MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2020, 1:30 PM
Special Virtual Meeting
Broadcast live at: https://www.youtube.com/CityOfGreenBay

A. ROLL CALL.

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

Members Present: Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Melanie Parma, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, James Blumreich, Excused: Kathy Hinkfuss
Others Present: Ald. Brian Johnson

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

1. Approval of the agenda for the March 24, 2020, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Melanie Parma to approve the agenda for the March 24, 2020, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the February 11, 2020, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the minutes from the February

11, 2020, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Election of Officers - Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary.

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to nominate Gary Delveaux as Chair. Gary Delveaux asked three times if there were any other nominations. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by James Blumreich to nominate Matt Schueller as Vice-Chair. Gary Delveaux asked three times if there were any other nominations. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Matt Schueller to appoint Kevin Vonck as Secretary/Executive Director. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

2. Selection of members to serve on various subcommittees of the Redevelopment Authority.

This item is on hold until the next meeting.

3. Consideration with possible action on communication from Ald. Johnson (District 9) "To direct the Redevelopment Authority to initiate negotiations to purchase 927 Liberty Avenue utilizing neighborhood enhancement funds, block grant or other funding resources available to the City of Green Bay or RDA."

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by James Blumreich to refer to staff and report back to RDA in April 2020. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on communication from Ald. Wery (District 8) on "Request to purchase and remove 1077 and 1079 Shawano Ave."

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Matt Schueller to refer to staff and report back to RDA in April 2020. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,

No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on communication from Ald. Johnson (District 9) on "Creation of an emergency relief fund to provide loans to assist small business owners with the impacts of coronavirus (COVID-19)."

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by James Blumreich to refer to staff and report back to RDA in April 2020. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on Term Sheet with Merge, LLC for a development project at the Shipyard, 239 Arndt St., 101 Bridge St., and 119 Bridge St. (Tax Parcels 3-551, 3-554-A, 3-556).

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

Dan Drendel gave a presentation for Merge LLC.

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

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by James Blumreich to go into closed session. Motion carried.
Matt Schueller read the closed session language.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to return to regular order of business. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve Term Sheet with Merge, LLC for a development project at the Shipyard, 239 Arndt St., 101 Bridge St., and 119 Bridge St. (Tax Parcels 3-551, 3-554-A, 3-556), subject to minor legal and technical changes, and direct staff to work on a Development Agreement as discussed in closed session. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on communication from Ald. Johnson (District 9) "To create a policy guaranteeing City Council oversight and disbursement of funds related to Affordable Housing Extension Resolutions for TIDs 7, 8, and 12."

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Deby Dehn to refer to staff to report back in September 2020. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

8. Consideration with possible action on the acquisition of 301-303 South Quincy Street (Tax Parcel 14-491) using Neighborhood Enhancement Funds.

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve the acquisition of 301-303 South Quincy Street (Tax Parcel 14-491) utilizing $55,000 of CDBG funds and then deed the property to NeighborWorks Green Bay, who will utilize up to $45,000 of CHDO funds for redevelopment. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on the adoption of the Curb Appeal Grant into the Neighborhood Enhancement Fund programming.

Moved by Melanie Parma, seconded by Deby Dehn to approve the adoption of the Curb Appeal Grant into the Neighborhood Enhancement Fund programming. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

10. Consideration with possible action on awarding the Annual IT Service Contract and software licensing for KI Convention Center to Elevate 97.

Moved by James Blumreich, seconded by Melanie Parma to award to the lowest responsive, responsible vendor, Elevate 97, Inc., for a (1) one year contract for $31,428.00, which includes the maintenance and the licensing for Four Winds software. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

11. Consideration with possible action to partner with the City of Green Bay Parks Department in the purchase of 601 St. George Street for trail expansion and housing development.

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 Deby Dehn, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve partnering with the City of Green

Bay Parks Department in purchasing 601 St. George Street. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

12. Consideration with possible action on the transfer of $50,000.00 of CDBG funds from the 2019 CDBG Eligible Area Projects budget to the 2019 ED Facade and Demo budget.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by James Blumreich to approve the transfer of $50,000.00 of CDBG funds from the 2019 CDBG Eligible Area Projects budget to the 2019 ED Facade and Demo budget. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, James Blumreich, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn,
No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Financial report and check register.

No action was taken.

2. Director's report and project updates.
a. RDA Property Disposition Plan
b. On Broadway, Inc. - S.A.S.S. (Street Art Silver Series)

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

3. Next meeting: April 14, 2020 at 1:30 PM.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- We're starting.

- The roll call please.

- Okay, so we have present Chair Gary Delveaux.

- Here.

- And we have... Let's see if I can unmute it here. It's gonna be a second. All right, Vice Chair Matt Schueller?

- [Matt] Present.

- Okay, that was a thumbs up.

- [Matt] I think you heard me.

- Yep, no, we hear you now. We have Alderperson Barbara Dorff?

- [Barb] Here.

- We have Deby Dehn.

- [Deby] Here.

- We have Jim Blumreich?

- [Jim] Here.

- And we have Melanie Parma?

- [Melanie] Here.

- All right, so--

- [Jim] Is Gary by audio only?

- Gary is by audio only, if you want to see Gary he can step into the picture right here.

- Hi, how's everybody doing?

- [Jim] Hey, Gary.

- I thought it'd be easier if I came in and ran the meeting this way, but I guess we could have done it either way. But anyway, bottom line, approval of the agenda for today's meeting?

- [Barb] Move to approve.

- Alder Dorff?

- [Barb] Alder Dorff.

- Yes, and a second by someone?

- [Melanie] I'll second, Melanie.

- Second by Melanie, all right, great. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- The agenda is so approved. Approval of minutes from February 11th.

- [Barb] Move to approve.

- [Matt] Second.

- Was that Matt?

- [Matt] Yes it was.

- Okay, yep. Okay, motion made by Alder Dorff and a second by Matt. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried. Regular business, first thing we have is the election of officers. So I'll guess I'll entertain a motion for chair?

- [Jim] I nominate Gary Delveaux.

- [Barb] Second, by Barb Dorff.

- Okay, a motion made by Jim and a second by Barb Dorff, for Gary. Is there other nominations? Are there any other nominations? No other nominations? All those in favor of seeing Gary Delveaux being our chair, signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried. Thank you. Vice chair, nominations for vice chair, please?

- [Barb] I nominate Matt Schueller, this is Barb Dorff.

- Alder Dorff, nomination--

- [Jim] Second, Blumreich.

- Blumereich, a second. Are there any other nominations besides Matt? Any other nominations besides Matt? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye for Matt to be our vice chair?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposition? No, so carried, thank you. In our bylaws it mentions that the secretary is our executive director, and I'm not positive that we need to make a motion in that regard each year, but I thought we'd put it on here, or at least to remind me to put it on there. So the bottom line, I'm looking for nominations that our Executive Director Kevin would be our secretary?

- [Jim] I so move.

- [Matt] Second.

- Matt, who was the first one? I'm sorry.

- [Jim] Jim.

- Jim, motion by Jim, second by Matt for Kevin to be our, who is our Executive Director, to be our secretary. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Seeing none, Kevin, you are our secretary as we--

- [Kevin] No other nominations?

- No, no other nominations, no. Okay, and now, we have that write up as far as the various subcommittees, and I don't know if we sent it out to everybody. If someone would like to change something, let me know. And we can actually finalize that for the next meeting because it's the first time it was brought up. So that's, our present subcommittees are staffed, if you will, so if someone wants to change or something different, please let me know, and we could actually finalize it next meeting. Is that okay with you, Lisa? We'll finalize it next meeting. Is that okay, is that okay with everybody? Okay, thank you. All right. Item number three, consideration with possible action on communications from Alder Johnson, District 9. to direct the Redevelopment Authority to initiate negotiations to purchase 927 Liberty Avenue utilizing Neighborhood Enhancement funds, Block Grant or other funding resources available to the City of Green Bay or the RDA. Did everybody have a chance to look at that? As far as purchasing 927 Liberty Avenue?

- [Kevin] Do you want?

- Please.

- Sure. I think we sent out, the recommendation was to refer to staff to look at our resources. I believe Alder Johnson is on, so what I'm gonna do is see if I can unmute Alder Johnson here, and if there's anything that he wanted to speak on this, hopefully, Alder Johnson, I think you should be unmuted?

- [Brian] Yep, can you hear me?

- [Gary] Yes.

- Yes.

- [Brian] Beautiful. Yeah, I don't think there's any secret about what's going on over in this particular neighborhood. So we're just looking to have the RDA at least conduct some outreach and see if the owner of that property is agreeable to a sale, and if so, what that price is gonna look like. So to me at this point, I'm just looking for referral to staff as well just to give you the green light to do some initial work on this. Obviously not looking for the RDA to authorize any type of action at this point, other than to let staff take a look and see what we can come to terms with here.

- So I guess we'll entertain a motion to refer this to staff.

- [Barb] Motion to refer to staff by Alder Dorff.

- [Jim] Second, Blumreich.

- Okay, there's motion by Alder Dorff and a second by Jim to refer to staff. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried. Thank you. I think we're gonna handle most of the voting that way. For votes, okay? I think it'd be easier. Okay, number four, consideration with possible action on communication from Alder Wery, District 8, on a request to purchase and remove 1077 and 1079 Shawano Avenue.

