MINUTES OF THE TAX INCREMENTAL DISTRICTS JOINT REVIEW COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 2020, 12:30 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION

1. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

1. Members: Diana Ellenbecker, City of Green Bay; Bradley Klingsporn, Brown County; Peter Ross, Green Bay Area Public School District; Bob Matthews, Northeast Wisconsin Technical College; Brent Weycker, Citizen Member.

Present: Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, Excused: None, Absent: Brent Weycker.

Others present: Ald. Barb Dorff, Ald. Lynn Gerlach

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

1. Approval of the agenda for the August 18, 2020, meeting of the Tax Incremental Districts Joint Review Committee.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Bob Mathews to approve the agenda. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the July 9, 2020 meeting.

An amendment to the minutes was made by Bradley Klingsporn. He asked the following amendment be made:
Under Regular Business, Item #1, that Chad Weininger's name for the "Yes" vote be removed and

replaced with his name, Bradley Klingsporn.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Bob Mathews to approve the amendment of the minutes from the July 9, 2020 meeting. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

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

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to take the agenda out of order and review Agenda Item #7 before Agenda Item #1. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Seven (7), Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Peter Ross, seconded by Bradley Klingsporn to adopt an Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID Seven (7), Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Peter Ross, seconded by Bradley Klingsporn to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a Project Plan, for the closure of TID Seven (7), Ashland Avenue and Lombardi Avenue Corridors. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Peter Ross, seconded by Bob Mathews to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID

Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to adopt an Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Peter Ross, seconded by Bob Mathews to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a Project Plan, for the closure of TID Eight (8), Henry and Morrow Streets. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action to adopt a Resolution amending the Project Plan for TID Nine (9), State Highway 54/57 Business Park. The proposed costs include projects within the proposed boundary and within a one-half (1/2) mile radius of the proposed boundary of the TID.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to adopt a Resolution amending the Project Plan for TID Nine (9), State Highway 54/57 Business Park. The proposed costs include projects within the proposed boundary and within a one-half (1/2) mile radius of the proposed boundary of the TID. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- Bob Mathews, Abstain- None

Agenda Item #8 was reviewed before going back to Agenda Item #1.

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

Moved by Member Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a Project Plan, for the closure of TID Nine (9), State Highway 54/57 Business Park. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- Bob Mathews, Abstain- None

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Bob Mathews to return back to the regular order of the Agenda. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Bob Mathews to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Twelve (12), I-43 Commercial Development. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to adopt an Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID Twelve (12), I-43 Commercial Development. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Bob Mathews to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a TID Plan, for the closure of TID Twelve (12), I-43 Commercial Development. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Bob Mathews left the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to table the adoption of a Standard Extension Resolution for TID Fourteen (14), North Broadway Redevelopment until early next year or sooner as directed by the Director of the Department of Community and Economic Development. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Peter Ross, No- Diana Ellenbecker, Abstain- None

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

Moved by Peter Ross, seconded by Bradley Klingsporn to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a TID Plan, for the closure of TID Seventeen (17), 900 Block North Broadway. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Set next meeting date and time.

The next meeting will be scheduled for the week of September 21, 2020.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Peter Ross to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.
Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Okay.

- All right. And then. Think if you want to begin, Diana, I think if you want to start I think last time you were chair for this meeting, so if we want to get started with that. And begin.

- [Diana] All right, we'll call to order the Joint Finance Joint Review Board. For Tuesday, August 18 2020. We'll take roll call, Bradley Klingsporn,

- [Bradley] Here.

- [Diana] Peter Ross. I see him. He's here, Okay, he's waving. Bob Matthew.

- [Bob] Here, I'm here.

- [Diana] Thank you, thank you. Do we have Brent Weycker? I don't see him online right now and I'm Diana Ellenbecker from the city of Green Bay. I will entertain a motion to approve the agenda. Any discussion?

- If there's no discussion I'll move.

- Okay, we have a motion by Bradley, seconded by Bob. All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- Take motion to approve the minutes.

- [Bradley]|Actually one the amendment.

- Okay.

- And that's, on the summary. The one that says the info came from Chad, I just wanted to correct that. On the summary regular business.

- [Diana] Okay, we will look into that, correct because his name was in there at the beginning, they had to manually go through each one and take it out, on group basis. So apologize for that, we will get that cleaned up.

- Okay.

- With that approval I move to

- We have motion by Bradley, seconded by Bob. All in favor.

- Aye.

- Passes. To regular business. Consideration possible action to adopt an allocation amend resolution, and amend the project plan for TID seven, National Avenue Lombardi Avenue Corridors. Over to the director.

- All right, thank you very much. I'm going to go ahead and see if I can't share slides here. Let's see if this works. No, that's not what I want. All right, can you see a PowerPoint slideshow?

- [Diana] Yeah.

- Yes, okay. And does it have notes on it, or is it just the slides?

- [Board] Just the slides.

- Just the slides. Great. So what I will do is just as we get into it, today on the agenda, a number of things looking at TID seven, eight, nine, 12, 14, and 17. A lot of this is going to be a repeat of what we did last year. We have updated some numbers based on current projections, DOR and the state statute requires us to do some of these actions in the actual year that they're happening. I think it was important that we did do them last year because I think it was important to put together how these all fit, in terms of you know, closing TIDs and opening up new TIDs. So it's really important to get them all on the table. Now we're actually coming up on timelines for having to do some of these actions for allocations, the affordable housing extensions and terminations. So we'll need to go through and really kind of re-approved, you know, what we've talked about, as we went through the annual meeting, our 2019 final numbers are in. So we updated some of the projections with those, and just, made some small tweaks to see where we're at based on our estimates last year moving forward. So with that, these again, are where we're at, as we go through and just, a high level of some proposed allocations, and we could come back to the summary slide. Really, the allocations are to help close primarily TID nine, and then TID 17. And so, again, just kind of to show like the comprehensive package of how these are all together, we need about $2.7 million to close down TID nine. So here are the limits that have been proposed through the allocation amendments, and then basically what we feel in terms of the actual cash that's needed from each. Again, you know, the final accounting, these numbers will adjust a little bit. That's where we did put a little higher limit, but this is where we're projecting. And then for, we'll need about $60,000. So, I wanted to go through and, you know, kind of take these one, one by one. All of these have resolutions, that will go before you today, with recommendations and to go to our Redevelopment Authority, which is having a public hearing on this a week from today, next Tuesday, the 25th. And then those resolutions, if recommended for approval, will go to the Green Bay City Council on the 15th of September for approval there, and then the Joint Review Board will meet after that, and we can talk about some calendar dates, in the days after that sometime between the 15th and the end of September. So agenda item one, is the consideration possible action for an allocation amendment and amending the project plan for TID seven. Which is Ashland Avenue and the party quarters. Again, this is the area, now referred to as the Legends District recreated TID 23, which over lapses to facilitate the development of the Legacy Hotel, and some future projects more towards the stadium Expo hall in

Rest center. This TID was really created to finance the development of the Tundra Lodge and some adjacent properties with that. However, we were done with the most part for developer incentives. There's one small project outstanding for Shorewest, which we'll talk about closing out. And so that, we would still like to move forward with the termination. And that is that termination. This will be the last year that we've collected taxes, and so 2019 taxes which have been payable in 2020. We'll be using those to basically close out this TID and then the next item talks about affordable housing allocation amendment. But so 2019 these are the numbers that match up with our annual reviews, starting balance of 712 ending balance of one point, just under 1.3. We have talked about, vitalizing some public expenses in that area. One of the things that has been identified in the project plan, is some improvements when it comes to pedestrian accommodations in that area, after you been out before or after game and that's football, basketball, hockey. you know, it can be difficult to get around in that area. So we have allocated funds. We thought we maybe get to it last year, but we're not going to get to until this year, to put in sidewalks lighting in some areas, because we're doing it, the Wisconsin Public Service and AT&T have offered to work with us to bury the utilities also in that area, as long as we are digging up the ground. So we anticipate, with our revenues, to use those funds, to complete those public projects that were identified in the plan. To encumber funds to pay out one outstanding development agreement, which is for the Shorewest property, to encumber some funds to pay out the rest of the outstanding debt service that exists there. And then take $800,000 and allocate it towards TID nine, to help close that TID out, basically, to break even. And then we'll talk about on the next case, all expenses will be closed out in 2020. So that way, all the increments that will be billed for tax year 2020, collected in 2021, we're proposing that that gets allocated towards affordable housing, and this TID will terminate in April of 2021. So we're taking the 2020 taxes that will be collected and using that for affordable housing 2021, which we'll talk about on the next item. And so with that we're recommending doing this allocation amendment as it's part agenda item one. So as allocation item, we talked about an allocation, the resolutions attached. And we're looking for an allocation not to exceed $1 million. Just based on the estimates we have so far, we figure that we'll probably come out to about $800,000. But again, you know, final accounting will adjust, and so that's what we're asking for up to 1 million in this application resolution.

