



MINUTES OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2019, 5:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 604 - THE HARRY MAIER ROOM**

A. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Vacant - Chair, Pam Parish Vice-Chair, Ald. Brian Johnson, Mahamed Rage, Michael Peot, John Calewarts and Glen Sherman

Members present: Glen Sherman, Brian Johnson, John Calewarts, Mike Peot (arrived at 5:32 p.m.),
Excused: Pam Parish, Mahamed Rage

Ald. Brian Johnson chaired the Economic Development meeting.

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the November 11, 2019, meeting of the Economic Development Authority.

Moved by Mike Peot, seconded by Glen Sherman to approve the agenda. Motion carried.
Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the August 12, 2019, meeting of the Economic Development Authority.

Moved by John Calewarts, seconded by Mike Peot to approve the minutes. Motion carried.
Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Election of Chair for the Economic Development Authority due to a vacancy.

Moved by Glen Sherman, seconded by John Calewarts to hold the Election of Chair for the Economic Development Authority, due to a vacancy, to the next scheduled meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on University Heights Commerce Center development strategy.

Moved by John Calewarts, seconded by Glen Sherman to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Glen Sherman, seconded by Mike Peot to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by John Calewarts, seconded by Mike Peot to refer to staff to work with the property owners and analyze current and future land use. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action of resolution for nomination for the 2019-2020 Community Development Investment (CDI) Grant.

The Committee 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 Committee 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 Mike Peot, seconded by John Calewarts to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Mike Peot, seconded by John Calewarts to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by John Calewarts, seconded by Glen Sherman to reopen the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by John Calewarts, seconded by Glen Sherman to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Glen Sherman, seconded by John Calewarts to close the floor for discussion. Motion

carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Mike Peot, seconded by Glen Sherman to go into closed session. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

Mike Peot read the closed session language into record.

After the closed session, Ald. Brian Johnson called the meeting to order and presented roll call:

Present: Glen Sherman, Brian Johnson, John Calewarts, Mike Peot

Moved by Glen Sherman, seconded by Mike Peot to advance the Merge Urban Development project as the City's CDI nomination and adopt the nomination resolution for the Merge Urban Development project to the Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC) for the CDI grant. Also, to refer to staff to work with the Farmory and their application for further review. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on the I-43 wetland study and business park expansion.

The Committee 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 Committee 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 Mike Peot, seconded by John Calewarts to hold the I-43 wetland study and business park expansion update to the next scheduled Economic Development Authority meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Update on Brownfields Program.

Wendy Townsend presented the Brownfields Program update.

2. Director's Report.

No report was given.

3. Date of next meeting: December 9, 2019.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Glen Sherman, seconded by John Calewarts to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Mike Peot, John Calewarts, Glen Sherman, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- [Brian] I call this meeting to order, of the Economic Development Authority at 5:36 p.m. Let the record reflect Mike Peot is present, Glen Sherman, John Calewarts and Brian Johnson. Pam Parish and Mahamed Rage are excused. Call for approval of agenda.
- [Glen] Second.
- [Brian] So we have a motion by Peot, second by Sherman. Any discussions, seeing all in favor, say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- [Brian] Oppose motion carries per the minutes. Entertain a motion? Motion by Calewarts.
- Yeah, I want to motion, yep.
- [Brian] Second by, by Peot, I believe that was, any discussion seeing all as in favor, say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. Item number one election of chair for economic development authority due to a vacancy. I would entertain a motion to table this item.
- [Glen] Second that.
- [John] Second.
- [Brian] All right so we have a motion by Sherman. We'll go with the second by Calewarts. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. Item number two, consideration possible action on University Center Heights commerce development strategy staff.
- [Wendy] Is it off of this report, or do we read off of it for you? Okay they the city of Green Bay created it--
- [Brian] I need you to read what's here.
- [Wendy] Okay, got it for ya.