- All right, I believe this is another request for a property acquisition. I did not see Alderperson Wery on the line, I'm just gonna double check here. I don't see, unless there's any other discussion, again, the recommendation would be to refer to staff here.

- I'll entertain a motion accordingly.

- [Jim] Blumerich, so moved.

- Motion made by Jim.

- [Matt] Second by Schueller.

- Second by Matt. Any other comments or discussion in that regard? If not, we'll continue voting verbally. All those in favor signify by, to refer item number four to staff, signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposition? No, so carried. Number five, consideration with possible action on communication from Alder Johnson, District 9, on creation of an emergency relief fund to provide loans to assist small business owners with the impact of coronavirus 19. Alder Johnson, please?

- Yep, hold on, I'm gonna get Alder Johnson unmuted, and again, recommendation here was to refer to staff, but I'll let Alder Johnson speak on behalf of this communication.

- [Brian] I think, what we're really looking for here is something that kind of fits our small business community. Obviously there's a few things that have come out at the federal, so it's, I have found all of them to be very cumbersome and taking a lot of time. What I envision here, is the scenario of small micro loans that can help with immediate needs that our small businesses are incurring, something that might just require nothing more than a personal guarantee. Again, small amounts, we're not looking to fund $50,000.00 loans here. I'm even, just in the spirit of discussion, thinking of a threshold of something like $5,000.00, but that could easily be overseen by the Revolving Loan Fund Committee or even approved at the staff level. I think if we do refer this to staff, I do still think expediency is a necessity. What we're trying to do is help those small businesses that are imminently facing dangerous situations where they cannot recover from this. My greatest fear, of course, is that the impact of this finds us with fewer small businesses than we had before, and if there are funds that we can access for this, including the Wisconsin Trust Fund, I'm not sure if that would be a qualifier, but I'm just looking for staff to explore that.

- Kevin, the funds that come from the Revolving Loan Fund?

- So, yeah, so we did look at some numbers, and I believe we have right now, I think Wendy and Krista looked through, probably about $90,000.00 in our Revolving Loan Fund right now that's now encumbered. Either it's not out in a loan or in a loan that is pending. I know we've talked a little bit, and we'll probably talk at Development Team tomorrow about the use of those funds. With that, it's Block Grant funding, so some of the strings are still attached in terms of job creation, retention. With that, I think most of the businesses that we're working with do target low to moderate income individuals in terms of employment. So we're just checking on the requirements that would be in place from HUD just to make sure, we don't want to put people in more of a bind if there's certain things that they have to do by taking this money. With that, I don't know if it would be appropriate, I think we do have another meeting scheduled on the 14th of April, I know we're gonna be talking about this at Development Team tomorrow. I guess in terms of expediency, I guess the RDA would be okay with some things administratively, I just want to be careful just how this is worded on the agenda in terms of approval, and if we need to have maybe a special meeting to get something out there, we could do that. But I think maybe even just this week coming up with maybe a framework and sending it out, and I guess checking with legal to make sure that if we need to make certain approvals, either through the Revolving Loan Committee or this body, we get that done before we start awarding those loans.

- So this would be another one to refer to staff, do you think?

- Yeah, and I think, for sure coming back in April, but if not possibly even beforehand, or something that could be even discussed or maybe, yeah, talked about even at, if time was of the essence, being brought back to, even as a Committee of the Whole Meeting at the Council, ultimately they're the ones who accept the Block Grant funds, they give it to RDA to distribute, but that might be an appropriate piece as well. I don't know if that helps, Alder Johnson, in terms of things that you're looking for in terms of this piece?

- [Brian] Well, I think the existing Block Grant funding is certainly an option, but my fear is that that's not sufficient enough, which is why I allude to the Wisconsin Trust Fund, I know that that's where we borrow money for Neighborhood Enhancement funds. What I'm not overly familiar with is what are possible uses when we look at that as an option, so that's why, I still support just referring to staff

and letting you explore what options that we have out there, but I think we need to find a way to get a larger volume of cash injection into a program like this, if it's actually going to be effective.

- Okay.

- Sure, and I think that would be one thing then, probably to go back both through RDA and Council in terms of if there's Trust Fund or other general purpose borrowing, just that it's clear for what it's for. I think the benefit of not using Block Grant funds is, right, you take out all of the strings that are attached with it.

- Okay.

- [Jim] And just one comment, Kevin. Myself, Matt, and Brian are on the Revolving Loan Fund Committee, and I guess my preference would be to set some minimal level that staff can approve, we give advanced authorization to do that based on certain criteria, and then perhaps larger requests come directly to the Revolving Loan Fund Committee. Otherwise we're gonna have a meeting a day.

- Right, right.

- Right.

- [Brian] That's actually exactly what I envision, Jim. And again, I'd through out arbitrarily the number $5,000.00, but if we say staff has the authority to loan up to $5,000.00 and make that decision in house, you could turn these requests in 24 hours. I'd rather, even with small amounts like that, that's why I suggest just a personal guarantee. Anything that complicates this process diminishes its impact, so the sooner that we can get that money into the hands of the businesses, I think the more effective the program will be.

- [Jim] Right, makes sense.

- I'm just going to quickly unmute, I believe, Director Ellenbecker is on, Wendy Townsend is on, Krista Cisneroz is on, anything that you wanted to add to this?

- [Wendy] This is Wendy. I was gonna say that there's some, all over the state, we'll keep our eyes open for the best program that we can put together quickly. And the idea of some small loans coming through and I like Jim's idea of being able to have some minimal approvals that we can act quickly. So these are all great ideas. We'll try and frame up something for them. Did that come through at all?

- Yep yep, we got it great, thank you.

- [Deby] This is Deby. I would just like to point out that almost every source of funding that is coming out does not cover independent contractors, such as hairdressers or temporary workers, even if they've had a temporary job for a year. So there's a lot of people that are falling through the cracks with the assistance that's out there right now. And I don't know why I'm coming up as Diane E.

- [Barb] You're not, we can see you.

- Yeah, we see you.

- [Deby] Okay. So if we could figure out something for those, that population, that would be very helpful.

- Great. Alder Dorff, I think you're raising your hand?

- [Barb] Thank you, yes, I certainly support Alder Johnson, and also in the decision to try to refer this to staff, because we don't want unintended consequences. I'm glad that Alder Johnson has come up with this idea. I think our small business owners really need us. And let's find out what is the best way we can help them without harming anyone else, including the City. So thank you, Alder Johnson, for doing this.

- Okay, with all those comments being said, let's entertain a motion to refer this to staff to work with Alder Johnson. Sounds like a lot of great ideas and it's something that's gonna be desperately needed. So Kevin, how soon do you think you could come back with a proposal?

- We'll be talking about it at a staff level, we've already been talking about it, so for sure by the next meeting, our regular meeting in April, if not sooner.

- Okay.

- [Barb] Alder Dorff, move to refer to staff.

- Alder Dorff, motion.

- [Jim] Blumreich, second.

- Second by Jim. Any other comments or suggestions? If not--

- I think it's a great idea.

- All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried, thank you. All right, number six. Consideration with possible action on Term Sheet with Merge, LLC, for a development project at the Shipyard, 239 Arndt Street, 101 Bridge Street, 119 Bridge Street, Tax Parcels 3-551, 3-554-A, 3-556. Kevin, Term Sheet, which I think we all have.

- Correct. Despite all the negative things going on, we're very excited about a future development project at the Shipyard. As you know, things have shifted in terms of our private development partners at the site. We're continuing to work with Breakthrough on a new location and pretty confident that we're gonna find another great spot for them in the city. With that, we have been working, and you may be familiar with Merge, who has been proposing a project on North Broadway. That one we just put on hold for right now while we really explored this opportunity, to bring a really awesome, dynamic, multi-phased development to the Shipyard site. So I think probably the best

thing to do is what I'm going to do is I'm going to turn it over, I'm going to put all the RDA members on mute for a moment. I'm gonna open it up to the Merge team and their colleagues to go through and really talk about the project. Trying to bridge the technology gaps here, I do have the package that Merge sent. I can bring that up or if Merge would rather use it from their screen, we've got both efforts at hand, but first thing I'm gonna do is just let Merge go through and talk a little bit about the proposal, where they came from and where they're going. And then we can open it up for questions. And then I can talk a little bit more about the terms and conditions that are listed in the Term Sheet. So, with that, I am going to go through and, just give me one second, I'm gonna transition over to the Merge team. Yeah, probably should do that, right? All right, we're gonna take, I'm bringing you back for just one second. So we're gonna just, procedurally, get a motion and a second to open the floor here, to hear from interested parties.

- Okay, I need a motion to open the floor.

- [Barb] Move to open the floor.

- Alder Dorff.

- [Jim] Blumreich, second.

- And then Jim. All in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- The floor is open, thank you.

- All right, so, let's skip that. All right, so Joy, you're on, can you hear me?

- [Joy] Yes, I can hear you.

- Great, I've got Steve and we've got Dan, and is Brent on or is it you today, Joy? Oh, there's Brent right there. All right. All right, and we got Brent. So we got Brent, Joy, Steve, and Dan. Anyone else from your team?

- I think that's it.

- That's all.