- [Diana] Any discussion? The motion?

- [Bob] Yes, I'd like to ask a couple questions. Specifically we're doing the, well considering the allocation amendments, and it would be an allocation to TID nine, correct?

- Correct.

- [Bob] And then TID nine is asking for an amendment to their plan, to spend two and a half million dollars, which is the reason for the allocation. So I'm just wondering if we can table any of these until we've considered the TID nine, because if we're not going to amend the costs, they're not going to mend the plan on TID nine and then these allocations are unnecessary.

- Correct, so if you want to hold this and we can go right to TID nine to talk about that, and that will maybe kind of set the stage for the rest of these. I think that would be appropriate if you want to make a motion just to table this for the moment and take up, I believe it would be, item number seven.

- [Diana] Seven, yes.

- [Bob] I motion to table and consider item seven.

- Hey Kevin, the table is ready, seconded by Peter to table this item and move on to item number seven, all in favor.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Okay, that's approved.

- All right. So, number seven, consideration possible action to adopt a resolution amending the project plan for TID nine, State Highway 54, 57 Business Park. TID nine is one we spent quite some time talking about. It's been referred to as the University Heights, Business Park. And it's one that was created with really good intentions, but in terms of timing, probably was not so great, with the economy and growth and things really slowed down, in terms of how we anticipated this developing. Most of the area to the south of Algoma road was anticipated to develop industrial, and then towards the North, some commercial primarily a big box in this area. One of the things that we are looking for in consideration of amending the project plan, is to make this TID actually eligible for an allocation, based on when this TID was created and TID law at the time, this type of TID which is an industrial TID , is not eligible to be a recipient for allocations. Because of, again, when it was created at that time, it's not eligible to receive any funds from other Tax Increment Districts. Unless it contains a number of things. In one case, it could be declared distressed. It's close to this, unfortunately, the issue we have with this, it's not that the property values have declined, it's that we encumbered a lot of debt service, without having the growth to support it. So distressed TIDs are really for those that have properties taken, you know, offline or go tax exempt or have some sort of blank go through. And so it does not qualify to be a distressed TID, but it does also eligible to be a recipient TID, if it does contain cost or project costs, related to either A affordable housing, or B, environmental remedial. And so what we're looking to do is, based on some things that we have found in the last year, again, there's still a timeline on this for closing out this TID. We talk about projects kind of being dead in the water, there has been a little bit of effort, from a developer to look at a housing project out in this area. So to amend the project, to talk about potentially some fordable housing options, primarily in the area around Algoma Road and Niagara trail, that is a potential project, and then also, just as far as, you know, development of the further land, to have the environmental remediation as a possibility. Just based over from pooled farming agricultural practices, that is also a potential cause for expending funds. I can say that we haven't identified any specific projects on which to expand these funds. Really our primary interest is to include these in the project plan, to make this eligible for an allocation from the other Tax Increment Districts. If we do not amend this project plan to allow for the allocations, we will not be allowed to allocate from TIDs, eight, nine and 12. And so with that we would have to look for alternative uses, either projects within those particular TIDs. Or if we shut it down, there would be I would say, if there's not project expenses, then the proceeds would be divided among the taxing jurisdictions. With that, that would put the city in the pension in terms of where those funds would be needed to come from to pay for that debt service. That would be something that this TID, I think there's about six more years left on this, would have to come back to the city to basically fill the gap in terms of plugging that hole. And so, we did check with the Department of Revenue in terms of how we could make this TID eligible, and asking if we did amend the project plan, if that would qualify for it. We do have confirmation that it would. And so that is why we were asking for that addition and amendment on the project plan, here today. But as Mr. Klingsporn had said, I think it's appropriate to take this up first, because if this is not amended, I think the other points do become moot.

- The two and a half million did you arrive at that because that's the projected excess that would be in the other soon to be terminated TIDs? Or do you have an idea for what to do with the two and a half million?

- [Kevin] So, yeah, so I think the numbers were calculated both on one based on some excess that was available, but also just running some high level numbers about a potential housing project development out there. And what potentially that would assess out at, and what potentially the incentive needed would be to facilitate that development. The environmental costs were based on, you know, looking at, we've done a lot of environmental remediation throughout the city. And just kind of a worst case scenario, if a number of properties had to be cleaned up what those potentially could be. I think some of those, you know, we've had some properties, not only agricultural, but the service station has been abandoned for some time, and just wanted to be prepared in case those were not maintained to clean that up. So I think that's where those numbers came from, and in terms of where that those monies could potentially be expended.

- exposure to heaven on TID nine, if you did not term and you just let it play out. What is the projection on TID nine?

- The projection on TID nine, this would be as proposed with that allocation amendment, would leave us, we basically need about $2.7 million. That I mean, that's what's proposed in terms of, I think as we talked about last year, you know, the income, the increment is not nearly enough to pay for the debt service. And so annually, we're getting about 190,000 in income, our debt service expenses, straight of expenses, which we've tried to cut back because there's not a lot of staff activity, it's really the DIR fees and some basic legal fees. You know, like I said, we're going into the red every year on this and continuing to eat up additional debt. So our exposure for the city is about 2.7 million and again director Ellenbecker if you want to discuss that.

- [Diana] Yeah, on exactly at the end of 2019, as we recorded, we are at 1,000,005 negative, and with debt service remaining to the end of the TID year, we still have 1 million for outstanding and debt service. So between those offset by a very little increments, that is roughly where the 2.7 million came from. Again, at this point, we're ready 1.5 in the hole, and still have debt we're to pay.

- So you're essentially amending the plan, and you're saying, "Hey, we're going to invest this money." But you're really not going to invest it unless the project come through with the project, if you come through and essentially cover what you have to invent, but it gives you a tool to get funding to cover your gap. But that's right when you think about it.

- So I will say this is a last ditch effort to potentially get a project off the ground, that could like get this TID right side up. I can't guarantee that that project would move forward, but right now, you know, we don't have any really tools at our disposal because of the shape that this is in. And so yes, that that's why it's being proposed. There's still a termination resolution on here, I think just to give us some options in terms of moving forward with it, if it does not pan out. But yes, that is correct in terms of, alright, can we have some at least funds available to do this particular project, especially the housing component, because the housing was not identified in the original project plan.

- So if the housing project doesn't come through, does that exclude your ability to transfer funds over to this TID? Or do you I mean, I'm assuming you have to spend that money, but you're only going to spend it in that increment will offset the investment you made. So those just, those two wash it out. So it doesn't come to pass. You still can't use it or because you amended it to say that you could, now all of a sudden you can still transfer that money over. Does that make sense?

- Yes. It's the latter. If it's the end the project plan, it can be a recipient, it does not have to actually be expended on those particular project costs, it just needs to be a part of the project plan.

- So I'm really, really, if we support is this, what is the likelihood that wouldn't really happen? I mean, is it 50, 50? Is it a 80, 20? Is it a 20, 80?

