MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019, 1:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 604 - THE HARRY MAIER ROOM

A. ROLL CALL.

1. Members: Gary Delveaux, Chair; Matt Schueller, Vice-Chair; Ald. Barbara Dorff, James Blumreich, Deby Dehn, Kathy Hinkfuss, and Melanie Parma.
Liaisons: Chelsea Kocken, Jeff Mirkes, and Leah Weycker.

Members present: Matt Schueller, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Barbara Dorff, Deby Dehn, Kathy Hinkfuss, Excused: Melanie Parma
Liaisons present: Leah Weycker

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

1. Approval of the agenda for the August 20, 2019, special meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve the agenda. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

1. Public Hearing regarding changes to:
TID Five (5), East and West Downtown
TID Seven (7), Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors

TID Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets
TID Nine (9), State Highway 54/57 Business Park
TID Twelve (12), I-43 Commercial Development
TID Thirteen (13), Downtown Redevelopment
TID Fourteen (14), North Broadway Redevelopment
TID Seventeen (17), 900 Block North Broadway
TID Number Twenty-Two (22), The Shipyard
TID Number Twenty-Three (23), Legends District
in the City of Green Bay, Wisconsin

Chair Gary Delveaux opened the public hearing asking if there was anyone present wished to speak.

Chair Gary Delveaux then asked three more times if there was anyone present who wished to speak. No one else wished to speak and the public hearing was closed.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by James Blumreich to suspend the rules and discuss TIDs (Agenda items 2 - 18) out of agenda order. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to suspend the rules to for a single motion to approve all TIDs with proposed amendments. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Jim Blumreich, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve, with the amendment to TID 23, the recommendations provided by staff for each TID. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

1. Consideration with possible action on a development agreement with NeighborWorks Green Bay for the property located at 505 5th Street (Parcel 2-879).

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve a development agreement with NeighborWorks Green Bay for the property located at 505 5th Street (Parcel 2-879) using $20,000 of Neighborhood Enhancement Funds. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, No- None, Abstain- Deby Dehn

2. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Territory Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Five (5), East and West Downtown. The proposal seeks to remove parcels from TID 5 that are generally located in the area east of S. Maple Street, south of Howard Street, west of the Fox River, and north of Fifth (5th) Street.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

3. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Seven (7), Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

4. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID Seven (7), Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

5. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a Project Plan, for the closure of TID Seven (7), Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

6. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

7. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

8. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a Project Plan, for the closure of TID Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

9. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a Project Plan, for the closure of TID Nine (9), State Highway 54/57 Business Park.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

10. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Twelve (12), I-43 Commercial Development.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

11. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID Twelve (12), I-43 Commercial Development.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

12. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a TID Plan, for the closure of TID Twelve (12), I-43 Commercial Development.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

13. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Resolution amending the Project Plan for TID Thirteen (13), Downtown Redevelopment. The proposed costs include projects within the proposed boundary and within a one-half (1/2) mile radius of the proposed boundary of the TID.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

14. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Territory Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Fourteen (14), North Broadway Redevelopment. The proposal seeks to add parcels that are generally east of Broadway, south of Mather Street, west of the Fox River, and north of Dousman Street.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

15. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Standard Extension Resolution for TID Fourteen (14), North Broadway Redevelopment.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

16. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a TID Plan, for the closure of TID Seventeen (17), 900 Block North Broadway.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

17. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Creation Resolution to establish TID Number Twenty-Two (22), The Shipyard, and adopt the Project Plan. TID 22 is generally located in the area east of S. Maple Street, south of Howard Street, west of the Fox River, and north of Fifth (5th) Street. TID 22 will be classified as a blight elimination district based on the identification and classification of the property proposed to be included within the TID. Proposed projects include cash grants and loans to owners, lessees, or developers of property within the TID; road, pedestrian, bicycle, and other transportation improvements; potable water, sanitary sewer, and storm water

infrastructure; public spaces and amenities; land acquisition, environmental remediation, structural rehabilitation, and new construction; and administration. The proposed costs include projects within the proposed boundary and within a one-half (1/2) mile radius of the proposed boundary of the TID.

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

18. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Creation Resolution to establish TID Number Twenty-Three (23), Legends District, and adopt the Project Plan. TID 23 is generally located in the area east of Holmgren Way, south of Lombardi Avenue, west of Bart Starr Drive, and north of Mike McCarthy Way. TID 23 will be classified as a blight elimination district based on the identification and classification of the property proposed to be included within the TID. Proposed projects include cash grants and loans to owners, lessees, or developers of property within the TID; road, pedestrian, bicycle, and other transportation improvements; potable water, sanitary sewer, and storm water infrastructure; public spaces and amenities; land acquisition, environmental remediation, structural rehabilitation, and new construction; and administration. The proposed costs include projects within the proposed boundary and within a one-half (1/2) mile radius of the proposed boundary of the TID.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to amend and remove the blight designation from parcels owned by Ron Smits, Tax Parcels 1-1841-E and 1-1841-E-1, but keep the parcels within TID 23. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

Motion and vote for this item is under Agenda Item D.

E. INFORMATIONAL.

No information was presented.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Deby Dehn, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to adjourn. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- I call the meeting to order with the roll call, please.

- [Kevin] All right. Chair Gary Delveaux?

- Here.

- Matt Schueller?

- Here.

- Alderperson Barbara Dorff?

- Here.

- James Blumreich?

- Here.

- Deby Dehn?

- Here.

- Kathy Hinkfuss?

- Here.

- [Kevin] And Melanie Parma asked to be excused.

- Next up, a motion to approve the agenda for this meeting.

- So moved.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Jim and Alder Dorff. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Herein then and the motion approved. The first thing is the public hearing regarding the changes to TID 5, East and West Downtown, TID 7, Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors, TID 8, Henry and Morrow Streets, TID 9, State Highway 54/57 Business Park, TID 12, I-43 Commercial Development, TID 13, Downtown Redevelopment, TID 14, North Broadway Redevelopment, TID 17, 900 Block North Broadway, TID 22, The Shipyards, TID 23, The Legends District in the City of Green Bay. So we're going to handle all of the public hearing, all changes at a time. So first thing, is there anybody who would like to make a comment at any of these changes. Please.

- [Shannon] I'd like to make a comment on TID 9.

- TID 9, okay.

- [Kevin] Do you want me to get the podium up?

- Oh yeah.

- [Shannon] Can I go, or?

- Oh yeah, please, go up there please.

- [Shannon] Awesome.

- Your name and address.