- Okay. And as far as presenting, do you want me to bring up the concept plan or do you want to try and do it from your desktop?

- [Dan] I should be able to do it from my desktop.

- Okay, so I'm going to allow you to... If I get you as a co-host. And then you should be able to share your screen. And then once that's up I'll pull it up on our site here.

- [Brent] Kevin, while you start to pull that up, I just want to say, thanks for having us. This was one of the original sites we looked at first coming to Green Bay almost over a year ago. And it was always

an exciting site, but at the time it wasn't available then. We remained interested and wanted to see the process through with the group that had been looking at it for a long time. But we'd stayed in contact with Kevin and the rest of the staff and said that if it would ever come available, that's really the scale and the size of the project that we're completing throughout the Midwest, and so we're excited to make a presentation there. And I'll turn it over to Dan.

- Great.

- Great.

- All right, Dan, I can see just the headline, or just your header bar for your presentation. I'm not getting any graphics whatsoever. It started with part of the Pullback plan, but now there's nothing on there.

- It should be ... So then, again.

- Okay. All right.

- [Dan] Is that working?

- It was. And let me just pull it back on, start screen-sharing. All right, we are seeing it right now. All right, I think we are good.

- Very good. All right. Well thank you for bringing us back to talk about the project here. Brent hit the nail on the head. This is a lot more comparable in scale to the other projects that we worked on throughout the Midwest with development. So some of this process will look familiar for those who saw this presentation from our previous parts. Every time we start working in a community or working on a project, we're first investigating, and collecting information before proposing ideas. I'm hearing some echo, are you guys hearing echo from me? No?

- We're good, I muted the RDA members.

- Okay, all right.

- Just to cut down on feedback, I got a thumbs-up, so we're good.

- Sounds a little better on my end too. So we leveraged through what we had learned about the success of Broadway, and how some of the different events in the community are going, learned more about effect of the casino park and what could happen down here at the Shipyard, and started exploring that and thought we'd bring it back. We look at this site, these are all brief statements to what we were working on for Green Bay, previously specific to this site. We look at the opportunity to be an end and a connector, an extension of the success that's been happening on Broadway that really, once people are added to the urban living space, particularly living down here in the Shipyard in some amount of density, that quantity of people will really show that really the whole area of Broadway that fronts the riverfront is a really walkable distance. It just doesn't feel that way today. There's industry in the middle and there's more or less in between. But the Shipyard Park that you have proposed in this development, we really seek to add that Shipyard Park activity and connectivity to the city. We're excited with the Shipyard. It's the heart of your industrial space. We think that a

lot of times when developing in these kinds of conditions, in a way your first mover if people are used to seeing this area as industrial, it feels a bit tough, there are metal buildings and manufacturing around the area. So we look for architectural solutions that respond to that. We don't ignore that condition. We don't pretend it's a downtown looking suite. We actually capitalize on that specific nature of what the riverfront is in this current day, and then tell a story of what it can be, and what it can be in transition and what it can be there in the future. So we're excited about that and we talk about how can we bring that sense that we're both a part of the history there and we're part of a future. We can drive urban growth this way. And this will really connect to recreation. We have riverfront paths and connectivity going through the city already. The park will be a great opportunity in the space. This site can be like an extension to that park so that people are really excited to be a part of it. I'm not going to go into all the numbers, but we do look at benchmarking within the Opportunity Zones that we're developing in, and we also look for patterns inside the city. And so here, in the red area, that, there's the sources of employment. And our site is this yellow box. In the green we see that there's a void of dwelling units in this, there's a bit of a, call it a donut or a valley, but there's other urban housing in other adjacent areas, not really here, so we're filling in that gap. There's nothing to connect here. And then we just looked at how many people are present in here and what's happening in here as far as jobs and throughout the region in a little bit broader sense, as much so you understand what's going on through here and for us to have a good picture of what potential residents might be or people who might use the site and inhabit the site. We've been sort of mapping the context, seeing all of the great assets here on Broadway, Broadway District and things that are happening there, the Titletown Brewery, that area. The already in place single trail components, and then what can happen inside of this site. And then we look at walkability and really how far can you walk in five minutes, and sometimes we branch off to 10 minutes. Five minutes is really that walk that you can kind of take a walk in the neighborhood, you can go grab something at the store or something like that. Not necessarily a destination walk, just a neighborhood walk, walking the dog and that. So really, between the development site you can get basically to the edge of the existing Broadway events, the Farmers Market and things, inside that time. It just doesn't necessarily feel that way to everybody out on a walk and we want to change that. So the public transportation, mapping that area, so we understand what's going on, so that's their linkage to the site and to the downtown. Then we start looking at well, what can happen, just in an experience mapping and program mapping so this is on the site for our proposal. And this is a final version of the whole plan, but this is really the thing that we've been sketching on and dreaming about in that we can really draw off connections for pedestrians, people, cars too, but really focus on people that could walk in the urban space off of Broadway, just being a block away, it's actually to the gateway to the site. Then having pedestrian loops, basically so people can walk through. But the site is very open and public. And would feel safe, they're able to walk around the site itself. So the yellow paths and blocks are coming from the idea of nodes and places where you could walk to that place, feel safe, know where you're going, and take that next step thing. So a trail around the perimeter of the site and a pedestrian way against the industrial neighbor there, the existing brick building isn't really part of the site, we could see it staying, maybe it transitions someday in use or not, but it's part of the site. And then the building, we thought about how could we make a building shaped footprint that made it so that residents living inside the building would all be able to share in the riverfront experience of living essentially in a park space in the riverfront. And so, really every unit is, we don't just face one big long face of the building to the river, we actually try to open up everyone's balcony, everyone's interior spaces to catch views of the river, in that not just a few are given the kind of the penthouse view of the river, but everyone's given partial views of the river. And then that's moved up in the interior spaces that are inside of the site. The connection of the floors too is just an interesting idea that we can connect the upper floors of the building while leaving the ground plane opening so that

people can walk through it, so really, you can walk around all the buildings and connect in many different ways throughout the site. Parking against the exterior road and the power distribution lines, and parking against some of the industrial neighbors for now, that can lend to great phasing in the future if there's need for parking requirements for future buildings. But the parking strategy was for now . The pieces that wouldn't be as exciting as a resident, so really putting everyone out near the river. The purple is a proposal to have a restaurant-type space, so commercial space on the water, looking over to the park. Then you can just see the way the buildings lay out, and they're seeking to engage and let people see out to the river and see out to the park. But we're gonna get way more graphic after this. Any questions leading to the thinking that's shaping this? I'd be happy to answer, or I'll proceed.

- Why don't we just keep going a little bit, and then I'll take everybody off mute.

- Very good.

- Thanks.

- So between the two buildings proposed, four story residential buildings. You can track through our comparison here. 130 units in the larger building and just under a 100 at 96 in the smaller building. And a commercial space at 4,000 square feet is a good size for what we've seen in restaurant plans, and making sure any kind of patio in the space. Now we are looking at exploring having parking underneath the garage, underneath just the one wing of this building, not fully submerged, but just down to the floodplain level, about four feet down, about four feet up, and that the patio, that internal courtyard, would be about four feet as well. So the train on this might work for private, but partially submerged parking. So the inspiration from other communities, this would be our proposal, other riverfront developments and how they open up and how they catch the shared views of the waterfront. Inspiration too from the industrial waterfront. The interesting roof-lines that are part of their , it's really part of, like a sawtooth roof, we talked about in a warehouse, facilitates bringing light into the middle of the plan of a warehouse. So we're looking at that concept and kind of turning it on its head or turning it on its side, and not just capture light into spaces, but to capture those views that we're talking about, those smaller views. You'll see what I'm talking about in just a second. And then we researched, how we can embrace some of that, essentially of the industrial buildings on the site, not just mimic them, but get some of that material pallette, and making a really exciting new, modern building. So this is kind of the idea of the sawtooth, on the side, outside of the building where you can see out the side of the unit, that's kind of special. And then there's a lot of white wall painting in this context, so we're looking at how we can elevate that, both through patterning, and some other detailing, and then pairing that with some other material. So the articulation as we've got it planned, this is just a plan of the massing I was showing you a second ago, where you can start to see the idea of those paths going through the site. You can also see, these yellow lines are the view lines out of those courtyards and of the sight from the buildings. So where we have more oblique views of the water, we'll actually have a stepping back and a sawtooth type of plan so that windows can look out the side of those units and catch the water as well. So there's really no bad view from any of the residential spaces. So this is a visualization of the building as we're envisioning it, and we have several views that I'll walk you through. But where that path is continued as part of the master planning around the Shipyard Park, that connection to the river is really as proposed, and our building's way on top of that. This is the restaurant space, elevated up to that floodplain level that I was talking about. So it's elevated a bit, you can walk over the path and look over the water. And so you can see, there's some of those ideas about patterning in white metal, but then that's paired with a black

architectural metal that tends to be the pieces where we're kind of carving river and of the space. So as you see these materials patterned throughout the site, and this courtyard, the views out of the spaces are in these black slots. The courtyard beyond the next building also has that sawtooth looking pattern, with the black is just the face of the sawtooth. So outside you can see it. But really the idea is to take these two materials and use them in so many different , in several different ways, there's some layers in the site, and how to way find through points drawn in to the next courtyard and goes through it. So this is just stepping around this same building. And the idea of a courtyard with all the sawtooth windows looking out across the water to the park, the container park that looks across the water. And you can see the elevated hallways, so you can walk under, underneath the courtyards, there real good avenues in the pedestrian . And then at the riverfront edge of that same building. So the restaurant was back here. These are walk-up units with little stoops, some patios that come off of the path, just to try to further activate space, and then sort of larger balconies proposed really on that riverfront view. And then we can see that the building beyond here that has its own articulation of its courtyard, and you can start to see those steel walls that we were seeing beyond in the first image on the side of that building with those sawtooths out to allow those spaces to look out too. And then this is the existing industrial building beyond, and just in coloration to indicate the idea of what can be done in that public realm space. And then our last image is, we wanted to step out a little bit further and start to see that courtyard open up and start to see what the different pieces of the materiality through the site, that the . Indicate the places for each pedestrian. So, we just think this articulation paired with the existing buildings that are transitioning from the existing manufacturing buildings beyond that we can be a part of that dialogue and part of the story of a really active space . But not just turning our back on the industrial, historical part of the site for now. So that is what I have to share with you guys today. And we'd love to discuss further or answer any questions you have. Hope that covered it in a good broad brush stroke. But let me know what else I can explain or speak to.

