MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

TUESDAY, JULY 27, 2021, 1:30 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: Gary Delveaux, Chair; Matt Schueller, Vice-Chair; Ald. Barbara Dorff, Deby Dehn, Kathy Hinkfuss, Melanie Parma, and Brighid Riordan.
Liaisons: Jeff Mirkes and Leah Weycker.

Members Present: Ald. Barbara Dorff, Melanie Parma, Gary J. Delveaux, Deby Dehn, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Brighid Riordan, Excused: None
Liaisons Present: Leah Weycker, Excused: Jeff Mirkes
Others Present: Mayor Eric Genrich

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

1. Approval of the agenda for the July 27, 2021, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve the agenda for the July 27, 2021, meeting. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Debra Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on a new development agreement with Toonen Properties for up to $5 million in TIF assistance for completion of demolition of existing structures and development of approximately 209 market rate apartments on the former JBS Packerland site at 2580 University Avenue (Parcel 21-301), and replacing the previously executed agreement with TMD Properties.

The Authority may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons, and Section 19.85(1) (g), Wis. Stats., for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. The Authority will thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to enter closed session at 1:46 p.m. Motion Passed.
Ald. Barbara Dorff read the closed session language.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Debra Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Melanie Parma to return to open session at 2:05 p.m. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Debra Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the development agreement as discussed in closed session subject to any final text amendments by the City Attorney, and forward to the City Council for their consideration. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Debra Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Consideration with possible action on a request to amend the development agreement with Whitney School Development, LLC regarding moving the timing of their first PayGo TIF payment for the Whitney School Apartments (Lofts) development at 215 N. Webster Avenue (Parcel 9-112) from 2022 to 2021.

The Authority may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons, and Section 19.85(1) (g), Wis. Stats., for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. The Authority will thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda.

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve the amendment to advance the first PayGo TIF payment to the Developer to 2021, subject to 1) confirmation of available cash flow

in TID 20, and 2) that the Developer has met its other obligations under the current development agreement. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbavra Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Debra Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

E. INFORMATIONAL

1. Next meeting date - August 10, 2021 at 1:30 p.m.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Brighid Riordan, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to adjourn. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Debra Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- All right, Neil, it's 1:30. I guess we can rock and roll.

- Let's do it.

- All right, sounds good, sir.

- Roll call, please.

- Yep. Gary Delveaux? Gary's here.

- Yes. Matt Schueller? I think he said he was excused. I believe he wasn't available to make it. Alder Dorff?

- Here.

- Deby Dehn?

- Here.

- Kathy Hinkfuss?

- Here.

- Melanie Parma?

- Here.

- Brighid Riordan?

- I think she's excused too.

- I think she's excused, too, so, I believe we do have quorum then, sir.

- Okay. A motion to approve the agenda?

- Move to approve.

- Alder Dorff.

- Second.

- Second second by Kathy. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you.

- Oh, Matt joined us.

- Oh. Matt's in, okay Matt, how are you, sir?

- Good.

- Hey, Matt, welcome.

- Thank you.

- Yay, Matt.

- So, regular business, number one. Consideration with possible action on a new development agreement with Toonen Properties for up to $5 million in TIF assistance for completion of demolition of existing structures and development of approximately 209 market rate apartments on the former JBS Packerland site at 2580 University Avenue, Parcel 21-301, and replacing the previous agreement with TMD Properties. Somewhere along the line I want to go in closed session, because I've got some questions--

- Wait, what?

- In that regard. But before that, Neil, do you want to set the pace here?

- Yep, absolutely. Again, this item was just discussed--

- Hey, everybody?

- Whoop, Deby, yes?

- Brighid is here.

- Oh, Brighid!

- Excellent, okay.

- Oh, Brighid is here. Okay, everybody's here.

- Perfect.

- Full house, excellent.

- Yeah, on a special meeting, that's great.

- We appreciate it, you guys. Thank you.

- Brighid, we haven't met. Hi, and welcome, Gary, thank you.

- Hello. Hi, Gary. Nice to meet you.

- All right. Neil, please?