- [Brian] City of Green Bay created tax increment district nine, TID nine. TID nine Highway 54, 57 business park in 2003 in order to facilitate commercial, industrial development on the northeast side of the city. The development in subsequent years did not occur as expected and as a result the TID has not generated sufficient increment needed to pay project expenses. Thus staff recommended that the city allocate funds from other TIDs, TID nine, in order to close it before it's mandatory termination date of 2026. Already approved the termination resolution on August 20, 2019 and the economic council approved it on September 17, 2019. Despite the closure of the TID staff strongly believes that development opportunity still remains, especially for large scale, light manufacturing uses. Staff is seeking direction from the EDA in terms of next steps regarding a development strategy that covers land use change, marketing and financial incentives.

- [Wendy] That's right and if see that we did attach a TID nine map and there was also a project plan that we did have for the University Heights that was dated October 1st of 2003, that was also attached in the items. And then there was also the resolution that took place on September 17th of 2019 for the termination of the TID nine. The staff is seeking direction from the EDA on next steps because we do, as stated earlier, believe that there is development opportunities there, especially the way that the economy is going. Regarding developing a new development strategy that would cover marketing, land use changes and financial incentives. We do have some people to speak to this item as well.

- [Brian] All right, entertain a motion to open the floor for interested parties.

- [Wendy] We need a motion.

- [John] Yeah, I'll get the motion.

- [Wendy] Thank you John.

- [Brian] We have a motion by Calewatts, second by Sherman. Any objection? Seeing none, all of those in favor say aye.

- [Glen] Aye.

- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. Any interested parties please step on up and state your name and your address for the record please.

- [Shannon] Hi my name is Shannon Madigan, 1005 South Clay Street Green Bay, Wisconsin and I'm here today representing 7180 and Scott Development, two of the landowners that are part of the University Heights business district. A little history about our land, in early 2000 city of Green Bay officials were nervous about tight boundaries and having nowhere to grown on the northeast side. They approached us about annexing our land from the town of Scott. We didn't agree to this until we were the sure the city of Green Bay was contractually obligated to the town of Scott to provide them water. In addition, a developer's agreement was created that promised help from the city of Green Bay to develop the land along with a TIF, in exchange for annexation. Unfortunately, soon after all this took place the economy went south and it has taken until just recently for it to improve. Recently our TIF was canceled, with the main reason being that it was in the red. I wanted to be clear that the negative balance wasn't the result of the landowners. Per developer's agreement we held up our contractual obligations and paid 100% of our portion of the TIF every year. The outstanding debt was the result of one party, the city of Green Bay. They made a poor land purchase that should never have been tied into our TIF. Had the city not purchased the land, the TIF would not have been in debt. I don't say this to point fingers. I understand this went on before most, if not all of your time. I'm telling this to you so you don't think negatively of the land, it's potential and the owners who annexed. After speaking with Kevin, he explained it was the best interest to close the TIF because it was nearing the end and not much could be done in a short time. He also mentioned he wasn't opposed to a new TIF being put in place. I'd like to request that new TIF be created for University Heights as soon as possible to encourage development. The city

originally came up with the zoning plan and I'd like to request they look at it and make changes based on today's needs. Per our developer's agreement I'd like to request the city work to bring a major hub business to the University Heights business district and encourage other businesses to locate in the area. The land has so much potential. It's close to the rapidly growing UW-GB campus, it's highway frontage and it's the last major interchange before residents and tourists pass on their way to Door County. With the economy doing well now is the time to work together to develop University Heights and grow the tax base for the city of Green Bay. Thank you.

- [Brian] Questions? Yep. I reviewed the development agreement, the original development agreement, which was included in our meeting packet here. To your knowledge, has the city met all of it's obligation in terms of infrastructure improvements?

- [Shannon] No. They haven't met the infrastructure improvements and they haven't met the bringing the major hub business. It could be a school, it could be Amazon, but they did promise when we annexed that they would bring something to spark the growth and that hasn't occurred. And I want it to be clear that just because the TIF was canceled doesn't mean the developer's agreement is canceled, that is still in play and that's why I'd like to get a new TIF in place that we can get a business out there. At some of the meetings Kevin has made it clear that TIFs encourage growth because it'll bring someone out there. If we don't have the TIF I can't do much. And also I do know the school district looked at some of the land and they said, "We won't even consider it because there's no water." Which the TIF would've funded the infrastructure and we're kind of at a loss where we can't bring anyone out there.