- All right, so I unmuted everyone. If you don't have a question, I'll ask you to just mute yourself back, because there might be some feedback here. But I think what I'll do is just try and get everyone available, so I guess maybe I'll start and actually, you know what, I'm gonna get the, I'm gettin' some feedback, so what I'm gonna do is I'm gonna unmute the RDA members, and then go through and if there's any, oops, that's not what I wanted. Any other questions from others outside, I'll go through and get them. So, let us mute, all right. We'll start with, I see Alder Dorff, so I'm gonna get her first, and then bring back up, I'll bring Dan back on. Alder Dorff?

- [Barb] Thank you. I don't have any questions. I just think it's beautiful. If this can be done, it is going to add so much, to the neighborhood, to the city. It's just a beautiful development. Thank you so much for this great presentation.

- [Dan] Thank you.

- [Matt] Dan, what do you see as the potential schedule, and the contingencies towards fulfilling that schedule?

- [Dan] I might turn it over to Joy now.

- [Brent] Brent, I'll take that. So right now this year was what we thought of as the year for the city to get the site fully ready for construction. So there's still some obstacles on the site to make this a buildable site. Once that is complete, really we thought that this would push the project into 2021.

That was before more recently things of our current environment that we've found ourselves in. But even with what's today, 2021 is really a logical timeframe to start construction. So we don't really have a lot of contingencies on our end. It would just be working through the development agreement with the city, and making sure we're all on the same page.

- [Matt] And then is the thought still completion by June 1 of 2022?

- [Brent] Yeah, so once we start on that first building, our average construction is 12 to 14 months, so depending on when we can get started in 2021, yeah, June is a great estimate of completion, but it could be sooner, it could be a little bit later. Matt, one of the things that is important to us is that we see the work with the container park started as well, so whether our work and that work starts at the same time, it's important that we're developing this and it comes online, it doesn't feel like two separate developments, but one great development and one great with both the city's park and this development. So that's really important and that's a timeline that we're not exactly sure of on the Green Bay side.

- Yeah, so this is Kevin. So one of the things that we've talked about is we've been moving ahead with the filling and grading for the site, both the Shipyard Park on the south as well as the private on the north. Number one, that site needs to be bring out, out of the flood plain, regardless, in order to do any type of development. It's also part of the cap in terms of remediating the site. And so we plan to continue to do that. We've connected Merge with our Stantec team, if there's any adjustments that need to be made in terms of maybe where particular fill is being placed. But otherwise, we feel good about being able to get some of that filling and grading back up, moving again this spring. What we really wanted to do here is just provide an opportunity to get the Term Sheet out in front, kind of make that transition from the past project to this project, and really get a sense of support from the RDA and the Council on how we'd move forward with that. But I think, right, everything's a little bit up in the air right now, but we still feel overall pretty good about the timelines of working on our piece, but the filling and grading this year, doing some of the Shipyard stuff, with more construction in '21, with these things completed in '22. Yes, I think Melanie has a question?

- Overall, broad brush looks great. Just a few comments that I'll make based on just taking a look at it from an aesthetic perspective and some of the site components. I like the conversation about the elevating the connection so that you have the pedestrian walk underneath. As we look at the site plan where you had identified kind of some of the traffic patterns and then nodes, it'd be nice if there was an option with building one to be pushed back from the street view, you could see all the way to the river and not be truncated by the building, but I know some of that is just based on the amount of units in the building, the footprint, the unique shape of the site. But I just noticed that it would be nice if from that view from the street driving through if you could see through the buildings to see, where you have the courtyard, you can kind of see where the street comes through. That building one corner kind of, yeah, off, again, I understand the constraints you're working with, but just a comment there. And then as we look at the building facade of the different color of metal, so I like how you have the dark and the light. It'd be nice if it could be two different materials than same material, two colors, I think you could drive that point home a little harder. And I also noticed you have, part of it, I see metal come down to grade where there's potential snow removal, and just from an overall maintenance and longevity from metal buildings with metal panels. So those are just some detailed comments, but overall, a large brush, the plot is really nice.

- Thanks. Yeah, we definitely agree on space of building detailing for sure. A lot of times when we do bring down material, we'll keep it up two feet , but definitely. And I think the idea about the connection a nice thought too and I think we'll explore those view corridors further to make sure that that connection is strong like that.

- Thank you.

- All right, RDA members, any more hands, questions, in terms of the project? I'm just making sure here. With that then, I will, Mayor, or Alder Johnson, if there's anything you have in terms of comments?

- Yeah, I'll just jump in real quickly and express my appreciation to Merge and Kevin and everybody at the City team on bringing this proposal forward. I really appreciate the patience on the part of Brent and Joy and Dan. As you said at the beginning of your presentation, I know you've identified this site as a really appealing one, so just appreciate the fact that you've been patient with us and really turned lemons into lemonade with some of the announcements about our change in plans with regard to the Shipyard generally. So I think that the design is fantastic. I think the density of the development is really strong. Obviously the validation, a really, really positive thing. So all and all, just really, really excited and thankful to you all for bringing this forward. I just wanted to throw something out as a question. It's not necessarily specific to the project, but I thought the five minute walk radius was really interesting to see, where that reaches, not just west side of the river but also the east side. One of the issues that we've faced with regards to the Tillman Bridge, or the Mason Street Bridge, is it's not at all very friendly to pedestrians, and it ends up being a very long walk because you're walking up an on-ramp and then down an off-ramp, and so I was just curious if you all, anyone on the RDA or with Merge, if you've seen any sort of retrofitted pedestrian accommodations, one thing that came up at a Mayors' Institute for City Design that I attended was this idea of a cantilevered pedestrian bridge. So I just wanted to throw that out for discussion, with the understanding that I'm definitely not gonna get a decisive answer or conclusion from that, but wanted us all to be thinking about connectivity, not just on the west side but also to the amenities on the east side of the river, the Fox River Trail, Astor Park Neighborhood, and the like.

- Yeah, I would say, just to throw out from our analysis perspective and being outsiders, as we've been picking it apart, the Walnut seems the likely way to go from here. You'd probably not on the elevated walk, just because of the pleasant nature as a pedestrian or a bike rider, a great opportunity.

- On that, hi, I was just in Madeira Beach for the month of March, and they have the John's Pass right there, which has got a nice boardwalk, very commercial. And the bridge opens and closes to traffic, primarily for sailboats and the like. But on each side of the bridge, they have a stair step that goes right from the bridge level down to the boardwalk level, so it provides easier access if you're okay with climbing stair steps. And I think that would prevent kind of this circuitous route to get up onto Mason Street. It's still gonna be a climb given the height of the bridge, but maybe there's some ramping that we could do as well.

- Okay, thank, Jim.

- [Brian] And I have some photos too, Jim, that I took when I was in Cincinnati, a very similar layout with steps that I'll be sure to share. I think that would particularly, from the Shipyard area, but I think

it's a good thing to be thinking about, so a good recommendation, Mayor. I do have two questions, one for Brent and one for Dan. Brent, this is an Opportunity Zone Funded project, correct?

- Right.

- [Brent] That's correct.

- [Brian] Do you have certain deadlines that you need to make in terms of when you need to have shovels in the ground?

- [Brent] So the, no, not exactly. It would be dependent upon when we have the shovels in the ground would depend on what year the capital gains were, when the capital gains happened, that particular year's. So this year's projects are mostly happening with 2019 capital gains. 2021 will be an interesting year unless things turn quickly, there'll be less Opportunity Zone projects due to a lack of capital gain possibility with what's happened with the stock market. So we may see 2022 the next really good year for Opportunity Zone projects. But that could change, everything's changing very quickly, but yes, it is an Opportunity Zone project.

- [Brian] Jim just said, the market situation, will that impact your ability to move forward with this project, or do you already have gains that are ready to invest?

- [Brent] So we have, our group has investments that would be able to be sold for capital gains, but when you start to talk about a 2021 or a 2022 project, you can't have actually recognized those gains today. So we're under construction on current Opportunity Zone projects, and continue to push forward even harder today than we were before because of the environment. But then it'll be different asset sales for this project.

