



MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2021, 1:30 PM
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: Gary Delveaux, Chair; Matt Schueller, Vice-Chair; Ald. Barbara Dorff, Deby Dehn, Kathy Hinkfuss, Melanie Parma, and Brighid Riordan.
Liaisons: Jeff Mirkes, Leah Weycker, and Brooke Gehrke.

Members Present: Matt Schueller, Ald. Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Brighid Riordan, Melanie Parma, and Deby Dehn, Excused:
Liaisons Present: Jeff Mirkes, Leah Weycker, and Brooke Gehrke
Others Present: Ald. Brian Johnson and Mayor Eric Genrich

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the September 14, 2021, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.
Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the August 10, 2021, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.
Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the minutes from the August 10,

2021, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on preliminary terms with H.J. Martin and Son regarding temporary uses and the redevelopment of the former Shopko site located at 216 S. Military Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to open the floor. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to close the floor. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Melanie Parma to direct staff to proceed with a development agreement based on the terms presented at the RDA meeting for consideration by the City Council, and prepare a draft PUD zoning for the site for consideration by the Plan Commission and City Council. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Impact Seven for a Planning Option Extension on 420 S. Broadway.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Deby Dehn to approve the extension of the planning option to Impact Seven for 420 S. Broadway to March 1, 2022. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

3. Consideration with possible action on an amendment to the development agreement with Toonen Properties for an expanded project at 2540 University Avenue.

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve the proposed changes to the development agreement with Toonen Properties for an expanded project at 2540 University Avenue, subject to final review by the City Attorney, and prepare a formal revised development agreement for consideration by the City Council. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

4. Consideration with possible action on providing financing assistance to the Northland Hotel to pave the parking lot at 330 N. Adams Street.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Brighid Riordan to direct staff to prepare a formal development agreement authorizing financing assistance to the Northland Hotel to complete the paving of the parking lot at 330 N. Adams Street by May 1, 2022, in the form of a loan not to exceed \$150,000, payable over a five year term at 2% interest, and requiring the paving of the lot to be completed to a City approved design, subject to review and approval 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, Deby Dehn, Brigid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

5. Consideration with possible action on allocation of State of Wisconsin Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Coronavirus (CV) Round 2 funding (CDBG-CV2).

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the allocation of CDBG-CV2 funds in the amount of \$253,062.34 from the State of Wisconsin to provide public broadband and wireless access to low-moderate income persons at designated neighborhood parks under the Essential Frontline Employee Relief Program. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brigid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

6. Consideration with possible action on a request to execute an agreement with West Shore Pipeline Company to abandon an existing petroleum gas pipeline at 420 S. Broadway.

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by Melanie Parma to execute the Pipeline Access and Abandonment Agreement with West Shore Pipeline Company to abandon an existing petroleum gas pipeline at 420 S. Broadway. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brigid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

7. Consideration with possible action on awarding additional CDBG and HOME funding to the Home Improvement Loan Program (HILP) contract with NeighborWorks Green Bay.

Moved by Melanie Parma, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to authorize award of additional CDBG and HOME funding to the Home Improvement Loan Program (HILP) contract with NeighborWorks Green Bay. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brigid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

8. Consideration with possible action on request by Bicycle Collective for permission to hold a fundraiser at 418 4th Street (and adjacent parcels) owned by the RDA.

Moved by Brigid Riordan, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve the use of RDA property for the Bicycle Collective Fundraiser event contingent on a hold harmless agreement signed by all parties. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brigid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

9. Consideration with possible action on awarding CD 21-02 Seymour Park Pedestrian Crossing and Alley Resurfacing to the low qualified bidder, Peters Concrete Co., in the amount of \$177,483.00.

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by Melanie Parma to authorize award of CD 21-02 Seymour Park Pedestrian Crossing and Alley Resurfacing to the low qualified bidder, Peters Concrete Co., in the amount of \$177,483.00. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brigid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Update on Housing Study.

Cheryl Renier-Wigg presented the update. No action was taken.

2. Financial report and check register.

No action was taken.

3. RDA loan update.

No action was taken.

4. Director's report and project updates.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's report and project updates. No action was taken.

5. Next Regular Meeting: October 12, 2021 at 1:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to adjourn. Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- It's--

- Okay, will do. Delveaux?

- Here.

- Schueller?

- Here.

- Dorff?

- Here.

- Dehn?

- Here.

- Hinkfuss?

