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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Stimson Mill Site, located adjacent to the Spokane River, was used for lumber mill operations for more than 100 years (See Figure 1). In 2005, Stimson Lumber closed. The Stimson Mill Site was acquired by Blackrock Development in 2006, foreclosed by Washington Trust Bank in 2013 and later sold in three large parcels. The 21-acre parcel (“Rivers Edge”) and 3.8-acre parcel (“Triangle Piece”) were acquired by Douglass Properties and are still owned by Douglass entities (See Figure 2). The City is in discussions with Douglass to trade the City parcel that crosses the Rivers Edge parcel for the Triangle Piece and a 40-foot waterfront public easement. The third 45-acre parcel (“Atlas Site”) changed ownership several times and numerous private developers evaluated the Atlas Site for development, but passed because of the site’s unique and complicated characteristics, including the City owned 4-acre former railroad right of way that crosses the site.

In 2017, the City of Coeur d’Alene recognized the opportunity to, in collaboration with the City’s urban renewal agency, ignite cda, to achieve two major community objectives:

1. Preserve waterfront property for the community.
2. Stimulate private development in a blighted portion of the City’s area of impact.
In 2018, the City purchased the Atlas Site and the City and ignite cda initiated a master planning and financial feasibility analysis to evaluate “what it would take” to create a market driven development that would adequately fund, through land sales and ignite cda tax increment funds (“TIF”), the Atlas Site purchase, remediation, infrastructure improvements and preservation of the waterfront as public space. ignite cda engaged Welch Comer Engineers and their team of real-estate advisors (Heartland, LLC), urban planners (GGLO) and landscape architects (BWA) to evaluate the options, engage the public, collaborate with the City and ignite cda and ultimately develop a project that will meet the City and ignite cda’s objectives.

The result of this effort is a development master plan of the Atlas Site primarily focused on a variety of residential product types, to capture multiple market segments, along with a smaller amount of destination commercial areas. The financial analysis indicates that this type of development will fund, through land sales and TIF, the necessary infrastructure improvements and preservation of nearly 4,000 lineal feet (lf) of waterfront and 22 acres as public space, 12.5 acres on the waterfront and 9.5 acres in an upland area.

The master plan contemplates expansion of the River and Lake Districts and creation of the new Atlas District which includes the Atlas Site, Rivers Edge and Triangle Piece sites. ignite cda will lead the Atlas Site land development process, constructing the infrastructure “backbone” and disposing of the large neighborhood blocks to developers/builders through the request for proposal (“RFP”) process. Development standards will be created, following applicable City standards, for use in the RFPs to ensure consistent and market valuable/stable products are constructed, while also allowing flexibility to adjust to market changes over the six to eight-year absorption period. ignite cda TIF funds will be used to complete the waterfront public space.
improvements early in the schedule to allow the public to enjoy the public space and to stimulate investment on the adjacent development land. ignite cda also contemplates participation in development projects in the Rivers Edge and Triangle Piece which may include infrastructure and public space improvements.

The Atlas Site Financial Feasibility model demonstrates that, based on estimated costs and revenues, the Atlas Site can be redeveloped and achieve the City and ignite cda objectives. The financial feasibility model also demonstrates that TIF would be available to aid redevelopment of other parcels in the Stimson Mill Site area.

The Atlas Site development implementation plan anticipates change will occur due to market conditions and this reality will be woven into the process and products developed for development implementation to increase the opportunity for success.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 PROJECT HISTORY

The City of Coeur d’Alene (‘City’) began to explore the purchase of the abandoned Atlas Mill Site (‘Atlas Site”) in the Summer of 2017 after several potential private buyers passed on the site purchase citing several factors including:

- High raw land cost
- Extensive site topography remediation and grading
- Uncertain site environmental conditions
- The City owned former BNSF ROW divided the north and south portions of the property limiting development flexibility
- Significant community interest in preserving the waterfront as public space instead of private waterfront parcels

City staff, including City Attorney Mike Gridley and Community Planning Director Hilary Anderson, who had met with several potential buyers, recommended to the Mayor and Council that the City consider taking the lead to purchase the property in order to preserve the waterfront for public space and incentivize private development by removing/resolving the unknown physical site conditions and land entitlement matters (including annexation, zoning, etc.).

The City partnered with ignite cda, the City’s Urban Renewal Agency (URA), to undertake a preliminary concept plan and financial feasibility assessment to determine if ignite cda would form a new Urban Renewal District (URD) and/or expand existing URDs that would allow tax increment funding to be used to purchase the parcel and fund site improvements.

ignite cda engaged Welch Comer Engineers (‘Welch Comer’) to develop a conceptual single-family development layout and infrastructure improvements and estimate the cost of the improvements. ignite cda utilized the project cost information along with projected single-family home sales revenue and tax increment funding to evaluate the project feasibility. The ignite cda Board determined that as a single-family development that excluded any waterfront development, the project was too financially “lean.”
In the Fall of 2017, the City Council voted to purchase the Atlas site and requested ignite cda conduct a more in-depth master plan and financial feasibility analysis. Welch Comer was engaged to complete this in-depth master plan and financial feasibility analysis along with a group of specialized sub-consultants including real-estate advisory (Heartland), urban planners (GGLO) and landscape architects (BWA) (“Consultant Team”). The City also initiated a community outreach program to solicit community input that would help shape the public space development.