- My name is Shannon Madigan. My address is 1005 South Clay Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54301. I'm here today representing 7180 and Scott Development, which are two significant landowners that are part of University Heights, which is the TID 9 District proposed to be shut down. A little about TID 9. It was created to expand the City's interest in the East side of Green Bay. This TID is unique in that it involves agreements with both the Town of Scott and annexing landowners. Green Bay and the Town of Scott entered into a Joint Order Agreement to allow the Town of Scott access to infrastructure in exchange for land annexation. Water was promised to the Town of Scott within seven years of that agreement. We are now past the seven year mark, and the City of Green Bay has not fulfilled that. Landowners that annexed were promised help from the City to create a business park, University Heights. The boundary agreements and the developers agreements show the obligations that the City of Green Bay has to the landowners and the Town for their annexation. The annexation and implementation of TID 9 took place just before the 2008 recession. Bad timing and a slow economy does not dismiss agreements though. TID 9 should not be closed down, but rather extended to allow for these promises to be fulfilled between the parties affected. University Heights is one of the only areas in Green Bay that still offers substantial plots of land for large industrial or manufacturing companies, much like Robinson Metal which I heard was being discussed prior to the start of the meeting. Without this TIF or the infrastructure, University Heights will lose all potential development. These businesses will look at neighboring villages, towns or cities that can offer both the land and assistance with infrastructure. Longterm TIFs are a positive way to make sure businesses expand in the City of Green Bay. Once developed, TIF districts offer a substantial increase in property tax revenue that can be used however the City likes. A developed TIF district also creates more jobs and brings more residents to the area for those jobs. Anyone looking at this from a County's perspective or thinking short-term, may not mind if a business builds elsewhere, as TIFs can create perceived tax revenue issues for local governments. We as a City though, should be thinking long term, and about our own City needs. Keeping TID 9 open costs the taxpayers nothing. It was managed carefully during the recession, and was not put in the negative because of overspending on infrastructure. It is my understanding that the negative balance of around $1.6 million was essentially the result of the City of Green Bay's own land purchase within University Heights. Closing down this TID does not make that debt disappear. But it does make it almost impossible for the land to be developed and that debt to be paid back to the taxpayers of Green Bay. Now that the economy is doing well, the City of Green Bay should be focusing on University Heights. In five years, almost no marketing has been done on University Heights. During those years, the City focused instead on other business parks within Green Bay. Those parks are near capacity now though, and instead of filling in environmentally sensitive areas to expand them, which I know is what is currently being researched and proposed, the City should be working to grow University Heights and the land that is readily available out there. They should be using the TID to bring in businesses so they can meet the obligations they committed to when they entered joint agreements with landowners and the Town of Scott. In closing, I'd like to ask, has anyone reviewed all of the agreements made related to that area? And has anyone reviewed how the City of Green Bay will meet and fund those agreements without TID 9? We are one of the landowners in the area. No one has talked to us as to how the City of Green Bay will fulfill their obligations. In fact, had I not read the meeting minutes, I would know nothing about the proposed TID 9 closure. Further review of City and Town minutes do not show the issues that I've mentioned as being resolved. I believe the decision to close TID 9 should be tabled until after those issues are resolved. Thank you.

- Any other comments in regard to any of these TIDs?

- Is it appropriate for me to make comments now, or when we discuss TID 9 when we get to it?

- [Kevin] We'll probably handle it under the action items. We'll just let the public speak at this time.

- Okay.

- Any other--

- TID 23.

- Please.

- TID 23.

- Yes, please.

- My name is Ron Smitts, 3777 Mighty Oak Trail, Howard, Wisconsin. I would like to request my property at 913 Lombardi Avenue, Tax Parcel 1-1841E1, and 1920 Bart Starr Drive, Tax Parcel 1-1841E, not be labeled as a blighted property, but remain included in the TID District.

- Any other comments or questions with regards to any of the TIDs? If not, we shall consider the public hearing closed. All right. I think it--

- [Kevin] You have to ask two more times.

- He has to ask two more times.

- Okay. Any other questions or comments with regards to the TID public hearing? Any other questions or comments with regard to the TID public hearing? If not, we shall consider the public hearing closed. And before we get into discussion on each one of these TIDs, we've got another Regular Business item that we're going to cover. Consideration with possible action on a development agreement with NeighborWorks Green Bay for the property located at 505 5th Street, Parcel 2-879.

- Ken.

- [Ken] All right, a quick one here for you today. The property located at 505 5th Street, the RDA purchased this property in 2018 for $8,800.00. We demolished the property on-site. It was a blighted property. It hadn't been occupied for quite some time. The owner was looking to get out of it. We ended up purchasing it last year. NeighborWorks Green Bay submitted for our New Homes in Your Neighborhood Program. At this time they are requesting a grant of $20,000.00 to be used alongside the Adopt-A-Home Program to build a new single family home on that site. The plan that I passed out here today was up, they sent that today as an update for the actual plan that will be going on the site. When they submitted they have their proposal which was in the packet, of a design that they use on other sites successfully. Let's see, so they're requesting the $20,000.00 grant, and that number could come down a bit depending on the donor funding for the Adopt-A-Home portion of the program. Staff is looking for approval on the New Homes in Your Neighborhood development at 505 5th Street.

- And that would be a recommendation?

- [Ken] That is our recommendation, yes.

- Okay.

- And we've got these dollars that'll be allocated in their plan, I mean as far as the business end.

- [Ken] Yes, correct. So this is both in our Neighborhood Enhancement Funds, we have funds allocated for this. But then this will also go towards our Shipyard allocations.

- I would move to approve it.

- And I'll second it.

- Okay, moved by Alder Dorff, second by Kathy. Any questions or comments? Okay, if not, we shall vote.

- Maybe.

- Maybe?

- [Woman] Now we can vote.

- It still has to come up, there it is. Good, thank you.

- [Woman] All right, we have five to one. We have one abstaining.

- Okay. Very good, thank you.

- [Ken] Perfect, okay. Thank you.

- Now the way that I want to do things is we have 10 items to move through all these TIDs. At a July meeting, we tried to spend 25 minutes to an hour going over each one. So, it's up to the Committee, but we can either do each one individually, or make comments or suggestions as a group. Like Barb says, we should definitely be addressing number eight, which was TID 9, in regard to how we should proceed. Kevin, your thoughts? I guess that, let's do number eight for sure, let's do number eight.

- [Kevin] Sure, and if you want, we can through and pull out, and just, maybe if you want to discuss them. Just unroll them, put them all on the table at once to discuss, and then we kind of go back and forth. I think important for the discussion for TID 9, is looking at, okay, how are we going to close it, and the other TIDs. I think they're looking at how they're all integrated. So I would recommend suspending the rules and put them all on the table at once, and then we can decide if you'd like to pull any out separately, I think that's okay to do.

- Move to suspend.

- Second.

- Okay, a motion and a second to suspend the rules and handle them all at once with specific comments. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, rules suspended.