- Okay, this was, both of these items on the agenda here for this afternoon were discussed here two weeks ago, but what we've brought forward is actually brought the actual documents back to you for your review and hopefully blessing here today. The first one here is, obviously, is the Toonen Properties agreement. This is for the JBS Packerland, also known as University Heights or the Devillers project. Essentially what would be going on here is this would be, is Toonen would be taking the place of TMD properties of Devillers and proceeding with the project. So we had a couple of things we needed to do in terms of obviously revising the agreement, which I'll go through here. If you want to do that in closed session, Mr. Chair, we can do that. Otherwise we can go through it here in open session. I don't think there's anything from that regard that we need a closed session discussion for, regarded specifically to the changes, but certainly will be up to your discretion on that. But the other key item that was the important part was actually figuring out how to basically disengage from the original development agreement and enter into the new one without having a gap. So we wanted to make sure that we actually had that covered, the city was covered in terms of making sure that someone was still on the hook to proceed with that. So what has been presented to you today, is what is the actual draft document, which we will go through here shortly. Also as a preliminary notice of termination, essentially to TMD Properties that has been prepared by our legal counsel that would be going out that essentially is a conditional termination saying if the property is, and basically we execute a development agreement with a new developer, that it will be essentially be a notice of, basically a lack of performance from the original developer and then terminating that specific agreement, allowing us to move forward with the new one. So Attorney Chavez is here today if you have any specific questions on that, but that has been attached. I guess, Mr. Chair, if you'd like me to, I can go in and just kind of review the key updates to the document that I think that the Authority would be most interested in?

- Yes, in particular, ones that have changed since our last review of this.

- Yep, absolutely. And we do have a couple of items. We've had some discussions with the developer. We'll go ahead and get those here. Let's see, let me move, here. So hopefully everyone can see the RDA drafts on their screen, hopefully?

- Oh, thank you.

- Good.

- Perfect.

- Okay.

- Okay, we will be updating Toonen Properties. There will be an LLC established for this, so we'll be updating that throughout the document. I wanted to make sure of that one. We have some definitions to clear up in terms of master parcel and property definition, but that's largely a scribner's error to be working with the attorney's office on. So the description of the property is still the same. Again, the assessed values are presented. These have been pretty standard in terms of this, the only little bit unusual on this one is that there's three different sections in here because there's the original base value, the value once the two buildings from TMD have been built, and then obviously then one has built all of their projects. So we actually have three points in time we're measuring with this agreement. So that's why there are three sections. Usually there are only two. So we've talked about, this is largely a Pay As You Go district, essentially, is what we're doing. There is a $1.5 million project grant that was already provided to TMD Properties as part of this. The way the Pay As You Go project is set up, that 1.5 million will be fully repaid prior to any disbursements to Toonen Properties. So we have positioned essentially to recover those funds in advance of providing any direct assistance to the developer, which we feel is very advantageous to the city. We're excited about that. That's good.

- Yes.

- Yes.

