



MINUTES OF THE TAX INCREMENTAL DISTRICTS JOINT REVIEW BOARD

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 2021, 11:00 AM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

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

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

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the March 8, 2021, meeting of the Tax Incremental Districts Joint Review Committee.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Bob Mathews to approve the agenda for the March 8,

2021, meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Brent Weycker, Diana Ellenbecker, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the September 22, 2020 meeting.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Bob Mathews to approve the minutes from the September 22, 2020 meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Brent Weycker, Diana Ellenbecker, 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 to make an allocation to TID Twenty-Three (23), Legends District, for purposes of blight elimination and public infrastructure costs.

No action needed until the next meeting of the Joint Review Board.

2. Consideration with possible action to adopt an Allocation Amendment Resolution and amend the Project Plan for TID Twenty-Three (23), Legends District, to be a recipient of an allocation from TID Seven (7), Lombardi Avenue and Ashland Avenue Corridors for purposes of blight elimination and public infrastructure costs.

No action needed until the next meeting of the Joint Review Board.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

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

No action needed by the Joint Review Board.

2. 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.

No action needed by the Joint Review Board.

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

No action needed by the Joint Review Board.

4. 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.

No action needed by the Joint Review Board.

5. 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.

No action needed by the Joint Review Board.

6. Set next meeting date and time.

Staff will reach out to members to schedule the next meeting.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Bradley Klingsporn, seconded by Brent Weycker to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- Bradley Klingsporn, Bob Mathews, Brent Weycker, Diana Ellenbecker, Peter Ross, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- All right, well, I guess let's go ahead and get started then, I guess. Out of respect of everybody's time. Um, We'll just do uh I guess we'll just do a quick roll call, if that's okay. Everybody ready to go ahead and get started?

- Yes.

- Okay, perfect, okay. Uh Roll call is, Diana Ellenbecker?

- Here, yep.

- Bradley Klingsporn?

- Here.

- Peter Ros? Bob Matthews? I see Bob there, he's working on unmuting. I see Bob, yep, he's waving, I got him. Got you, Bob, thanks. Brent Weycker?

- Here. Okay, all right. We have a quorum. Uh I would ask for an approval of the agenda for the March 8th Tax Incremental District's Joint Review Board meeting, please.

- So moved.

- By Brad.

- Second.

- Seconded by Bob.

- I'm still unmuting here.

- It's okay, thank you. It's all right, sir, thank you. Okay, I guess all in favor, please say, aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? There being none, okay, motion carries. Approval of the minutes from the September 22nd, 2020 meeting. Those are attached and in your packet, hopefully everyone should have a copy of those. Any questions on those minutes?

- It's not something we needed to change, but I did notice that the way a request for motion was written down as, "Anyone want emotion, E-M-O."

- Okay, we can amend that. No need to change that, it's funny, but.

- Okay, Any other amendments for the minutes? Could I please have a motion to approve the minutes, please?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Brad.

- Second.

- Seconded by Bob. All in favor, please say, aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. All right, all opposed All right, thank you very much. Uh, we will go on to regular business, I guess now this will be just as good as time as any for me, for, for Brent, for Bob and Brad Brad a little bit. We read at least have talked to at least introduced a couple of times. My name is Neil Stechschulte. I'm the new development director here for the city. So nothing like hopping on mic. I'm speeding right now. Wait a second here. Here we go. Hello, Peter.

- Sorry.

- Okay. We were having some zoom issues on our end, too. Not a problem. So thank you for joining us. We just got started. I was just introducing myself. I'm Neil Stechschulte the new development director here. I took Kevin's Kevin Vonck's place. So nothing like jumping into, amending some TIF districts on, on week six of the jobs here. So, so how can we, hopefully we've got these all in. Then they said several of these things should look pretty familiar. We have approved the agenda and the minutes we just just now getting ready to start talking about regular business. So you've got perfect timing. So

- Yep.