- [Kevin] Sure.

- Okay, so, like I said we spent quite a bit of time at our July meeting. So we should talk about any specific comments, suggestions, or whatever in regard to any of these, and again, I definitely want to talk about number eight in regard to TID 9.

- Yeah, it's number nine here.

- Well it's TID 9, it's eight on this agenda item, I'm sorry, Jim.

- No, it's number nine.

- [Kevin] It got moved.

- It got moved after you printed the agenda.

- Oh.

- [Kevin] That is the public hearing notice, which numbers them all, and then so they all got bumped down. So you want to talk about University Heights first?

- Yes, please.

- [Kevin] Okay.

- Yes, please.

- Okay, so I was contacted because this is in my district, by not this particular landowner, but by someone else that lives there. And she had a lot of questions. We talked a lot and she was going to come, but went to a meeting yesterday, and felt she had gotten her answers. So she seems satisfied. But just to bring up the things that she talked about, I guess I do want to know is there any opportunity to look at developing this more, and why we would want to close this right now hearing, these are the same concerns that I heard. But somehow she got her answers yesterday. So what did she hear yesterday that satisfied her?

- [Kevin] Sure. So I believe you're probably referring to Mrs. Peters.

- Yes, I am.

- So what we talked about yesterday is the difference between the University Heights, like business park, business center, and then this particular tax incremental district. University Heights is a little bit different. Unlike I-43 when the City bought a lot of land, and we put a Planned Unit Development over all of it to basically guide and then help out with design criteria to make sure it looks the way that it did. In the same way, we have Planned Unit Development that kind of encompasses the University Heights area, which is more from a land use, saying, okay, here's the types of land use we want to see out here, and here's restrictions on design and other things. That's staying in place, that's not changing. What we are looking at is the specific tax incremental district that was created out there at the same time that this PUD was created. And then basically, this is the area east of 57, and then along I-54 Algoma Road. And I think in terms of timing, probably right, one of the worst times to create a tax incremental district and spend money, but, right, people were predicting recessions and then being different business, but it is what it is. And the City has spent money. They've spent money on infrastructure. And they've spent money on land acquisition. What we have done is, after the recession, this area was really targeted for, along 57 and 54, a lot of big box retail development, and then further to the east more industrial type development like manufacturing. As we all know, since the recession, retail has been remarkably different. Population growth has slowed out there. I think one of the things we were also looking at if you look at the Town of Scott and their population, what it was, it was growing by 4%, 5%, 6%, annually, prior to that. Since then it's been closer to what the City is, and that's a percentage or less. So the population, the rooftops weren't up there for the commercial development, and then the retail world, right, was upside down. So one of the things that we've looked at is, in addition to the commercial aspect of, all right, manufacturing parcels, and manufacturing is still growing and we don't have a lot of big parcels in the city. And so what we have done in terms of our efforts, when, generally we get referrals through the chamber, through the Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation, or The New North, basically it's sites there's an approach, these regional organizations say look, I'm looking for sites in the area, and they need to have certain facilities, sometimes it's just draw land, sometimes they want an existing building. And so we submit into those, or when clients come talk directly to us we bring them out and show them parcels that are available out here. There's some limitations with R Parcel, it doesn't have the direct access to 54. It's a State highway, and they're controlling a number of access points. So it's a challenge. As said at the public hearing, there's infrastructure limitations. There's not water fully out to all of this area, she is correct. And one of the things we talked about in those discussions is woulds. For a project, we can complete the infrastructure cost and make the project happen, and bring water out there, and put in the access points and get that infrastructure so you can have a fully developed site. But we haven't gotten a project that far as far as committing to acquiring land or actually building and doing the project. There's been, I think there's been a perception issue that this is too far out there. And they'd rather be on I-43. Even though if you right measure it and access from a four-lane highway, the very far east side of I-43, like Nature's Way, it's probably a lot further than the four-lane highway is out here, but I think that's a perception issue that we're trying to push past. But we haven't gotten anyone to move forward and the claim hasn't been about the infrastructure, it's been just like this isn't the right site for us. And so to kind of discuss why we're recommending the closure of this tax incremental district is waiting, and that is it's continuing to go further into debt. If we go looking at, this is when talk about the TID reports, year-end 2018, so we started this year in the hole, almost a million and a half. With that, there has been some development out there, it has created some increment. But when you look at what we have to pay in terms of our administration fees, the DOR, and the debt that we have on the infrastructure and land purchases, taking in 190 and we're spending 230. And so this is gonna go on for a few more years until the TID terminates. It's mandatory termination date is in 2026. So we're basically saying look, if we continue to keep it open, it's just going to get further and further into the hole. If a TID closes with a negative balance, there's two options for filling the hole. The option that we're talking about here is to make some allocations from other tax incremental districts to take surplus in those funds and plug the hole here. If we don't do that, then it becomes the responsibility of the municipality, so the City would have to inherit the debt and figure out a way to, we'd basically have to bond to repay the debt for what's been outstanding here. And so part of the reason that we're looking at this closure is because we believe, and this is how it gets tied in to the closure of TID 7, the closure of TID 8, and the closure of TID 12, is that we have sufficient funds in there to be able to shut 9 down, and keep it from impacting the tax levy in the City of Green Bay.

- But what does it do to the people, the landowners out there? Tell me what their hope for the future could be.

- [Kevin] Sure, so I think what we do is we would look, if there is a project that comes through, like in other areas, we have to create a new tax incremental district at the time to help incent that future development. I think one of the things that we've tried to do, and that's why we're talking about 22 and 23 today is they're parallel with projects in terms of having things, right, take maximum advantage of the life of the TID. I think if we start a tax incremental district today, or this year, and we don't get development for five, 10 years, the industrial TIDs are only 20 years long, so if we lose that time, we lose the ability to make the incentive, so it's better if we pair it with an incentive. And the second part is by closing this down and using money from the other tax incremental districts, we're gonna take care of the infrastructure piece, and we can better project when projects are coming through, the funds that they have to finish up the infrastructure pieces out there with the water and the road access and those other types of things. So, in terms of closing this tax increment down, we will still continue to market this as available land for future development, and if a project decides to move forward, we've talked about a lot of these, right, if they move forward we've speculated on the condition that the City is going to create a new tax incremental district to help them help finance it.

- So when the landowner was speaking, I heard about promises the City made to do certain things. And so what happens with those?

- [Kevin] So we've had some discussions with the Town of Scott in terms of that agreement. We have met, our senior staff and our City attorney with representatives for the Town of Scott, and we're working through those right now. I'll say we're probably negotiating through those right now, and so probably don't--

- Can't talk about that now.

- Correct.

- How many acres does the City of Green Bay actually own in that TID?

