the vote and Riley Tubbs voting to deny.

**Motion: 734 N. Last Chance Gulch - \$75,000 Requested in TIF Funds**

Chair Shirtliff welcomed a motion to approve or deny a request of \$72,075 (\$75,000 - \$2,925 = \$72,075) in TIF funds for 734 N. Last Chance Gulch for the purpose of façade improvements and to provide a 3 bedroom apartment on the second story of the building.

Charlie Carson made a motion to approve a request of \$72,075 in TIF funds for 734 N. Last Chance Gulch for the purpose of façade improvements and to provide a 3 bedroom apartment on the second story of the building.

Jennifer Deherrera seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously with ten (10) votes.

**Motion: For When Delinquent Taxes Come In**

Chair Shirliff welcomes a motion to approve or deny that \$2,925 be awarded to both the Seeley Building LLC and 734 N. Last Chance Gulch for a total additional awarded amount of \$5,850 when the delinquent taxes become available at the City.

Nathan Bilyeu made a motion to approve \$2,925 for both the Seeley Building LLC and 734 N. Last Chance Gulch for a total additional awarded amount of \$5,850 when the delinquent taxes become available at the City.

Lee Shubert seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously with ten (10) votes.

**Other Business:**

No other business at this time.

**Public Comment:**

There was no public comment.

**Next Meeting:**

The next Downtown TIF Advisory Board meeting is scheduled for March 11, 2021. City staff informed the board that if they could get a recommendation from the City Attorney before this date, then they would plan to have the meeting. If not, then the meeting may be canceled and postponed until April.

**Adjournment:**

With no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Attachment A

Downtown TIF District  
Board Financial Report  
2/11/2020

Beginning Cash - July 1, 2020	\$	230,777	
Revenue: FY21			
Real Property Taxes	\$	67,000	\$ 39,803
Personal Property Taxes	\$	5,000	\$ 3,497
Penalty & Interest	\$	300	\$ 107
Interest	\$	1,500	\$ -
Total Revenue	\$	73,800	\$ 43,407
Expenditures:			
Contracted Services - Hill Park Theater	\$	18,643	\$ 18,642
Capital Outlay	\$	-	\$ -
Total Expenditures	\$	18,643	\$ 18,642
Ending Cash - 6/30/2021	\$	285,934	\$ 255,542
Less			
Project Commitments - Downtown Trees	\$	30,000	\$ 30,000
Cash Available for FY21	\$	255,934	\$ 225,542