MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 13, 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.

Present: Matt Schueller, James Blumreich, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Deby Dehn, Barbara Dorff, Melanie Parma, Excused:
Liaisons Present: Chelsea Kocken, Leah Weycker, Jeff Mirkes (arrived at 1:45 p.m.)
Others Present: Ald. Brian Johnson

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

1. Approval of the agenda for the August 13, 2019, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

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

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the July 9, 2019, regular meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve the minutes from the July 9, 2019, regular meeting of the Redevelopment Authority. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on communication from July 16, 2019, of the Common Council by Ald. Brian Johnson, to consider forgiveness of Broadway loan made to Cup O' Joy.

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to refer to staff to come back at the September meeting. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on Obligations of Developer to Development Agreement 19-02 with The Legacy Green Bay, LLC, for the Legacy Hotel at 1004 Brett Favre Pass (Tax Parcel 1-1841-C-2).

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve Obligations of Developer to Development Agreement 19-02 with The Legacy Green Bay, LLC, for the Legacy Hotel at 1004 Brett Favre Pass (Tax Parcel 1-1841-C-2). Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action to issue Request for Qualifications for an Operator(s) for the Shipyard at 100 W. Mason Street (Tax Parcel 2-78).

The Authority may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons. The Authority may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

Moved by Melanie Parma, seconded by Deby Dehn to approve issuance of Request for Qualifications for an Operator(s) for the Shipyard at 100 W. Mason Street (Tax Parcel 2-78), subject to minor legal and technical clarifications. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on communication from June 19, 2018, of the Common Council by Ald. Brian Johnson, to direct staff to draft a percent for the arts proposal that would assess a specified percent on all new and/or redevelopment projects for the purpose of public art installation, maintenance and funding staff to support the public arts commission.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Melanie Parma to adopt Resolution 19-03 Regarding Percent for Art with the requirement of an annual report to the RDA each August. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie

Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on a request by Merge Urban Development Group for a three (3)-month extension on their Planning Option Agreement dated April 9, 2019 for the development of the RDA's properties located at 321 and 325 N. Broadway.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Matt Schueller to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by James Blumreich to grant a three (3)-month extension to Merge Urban Development Group and per the Planning Option Agreement, Developer shall pay to the RDA an additional payment in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000.00). Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on award of Contract CD 19-01 Part "A" Sidewalk & Pavement Repair to the low qualified bidder, Martell Construction, in the amount of $141,991.00 and Part "B" Alley Resurfacing to the low qualified bidder, Northeast Asphalt Inc., in the amount of $274,435.80.

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Matt Schueller to award Contract CD 19-01 Part "A" Sidewalk & Pavement Repair to the low qualified bidder, Martell Construction, in the amount of $141,991.00 and Part "B" Alley Resurfacing to the low qualified bidder, Northeast Asphalt Inc., in the amount of $274,435.80. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action to approve the purchase of a mobile stage for the KI Convention Center.

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve purchase of a new stage from StageRight Corporation for $33,322.00 using KI Maintenance Funds. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Financial report and check register.

2. Director's report and project updates.

Kevin Vonck provided the Director's report and project updates.

3. Next meeting: September 10, 2019 at 1:30 PM.

A special meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 20, 2019 at 1:30 p.m. The next regular meeting is September 10, 2019 at 1:30 p.m.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Get ready to rock and roll. Roll call please.

- [Kevin] All right. Chair Gary Delveaux?

- Yes.

- Vice Chair Matt Schueller?

- Here.

- Alderperson Barbara Dorff?

- Here.

- Jim Blumerich?

- Here.

- Deby Dehn?

- Here.

- Kathy Hinkfuss?

- Here.

- Melanie Parma?

- Here.

- Well.

- It is so neat that everybody's here.

- I know.

- And August to boot.

- Motion to approve the agenda.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Jim and Matt, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- So carried. Approval of minutes from our July 9th meeting. Motion please.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Deby and Barb, Alder Dorff. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Minutes are approved. Regular Business, number one. Consideration with possible action on communication from July 16, 2019, of the Common Council by Aldperson Brian Johnson, to consider forgiveness of Broadway loan made to Cup O' Joy. And I see that he's recommending that we refer to staff.

- [Kevin] Correct, this communication is received just to make sure that each party is to be available for whatever it takes for communication, for this to come back to the September meeting.

- Okay.

- And just a quick question on this. Who made the loan?

- [Cheryl] The RDA did.

- The RDA did, okay. Because it was referred to as a Broadway loan, and I didn't know.

- Yeah, that's the way--

- [Cheryl] The funding that was used was that old Broadway fund that we used for acquisition and relocation when we did the Redevelopment Authority loan.

- Long, long, okay.

- Oh wow.

- Okay.

- [Cheryl] But it was granted by the RDA.

- Okay, got it. And you'll come back to us with a full--

- [Kevin] Yes.

- Scope and context, okay.

- Mm hm.

- What's that?

- Back to fau-te-lia.

- Fau-te-lia. I'd make a motion then to refer this to staff to come back with this at the September meeting.

- Second.

- Motion by Matt, the second by Kathy. I'm not sure even where they're coming up with, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- All right. Number two. Consideration with possible action on Obligations of Developer to Development Agreement 19-02 with The Legacy Green Bay, LLC, for the Legacy Hotel at 1004 Brett Favre Pass, Tax Parcel 1-1841-C-2.

- [Kevin] Yes, all right. So this rebuts back to earlier this summer we approved a developer agreement with Legacy Green Bay, LLC, to develop, basically turn the old Brett Favre Steakhouse into a Legacy Hotel. And in that development agreement we mentioned a few things about just getting some civic approvals for a conceptual plan, construction documents, and then a budget. Some of this you've seen already before but this is more formally going through those. One of the things that we wanted to see in the concept plan, since the building, the first building is going to be set back on the site, really to open up that visual corridor in order to kind of comply with the Legends District plan, where we were talking about buildings out of corners. They're doing so in a way that actually works. You could fit potentially a future building up at the corner. This is not obligating them to do any type of development. But we really just wanted to make sure that there's room enough, as you continue to develop this area, that you could put another building up on that corner. And then, right now, we do have the Legends Walk over there, with a number of art pieces, primarily on private property. But the Legends District also references you have public art gateways, and things like that. And so we just wanted the client to identify some potential pieces, and in that, because there's ownership that involves the parcel next door with the Fabry glove companies, some of those are identified there as well. And so we just wanted to get those on a concept plan, just to run some ideas in terms of where those could potentially be in the future. Second, it just, I know it took up a bunch of pages, and showing a lot of memory in your files, with construction documents, so making sure everything's right and in place. But really it's just reflecting what they present in terms of the graphics and the renderings is really what they're going to build. This is what was submitted to us as the City for approval. And then the budget which is also reflected the first time of what that is involved in that. So I'll be happy to answer any questions. Otherwise staff is recommending approval of these documents.

- Okay, we've had a look at this once before.

- Mm hm.

- [Kevin] Correct, and really what this, the first time around it was just more conceptual. This is just a formal administrative approval, just through the RDA. It's really just to confirm, right, what we said we were going to do is actually what we're going to be doing.

- Yes. I don't see any problems with it. Anybody else have any questions or comments?

- I will have one when the document opens. There we go, and it's really the first page of I think the first document, and it's the conceptual plan. And there are two buildings laid out on there and I'm not fully understanding that from what I remember of the presentation the last time. I remember a hotel.

- Mm hm.

- Correct.

- I don't remember why there's two buildings.

- [Kevin] So the hotel is there, that is what is approved in terms of the development agreement. Say the developer is going to be building this hotel. In the obligations of developer, we want to say, look, because you're building it further back, and the Legends Plan calls for buildings up at the corner, we just want to make sure that, look, in the future, could you potentially subdivide, move things around, and build a building at that corner. And so they basically took another structure that's a little smaller in size, but you could fit a substantial building at that corner, we just wanted to be able to see that.

- It's the whole piece you just explained.