- [Brian] Sure. Okay, any other questions from members of the committee? Okay, thank you very much for your patience too. Is there anyone else here to speak on this matter? See now I entertain a motion to close the floor.

- [Glen] Make a motion that would close the floor.

- [Michael] Second.

- [John] Second.

- [Brian] Motion by Sherman, a second by Peot, any discussion seeing all those in favor say aye.

- [John] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed motion carries. Wendy could you please talk to us a little bit about I guess obligations of the city with respect to infrastructure and investment, where we're at with that.

- [Wendy] I probably have to refer to Kevin on some of that I haven't been posted on a lot of that dialogue because it's been, involved more at his conversation.

- [Brian] Okay. Has there been any new development that's been attracted to that site?

- [Wendy] We haven't had any calls recently.

- [Brian] But I mean in terms of when the development agreement was first executed, which was I believe back in 2003. Have we met any of the obligations of that original development agreement with respect to generating new tax increment?

- [Wendy] I'd have to refer to Kevin on those.

- [Brian] Okay.

- [Wendy] That's a good question and I think it would be best to answer it by Kevin.
- [Brian] Okay, I guess what are you looking for at this point is just to refer to staff to come back with a plan?
- [Wendy] Yeah we do need to and Kevin put this communication in, so this is from his, that is seeking direction from the EDA as next steps regarding the development strategy for University Heights commerce center.
- [Brian] Well it seems to me that, well I spoke with Kelly from the chamber and it seems like that, I mean the city is obviously lacking industrial uses on that site, or, excuse me, throughout the city. But this is, I mean, it could be used for light industrial, it's not intended for heavy industrial if my memory serves me correctly.
- [Wendy] We have it zoned inappropriately for what today's market is asking for.
- [Brian] Right.
- [Wendy] And one of the things would be to redo our land uses out there. We know that there's probably more opportunity in a manufacturing setting than retail settings now. A lot of it was zoned retail, for commercial uses and we know that's probably not as likely.
- [Brian] Right.
- [Wendy] As maybe what a manufacturing setting would be in this economic environment. And one of the things that we'd like to do is, as you know we're going through our HAP plan, is to develop a strategy out there of how to develop University Heights. And that would be marketing it, it would be financial incentives, it would include all those things.
- [Brian] Okay. For those maybe, for the other commission members, I mean the city council did vote to close this TID and it was because I think we were looking at about \$3 million that was going to hit the levy otherwise if we didn't do that. And we were able to take the proceeds from the few other TIDs, redirect it towards this one, to keep it off the levy, but then we had to close it. As their speaker indicted we still have the development agreement in place, but because the TID was starting to get closer to the end of it's expiration, I mean there just wasn't sufficient time left to really create any type of tangible incentive for somebody to come in, so that's why it was closed. I think, I don't wanna say exception, but I think it was with the understanding maybe that we would refer this back to staff hoping that we could reopen that TID. I mean Wendy it's your knowledge and I don't know if this is a Kevin question too, but would there be sort of an expectation that we would make additional infrastructure improvements through the creation of the new TID?
- [Wendy] I would have to refer to him but I would almost assume that that would be not a part of it, but I can't speak to that exactly.
- [Brian] Okay, is there anyone else that wishes to speak on this item, any questions?
- [Michael] It's an interesting matter I'd like to get some more information to be honest.
- [Brian] Yeah I think at this point probably the appropriate motion would be to refer this back to staff and have them come to a future meeting to present to us, I mean what they're looking for. I mean without Kevin it sounds like we're just missing a lot of pieces of information that would be necessary to create any type of real direction.
- [Wendy] Yeah it's his too.

- [Brian] Dave, you look like you want to say something.

- [Wendy] Go ahead.

- [David] I was just gonna say this, the covenants and the area itself was drafted for land use and for infrastructure at a time when it was boom for retail. So when I take a look at the land use planner, right if you take a look it was a big box area. This was place that people saw Target and Walmart, and Shannon you may be probably right, am I right?

- Yeah.