- Perfect. So I guess just what we wanted to do is maybe just kind of quickly go through whether there's two actionable items that we're going to be discussing under regular business as essentially the allocation amendment from 27 to two 23, and then essentially making 23 the recipient of that exact same allocation amendment. We other items essentially don't require joint review board action, but we've included them under information under the next item. So we'll certainly we'll walk through those to see if anyone has any questions on those items. Is that acceptable? Does anybody have any questions before we get started and go through those? Okay. Excellent. When you attempt to share my screen here, See we'll get that up to here. Let's see. How's this going to work? I need to move you guys off of my key screen here. This lesson learned from last time. There we go. Okay. Give that a second here. All right. Hopefully that shows up for, everybody's see, try that. Okay. All right. Not exactly the view I wanted on the screen And hopefully everybody can read that. Can anybody read the slides? Okay. On those? Okay. We'll just kind of briefly go through these. These are the, essentially the four districts we had action proposed for essentially for these amendments that we are looking at a tid seven is actually three different items in allocation amendment. The housing extension, and then termination. Did eight is the affordable housing extension. And then just the termination of that district did nine is simply a termination. And then 10 23 is a allocation amendment specifically. So those are the four districts. Those are the actions we are asking for your consideration. On, at this organizational meeting, TID seven is specifically the, the allocation amendment is essentially adoption of the resolution and actually amending the budget plan document. Those are both attached in your packet for your information on those. Essentially the purpose of the the district here is actually folks kind of get the idea of call where that is. This is essentially Ashland Avenue, a and Lombardi Avenue. The specifics behind this particular allocation amendment. This was essentially for infrastructure improvements related to a project that was going to be funded in tid seven. This really related to a hospitality project a hotel project, we call the legacy project was going to be occurring. Really. I think it was actually going to start late 2021. It, to get started. Pandemic has obviously slowed down their efforts to to get moving on that project and caused a delay in that project moving forward. So we were looking at the option of either delaying everything by year and seven. So we're leaving at seven, but as we looked at and analyzed that we realized that if we could it is within the same proximity for Ted 23. So we could move essentially the expenditure that we had for tid 23 for tid seven into Ted 23 that would actually still allow us to close seven then on time here

this particular year. So the expenditure really isn't any different that was previously proposed is simply being moved from one district to the other to allow this one to seven to close as was originally anticipated, essentially. So that is primarily pedestrian improvements related to that particular project. Is anyone have any general questions on that in particular? Or can I get any more details on anything on that?

- Yeah, I, I have a couple of questions, I guess. Do you have any more details about what these projects specifically are?

- Primarily pedestrian? And again, it's a lot of some sidewalks in an area that does not have sidewalks. Brad is the main area there we are in discussions actually with with the applicant right now on, on doing a couple of possible other amendments in terms of maybe some more pedestrian safety islands, some other things depending on exactly how the other project moves forward. So essentially this is an area where there are no sidewalks right now and a lot a large part of the legends district in this media there, it was really meant to kind of enhance its the pedestrian aspects of its particularly obviously with game day is big focus. Lots of people walking in this immediate area the idea was this project that hotel project was kind of meant to be the really the key funding projects to help pay for those improvements in this particular area. So it's really a matter of kind of just trying to tie it into, again the delay of the project really just allowing us to still became a kind of a little bit of an exercise. We rather than leave seven open-ended additional year we just felt it would be more appropriate to shift it to seven because it is within a half mile of that district. And we'll still serve that district for 23. So again, primarily sidewalk improvements on at least two streets. I'm trying to remember exactly which two they were not being from green Bay. That doesn't help me originally when we get actually. So I can't actually bring some more in additional details if you can share that out with the specific improvements, if they if the board would like to see those, we're happy to I'm happy to share those with them.

- Well, the reason that I was asking was because on the Ted 23 slide, it shows 850,000 I mean \$820,000 reduction in debt or payment towards debt. And so I just wanted to know if this is assigned to a specific project or if it's just going into points of funds 23.