- [Kevin] Correct.

- Yeah, now I'm feeling it

- No, it's okay.

- They're really good.

- One more question I had, the rooftop, is that a restaurant as well, is it more like the Kohler building, because it said lounge, bar, but it also talks about kitchen material. I was just curious.

- [Kevin] Yeah, potentially, they want to, the way it's designed they're gonna have use of the stadium and the whole area. I think additionally they had looked at just having event space or social space out there, but they may look at putting some kitchen, bar facilities up there as well to be able to take advantage of the whole scenery that's up there.

- It would certainly make sense.

- [Kevin] I'm a big advocate for rooftop bars. But yes. It won't be required as part of this plan, but the department will dictate that that's a really good option.

- I think that would, yeah, it would be a good one.

- And I don't remember the development budget they had presented when they were here.

- [Kevin] This was the one that was in the proforma. It's under about $22 million of hard cost and about $33 million all in.

- Total.

- [Kevin] Yeah.

- And that's consistent with what we saw a few months ago?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- [Kevin] Yeah, just overall in terms of timing, getting to work now we've got buildings approved but they would like to be open for the football season in 2020, so a pretty aggressive timeline in terms of a very tight construction window. But they would like to be open for the season next year.

- Are there further approvals we would have to give in the future?

- [Kevin] No, this is it. Unless they would transfer to another development entity or make significant change. No, this would be it.

- This is quite a bit of detail on here, this should be enough detail for us to make a decision.

- You were going to ask about one of the drainage pipes?

- I thought it was funny.

- I figured Melanie was the only one who could make that question.

- Great, looks great.

- What do you think Melanie?

- It looks good. I think it will be a nice addition down there.

- Good.

- Yes it will.

- I'll entertain a motion.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- A motion by Alder Dorff and a second by Matt. Any other questions or comments? Then we shall vote.

- [Lisa] Passed unanimously.

- Very good, thank you. I think it will be a great project. Number three, consideration with possible action to issue a Request for Qualifications for an Operator, or Operators, for the Shipyard at 100 West Mason Street, Tax Parcel 2-78.

- [Kevin] Okay, this is a reflection, kind of an ongoing conversation about the development of the Shipyard. As you know, over the summer we approved conceptual plans. We've had some really great public meetings. We got some really good feedback. We had one at the Farmers Market, I think we had over 300 contacts in terms of how do we take these concepts and where do we find the details. But we also are talking about managing this facility. Operations, maintenance, and ongoing things, and this is a result of our discussion last month in terms of the direction that you'd like us to take. And really what we put together in this request for qualifications is we would like to seek an operator or operators who could come and partner with the City and the Redevelopment Authority to run the Shipyard. And based on some of the conversations that we've had, the kind of four components that are part of this. One is the facility management, which is kind of like the basics, right, making sure the grass is cut, things are clean, garbage is emptied, and just making sure that it operates smoothly like a facility should. Kind of tied with that but separate enough is dealing with parking. We're gonna be creating a number of parking spaces with this, so there's a little bit heavier equipment involved when it comes to maintaining parking lots, and also potentially working on managing or leasing the spaces for events. But their program management, making sure that this facility succeeds by programing it, and making sure there's a variety of events. And the fourth is management of the Container Park.

- Right.

- [Kevin] Really working, and really build the importance of cultivating entrepreneurship in our community, working with the right small businesses to get in, especially food, beverage, retail, would be targeted for this piece, and put together a management plan.

- Right.

- [Kevin] And what we did is we kind of identified those four things. And in putting out this request for qualifications there may be an entity that can do all four. There may be an entity that can do one. But really we want to, and that's why we did it as qualifications instead of a proposal, kind of get to us the broadest net possible to figure out what the right assembly of operator, operators may be. So with that, upon your approval, if you would release this, put it out there for just over a month with the goal of then bringing it back, having some discussions and making a recommendation at our October meeting. I think one of the things that's important now as we move from concept really into construction documents, is that we'd like to have engagement with somebody some time this fall because once you start talking about the details, that potential operator is going to want to be involved in, all right, what am I doing or what am I operating. I think it just makes for a better product and relationship overall if you can kind of get in a little bit before the facility is fully finished, and then just help negotiate some of those details. So with that, I think one of the things we also talked about, like, who does this kind of stuff. One, we'll continue to have discussions here internally in terms of what the City is capable of. I think as we start to go through the budget and talking with our department, Parks and Recreation, in terms of what are we capable of, and then what we may be able to do or service. But also sending it out to entities who are already in the arts and entertainment space, also potentially sending this out to property management firms, those that just really do leasing and property management. And again, maybe it would involve somebody coming out of the woodwork, it's not like there's somebody who does all this right now, so we're gonna be a little bit creative on how we market it and push it out. But we're hopeful we get the right assembly or group of operators potentially coming in to this facility.

- I'm all in favor of sending out an RFP, but by the same token I think we should also do our own, whatever, so what would it cost, I know it would be spread over several departments, Public Works, Parks, et cetera, et cetera, but what would that cost if we did it ourselves. So we have an easy comparison.

- [Kevin] Right, and I think that's part of this process that we really wanted to set out the questions, like what are we asking ourselves in terms of, okay, what would it cost us to do some of these things in terms of right, we have kind of a per unit cost for some of these things in Parks and facilities throughout. We look a little bit throughout the City, and what might be comparable, and then what would be our incremental cost to do things, and there may be cases where, yes it's more efficient. And there may be cases where someone else comes in and says, no, we can do it for a better price. Our goal is to bring back and have that discussion about what that right mix would be. I honestly don't think it would be good if we had four different entities doing like each unit here, so if you can have, right, one or maybe two that can work together to manage this efficiently. And again, whether one of those entities is the City or the RDA, I think that's worth exploring. We'll definitely look at that, we're not excluding ourselves from moving forward with it.

- How does this compare to any of our current parks or development, like The CityDeck, Main Street, because this sounds like we're gonna put up this park together and we want an organization to come in and run it for the City of Green Bay. Is that, am I understanding that from a--

- [Kevin] Correct. The CityDeck is totally run by us. We partner with other organizations, and we partner with Downtown Green Bay a lot in terms of events and programming. But in terms of the ownership of it, it's through the City. Both Parks and Rec, and their adjacent right of way in Public Works. In contrast to that would be the KI Convention Center where the Redevelopment Authority owns the facility by we hire a manager, and in this case Hyatt, to run the whole thing. And so what we have here is potentially one or the other, or a hybrid, where we could have just somebody come in and totally manager the whole facility, like the KI. Or we could do it all of ourselves, like The CityDeck. Or we could have some type of combination based on what types of strengths and costs in terms of, I don't know if that's a good analogy to kind of help, put your arms around.

- Well, the only reason I ask is because I think I just was over at the Wildlife Sanctuary and got a tour. And that's a beautiful facility that there's huge space for rental and events. And so as you're bringing this up I'm thinking to myself, well, from a Park and Rec, or from a City, how does that all work? And I guess what I'm hearing you say is I'm trying to figure it out, and so we want to put this out and let's see what we would.

- Right, and for us, on the internal side, I think I saw her, Finance Director Ellenbecker's here too, and the Mayor, and if we're gonna also do it. I mean, I'm counting for it in our budget in terms of balancing with revenues, and there's a lot stickier things, right, expenditure restricting money limits and all those other things that we have to consider if we are thinking about taking on this additional task in the scheme of all the other things that we do, having also see where that fits in.

- Right.

- [Kevin] In terms of that process. So I think, yeah, both your points, I don't think we're excluding ourselves from it. I think it's kind of testing the waters to see what might be out there. And if all we hear is crickets, then we maybe looking at doing it ourselves. But I don't think that'll be the case. I think that's why we'd like to go down this road and put this out there.

- I just think of all the revenue, I mean, there's just a zillion questions going through my mind right now.

- [Kevin] I think those will be a lot, sometimes we don't know what we don't know until we get some of these proposals in.

- I'm just thinking the financial aspects of it.