2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVE

The City/ignite cda overall project objective is to transform vacant un-productive (in a multitude of categories) land into productive private and public land. The City/ignite cda identified three primary objectives:

1. Preserve the waterfront area as public space.
2. Create a land development plan that will fund the property purchase, public space and infrastructure improvements through land sale revenue and tax increment funding.
3. Create a unique and desirable community addition that reflects Coeur d’Alene community values.

2.3 SITE CONTEXT

The Atlas site, which is in the process of being annexed into the City, is located at the western edge of the City and bordered on the north by Seltice Way, an arterial that was formerly US-10 and connects Coeur d’Alene with Post Falls and continues into Washington. The Spokane River establishes the south property boundary and land to the west is vacant (planned to be multi-family) and to the east is multi-family. The surrounding land density is shown in Figure 4.

Seltice Way was recently revitalized from an old highway corridor to a modern multi-modal transportation corridor including two, two lane roundabouts and multiuse paths on the north and south sides. The corridor is experiencing growth with a recent single-family development on the north side and the anticipated multifamily development to the west of the Atlas project.

The proposed Atlas Waterfront Project, as described in this report, meets the City’s comprehensive plan future land use characterization (see Figure 5, top image). Additionally, the project goal of preserving the entire +/- 4,000 lf. of waterfront as public space will meet the comprehensive plan special areas “Shoreline” policy objectives (See Figure 5, bottom image).
Land Use: Spokane River District

Spokane River District Tomorrow
This area is going through a multitude of changes and this trend will continue for many years. Generally, the Spokane River District is envisioned to be mixed use neighborhoods consisting of housing and commercial retail and service activities that embrace the aesthetics of the proximity to the Spokane River. As the mills are removed to make way for new development, the river shoreline is sure to change dramatically.

The characteristics of the Spokane River District will be:
- Various commercial, residential, and mixed uses.
- Public access should be provided to the river.
- That overall density may approach ten to sixteen dwelling units per acre (10-16/1), but pockets of denser housing are appropriate and encouraged.
- That open space, parks, pedestrian and bicycle connections, and other public spaces will be provided throughout, especially adjacent to the Spokane River.
- That the scale of development will be urban in nature, promoting multi-modal connectivity to downtown.
- That the scale and intensity of development will be less than the Downtown Core.
- Neighborhood service nodes are encouraged where appropriate.
- That street networks will be interconnected, defining and creating smaller residential blocks and avoiding cul-de-sacs.
- That neighborhoods will retain and include planting of future, large-scale, native variety trees.

Special Areas: Areas of Coeur d'Alene Requiring Unique Planning

Shorelines
The City of Coeur d'Alene is known for its shorelines. They are an asset and provide a multitude of benefits. Community pride, economic advantages, transportation, recreation, and tourism are just a few examples of how shorelines affect the use and perception of our city.

Public access to and enhancement of our shorelines is a priority. Shorelines are a positive feature for a community and they must be protected. To ensure preservation, the city has an ordinance that protects, preserves, and enhances our visual resources and public access by establishing limitations and restrictions on specifically defined shoreline property located within city limits.

To increase desired uses and access to this finite resource, the city will provide incentives for enhancement. Efficient use of adjacent land, including mixed use and shared parking where appropriate, are just a few tools we employ to reach this goal.

Policy:
- Make public access to river and lake shorelines a priority.

Methods:
- Shoreline ordinances will govern appropriate development in designated areas.
- Ensure scale, use, and intensity are suitable with location.
- Promote protection and connectivity along shorelines.

Related Objectives:
1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 1.05, 1.17, 3.14

Shoreline

Special Point of Interest
- The Coeur d'Alene shoreline, measuring 5.16 miles within city limits, contains 2.36 public shoreline miles.

Figure 5: City Comprehensive Plan Excerpts
2.4 **SITE HISTORY AND CONDITION**

For more than 100 years, the Atlas site was a lumber mill. In 2005, Stimson Lumber closed their mill and the property was sold to Blackrock Development in 2006. Blackrock started removing un-suitable materials from near the river to a more upland location near Seltice Way but worked stalled during the 2008 financial downturn. The City purchased the BNSF railroad right-of-way that crosses the site in the mid-2000s. Washington Trust Bank foreclosed on the property in 2013 and the property was sold a few more times before the City purchased the property in 2018. Virtually no changes have been made to the site topography since 2008 (See Figures Figure 7 -Figure 8).

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality conducted a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to determine if hazardous substances had been released to the site. The Phase 1 ESA reveled no evidence of hazardous substances on the majority of the site but did indicate that the “Mt. Hink” wood chips/soil stockpile in the north eastern part of the site and remaining topsoil layers may contain hazardous materials and further exploration and testing is required to confirm.

The site requires extensive topographic remediation that is divided into three categories:

1. Regrading and filling of areas previously stripped of topsoil.
2. Regrading or removal of structurally unsuitable soils above surrounding grades.
3. Removal of structurally unsuitable soils below grade.
In 2018, the City took the opportunity to acquire suitable structural soils from the I-90 roadway “lowering” project which generated more than 100,000 CY of structural soils. This soil has been placed, compacted, and tested, at less than 1/3 the market cost for this soil saving the overall project topographic remediation costs in excess of $1,000,000. Error! Reference source not found. shows the current condition of the site.