- [Brian] Okay, great, thank you for that explanation. Dan, from the design perspective, I'm actually gonna share some photos with you, Brent and Joy, of the place in Amsterdam that I was at. This is on the water, interestingly a container-type development as well. Where the restaurant is just positioned a little bit differently to provide, I think, greater views of the waterfront. This design obviously has them kind of tucked in on that first step, and I think there's really maybe an opportunity here to make a statement with, sort of open up the window views to the water. Nothing wrong with what you have here so much as to say, hey, this would be really cool if your numbers could make it work. So I'll shoot you that message.

- Thank you.

- All right, any other questions out there from development perspective?

- No.

- So I just want to go over quick, then, one second here, just kind of the deal that's been outlined in the Term Sheet. And, whoop, we got Ken on there now, huh, how'd I do that? Sorry Ken, I was trying to get you muted because you were coming on. Let me come back to, here we go, sorry about that. So in short, what we're looking at in terms of incentive, we're gonna be doing some things in terms of, well first of all, the land transfer, transferring the land, selling the land to the entity for a dollar. With that we will look at some public improvements. These are things that have been

contemplated overall as part of the Shipyard project in terms of improvements to Arndt Street and Bridge Street, doing some things in terms of making some more parking that we're doing for the Shipyard accessible to this development. And then of course, moving forward with the Shipyard itself. Doing some property improvements, again this is some of the filling and grading that we talked about in terms of making that site developable. Filling, grading, that also lays into the environmental remediation piece of this. We've been working, since day one, with the DNR in terms of providing them information and then getting some guidance of what the best path forward is and in amending the soil management plan that's in place to keep that cap in place. And then working on a PAYGO incentive. That'll be a 70% PAYGO after the building comes online and it will be capped at $6 million. We anticipate that over the life of this that it will probably net more than that. Right now the property's worth nothing. Coming into our new TID 22, when all is said and done, we believe the estimate will be somewhere around $21 million with that, and then provided the tax rate, that'll be generating at about $505,000.00 in new property taxes per year, with just shy of $200,000.00 going to the City. So we are proposing that 70% PAYGO with the $6 million cap. That should then bring in somewhere between $5 and 7 million for the City, in terms of helping to fund the Shipyard project. So with that, that's what been presented in the Term Sheet in front of you. As mentioned, as we kind of work through some of the details, those are gonna be ingrained into a development agreement that will be coming hopefully sooner than later. But at least wanted to get this out there and get a sense of support from RDA and the Council in terms of our ability to move forward with this project. Just with that, Mayor's comments, really appreciate Merge being patient with us. There's some tight times in terms of what we're gonna do with this site. But, yeah, they've had their eye on this since day one and I really think we've got a great asset that can help really drive the Shipyard, and also development in this neighborhood and the downtown core.

- [Jim] Kevin, refresh my memory, does TID 22 exist, or is that a new one we have to set up?

- No, TID 22 exists right now. It started 01/01 of this year. So basically, we started it at, I'll call it the low point, where we as the Redevelopment Authority owned most all of the property. So that is in effect right now.

- [Jim] Okay, thank you.

- Yep.

- [Matt] And Kevin, when I look at sections 3A and 3B, 3A is like a rectangle, you build it up four feet above floodplain. Where are we at now on that property regarding site closing?

- So, depending on the engineer you ask, I would say maybe we're about a third of the way done. We got a late start last year because the water level was so high and it was underwater, and we had trouble getting onto the site itself. Then it dried up and we were able to start moving fill. But then we got the early winter and everything froze around Halloween. And so we had to stop because you need warm soils in order for them to compact properly. And so I would say we're probably about a third done with it. We had contact with Merge and Stantec, actually earlier today, and they're basically going to say, look, there's not a whole lot of tweaks that need to be made, it's still gotta be four feet, but maybe the types of soil that we're bringing in, now that we know, all right, here's where the building pads are going to be. In essence, the buildings are going to have to be done on an aggregate ramped piers or pilings or something. It's more just, in terms of what ultimately, where do we want the biggest source of cap. So Stantec actually is gonna turn around and kind of adjust the

plan and then we can communicate that through our contractor before filling and grading starts again this spring.

- [Matt] Great. And then on environmental remediation, do we know if there's any further work that needs to be done in that regard?

- So right now what we will do is we have an amended plan based on what we want to do. We may need to make a further amendment to it, based on what type of a work we're gonna be doing here. The biggest form of amendment would be if we're going into the ground and taking out dirt for pilings, footings, of that nature, could they be put somewhere else and capped onsite? Or would they have to be moved off. So we've been working again through Stantec and the DNR to make those modifications. So once the final plans are done, we may have to tweak that. But we don't really see anything that more extensive or further that needs to be done moving forward.

- [Matt] Okay.

- [Gary] A question I've got, Kevin.

- Sure.

- When I look at the total City commitment, obviously environmental cleanup, improvements to Arndt and Bridge Streets, and so we don't really know what those numbers are until we get the development agreement, will we?

- Correct, and some of those have been contemplated in the original Shipyard agreement, when we talked about making some of those public improvements. Right now, now that we've got this concept plan in place, working with the engineers to finalize, all right, what exactly needs to be done? We'll get a better estimate of what those costs are gonna be. We feel comfortable that they're gonna be in line with the previous project. With that, since that time, Matt Buchanan, our team, has secured two pretty substantial grants, upwards of close to a million dollars to help with some of that.

- [Gary] Good.

- Yeah, so that'll be able to be applied towards, the filling and capping in some cases is close to the same thing, but we feel comfortable with where that's at and how we'll be able to move forward. But of course we'll have a lot better estimates before the development agreement comes through.

- Any other questions for Kevin or the developers?

- [Matt] Are we gonna go in the closed session, Gary?

- We can, if you'd like. If the group would like to do that, we can.

- [Brian] Gary, if I could just ask you a question or two in open session yet?

- Yes.

- [Brian] Thank you. Kevin, just related to the 70% TIF from the $21 million, recognizing that the objective is to keep the entire Shipyard investment off of the levy, is that 30% balance, is that gonna be enough to generate the balance of the value that's necessary to keep the Shipyard off the levy?

- Yes, we believe so. I think one of the things that we look in there is, and we could talk about this in closed session in terms of the negotiations of money up front versus money on the back end. With that, having a $6 million cap and what it equates to, roughly, kind of 3-1/2 million being offered today. If we can avoid bonding, I think that's something we've talked about is a good thing overall. With that, it allows then for a few years where all the increment would be going toward the Shipyard. I think based, also on our estimates, we generally come in, I would say conservative with our assessed values, and this also does not contemplate any additional development that may occur on the site. There's still parking lots there that could be developed in the future on a second phase. Yeah, so we feel comfortable in terms of bringing these numbers in. And I think that's also the balance of what we look at in terms of how we're spending money to do the actual Shipyard piece of it. We've been limited in the draws that we're actually taking and bonding to make sure that we're gonna be having sufficient revenue to do those. So with that, we feel this will definitely give a big boost and be able to keep that project off the levy.

- [Brian] So hypothetical situation, if additional funding is necessary for the Shipyard, do you see that impacting the numbers in terms of our ability to continue to keep that off the levy?

- At this time, no. I think, right, there's still some wild cards that could be had, but I think so long as our commitment, and that's both the RDA and Council, authorized up to, I think, $9-1/2 million worth of bonding into this, or funds into this, as long as we can continue to take out those chunks in phases based on what we feel could be coming back in, with that we've got over a million dollars of grant money going into here, so I think as long as we're making kind of informed choices as we go along, I think we'll be able to keep along that path.

- [Brian] Okay, then this is an ownership transfer, not a ground lease?

- Correct, yep. So the proposal would be similar to Breakthrough, that they would have the property fee simple, minus, we're gonna take the first, or retain 50 feet all along the waterfront, so that's still retains, it's open to the public all along the waterfront. The rest of the property they will own fee simple.

- [Matt] And Kevin, right now, when is the thought on when the title would pass to Merge?

- I think that's probably gonna be contemplated in the development agreement bit. I think one of the things that will be discussed is who's gonna be doing the work. I think at first, it's gonna retain in our hands in terms of being able to do some of the site prep. I think it will come to a time, probably after that site prep is done, where that transfer will be made. I'm guessing, maybe towards the end of this year or beginning of '20 and '21. In terms of the increment that's created, really the incentive is designed when the structure's built. I know there'll be some tax value when it gets transferred to the private property, but really it's built on the incentive for the structure. So whether that happens at the end of this year or next, I think, really, what we want to do, as long as it's under common ownership right now, there's a lot more flexibility we have when it comes to moving dirt around and working on a brownfield. And so you don't have to worry about easements and access and

agreements that way. So I think for the time being it's easiest for us just to keep it under our ownership and work on that transfer later this year or early next year.

- [Jim] So Kevin, there's no contemplation of phasing in the construction then, it's gonna be both building one and two from the start? I will defer, but I believe they were gonna be done in pretty short order, one, two after another. We'll call it maybe phase three in the parking lots at a later date, but I'll defer to either Brent or Joy on that one.

- [Brent] We always like to reserve the ability to do one in the other year, just so that we don't bring on so many units at one time. It just really depends on the size, and that hasn't been decided at this time.