- [Kevin] Sure.

- But I totally get why you're.

- [Kevin] Sure, and then I think maybe we did put closed session language on here, if you wanted to kind of dive in, what were thinking about in terms of projections for either revenue or strategies. This goes back to when we were talking about the stadium, based on different models, we could go into that. But I think, yeah, those are some of the things that we discussed based on what's gonna be offered from these proposals.

- And I'm sure we'll get the information back from these RFPs, we'll be getting into that. But right now all we're seeing, all this action item is to issue them. We'll do a Request for Qualifications.

- Correct.

- Yeah.

- And so who manages the, that whole, 'cause this is almost like--

- [Kevin] Sure, it's a combination of the Packers themselves and Delaware North. Because a lot of, they do the Packers services over there.

- Okay.

- Any other questions or comments? If there aren't, I'll entertain a motion.

- I'll make a motion to approve the issuance of the RFQ.

- Motion by Melanie.

- I'll second it.

- Second by, Deby, I'm sorry, I wasn't sure if I was spelling it right. Okay, a motion and a second. Any other questions or comments? If not we shall vote.

- [Lisa] It passed unanimously.

- Very good, thank you. Good luck with that. It will be quite interesting. Number four, consideration with possible action on communication from June 19, 2018, of the Common Council by Alderperson Brian Johnson, to direct staff to draft a percent for the arts proposal that would assess a specified percent on all new and or redevelopment projects for the purpose of public art installation, maintenance, and funding to support the Public Arts Commission. Okay, number four.

- All right. So I will start by first apologizing to Alder Johnson. He brought this communication a year ago.

- At my first meeting.

- [Kevin] We worked on it for a while, and then we got sidetracked with other projects, but with that, feel that it's important to discuss. I think one of the things that, for us, it was hard to get our arms around because we really started with, right, percent to the arts, I'm like, any type of development project in the city, whether that was a private applicant coming in, right, build a house to our public works projects, to, I mean, there's a lot of development that happens in the city in different ways. And just maybe kind of got too far ahead of ourselves in looking at it all, but we had some good discussion. And one of the things that we focused on that we felt would be maybe a very good first step, or I guess maybe second step, I think first step is we reallocated some of our block grant dollars to support the Public Arts Coordinator, and I think in terms of using those dollars, public service dollars, to support a position is solid in terms of sometimes it's hard to fundraise or get money for operating costs for personnel. So now that we have that position, and a little more solid funding, we looked at how do we raise revenue for particular art projects in the city. And one of the things that came up was, all right, what about when we're doing development agreements, using public dollars for tax increment financing, is there a way that we could require a certain, in this case, a percent, be allocated towards public art. And we really felt that this would be good way to start the process of getting more public art projects in the community through a specific policy. And with that, when we look at tax increment financing, and creating tax increment districts, that's where we're gonna have a nice meeting next week talking about that. You do it for public benefit. And there can be public benefits in terms of infrastructure, we're removing blight, but public art is a public asset. And so we felt that including this in development agreements, where you would have a percent, and we looked at a percent of the estimated value of the property. And one of the things that we looked at is some communities do like a percent of construction costs. But we really didn't want to hurt affordable housing projects. Affordable housing projects, a good example is like Broadway Lofts, the cost to build it is probably going to be over $20 million, but the assessment is going to be under $10 million because the rents are restricted. And so we didn't want people who are doing affordable housing in the community, right, make this choice like, oh, we're not going to do it now because I can't, the public art piece, and thing, so. So we looked at just, okay, what's the estimated assessed value. I think working with our assessors, we've been pretty good about estimating what that might be. So of that assessed value, to dedicate 1% towards public art, and that can be either on the parcel itself, the adjoining right of way, within a half-mile, 'cause generally most tax increment projects allow you to go within a half-mile of the district. Or, a separate public art project that would be approved here, probably through part of the development agreement and in consultation with the Public Arts Commission. One of the things we also discussed is that those funds could be used for maintenance. It's always great to put up a public art piece, but sometimes let's not forget that that public art piece ages and put some money aside to maintain it in the future, that those would potentially be the eligible costs. And so in terms of implementing this and how we got it done, we felt it would be best to do it through a resolution. It's just a little more official, it stands out. There's a separate record of it, and really felt that, in terms of how we put together development agreements, that this would be done in a way that, really, if somebody wanted it out, that they would have to come to the RDA to ask to have it removed. That this wouldn't be a negotiating piece in terms of things that we bring to you, that, okay, if you didn't want to do this percent, then you'd have to make a case to this board here, and say, why you didn't want to do it, or maybe how you're going to accommodates it. And really it would kind of be up to this board to decide whether they wanted it in or not. So with that, we drafted a resolution that will then, from the development agreements moving forward, put this in. And I don't know, if Alder Johnson had anything else that he wanted to say about this.

- Sure Wow, that thing's got some. How're you doing, everybody? I feel strong after that. Yeah, so thank you, Kevin, to you and the staff for providing the proposal. And I think I'd maybe start by saying that the way that it's drafted I do support. There's just maybe one question that I would add in there, or maybe a request. There's option two, public art within one-half mile of the property. And so I think there oughta be a way maybe that if you do have a developer who's willing to waive that, and if they're willing to say, hey, leave it up to the Public Arts Commission to decide where this would be appropriately invested, I would support that because sometimes, especially with bigger projects, hypothetically I think of like a Green Bay Packaging, and I think of that development, to invest that level of public art in an industrial site might not make as much sense. And so to leave us the ability to maybe invest that in some areas where you have a little bit more residential commercial density I think could be in our best interests there. So maybe a couple of things that I want to highlight and talk about in terms of why I brought this project forward. And I think at the end of the day it's really identifying that Green Bay has maybe been a little bit of a trailer, I guess, in this industry. And so I think there's an opportunity for us to maybe overcome this a little bit, and I think it's important to lay some groundwork here. And first of all it's that arts means business. And this is a really important thing. In the Wisconsin economy, $9.7 billion is directly related to the arts. In the U.S. economy, $804 billion. So Wisconsin has 3.1% of our total share of the economy, 3.1%. Nationally 4.3%, again, that means that we're lagging, we are more than a percent behind the national average. 94,000 people are employed in the State of Wisconsin by arts. By contrast, only 63,000 in the beer industry, 31,000 in paper making, 35,000 in biotech. This is a real industry, this isn't just feel good stuff. 2017 Arts & Economic Impact 5 report indicates that $75 million are directly contributed to local and state tax revenues because of arts-related activity. It's good for merchants. Attendees at events spend on average $19.06 per person per event. They're spending on things like meals, on parking, on gas, on babysitters. Everything that allows people to experience the arts. 9% of the 9.4 million attendees throughout the State of Wisconsin are out of state, which means that their level of spending is doubled. It's good for hotels, it's good for tourism. How many of you have ever seen public art shared, right, people who travel, they go to other cities, they take pictures in front of murals and art, and that is selling that community's brand. I swear I've been on the Nashville mural tour a half a dozen times and I've never been to Nashville. I can tell you every mural that is in that city, we've been talking about it in our staff meetings with on Broadway, and I've said to the staff, how do we get people to want to come to Green Bay and tell our story without actually having to pay to do that? You do that through public art. It sparks creativity and innovation. Social impact, we need to start having quality of life discussions about our community. Communities that have high degrees of art have higher civic engagement. They have more social cohesion. The welfare of their children are at a higher level. There is lower crime and poverty. Find me a community that doesn't want lower crime, and lower poverty. And more importantly, we get to educate on the different cultures that exist in our community. There's been a lot of discussion lately that I've been having with people about the changing demographics in our community, and how the Green Bay Public School District right now is a majority minority school district, and we need to do a more effective job in our community with telling that story, and why that is a benefit to our community, and public art can be one form of which to do that. There's improved academic performance. Students enriched in the arts have higher GPAs, they have higher standardized test scores, and they have lower drop-out rates. Those are all good things. Beautification leads to economic development, it leads to improved tax base, A sense of place where people want to live. And make no mistake, we are competing for talent. We want people to choose to live in the City of Green Bay. At the end of the day, a part of this proposal is I want to make Green Bay a competitor, a leader that recognizes the importance of arts for not only quality of life, but as the economic development strategy that it is. So I would implore the Redevelopment Authority to seriously consider this proposal. I think it's a good thing for the City of Green Bay. I'm happy to take any questions.