The site does not have any internal infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, stormwater, power, telecommunications). Perimeter infrastructure has capacity to service the site, but a 3,500-foot sewer extension to the west will be necessary.

3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

3.1 STEERING COMMITTEE

Mayor Widmyer and ignite cda Chairman Hoskins appointed a nine-person steering committee to guide the feasibility study process. The steering committee members included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Members</th>
<th>Ignite cda Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Steve Widmyer</td>
<td>Chairman Scott Hoskins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Amy Evans</td>
<td>Board Member Alivia Metts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Kiki Miller</td>
<td>Board Member Mic Armon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Administrator Troy Tymesen</td>
<td>Executive Director Tony Berns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planner Hilary Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Steering Committee members

3.2 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The City and ignite cda desired specific community input on the public spaces and also desired general community observations about the potential development character. CDA 2030, a community based non-profit working to establish a vision for the City, initiated the community engagement process on February 7, 2018 with the Community Organization Representative (COR) Vision Group. The COR Vision Group represented over 50 community groups (see Figure 10).
Figure 10: COR Vision Group Participants

**Community and Identity**
- Cd'A Chamber of Commerce ✓
- Kootenai County ✓
- Cd'A Arts Commission ✓
- Arts and Culture Alliance ✓
- Design Review Commission ✓
- Museum of North Idaho ✓
- Cd'A Tribe ✓
- Lake City Senior Center ✓
- Area Agency on Aging ✓
- Kootenai County Young Professionals ✓
- Mill River HOA ✓
- Bellaire HOA ✓
- Riverstone Master Association ✓

**Education and Learning**
- North Idaho College ✓
- School Dist 271 ✓
- University of Idaho ✓
- North Idaho Higher Education ✓
- North Idaho College Athletics ✓
- School Booster Cubs (H.S.) ✓
- School Booster Club - NIC ✓
- School Booster Club - LCSC ✓
- Vandal Scholarship Fund - University of Idaho ✓

**Environment and Recreation**
- Panhandle Parks Foundation ✓
- Spokane River Corridor organizations (Friends of and Splash) ✓
- Kootenai Environmental Alliance ✓
- Parks and Rec Dept City of Cd'A ✓
- Cd'A Parks & Recreation Commission ✓
- Cd'A Ped Bike Committee ✓
- Natural Open Space Committee ✓
- Centennial Trail Foundation ✓
- Cd'A CVB ✓
- Coeur d'Alene Lake Property Owners Association ✓
- Lake City Bicycle Collective ✓

**Growth and Development**
- North Idaho Building Contractors Association ✓
- CDA Board of Realtors - Residential ✓
- CDA Board of Realtors - Commercial ✓
- Planning Commission ✓
- Urban Land Institute ✓
- Coeur Group ✓
- Lady d’Alenes ✓

**Health and Safety**
- Kootenai Health ✓
- Panhandle Health District ✓
- Disability Action Center ✓
- Cd'A FD ✓
- Cd'A FD ✓
- Kootenai Co Sheriff's Office ✓

**Jobs and Economy**
- Jobs Plus (CDA EDC) ✓
- Innovation Collective ✓
- Cd'A Downtown Association ✓
- North Idaho Family Group ✓
- Idaho NonProfit Association (Idaho Nonprofit Center?)

**Council**
- Councilmember Dan Gookin ✓
CDA 2030 posed a variety of questions to the COR Group who voted on the questions and the results are found in Appendix 6.1. The “key takeaways” from the COR Vision Group were:

- Provide Pedestrian and Bike Access Throughout
- Create a Natural and Unique Identity
- Higher Density is Acceptable in Exchange for More Public Space (Inclusive of the Entire Waterfront as Public)
- Water Access is a Priority
- Reserving Commercial Property for Higher Wage-Job Creating Businesses is Supported

The COR Vision Group results were used to shape the subsequent public meeting content, which further focused on:

- Road network types (which help define a neighborhood character)
- Public Space/Private space land area ratios
- Public space character
- Riverbank restoration and stabilization

Appendix 6.2 has the Public Presentation/Open House Meeting #2 – March 22, 2018 presentation and community feedback results, which are generally summarized as:

- A meandering/grid street network is preferred, and higher density development is an acceptable tradeoff for more public space.
- Public areas should be large, but passive use areas, with separated pedestrian and bike trails.
- Shoreline restoration/stabilization methods that allow public access to the water is preferred.

Figure 11: Public Meeting #2
Public Presentation/Open House Meeting #3 on April 25, 2018 (Appendix 6.3) built upon the prior two public meetings with two major objectives:

- Refine the public space character by defining desired amenities
- Presenting the private space land use character and economics to allow the public to understand the private development “tradeoff” necessary to allow the waterfront to be completely public space.

The meeting results included in Appendixes 6.1– 6.3 present the community input on public space amenities, and Figure 12 - Figure 14 present two land use masterplans that provided sufficient estimated land sale revenue and tax increment to fund the project.
The final public meeting was a City Council/ignite cda Workshop held on April 26, 2018. The meeting objectives were as follows:

1. Present the City Council and ignite cda Board with a description of the project objective and community input process
2. Discuss how the land use/site development may occur to fund the creation of the public space and fund the site development.
3. Solicit the City Council/ignite cda Board's comments, edits or “approval in concept.” Appendix 6.3 contains the meeting presentation content.