- I would say it's a 20, 80. I mean, there's infrastructure issues out there. And I just look, I'll be up front. I mean-. That would be an accurate statement. I think, you know, one of the things that when we've discussed this, and yeah, as we've talked about in the annual report, I think for the most part, you know, our Tax Increment Districts are in fairly good shape, and we've tried to be, conservative in the way we approach financing and doing new ones. This was one that just I mean, it's been a bear and does not show any signs, in the five years that I've been here of getting any better. There's been fits and starts with different projects, and I'll say, yeah, I mean, a Hail Mary is the appropriate term to use in terms of we're just trying to see if there's anything else that we can do, you know, to at least at the end of the day, best case, you know, make this Tax Increment District, come back up to balance a zero. Or at minimum, at least reduce some of the deficit that it's going into. Again, I think, Director Ellenbecker can probably attest in terms of, you know, even Military Avenue, which was distressing at one time is seeing the light at the end of the tunnel and crawling out and generating more increment that, thing starting next year, it's going to be back in the black. But this one is just it's it hasn't turned and it doesn't show any signs of doing so. It's a tough one, I understand. You know, I think...

- [Ald. Dorff] from my district, this district one, and I mailed in I'm not sure how long ago I lose track of time. But do you remember that the people that have sold the land to the city, they were highly concerned, right. I'm trying to remember what some of those concerns are, could you review a little bit of their concern?

- Sure, it was really having to do with infrastructure. So there is a complex agreement that when this Tax Increment District was created, this was also done, I believe, parallel with a boundary agreement with the town of Scott. And there were some discussions about infrastructure, roads, water, sewer out in this area, and things that, would be done by certain parties at certain times. Some of those dates and deadlines were missed. And one of the challenges and of like chicken and the eggs the right analogy here, but, in order to, I think there's some hesitation to do a build it and they will come, just given the economy at the time, that you could invest a lot of infrastructure and that, you know, you would all see the development follow. And I think what happened is, we the city started to invest a lot in infrastructure, and I think Director Ellenbecker might be able to pull some particulars. But I think some of this bonding was originally for some of that infrastructure, primarily roads and streets. And we did it and the development didn't come, and so I think the city pulled back a little bit saying, "Look, do we want to continue to spend more of this development is not coming and go further into the hole?" And I think we've always said, "Look if there is actually a project in the queue, and we've gotten, you know, down the aisle, and close to the altar a few times, but that project has never pushed forward that could provide the increments to actually, then subsidize the rest of the infrastructure costs that are needed. And so I think just we've tried, at least from an administrative perspective, not to put US any further in the hole that it needs to be. And especially since it's you know, getting towards the latter age of the Tax Increment District, there's just not enough time to start to crawl back out of it. If there's a new district, and he had, you know, 15-20 years to pay it back, maybe we think differently. But we're coming in on the homestretch of this one, with only a few years left to catch up, to be able to pay it back. So I think with that, you know, if there was some discussions with the developer about, if we do when we do end up closing this one down, if there is a project, that could be a commitment from the city, we really to kind of look fresh at this area, and create a new Tax Increment District based on that, which we're, really trying to do now is that look, we tie these districts to certain projects, because then we know that there's revenue starting to come forward. And I think we've made that commitment, that we made it an RDA, I think we made it at Council. You know, I can't speak for the GRB here in terms of like actually approving it. But I think the same thing with TID 12, and the far East side of the city there, you know, we've talked about expanding that business park, but we're not going to do it to actually have you know, a project in the queue that can help generate some increment to pay for it. So if that's the case here, and we'll still propose the same thing.

- [Ald. Dorff] Okay, I just want to be sure that even if it closes, at some point in the future, we still might be willing to look at having a TID out there.

- Yeah, absolutely.

- [Ald. Doff] Okay, that's all I have, thank you.

- So, is this Kevin? This goes out till-.

- [Diana] Yeah, October 2025 term.

- So you work with your 20% chance a project of 80% maybe it will work? It's not but it's a whole new project, if I understand could you describe what that might look like out there?

- Sure, so I mean, we've had one, two developers who have been interested in a, I'll call it an Affordable Housing Project. Just kind of all call it, you know, kind of typical suburban multifamily. There's a demand for housing obviously throughout the city. But there's been interest especially out in that area, you know, both tied into GB. And also, you know, just the area of the city that has been growing, there's some employment opportunities, it's an attractive area and there's some decent sized parcels, in which to get a complex in which you can, you know, scale it and get 100, 200 plus units, to make it worthwhile to do that development.

- So, would this be low income housing that?

- No, I think in terms of, you know, affordable housing, I think what we looked at is, you know, this wouldn't necessarily be a tax credit housing project, but affordable in terms of, gearing towards individuals would not have to spend, more than 30% of their income on housing. So, developer did not talk about a subsidized housing project, in terms of using tax credits, but really geared towards just using the market but providing a product that would allow individuals to, not spend more than 30% of their income on housing.

- So here's the question that I have ultimately, and I know you and I've had this conversation in the past, that we both agreed that in properties that are developed for housing should be multi income capable properties so that there is a stratification, income levels, the property is that was what you had planned for this one as well .

- Yeah, I think, you know, this particular project had looked at that, but in talking with, you know, other land owners out there, there's only a handful. You know, I think we definitely talked and supported, you know, shifting away from the original plan that talked a lot about commercial and really was, you know, targeted for Big Box commercial, and shifting that to different types of housing and residential products. I think there's a way to get both renter and owner occupied housing out in that area, and also looking at a variety of incomes, in terms of you know, getting that from one specific developer, that's really tough, just because developers have like a product that you know, is their bread and butter, and then a lot of times it doesn't include, striation across, you know, incomes in one project. But with that, then that's why you work to not give one developer a monopoly on every, all the land out there, so that you can bring in some, you know, differences in terms of housing products, you know, so with that, I think, you know, there's been no formal request in terms of, you know, changing into the entitlement, to change from that commercial to residential. But we have had those discussions about having additional residential out there, to kind of fit the demand that has been in the city.

- So I guess my question is, Kevin, are there other TIDs sitting out there that have that will have reserves that are beyond the ones that you're looking to fund so that you leave it open, you can go, you just leave this open, work with other developers put together an alternative plan for how to pay for it if they don't come to pass or in a future time, go back and pull from another TID, to try to cover that. And again, I know you're stuck, because if you don't do this amendment, you can't use those funds, but I mean, is there a time where you have to make those decision here, you run out of time to say, I've got to make this amendment within the next year, two years, four years before I walk past that opportunity to get other funding. So can you have to make that decision today? In other words, just okay, I know, these are closing, I know, I can get funds from here, I can get this covered. I understand what you're trying, I mean, I guess we're trying to do but is there? Is there something else out there? I don't. I mean, I feel like we're working around the system, to be honest with you, to make it work. And again, we're here to work together, but this one feels so far in the bones personally check that I'm having a difficult time with it.