- This One is

- Yeah, I can just step in. I'm the one who filled out this slide. We just didn't have another line. That was just saying for more on public expenses I guess maybe I put it on the wrong line. I guess I'm Neil I'm he's talking about that last slide. That for 23, if you would want to jump to that one

- You can hop ahead here. Whoops. Let's see here. Oops.

- But these are know related.

- Absolutely. No, absolutely. No good questions in the note. I think the key note on this one too, And 50,000 is a is a not to exceed number the budget estimate. I think we had when we took a look at this one, Brad was 750 to 850,000. So if you actually look at the resolution, I think we ended up putting a re a bracket range of seven 50 to eight 50. So let's I think Diane I probably just inserted the maximum number on the table there.

- He's saying, I guess I put it in the expensive deadline and the debt has that actually been incurred yet? That is correct. Bradley it's probably should be up in probably public. I mean, expenses are projected expenses for 2021 that has not been incurred yet. We certainly have worked with our director of public works and his staff is working on the engineering. And then, the kind of the design of the infrastructure, again, it was really they already put one plan together that in 2020 and then things have changed. So they only have to go back and incorporate the, the plan that's for that area and the changes with this hotel. So the, the department of public works is working on it. It just has not, did not get finalized in 20. They have to make some tweaks for 21 and then there'll be moving forward to put those these bids out on the street.

- So the resolution for consideration is, is really to transfer funds, to not to exceed 850,000 to complete capital projects related to Ted 23. And those funds I would assume, will need to be like we'll need to have that amount by the end of 2021 so that we can complete the term.

- Correct.

- So at some point during the year, probably in October meeting, we'll have an idea whether that's seven 5,800 or 850. Okay. And

- Diane, I'm assuming we can just go and make a splint to that table. Great question Brad. Good catch. Thank you. So back to here, hopping back on to seven, does anyone else have any questions regarding a seven at this point in terms of the specifics, the allocation amendment?

- The only other question is there any remaining net value Three going out for affordable housing, which is a one-year revenue projection. We have 850 not to exceed 850 going for these Capital projects. Where does that put the tid seven fund

- With, with projected and with the remaining debt service? It will put us at about somewhere between depends. If we put up picking eight 50 out, Nope about 800 again, if, if he's on the high end that would put it down to zero. If it was closer to 800 million, we might be closer to you don't have any remaining balance of, 40 to 50,000. So it's going to kind of be depend on how the bids come in this, this, this summer.

- And if, if the construction is authorized up to eight 50 and they expend it and it ends up negative, what, how do we, does the city of green Bay eat the negative amount upon termination? And if it ends up positive, is there a distribution?

- Yes, correct. Well, this project probably would end up being wind over the eight 50. It would get enough paying out probably either the city would pay before or like you said or would probably be a tip to I'm 23 then expense. And if there was a yes, then that would get distributed at the end of the year when this term empty tin is closed.

- Okay.

- Other questions on the two seven allocation amendment

- A hundred thousand dollars?

- Yes. There was a \$900,000 allocation that was approved last year to go to tips, tip nine, if you remember that is our 54 57 industrial park that had very negative. So yes, there was 900 approved in a prior meeting. And then we expected not only this 900,000 we also expected these amenities for these pedestrian amenities would have been completed in 20 and then we were going to close it. So the only thing that didn't happen was the some of those amenities to dock it finished in 20. And so we're asking instead of leaving again, as Neil said leaving this tid open one more year let's still close it down get that affordable housing again for our sake. And then in a year from now then all the texting jurisdictions will have the additional increment for this tid which is 2021 increment for tid seven is 793,000. Now it's 800,000. Now there's one all to go back, closing down to seven.

- And I think to something to make that a little clearer would do to fill in the ending balance. Yeah.