- Let's see. Some of the exhibits. So a lot of the definitions, I think there's nothing too critical on these. We are wrestling with the deposition of qualified expenditures a little bit, but I'll talk about that when we get down there. We talk about the PAYGo reimbursement. This is an 80/20 project we are pursuing, repayment of the upfront project grant, as I said. And then once that is repaid, there's an 80/20 split between the developer and the city going forward at that point. So there is a cap, essentially, on this one, that is, we'll talk about that, it is a $5 million cap. You'll see a reference to 6-1/2 million dollars here, but that includes the 1-1/2 million that was already allocated to the project from the original project. So again, recovering the, all of the debt service obligation on our own project grants comes first. This language here, I highlighted here, was newly added. This essentially allows for some flexibility in case the valuation does not quite come in at the full $22 million. So they wouldn't qualify for a full amount, they would qualify for a reduced percentage of increment, if they at least hit $17,600,000.00, which we really are having, not at all, any concerns there, as long as they build what they say they're going to build, we really don't think this will come into play. We're assuming it will be a full 80/20% going forward. But this does allow, in this environment, because of the questionable, of being able to get materials, of labor, of other things, for some reason, if the project doesn't quite get built as fast as they'd like, this still allows them to recapture some increment, if in fact that happens. And it does not change the overall cap or the end date of when the assistance would end. So there really isn't any. So this is also language that I think that the RDA first saw in the 200 North Monroe agreement here that was recently approved. So this is exact similar type of language that was essentially brought forward from that agreement and entered into this one. So a couple of highlights on the screen here. The text did not match the percentage, the numbers here was a scribner's error. So we had to just change those. So 64 and 64 and 72 and 72, so those matched, that was just a correction on our part. And just to note that we are allowing the, we are including the project valuation of those first two buildings from TMD Properties in the overall, simply because we are going back far enough that including that project grant, that same timeframe, that we felt that it was only fair to allow those valuations on those particular properties to be included in the overall valuation as well. You mentioned the PAYGo disbursements, the other incentive, just acknowledging that this was a previous grant that was involved in the city. Qualified expenditures, I mentioned we were looking at, we've asked in conversations with the developer, they've asked if we would add like driveway access, sidewalks, and trails, essentially, as infrastructure to be added as eligible expenditures. Again, the staff really did not have any issues with including those for this particular site, in fact, we feel especially. Is actually a kind of a key amenity to the site and connecting this area for the residential development to the parks area that is in this immediate area. So we talked about some limitations. Again, this is capped at $6,500,000.00, includes the 1-1/2 million, so it is really a $5 million PAYGo incentive. We talked about 80% being the top maximum owing in a year. The temporal limitation. This is when the developer was actually asking for a little bit of consideration to go past the year 2038, the expenditure end of the expenditure period for the TIF. And staff has kind of said, we'd like to keep that, maintain that within that expenditure period, if at all possible. However, we did say that we were open to, if at some point, for whatever reason, if there was a performance situation where the project was done, all the other obligations were met. If it looked like they would be needing an additional year of increment, then certainly we would encourage them to come back and request an amendment to the agreement at that time. But we didn't feel that there was, we feel that most likely going to meet all the criteria and an extension will not be required. So at this time, staff is recommending that we do not change from 2038. And we'll address that if and when it's needed. One request that they did make, we asked for a concept plan to be submitted by September 1st. Simply because of negotiations with the existing developer and just kind of overall schedules, asked if they could move that to December 31st, 2021. They did not adjust any of their other dates and schedules that are included in the agreement, so staff did not have any concerns with moving that to 12/31/21. I don't think we mentioned the bike path. I think the engineering staff, or consultant, probably for the developer, took a look at the area out here. There is a substantial grade change out in this area, in addition to some possible water crossing that might need to be done. So they were not really in a position to kind of want to jump on and just blank check without knowing how much it's really gonna do and whether or not it's actually feasible. So we kind of wanted to add language there since, assuming confirmation between the city and the developer, that just the scope, that that would be basically then an eligible project that we would consider for them. So just making sure that it is actually a designable, buildable trail extension. And there might be some, if for some reason, the grade is not what we expect it to be or is problematic, there may be a different route that is chosen, simply to be approved then by Public Works or the Parks Department to allow that to go forward. But we would still like to see a connection there. We think that would be a great amenity for the city.

- Yes.

- Then a note, number three here, is about a utility plan demonstrating that water and sewer can be served, but specifically that water pressure is available. This is note to the city, as well as it is to the developer, is ensuring that adequate water pressure is there to serve the number of units that are gonna be put into this area. So it's just kind of putting everyone on notice that we all need to make sure that there is adequate water pressure for this area. The CSM is gonna be something that's gonna be required, probably April 1st, simply we're looking at, obviously, at least at this current time, the developer, Toonen properties is looking at developing the rest, the remainder of the original master parcel, while TMD Properties is gonna retain their two properties. So if in fact that is the way it goes, then we will require, obviously, a land division between those two owners will be required to be done. So this is just acknowledging that that land division will be required. Some, all of the other, a lot of the other dates are all tied to April 1st, 2022, including project budget, construction documents, the overall development budget. RDA members will see this highlighted section here, and will remember our public arts contribution here. This was one we had to actually consult with Attorney Chavez on, as this was obviously a project that was started prior to that requirement. But this is actually a new agreement with a new developer. So it was felt that this was, based on RDA actions, this was something that we needed to add into the agreement. So we've got preliminary conversation with the developer. At this point, they understand it would probably be a $220,000.00 amount at some point, in terms of value. So they're evaluating some options in terms of how they think they might be able to address that. Although, they may have some questions or some comments on that as we go through. Just a reminder that RDA approvals are needed for the concept plan and some of the other documents in here, and that those are actually still separate from the zoning approvals that are needed. So we talked about the compliance with zoning. Proof of equity, proof of financing. Again, all things that are pretty standard in other agreements that we have had in the past, but similar, on the same timelines. A lot of our boiler plate language here to this point. Let me see if there was specifically, where's the next key amendment I wanted to make sure folks were aware of. Insurance is still in the same. Risk insurance, general indemnity, is all the same. All right, conditions precedent, here we go here. It won't really change the documents, by anyways. I apologize for scrolling through and going through here on these. Default. These are the actual terms we have in terms for failure to perform. One interest that was added. I think based on Gary's comment at the last meeting, we have suggested a personal guarantee requirement on here. However, further discussions with the developer, staff is questioning exactly if this is, that is essentially like an outstanding, finance liability at this point is essentially the upfront project grant. There's 1-1/2 million dollars. The developer has requested that this not be included at this point, citing the concession that they are essentially repaying all of that upfront as the very first thing before they get any. So I certainly would agree with that, and to that extent. Yeah, the real risk on certainly the personal guarantee helps when there is actually a borrowed amount. It does not have as much of an impact on a Pay As You Go TIF model. Obviously there is not a borrowed amount essentially to protect. So certainly looking forward to seeing what RDA members feel about that particular requirement, to see if there's, they would like to see some flexibility on that. I think in terms of the way we've had, the way we've structured the minimum valuation guarantees in order to qualify for any assistance, including that prorated amount down, and the fact that it gets paid back first, staff is certainly comfortable proceeding with that at a minimum, it is a minimum requirement, we feel at this point to proceed. And it's certainly an improvement over our current situation. But again, happy to discuss that further. We talked about termination of the agreement. Again, we mentioned the 2038 year being kind of the last year we need to do anything there. That was the last kind of real key item that was a change in the agreement. So, with that, certainly available to answer any questions.