- Yes. And of course that market is gone. I believe the first thing that needs to be done, maybe because of the land use planners, is we really need to look at the land use out there. As far as marketing and infrastructure, generally it's going to be dependent on your land use. And in my opinion that's the first, the first thing.

- [Brian] So you think we need some new zoning out there?

- [David] I definitely think we do.

- [Brian] Okay, so.

- [David] And land use mix. What I would recommend is refer to staff to work with property owners and reanalyze land use, and bring that back to the EDA.

- [Brian] All right.

- [David] I mean from that point then I think you can start talking about the other items, marketing and the any type of incentives you would have, but you really gotta get that base down right now and I think that's really what may be lacking. It's hard to market a property for Target when they're closing everywhere. Well not Targets per say.

- [John] Sears.

- [Brian] Okay so I guess I would, I mean unless there's further discussion I would entertain a motion that we refer this to staff with reevaluation of land use.

- [Michael] Would it come back to us?

- [Brian] Yes.

- [Michael] After that?

- [Brian] Yes.

- [John] I'll move.

- [Brian] Okay, we have a motion by Calewarts.

- [Michael] Second.

- [Brian] Second by Peot, any discussion? Seeing all those in favor say aye.

- [All] Aye.

- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. Item number three, consideration of possible action of resolution nomination for 2019/2020 Community Development Investment Grant staff. Want me to read the whole thing again?
- [Wendy] It's pretty much out there that there's, go ahead if you wanna, yes.
- [Brian] Yes.
- [Wendy] Whoever, it's up to you if you just want--
- [Brian] All right, the economic development authority of the city of Green Bay EDA reviews the nomination of ready projects that meet the requirements laid out by the Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation, WEDC, for Community Development Investment Grant program. WEDC will have final approval of project selection. Submittals are not guaranteed funding. The city of Green Bay release an RFP for project nominations for the Community Development Investment CDI Grant program on August 12, 2019. The city received two project proposals. Project description, the program will support community redevelopment efforts by providing financial incentives for priority projects with emphasis on but not limited to downtown community driven efforts. Funded activities should lead to measurable benefits in job--
- [Wendy] You item is a--
- [Brian] Opportunities, property values, and/or leverage investments by local and private partners.
- [Wendy] Okay, so I have Joy Hannemann.
- [Brian] All right.
- [Wendy] On of the--
- [Brian] We entertain a motion to open the floor for interested parties.
- [Michael] So moved.
- [Brian] The motion by Peot.
- [John] Second.
- [Brian] Second by Calewarts, all those in favor say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. Joy you have the floor.
- [Wendy] Actually there's also Claire here too from The Farmory, so there's two people to speak to this item.
- [Brian] Yep, we'll start with one.
- [Wendy] Okay, yep.
- [Brian] Unless staff wants to give any kind of background first but.

- [Wendy] I'm gonna say something real quickly on that if I could. Anyway, the staff did take both of these applications. It's been a couple of years since we actually submitted for the Community Development Investment Grant. So one project, we had to select usually one project per year cycle is when the funding comes through, it's for \$250,000 that goes to this project. We decided to do it a little bit different this year where we put an RFP out to get the projects in and then select them through a process. And so we put the RFP out. There's a copy of that in the attachments and you approved that last time. There's the two business plans in there and a scoring sheet. We brought those to both our business development team and also our finance team. We scored it internally and then we also met with Wisconsin Economic Development Corp, who is actually where we would make the recommendation to. And they reviewed the two applications as well and gave us their recommendation. So that's what we're bringing forward to, the recommendation is here from those three scoring criteria and the rubric that went along with that was included in your packet. That's it, Joy is gonna speak to her Merge project and if you had any questions regarding her application.

- [Brian] Joy if you could tell us a little bit about your project.