![Figure 14: Further Refined Plan with Less Intensive Public Space Amenities to Lower Project Costs](image)

After lengthy discussion and deliberation, both the City Council and ignite cda Board approved moving forward with the financial feasibility study based on the proposed land development concept and public space areas.
The Master Plan purpose is to establish a conceptual site development that would form the basis of a financial feasibility analysis, confirm URDs expansion/creation is appropriate, and confirm the development’s financial ability to fund the land purchase, develop the site infrastructure and preserve the waterfront as public space. The Financial Feasibility Report indicates, with noted assumptions, that the master plan is feasible. The next step major step will be formation of the new Atlas District and expansion of the Lake and River District. That process is anticipated to start in later September 2018, and subject to ignite CDA and City approvals, should be complete before the end of 2018.

Once the districts are expanded/created, ignite cda anticipates initiating the land entitlement process, including development standards, infrastructure design and site pre-marketing. Figure 15 provides a general task list and timeline to complete Phase 1.

The real-estate market is currently very active and ignite cda recognizes the need to move quickly to take advantage of an active market place.
5 Conclusion

Ignite CDA initiated the master planning and Financial Feasibility Analysis with the primary objectives of preserving public waterfront space and stimulating redevelopment of a blighted area of the City’s area of impact. The master plan public space development responds to the public’s desire for a natural park with pedestrian and bicycle trails and provides the necessary development land and density to make the project financially feasible, given the estimated costs and revenue.
Atlas Waterfront Community Organization Representatives (COR) Vision Group Meeting
Welcome to the Community Organization Representative Vision Group meeting on the Atlas Waterfront Project!
Background & Timeline

- Overview of Project Site
- City’s Purchasing Goals
- Where have we been? Where are we now? Where are we going?
Atlas Waterfront

cdaid.org/atlaswaterfront
Overview of Site & Purchasing Goals
Anticipated Timeline

• **January/February 2018:** Market Assessments, preliminary land use research

• **February/March 2018:** COR Vision group meeting; community input; refinement of land use research

• **April/May 2018:** City Council/ignite workshop; steering committee directs final land use plan; site development/strategy plan

• **May/June 2018:** Urban renewal/site development plans & formation discussion

• **June – October 2018:** Possible expanded River District and new Atlas District process; development funding strategy concluded
Project Feasibility & Market Analysis

Community Vision & Values

Site Development Analysis
Cost/Funding Research
Assessment: Market Feasibility

Opportunities & Decision Points
COR Vision & Values – Basis of Polling Questions

• Data reviewed
• Previous input, past & current community projects, CDA 2030
• Variety of sources, studies, community input and council resolutions to date
Live Polling

Tell us your organization’s Vision and Values for the Atlas Waterfront Project!
Polling Instructions

• Facilitators will hand out Voting Notes

• We will ask you a question

• Write down your responses on Voting Notes for live polling (optional)

• Enter your responses on the keypad

• We will call for final votes

• Results will be displayed on the screen
Sample Questions
T1. Who is your favorite football team?

1) Seahawks: 43%
2) Broncos: 5%
3) Patriots: 14%
4) Eagles: 5%
5) Vikings (H.S.): 8%
6) Timberwolves (H.S.): 11%
7) I don’t like football: 14%
T2. Did you read the Atlas Waterfront webpage?

1) Yes - 88%
2) No - 9%
3) Maybe - 3%
Actual Questions
Q1. Which of the following public components is most important for this project? (choose 1)

1) Preservation of view corridors from all public areas
2) Pedestrian and bike access throughout the site with connections to trails and multi-use paths
3) Boat dock with public mooring with access to public and commercial uses
4) All of the above
Q2. What is most important for overall project identity? (choose 1)

11% 1) Cultural (Emphasis on human history; site’s logging history and growth of North Idaho)

54% 2) Natural (Natural environment; river ecology; sustainable design; low impact infrastructure)

35% 3) Cultural & Natural
Q3. Is it important that the project includes unique components to create an authentic place that does not duplicate other projects in the city?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1) Yes</th>
<th>2) No</th>
<th>3) Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Would you support more intensive development (such as a mix of housing types, smaller residential lots, buildings taller than 3 stories, etc.) in exchange for improved open space and preservation of the entire shoreline for public use?

1) Yes 62%
2) No 27%
3) Maybe 11%
Q5. Which of the following public facilities does the community need most? (vote for top 3, in order of preference)

1) Performing Arts Center - 23%
2) Arena/Sports Complex - 22%
3) School Site - 8%
4) Fire/Police Station - 5%
5) New Museum of North Idaho - 7%
6) Satellite Library - 3%
7) Science & Technology Center - 21%
8) Velodrome - 3%
9) Outdoor Ice Rink - 6%
10) Other? - 3%
Q6. What are your preferences for the commercial uses of the project?
(rank in order of preference)

1) Food & Beverage 26%
2) Retail 20%
3) Office (Professional & Administrative) 19%
4) Lodging 20%
5) Other? 15%
Q7. What are your preference for the residential uses of the project? (choose 1)

