

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
CITY OF RAMSEY
ANOKA COUNTY
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The City of Ramsey Economic Development Authority (EDA) conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, August 13, 2015, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Jim Steffen
 Member Brian Burandt
 Member Glen Hardin
 Member Chris Riley
 Member Wayne Skaff
 Member Kristine Williams

Members Absent: Member Philip Brunt

Also Present: Patrick Brama, Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator
 Tim Gladhill, Community Development Director
 Kurt Ulrich, City Administrator
 Brian Pankratz, Vice President of Land Services with CBRE

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Steffen called the Economic Development Authority meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Member Riley, seconded by Member Hardin, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Riley, Hardin, Skaff, Burandt and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Member Brunt.

3. APPROVE MINUTES

3.01: Approve Meeting Minutes Dated July 9, 2015

Motion by Member Hardin, seconded by Member Skaff, to approve the July 9, 2015, minutes as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Hardin, Skaff, Burandt, Riley, and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Member Brunt.

4. EDA BUSINESS

4.01: Dedicated Networks: Consider Resolution in Support of Minnesota Job Creation Fund Application for a Proposed Facility Expansion at 14000 Unity St NW

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama reviewed the staff report with the Board.

Mr. Jerry Column, CEO of Dedicated Networks, and Mr. Andy Decker, Decklin Group, were in attendance.

Chairperson Steffen thought this was great and did not see any reason not to support this. The other EDA members concurred.

Motion by Member Steffen, seconded by Member Skaff, to recommend City Council adopt Resolution #15-08195, declaring the City of Ramsey's support of applying to the State of Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development Job Creation Fund program.

Further discussion: Member Riley stated the lack of discussion is not for lack of interest.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Skaff, Burandt, Hardin, Riley, and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Member Brunt.

4.02: CBRE Updates, Pricing Table, Advertising Plan, and Restaurant Discussion (Portions were closed to the Public).

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama introduced Brian Pankratz, Vice President of Land Services with CBRE.

Mr. Pankratz reviewed the marketing that has been done within the City as well as reviewed marketing opportunities.

Chairperson Steffen asked what the advertising plan has been to date.

Mr. Pankratz reviewed with the EDA all of the different advertising CBRE has done in the City including brochures that have been created. He stated there are also opportunities for listing on CBRE.com, MNCARD.com and he noted that they also can do email blasts out from their database and MNCARD database.

Chairperson Steffen asked if the City would pay for this or would there be some cost-share.

Mr. Pankratz stated the City would pay for it.

Chairperson Steffen asked what Mr. Pankratz has seen with the Highway 10 and Armstrong Boulevard improvements being done.

Mr. Pankratz stated he has had inquiries from a couple of convenience stores and large box stores. He indicated that things are picking up and as the population grows there will be more commercial development happening.

Member Williams asked who the City would advertise to in the print ads that they are not targeting now.

Mr. Pankratz stated that would target attorneys, architects, new deals or new developments that may not know about Ramsey as well as the groups that are out there currently. He reviewed with the Board restaurants in the City and how they can promote more restaurants to come to Ramsey.

Chairperson Steffen wondered why the City made a sunset clause for the restaurant subsidy and if they were losing restaurants because it is no longer in effect.

Mr. Pankratz indicated they were not.

Member Riley stated the City Council did the Sunset Clause on purpose because they wanted to get out of subsidizing restaurants. He indicated if the City would want to reinstate it they could but he would need additional discussion. They specifically had the subsidy for a short amount of time to hopefully get some businesses in and easily get out.

Member Skaff stated at that time they were not in the retail business and their emphasis was not necessarily promoting retail as far as the EDA and he was not against going back to that either if it helps in the total plan of building business.

Member Riley stated Ramsey was at a distinct disadvantage because if the business was going into a pre-established restaurant site in another city the water credits had already been paid and so with Ramsey, the business would have to go into a brand new site and they would have paid a minimum of getting that multi-tenant building and for a restaurant to go into the building there was a large additional cost to get the extra water credits so that was putting Ramsey at a disadvantage over another city were they could go into an existing restaurant site.

Member Burandt asked what the value was of the incentive Acapulco received.

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama thought it was around \$150,000.

Member Riley stated it was tied to the building and the subsidy was given directly to the landlord but flowed through as a rent reduction and there was an earn-out attached to it.

Chairperson Steffen thought they would consider the subsidy again if they actually had a deal on the table.

Mr. Pankratz stated there is that distinction that needed to be made. They need to identify what kind of restaurant the City would want, a fast food type or sit down type of business.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the previous policy indicated the subsidy was for a full service sit down type and that language is in there defining it as well.

Member Williams asked if there was a specific type of rooftop needed.

Mr. Pankratz stated retailers look at the demographics of an area before bringing in a restaurant. The main criteria are the number of people and median income. He thought there was a lot of demand for apartments and single family homes.