- I've got a number of questions, but the ones I have, I want to cover in closed session. Is there anything in general that people want to ask before we go into closed session?

- I'll make a motion to go into closed session.

- Second.

- A motion by Alder Dorff, and second by Matt, to go into closed session. A roll call, please, Neil?

- Okay. Yep, we'll do that here. Delveaux?

- Yes.

- Schueller?

- Yes.

- Dorff?

- Yes.

- Dehn?

- Yes.

- Hinkfuss?

- Her lips moved.

- Oh, okay.

- But she's muted.

- Fair enough. Parma?

- Yes.

- Riordan?

- [Kathy] I didn't know I was on mute.

- There we go. I think Brighid's the same thing. So I do believe that we have the developer is here. Schueller?

- Yes.

- Dorff?

- Yes.

- [Neil] Dehn?

- [Deby] Yes.

- Hinkfuss?

- Yes.

- Parma?

- Yes.

- Riordan?

- Yes.

- [Neil] Okay. All right, so now we just need to see.

- [Gary] To go back to open session. All those in favor, signify by saying aye?

- [Barb] We can vote in open session.

- [Gary] Yeah, we will vote, yeah, we'll make a motion to vote open session. We need to do a roll call again, though.

- [Barb] Okay.

- [Neil] Yep. We'll do that.

- [Woman] It always has to be done on the record.

- [Neil] Okay. Okay, so we go back in, okay.

- [Gary] I mean, the...

- [Neil] So Will, if Will, if you could go in and get us back into open please?

- [Will] Okay.

- [Woman] Hi, it's just me.

- [Gary] Okay.

- [Neil] See, it looks like folks are coming back in now.

- [Kathy] It says we are live.

- All right, perfect.

- That's what it said.

- [Neil] Yep. Excellent. All right, we will do, so... Could we, just ask someone to remake the motion to go back and open, please?

- [Kathy] I move to go back into open session.

- [Melanie] I'll second.

- [Gary] Kathy and Melanie, a motion to go back to open session. We will do a roll call.

- Delveaux?

- Yes.

- Schueller?

- Yes.

- Dorff?

- Yes.

- Dehn?

- Yes.

- Hinkfuss?

- Yes.

- Parma?

- Yes.

- Riordan?

- Yes.

- [Neil] All right, we are back in open session.

- [Gary] First of all, I'd like to thank the group. There was some excellent questions in closed session. And I think we're ready to proceed. There's some questions or comments that we wanted to ask in open session.

- [Neil] And just to note that Mr. John Van Dyke from the developer is available for questions, if so, desired by the body.

- [Gary] Okay. Yes, Alder Dorff, please?

- [Barb] Wasn't there the one question about the water pressure someone wanted to ask?

- [Kathy] Yes. Okay. We have in the contract that we're assuming adequate water pressure, and we're recommending that we put, what is the water pressure and get that recommendation from the water department or the fire, whoever, so that it's a actually a measurable figure.

- [Neil] Okay, it appears that John is still attempting to connect to his audio here. So he's not fully in here yet, but.