- 24% 1) Low density (single family, cottage housing, duplexes, rowhouses)
- 59% 2) Medium density (townhomes, mid-rise apartments/condominiums)
- 16% 3) High density (high-rise apartments, multi-unit condominiums)
Q8. What is your preferred ratio of residential to commercial land uses for this project? (choose 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Residential to % Commercial</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22% 1) 75:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38% 2) 50:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% 3) 25:75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9. How important is it that the project reserves some commercial property for businesses providing higher wage jobs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1) Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2) Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3) Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4) No Opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Given the proximity to the Spokane River, what environmental components should be incorporated? (rank in order of preference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Innovative stormwater solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Shoreline rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Dark sky compliant lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Multi-modal transportation (bike, bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Use of local/regional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Energy efficient design elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>LEED certified/Green building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Other?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11. What water recreation components are most important as part of the public space? (rank top 3)

13% 1) Water dog park

13% 2) Dock for passive use (*e.g.*, fishing)

9% 3) Motorized boat dock

12% 4) Accessible non-motorized launch

18% 5) Play facility with water features (*natural play area, not a splash pad*)

16% 6) Kayak/stand up paddle board area

19% 7) Accessible swim area
Q12. What land recreation components are most important as part of the public space? (rank top 3)

1) Natural amphitheater (sloped lawn with tiered seating made of rocks or concrete slabs) 18%
2) Active park (play structure, play fields) 7%
3) Passive park (seating areas, lawn area, sandy beach and natural vegetation) 16%
4) Use of native plants & trees with educational signage (e.g., arboretum or demonstration garden) 14%
5) Multi-use trail along the waterfront 31%
6) Commercial vendors in the open space (café/cocktails, equipment rentals) 14%
Polling Results
Atlas COR Vision Group Meeting – Polling Question Voting Results

Combined Voting Results from LIVE POLLING QUESTIONS on 2-7-18

45 participants (38 using clickers and 7 using paper ballots)

Q1. Which of the following components is most important for this project? (choose 1)

1) Preservation of view corridors from all public areas

2) Pedestrian and bike access throughout the site with connections to trails and multi-use paths

3) Boat dock with public mooring with access to public and commercial uses

4) All of the above

Q2. What is most important for overall project identity? (choose 1)

1) Cultural (Emphasis on human history; the site’s connection to the logging industry and growth of northern Idaho)

2) Natural (The natural environment; the river ecology; sustainable design and low impact infrastructure)

3) Cultural & Natural

Q3. Is it important that the project includes unique components to create an authentic place that does not duplicate other projects in the city?

1) Yes

2) No

3) Maybe

Q4. Would you support more intensive development (such as a mix of housing types, smaller residential lots, buildings taller than 3 stories, etc.) in exchange for improved open space and preservation of the entire shoreline for public use?

1) Yes

2) No

3) Maybe
Q5. Which of the following public facilities does the community need most? (vote for top 3, in order of preference)

1) Performing Arts Center  
2) Arena/Sports Complex  
3) School Site  
4) Fire/Police Station  
5) New Museum of North Idaho  
6) Satellite Library  
7) Science & Technology Center  
8) Velodrome  
9) Outdoor Ice Rink  
10) Other?

Q6. What are your preferences for the commercial uses of the project? (rank in order of preference)

1) Food & Beverage  
2) Retail  
3) Office (Professional & Administrative)  
4) Lodging  
5) Other?

Q7. What are your preferences for the residential uses of the project? (choose 1)

1) Low density  
2) Medium density (townhomes, mid-rise apartments/condominiums)  
3) High density  
   (high-rise apartments, multi-unit condominiums)

Q8. What is your preferred ratio of residential to commercial land uses for this project? (choose 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Residential to % Commercial</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Residential to % Commercial</td>
<td>75:25</td>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>25:75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9. How important is it that the project reserves some commercial property for businesses providing higher wage jobs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Very Important</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Somewhat Important</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Not Important</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) No Opinion</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. Given the proximity to the Spokane River, what environmental components should be incorporated? (rank in order of preference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Innovative stormwater solutions</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Shoreline rehabilitation</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Dark sky compliant lighting</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Multi-modal transportation (bike, bus)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Use of local/regional materials</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Energy efficient design elements</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) LEED certified/Green building</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Other?</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. What water recreation components are most important as part of the public space? (rank top 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Water dog park</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Dock for passive use (e.g., fishing)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Motorized boat dock</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Accessible non-motorized launch</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Play facility with water features (natural play area, not a splash pad)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Kayak/stand up paddle board area</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Accessible swim area</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12. What land recreation components are most important as part of the public space? (rank top 3)

1) Natural amphitheater (sloped lawn with tiered seating made of rocks or concrete slabs)
2) Active park (play structure, play fields)
3) Passive park (seating areas, lawn area, sandy beach and natural vegetation)
4) Use of native plants and trees with educational signage (e.g., arboretum or demonstration garden)
5) Multi-use trail along the waterfront
6) Commercial vendors in the open space (café/cocktails, equipment rentals)
Presentation Objective

• Based on what we have learned to date (and you have seen on the Atlas Waterfront Website), we want to bring more focus to establishing the site character by providing you information about:

  • The Site Road Network Options
  • The Tradeoffs Between Public Space and Private Space
  • Options for Public Space Character
  • Options for Riverbank Restoration and Stabilization