- Are there some questions that we'd like to ask in closed session? Matt were you thinking--

- [Brian] Gary, if I could just ask one more question?

- Sure.

- [Brian] Kevin, could you explain the item 1D, where they get deferred forgivable equity investment?

- Sure. So that's something, it was contemplated in an agreement a while ago. In short it says, we'll transfer you the property for a dollar, but we really want to acknowledge, one, the market worth of that property, so here's what that property's worth, and our assessor believes all in, it's around somewhere $850,000.00. And so once you have that property in terms of, even though it's a PAYGO, we still are dependent upon increment from that to drive other projects. And so our goal is to have that be at least $15 million, and if it's not, we would at least like to be then compensated for the value of the land. So if it does not hit that threshold, then instead of it being sold for a dollar, you basically have to pay the $850,000.00 for the true value of the land.

- [Brian] And that's what the January 1st, 2024 date reflects, is that that value has to be achieved by that date?

- Correct.

- [Brian] Okay. Is that $850,000.00 assuming land that is buildable?

- Yes, and basically it kind of took off the waterfront property, so it's not as valuable as being on the water itself. But based on the location and water views, and actually it's a pretty sizable site, that that is what it is, yes, based on. And for our intents, the whole site itself is buildable. Again, the structure's probably gonna require some foundation work, but there's nothing on the site, there's no areas on the site that have been deemed unbuildable.

- [Brian] Okay, and then just one last, I didn't see it in here, unless I missed it, about the public art requirement?

- [Cheryl] It's in there.

- [Brian] Was that funded projects?

- Correct.

- It's in there.

- It's mentioned in here, and it is also being drafted in the development agreement.

- [Brian] Perfect, thank you.

- Yep.

- Okay, so we certainly can go in closed session. This is strictly a Term Sheet, it's not the development agreement, but we can. Are there some questions that people would like to ask in closed session? Yes, Alder Dorff, please.

- [Barb] Do we need to procedurally return to regular order of business now and close the floor?

- Yeah.

- Okay.

- Okay.

- Any more questions for the developer or Kevin, before we go back to regular order of business? If not, motion to proceed to regular order of business?

- [Barb] So moved.

- Alder Dorff.

- [Jim] Second.

- And Jim. All in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- So carried, we are back to regular order of business. So now the question would be if we felt it was necessary to go into closed session. Are there some questions that we'd like to ask in closed session that we can't ask in open session, we will certainly do that. Comments in that regard?

- [Jim] I had one question I'd like to talk about in closed session.

- Okay, then I'll entertain a motion to go into closed session. Jim?

- [Matt] So moved.

- Matt.

- [Jim] Jim, second.

- Okay.

- All right.

- Matt and Jim.

- [Kevin] Gotta read the language.

- Okay, Matt, you get the pleasure of reading the language.

- [Matt] I've gotta find it here first, Gary.

- Otherwise I can do it, it's up to you.

- [Matt] No, I'm just pulling it up right now online.

- Being the newly elected vice chair we've gotta give you some responsibilities.

- [Matt] Okay, here we go. The Authority may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85 , Wisconsin Statutes, for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public property, 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 , Wisconsin Statutes, to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

- Okay, roll call please.

- All right, so, Chair Gary Delveaux?

- Yes.

- Vice Chair Matt Schueller?

- [Matt] Yes.

- Alderperson Barbara Dorff?

- [Barb] Yes.

- Jim Blumreich?

- [Jim] Yes.

- Deby Dehn?

- [Deby] Yes.

- And Melanie Parma?

- [Melanie] Yes.

- Okay, so even though we're virtual here, what we're gonna have to do is, I'm probably gonna take everyone on the Zoom meeting who's not an RDA member and put you into the Waiting Room. So motion to go back into open, we had a motion and a second to go back into open session?

- Yes, Jim and--

- [Jim] That was me and Barb.

- Okay.

- Jim and Barb, yep.

- So Gary Delveaux?

- Yes.

- Matt Schueller?

- [Matt] Yes.

- Alderperson Barbara Dorff?

- [Barb] Yes.

- Jim Blumreich?

- [Jim] Yes.

- Deby Dehn?

- [Deby] Yes.

- Melanie Parma?

- [Melanie] Yes.

- All right, and I'm gonna admit everybody back in. All right, wake up everyone. Okay, we are back in open session. Thank you for your patience. All right, I'll turn it back over to Chair.

- In closed session we had some good comments and suggestions, and I think we're ready to entertain a motion in regard to the Term Sheet. Jim?

- [Jim] So I would go ahead and make a motion to approve the Term Sheet with Merge, LLC, for a development project at the Shipyard, 239 Arndt Street, 101 Bridge Street, and 119 Bridge Street, Tax Parcels 3-551, 3-554-A, 3-556, and direct staff to work on the development agreement per our discussions in today's meeting.

- Is there a second?

- [Matt] Second.

- Second by Matt. Any other comments or questions in regard to that motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. Excellent project, thanks for everybody's, the development team and everybody's work. It's a beautiful project. We're looking forward to working with the developer. Thank you.

- [Dan] Thank you.

- Thank you, guys. If you're willing to, able to stick around if you'd like, and see what other business we do. Otherwise, no pressure, I know you've got other things going on, so if you check out. And I'll follow up about just kind of next steps with Council and the development agreement. But again, yes, thank you.

- [Brent] Thanks, Kevin. Thanks, everyone, bye.

- [Joy] Thanks, everybody.

- Lots of luck.

- [Joy] Bye now.

- Number seven, consideration with possible action on a communication from Alder Johnson, District 9, to create a policy guaranteeing City Council oversight and disbursement of funds related to Affordable Housing Extension Resolutions for TIDs 7, 8, and 12. Alder Johnson, please. Oh, is he still there?

- All right.

- [Brian] So I think staff has put together a plan on this. This is really just taking a look at that Affordable Housing Resolution and setting up some guidelines of how we're gonna disperse that, so I would actually just let Kevin and his team talk about it.

- Okay.

- Thank you. So included in your packet is, what we have is a draft for some guidelines or a policy for the Tax Increment District Affordable Housing, which we call, TI-DA policy. I know. If you don't like it, Cheryl came up with it.

- [Gary] Right, right.

- Really, two parts with this. One, I think it was important to follow up on Alder Johnson's request in terms of getting some parameters around how we're gonna use these funds that will be coming into the City. They're not coming in for another year yet, so we have some time to work on this. But I at least wanted to put something out there for discussion. And with that, talk about creating this policy and how we're gonna manage this fund. But then the recommendation today would actually be to send back to staff and bring back after our Housing Study is completed, that we anticipate to be done later this summer. We don't have the money coming in yet and we don't have to allocate it yet. And really the last thing we want to do is make decisions based on not good data, so if there's certain products or things, surprises that come out with the Housing Study, we want to be able to adjust to that. But just in short, and again, we would like to take some direction today. Section one, basically gives us, the State gives us the authority to create this fund. It's gonna be a segregated fund. What we really look at this is kind of like we've been doing Block Grant, Neighborhood Enhancement Fund, is that the Redevelopment Authority would be the administrator of this fund, but be responsible to come up with an annual plan that it submits to Council, saying, look, here's how we'd like to spend the money, here's the money we've had coming in, here's what we spent before in the past, and really provide that check from Council to say, are there any things that need to be adjusted. Council sets up parameters and then the RDA goes through and works on the projects. In terms of then just the purpose, again, it's gotta be for housing, and most of it for affordable housing. Looking in in terms of defining affordable housing, 30% of the gross monthly income. One of the things that we didn't target is just affordable, yes, 30% of your income, but are we gonna put some bounds on exactly who that is? Is that a household? Obviously it's a household making 35, a larger one, $50,000.00 a year. But do we want, how far up do we want to go in terms of a cap on the household income size? And then just in terms of priority for different types of projects, I think this'll probably be the one that gets most tweaked based on the Housing Study. What are some of the specific housing needs that we need? And then really, just for particular projects, those criteria that are out there. We really want to invest in things that are what we need, and just like our Tax Increment projects, things that really create higher property values, do things that are part of the public good, and you're removing blighted properties, addressing contamination, and just also, again, having some parameters that developers, people doing these projects have some skin in the game, and then really best to move forward. Another piece, we talked about, and this is up for discussion, is at first, included the public art requirement in here. In terms of making something affordable or not affordable at this scale, I'm not sure where that falls, but again, I think one of the things we talked about is just because it's an affordable housing project it doesn't necessarily mean that it would have to go without public art, which is again, another benefit for the City. So with that, this is kind of the outline of where we started and we are open for discussion, comments, and then how you'd like to move forward with it.

- [Jim] So I had one thought, and it goes to Cheryl. Because when you bring property purchases to the RDA, you've already got a point value assigned to that particular property based upon certain parameters. And this has got an outline of what those parameters might be for these affordable housing projects. I wonder if you might be able to formulate some similar formula that you could bring a numerical value to the RDA for us to have an easier way of understanding where is it prioritized with all the other factions?

- [Cheryl] Yes, I think that's totally possible, and when we get that Housing Study data back, we'll know where the priorities are, so we'll be able to rank that based on the level of affordability we need, the size, bedroom sizes, those types of things. So I, absolutely we could be doing that.