- [Kevin] Oh, a few hundred. The total land area in here, I think I've got data on that, it's a few hundred.

- Okay, so that's all City property right there.

- [Kevin] Correct, so that was traded, or basically came from the Town of Scott.

- So if I were a landowner out there with concerns, what would you recommend my next step would be if I were sitting out in the audience right now? What should I do to help me understand completely what's happening?

- Sure, I think in terms of if there is concerns in terms of the limitation on infrastructure right now for the availability, if the lack of infrastructure is limiting a property owner's ability to conduct business right now, or to potentially develop it, then they should come talk to our office, and talk to the City and say, look, I want to do this with my property, but the City hasn't done this or I need the City to do that in order for us to then figure out a way to do it. I think one of the things that we've talked about is is right now just, because of the financial situation to continue to keep putting in infrastructure without any imminent development is not fiscally prudent. But if there is a project, or there is something that could help come through and then provide a property tax increment to do it, then we can think differently about it. And so that's really kind of project based. I know, I think I saw Wendy Townsend from our office. I know she's done a lot of work towards retention and recruitment. She can probably attest to her marketing efforts out there. I don't know how many dozens of clients you've worked with out there, and they just choose to go somewhere else and it doesn't take that step forward. But I will say in terms of, we do have them in a rotation of parcels that we offer. I can't make somebody develop somewhere.

- Right.

- Right.

- [Kevin] I can try and incentivize someone, but ultimately it's the business owner that makes the decision where they want to acquire their land.

- That was a good explanation.

- Plus, I think our basic philosophy on TIDs have changed a little bit, where before we'd do a lot of up-front money, and sometimes we cover and sometimes not. Now it's more pay as you go. And as the project comes in, we will make that investment. It's just a better business model.

- [Kevin] Correct, we're gonna challenge that business model today with the official Rail Yard TID because we are gonna allocate some funds up front. I think with that it's predicated on some more real development or some projects coming down down the line. It's one of the more aggressive TIDs, and I'll get into why I think it's the right approach for that particular district. But yes, you're correct in terms of the last ones we've created for East University Avenue, East Town, Whitney, Green Bay Packaging. Those have all been primarily structured pay as you go.

- Has the G.M. from Green Bay Water been involved in most of these--

- Yes.

- I can understand what's going on here. What we've had, one of the best recoveries ever, and if we haven't found property to develop in that TIF during an excellent recovery, I don't know when we will. That being said, my mind was exactly where you mentioned, Kevin, is that if a developer comes along and wants to do something there, create another TID.

- Right.

- Very project specific, that's what we need to do. And then incorporate the things that perhaps haven't gotten down thus far in the existing TID. If I'm a Green Bay City taxpayer, this is the best bailout ever, because it doesn't go on your tax bill as a resident because it's being picked up by the other TIF district surpluses.

- [Kevin] If you approve those other allocations.

- If we approve, yeah, I mean, it going full circle, I think it makes a lot of sense to do that.

- And we would, I don't see a way that we'd market it any less as a result of this. We still want that to happen.

- Yeah, Wendy's not going anywhere. She's got a record of those she's seen before

- So it's maybe the end of this one, but it's not the end of the plan if there's something.

- [Kevin] No, I think in terms of the planning and development, if anything we need to revisit and change out some of the commercial for something a bit more mixed-use or like manufacturing out there to reflect the market. But I think in terms of, yeah, the availability of large parcels is rare within the City corridors, and we continue to want to see that type of development in that area.

- Yes. Yes please, Kathy.

- One last question. And we had talked about this when we make amendments to different TIDs and things like that, but we can close one and then reopen one in the same type of corridor, or does it have to be?

- [Kevin] We can do exactly the same.

- Okay.

- [Kevin] Yeah, depending on how you create it, yes.

- Okay, I just didn't know what the rules and regs were.

- [Kevin] Yeah, you can make one that looks exactly the same, borders and boundaries.

- Thanks.

- The big deal here is the other TIDs are going to bail this one out.

- That's my concern.

- That is, and then the City could go on to fund both, .

- [Kevin] I did want to, if it's okay, jump in to the new creation. I know there are some other parties here, who want to hear just about 14. I'm sorry, TID 14 which would probably be number--

- It is 14 on mine.

- It is, it has TID 14.

- All right. I was looking at the previous agenda, I'm sorry.

- [Kevin] About two actions for this tax incremental district. A territory amendment and a standard extension. TID 14 is North Broadway Redevelopment. So basically it's North Dousman, East Broadway, to the railroad tracks. Generally this has been the Rail Yard Redevelopment, which is one of the things that we'd like to propose and actually rename the TID, and so I think a part of the update here is to rename the project plan The Rail Yard because that's what it is and that's what it's become. So we'd just write nebulous names because we really didn't know what it was when we created it. But we would like to add four additional parcels. These actually will be added as one parcel because of January 1st of this year it was one parcel. It's basically a strip of land right to the east of the existing tax incremental district. CN owned this parcel, they sold it to the developer, an owner of the adjacent properties. But again, I don't know how CN ever sold something, which is amazing that they sold it. But it's gone, but it's not been in a tax incremental district.

- I wonder if they had enough money.

- [Kevin] No, they were reasonable. So with that, we would like to, because there are projects proposed that overlap and go onto those properties, to add these properties in. We've considered them all blighted because they're former rail, not into highest and best use. They've actually found a fair amount of contamination on it. And they are having input base value of zero, there's no value on it to begin, so they will come in with zero. So to have the territory amendment that would add these parcels in, so it would basically include the new projects. And then the second is for an extension, or a request for a standard extension. State law allows you to extend tax incremental districts for three years. Part of the reason, there are two reasons for asking. One, and really the biggest one, is post-Walmart we'll call it. There was a lot of time where this property was off the tax rolls. When On Broadway basically defaulted on their note, the bank came to the City as the guarantor, and said, look, you've got to pay up on the note. The City in return said, look, if I'm gonna pay up on it I want the property. So the Redevelopment Authority acquired it, and basically we got two years where we just basically wiped out the increment. Now there wasn't a ton in the account, but we wiped it out, and it wasn't paying any taxes for over two years. And so with that, combined with now putting in the infrastructure, the cost of construction hasn't gotten any cheaper since we started to provide estimates for putting that in, we think we would need the three extra years to be able to have enough increment to successfully make sure that we pay back to get that on. And then the third would be with the affordable housing project, the TWG Development. Part of their development agreement was, looked at the assumption that we would extend the TID. Again, I think one of our objectives was to get affordable housing for the community in a way to help make the numbers work, and also just to fit in with loan terms, instead of 12 years, 15 years to put the financing together to have the three extra years to be able for them to get the financing package to move forward with that project. So, time off the tax rolls, the additional costs of infrastructure, and the TWG agreement are the reasons that we believe that the project cost cannot be repaid within the allotted time, and that's why I asked for the extension for three years, so instead of closing in 2033, it would close in 2036.