- [Joy] Yeah absolutely, so thanks for having me on and especially thank you for allowing me to call in remotely. This is Joy Hannemann with Merge Urban Development Group. We submitted an application for the CDI grant through WEDC for our site that we have under our planning action at 321 and 325 North Broadway. You should be pretty familiar with this project. It is a five story building that is a mixed use building with 32 single dwelling units and around 26,000 square feet of retail on the first floor. We've been in communication for several months with the economic development staff, both Wendy and Kevin Vonck. And we anticipate having a development agreement between the city and Merge in the next week or so, that we would be working through the details of that agreement. And as I prepare the financials and we solicited a construction estimate from Greenfire, has offices both in Milwaukee and in Wausau. They have provided the construction budget which is gonna be in the application and there is certainly a need given the complexity of this site for a grant like this to help make the project a reality. What I would envision, I also had met with Naletta Burr from the Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation and it was great to understand her knowledge of the area and given her history with the Broadway district. And she seemed very excited about the project and understood that this site has been a challenge to get developed in the past. We would imagine that the funding, I would definitely, if we were give the opportunity to apply, want to speak at greater length with Naletta understanding that the eligible costs could be either directed toward site cleanup and remediation efforts. Complexity is given that it is a tight site and also some of the community features like creating a viable mixed use project with first floor activity, bike racks, bike room, all of the things that are really bode well with the CDI narrative. Merge has experience applying and being awarded this grant for our projects, the north side yard project. And the application that we prepared for the city of Green Bay through this RFP process is hopefully a reflection of the work product and quality of application that we're happy to put together and work with the city through the application processes of the previous applicants. If there any questions I'm happy to take them now.

- [Brian] Yeah Joy, Brian Johnson here, I haven't looked at the redevelopment authority agenda tomorrow, is your project on that agenda tomorrow for staff, do we know?

- [Wendy] I don't think so. No I don't think.

- [Brian] So we'd be looking at the meeting after that. Correct?

- [Wendy] I only looked at this meeting.

- [Brian] Or has the development agreement been extended so the parties just need to sign? Where are we at with that, do we know?

- [Joy] The development agreement right now is in the city of Green Bay's hands and we thought that we would have a draft for Merge's review last week, but it sounds like it should be this week based on what Kevin

told us last week. But we have talked about those preliminary terms and feel like we're very close to an agreement.

- [Brian] Okay part of the reason I'm asking is can we even submit this? I mean does the development agreement need to be executed prior to submitting?

- [Wendy] Double checked with Naletta on that.

- [Brian] So the answer's no?

- [Wendy] I think she was fine with where we were and we went through all that information with her and she was okay with that.

- [Brian] Okay.

- [Joy] In my experience with the application they require an executed development agreement before--

- [Wendy] Awarding.

- [Joy] Any award is dispersed.

- [Wendy] So that would have to be in place before we'd make the recommendation.

- [Brian] Okay, but thank you. Are there any other questions for Joy? Okay I think that's all we've got right now Joy. I don't know if you're gonna stay on the line or not, but I think there's other people here who wish to speak to this item. Any other interested parties just go ahead step on up, state your name and address for the record please.

- [Claire] Claire Thompson representing The Farmory at 815 Chicago Street.

- [Noel] And Noel Halvorsen of NeighborWorks Green Bay, the owner of the property.

- [Claire] The Farmory submitted an application last spring, actually back in May of 2019, after a discussion with Naletta Burr also on the profitability of this funding stream to help us launch The Farmory's phase two construction efforts, which would build out our hatchery, our fish hatchery component of our business line and complete the exterior of The Farmory. The Farmory is an urban farm and fish hatchery located in the old Armory building. We're a social enterprise. We have mission programming that includes workforce development, and also health and wellness education involved with our mission programming. And we've been going strong for the last year really on our fish hatchery business line. The capital build out proposal that we submitted has already actually morphed because we received actually an improvement grant from the city last month, which we're really thankful. And this was one of the last pieces to really help us secure our financing for a broader roll out. I know that some recommendations have been made for this particular line of funding, but we did want to give you an update as to where we're at right now with our project. Here's some of those brochures. Front page is our new capital financing plan for our capital build out and there's been a couple changes that have taken place. First of all we got actual numbers as a result of going through the facade improvement grant, which required actual bids for the construction and the hatchery build out so that we could become actually cash flow positive in our first year of operation, of full commercial operation in 2020 was \$553,000 is the total remaining need to build out phase two of our construction and we also have on there phase three, which is an expansion onto the upper level of the building, which is an additional \$1.07 million. We have source of funds which remains roughly similar to what we had originally proposed in the business plan that's in your packet. But so far we've moved forward with achieving a commercial loan for the \$550,000, which will bring us to cash flow positive in 2020 with our business plan and we're looking forward to moving that forward. This grant from the WEDC for \$250,000 would allow us to actually add more equipment

and complete some of the other things that we would like to be able to complete that would bring us a little bit further into phase three and further down the path of completing the project.