- The eight 50 puts it right around right around zero balance. And so if you vote to put 800, yes, yes. It would have had a positive fund balance about 50. So that, that is why we allocated anywhere from seven 50 to eight 50. That is two things we knew. What would, what was allowed or what was we had available in here and based on some of the preliminary quotes that DPW had put out there and estimates that it was in that ballpark

- We can make that make that edit. That's not a problem. So from 10, seven to 10 23, okay. We'll move on to jug. And this is again we mentioned that this essentially just identifying the affordable housing resolution extension which was in the previous table as, as well as and then the termination resolution for this particular district. So any questions on either anything else related to tid seven, if not, we'll hop onto to tid eight. Again, this is the this is the moral street district here specifically. This is the one, this is the district here. We're looking at again starting balances is primarily simply the housing extension resolution for this particular district. So again, there's our there's our numbers as currently projected. So this would be obsession to be a \$381,000 extension into today's date. So no other expenses on this one any questions on tid eight? Okay. Continuously again this resolution items specifically were again drafted and included in your packet. This case there will there was no specific action required by this body but then also the termination resolution for eight, again to make sure that we'll take care of both of those. So getting two of those closed will be a nice to get a couple of those put away and back on the tax roll for everyone. So that we've learned to a TIF district. Number nine. Again, this is the highway 54 57 business park district. This is the one we are simply termination resolution. This one does still have a balance of funds owed here again. This is the actual item. Here is the actual, the notice. They still have the expenses of \$1.4 million on this one. So this is one Diana, correct me. If I'm wrong, the city essentially will be taking on the debt for this particular district.

- We have, as you have seen, you can see that we've moved in 2.9 million, cover those expenses. It was a negative fund bales of 1.3 one point somewhere around 1.3. We still had some few small expenses this year. And then we have in remaining outstanding debt of 1.4 that would roll up with would end up with and things zero. Yes. If that's a small surplus then it would get allocated to the texting jurisdictions. If it's a shorter shortfall, then the city would take on the, if there is so it's right around the ending balance should be close to zero.

- Yes.

- And this will just obviously with the transfer from the previous, from the previous year this is essentially bringing this one to a close. Any questions on tid night? This is one, the city actually does have some, we do plan on continuing to allocate to assist the property owners in marketing this

property. Even though we are looking at closing this one there's still some developable potential out in this area. So we will be continuing to work with the owners on there and try to get this area improved to add some additional taxable value out here but it will simply will not be the district will be open to help us do that. We're just gonna need to look at some other opportunities to help make that happen. So any questions on tid nine? And then 10 23 is simply the allocation amendment. This is the recipient to the first one we initially discussed. Essentially it's the same for project that we were discussing earlier. So again, stills of the resolution is resolved. It is required from the joint review board. At this point, looking at this kind of simple numbers here, I don't have that we can certainly could be make available as as is obviously long. This is a fairly new district. So there's minimal amount of projects and things to be done in this one going forward. So we don't have necessarily a projected and balance at this point because it's subject to a lot of other projects, but certainly happy to, to, spend some more detailed reviewing to 23 of the actual expenses in that one if that was something that was desired by this body.

- So the way I'm interpreting kid 23 is, is that if we can get the infrastructure in place, then we have a potential opportunity that would add to the increment of this kid. So until that work gets done they're not willing to sign off. Is that kind of the way to think about it? Is this how the final piece that if we put the infrastructure in they'll sign, I mean I guess my question is, are we spending with a are we spending the money knowing that we're going to get are we spending that hoping that we get it?

- No, this is, we know this. We are fairly certain with the one project we were looking at doing here. We are looking at almost for certain on the hotel project but there's a couple of other lots in this immediate area that I think we're kind of projecting some increment on, but we do know for sure the one project we are certainly doing the allocation for we're we're, we don't have a we actually have a development agreement in place with this particular developer to do the project. They are essentially because of the delay. They are essentially in violation of that. We are re basically renegotiating that particular agreement to kind of do that one year extension Bob. So we're, we're pretty, fairly confident that that project is going to move forward. It's going to generate this essentially to make this one happen. And we do think that it is going to have a positive impact on dependents, rounding lots immediately around this hotel site, we think there are going to be additional increment that's likely going to happen because this hotel project gets put in. So the minimum requirement is this hotel is one. Yes, we are fairly sure that it's going to come in once this amendment is made, but the other, the it should hopefully be a catalyst for the other increment that's projected for Ted 23 to kind of help make some increment happen for surrounding this particular project.