- No and look, I mean, I think that's, you know, wanting to be kind of upfront about the purposes and realistic chances of projects happening. You know, I think for us and discussions, with the Department of Revenue, and I think Director Ellenbecker can attest, right. I mean, the legislature has made changes over time, and every year, you know, I kind of have to keep track like, "Okay, when was this TID created? And what were the rules in place at the time the TID was created? And, you know, we've done applications before, and as we dug in and submitted some documents, we're basically told but know that this one's not eligible, because when it was created, it doesn't have these elements that you cannot donate to it. I think in terms of potential other funding sources, I think we're limited, if you want to go, and I can bring up and hopefully it's not like too small of microprint here. This was our Annual Report. You know, we went through at the last meeting, and just talked about, all the Tax Increment Districts and where they're at. And then really, at the very far end, projecting out, future project costs, and future revenue and surplus and deficit. As you see, right, nine sticks out on there, pretty bad that it's going to end up in the hole. And we think even a little bit more again, than it was projected here. You know, these other Tax Increment Districts, there is some potential, for that, I think on here, and it's hard to fit all in one screen. But seven and eight, you know, have the best, I would say, financial position in terms of where they're at. I think if we don't amend, one of those things is we will still have to go down the path of closing seven and eight because we're running out of projects. And I don't think in terms of just again being ethical, that it's fair to look at, putting projects in that don't necessarily, need to be done, or that weren't part of the project plan, just to do a project for the sake of doing projects. I think there would be some further discussion potentially about okay, because there is, you know, surplus. In these are there some other TIDs, that we would perhaps allocate to, maybe other blight or redevelopment ones? You know, that we would say, "Look, maybe we have gone in deep on some of those, and that's where I would talk, potentially about, you know, the shipyard." Which we did do some borrowing upfront on TID 22. Would you potentially do the allocations to that to, because it is going to be a few years till projects come online and start to generate an increment there? Perhaps we would come back with the request to allocate there. I think either way, just in fairness for the other taxing jurisdictions, I mean, seven, eight and 12. Like, we want to start the process of closing down and terminating early. And I think that's just one way or another we would like to do that. In doing so, I think our attempt here was to try and right side, nine back up. But again, I mean, just, it's the city's responsibility to manage these Tax Increment Districts. And the Joint Review Board decides not to move forward with the amendment, it'll be up to the city to determine how we want to go forward and potentially close out that TID. And that's, you know, I think all the get hotter here. I mean, we're tight as it is on our budget, and in terms of finding funds, to help close that gap, there's gonna be some tough choices to do it. When down the road, right, and wait till 2026 that we have to close it to make that decision. But I think in fairness, we should probably start to look at how we could do that sooner than later. So, I mean, I again, I think you know, our staff, our Director Ellenbecker and I have tried to be creative about how we do some things, and put these things together, but also understand and respect the role of the JRB here, and what they decide, we will work with, and take steps to move forward from that. I think one of the things that is the purpose of today, is to you know, make recommendations on each of these resolutions that are here. Ultimately, the RBA and council will make their adoption or rejection of these before coming back here to finalize it. The JRB as we discussed last year, does not have a role in the affordable housing resolutions, but they will have a role in these allocations, because they have to adopt the project plan. So, I mean, there is a, I guess a few weeks, to think about in terms of making that final decision. But if there's hesitation, I think it would be important for the RDA and council to know now, so they can, have that in their discussions, when it comes to for those boards.

- Hearing you find it for infrastructure, then knowledge, and it was for lighting industrial use or an industrial park power is that infrastructure for housing projects? And how would that be used in?

- Sure.

- Sure I could have had, again, the infrastructure and the purchases were done years ago, in 2003, the city spent 1.2 million on a land purchase. Again, they bought some additional land in 2005, they spent about 350,000, and then between 2004 and 2005, they spent money on sewer water pavement of about 700,000. And then back in 2006 and 2007 they spent another 400,000 on storm water management and some additional water construction. So it would be definitely for any development, you got storm pavement, sewer and water. Then another land purchases, what was done between some in three in 2007.

- Yeah, I think in terms of I mean, there wasn't any, I would say right things that can only be used by an industrial user. I mean it's pretty standard public infrastructure. So in terms of the flexibility, you know, that's an option. I think the other piece is that look, I mean, the city bonds for public infrastructure like this all the time, in this case it was really targeted towards future development. And I think as we talked about the annual meeting, right, I mean, we put into public infrastructure into TID 14, and the rail yard, and here we have the development to help support, you know, paying back that infrastructure, and in this case, we just we didn't get it.

- What happens to this land that was purchased? That sounds like a lot of land and essentially, if we were to terminate the other TIDs, and then those excess amounts were distributed, they would come back to our taxing jurisdictions. So is there the possibility that instead of doing this allocation to TID nine that that land could be sold to redeem part of that, or does it go to the city if the city is terminated?

- So there's potential we could sell some of the land, I was not here at the time, I will say it's probably not land I would have recommended purchasing and I'll leave it at that. I just yeah, I don't think we would get a whole lot for it. I mean, I think we could get some things for it. But it's marginal land, there's no highway access to it. So, in terms of a functional piece of it will require purchasing additional land from adjacent land owners, because that's a state controlled highway out there, and you'd have to buy the access rights through somebody else. So you can see it, but you can't really get there.

- Am I right to say that it will be city owned land, if nothing changes, if nothing happens?

- Yeah, I mean, I think for sure, we've had it out there on the market in terms of development potential and again, if the right project came along, that could generate enough increment, to do additional improvements, like buying additional land, to buy the highway access rights, it's a great piece of land to do that development. Unfortunately, we just haven't had that project that could push it that far to make it feasible. And, I think again, in the interest of being conservative with the funds that we have now, we just don't want to go any further into the debt in terms of like, "Okay, let's do it." Hoping that something will come." I think just internally, from an administrative point of view, this is myself, Finance Director, Public Works Director, we just didn't feel appropriate, spending more money to do more infrastructure when it just the market appetite for development out there, just has not been as strong for industrial users. Even though it has great, highway access and this close to things, there's still a perception problem that it's too far out, to do industrial businesses and people go look at it, and then they say, "Well, what do you have out in Far East I-43 Business Park.

- [Diana} I would add is probably the discussion was I don't think we would shut down seven, we wouldn't have recommended to shut seven and eight early if we weren't going to shut down nine.

- Yeah, I would agree. I think the having them all, tied together is what kind of we call it last year, kind of like the TID cleanup and that is, really to get you know, seven, nine, 12, 17. Really all closed early before their mandatory termination date, and do it in a way that, really kind of left the books at zero. And in terms of, you know, there's not a cash disbursement to the taxing jurisdictions. There's also been a obligation for the city, but in the same way, they're all, before the mandatory termination date anywhere from I think, you know, four to 10 years, which then just at least gets those back on an annual basis back on the tax rolls for those taxing jurisdictions.

- Right, because it looks like seven and eight, you don't mandatory cool till 2029, and there's some pretty substantial surplus that is expected in those two TIDs. So you know, we really are giving that additional surplus increments back to the other taxing jurisdictions, if we shut it down in 21 versus 29.

- Yeah, I agree with that with respect to the tax increment in both seven and eight and getting that checked out early, it does provide revenue for the taxing jurisdictions ahead of time. Yeah, almost you're really treating it, even though they're not attached to each other. You are treating it as though it's one large TID. What is the tax increment from number nine? You have 182,000, where's that coming from?

- There has been a little industrial development out in that area, so a few projects. And then also I believe, the Aurora Bay Care facility is also generating that increment out there. So it's a tough one. .

- I'm really struggling with this one, because it just feels like we're manning the system. And again, I appreciate that you're being upfront and honest. But it's like I said, we have a responsibility to you know, to manage it properly. And again, I mean, that's some of the challenges you have. And I think we've done a great job of working together to try and find ways to make it work. Even if it's 50-50 or 60-40, I could probably get myself along the path. But if it's really just, you know, a loop hole, it doesn't feel like we're doing what's right. That's just my personal opinion and others may feel differently, but that's what I'm struggling with.

- So, and I don't know if it's appropriate to, you know, put this out on the fly. I think one of the things as Director Ellenbecker talked about in terms of right, having these all tied together and trying to, absolve, you know, potential exposure for the city for debt service. I think, you know, JLB has been very supportive of development of our new Tax Increment Districts. I think we've been really good. We've talked about creating them right, showing them most of them have been paid, you go you're not encumbering a lot of funds up front, in terms of being able to perhaps then use, some of these allocations, then in order to terminate it early, with the JRB consider changing those allocations, and we'd probably have to go through, a process again about amending, but potentially to TID 22. And I get it right, which is the shipyard, in terms of that project has required, some borrowing on the city up front, it's a piece of land I mean I don't have to tell you, right you know 40 years vacant, and is required some substantial investment in terms of, environmental remediation, bringing in the fill to get it all over the floodplain. And really, I mean design what we talked about here, for two things doing environmental remediation, but then also housing moving forward. And so that just in terms of I think, the project when it was discussed and approved at council again, and hope to keep that off the the tax levy, and use Tax Increment to do that. As you know, we've got a term sheet with merger been development for 20 $ 25 million project. We hope to bring a development agreement that in the upcoming weeks, but again, it's going to be, two, three years before the actual Tax Increment from that project starts moving forward. So just I mean, I think, again, it's probably not appropriate right now to actually make a motion on, because this was not, you know, notice as part of the agenda, but I think that would help us in terms of the city, if we could make some other consideration that, again, I can't project everything out 27, you know, 26 years in the future where that would be at. But at least, you know, for some of the borrowing that we've uncovered there, and I think director Ellenbecker correct them wrong, I think we're in about three and a half, 4 million of borrowing for the shipyard so far.