• So You Can Provide Feedback During the Open House
Primary Project Goals
1. Waterfront Public Access
2. An Authentic Place (COR Vision)
3. Balanced Project Economics

Atlas Waterfront COR Vision Group
60% support for entire waterfront as public space among residents.
Balanced Project Economics

Public
- G.O. Bond
- City/ignite Funds
- Features
- Acreage

Private
- Intensity
- Density
- Acreage

Development Density/Intensity
Public Space-Development Density/Intensity Relationship
Public Space Size and Features
Information and Feedback

Providing You Information and Options on Four Topics:
1. Road Network Type
2. Public Space/Private Space
3. Public Space Character
4. Riverbank Restoration and Stabilization

So You Can Provide Feedback…by Placing Your Dot on the Option:
- You Most Prefer
- You Moderately Prefer
- You Least Prefer

Option 1 Road Network

Grid
- Efficient
- Classic Neighborhood (Authentic Place)
- Streets Function as View Corridors
- Challenging with Topography
Option 2 Road Network

Meandering with Grid
- Less Efficient
- Enhances Neighborhood Greenspace
- Fewer Streets Function as View Corridors
- Works with Topography

Option 3 Road Network

Meandering
1. Least Efficient
2. Non-Traditional Neighborhood
3. Limited View Corridor Opportunities
4. Works with Topography
Which Road Network Do You Prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Classic Neighborhood (Authentic place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Challenging with topography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Meandering with Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Less efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Enhances Neighborhood Greenspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fewer Streets Function as View Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Works with topography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Meandering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Least Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Non-Traditional Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Limited View Corridor Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Works with topography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place your dot on the option you prefer according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer.

Option 1 Public Space/Private Space

Land Uses
- 25% Public Area
- 20% Road Area
- 55% Development Area

Funding Sources
- Land Sales
- IgniteCDA
A general obligation (G.O.) bond requires a 66-2/3% affirmative vote.

**Option 2 Public Space/Private Space**

- **Land Uses**
  - 35% Public Area
  - 15% Road Area
  - 50% Development Area

**Funding Sources**
- Land Sales
- IgniteCDA
- G.O. Bond

**Option 3 Public Space/Private Space**

- **Land Uses**
  - 45% Public Area
  - 10% Road Area
  - 45% Development Area

**Funding Sources**
- Land Sales
- IgniteCDA
- G.O. Bond

DENVER IMAGE TBD
## What Size of Public Space Do You Prefer, Considering the Funding Tradeoffs?

Place your dot on the option you prefer according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer

| Option 1 | 25% Public Area  
| 20% Road Area  
| 55% Development Area |
| --- | --- |
| Land Sales IgniteCDA G.O. Bond |
| March 22, 2018 Meeting Response |
| Option 2 | 35% Public Area  
| 15% Road Area  
| 50% Development Area |
| --- | --- |
| Land Sales IgniteCDA G.O. Bond |
| March 22, 2018 Meeting Response |
| Option 3 | 45% Public Area  
| 10% Road Area  
| 45% Development Area |
| --- | --- |
| Land Sales IgniteCDA G.O. Bond |
| March 22, 2018 Meeting Response |

### Option 1 Public Space Character
Option 2 Public Space Character

Option 3 Public Space Character
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Place your dot on the option you prefer according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer

March 22, 2018 Meeting Response

Option 1

March 22, 2018 Meeting Response

Option 2

March 22, 2018 Meeting Response

Option 3

Riverbank Restoration and Stabilization
**Tall Riverbank – Water View Access**

- **Ground Surface**
- **Summer Water Level**
- **8 to 12 ft**

Photos at Low Water

**Tall Riverbank Areas Stabilization Options**

- **Vegetative Stabilization**
- **Rip Rap Rock Stabilization**
- **Retaining Wall**
In Tall Riverbank Areas, Which Stabilization Option do You Prefer?

Place your dot on the option you prefer according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer

Vegetative Stabilization

Rip Rap Rock Stabilization

Retaining Wall

Mid-Height Riverbank - Areas with Water View and Limited Physical Access

Ground Surface

Summer Water Level

Existing Photos at Low Water
In Mid-Height Riverbank Areas, Which Stabilization Option do You Prefer?

Place your dot on the option you prefer according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer.
Low Height Riverbank Areas

Existing Photos at Low Water

Low Height Riverbank Stabilization Options

Beach

Vegetative Stabilization

Plaza

Rip Rap Rock Stabilization

Ground Surface

Summer Water Level

3-5 ft
In Low Riverbank Areas, Which Stabilization Option do You Prefer?

Place your dot on the option you prefer according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer.

March 22, 2018 Meeting Response

Vegetative Stabilization

Rip Rap Rock Stabilization

March 22, 2018 Meeting Response

Open House Feedback…

Please Provide Feedback…by Placing Your Dot on the Option:

- You Most Prefer
- You Moderately Prefer
- You Least Prefer
Introduction

City/igniteCDA
- Councilmember Kiki Miller
- Troy Tymesen, City Administrator
- Hilary Anderson, Community Development Director
- Tony Berns, Executive Director, igniteCDA

Consulting Team
- Phil Boyd & Taylor Tompke, Welch Comer Engineers
- Matt Anderson & Amy Hartman, Heartland Real-estate Advisors
- Mark Sindell & Don Vehige, GGLO Design
- Dell Hatch, BWA Landscape Architect

The City is Purchasing the Atlas Property to Create Permanent, Public Waterfront Access and Encourage Economic Development Initiatives on the Site.