- So Diana, have you run the numbers to take a look at what it looks when it could be based off of the work? I mean, is this put us into a really strong position on two 23? I'm assuming that it's just, we're getting snippets of it. And so I'm trying to understand what 23 looks.

- Yep. 23 is brand new, just got open in 2020. So nothing really, not much action has happened in here so that this is part of the reason why we wanted to take this allocation. I'm also through. So what we're looking at is pretty pretty much what we think the expense for these amenities for a pedestrian amenities are going to be paid for the prior 10 moving forward. Do do I have a forecast we'll be bringing obviously we'll have all that information at our next meetings. our, as we finish out the year of 2020 and we project 2021 and future years we would have more information on the 10 23, but at this point really what the project that we're planning to take we're really looking expecting that, up to that eight 50 it's just going to pay for those amenities. And that helps really though the former tid seven and it will help to tid 23, which will be a big big asset for the new hotel project

coming in. So I don't I don't have those specific numbers right now for you. I'm obviously we will have that when we have our annual meeting in June and the projections for that for that hotel project, we're still working on their timing they've at, looking for, they looked they were ahead asked to delay because of the cold COVID year. So we were working with them and looking at the new timelines. So then we'll have better projections later this year.

- Okay, perfect. Thank you.

- Any other questions regarding two 23 and or seventh? They are kind of joined at the hip here. My, for this one, any other questions on either of these? Okay. If not a meeting schedule coming up here obviously this is us today, but yes

- We didn't take an official vote the resolutions

- Actually, I guess that's my understanding is that those resolutions don't necessarily get approved until actually they're the second JRB meetings. Is that correct? I guess that they're, that they were introduced at this particular meeting and then they were actually voted on at the, at the second meeting. Is that, I mean, I'm certainly happy to, we can certainly have them take the vote on it, but I believe with cause I think the Jeremy Rose resolution specifically include the fact that the RDA has met and that council has taken action. So obviously they can't do that until their second meeting.

- I apologize for that.

- Okay. So just Tara, so RDA as our entity is such that it acts like our plan commission on these tomorrow tomorrow afternoon at one 30, we're looking at this taking these to the city council on March 16th and then obviously sending out some sort of a doodle poll or other scheduling mechanism with, with the joint review board here to get to the second meeting scheduled to where where we will actually take action on the two resolutions any questions or concerns on either of those

- I am just wondering whether there's a way that we can make it. It says not to exceed 850,000, but I don't know that it's limiting to identified capital improvements. If we can say somehow in the resolution that these are four capital projects identified within 2020 as a way to make sure that it's my concern is that it'll just be we've identified that there's this much leftover in tid seven and we're transferring it over for capital projects to be determined. And I'd rather it be for capital projects that we've identified in 2020.

- I don't see any issues with that whatsoever. Easy to add, happy to do that. And that's why we don't load on it at the first meeting also to help us dial it in that's that's not a problem, so. Okay. All right. Any other questions I'm bringing everybody back here. Righty. All right. Looking back on those items, we've kind of covered regular business and the informational ones throughout all those presentations. So is there any, any questions on really any of the the proposed actions here? He's our intersections ERF. We kind of covered them all in one shot here. Okay. And then we will set the next date meeting date and time we'll do that. We'll do a poll of confirm everyone's availability in the, if anyone has any questions, I'll make sure hopefully via email. I think everyone has my contact information and, or Diana's. If any questions do come up please don't hesitate to reach out and let us know. Otherwise we will send out a poll for the next meeting date and time. Once the RDA and city

council has taken action on these items, I guess, was that we would be ready for a motion to adjourn all in favor, please say aye.

- Aye All right. Thank you for your time, everyone. Sorry for the glitch at the beginning of the meeting, hopefully we will dial that one in the next time around, so thank you everybody.

- Thanks.