Chairperson Steffen asked if they had a restaurant subsidy would that be a tool that would be used to bring business in.

Mr. Pankratz stated the question is if the City wants to get into the business of subsidizing. He indicated that would definitely be a tool that could be used on a case-by-case basis.

RECESS AND RECONVENE

It was noted that under Minnesota Statutes, Section 13D.05, Subd.3, the meeting can move into Closed Session to discuss pricing strategies for EDA-owned property.

Motion by Member Riley, seconded by Member Skaff, to move to Closed Session.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Riley, Skaff, Burandt, Hardin, and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Member Brunt.

The EDA moved into a Closed Session at 8:12 a.m.

The EDA reconvened in Open Session at 8:40 a.m.

To accommodate Kevin Kelb, the EDA agreed to next consider Case 4.04.

4.04: Review Future Business Park Infrastructure Analysis Preliminary Report

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama stated the purpose of this case is to review a finalized report from Bolton & Menk on required infrastructure improvements to the City's future business park. Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama reviewed the staff report with the Board.

Mr. Kevin Kelb, Bolton and Menk, discussed the process they use.

Chairperson Steffen asked once the Council adopts this document what will happen next.

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama explained the process going forward and noted this would be a policy discussion.

Chairperson Steffen asked if they were at a disadvantage relative to Elk River who is ready to go and has free land. He also wondered if they have to keep up with other cities.

Mr. Pankratz stated they could go up Highway 10 and see the number of city's that own industrial parks. He did not think they were at a disadvantage because nothing has really transpired in those locations.

Chairperson Steffen thought this was a start and should be discussed further at a future meeting.

4.03: Consider Supporting 1st Annual Anoka County Broker/Developer Event

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama stated this item is to discuss consideration of participation in a new event: 1st Annual Anoka County Broker/Developer Networking Event on Tuesday, October 27, 2015 from 9-11 a.m. Staff is asking for EDA support to participate in this event.

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama reviewed the staff report with the Board.

The EDA affirmed support for the 1st Annual Anoka County Broker/Developer event.

4.05: 2016 Proposed EDA Budget & Levy

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama reviewed the 2016 proposed EDA Budget & Levy with the Board.

Chairperson Steffen asked how much cash on hand do they currently have.

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama stated they currently have over \$600,000 unallocated and an unused loan fund of \$300,000.

Member Hardin thought it would be nice to see an EDA Balance Sheet and Income Statement at some point.

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama stated he would present that at the next meeting and indicated he would email the 2015 EDA Dashboard to the Board.

The EDA was in favor of the 2016 EDA Budget & Levy.

Motion by Member Skaff, seconded by Member Hardin, to recommend to City Council approval of the budget as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Skaff, Hardin, Burandt, Riley, and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Member Brunt.

4.06: Review Comparison Document of The COR Development Plan and Original Ramsey Town Center Master Plan Prepared by the Planning Commission.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated the purpose of this case is to review a comparison document between the original Ramsey Town Center Mast Plan and the current The COR Development Plan as requested by the City Council and Planning Commission on May 26, 2015. Mr. Gladhill reviewed the staff report with the Board.

Chairperson Steffen asked what some of the big differences were between the original and the current development plan.

Development Services Manager Gladhill explained some of the differences; key piece is the idea of shared parking.

Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator Brama thought one nice component of the process is they have developed an inventory of policy questions that different boards want to see addressed in the future.

Chairperson Steffen asked if they feel like the City has not followed the original master plan.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated things have changed to the vision. There are areas that have developed or plan on being developed in a much different manner than what was originally proposed.

Staff reviewed with the EDA Board differences in the development plan and the original Master Plan.

Mr. Pankratz, CBRE, stated the amount of retail land available and where Dominion was going has to do with the proximity to the rail. He stated people want to go with housing by retail and where high density can be placed in proximity to the light rail.

Development Services Manager Gladhill stated based on discussion he thought some of the questions brought up that need to be addressed are: How does the market bare the original or current vision. What key components have changed over time and what is the appropriate amount and locations for retail.

Motion by Member Steffen, seconded by Member Skaff, to recommend to City Council adoption of the Comparison Document for The COR.

Further discussion: Member Riley stated he would like to hear more discussion from the EDA. Steffen asked if this could be done at an upcoming meeting.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Skaff, Burandt, Hardin, Riley, and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Member Brunt.

5. MEMBER / STAFF UPDATE

There were no updates.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Member Riley, seconded by Member Skaff, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Riley, Skaff, Burandt, Hardin, and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Member Brunt.

The regular meeting of the Economic Development Authority adjourned at 9:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurtis G. Ulrich
City Administrator

ATTEST:

Patrick Brama
Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator

Draft by Sue Osbeck
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.