- Mr. Chair?

- Yes, please.

- So you said that the land is contaminated?

- [Kevin] Yes.

- So part of it is, and you're talking about putting housing on it, right?

- Right.

- Right, he said.

- So, yeah. So most of the contamination is historical fill. It's basically, right, we had a lot of hills and valleys in this area, and we just brought in whatever dirt we had and we just dumped it in the way. The majority, we've been working very closely with the DNR, and there's certain standards for, all right, how do you remediate contaminated area? And when you have residences or businesses, there's different levels of acceptable contamination. So we've been working with them to make sure that those are within the legal limits, or under, in terms of what is required. The second is, for most of this stuff, it's petroleum, and so we need to cap it and basically prevent human contact. So generally anywhere from 18 inches to three feet of fill and clay to be between somebody and where those contaminants are. They stay in the ground and naturally over time they will decompose, or in some cases there's a few areas where it might be too saturated that it would have to be hauled away and land-filled. What we've done, Matt is here, in very close coordination with the DNR and a consultant on the project, our environmental consultant, Stantec, working to make sure that it's been remediated to the appropriate standards.

- Thank you.

- Sure.

- Kevin, that remediation, is it in the territory amendment?

- So it's all all over, but yes, part of it would be also in the added territory as well. Up on the very north-east part, where you see the parcel ending in 77 and in 78, that's where the stormwater pond is being dug out, and there was some contamination in that area.

- So TIF expenses will go up because of the remediation.

- Correct.

- Okay. And then, is this our first territory amendment for this?

- [Kevin] Yes, this was created in 2006 and there have been no changes since it was created.

- So we have three left?

- Correct.

- Okay, all right.

- And what is 5-1766, who's that owned by?

- That's Hometown Brewing.

- Oh, okay.

- And they're not in the TIF.

- That is correct.

- Okay.

- Kevin, how do you dress that gentleman's concern that spoke earlier about the blighted, he didn't like the word blighted.

- That was in the--

- Sure, not this one. That was in 23.

- This wasn't in, that's 23.

- Okay, oh I'm sorry, we'll do it afterwards. Sorry about that. Okay. I'm comfortable with this one. I'm comfortable with 14.

- Mm hm.

- Okay, so let's jump down to 23.

- Yeah, please.

- [Kevin] So 23, which is agenda item--

- It should be 23.

- 18.

- Okay, good.

- Yep, actually have to--

- Missing a few TIDs.

- Would be to establish a new tax incremental district down in the Legends District. With this area we'll go back and talk about where we're looking to close down an existing TID 7, Lombardi and Ashland corridors. This is a new TID that we created to facilitate redevelopment, one, of the Legacy Hotel, the former Brett Favre Steakhouse. And also includes parcels that were identified in the Legends District Redevelopment Plan, primarily a lot of surface parking that could have a higher and better use on it. So the projects specifically identified on that were at the Badger State Brewing / Hudson-Sharp property, the stadium parking lot, and then the White Starr parcels down on Canadeo. And so with that we've created this district as a blight district, given the condition of some of the parcels and the condition of some of the surface treatments for parking, and just given the notion that they are not at their highest and best use, and considering everything else that is going on around there, as to the west and to the south. So with that, the gentleman, Mr. Smitts, who spoke earlier, those parcels are these parcels up up here. And so we included them in the tax incremental district, one from a land use perspective, and part of it was surface parking, it's at a corner, a gateway corner of the district, and felt there'd be a higher and better use. They were identified as blighted, not necessarily the structure on the corner of Lombardi, but the parcel to the south in terms of the condition of the structure that's there and the parking lot. In terms of, we classified 100% of the parcels in this district as blight. If the Committee wished to remove those parcels from the blight condition, per the gentleman's request, it would still be more than above the 50% threshold for blight to create this district. And just from a staff perspective, we do not have an issue .

- And from the landowner's perspective, it's their advantage to be in this TID.

- [Kevin] Yeah, and I think in terms of rating, you create a tax incremental district, as a property owner you're not gonna know the difference because you're not going to see a change in your taxes or anything, but you will be able to market in terms of what if somebody wants to, if the current owner or the future owner wants to do redevelopment, there's a potential that incentive could be involved. With that, if they were not in the tax incremental district now, I know we discussed at the staff level, including the undeveloped Tundra Lodge parcels. But again, just in terms of timing, we didn't feel it was appropriate at this point. If you took the parcels out entirely, they could come back in at the future, but there's a process to that. So per Mr. Smitts' request, and if you'd like to entertain an amendment of the blight designation, it would just have to be consented to--

- And that's definitely what the landowner would like, right, Mr. Smitts?

- Correct.

- Just for my own--

- Yes.

- Whether a parcel is deemed as to be blighted or not, what's the difference? If it's in the TID, and I understand that a certain percentage of the property has to be deemed as blighted for it to be able to be created as a TID, what's the difference, say, for the property owner in this case, If my property is designated as blighted or not, but still in the TID.

- [Kevin] Sure, so if your property is blighted, from a City perspective, if it's identified as blighted, there's some advantages to the City if we were ever to acquire that property, because we said it's blighted, and if we identified it with a brownfield contamination, there's some benefits to us when it comes to remediating and compliance just as far as getting clearance with the DNR, right?

- Yeah, that's pretty much it.

- Okay, that's my brownfields expert here. The piece from a landowner perspective, and this goes back to the property rights, so the City can condemn property, right. We have that authority to condemn property. We have the authority to condemn blighted property, and non-blighted property, where there's a subtle difference, it goes back to that supreme court case, Kelo versus New London, and basically it said in there that a City could condemn any type of property, and in that case, turn around for private benefit, or turn around for economic development. It didn't have to be for like streets or parks, they could actually condemn it and then give it to a private developer. So the State of Wisconsin passed some legislation and said that if you are a non-blighted property, the municipality cannot come in and condemn you for economic development. They can still condemn you for street parking, that's public benefit in there, but they cannot do it for a private use. If they're blighted, they can still do that. So there is a distinction. Bigger picture, I'll refer to the attorney on this, the City doesn't have any plans for condemnation in this area. We generally have not in any of our tax incremental districts. It's a right that we're granted, but we don't anticipate having to use it for anything in this area. But it's a little bit of difference, and if you want to, perhaps you'd like to speak as the attorney on it.

- No, you're doing a great job on it.

- I'm finished talking to it.

- So then there would be, an appropriate motion might be to--

- Honor.

- Honor the request of--

- The affected landowner.

- Of those two properties, or re-designate them as non-blighted?