- Brian, I noticed that you contacted some other municipalities, and they're doing something similar.

- Yeah, nationally there are many communities that do this. To my knowledge I think the City of Madison might be the only one that does this in the state, but please don't hold me to that. The State of Wisconsin used to do something similar to this. They repealed it in 2011, I believe. I tell you, I just did a trip out to Denver, and one of the things that really struck me is the amount of public art throughout the city, it's everywhere, and they redo these murals every single year. Now certainly I'm not suggesting that we do that, but I did make some inquiries of some of the locals, and they said it's all state funding. Their state allocates revenue for this because they recognize the importance that it plays in terms of economic development and tourism. So I think, again, directly to your point, Jim, other communities do this, other states do this. Wisconsin, we are lagging. I think it's a real opportunity for Green Bay to be a leader in this industry.

- You mentioned Madison. How is Madison funding it?

- To my knowledge it's a very comparably based proposal. I think there's probably some subtle differences in it. I haven't reviewed their plan explicitly. It's usually based on development. You assess a percentage, and it can be 1%, it can be half a percent, it could be 2%. I've seen 2% in communities, particularly on the West coast.

- Kevin, we've got the Legendary Hotels development agreement in front of us, $33 million. So, would we be adding, at 1%, $330,000.00 that was, would we be adding that to that developer, that increases estimate by $330,000.00.

- [Kevin] Less, so it would be on the proposed estimated assessed value.

- Right.

- Okay.

- [Kevin] Which I think that one came out at, just a little under $12 million. So that would be, say $120,000.00 in addition to the budget.

- And if I could interject, Gary.

- Yes.

- One recommendation that I would make for the Committee, that was not part of this proposal, is that I would exclude any development agreements that are currently under negotiation with the City of Green Bay, prevent any issues there.

- And Chair, our Public Arts Coordinator is here, Laura, who's actually done some research on those percentages for other cities as well. So if you have questions for her.

- I'd like to hear about that.

- Yeah, I'd like to hear that.

- [Laura] Madison is currently rolling out their percent for art policy. It's a 1% policy. It's like Brian said, it's very similar to what we're proposing today. Outside of that, Milwaukee, I haven't heard anything about their percent for art policy, but in their art center they're booming. They're constantly getting murals, and it's a huge portion of their tourism and what they project for their city as people wanting to visit it. On a national level, best practice is to have 1% allocated for arts. Other communities are doing more. Oregon is doing 2% for public arts. But it kind of varies based on communities.

- Okay, I'm just trying to fully understand this. So $12 million assessed value, on this example right here.

- [Kevin] Correct.

- Okay, so $120,000.00.

- Correct.

- So is that coming out of the taxes they pay?

- [Kevin] So in terms of project cost, I think it would have to be identified in the budget in terms of sources and uses. I think when you illustrate a budget, one of the things that we look for is basically what's the gap that is created in terms of the ability to get financing things. I think one of the things in terms of eligibility for using tax increment dollars on it, it could be an eligible expense. I think what you're doing in a lot of our models is it's PAYGO models. So instead of us going into the tin and saying, all right, we're gonna take $120,000.00, and put it in a public art piece, we're going to make a developer do it and use the incremental tax that they're creating to help fund that piece. So it's shifting the burden, in a sense, from us to a developer, and really allows it to be done after some of those taxes are coming in.

- I just wanted to clarify one thing in that regard too. My mind was in the same place as Gary's. The 1%, let's say it's $120,000.00 can be used for projects, the way it's written, within half a mile, and maintenance on those public art projects. We said that it doesn't impact tax levy. I don't know that's 100% accurate, because if it does create additional cost within a tax district, it will defer the eventual closing of that district, and the incremental revenues coming back to the City. So I wanted that to be clear. It does impact the project financing, and the ultimate closure of the project. I would agree that Green Bay lacks a public arts display.

- One thing that I did notice, because I think, my first meeting this came through, Brian, is a lot of the proposals that we've gotten since had 1% built in there for art, and it wasn't based on us recommending it, but a lot of the proposals that have come through for apartments, and a couple of other things, had 1% for art in there, because I noted it. So my question is when they put it in the budget, does that mean it goes in to an arts endowment, and then, where does the 1%, does that money sit in a arts council or?

- [Kevin] So we haven't had any development agreements with it. I know it's been discussed and negotiated, but it actually--

- In the budget there were lines in there that said 1%. I can go back and pull them out, but I did notice it. I was like, wow, these already have the 1% built in. Yeah, it was internal to their, it was in their--

- [Kevin] That was the, it was the Request for Proposals. So on Adam's street lot, Associated Bank lot, we built it into those proposals, that's where it was in. It wasn't in anything we've negotiated so far, but we did put it in knowing we were discussing this and wanted to--

- Oh, okay, because when they were coming back I noticed they were in there.

- [Kevin] So our understanding is that funds would be placed into an account that would be managed then, in this case, for the proposed funds for projects approved by RDA and Public Arts Commission. And I think that sub three in there, hopefully, it might get to your point, about, right, so if the half mile still puts us in an area where it's like, hm, public art is not going to be used or beneficial to the community, then between the RDA and the PAC, we can say, yep, we're using these funds for this.

- 'Cause I think that that's important from a maintenance perspective, because when you get the art in, it's awesome, but if you don't maintain it, it looks terrible. So that's why I was making sure it was going to be something that we could allocate for maintenance after, or somebody within the city, there would be money.

- Well, and the developer could actually add the art into the project, as a public art piece. It doesn't necessarily be money out, it could be money that's actually part of the design of the building, which would be really cool on a grand scale, something larger.

- Right, and Laura's very good at getting all types of art kind of covered in there, which I think is cool in a way that you can integrate it into projects themselves. Yeah, it may be private property, but at the end of the day, if it's still accessible to the public--

- You can see it public.

- Yep.

- [Kevin] There's still a benefit.

- Yeah, I get that.

- So one more question. So if I'm a developer, and I'm operating on a shoe string, and I request any TIF development fundings, and I protest the 1% you had mentioned that earlier. What's the provision there for granting some relief? Because the way it's written it almost seems like it's got to be at least 1% on any one project.

- [Kevin] I think it would be, ultimately up to the RDA to decide. I think what staff would do is look at, okay, what's on a shoestring here, and our goal is to get public arts, and then they're using funds in a way that, we look at public benefit, public benefits as well as some of those other things, but if they're addressing a super-dirty site, and all their budget's going into environmental remediation or eliminating a blight piece, I think you would waive those in making that recommendation, or maybe like reducing that, or looking for some other alternatives. But I think, if we wanted to go into it, with the result being like doing it, then, right, like every negotiation, that's just one piece that we kind of felt like taking away from staff negotiating, that's one that the RDA should decide.

- I did see it as a negotiating tactic so long as there's the ability--

- So I assume--

- There clearly would be a check point on every project.

- [Kevin] Yeah, it would be included in just like, you've may have heard, in our standard language, which we start our negotiations from. In terms of that point, that would be one if they wanted to change or relieve, it wouldn't be done through staff, it would eventually be done then through .