The Community Engagement Process is Intended to Inform the Public About the Site and Receive Community Feedback to Establish Community Values Balanced with Economic Realities.
Atlas Waterfront Project Process

1. Community Engagement
   1. COR Vision Group Meeting #1 – February 7, 2018
   2. Public Presentation/Open House Meeting #2 – March 22, 2018
   3. Public Presentation/Open House Meeting #3 – April 25, 2018
   4. City Council/igniteCDA Workshop – Lake Coeur d’Alene Room at NIC’s Student Union – April 26, 2018 5pm

2. The Consulting Team will Prepare a Development/Public Space Plan for Council/igniteCDA Consideration

3. City Council will Consider Expanding/Creating Urban Renewal Districts and Possibly Proposing a General Obligation Bond to Assist with Financing the Project Development

Tonight’s Agenda

Presentation 5:30 pm to 6:30 pm
1. Project Objective, What We Have Learned so Far – Phil Boyd
2. Site Design and Land Use Planning - Don Vehige, Mark Sindell
3. Public Space Size and Features – Dell Hatch
4. Real-Estate, Market Feasibility – Amy Hartman, Matt Anderson

Open House for Feedback (Dot Exercise) 6:30 pm to 7 pm
Re-Convene for Question and Answer 7 pm to 7:30 on
Adjournment - Councilmember Miller
Project Objective

Create a Private Development Land Use and Public Space Concept Plan that will:

1. Support Preserving the Entire Waterfront as Public Space
2. Balance Public and Private Funding, if Possible
3. Create a Unique and Desirable Community Addition that Reflects our Community Values

COR Vision Group Meeting – February 7, 2018 Takeaways

- Provide Pedestrian and Bike Access Throughout
- Create a Natural and Unique Identity
- Acceptable Trade-Off: Higher Density in Exchange for More Public Space (Inclusive of the Entire Waterfront as Public)
- Water Access is a Priority
- Reserving Commercial Property for Higher Wage-Job Creating Businesses is Supported
Public Meeting #2 Takeaways – Road Network and Development

Public Meeting #2 Takeaways – Public Space and Shoreline Restoration/Stabilization
GGLO designs distinct places where people connect and thrive.

We seek to bring the essence of community alive in each of our projects—believing that the fundamental desire to interact and feel a part of something can be evoked through design. This perspective runs deep through our practice, helping ensure our solutions have the most positive impact in any context.

Site Plan - Context
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

- West Edge - Retail
- West Edge - Plaza
West Edge - Townhomes

Central Neighborhood
Central Neighborhood

East Edge – Riverfront Open Space
Central Neighborhood

What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Pedestrians
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

East Edge – Riverfront Open Space

East Edge – Riverfront Open Space
East Edge – Riverfront Open Space

Pedestrians

What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

East Edge – Riverfront Open Space

Pedestrians

What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?
East Edge – Open Space

Public Space Size and Features
Public Space Size and Features
Public Space Amenities

Results of items preferred from April 25, 2018 Meeting according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer
Economic Analysis

YEAR 1 2 3 4 5
Land & Park Costs

YEAR 3 4 5 6 7
Land Sale Revenue

TOTAL Land Development Costs

TOTAL Land Sale Revenue

NET (Cost)/Revenue

* Dependent on land use

RLV Residual Land Value by Block *
Economic Analysis

Residual Land Value: Land Value from Developer’s Perspective

- Developer analyzes market-specific costs and returns* to make a decision on the feasibility of development
- *Residual Land Value (‘RLV’): Amount the developer can afford to pay for the land

Economic Analysis

ABSORPTION & MARKET SEGMENTATION

Scenario 1: Mixed-Use
- Single Family
- Townhomes
- Condos
- Apartments
- Retail

Scenario 2: Single Use
- Single Family

Quarterly Absorption

| Y1  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Y2  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Y3  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Y4  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Y5  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Y6  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|

* Values are hypothetical and for demonstration purposes only.
Economic Analysis

- 419 units over four phases
- Mix of product types:
  - Multi-Family: 90 Units
  - Condo: 148 Units
  - 122 Townhomes
  - 59 Single Family Homes

Open House Feedback...

Please Provide Feedback...by Placing Your Dot on the Feature:
- 🟢 You Most Prefer
- 🟠 You Moderately Prefer
- 🔴 You Least Prefer
Introduction

Consulting Team
• Phil Boyd & Taylor Tompke, Welch Comer Engineers
• Matt Anderson & Amy Hartman, Heartland Real-estate Advisors
• Mark Sindell & Don Vehige, GGLO Design
• Dell Hatch, BWA Landscape Architect
Tonight’s Agenda

Meeting Objective
Present the City Council and igniteCDA Board with a description of the project objective, community input process and how the land use/site development may occur to achieve the public space and economic balance objectives for the site.