- [Kevin] Correct, yeah.

- Or should we designate the two properties, I don't know the exact names of the properties.

- [Kevin] We've got them on the packet, but I know what they are, they were mentioned here, so we'll take those two off.

- That's a motion.

- That's a motion.

- Okay.

- But is that to keep them in the TID? So they'd be non-blighted, but in the TID.

- TID, yes.

- I believe that's what I--

- That's what you asked for.

- That would be my motion.

- Okay.

- Is there a second to that?

- Second.

- Kathy.

- So for information--

- Yeah, please.

- I just want to reiterate the point that even with the removal of those properties, it wouldn't affect the qualification of the percent of the blight required for the district?

- No.

- Correct. It's still a bit, it'd be over 90%.

- But it doesn't always happen when you designate blighted property. Because I recall other public hearings where we've had people protest calling their property blighted, and in some cases we would refuse to do that because it would affect the future development. In this case, it shouldn't.

- [Kevin] No, it will not.

- It will not. Any other discussion or comments? I'm not sure, are we in a middle of a vote online, or, okay, then we will vote.

- [Kevin] This is a vote on the amendment?

- Amendment.

- Yes. I actually remember that. There we go.

- [Woman] Unanimously approved.

- Okay, so, thank you.

- [Ron] Thank you.

- [Kevin] So as long as we're on 23, I just want to finish up a little bit, just discussion. Again, I said the purpose of this is really to facilitate higher and better use of certain parking in this area. I think in the project plan we identified four different kettles of redevelopment sites. As mentioned, currently undergoing, the Legacy Hotel on the old Brett Favre Steakhouse. The parking lot area of the Hudson-Sharp building, Badger State Brewing, the White Starr parcels, which is basically the intersection of Canadeo and Reggie White Way, and Bart Starr, that area there. And then the Stadium View parking lot. Based on that, we structured the Legacy Hotel as a PayGo, and would propose doing the same types of things in this area. Based on there's most of the infrastructure in here already, so i don't anticipate a lot of heavy project costs. In there there's some budgeted, kind of on the back end, like we're gonna do on TID 7, which I'm talking about. So just in terms of the proforma, there's a little in with some of our admin costs eventually, but this looks at over time, again this would vary depending on the timing of the project and the amount of the incentive, but it should be a very healthy TID in terms of performing based on some of those assumptions.

- Well we have a good start, with an anchor.

- [Kevin] Yeah, I think the Legacy Hotel project will be a great for that area. Based on just what's going on, that was very hot, and we'll probably see the rest of that developed probably sooner than later.

- Absolutely, good. Which one of those do we want to talk about next? Did you say 7?

- I think we can go back to, check back to the beginning, make sure we get all those items on each one. All right. Oh, I should start with TID 5. So TID 5 is our East and West Downtown. It's one of our larger tax incremental districts, basically spanning both sides of the river, one of the older ones. Created in 2000. This has had two amendments to it. In 2004 and in 2006 territory was added to it. What we're proposing today is a territory amendment to actually subtract territory. With the new Tax Incremental District 22 for The Shipyard, there's gonna be some overlap with the parcel in TID 5. We feel that we can remove those parcels given there is not a ton of value to them, or I should say, not a ton of incremental value to them, and it will not impact the long term projections in terms of creating revenue sufficient to pay the cost in that area. And so, also from a finance perspective and an administration perspective, it makes for math a little easier. It's usually better to have one TID layer, instead of timing, right, base value from 2000, base value from 2019. And so with that, in your packet was proposed the list of parcels that we're proposing to remove. This map just kind of shows the overlap, the ones that are yellow and have a pattern behind would be the ones that would be removed from 5 because they becoming part of TID 22. So just with that, and I think back to a question about are there any parcels that won't be in a TID moving forward. The one that won't be in, I take that back. These will still remain in TID 5. But some of these up here will not go into the new tax incremental district. So we may have to just double check that one parcel up on the left, it may also have to get removed, just because you have to have a contiguous territory, but again, there's not a lot of value from the base to what it is now, so they're not, there's not a lot of incremental property taxes coming in that would help. So we would recommend removing the parcels that were presented in the packet.

- When we do these, are we going to do these each individually, are we, Kevin? Because if we are, we maybe should do them as we.

- [Kevin] Sure--

- But if we could just take them as a lump sum?

- [Kevin] Right. They're all listed individually because we have to have individual resolutions for all of them. But with that, I think Robert's Rules allows you to suspend, and take more than one at once. If you want to take them all together, all the recommendations.

- I was just curious, I hate to go off one if we have to come back to it again, and then vote, but, legal?

- You can speak to, you've already suspended the rules to take them all up at one time.

- Right, right, with the hearing, oh, okay, I thought that was just with the hearing.

- No, not the hearing, we did that with everything.

- We did.

- We decided to take them all up, and so once you've finished your discussions, you can decide to suspend the rules again to take them all up with one vote, you'll lump them essentially.

- Okay, we can just make up amendments along the way that we want.

- [Kevin] Correct, yep.

- That we want.

- Which we'll do, yes.

- All right, TID 7. This goes back down to the Legends District area. This was created in 2002 primarily to help incentivize the development of the Tundra Lodge. Since then we have had a whole lot of additional projects with that. And so what we're looking at is proposing three things. One is to look at doing an affordable housing resolution. Let me go back, I'm sorry, an allocation amendment, first, to allocate some funds to help close TID 9. And then an affordable housing resolution to put funding into a housing fund for the City, and then a third would be a termination resolution. So basically winding this one down. And here is what we have projected. Based on, and these are estimated numbers. But our starting balance this year, public expenses, the last thing that we like to accomplish in the project plan is putting sidewalks in this area. As you know it gets very crowded on there on event days, both at Lambeau and the Rush, and that's been a complaint from some business owners. So we'll be looking at spending the remaining funds on putting in sidewalks and the lighting just to enhance pedestrian accommodations through that area. With that, we'll have an ending balance about 450, with an increment coming in at 2020, and after administration expenses, we'll have an escrow for development. There's still one PayGo out there for Shorewest, so we need to put that money, they still have a few more years coming, so we'll put that in escrow, escrow the rest of the remaining debt payments for some previous infrastructure expenses, that is just basically debt service, it's not callable yet, so we just have to put some money aside to pay that out, but it may be callable, when did we say, maybe in two years or three years? And maybe a little lower if we're able, if it gets recalled in, and then we can prepay. And then proposing $820,000.00 to go into TID 9 to help with that closure. All those project expenses would balance out in the end of 2020. State statute allows you to keep, after all project costs have been paid off, it allows you to keep a tax incremental district open for a year, and use all that increment for housing, of which 75% of that has to go to affordable housing. And so for this district we would look at an increment of $740,000.00 to be placed in a housing fund. We're still kind of putting our arms around what we would use that money for exactly here. But I think really we've got some great programs in place. Our Rehab program, our Neighborhood Enhancement program, helping with projects for affordable housing that aren't in tax incremental districts. And so I have to put together some policies of how that gets spent. I'm guessing it probably gonna be like block grant enhancement. The City is gonna approve a plan, and the RDA will probably approve projects as it comes through. So with that, have 2021 be the affordable housing year, and this will be fully closed out, terminated at the end of 2021, which is eight years before its mandatory termination date of '2029.