- [Noel] Sure, and just to reiterate, both NeighborWorks Green Bay, the owner of the building, and The Farmory are locally resident led, not for profit corporations. We're volunteer based organizations 501c3, and this is part of a long strategy of community development in this neighborhood, and attempting to make this property and this community stronger, and address a food desert on the near east side, and really make an impact on a building that's been distressed and underutilized for more than half a century. You can see some pictures. We've actually got work going on on the site right now and this packet has photos of the construction work that's underway, as well as the hatchery equipment. And the plan is to raise over half a million yellow perch and building annually, that would be raised to fingerling size and then sold to fish farmers who will grow them out to eating size for all of us. 'Cause as we all love to eat perch, but there are not enough of them. The perch we eat in our community are coming from Canadian lakes or operations, and they're not coming from Wisconsin, and we're gonna change that. And the profit ultimately that this program produces is going to fund mission programming that makes the neighborhood better, makes our community better, improves access to job skills training, workforce development, entrepreneurial work, as well as food related demands. We've got a strong partnership with the UD Green Bay and others. We do recommend that the development quota of 25 housing units, as a houser I've got to say is a really critical thing for us to look at as a community. We need more dwelling units at all levels of the market, but we need this project to advance as well. We've been great partners with the city on this over a number of years and we'd love to see you figure out a way to either advance both of these proposals, or if you had to choose one, choose this one. This is really key and can make a big difference in this project.

- [Brian] Thank you, are there any questions? Okay. Thank you guys.

- [Noel] Thanks Brian.

- [Brian] Anyone else here to speak on this item? I just need a motion to close the floor.

- [Michael] So moved.

- [John] Second.

- [Brian] Motion by Peot, second by Calewatts, any discussion, all those in favor say aye. Oppose motion carries. Wendy one of the things, as I was doing a little bit of research on this I came across the guidelines from WEDC. And in particular indicates that, I'll just read it. "Generally applicants may only receive one CDI grant per fiscal year." The applicant would be the city of Green Bay. "Applicants within designated rural counties or opportunity zones may receive more than one grant per year based on available funding." My understanding is that this is a rolling fund, first come, first serve. However, is there any reason that the city of Green Bay cannot advance both of these?

- [Wendy] Great question and I shoulda probably put that in at the beginning. I didn't know where to add that information into it. But we actually have been in touch with WEDC to find out how we could do that. We know that up to a zone funds that we are potentially eligible according to the information that's on their website to make that double nomination. That this is the first time they're allowing where you can advance more than one project. And we have asked about that because the Merge project is actually in an opportunity zone and I didn't point that out in the beginning because we were just creating the projects, but the Merge project is in an opportunity zone. Since the scoring rubric came back with that one graded higher on all three testing that we did, internal measures, we asked WEDC what if we nominated the opportunity zone first? Could we still nominate another project if one ends up in an opportunity zone because we know that that project has an expedited piece to it because of the opportunity zone project and also just the way that it scored. And she's checking with it because nobody else has requested that yet. Naletta was checking with her leadership team on how that would work and we just haven't heard back from her yet, but we did investigate

that. Often we don't have always have one project come forward, this time we have two projects coming forward, two good projects, and just by the way that we scored.

- [Brian] We just haven't gotten an answer from WEDC yet?

- [Wendy] No, to see if we can nominate or not.

- [Brian] Okay.

- [Wendy] To nominate a second project that's outside of an opportunity zone. If we use our first nomination for eligibility and it's a project that's in an opportunity zone, can we nominate another one that's not.

- [Brian] Is there any reason that they need to be prioritized, is there a reason that we couldn't just submit them both at the same time and have the resolution reflect that?

- [Wendy] Because the other one didn't score higher than the other, so we took the best project that the city scored and we're nominating that project. And that one happens to be in an opportunity zone.