- [Jim] Cool.

- [Deby] This is Deby. One of the things that was tied to the developer agreements for the condition of putting 1% of public art in was if the development received TIF. And as far as I could see in this proposal, this money could not be used in a project that was receiving TIF?

- So that is correct. I think one of the things that we talked about is this fund, even though it's created, or the revenue comes from tax increment districts, we felt that if project is going on within a tax increment district, let's use the tax increment district, let's use the tool in place to be able to fund that project. Things that we thought about were the Friar House project, over at St. Mary's of the Angels. This would be a good project, it provides affordable housing, but it's in a neighborhood and it's in an area that I don't know if it's really creating a tax increment district. So we wanted to provide a financial tool for housing projects that might not be in TIDs, but still could benefit from some public assistance because they can't get the numbers to work, again, based on construction costs or other challenges.

- [Deby] No, I was just looking at waiving, not having the public art requirement attached to it then, if it didn't have the condition of the TIF in there. Just a thought. Because they're gonna be smaller projects and they're gonna be running on tighter budgets than something that's gonna be receiving TIF. Just a thought.

- Sure.

- [Matt] I think though, Deby, the way that it's written, it has to $500,000.00 for the public art project to be in place.

- [Deby] Okay.

- Correct, yep.

- [Brian] Kevin, one program in particular that I'm interested in, and the intent of this was still just to be very broad, and if you're eventually gonna get into specific programs, but one program that I would like to see in particular is a funding source for above store front renovations. We have a number of properties where currently it's cost-prohibitive to do that. And so what I'm trying to do is identify where can we get resources local, state level, that would incent people to actually convert those spaces and achieve some of that density that we're looking for in our downtown neighborhoods?

- [Deby] There was a program like that about four years ago. Though the City.

- [Brian] It no longer exists or?

- [Deby] Through the City.

- [Brian] Oh, it's through the City?

- [Deby] Yep, specifically for converting upper floors. Into apartments.

- [Brian] Yeah.

- [Deby] Kevin, was that .

- Yes, that was before me, and Cheryl might know the funding source of that. I don't, that's not one I recall, but I don't know if Cheryl knows, if that one was one of ours?

- [Cheryl] It was. I'm trying to think if that was, was that Block Grant, Deby or was it federally funded, or was it--

- [Deby] No, it was Block Grant. It was something the City had done. I was on the housing task force--

- [Wendy] This is Wendy, it was Neil and Greg put it together.

- [Gary] Was it used much?

- [Wendy] Sorry to interrupt, it was something that Neil and Greg had put together, and I believe, it was something that Neil and Greg had put together when they were here, and I think they did cut out some funds from Block Grant Funds to do something like that.

- [Woman] Okay.

- [Wendy] And I know that The Gift Itself took advantage of that and some others. Can you hear okay, or?

- Mm hm.

- Yep.

- [Wendy] Okay, thank you.

- [Brian] And I think just recognizing that--

- [Wendy] I know Michelle over at The Gift Itself took--

- [Gary] Kevin, are you looking for us to approve the draft of this one then?

- [Woman] Can't hear you, Wendy.

- Yeah, so I think what we're looking for is comments on the draft and then basically, I guess maybe send it back to staff and come back after the Housing Study is completed. I think I put a date on there, I have to look, September. Again, it may get pushed back just a little bit 'cause we might have

our focus groups, but at least it's important to get it back on the calendar and we can give an update in September.

- [Gary] Okay, I don't think we really need a motion there. Just, are you good with that?

- Well, I'd prefer a motion to send it to staff and come back at a date, so.

- All right, I'll entertain a motion to send this back to staff and--

- [Barb] So Moved.

- To report to us in September or?

- [Kevin] September, yep. And we'll come back.

- Okay. Motion--

- [Barb] So moved to report to us in September.

- Alder Dorff.

- Second.

- Second.

- Second by Matt, Matt? Or Deby, I'm sorry, second by Deby?

- [Deby] Yeah.

- All right. Any other comments or questions? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Very good, opposed? So carried, thank you. Number eight, consideration with possible action on the acquisition of 301-303 South Quincy Street, Tax Parcel 14-491, using Neighborhood Enhancement Funds.

- [Kevin] Cheryl.

- Cheryl?

- [Cheryl] It's Ken, actually.

- Ken?

- [Ken] Yeah, so 301-303 South Quincy, this is a highly visible property over in the Navarino Neighborhood. When you're coming down Stuart Street up from Monroe, this is really one of the first you see when you're going over towards the park. There was a fire that happened at this

property, so it is vacant. The fire was contained mainly to the upper unit, but there was some damage that got into the walls. There is some structural repairs that will need to be done. But we've been working with Neighborworks Green Bay on this project and they have put together numbers, and they're really looking at a rehab here, they're looking at about $60,000.00 for the rehab to remediate any of the smoke damage and to repair the kitchens that have been damaged. With that they'll also be redoing the exterior of the building, reestablishing two front porches for both the upper and lower unit that had been converted to bedrooms, the course of the history of this building. So they will be, basically they're working with us to get the house back to the appropriate density. So it'll be an upper, lower flats, two bedroom. They will be looking at that as part of their portfolio. And so originally when we were looking at it we were looking at using Neighborhood Enhancement Funds. But the further they dug into the project, they didn't expect the structural damage on the first walk-through, so they're actually going to, NeighborWorks will be looking to request total funding for the rehab. So the initial item $40,000.00 of Neighborhood Enhancement Funds. And then that was gonna be partnered with NeighborWorks' $15,000.00 for the acquisition. We're going to change that to the RDA purchasing the property for $55,000.00, and then approving up to $45,000.00 of CHDO funding to be paired with NeighborWorks' $15,000.00 for rehab for the project.

- [Cheryl] And the purchase, Ken, would be, you would utilize Block Grant dollars, correct, Ken, and not Neighborhood Enhancement?

- Correct, yeah, so Neighborhood Enhancement would be taken out of this. With the CHDO request, there would be the low to moderate income strings that will be attached to this, so we figured it would be best to use our Block Grant funds that also have the same strings on them rather than using our Enhancement dollars that we could put towards other projects that don't have LMI component.

- [Gary] What's the end tax value, tax base?

- Yeah, so right now the present tax, 106,000.00, they should be able to put it back on the tax rolls, or a new assessed value is probably about 150, 160,000.00.

- [Gary] Okay.

- They will be keeping that although in their portfolios that'll we have that... I can't think of the word right now.

- [Kevin] Pilot?

- Yeah, pilot, thanks, Kevin.

- [Kevin] All right.

- So with that, did anybody have any questions on the project?

- So then the motion would be to approve the acquisition of 301-303 South Quincy Street, Tax Parcel 14-491, utilizing 45,000.00 of Block Grant Funds, as well as 15,000.00 from NeighborWorks Green Bay.

- So it would be utilizing 55,000.00 of Community Development Block Grant, and then to utilize 45,000 in CHDO funds.

- Whoops, missed that, sorry. If that's the case, I'll make the motion.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Who did?

- [Gary] Barb, Alder.

- Can you report the motion one more time, just for Lisa to get that?

- Yes, and I can send it, approve the acquisition of 301-303 South Quincy, 14-491, utilizing $55,000.00 of Community Development Block Grant, and then deed the property to NeighborWorks Green Bay, who will utilize up to $40,000.00 CHDO.

- 40,000.00 of CHDO?

- 45,000.00.

- 45,000.00 of CHDO, okay.

- [Gary] Is that the motion, Jim?

- It is.

- [Gary] Okay.

- And that's the second.

- [Gary] Alder Dorff? I'm sorry, or Deby? I'm sorry, who was second?

- I had seconded it, Barb Dorff.

- Okay, thank you, Barb. Okay, so a motion and a second to approve the motion as stated by Ken. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried. Number nine, consideration with possible action on the adoption of the Curb Appeal Grant into the Neighborhood Enhancement Fund programming. Who's got that?

- That would be me as well. So the Curb Appeal Grant program, we brought in front of the RDA last year as part of the Shipyard redevelopment and the Shipyard neighborhood. Let me just pull up my file here, one second. Okay, so initially you put $50,000.00 into the Curb Appeal Grant fund to see how the program would be received and how it would work in the community. The Curb Appeal Grant, the 75% matching grant incentive, so the homeowners apply to the program to do landscaping,

exterior building and structure rehab, as well as other site improvements including driveway repair or paving. The initial 50,000.00, we were able to get all of it allocated pretty much within the first three months of the program. If you look in the package, look at some of those numbers, what those projects ended up generating by project costs, and what we awarded for grants, and if you dive a little deeper to looking at the prospective, it actually comes out more to being about 50% of what funding is actually going in on private. So people are actually putting more into these projects than just the 75% of what we're putting in, they're actually adding in about an extra 25% towards these projects. So far it's been received really well, and we've actually had about three or four new applications that have come in that we've had to put on hold until we get approval to spend more in that area. So with this, we would like to basically, we would like to incorporate this program into our Neighborhood Enhancement funding so we can do it on a yearly basis, and just include it in our annual budget that we bring to you at the start of every year. And in the future if you think that to other neighborhoods, and that'll be once we get the Housing Study back and do a few more neighborhoods studied to see where else the program could actually be utilized. But in the meantime, we're looking to add this into the program in that, allocate the 50,000.00 to Neighborhood Enhancement.