- So is 740 the 75%?

- [Kevin] No, that's the total fund, that's the total increment. Of that 740, 75% of it would have to be used on affordable housing.

- And the remainder?

- [Kevin] Has to be used on housing. And this can be done, the housing can be done anywhere in the municipality.

- Okay.

- Anywhere in Green Bay?

- [Kevin] Anywhere in the City.

- Anywhere in Green Bay, yeah.

- And if an allocation is made from this or any district to fund the debt from another district, is there a timeframe on which that must be done?

- [Kevin] Yes, so I think what we are proposing is that we would have these allocations, just in terms of cash flow, done in 2020, so that our 2019 taxes, we would get 2019 taxes due in 2020, and then in 2020 we would have the cash to move over to close it out.

- Okay.

- So TID 8, we're looking at the same type of closure process. TID 8 is over on the near East side, per the Morrow area. And again, a pretty successful project here, but really not a lot of other development that's been going on. From a financial perspective, we haven't added a lot of cost here, so we've had a lot of increment building up and had a very nice reserve of funding here. With that we'll get some additional tax increment this year, still a little bit of debt to pay off from the original project. It puts us at $1.9 million coming in 2020. And some additional tax increment, again, same situation, there's some debt payments outstanding. We would escrow that amount, and then look at an allocation amendment. We're estimating about $1.4 million would go to, I'm sorry, $1.4 million to be allocated between TID 9, and then TID 17. TID 17 probably needs under $100,000.00, and we'll look at talking about that. Most of it would go to TID 9. With that then, keeping it open in 2021 for one year to put $290,000.00 into that affordable housing fund. Then everything would be paid off and terminated at the end of 2021.

- Is this where Stillmank is?

- [Kevin] Close. It's right across the street.

- Is this like Bornemann Nursing Home?

- [Kevin] Yeah.

- Oh.

- Stillmank's on Henry, so this is on the other, just to the east of it.

- We'll move on.

- Questions? Okay. So TID 9, we talked a little bit about this. And basically you're gonna see in here the plan to close it down. Those allocations talk about cash flow coming in in 2020. So in essence, we're about 1-1/2 million dollars in the hole, and we have about another million and a half plus of outstanding obligations, debt service coming down the line. So it's gonna take a lot to close this down. About 2.6 needs to be allocated, with the biggest chunk coming from 8, then from 7, then from TID 12, but we belief there's enough in there, in those tax incremental districts to be able to successfully close that down and prevent that from coming back to the taxpayers, and then coming back to a levy in the City.

- Good.

- [Kevin] So, with that, if everything gets right-side back up in 2020, then we should be able to close this down at the end of 2021.

- Diana, what's the total levy for the City?

- [Diana] $53 million.

- So 2.6 is roughly 5%, so my property tax bill would go up 5% in order to pay off this debt if we didn't move the funding.

- It should be over $0.30 per 100,000.00.

- Or we won't be able to bond for equipment or streets.

- Well, it's the same as firefighters.

- [Kevin] Exactly.

- Is there any timetable Kevin, on the negotiations that are going on with the Town of Scott?

- The ball is in their court, I would say. Right, is that fair? Yes. But we've had, I think, a little bit difficult transition, and then the mayoral position. But that was one of the, within the first month, Mayor Genrich sat down and we had a discussion, and we've had ongoing discussions, but, yeah, the ball's in their court right now.

- Then we're cautiously optimistic.

- [Kevin] Yeah.

- Great. Great.

- [Kevin] TID 12, so this is item number nine. So here, the same thing as 7 and 8, an allocation, affordable housing, and then a termination. TID 12, I-43 commercial development, basically our very successful business park on the far east side. What we'd like to do here is finalize some infrastructure improvements. We extended Eire Road, urbanized it down to here, for Nature's Way, and then are planning to extend it all the way down to the border with the Village of Bellevue. More importantly, we're bringing a huge sewer interceptor all the way down in here which would basically allow capacity for all of this to develop, along with water. This is kind of end of the line in terms of water and sewer capacity. So we'd like to use the funds that we have existing in that tax incremental district to complete those improvements. One of the questions that came up with Director Dearborn yesterday was just, all right, can we get a little better handle on what exactly those improvements are. These were estimated from Public Works, but I'm going to have, prior to the Council resolution, just a lot more detail that explains what exactly we're doing in those areas.

- Right.

- And how it could potentially support development, basically along the Erie and the Mason Street corridors. We are in the process of looking at expanding the business park, again, kind of like University Heights, the business park itself is what's covered under the Planning Unit Development. It definitely only goes to about Erie Road right now. And so we're saying it should be extended further east, and if so, how far, and what land is potentially developable and for what uses out in this area. So in terms of cash flows, spending down on infrastructure, programming most of that this year to get it done in 2020. With that we would look at, in 2020, again, there's a pretty healthy increment in here. The wild card in terms of, I guess, estimating future development expenses, comes in 2021. That looks at the Nature's Way agreement, and that is predicated on Nature's Way getting a $15 million assessed value, and the amount potentially that we could owe on the back end in terms of a PayGo over that term, because they're still under construction, they won't be fully assessed until 01/01 of '20, and because it's by the State it usually takes a little longer, and maybe potentially under that. So we won't know for sure, but because it's PayGo, that's the maximum amount it could potentially be. With that, also just trying to be conservative, I didn't even place a value on their increment. So even with that, we tried to estimate it in a way that most likely there's going to be a positive cash balance when this thing closes out. So that would have all project costs paid off in 2021. And then we would ask just to keep it open for one year, 2022. This would really, really enhance our housing fund by putting $2.2 million dollars into that fund, and then it would be closed at the end of '22, which is three years before its mandatory date of 2025. So even with that affordable housing extension, it's still going to close before it's scheduled to.

- Good.