- [Brian] And that's because that was the requirement set out in the RFP, I presume?

- [Wendy] Yes.

- [Brian] Okay.

- [Wendy] So we brought the best project forward, or the best, or the one that--

- [Brian] And I can appreciate that.

- [Wendy] Not the best project, but the one that scored the highest, they're both great projects, I mean there's no argument there.

- [Brian] And I certainly appreciate that.

- [Wendy] That's why we're here talking about them.

- [Brian] But I think given that we do have two projects that we could potentially, I mean that both qualify, that we could potentially advance. I think it would be nice to have an answer from Naletta on how that works. I mean, and again I'm looking at this document, it says \$6 million is what's been allocated for this program at the state level. I think another piece of information that would be nice to have is how much of that has been dispensed, so that we can better understand the sense of urgency behind these. And if we had previously been talking about the need to reschedule a meeting.

- [Wendy] I know there's been a number of them.

- [Brian] Yeah. I think knowing that we were potentially discussing a special meeting on Thursday. I just I wonder if we could perhaps over the next two days try to get any answer from WEDC on a couple of those questions. I would hate to prematurely make a recommendation without at least having some of that information available to us. And two days I don't think would stall anything.

- [Wendy] We understand that if you would a nomination to hold off until you get the information from Naletta then come back to the committee.

- [Brian] 'Cause we're planning to schedule a special meeting on Thursday anyway, right, so that, I guess what I'm suggesting is that we could take it up at that time.
- [Wendy] We're having a meeting right now.
- [Stephanie] We don't have to schedule that one on Thursday if we don't need to.
- [Brian] They don't want--
- [Wendy] Here's some closed session language here, if you want to go into closed session.
- [Stephanie] Do you want to say that we nominate both, once we have understanding from Naletta that we can do both? And if we can only do one just choose one, I mean that's--
- [Brian] Yeah I mean I guess that's ultimately what I'm getting at, right? If we can advance both and again I recognize that the RFP said we were going to advance one, but given this information that if you're an opportunity zone project that you can advance more than one project.
- [Wendy] We're investigating it.
- [Brian] I'm not sure why we wouldn't want to do that.
- [Stephanie] So as long as we get the okay from Naletta that we can we do both, we go both, otherwise if we can only do one we just choose the one that's ranked higher.
- [Wendy] We have to actually have a resolution that goes to council and that's in the packet as well.
- [Brian] Correct.
- [Wendy] And so there is that in there because we wanted to get the strongest project forward as fast as possible with WEDC so we don't lose the opportunity to have all \$250,000 worth of funds for that one.
- [Brian] Right, but we could just modify the resolution, right?
- [Wendy] And we don't wanna hold at Merge as well. 'Cause this is hinging on Merge's project. And it's probably hinging on the other project as well, but.
- [Brian] Is there any other discussion on this item? Anybody wish to contribute? Noel do you wanna speak again?
- [Noel] Again?
- [Brian] Yeah, can I obtain a motion to open the floor for interested parties?
- [John] I move.
- [Brian] Motion by Calewarts.
- [Glen] Second.
- [Brian] Second by Sherman, any discussion, seeing all those in favor say aye.
- [Michael] Aye.

- [Brian] Oppose motion carries, Noel go ahead.
- [Noel] Thank you, I just wanted to say if you've got the opportunity to nominate both projects and do it flagging one as a priority. If they ultimately at the WEDC say, "No, no that isn't what we meant, we only want one nomination." Well then just do that with your choice, but if you're inclined to support both of these efforts that address different but important needs in the community, and it sounds like the program will allow it, then why not take that action tonight and make that happen. Staff can deal with the ends and outs of submittals to the WEDC.
- [Brian] Okay. Okay, anything else?
- [Noel] No, just wanted to say that.
- [Brian] Sure, any questions for Noel? All right, entertain a motion to close the floor.
- [Glen] Motion to close the floor.
- [Brian] We have a motion by Sherman.
- [John] Second.
- [Brian] Second by Calewarts, any discussion, seeing all those in favor say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. I think at this time I am going to actually ask that we go into closed session if somebody's willing to make that motion.
- [Michael] I'll make it.
- [Brian] Okay, if you could read the language Mike on the agenda. Get your specs there.
- [Wendy] It's a pretty small sort of event.
- [Michael] I'm sorry, where is it?
- [Brian] Underneath the regular business item three, the committee may convene for this.
- [Michael] Oh, okay.
- [Brian] Just need you to read that out loud.
- [Michael] Okay, the committee may convene in closed session pursuant to sections 19.85 ie Wisconsin 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 committee may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to section 19.85 reference to Wisconsin stats to report the results of the closed session to the developing community members.
- [Brian] Do we have a second?
- [Glen] Second.