- Okay, any questions or comments for Ken? If not, I'll entertain a motion one way or another.

- [Melanie] I think it's great that the funds have been used and it's been a successful program, so I'll make a motion to approve the adoption of the Curb Appeal Grant to the Neighborhood Enhancement funding program.

- Is there a second?

- [Deby] Second.

- Deby?

- Yep.

- Okay, great. Motion by Melanie, second by Deby for the adoption of the Curb Appeal Grant into the Neighborhood Enhancement fund program. Any questions or comments? All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried, thank you.

- [Ken] Awesome.

- Number 10, consideration with possible action on awarding the Annual IT Service Contract and software licensing for KI Convention Center to Elevate 97.

- That's me. So every year we go out for contract for KI Convention Center. Of course we have all of the technology there that's directional and folks can use their equipment. Every year we have to go out for a service agreement to maintain that equipment, and then also for the software that provides the backup for that equipment. So we went out for bid through purchasing and we had one vendor, actually, we only had one vendor, but it was Elevate 97 who we're using now anyway. So my

recommendation would be to approve the contract with Elevate 97, who was the lowest responsive bidder, for a one year contract for $31,428.00, which includes the licensing for the Four Winds software.

- [Gary] And you've been very satisfied with them in the past?

- We have been, yep.

- Move to approve.

- [Gary] A motion by Jim.

- [Melanie] I'll second.

- [Gary] Second by Melanie. Any question or comments? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- [Gary] Opposed? So carried. I've got a feeling this group likes it better when they do the thing online. I've just got a feeling. Okay, number 11, consideration with possible action to partner with the City of Green Bay Parks Department in the purchase of 601 Saint George Street for trail expansion and housing development. Who's that?

- Okay, that's me.

- Cheryl again.

- [Gary] Okay, Cheryl.

- That's me. So I sent out the report to you with the information with regards to how the project was negotiated. This is really a trail expansion project that Parks has been working on to extend the East River Trail. This is the section of trail that runs behind Golden House on University Avenue. So this parcel, when you look at your map, is one of the last parcels we need to acquire to get to that land. It's been a very difficult acquisition in that just it's a trust property, and there are a number of siblings involved, and we've been through a number of appraisals back and forth. But I think partnering with the Parks Department, with the utilization that they have of their DNR grant dollars, along with money that they had allocated for this purchase, if we can add some additional dollars to this, with Enhancement funds, we would then have two buildable lots that we could do some housing development on after they used the section they need for the trail. So remember we cannot use eminent domain powers for trail purchases anymore. So that's why this is a property, it's like the last one, and it would be really great if we could just tie this whole project up, get these commercial buildings that are on the site out of there, and then have some additional housing development. One small parcel, single family, on Saint George, and then a larger area for development on University Avenue. Any questions?

- Yeah, who did that appraisal for five hundred and seventy some thousand dollars?

- Well, that's listed on the sheet that I sent you. We can go into closed session if you would like to?

- No, that's okay.

- And talk about those?

- I did read it, but I have no access to any of my documents right now, my computer screen is just froze with this in front of it. I can't get at anything else.

- If you would like to go into closed session, I sent the information sheet out because we--

- You did, and I read it. No, you did it, and I read it, I'm just like, wow, where does that come from? Anyway. Move to approve.

- Second.

- Deby made the motion to approve? I'm sorry?

- Yep.

- And Alder Dorff?

- Alder Dorff seconded it.

- Excellent.

- And I need to say, though, that this is contingent on, of course, Parks and Council approving this, so this needs to be a partnership.

- Okay.

- Mm hm.

- Any other questions or comments? All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried. Number 12, consideration with possible action on the transfer of $50,000.00 of CDBG funds from the 2019 CDBG Eligible Area Projects budget to the 2019 ED Facade and Demo budget.

- Facade grants, yeah, yeah yeah yeah. This would be Matt.

- Okay, can you hear me everybody? You've got a lot.

- [Kevin] All right, you're up.

- Yep, we can hear you.

- Good. All right, so last year, RDA had allocated $50,000.00 toward our Facade and Demolition program. As you're aware, we've had a very successful year with those funds, we've funded four strong facade projects. We've had two larger ones with Richard Craniums and the Farmory and a couple of smaller ones, with Olde Town Crossing on Main Street and Motel 6 on Dousman. So after funding those projects we've allocated about all of our funds, I think we have about $800.00 left for this year. We're still getting applications in, despite the COVID-19 craziness, there are still business owners that are interested in utilizing this program. So we're back asking for more funding. We'd like to request 50,000.00 be re-allocated to do more facade projects.

- Well you sure did have a lot of great success last year. So we're anticipating the same.

- Excellent.

- Any motions?

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Alder Dorff and second by Jim. Any questions or comments? All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried. Informational. I didn't have any questions with the financial report or the check register, I don't know if anybody else did? If not, we'll get into the Director's Report. Lots of project updates here.

- Yeah, so thank you. Just overall, thanks for you all taking the time here. I think we muddled through this pretty well.

- [Barb] You did great.

- Thanks to Lisa, Shelby, for keeping us on track. Of course, right, we have a large, huge agenda. That's how a lot of this happens. But look, this is how we're gonna be operating right now for the foreseeable future, so I'll plan on this for April or if you need a special meeting in between. Again, I think we're gonna continue to put pieces together for some of these development projects as we've been working on them. I think this Merge project will be a really great boost for us to get back on it with the Shipyard, and how we move ahead there. Overall, we're operating, most of our staff is remote right now, with limited in-office presence, but we're still being able to work on some things and we'll do the best that we can with the resources that we have to keep moving forward. So with that, we anticipate moving some things ahead in the coming months and just appreciate your patience in working with us. I know we're all getting this, sometimes it's nice too just to see other faces, and to get together virtually,

- Yes.

- Yeah.

- Right, so that we're all still here. So I don't have any other specific updates, unless anybody has any particular questions, yes, Jim?

- [Jim] Question for you Kevin. These can be a little perturbing, these conference calls, when you get a lot of feedback.

- Yeah.

- [Jim] And I don't know how to test that ahead of time to see where it's coming from. But in particular, when Dan was making his presentation and when Ken was discussing his items too, I was getting a lot of feedback.

- Okay.

- [Jim] So I know when you don't have a technology like Zoom, everybody's got to put their phones or whatever on mute, and then it makes all the difference in the world in terms on not getting that feedback. I'm not sure where to start on that, but it would make our meetings a lot smoother, I would think, if we could solve that problem.

- I am getting a nod from Shelby across the room, that we are working on some upgrades here. We weren't set up, we're in Council Chambers just because we wanted to be able to broadcast like the slides and use pictures to you, which we can't do in the other conference rooms, but Shelby and IT, they are working to get us some upgrades so that we can have a more integrated conference experience, because I know, right, after two plus hours, some of that reverb and things can get a little testy. But we are working on it here to hopefully improve that for next time around, so thank you. And if there's any others, I think Ken texted me, there was some echo, and Diana, so yeah, we're trying to address those as we can. Thankfully at least the recording of this is coming through okay, and so for the public and the records it'll be good, but yes, we'll be continuing to work on that for future meetings.

- [Jim] So are we not going to use Civic Clerk to record our votes any longer then?

- Yeah, that was kind of a decision I made and maybe I shouldn't have, whatever, but Lisa, if you have remote, can you still use it?

- So yes, we can. I think it was a lot, I think, for us just to kind of take in the Zoom this time. So I think we're recording through voice votes. I think next time, again, some of you might be on a phone or a laptop, it may be tough to go back and forth between the meeting and Civic Clerk. If you can, we'll maybe try it next time, but we figured, and look, put me at fault for this, one technology at a time, I just wanted everybody to be able to get online and talk to each other and at least in the spirit of public process, I think we were very transparent today and made it work. So we'll take some baby steps and next time maybe try and get Civic Clerk going at the same time.

- [Gary] Maybe, we'll see.

- [Jim] Yeah, Kevin, I actually have two laptops set up here, one for the Zoom video. Nice.

- [Jim] Or else I don't think I could've handled doing it.

- [Barb] Yep, we have two set up.

- Wow.

- Well then, maybe we may, before the next meeting, just give a little technology check, and then if those who are capable of doing it can do it, and if not, we'll just record voice votes from that. So we'll take a little poll before maybe the next meeting.

- Sure.

- [Jim] I just have to pay laptop rent to my wife, that's all.

- Good luck with that.

- [Cheryl] And maybe upgrade your system at home, right? 'Cause that's the other thing, if you've got a slow internet at home.

- [Jim] Oh, I've got a 100 meg service, I'm good.

- I think with that, I'll take a motion to adjourn, please.

- [Barb] Move to adjourn.

- Alder Dorff.

- [Jim] Second.

- And Jim, all those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- [Jim] Ta-dah, aye.

- Yeah, oh I know, thank you. Thanks very much, guys.

- All right.

- [Cheryl] Kevin?

- Yes?

- [Cheryl] You have a couple of items on your Director's Report?

- I think there were some property things, I think just in interest of time we're gonna hold those, we'll just hold those 'til next time.

- [Cheryl] Hold them, okay, all right, okay.

- Thank you.