- Three and a half.

- You know, could help us, you know, potentially delay some additional borrowing in that area to help, use cash to complete projects and some of those things. So, I just, I wanted to put that out there in terms of, you know, potentially using that as an option. But again, you know, we'll respect it, at the end of the day with the Joint Review Board decides.

- planning to do that, then the TID nine, I'm assuming that frees up dollars to cover off your risk in TID nine, you reallocate those dollars away from 22 in the nine, is that, does that help you or does that still leave everybody high and dry on TID nine?

- I mean, it still leaves us exposed, you know, for the debt service. I think just and again, I mean, I don't want to speak for Director Ellenbecker or that Council would ultimately decide. But at least gives a little bit of runway room, to anticipate that you know, coming back to the city, and maybe you don't have to take it all off in one chunk. And then there's some time built in there to say, "Look, maybe there is a development project that comes and perhaps it gets rolled over and encumbered into a new Tax Increment District." You know, when that time comes, at least I think we would probably then, keep it open, even though going into hole a little bit every year, with the hope that all right, a new project new TID, and you just kind of roll over that debt service into that piece, but at least allows the city, and that's why we're talking about it now right? I mean six years out, but it's going to come fast, could at least position ourselves and I think, you know, Dorff can attest, I mean sure the Finance Committee putting in a CIP, if we need to put this on the radar to say, "Look, there's some cost you might have to eat for some development out in this area. We can at least plan for it and it's not like alright, I mean, I hate to be coming to you right, and your 2026 being like, "Oh yeah, by the way, can we plug this hole?" It's at least giving us a little runway room to prepare for it.

- How do you go feel on JRB, I don't if I'm standing alone are there any other opinions or perspectives?

- Yeah, Kevin, when you went to the state and talked to them about allowing the transfer, did they say you need to put this in the project plan? And you don't actually need to do it. Or did they just say, you need to put it in the project plan quick? Or did they not give any indication at all, that the requirement was just to have it in the plan?

- Sure. I mean, a lot of it was communicated, through email, and I think it was, look, I think is Mr. Matthews and described like, "You found a way to get this done, and if you did it, yes, we would accept it." I don't think they would encourage saying like, "Go ahead and do it and figure it out." But yes, this would be part of it. That would be acceptable to them in terms of allowing and permitting that allocation.

- Given that I understand your reservations Bob, but I don't have a problem with that part, my sticking point was the idea that the city of Green Bay, is going to end up with, however much land out there, from this kind of no offense to the people, it's kind of failed projects. So as to the end of the failed project, we've invested two and a half million dollars in the city has 60 acres or whatever it is out there. And you know, even if it is valued, doesn't have any value and it still just kind of felt weird to me, they would have essentially gained as an entity for this. I don't know that it's gonna affect my position on this, or the county's position, but it made me want to stop and think about it for a minute before we moved on.

- Why is similar thoughts with respect to the gaining of property of the city, and what's the city going to do with the property? I do appreciate the comment about the city moving forward development of TID nine, regardless of what happened. I do like the fact that housing is being discussed, and I know we've had lots of conversations about stratification of housing with income levels. So I hope that continues all over Green Bay, because that's how you make a vibrant community and I all of that. So I'm just struggling with the, with the decision that was made in the past, and I do appreciate the movement of the city to get themselves into a better. And as a result of getting to seven and eight closed early. The impact to the taxing jurisdictions in. It does get the city off the hook though with the debt, and then provides them with the acreage, we want that developed. That's the reason that we.

- I have been given those points of view, I'm willing to make a motion to approve the amendment of the project plan for TID nine, considered under item seven.

- Okay, I'll second.

- Okay, we have a motion by Bradley, seconded by Peter. Any other discussion on this item? Otherwise I will take a vote on favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- I'm gonna say aye. And then any nays?

- Nay.

- Okay, that does pass, three to one.

- Discussion, thank you appreciate it.

- No, no. I've trying tried, I really appreciate the frankness we've been able to have here. I think again to mean, the whole notion of this Joint Review Board. You know, I think cooperatively we're trying to do things that are in the best interest of all the parties, and just what happens in the past has happened and we're just taking what we've gotten and trying to do the best way to move forward. You know, ultimately, I think, again, there's gonna be one more discussion on this, and I'm sure there may be some discussion at RDA Council as well, how this feels before it's finally finalized. All right, so with that said, there's a motion to, I guess, amend this project plan. If you want to just take up the other piece of number nine right now just so that we can kind of get that off the table because, I think that would be Item number eight.

- [Diana] Get for consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of the project plan for the closure of TID nine State Highway 54/57 Business Park.

- All right. So what that does then is just, as long as we're talking about TID nine, this goes back to the, again, timetable that we would anticipate with the allocations. This is where we're at, again in 2019, part of the Year End report, in 2020, we anticipate 190,000 coming in, public expenses, the dept expenses. If the other allocations are approved, we'd have 2.7 in to give us ending balance of 1.1, which is then enough to pay off, add an increment from next year, and then the rest of the future debt expenses. And so basically, you end at zero, and this TID would be terminated in 2021. Again, we're going to go back through, seven, and eight, to 12, to talk about those allocations. If all are approved, this will end again at zero. If for some reason, they're not I mean the hopes will be some potential debt encumbered, that will be the responsibility of the city. But with that we were recommending, based on these plans working together, to terminate this effective April 15th of 2021.

- [Diana] Any other discussions before we take a motion? We have a motion on the table by Bradley seconded by Peter, any other discussion? Otherwise, I'll take a vote. All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye. So passes three to one.

- All right, go back to number one. Reviewing a formal motion to pull it back off table. Continue.

- [Diana] Sure, the motion to move back to the beginning of the agenda.

- [Bradley] to resume the agenda.

- [Bob] Second.

- [Diana] Motion made by Bradley Bob.

- [Bradley] Yes.

- [Diana] And then second, all in favor, say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Passes, we're back to number one, consideration with possible action to adopt the allocation amendment resolution and then the project plan for TID seven National Avenue Lombardi Avenue corridors.

- Thank you, so as I talked to you before, with that this would allow for up to a million dollars, to be allocated, we anticipated we would need about $800,000 to go towards TID nine as part of this recommended allocation amendment.

- [Diana] Any discussion? Then we're going to take a motion.

- [Bob] I'll second.

- [Diana] All right. We have a motion by Peter and seconded by Bob. Any other discussion? All right, all favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Opposed nay, that passes four to zero.

- All right.

- [Diana] Number two, consideration with possible action to adopt a Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID seven, Ashland Avenue in Lombardi Avenue Corridors.

- Thank you. So just to go back to the slide of cash flows, with all the taxes that were due for 2019 coming in in 2020, there should be enough to balance out this TID and have it even, with that we would propose doing affordable housing extension, which would extend the TID until April 15th of 2021. That way the taxes for tax year 2020, which would be collected in 2021, which we believe will be around seven or $65,000. I know that backs out, you know, there's some computer, aid, and other things in there. So it could be a little more a little less, but we're anticipating about seven or $65,000. That we would put into an Affordable Housing Fund. The Redevelopment Authority and the city have discussed, particular fund in terms of call it TIDA. Tax Increment District Affordable Housing Fund, how they would allocate those projects that will the RDA Council approved a draft of that. That will be coming back to RDA Council this fall, along with recommendations from our housing study about just exactly how those funds should be allocated. But with that this would put $765,000 into that fund, this would still allow for a termination before it's mandatory termination date of 2029. So then, basically tax year 2021 for increment then coming in and 22, there'd be about 765,000 going back to the taxing jurisdiction split amongst you.