- [Kathy] Ah.

- [Gary] Okay, once he's on, we'll, Kathy, ask the question again, please?

- [Kathy] Yep.

- [Gary] Once we got him.

- [Neil] Let's see. Drop him an email and see if he's having some concerns here.

- [Gary] If that's something, Neil, you could work out with him, on the side.

- Yeah.

- Yes.

- [Neil] I think, we would, right now, staff would recommend adjusting that, adding language to be a specific pounds per square inch as recommended by either the fire department and or the water utility.

- [Gary] Okay. Yeah, we might not be able to get him aboard. If not, well, Neil, I'm sure you can work that out.

- [Barb] Can I make a motion to move this forward then, as discussed in closed session?

- [Gary] Motion by Alder Dorff to move forward.

- [Matt] Second.

- A second by Matt that we move forward as discussed in closed session. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? It's a great project. Good work.

- Mm hm.

- Everybody involved. Fantastic. Thank you.

- Thank you.

- All right. Believe it or not, Neil, you're gonna have to read agenda item two. When I printed it out I only printed out agenda item one.

- No problem, no, that's okay, not a problem here. For regular business, item D2, consideration with possible action on a request to amend the development agreement with Whitney School Development, LLC, moving the timing of their first PAYGo TIF payment for the Whitney School Apartments, or Lofts, development, at 215 North Webster, Parcel 9-112, from 2022 to 2021.

- Okay, one last comment on the previous agenda item. I want to thank Kathy for that catch. That was good catch, Kathy. But, anyway, back to agenda item two. Neil, proceed if you want?

- Absolutely, I can provide a brief overview. Again, this was discussed in concept here two weeks ago. Essentially, what we're looking for here is essentially authorization to proceed with basically making the first PAYGo payment to Whitney School lofts here in 2021 versus 2022. The situation that happened is essentially because of the way the timing on TIF and valuations work, they basically got their occupancy permit like two weeks into January. But all the assessments obviously are set 01/01 of each year, so they just missed the calendar year. So the project was substantially complete. It was assessed as such. There was actually a substantial amount of increment that was added to this project. So they're essentially asking for that, because of that substantial completion and that value being added, if they could basically initiate their initial payments starting here this year. I think I've had Director Ellenbecker did take a look at it, so there is adequate cash flow. There isn't really a situation on that. And it really does not increase the city's contribution to the project, that is still capped. And staff is recommending approval of the amendment to allow for their first PAYGo payment to be in 2021.

- So Neil, just help me real quick. I thought we had this in the last agenda item, and we approved it last--

- We approved it.

- We did, but we did not have specific language in front of you. Now, the actual amendment is actually before you in your packet, so the specific claim is in front of you. So we are being a little conservative in having you guys look at it twice. You guys did approve it conceptually, but we, again, are not comfortable proceeding with that without you guys actually seeing the actual amendment document.

- Very good, very good.

- Nice job.

- I'll entertain a motion?

- I'd make the motion that we go ahead and make the first PAYGo payment in 2021, rather than 2022 as stipulated in the motion.

- I'll second.

- Okay, there's a motion by Matt, a second by Kathy. Any other comments or questions in regard to the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? So carried. Very good. So Neil, when can we start having our meetings in the Harry Maier Room again?

- Well, the Harry Meier Room is certainly the challenge, unfortunately, Gary. I think we probably can get back to being in-person. I did send an email out briefly this afternoon. Apparently the one technological issue we were having in terms of us actually being able to record the meeting. So unfortunately, if it's a Zoom meeting like this, it's, by itself, essentially we are able to record it and have that available for the public to review afterwards. But again, the Council Chambers is one area that is set up to actually handle that sort of video recording for the overall meeting, especially if we have someone in person. Specifically, to come into the meeting, if we had someone from the public come in and attend the meeting, we would have the ability to actually record them and their comments in the Council Chambers. And we do not currently have that in 604. So we are back to trying to figure out exactly how to maybe either accommodate that in 604 or to require us to move back to, either hold it in the Council Chambers is kind of our options at this point. So, unfortunately we are being limited by our technology at this point. So certainly again, staff is certainly open to either suggestion. Gary, if the priority is to meet in person, we'll probably, for the foreseeable future, we'll probably need to use the Council Chambers to make that happen. So until we figure out a way to actually handle the video capability and to record the meeting in 604, we don't have that as an option right now.