- I think it's important that, I'm definitely not looking for a proposal that would potentially create a hardship on any developer in terms of wanting to do business in the City of Green Bay. And I think that's the importance of the exit strategy. But at the same time I'm not looking for us to be a doormat, and roll over, because nobody wants to invest in public art. I think the reality is when you invest in it, economically, these property owners, the value of the properties will appreciate when they're surrounded by public art. That's evidenced by every major community rehabilitation you've ever seen across America. It almost inevitably starts with public art. That's how gentrification starts. And I don't think gentrification is what we're shooting for here, and there are ways to prevent that, but it almost always starts with the arts, and then the developers come, and the value of everything around it increases. Art has very, very tangible value even though it may seem a little bit intangible right now. But there's plenty of research that demonstrates its impact, and I think a lot of developers out there would likely see the value of that, and understand that it does positively impact the properties, it'll help attract the tenants, whether they're residential or commercial, again, their properties will appreciate. It will help attract additional development around that. That's been proven time again. But at no point would I say that I want it to be something that inhibits any type of commercial development within the city.

- Yes, please.

- Coming from Military Avenue, we could potentially have very large projects. And I feel like we almost need to incentivize those projects and not be charging them. I love the concept of the arts, but I don't know that that's the right way to go about it. If you do do this plan, I think the half mile radius is going to be a nightmare to manage. I would say it just goes into an arts fund and we use it as needed. But I think that 1% is pretty high.

- Just a point of clarification, that this 1% would only be assessed on projects that are receiving an incentive.

- [Kevin] Correct, and that's something that we discussed in terms of, right, so a large project comes in, new assessed value of $10 million, and they're not taking tax increment financing, and there's some communities that charge every project those. I felt one that was a little larger conversation, and two, didn't want to put those kind of barriers in place. I think once you start talking about public assistance, there's other, right, there's strings, like, oh, with public assistance. And I think in terms of providing public benefit, we're just kind of adding in one other thing, and that's the arts in terms of those public benefit. So our whole, again, not to derail any project, but if there is new opportunity for public assistance going into a project, that some of those funds could be dedicated towards public art.

- And I think it's a redeemable discussion point to enter in quality of life. We do that in every development project that comes before us. We don't like this siding, we want to see a sidewalk put in here. How about more green space, more trees, more parking. Can we please stop saying more parking. We have that discussion, I think it's just this is new, right, we've never really had this talk around art before, but we have it around many other amenities that encompass virtually every development that comes before us.

- Conceptually I'm fully in favor of the whole concept, but I just don't know if 1% is the right percentage. Either it should be a half percent or wherever, I just don't know. But conceptually, absolutely. It's a great concept. Myor, you have a thought?

- Yeah, I'm very much in support of the program for all the reasons that were laid out by staff and Alder Johnson. I think we have seen tremendous momentum accrue over the last few years related to public art. But we do need to sort of push things to the next level from the government side of things, and I think this is a great way to do that. In terms of how we can massage it a little bit, I'm open to suggestions in terms of whether or not 1% is the right number, or if you sort of tier things based on project size or project assessment, if that would make some sense. But I think this is absolutely the right way to go, and I'm fully supportive of what Alder Johnson has proposed, and what staff has offered.

- Matt.

- Yeah, just a couple of questions. I am, and my apologies to the Green Bay Public Arts Council, because I just don't know enough about it. Governance standpoint, right. Here's this pot of money, and how, who controls it, what happens with it, oversight, auditing, help me understand that.

- Half mile. I think that was my nightmare, trying to manage.

- Half mile?

- I think the way of looking at how you manage the money, first of all, staff, we work very closely with developers and the agreements, so there would be the establishment of where they are going, is this part of your project, is that what it's going to be, is it going to be adjacent to the project, you map the six, that area map is not a large area, you can lay that out. I feel that's going to be the art, that's going to be more of a staff directed, led, kind of one-on-one with the director working on that. The Public Arts Commission is a commission, they report to the Council, so you're maybe not fully aware of that.

- I'm not.

- But they've got the chair, and they meet monthly. So they are established they have some funding that's in place for that, so they certainly are a body that can give input with regards to the arts themselves, and design, those types of things.

- There are seven, all appointed by the mayor, correct?

- Yes, yes.

- [Kevin] And, sorry--

- [Cheryl] And one alder.

- [Kevin] Six and one alder.

- Okay.

- [Kevin] And I think they, again, trying to diversify and they come from different branches of the arts. And you've seen their work, you've seen the, what's the name of the sailboat, I just call it the sailboat.

- Embark.

- Embark.

- Embark.

- [Kevin] Corner, RDA property in that corner there, that was done really through the Public Arts Commission, right, issuing a request for a proposal, going through, scoring them, ranking them, and then fundraising to get the funds to do that. So they're a vehicle that was established to do these types of things. Here's a way to provide some additional revenue to be able to do more projects and kind of amp up what they're doing. But in terms of finances, the numbers, the money's housed here within the City, and we have accounting--

- I didn't know it was accountable to the City Council.

- Yes.

- Okay, that helps. My next, I'm conceptually, I'm in line. I'd like to see this time-bound. And maybe it's something like five years. And then at five years we come back and look at this, and say, is this working or not? Because the idea that it's not time bounded, I'm not comfortable with at all. Right now this is a flow of funds into something. And I just don't know if it's working or not. Because to some extent I'd say I bet there's 20 different things that we'd love to say, hey, we'd like to attach a percent onto new development things to fund bike lanes, to fund more parks, more police. I don't know what those are, so we selected the arts for a reason, and I just think this should be time-bound, and not into perpetuity.

- To piggyback on your comment, I was thinking, might it have been nice to go out to a group of developers that we've done business with, TID projects that would have qualified for some kind of incentive like this, looking back on our relationship with them and how might this have impacted it. But I don't know that you'd get a straight answer. And involving the staff in the type of projects that we might have done just seems a little fruitless to me, looking back. So to some extent, I like looking ahead, from an implementation standpoint. Let's go ahead and do it, if it's a half a percent, 1%, whatever. And then have a periodic review of how is it going with the developers, with the arts commission, with the RDA.

- And can it evolve into the 1%, if we could start at half percent and see how it's going and evolve into 1% if we're satisfied. 1% isn't a pretty big number, but maybe it's just right.

- Well isn't that 1% part of the negotiation, based on what you had said. We'd indicate 1%, but they're negotiating with us.

- [Kevin] And then come back and ask for an amount that's less than.

- It could be less than, again, it's part of the negotiation that would have to come here first anyway.

- [Kevin] Usually they won't negotiate higher. Exactly. And I wouldn't think they would negotiate higher, but if there's a reason the project is so big, then it should only be a quarter, or a half, we're still allowing that judgment.

- [Kevin] Yeah, and I think just based on what Alder Johnson and Laura has found in those communities that it's not unheard of. I mean, if you came back with like 5%, and people are like, whoa, okay, you're getting a little far. But 1% has been pretty common language out there in terms of, all right, to your point, whether it's for arts or something else, but a percent is like, this is important for us. We're going to put it in there, and that's a common number I'd say.

- What's been the response from the developers since it's been in? Because I didn't realize we put it in. I thought they were putting it in .

- [Kevin] It hasn't been our first. I think maybe just in response to some of the RFPs that we've put out there, before the concern was $50 million, or Green Bay Packaging, something that a substantial project, what does that really mean or how does that play out. From a developer's perspective, I think that's why we added some language about the projects. There's an amount of pride or like some tangible things, like look, I'm going to be working on contributing towards this, I want some benefit too, I want to be able to say that I helped support this project, and just making sure that that can be applied the way it does, capacity for like getting those projects in line. But if you look at some of our projects, it's been public piece of art that has to weather the outdoors, like $300,000.00.

- Well, Embark was 100, I think it was 80 for the piece, and then another 20 for the maintenance. That's one piece. That tells you what it costs to put up a substantial piece of artwork.

- But I do like that time thing.

- Alder Dorff, please.

- Thank you. So just a couple of things about the half mile, within a half mile of the property. When I read that, I read it as more of, oh, so that they have some assurance that it will be near where they're developing. I thought it was like a positive thing for them. There's also four different options, and the very next one is or a separate public art project. So it's not like, there' four different places it could be. So it's not like ever limiting it to within the half mile, I didn't see it limiting it to that at all.

- [Kevin] I think the language in there was to your point to try and encourage it to buy it.

- Yeah.

- For some ownership.