- Presentation (Really a Work Session) 5:00 pm to 6:00
  1. Introduction, Project Objective, Process Review, Site Review – Phil – 5 minutes
  2. Land Use Planning Concept/Site Design – GGLO 15 minutes
  3. Public Space Concepts – Dell 10 minutes
  4. Real-Estate Requirements to Achieve Public Space– Heartland 25 minutes
  5. Closing – Phil 5 minutes

- Council and igniteCDA Board Q&A and Discussion 6:00 pm to 7:00

Project Objective

Create a Private Development Land Use and Public Space Concept Plan that will:

1. Support Preserving the Entire Waterfront as Public Space

2. Balance Public and Private Funding, if Possible

3. Create a Unique and Desirable Community Addition that Reflects our Community Values
Community Engagement Process

• The Community Engagement Process is Intended to Inform the Public About the Site and Receive Community Feedback to Establish Community Values Balanced with Economic Realities

Atlas Waterfront Project Process

1. Community Engagement
   1. COR Vision Group Meeting #1 – February 7, 2018
   2. Public Presentation/Open House Meeting #2 – March 22, 2018
   3. Public Presentation/Open House Meeting #3 – April 25, 2018
   4. City Council/igniteCDA Workshop – Lake Coeur d’Alene Room at NIC’s Student Union – April 26, 2018 5pm

2. The Consulting Team will Prepare a Development/Public Space Plan for Council/igniteCDA Consideration

3. City Council will Consider Expanding/Creating Urban Renewal Districts and Possibly Proposing a General Obligation Bond to Assist with Financing the Project Development
COR Vision Group Meeting – February 7, 2018 Takeaways

- Provide Pedestrian and Bike Access Throughout
- Create a Natural and Unique Identity
- Acceptable Trade-Off: Higher Density in Exchange for More Public Space (Inclusive of the Entire Waterfront as Public)
- Water Access is a Priority
- Reserving Commercial Property for Higher Wage-Job Creating Businesses is Supported

Public Meeting #2 Takeaways – Road Network and Development
Public Meeting #2 Takeaways – Public Space and Shoreline Restoration/Stabilization

Results of items preferred from April 25, 2018 Meeting according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer
Public Space Amenities

Results of items preferred from April 25, 2018 Meeting according to: Red: Least Prefer. Yellow: Moderately Prefer. Green: Most Prefer

---

GGLO designs distinct places where people connect and thrive.

We seek to bring the essence of community alive in each of our projects - believing that the fundamental desire to interact and feel a part of something can be evoked through design. This perspective runs deep through our practice, helping ensure our solutions have the most positive impact in any context.
Pedestrians

What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Site Plan - Context

Riverstone

Site Plan
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Site Plan
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Site Plan - Option 1 (West Blocks)

West Edge – Neighborhood Commercial
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

West Edge – Neighborhood Commercial

West Edge - Retail
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

West Edge - Plaza

West Edge - Townhomes
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Central Neighborhood

Pedestrians
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Central Neighborhood

East Edge – Riverfront Open Space
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

East Edge – Riverfront Open Space
What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

East Edge – Riverfront Open Space

East Edge – Open Space
Public Space Size and Features

What Type of Public Space Character do You Prefer?

Public Space Amenities

- Park Gateway
- Trail Bridges
- Harbor Master Building
- Commercial Character
- Adjacent Park
- Group Shelter / Pavilion
- Picnic / Shade Structures
- Amphitheater
Public Space Amenities

- Swimming Beach
- Children's Play Structures
- River Overlooks
- Water Dog Park
- ADA Non-Motorized Watercraft Launch
- Public/Trail Art
- Softball/Soccer Complex

- Riverfront Stabilization
Economic Analysis

**YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; Park Costs</td>
<td>ACQUISITION</td>
<td>BACKBONE INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>MULTI-MODAL NETWORKS</td>
<td>EARTH WORK</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Land Development Costs</td>
<td>MINUS COSTS</td>
<td>TOTAL Land Sale Revenue</td>
<td>NET (Cost)/Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Sale Revenue</td>
<td>BLOCK #1</td>
<td>BLOCK #3</td>
<td>BLOCK #5</td>
<td>BLOCK #7</td>
<td>BLOCK #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLOCK #2</td>
<td>BLOCK #4</td>
<td>BLOCK #6</td>
<td>BLOCK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RLV = Residual Land Value by Block

*Dependent on land use*
Economic Analysis

Residual Land Value: Land Value from Developer’s Perspective

- Developer analyzes market-specific costs and returns* to make a decision on the feasibility of development
- Residual Land Value (“RLV”): Amount the developer can afford to pay for the land

Economic Analysis

ABSORPTION & MARKET SEGMENTATION

Scenario 1: Mixed-Use
- Single Family
- Townhomes
- Condos
- Apartments
- Retail

Scenario 2: Single Use
- Single Family

Quarterly Absorption

- Y1: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4
- Y2: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4
- Y3: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4
- Y4: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4
- Y5: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4
- Y6: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4
Economic Analysis

- 419 units over four phases
- Mix of product types:
  - Multi-Family: 90 Units
  - Condo: 148 Units
  - 122 Townhomes
  - 59 Single Family Homes

Discussion

- Consulting Team Direction
  - Overall Site Plan and Concept
  - Public Space Size and Features
6.5 DISTRICT MAP

ATLAS PRELIMINARY
URD BOUNDARY MAP