- [Diana] Any discussion on number two? All right, motion.

- [Diana] motion by Peter and seconded by Bradley. All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Nay? That passes four zero. Item number three, consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of project plan, for the closure of TID seven, Ashland Avenue Lombardi Avenue Corridors.

- Thank you, so this is the three of three on TID seven, and basically says, once the affordable housing increment comes in, this TID will be terminated effective April 15th of 2021.

- [Peter] Motion moved.

- [Bradley] Second.

- [Diana] Motion by Peter seconded by Bradley, any discussion? None, all in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Any opposed? Nay, okay, that passes four-zero. Move on to number four consideration with possible action to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the project plan for TID eight, Henry and Morrow Streets.

- Thank you, so we have another set of three, which talks about doing an allocation. Here will be to primarily TID nine, but also TID 17. To do an allocation for that, TID eight is of the Near East side of the city, was used to finance some housing projects out in that area. Just some updated cash flows, 2019 we ended the year with just under $2 million in the fund. With that, we will expect another $340,000 increment this year, small expenses just for the admin fees, and allocation to staff to maintain this Tax Increment District, we would encumber than potentially all the future debt that is outstanding on here. And then look at an allocation of admin of 1.5 million, I think split 60,000 to go to TID 17, and then the remainder to go to TID nine to close it out. The following items that we'll talk about potentially one more year for an affordable housing extension, but then this Tax Increment District would be done in April of next year. So this item just specifically refers to the allocation amendment. Just to go back. This one for TID eight, there's a limit of 1.5, to go to TID nine, we anticipate almost all of that about 1.48 to go there, and then a limit of 100,000 to go into TID 17. We anticipate about 60,000 needed to close that Tax Increment District down. So we recommend the allocation, funds would be allocated this year, in order to permit terminations in April of next year.

- [Diana] Any other discussion on number four?

- [Peter] When would to the normally terminate?

- The latest 2029, I think it's the same as TID seven. Is that correct?

- [Diana] Yes, that is correct.

- [Bob] Second.

- [Diana] We have a motion by Peter seconded by Bob, other. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] All opposed say nay, that passes four to zero. Moving on to number five, consideration with possible action to adopt Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID eight, Henry Morrow Street.

- Thank you, as you look in the cash flows, this would be the same situation as TID seven, using all the increments from 2019 taxes this year, to basically break even. And then we would take the 2020 taxes that will be collected in 2021 to about 310,000. That would go into an affordable housing fund for the city, after those are collected that would permit again the termination in April of next year.

- [Peter] Second.

- [Diana] by Bradley, seconded by Peter. Any other discussion? All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Opposed nay, that passes four-zero. Moving on to number six consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of project plan for the closure of TID eight, Henry and Morrow Street.

- Again, just they're piecing the puzzle, allowing for after the affordable housing extension to close this down in April of 2021.

- [Bob] I'll second.

- [Diana] We have a motion by Peter seconded by Bob. Any other discussion? All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Opposed nay, that passes four-zero. Moving on to number nine, consideration with possible action to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend them for the Project Plan for TID 12. The I-43 Commercial Development.

- Thank you, this is TID 12, again, one of our more successful TIDs facilitating development of the I-43 Business Center, on the far east side of the city. Just some updates numbers, this is the same as seven and eight with the exception of this is just one more year out. As we've talked about in here, we are using some of the fund balance to complete infrastructure out in that area. That was needed A to facilitate existing development primarily for the Nature's Way Project, but also put the city in a good place to do a new Tax Increment District out here, upon expansion of I-43. So a lot of that has gone into some deep sewer work, sewer lab, or sewer extension, an interceptor to expand the capacity to develop, along with some road projects. If you've been out in that area over the last year or two, especially in right, you've seen a lot of things going on. So with that, we feel that the 2019 numbers, we came in with 3.4 million ended with about 2.5. We had about 2.7 million worth of expenses, in the public infrastructure. We anticipate about another 2 million this year. And with that, part of what we're looking to do as we wind this down, is to use some funding to allocate towards TID nine to help with part of the closure, puts a cap of $500,000, and here we'd be looking for $420,000, that would be allocated this year. And then next year, in final year that we would look at finishing up some projects, paying out any service and uncovering some funds for future development agreements. With then in 2022, affordable housing extension, which is the next item up. But for this element, we would be requesting up to $500,000, to allocate towards TID nine, again, we anticipate we'll need about 420,000 in the actual transfer.

- [Bradley] Just a general question, I was just noticing that the affordable housing amounts tend to drop from the previous year. So like 2.58 million to 2.1 million. Not all this, like computer or why does that amount go down?

- Yes, yes. So I just looked at pure property taxes and took out any other aid or subsidies.

- [Bradley] Okay, so the city of Green Bay then get to keep the computer aid, because it's not going to the .

- [Diana] No I believe that, TID is closed, for reference in 2019. Personal Property aid was what 31,000 and then 375 to just over $400,000, were between their property exempt computer aids. And again, I believe they both closed as soon as your typical this year in which it closes, when you start getting the increment, you also stopped getting those aids.

- Yep, my understanding is that those cannot be applied towards the Affordable Housing Fund. It's just strictly the property tax increment.

- [Bradley] I guess my question is, does that then come back to us as a taxing jurisdiction, like when we close these two, the TIDs that existed in 2017, when the personal property aid amounts were set, do they adjust our personal property aid, to add in whatever was contributed to the to ? Do you know that?

- [Diana] I believe at this point, I believe the state to stop allocating it to that in municipalities, which means it will not go to the taxing jurisdiction, we could get some clear clarification on that, we haven't to enclose the TID, a large TID in a long time to know the impact of it. The one who closed in the past has been relatively small, but we could find that, if we could ask that specific question.

- [Bradley] Associate with the personal property amount that seems to be set based on what personal property existed at 2017. You would only know that for post 2017 closures, so that would be a limited group if you get a check on that.

- [Diana] Yep.

- [Bradley] Otherwise, if there's no discussion, I would move to approve.

- [Bob] I will second.

- [Diana] We have a motion by Bradley a second by Bob. Any other discussion? That all in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Opposed, nay, that passes four-zero. Move on to number 10, consideration with possible action to adopt Affordable Housing Extension Resolution for TID 12, I-43 Commercial Development.

- Thank you. Again looking at using the, texting grid from texture 2020, using that in 2021, to basically close out all outstanding expenses. That way then keeping it open using tax year 2021 money, to be collected in 2022, with that about $2.1 million, and that would go into an Affordable Housing Fund. With that, the TID would still close. I think this one is mandatory termination date of 26, is that correct, I'm going to pull up my chart again. I know I should have these memorized by now.

- [Diana] October 26th correct.

- [Bradley] If there's no discussion, I'll move to approve.

- Oh,

- [Diana] Okay, motion by Bradley, second by Peter. Any other discussion? Let me vote, all in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Opposed nay, that one passes four-zero, move on to number 11 consideration with possible action to adapt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of a service plan for the closure of TID 12, I-43 Commercial Development.

- All right, thank you. Again, that's just the final step that after the increment is collected for the affordable housing, this TID would terminate in the fifth April of 2022. Again, just based on timeframes, you'll likely see this again in your cycle last year, just because we have to get it in when you're about to do it. But again, I think it's important just to kind of put all these together just for good measure that it shows how they're all related, and that the city is making a commitment to terminate this Tax Increment District.

- [Bradley] approve that motion.

- [Bob] Second.

- [Diana] We have a motion Bradley, seconded by Bob. All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Opposed nay, that passes for zero. Going to number 12, consideration with possible action to adopt a Standard Extension Resolution for TID 14, in North Broadway Redevelopment.