- And they get, actually, credit for it.

- So my comment about the exit piece then, Barb, like for them to relieve themselves of that and put it in anywhere, I didn't interpret number three as that. So now that I've got clarity on that, you can forget what I said--

- Oh, I interpreted as that or a separate public art project.

- Okay.

- That makes sense.

- Yeah, that was already in there.

- Well, and I think that's the clarity that I was looking for. We've got those four different options, and I'm assuming it's maybe a project by project developer in negotiation, and which of those four we're using. We're not asking them for that 1%, and then we get to decide on our own what happens to that, they're a part of that, right, and then we determine, like you were talking about Embark, X number of dollars go to, you can afford that, and if you keep it to this 1%, this much of a project, and then you're going to need some kind of endowment for a maintenance perspective, right. I don't want every developer to go with the option to put a piece on their property and nobody maintains it, right, the point that Kathy was making. But I think that this gives you enough flexibility to, it's all about working with said developer for each project.

- [Cheryl] I think it's a matter of what the developer would say, oh I'm definitely putting my, I'll use it on my property, on my fees, incorporate it. Or if they're like, aw, we don't really want to deal with that. So where can we put the money in. Here's the cheque, it goes to this account, and then we work together to place something, or they may say, I don't really care, I've done my due diligence. We try to keep that open depending on what the design is.

- And then I like that such requirements could be modified only upon consent of the RDA. So there is that.

- Yep.

- I think that covers it.

- So, philosophically, if we were to look at the resolution before you today, I think the question would be do we have enough information here to act accordingly in the resolution. But then it seems to me that an appropriate follow-up action, depending on the Committee's decision today, could be that staff could follow up with sort of a documented procedures if you will, that won't necessarily be pertinent to the resolution about how some of that process would actually occur from a staff level perspective. And it could answer some of those questions that you have, that again, seem to distance from the resolution but are probably still very important questions to have answers to.

- So to me the two key questions here is that the percent is correct, and secondly, I think Matt's idea of a timetable for a checkpoint to see how well it's working.

- Just on the sunset concept. I think it's important to have kind of a check-in opportunity. But I would prefer more like a report that's required of the department to present to the RDA rather than this program just dissolving and the body having to readopt it. There's no reason to fix it if it's not broken. But I think it's wise to inform the body about how the program's been operating.

- I'll just, I'm gonna differ on that one. I think the body readopting and approving it at a set time-point, call it five years is a really good idea. Continual endowed funding, I think becomes less accountable. And I think it's really good to have a checkpoint for anything that receives funding to be accountable to where that funding comes from, so people can have a literal chance to think about it and say, do we think that's the best use for that. And that's just my viewpoint on these, I don't, boy, things that don't have sunsets, or ability to pull them back, I think become bad public policy over time.

- Alder Dorff.

- I think there's always an ability to pull it back. And I think that if we require a report on this, even if the report is within three years, or within five years, or whenever we want to have a report, at that moment in time the RDA can say this isn't working. Just like any ordinance that we create at Council. We can change that ordinance. We can change this. So I would not want to put a sunset. Sunset clauses, I think, are kind of a nightmare, and then you have to go through the whole thing all over again. And if it's working, we'd not want to do that. And it it's not working, then we have the authority to say, okay, this isn't working, we're not gonna do this anymore. So that's where I would sit on a sunset clause. I would not be in favor of it.

- I have not been swayed yet.

- Nor have I.

- And I think from account, you're coming from an accountability perspective.

- Very much so. 'Cause my feeling is if it's working, of course the body would reapprove it again. It's a 1% additional cost that's being borne by a project. If it's working really well for the City, why wouldn't this group just be happily to do that? If it's working.

- How about a review instead of a sunset?

- I like sunset.

- I don't. I was going for a compromise.

- I would perhaps offer up one word. Maybe, Matt, in response to why wouldn't you approve it, politics. I think in 2011 we all know what happened in the State of Wisconsin that likely prompted the repeal of the State's use of this program. And so, I think when you have sunsets, political games are allowed to enter the equation. Whereas if you have something that works, and you can allow it to continue to work, I think that ultimately will lead to a stronger policy on something like this. It takes the politics out of the decision making, but also still by having it bound that the group must review any type of reporting procedures, it still makes elected officials, as well as appointed officials by way of the RDA, accountable for the progress and impact of that program.

- I think I tend to weigh-in on no sunsets because I think we have some natural built-in response vis-a-vis the developers. We'll know as we implement the program how it's going. And we'll be asking those questions at every one of our TIF review meetings on a developer front. So I think we'll have a pretty good sense of that rather than waiting for five years, letting it sunset, and then reapproving it, that's my sense on that.

- Yes, please.

- Not to complicate things more, but perhaps the City Council that I was in, we had very similar project, only it went to Parks. So they could either contribute to the Parks fund, or they could contribute land towards the park. So it kind of gave them the option. And it could be similarly done here, but perhaps it's more quality of life, and it's not strictly public art. I would kill to have public piece of property on Military Avenue to use. And I don't have anything to work with right now. If they were willing to give that 1% of something towards a public amenity or public asset, maybe that's another way to build it in. And could be more palatable for a developer, 'cause now it's on their space.

- I appreciate the alternative on that, Leah. I would not personally be supportive of that because I feel like that deviates from the intent of the program. I'm not aware at least of other scenarios where we offer that alternative, meaning that if we require trees to be installed, or landscaping to be installed, we don't give them the alternative to do something else. And again, it's another form of beautification much like we already require oftentimes under development agreements. But this one is specifically targeted at pieces of public art. And I think to go away from that and use that funding for another purpose would not honor the intent of the program. In which case then, I don't know that I would support it.

- [Leah] You were the one who talked about quality of life projects, and things in the community, so why is it strictly public art?

- Because that's the piece I feel that there is a gap right now. Much of the other things are already--

- But in my district there's also a gap of public spaces.

- I think that's something that the Parks Department needs to handle through the general levy or bonding process.

- And I'm not referring to a park, I'm not adding a park, I'm adding a place that could perhaps hold a farmers market or a fair, something, more green space in the mass of parking lots that we deal with on some of the outskirts, not downtown. You don't see the same thing. So I feel like there's a very different pieces of the city could look at it differently.

- And again, I do appreciate that. I feel there are other mechanisms within the city government that can handle those types of requests, but that would not be in alignment with the intent of the program as I've proposed it.

- [Laura] But if this is a sticking, I don't want this to be a sticking point, because public art is typically seen as murals and sculptures, that's kind of what people think of when they think of public art. But speaking about a plaza, if you had an artistically paved plaza with mosaics, or something that acts as a public space, but still has that art integrated into it, it would still qualify. And that's parts where having staff work with those developers to figure out, okay, you guys want a public meeting area, but how can we incorporate art into that meeting area. So still getting that public access point but making it more beautiful in the process.

- And it actually does say in here, artist designed public spaces. It actually does say that. And it mentions not only murals, but it also mentions fountains, so there's different ways to make that place-making work that you're looking for and integrate this concept.

- Would a yearly report to us, showing us the progress that is being made, would that be asking too much?

- No.

- No, good.

- I may think, I just think, put it out if you want to do this now, but have it come back every August.

- And then the funding, would that be in like an endowment, or is that just a budget line, or is that part of the processing you have to come back with?

- I feel it might be different for each development project. If the developers want to do their own artwork.

- Right, but if they hand us a cheque, is it in an endowment that's strictly for the arts, meaning you get the interest off of it and it's specifically for that. Or is it just a line item that can get moved around?

- We do have a fund for the arts group created right now which is a separate entity that, it could go into that fund. I don't know if we talked about exactly, we've obviously, it could be a City account, it could be the funds of the Public Arts account, it's what they use for fundraising I think.

- Right, but from a financial perspective, you're saying one percent and I wholly support this because I think we absolutely need more beautification. I just want to make sure that when there is a cheque written, where does the cheque goes, who's accountable, and I think, because we're asking for 1% art, that it stays in the arts account. For every time--

- Yes, that absolutely. I didn't know if your question was are we--

- Yes.