- [Brian] All right we have a motion by Peot, a second by Sherman, any discussion? Seeing all those in favor say aye. Oppose motion carries and we are now in closed session. We ask that everyone leave the room.
- [Stephanie] Give them a big round of applause there, applause there, applause there, applause there, applause there.
- [Wendy] All right ladies, thank you all for this and gentlemen too for this.
- [Noel] Do you need a motion to open it for open session?
- [Wendy] I think you have to read the same language again, take a roll call. I think you just have to take a roll call.
- [Stephanie] You just have to reconvene a different session.
- [Noel] Yeah.
- [Wendy] And they just take a roll call with that.
- [Stephanie] Yeah they do.
- [Wendy] Looks like he's got the head shake goin'.
- [Brian] I guess we'll reconvene into open session. Let the record show Peot, Sherman, Calewarts, and Johnson are all present.
- [Glen] All right, I make a motion to advance Merge's project to go to the WEDC, is that what you said?
- [Wendy] Yep.
- [Glen] I think that's it, I mean motion is to advance Merge.
- [Brian] And then refer.
- [Glen] Refer yes, I'm sorry, refer The Farmory to meet with city staff and come back with a completed application for finalizing.
- [Brian] Okay. We'll just say updated, 'cause it is a completed application.
- [Glen] Yeah.
- [Brian] And then to adopt the resolution. Yes. We have a motion by Sherman, need a second.
- [Michael] Second.
- [Brian] Second by Peot, is there any discussion? Seeing all those favor say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. Item number four.
- [Wendy] Unfortunately David had to go to the next meeting.

- [Brian] All right.
- [Wendy] And he's asked us to move the wetlands to the business park expansion information on, but for the most part I wanted to share with the committee that we will be bringing next time forward some potential land uses in the I-42 business park. We did a wetlands study and we'd like to update you on the findings for that. And what we'd like to do, we'll be having a meeting with the landowners coming up in the first week in December, so we were hoping to bring this to the EDA to talk about next steps and where we're going. There's obviously some language here, Stef wanted to work on a resolution of a mixed use development project, so land for this area. Oh I'm sorry I'm looking at something else anyway.
- [Brian] Right now we're just receiving business and funding right?
- [Wendy] Right, we are actually going to be moving this item until next time, but there is information on here for--
- [Brian] What do you mean by that?
- [Wendy] We have to move this to our next meeting because he's not here to speak to this now.
- [Brian] Oh because he needs to present, okay. So we're basically tabling it.
- [Wendy] Table number four.
- [Brian] All right we have a motion to table four.
- [Michael] So moved.
- [John] Motion.
- [Brian] We have a motion by Peot, a second by Calewarts, is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- [Brian] Oppose motion carries. I have an E informational update on Brownfield's program.
- [Wendy] Brownfield's, we've released the RFP for a consultant for the next assessment grant and the EDA will be voting on awarding the contract at our next meeting, December 9th.
- [Brian] Okay, director's report?
- [Wendy] We're gonna bypass that today 'cause Kevin's not here.
- [Brian] All right, next meeting is scheduled for December 9, 2019. Is there a motion to adjourn?
- [Glen] Motion to adjourn.
- [John] Second.
- [Brian] Motion by Sherman, second by Calewarts, is there any discussion, seeing all those in favor say aye.
- [All] Aye.

- [Brian] Oppose motion carries, we are done.
- [John] At the meeting we're gonna bring up Thursday now--
- [Brian] No meeting Thursday.