- Thank you, this is one that was also considered last year. This deals is with TID 14, which is the rail yard. We looked at two things last year one, we expanded the boundaries of Tax Increment District 14, that accounted for some parcels that were acquired from CN, to expand the development building footprint, on which some of the condos were going to be developed. We also and that was approved. We also considered extending this Tax Increment District three years, and that was held. One of the things that we looked at here is this Tax Increment District and development project went through a pretty tumultuous time a few years ago, when the original while I guess the interim owner of on Broadway basically defaulted on the loan, the Redevelopment Authority ended up with it. And short, you know, we lost two years of development while we were sorting through some of these things. You know, with that, we've, I think, if you've been over there, you've seen good progress, in terms of the development that has happened, when we have contemplated the development agreements in there. We have, that is for the ongoing projects, the main project to redevelop rehabbed the warehouses and built the condos was the first one that got started. After that TWG Indianapolis move forward with Broadway Lofts, which is 109 units of affordable housing. That should be finishing up very shortly and be online, of 21, an estimate somewhere around seven and a half million dollar valuation, even though it's a 22/$25 million project, because the rents are low, the assessment is going to come out lower. But again, as we've talked about affordable housing and I think you know, Mr. Ross saying right, "Make sure we've got housing for all incomes, that our community is really important." And we feel that feels a really good gap in our housing inventory. And then we also approved a development agreement also a TWG down on Kellogg Street, to do 225 units of market rate housing in a project called The Fort, and that will also include some retail out on Broadway and Kellogg Street. As soon as they finish up with Broadway Lofts, they will move to break ground on the Fort. That construction this year, hopefully finished up next year. That's about a $45 million project, and should assess out somewhere around $25 million, in each of those, because this area has required some substantial environmental mitigation, remediation and infrastructure. You know, putting in the streets, utilities, and then the storm water. You know, we really would like to make sure, that we're able to cover the costs of that. We have in the development agreements, the developers have requested an extension of those, both the payback part of the debt service, but then also, as part of the pay go incentive. The RBA said that they would make the request to JRB to extend those three years. With that, we believe that although this, Tax Increment District will likely continue to perform, and we should have sufficient funds to cover that. We are still asking for the extension in the event, we do hit a recession or something slows down to the area, really to kind of make up as I mentioned last year, to make up for the time that was lost when the Redevelopment Authority owned this, I guess two things one, I mean, it was our holding costs. But then also it was off the tax rolls I think for two full years, while we work to renegotiate and get this developed again. And so that is why we are asking for the standard extension, which would push it three years, and I believe, just looking at dates, so I get those correct. Right now is was created in 2006, scheduled to close in 2033, this request would put it up to 9 16th of 2036.

- Kevin, would you mind pulling up that annual report that you have just to show what your projected?

- Yep.

- Future cash flows are on this for?

- Yes they do. I will pull it up. So for yes 14 fund balance going into this year, was in the red and that is one thing we use cash to pay for a lot of the infrastructure. With that we are going forward with our bonding this year to bond for some of that money coming in. It's we've talked about this before in terms of using cash available versus bonding. To do some of these infrastructure projects, they've been meeting the requirements for increment to pay for that, which is a portion. Basically, we'll borrow $100,000 for every million of increment that will create. And with that, the long term projections right now, based on the development, feature project costs, and this is the debt service on the infrastructure, and part of the pay goes about 12.6/12.7 million. We do and participate future revenue about 19.2. That puts us about 3.3 at a surplus. So we feel good so far, but I think this is one of the things to, I guess prepare ourselves in case things do slow down, but we would have that extra time to make up for things. Again, you know, being a brownfield site, I mean, we do find surprises from time to time when we're going through, hopefully not uncovering too many additional extra costs in that, but, you know, we would like consideration for that potential extension.

- And we weren't going over this last year. But what's your timeline for when this would need to be done? I mean, what's the reason for considering this in 2020 instead of 2030?

- Sure. One of the things we contemplated in the development agreements that the city would look at primarily for the PAYGO incentives, and additional three years of incentive. And so with that, we've said we would ask for that extension in order to provide three additional years of incentive. If not it, we would be obligated to pay as if it were open three additional years, as part of the incentive, I guess, package deal. When they look at their financing basically, you know, structuring out, for some of them, all right, a 15 year borrower right that will gave them some time. "All right, here's how we stack it together." So the city would be required if this were to close down just to make sure enough funds were encumbered, you know, to pay that incentive there, with that there could be or should be enough to do that. On the flip side, I think we're looking at again, you know, things slow down, that we would at least be covered to pay out that incentive for those three additional years. You know, I can't speak for 2030 at this point. But I feel that we could also be in a position that one, I mean, things are blocked, and we could be having a conversation in 2028, about potentially closing this down early. So it's, it's one of those, I think, we are obligated to ask, because we said we could in the development agreement, if the JRB decides not to move forward with it. This is one I think there's a long runway in it. So I don't think it Director Ellenbecker, correct me if I'm wrong, it doesn't set anything out of sync at this point. Just understand that, you know, it may come back in a few years, a future thing, a future JRB meeting.

- [Diana] a situation where you're potentially planning to longer than a TID is open.

- But then again, if we get to 2033, and we have three and a half million dollars, then we could set up the payment out of that amount. Or we could, you know, say, "Hey, we owe you one and a half million for the next three years, so here's one and a half million." And we wouldn't have to terminate it early at that point. So that's, very interesting. Is this something where you think the three years would allow for some additional development? Are there any other projects that would be possible if that an extension would help you to negotiate that because she would have extra time for the repayments?

- So I would say yes, part of that mainly would deal with the I mean, some of it's for the PAYGO piece, but also, part of its for the infrastructure. You know, as we look at borrowing, we're starting right now to push the cushion of doing a 10 year borrowing for some of these things. And when we borrow anywhere from 10 to 20 years, but, you know, if we look at a project, in the works right now, by the time it gets started, starting to be in the ground next year, really not online till 2022, fully online 23, paying taxes in 24, you know, that it's still, you know, could provide then at least some room for us, to have that 10/15 year borrowing option instead of like, "Alright, we're getting towards the end of this cycle." The master development agreement for that area really calls for, you know, 100,000 upfront in infrastructure costs for every million created, and then potentially a 50/50 split of the remaining PAYGO. So once you start to get, kind of under I'd say, you know, 15 years, the numbers start to get a little bit tighter, in terms of these developers, especially for the PAYGO piece. You know, we asked them to front the money, and borrowing on the back end, it gets a little tighter once you start to get under 15, you know, to make it pencil out. So, it's a long way of saying, "Yes, I think that would give us some more flexibility." And I guess, advantage in leveraging or securing a future deal, there's still some development space available, and it would be helpful in doing that.

- Do you have any specific projects? Like I mean, it seems pretty tight over there. As these projects have come together. Is this something you would be working on, to try to get even more density? Or is it pretty well and nice, establish neighborhood with developments and so there wouldn't be as much interest?

- So there are still some possibilities and two pieces, one with the Northern warehouse buildings, in terms of still some flexibility with the three floors, or additional floors to develop there. And then the space, there's probably about three, four acres right behind that. That would be a quote unquote "Greenfield site." Available for development. So based on the footprints of some of our projects, especially for that Greenfield site, you can see anywhere from 15 to $25 million worth of additional increment in that particular area.

- Thank you.

- Sure.

- [Diana] Kevin, just to let you know that, Bob had to jump off at two o'clock here. He would still have three out of five.

- Correct. Thank you for noting that.

- [Bob] Okay, rattling around in my brain the same thing that Bradley's been asking, about it seems like that's a long time in the future we could postpone this decision. I guess one thing, if we get there, or our successors get there, and 2030 you guys are sitting on $5 million, but the city of Green Bay, Kevin's successor decides they don't want to terminate it because they want to build up a fund balance, so they can do a loan to another TID or something like that. Does the JRB have the authority to introduce a termination resolution? Or does the city have to bring it to us? Meaning, can we go back on this decision once it's made?