- And the account is earning interest.

- An endowment means that you can only use it for that, you can't change the line or borrow the line or move the line, or--

- This will be project specific. It's not just in the pool, I think it's project specific to whatever that development is.

- I think much the same as we see our RDA income and expense report, that we'll look at a mirror of this as they have an art project.

- And there was one point that you had sort of brought up, Kathy, that piques my interest a little bit that hadn't previously crossed my mind, and that is, hypothetically you say yes, we're gonna approve 1%. And if we allocated a percentage of that 1% towards an endowment that was committed to maintenance, because that is something at this point unaccounted for.

- Right, that's why I brought up the endowment, is the money gonna be placed in an endowment so that you have money available.

- So that is something that I would potentially consider for this. I'll defer to the body to figure out what that might look like, or if that even needs to be decided now as part of the resolution, because again, I do think that some adopted procedures would also make sense.

- Part of our campaign for public arts right now, and fundraising more for that, is money set aside for maintenance of public art pieces in the city so that if it's on the development site it's owned by the developer, they would maintain it. But if it's a piece of public art, that's something certainly that we could look at, maintaining like we do our other public art pieces right now.

- Melanie, your thoughts.

- Yeah, I think it's a great idea, and I think that the resolution gives us enough flexibility project by project to look at how we're addressing it.

- And to be honest, I had initially thought the 1% was too high based upon the Legacy project, but I think I'm willing to give it a go to see how it works over a period in some of the TID districts at the 1%.

- Any other questions or comments, otherwise I'll entertain a motion.

- I would like to move that we approve the resolution for the arts proposal that was presented by Alder Brian Johnson.

- [Kevin] Did you want to add a requirement for an annual report in there.

- Certainly, I forgot that. And to require an annual report to the RDA about progress.

- I have a motion.

- I'll second that.

- And a second, a motion made by Alder Dorff, second by Melanie. Questions or comments? This is a bold step. I think it's an exciting one.

- [Brian] Could I perhaps offer up one additional contingencies on that, and the contingency be that any development agreement currently under negotiation would be exempt from this proposal.

- Yes.

- That's good, yeah.

- All right, and, any development agreement currently under negotiation be exempt from this.

- Melanie--

- I will resecond that.

- Okay, any other questions or comments?

- I just wonder, if we had it in the RFPs, why would we want to take it out of negotiations?

- It really hasn't been in any RFPs so far.

- Oh yeah, it says 1%.

- But those RFPs are done, right.

- No, these proposals have been coming through, and I've noticed that it's in there, and so if it's under negotiation now, it was in the RFP, why would you not--

- I asked for a clarification.

- [Brian] If it's in the RFP, I agree with you. That's because there's transparency there, right, we told them ahead of time. My concern is any development agreements currently under negotiation such as Merge, that you're about to hear from, that the hotel that you took up, because this was not an item that had been previously disclosed to those developers. I'm just offering those two examples, there may be others.

- It may be easier just to delay the date that it takes effect?

- [Brian] And that could work too.

- So then it would match the date of one month from today's date.

- We should do the first, start September 1st.

- [Brian] I mean, at the end of the day, I don't want to disadvantage any developer that this was not properly disclosed to them.

- Okay, are we okay with the beginning of September 1st, even though RFPs have been out there already?

- [Kevin] Start it now.

- Don't you want to delay?

- Start it now?

- Tomorrow's the beginning of phone calls. Everyone will start negotiating.

- Oh, starting today, right?

- Well it takes five days for .

- Starting?

- I don't see any issue with it not being able to, and so we kind of would treat it like a building permit, and then it needs to be like certain changes. Building permits, and setting the timeframe. So I think if we treat it like that.

- Okay.

- I think for a minute we can do it.

- Is everybody clear on the motion and the second?

- I'm not even clear. Did I decide September 1st or August.

- [Kevin] No, I think just as the language, like you said.

- Don't even put a date on it.

- [Kevin] Correct.

- Got it, leave it the way it was, okay.

- Do you need to add, Deby, in?

- I would just like it like that in a couple of years.

- What does it read like?

- [Lisa] The motion?

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- [Lisa] The motion by Alder Dorff, seconded by Melanie Parma, to adopt Resolution 19-03 regarding a percent of art with the requirement that an annual report to the RDA.

- We clear?

- Yeah.

- Any other questions or comments? If not, we shall vote.

- [Lisa] It passed unanimously.

- The whole step, I think it's exciting, but the whole step, no question about it. Thank you very much. All right, number five. Consideration with possible action on a request by Merge Urban Development Group for a three month extension on their Planning Option Agreement dated April 9, 2019 for the development of the RDA's properties located at 321 and 325 North Broadway.

- All right.

- [Diana] I just wanted to bring back to the RDA that Merge Urban Development Group entered into a Planning Agreement with the RDA on April 9th, 2019, with the intent to build a mixed-use development of parcels 5-585 and 5-587, located at 321 and 325 North Broadway. They've been in constant contact frequently with Planning and Economic Development staff as they've been continuing to put their finishing touches on their proposal. But they also need additional time to do so and are asking for a three month extension. They are here today to give the RDA a project update to show what work has been completed since their April 19th proposal. They have Brent Dahlstrom from Merge Urban Development here, and Joy Hannemann, and Steve Miller, called Slingshot, their architect.

- Motion to open--

- Did I get that right?

- Dan Drendel.

- What?

- Dan Drendel.

- I'm sorry.

- A motion to open the--

- No worries.

- A motion made and to Matt, a motion and a second to open up the meeting. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Meeting is open, please. Give us the update.

- Yeah, I'm mostly here for a question and answer, but we've been working through just a few issues, parking being one of them, knowing that the parcel itself doesn't really have the parking onsite in order to serve the property. So we're starting to discuss a lot that maybe the RDA owns, and we've talked about lots that others own, and that's one of the big steps. And without all those pieces put together, we're unable to put together the financial analysis to start to think about a development agreement or TIF request. So we've been working on it daily. But we do need more time. And we hope that you would grant us a 90 day extension. So if you feel like that is enough time for that we can come back, at that point in time, the request that we need to move forward.

- Questions.

- Not really a question, but I know for you guys, especially because of the investment and opportunity zone that time is of the essence for you to be able to get a shovel in the ground. So I know that you will move forward as quickly as you can. And I know that you also have some developments and have made for Stevens Point in Wasau.

- Yes, so Stevens Point, we just issued a very large number for the utilities there, and they should be moving all the dirt here in August, or early September at the latest. No, we're definitely moving forward there. We're working throughout the state, but Green Bay is important to us, and it's one of the largest towns in Wisconsin, and for us to be folks in Wisconsin, we definitely want to find multiple projects here that will work for us.

- And this is something that you guys support?

- [Kevin] Oh yes, yeah, they've been great. We're in with them, really excited. The products that they made, the product that they're going to put forward I think is going to be a really great entity for the district and the city. So, yeah, we're really pleased with the progress.

- Any other questions before we shut down the public portion of the--

- Regular order of business.

- So moved.

- Second.

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

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, we're back to the regular order of business.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- I'd like to make a motion that we provide the extension on the planning agreement of three months to proceed on it.

- Second.

- Okay, a motion by Kathy, a second by Jim, to extend the planning agreement by three months. All right, any questions or comments? Then we'll vote.

- [Lisa] It passed unanimously.

- Very good, thank you. Number six. Consideration with possible action on an award of Contract CD 19-01 Part A Sidewalks abd Pavement Repairs to the low qualified bidder, Martell Construction, in the amount of $141,991.00, and Part B Alley Resurfacing to the low qualified bidder, Northeast Asphalt, in the amount of $274,435.80. Bottom line, low bidders, right?

- Are they the only bids or were they the low bids?

- They were the only bids, okay.

- [Kevin] That answer the question you asked.