- Okay, and so--

- A quick question, Neil.

- Yes sir.

- Did something change in requirements for video recording? 'Cause we always used to hold meetings in 604. So I'm trying to understand, did something change?

- Yeah, I think it has to do with specific, well there's certainly there's still social distancing, things we're still trying to encourage as part of that too, Matt. But it is the combination of the Zoom connection plus the video connection that we're trying to essentially to establish those at. If it was just, we weren't doing the Zoom factor, I think we would have the ability to facilitate that recording a little easier. So it is, yeah, it is a frustrating thing to be coming out of the pandemic and having to figure out how to wrap our arms around this to make it available. But it is something we are certainly, I think, we know we can make it happen, but if, at least for the foreseeable future, it would have to be in the Council Chambers,

- I get it, the aspect of Zoom and video recording. 'Cause I know we were doing the video recording before. We weren't doing Zoom. Okay.

- Right, I mean, are any of the members of the RDA uncomfortable going in on site?

- No. I don't think so. The only question would be, the awkwardness of being in the Chamber. We've had some meetings in there. It's just not quite as handy as being in 604.

- Right, but my point is, is if we said, we're gonna come back, we're gonna meet monthly in 604 and we're not gonna do it via Zoom, is that an issue?

- I hope not.

- I mean, can we as a committee make that decision or no?

- Well, I think it's an issue for social distancing though.

- Right.

- Because unless everyone's vaccinated, right, will there be a mask requirement? Like I remember the old days of 604. The table was completely full, right? And then the chairs were full in the back. So I think the problem with 604 is just that distancing.

- Distancing, okay.

- But, it's, I think I, I don't, I don't see the mayor on here anymore, Vanessa, I don't know if you have any comments with regards too? If the RDA makes that decision or if that's a city hall, council decision about that, but?

- [Vanessa] About attendance or about masks?

- About attending, like if let's say the RDA is like, look, we want to meet in 604. And that would result

- We want to meet--

- In maybe not social distancing. Can the RDA make that change?

- [Vanessa[The RDA can choose to meet in person, but where in the building they would meet is gonna be based on the capacity requirements. And then also in the social distancing requirements and the technology requirements. So those are gonna trump everything. So it's really, if you guys want to do it in person, it's really how can the city accommodate it? Not necessarily 604, but how can we accommodate it?

- Okay.

- Okay.

- A more complicated answer than we were hoping for, Kathy.

- I think we're gonna continue meeting in Zoom then until we can get a room that's a little more accommodating than the Chamber room. But I'm open to suggestions. If people want us, we can meet in the Chamber with Zoom, whatever.

- I'd certainly encourage this. Let's keep this as a discussion item moving forward. 'Cause certainly, let's, yeah. Let's keep this on the front of the radar. Absolutely.

- Okay. Absolutely. Anything else, Matt, under, I mean, Neil, other than our next meeting being August 10th at 1:30?

- Yep, just that. That is kind of what we're looking at right now. And we're evaluating in terms of what we think we might have for agenda items at that point. One item that is out there that I think we may need some discussion on is, Will Peter's, our staff has let me know that there has been, I think it's 253. Step 2 funding has been set aside for the City of Green Bay, which can be applied for once the previous allocation has been spent. So there might be some options, some opportunity to discuss that in terms of exactly how, what sort of funding might be required and what sort of things we can use those funds on. We may be bringing that forward to have that discussion with this body here at whenever that next meeting is, which may be, it could be the 10th at this point, it would be our regularly scheduled meeting. So right now I think that's the only item we have on the agenda that would be slated for that one. But we'll certainly take a look and let you know if any other items do come forward that we need some action.

- Neil?

- Okay. With all that in mind, I'd entertain a motion to adjourn?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Brighid, I think made the motion and second by Kathy. All in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? We're adjourned. Another great meeting and a great project.

- Yes.

- Thank you, everybody, for your flexibility in doing the second meeting this month. It was appreciated, so thank you.

- I noticed John was on, now he's off again, I guess. But anyway, compliment on the project.

- He's on.

- And I don't think it would be an issue with the change that they're suggesting, but we're very excited about that project, and full speed ahead.

- Good to work for it. So we're very appreciative.

- There's John. You're feeling some thumbs up, John.

- I'm glad you got that, John. We're excited to be working with you. We'll get the agreement language finally cleaned up and ready for Council, then.

- Fantastic.

- Thank you, everybody.