- From my understanding, and this is, I'll be careful because I'm speaking without an attorney, but I believe in terms of terminating, I think it is up to the city to decide when to terminate. There's a mandatory termination date, but anything that comes in terms of a premature termination, I believe is done by the city. And it's up to the city's discretion when to do that.

- [Bob] The other question is, does the three year standard extension extend to the period of expenditures for the city? Do you have a longer period to incurred expenses?

- That I believe it does not do. I think there's still and I'd have to double check on that, but I believe it's that does not change. It's just saying, "Look, we're not going to spend more money, we just need some more time to like pay it back." So we can't encumber anything additional, we can't make any new agreements. And so no I . Because I believe that's part of it, is like the reason this dissented like, "No, we don't want to do more stuff, we just need to pay back what we've already done."

- [Bradley] again, it helps your PAYGO argument or offer in negotiations. And that's the reason that I'm splitting a little bit on it, is I do want to give Kevin the ability to answer those agreements. But it seems like you've already entered one of those agreements where the payments extended beyond the end date. I would, I'm tempted to make a motion. I'm just curious what Peter things about this, to extend this decision again, with the option that if somebody needs us to do this, to have a development project go forward. We could reconvene to pass an extension, but I don't see the reason to do it now. And I feel like we're making a decision that should be made by this group in five years.

- Or10.

- [Bradley] Maybe 10 even, but I'm saying after all these things are done, and we have an idea what the increments coming in and the payment coming and going out at this point, you know, those future revenue numbers that you were showing us are based on, a lot of, lot of estimates. So we'll have a much better cash flow idea in five years, when most of these things are up and running and taxes are being collected. What do you think of that, Peter?

- [Peter] Well, I'm inclined to feel the same way and in while I know there could be potential downturn in the economy, and it's a long time out there. If we have a downturn in the economy 2033, we'll all be digging ditches by hand, tax incremental financing districts to do it.

- [Bradley] Okay, so I'll put a motion to table this, until our meeting next year, or an earlier time, if necessary, as determined by the economic development director.

- [Peter] I'll second the motion.

- [Diana] So this we have a motion by Bradley second by Peter to table this at least the next year, or until at our earlier date in which we would need to re-address this. Any other discussion? All in favor, say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Opposed? I'm going here but that passes two to one. All right, moving on to number 13, consideration with possible action to adopt a Termination Resolution for the dissolution of TID Plan for the closure of TID 17, 900 Block North Broadway.

- All right, final agenda item today. This is one again, we've we've discussed. This was a small Tax Increment District created for a specific project. Project happened, did not live up to expectations, the city spent some time last year actually in litigation to recover some of the taxes that should have been created are owed on this. We're successful in receiving a settlement, that to provide some additional funds for this. However, you know, we'll need to keep doing that, in order to keep those extra funds coming in, and just you know, the cost of litigation versus the cost of recovery versus, you know, the administrative cost of keeping this open, and talking about this all the time. Nothing more is going to happen in terms of development or increment. And so with that, we would like to use 60,000. This was allocated from TID eight, basically to come in to the fund this year, and so that this TID could be terminated in April of 2021. And with that, that's $60,000, we're just under just shy of that, should basically put us even and have this TID closed down.

- [Bradley] Second.

- [Diana] We have a motion on the floor by Peter seconded by Bradley to approve. All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] Aye, opposed nay, that passes three zero. Next item is information, informational, if you want to think consider, like, a next date.

- Correct. So, today's GRB meeting, Tuesday the 18th. There will be your recommendations will be going to the Redevelopment Authority next Tuesday, they're having a special meeting and having the public hearing on all of these proposed amendments. With that, then there's mandatory 15 days before it can go to City Council. So we'll go to counsel on the 15th. I think we just needed a breathing room. So as soon as the 17th, this group could reconvene again, you know, the week of the 21st, or the 28th, or 29th. Just we have to have the final resolutions adopted by JRB by the end of September. And so if there's any times, again, we can reach out to see what might work, but there's a week that you're going to be gone, just like a week or date can't work. Then let us know right now, and we just make sure not to schedule that.

- [Bradley] I will be out of town on the 17th 18th.

- Okay.

- [Bradley] If that's the sticking point obviously, someone else could be a delegate for me.

- But I think that would be appropriate just to meet the week of the 21st you know, after the meeting is passed and would allow us time, based on what counsel decides. Post the notice, have five days. So yeah, we'll reach out with some dates for that potential final meeting.

- [Peter] Yeah, I like that we put the 21st as well, that would work well. We'll make it work.

- All right, I'm going to just indulge myself for a moment. I just wanted to say thank you to everyone. This has been a really great group with which to work. This is my last week at the city, I am done on Friday. So, I told Diana, I would, you know, go through at least get this meeting done and the process started. Again, I think there's been some really great discussions at this group and these things are never easy. I do feel like really appreciate you know, the other taxing jurisdictions representatives, they are really trying to work through all these issues together. You know, these are complicated things, with rules changing all the time. But at the end of the day, you know, we're all trying to create a great community, and really tax base for all of us to do, the things that we need to do. So I really appreciate, the frank discussion and honesty and, you know, the productiveness of this group, I will miss it. But I know be in good hands with Director Ellenbecker, and I've got some staff who have been kind of in the wings working on some of these things. So they'll be working through the public hearing and the common council meeting and your next year be meeting. So, I am off to Richmond Virginia, to be their Deputy Planning Director. So it's a big move for myself and my family. And I learned that they do not have one Tax Increment District there, which is very appealing. So it's like, "All right." State legislation allows it's, I think I got my first challenge, my first project to work on when I when I get there. So again, I just wanted to say, you know, thank you and I'll follow up separately as Bob because you know, he had to go off. But just thank you again for taking the time to go through some of these. And I just I wish all of you and you know your respective boards the best.

- [Peter] I just wanna say, I've been around and Green Bay very long lived for many years in Northeast Wisconsin, and I've admired what was going on in Green Bay, and the development that has happened over here, over the last few decades. In particular, the last, you know, five or six years, I think you've been part of promoting Green Bay in a very positive way. And you're going to be invested in Richmond Virginia, damn lucky to have you.

- Thank you.

- [Bradley] I'll reiterate Peter's point, it's been a pleasure working with you, even before my current role here, so thank you very much and Richmond's a beautiful place. I lived in DC for a couple years, and really like that area of the country. So that's actually where I'm going to be on the 17th.

- Oh, nice.

- [Bradley] Not Richmond, around. So who's going to represent you at the next JRB meeting or?

- So I've been working there now we're on here. Dave Buck is our principal planner, and he's done some work, both the city of Oshkosh and city of Venetia, then also Matt Buccanan in our office is learning more, you know about tax increment jurisdiction. So I think David, you want to say hi, I think you're on the line.

- [David] Hello, everybody. I have sat through some of the JRB with the city for and probably just one of the audience members. So I'll be working on some of those that work quite a bit with is like going in Oshkosh and Venetia. So, I'm a Green Bay boy so this is my hometown.

- All right, that is all I have. So I think take a motion to adjourn.

- [Diana] Kevin, I just think you I would say that you have an interim.

- Oh, yes.

- [Diana] Your interim. Thank you.

- Yes. I know, Cheryl's along for the ride. So yeah, she'll be serving as interim director, while they do a search for my position. She's tough cookie, so you bet, you know, and tough with me watch out.

- [Diana] She's got a lot of experience.

- Yes.

- [Diana] So yeah, get back to that point, Kevin. Yeah, we're gonna thank you for your leadership and for all in the Tax Incremental District and for all your developments, so really appreciate that, and keeping things organized for on the TID slide. With that, I think I heard a motion for Bradley to adjourn. Is there a second. All in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- [Diana] That passes we're adjourn. Thank you.

- Thank you, all right.

- [Diana] Goodbye.