- This funding is DPW's block grant and Parks block grant funding, so it's a combination, they're doing sidewalks in parks and in neighborhoods, and then alleys as well. So that's why the contract amount is so high. They're using their 150 of 2019 funding for Parks and DPW, their annual allocation.

- And you have those funds?

- And we do have those funds, and some extra, some carryover from 2018.

- And I was thinking we've done a lot of work with these folks before in other contracts.

- It's kind of late, it's August 13th. Move to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Jim and a second by Matthew. Any questions or comments? We shall vote.

- [Lisa] It passed unanimously.

- Very good, thank you. Number seven. Consideration with possible action to approve the purchase of a mobile stage for the KI Convention Center.

- This is actually replacing the original stage. We added a new one in 2015. So the old one that was originally starting to get bad, so we needed to replace that one. They all intermatch, which is why we're using the same company where you purchase them as a one source because they all tie together. So this would come out of the KI Maintenance fund, there's a little under 1.8 million in that fund right now.

- One point what?

- It's 1,792,200.25 is the balance in the KI Maintenance fund. This comes down, the skywalk windows will need to come out of that. So those are going to be done I think in the next couple of weeks, which will be nice to have. And then we're also looking at, we looked at doing potentially the flooring in there and painting that skywalk area, and that would improve that entrance.

- That's kind of an entry into Green Bay.

- Exactly.

- So we'll probably be working with the Hyatt folks on that as well.

- But they changed the carpeting.

- And the door.

- Yeah.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Was that Melanie? Alder Dorff, sorry, Jim and Alder Dorff. Any other questions or comments? If not we shall vote. All right.

- [Lisa] It passed unanimously.

- Very good. Then Informational, all questions on the check register have been answered, anybody else have any questions or comments on the Finance Report? If not, the Director's report.

- [Kevin] All right. Two things, just procedural. Nothings been purchased, just process. So we'll talk with the Chairman afterwards. Just making sure, right, staff, usually prepares the agenda, just to make sure that the chair has the chance to review the agenda before it goes out. And we've kind of got a tight time frame when we put things together, but just making sure, right, that the chair or vice chair, if the chair's not available, making sure we're covering things that we need to at the meetings going forwards. So I'm just doing stuff. We're gonna start implementing in September. Adams Street, a lot. We reissued the request, or reached back out to the original firms that submitted proposals. Re-reviewed those internally with our projects team, up here on this floor, and then also on our City Mayor's development team. And at this point, we are recommending not moving forward with the proposal just based on some of the things that we saw in terms of size, scope, really, also further conversation we talked about just logistics and timing. We're gonna have our most popular parking lot downtown go out of commission for 18 to 24 months. And I know 120 spaces doesn't seem like a lot, but in terms of okay, now you've got the construction around there, there's a lot of things that we need to get our arms around first before doing that. And then also in addition just neither proposals we felt, that there's so little reliance on movement of the Bay Lake Building. And I think as we've discussed, we're not quite there yet. So we're gonna put that on the back burner, focus on the Associated lot. We've got a lot of properties and projects going on and maybe come back to that in a few months. But that is why you will not see that, you didn't see it on the agenda today and probably won't for at least another six months. Just informational thing. I know we own property all over the city. Gallow Park over on Broadway and Hubbard, we issued a hold harmless to allow a piano to be put in there, so if you happen to stop by and see that little corner, there's a little peace in the park, if you want to sit down and tickle the ivories, you're welcome to do that now.

- Is it covered with something?

- It's an outdoor piano, so, I don't have, Chelsea, you got details on the piano.

- All I know is it is meant to be outdoors. It's not quite, they're painting I think tomorrow or Thursday, so it's not quite out there yet but they're working on it.

- And where did you say it was, I'm sorry.

- By the red sculpture at the corner of Broadway and Hubbard. That'll be there's a little tiny corner that just fits on the property. So it's not our property, but it's gonna be on our property, so it's just giving you an update on that. As far as, I kind of came up before, but something with the Planning Commission recommended approval last night that we go into Council, pretty soon maybe get an overhaul of our minimum parking requirements. We're drastically reducing if not eliminating a lot of those requirements. Really just, a few things. One, as Merge had mentioned, but especially in our downtown core, and then our developing commercial areas, we've been running against some challenges in terms of being able to provide minimum parking. But as a math guy, I don't think there's any fuzzier math that parking requirements. I mean, how they're calculated and just like let's drive out to a suburban plaza in the 1950s and see how many cars that are there. And if requirements, thankfully we didn't have an article a bit like one per whatever. Just all sorts of uses. Nonetheless, we really wanted to make sure that one, we were working with the development community really let the market dictate a little bit more in terms of what spaces are needed. Secondly in terms of just reducing the overall costs, especially for projects where you can share parking, right, there's a day time use and a night time use, and if they don't need to use their own parking lot, or in developments that are designed to be accessed by foot, bicycle, or transit, or in the downtown area, right, where you park once and then walk around a bunch of spots. You don't need everyone to have their own parking lot. And then just really to encourage density, and then to minimize the costs that come along for parking. And so, had a workshop with the Planning Commission in the summer. Got some feedback on that, and then really made the changes to proposal. Gone, no, there he is. Based on a request from Alder Johnson in terms of lending those, but I think just in terms of development, I think it's a good thing overall, especially for things we focus on, and redevelopment. It just gave a little more progressive in terms of simulating that. And then just on the docket for a meeting next week, special meeting after this, I'll get a packet out to you probably tomorrow, tax increment district hearings. They don't need a public hearing in all of our changes, but it's just good practice to do all that. We've got a lot of changes that we're proposing including an affordable housing resolution, or an affordable housing extension for a few of our TIDs, coupled then with shutting down a number of them early, as their termination date, making an amended extension to TID 14 which is the Rail Yard area, looking at an allocation or some allocations to wind down the University Heights, which is the business park. And then there'd be the creation of two new tax increment districts, one for the Shipyard and one for the Legends District. So there's a lot to cover. I know 17 items on the agenda, but we had to take each action separately. But still there's 10 TIDs that we're touching this year.

- For how long do you think it will be?

- That depends--

- Is there going to be time between that and this, City Council starts--

- Correct, oh, no, I think we'll go through the packet, and I'll condense and try and write very succinct reports. Also I put a back step on this. Broadway lofts is having a groundbreaking at 3:00 p.m. which they'd like us to attend. So I think some of them are pretty straight forward.

- We've reviewed all of these, though, haven't we?

- In the last meeting.

- Was it the last one, or two months ago?

- [Kevin] So you gave consent, we kind of went through and talked about, right, overall, the projects.

- The plan, yeah.

- [Kevin] You kind of know what's coming. And then we got authorization from Council to do all this, so there shouldn't be any surprises, it's sort of like the technical details of the projections for revenue and expenses, and the formal actions of what we're recommending Council, and whichever you've--

- But it's very similar to the finance reporting we saw on this a couple of months ago.

- [Kevin] So what we did then, kind of said what we were recommending there, yes.

- Kevin were you there for the meeting last week, you make it?

- Yep.

- Good. A quick question on the, across the street from the Associated Bank parking lot I see they're moving the animals and the sculptures and whatever. The bottom line, the County owns that one, right?

- No, so the County owns, I think the County doing statues. I think they're going to the--

- Heritage Hill.

- Heritage Hill.

- The Voyageur ones I think.

- So who owns that property then?

- Associated Bank owns it. Associated Bank owns it. They had an agreement with the county for the county to use some parking spaces.

- So Associated Bank owns--

- Associated owns this.

- All right. I just noticed some activity here.

- [Kevin] Yes.

- Any questions for the Mayor or Kevin, or anybody. Staff, others? We spoke to this morning. He says he's having a ball, he's enjoying his job, that's great.

- That's true.

- As I said, our next meeting's September 10th, which we normally would, but we're actually meeting next--

- [Kevin] A special meeting, yes, so a week from today, Tuesday the 20th at 1:30.

- I'll take a motion to adjourn then.

- Move to adjourn.

- Second.

- Second.

- All those in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.