- All right, TID 13, Downtown Redevelopment. TID 13 is basically the northern end of the civic business district. It was created to facilitate the develop of Schreiber, and expansion of Hotel Northland, and what we'd like to do this year is a project plan amendment to specifically add the Associated Bank parking lot into this project plan. You can read the project plan and say that it's part of the project plan, but I think it's important to be specific because it's not specifically within the boundaries of this TID. The State statute allows you to work on projects within a half mile boundary, and it allows you to do infrastructure that supports the tax incremental district. This was TID 11 that we shut down two years ago. Those parcels actually were in TID 11, and were in there because we wanted future development, but obviously it wasn't worth saving TID 11 because that one was not performing so we shut it down. So we've talked about it before, so it's kind of a property or project of the tax incremental district, and so we would recommend adding this as an eligible project cost, or an identified project cost into the project plan. I think we've talked about here, through our acquisition, our short term strategy of having this as a parking asset. If you look at the additional employment that we've created downtown, and then long term spaces, or I should say monthly leasing spaces. And then with the clock ticking on the Main Street ramp, and the short term that we need, we have that flexibility in our spaces, but then a long term, obviously, our preference is for a development on that site, which will have, will pull some good requests for proposals coming back to the RDA. So the recommendation here is to add this to the project plan. All right, moving through 14, territory amendment and extension. TID 17, this is our Broadway. We talked a little bit about this last year. In your packets, we've got the exit strategy. This is a very small TID, it was done for a very specific project. That project did not meet the expectations in terms of the development agreement, so we are currently in litigation with them hoping to recover some funds in terms of what, right, a developer agreement, you say you're gonna provide a certain value, and they did not hit that, so we are going after them for the difference in that value. With that there's no other development that's really going to happen up here. It's developed, it's not really going to redevelop, and so we feel it's best just to terminate this TID. This proposes terminating it with going back to having TID 8 allocate some funding to close the gap. This is where we're at right now. I know it's, we could leave it open until 2035 and slowly it might get better and close down. But we would like to, based on the outcome of the court case, which we feel should be done in 2020, any outstanding balance, use an allocation to just fill and just shut this one down.

- Okay.

- And 22, The Shipyard. So The Shipyard, obviously a project that we've talked about extensively, both from The Shipyard itself to the neighborhood and the investment strategy and everything that we're looking at around there. I will attest that this is probably one of our more aggressive TIDs. I estimated pretty conservatively in terms of stretching out the development, but one of the things that we had talked about initially, and then got the support of potentially our City Council, is that The Shipyard project off the levy that we needed a development that was going to support that. And we put in this tax incremental district. With that, it's a bigger trough than probably some of the other ones that we talked about. With that, in terms of the estimated projects that we're looking at, you have some pretty, I feel, realistic values in terms of projects on one, the north side of the slip, with Breakthrough, Badger Sheet Metal, the White Store, and some parcels that we own further down that would generate enough increment as to pull us out. These assumptions don't call for any smaller projects or other improvements in the area, they're really just kind of relying on those two projects. And they also do include incentives in them as well. So just trying to put it out there, known to be the toughest scenario. With that though, I think going back to our reason for doing this, the project plan, you went through and identified all these properties that are going in, it's going to be a blighted district. But of the 55 acres, the whole base value for this district is less than $3 million.

- Wow.

- There is a ton of property owned by us, owned by the school district, by the church, or it's surface parking. And there just hasn't been a lot of development. 55 acres with only $3 million worth of value is probably the lowest per acre value that we've got in the whole city. So in terms of the need for a shot in the arm investment, if there's any place in the city, this is it.

- Absolutely.

- It's gonna be a goofy looking TID. This will be a tail TID, 'cause the rail road's in there, and we still have to talk to DOR about this, because it's not rail right of way, it's actually a parcel, and we have to include whole parcels in it, and this ridiculous parcel, it goes from like Arndt Street all the way down to 8th, almost 9th. So it looks goofy, but that's why the focus is on kind of the lower left kind of inset. Basically an area between 4th and School Street, and really kind of focusing on those areas right around the immediate Ship Yard.

- We're gonna see some big changes here, very positive changes.

- Yeah, and I think just for what it's worth, we've gotten some pretty good calls about the Curb Appeal program, and people really interested in what's happening here. We've had great turnout in terms of our Ship Yard itself, the public feedback we've gotten in the design process. And yeah, I think once we get going we're gonna see some monumental changes in this area.

- So is the school insured property included?

- [Kevin] They're included.

- And how does that work?

- [Kevin] So they're included, and they can come in. The school district owns a lot of surface parking. Maybe in the future that would develop. So it's coming in now as one, as tax-exempt at zero, because the school owns it. But even if a private entity owned it, and it's surface parking, so there's no improvements, so it's a pretty low value. So we try to pick up almost every parcel that had a parking lot on it, or it's just, as you can see, natural, and just very low values that really doesn't have anywhere to go but up. But churches and schools can be a part of a tax incremental district.

- Yes.

- 23.

- [Kevin] And 23, talk about a little bit, just kind of come full circle, Legends District, again, closing that new tax incremental district there permanently as a PayGo district, which will hopefully, like I said, kind of capture the momentum of what's going on down there.

- Yep, that it would.

- Mm hm.

- [Kevin] So there you have it, 17.

- There you have it.

- Okay, I recommend that we suspend the rules, and that we approve all the, with amendments that we've already adopted.

- So you would like somebody to make that motion first.

- We have to have two motions. One to suspend the rules, first of all, that we would vote on all of them, with the amendments that we already made. So that's the first one.

- I would move that.

- A motion by Alder Dorff. Second by Kathy. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, now we need a motion to do what I just said. Yes, please.

- Oh, I'm just asking a question to Vanessa, I'm just asking her if I can abstain on 12, if I've been involved in Nature's Way.

- Only if there's a direct conflict of interest. And you would have to be receiving some kind of benefit directly from your vote.

- And I'm not, so I won't abstain.

- Then I'll entertain a motion to approve all the TID changes with the amendments that we have already made.

- I'll make that--

- Okay, go ahead.

- I'll make that motion.

- Second.

- Okay, there's been a motion and a second. Any other questions or comments? Otherwise we shall vote, if we can.

- [Woman] Unanimously approved.

- Very good. With nothing else on the agenda, I'll entertain a motion to--

- [Kevin] Just in terms of timing, the State mandates at least 15 days between when these resolutions go to Council, so these will actually, from tonight, they will go to the September Council meeting. And then upon that, they will go to a Joint Review Board meeting after that Council meeting, sometime between the 17th and 30th of September. And then with that, the proposed creations and amendments would be effective 01/01 of this year, and then the allocations and terminations as specified in the dates.

- Well, I really want to compliment you, Kevin, and Leah, for all the work you guys did on this. This is very monumental as far as cleaning up the TIFs and putting us on good track for the future. So I just wanted to compliment you guys on all the hard work you've done.

- Nice job.

- [Kevin] Thank you.

- Motion to adjourn, Deby.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Thank you very much.

- [Kevin] Broadway Lofts start breaking at 3:00 o'clock, so we have enough time to go over there.