- Her lips moved.
- I'd say, I think Kathy's here. Yeah. Parma?
- Here.
- Riordan?
- Here.
- And I note that Leah Weycker is also here. Is Jeff Mirkes here? It doesn't sound like it. And let me see, is Brooke here, Brooke Gehrke, is she here?
- Very good, thank you.
- Okay.
- Approval of the agenda, please.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Second.
- Alder Dorff and second by who? Sorry.
- Kathy.
- Kathy. All those in favor signify by saying aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Agenda approved. Approval of the minutes from August 10th.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Matt was second and Kathy was first, I believe. All those in favor signify by saying aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Great, the minutes are approved. Regular business. Number one. Consideration with possible action on preliminary terms with H.J. Martin and Son regarding temporary uses and the redevelopment of the former Shopko site located at 216 South Military Avenue.

- Yes sir, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to get my screen saved here, or shared here with everyone, so we can see what's going on. Let's see. All right, here. I'm trying to get this to go to full-size here. There we go. I think that's what we need. Can everybody still see the title slide here, of the RDA?

- Yes.

- Yes.

- Perfect. Excellent. Thank you. All right. We will jump right in here. First item. We have been fortunate to be working with H.J. Martin and Son regarding the former Shopko site at 26 Military Avenue. They are essentially requesting, they really approached the city about getting approval for some temporary uses in the existing structure, including some warehousing spaces, including some training spaces for a tenant, and also some additional space for their operations, in addition to a lease tenant. So when they first approached us about that, essentially the existing zoning on the site does not generally allow that type of use. It's considered to be industrial use storage inside those buildings is not a permitted use. So in context of trying to work with them to identify a path forward, they have certainly had at least one redevelopment prospect talk to them about this particular site. They are interested. There is no pending agreement in place at this point. However they have, I think they're probably continuing some discussions with that potential user and have certainly approached the city about maybe the possibilities of that going forward. So this is the site in question here, folks are familiar with this here. This here is Military Avenue. This is the building. Essentially we'll be looking at at three different uses inside the building, according to the colors here. The one towards the bottom of your screen is primarily warehousing. The center is, the orange, is primarily going to be a training facility for H.J. Martin employees. And then the northern most, or I guess the top, in the northern most section of the building, would be for a contracted user doing some rehabilitation of medical equipment in that particular site. That's kind of just what's, that's what's being used. So again, we believe these uses are certainly viable for the site and would work. Essentially, we do have a couple of concerns, is that, we do not want to set a precedent to allow this sort of use to occur in other sites. This is not necessarily a concern with this particular site. We know this can be used and be effective here. However, if it's not done properly, we'd be in danger of setting a precedent to allow other vacant buildings and stuff to be used, and kind of slowing down redevelopment in some of these commercial areas where we're dealing with this. Especially, in other examples we have seen a tendency for temporary uses to remain longer than intended, although the Martins have been very, very communicative and have been very great to work with. We're confident that they're gonna be proceeding as they are saying. And they have expressed some interest in seeing some eventual redevelopment of the site and to allow them to, certainly at this point, to proceed with some of their temporary uses. So, essentially, prepared the details of kind of what has been proposed to the Martins is in your packet. There's a couple of things we still will certainly need to tighten up language on, but what we wanted to do today is simply present to you the concept and make sure that this is something the RDA was interested in. If so, we will be proceeding with preparing a formal development agreement to kind of go in tandem with the PUD zoning for the site. So in the actual agreement, then, the PUD zoning would cover the duration of use, property maintenance requirements, screening, traffic and parking management, creation of a redevelopment plan for the site, and then just process for going forward, so everybody has the same, essentially, path forward in terms of dates and process. So, staff's direction is to proceed as asking, RDA to provide direction, to proceed with the development agreement based on the terms presented here at the RDA meeting and in your packet, for consideration by the City Council, and prepare a draft Planned Unit

Development zoning for the site for consideration by the Planning Commission and Council that would permit their temporary uses. And with that, I am certainly available for questions. And I believe David Martin and Ed Martin are both available to answer questions as well.

- But with that in mind, and I know it's documented in your write up, I'd like to hear directly from the Martins as far as what the long range plans are. So I'd entertain a motion--

- Motion to, Motion to open the floor.

- Alder Dorff.

- Second.

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

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? We are open. Martins, please, give us an update on your long range strategy with the buildings.

- Thanks for having us. And Neil, thanks for the introduction. We were lucky to purchase two properties at the first quarter of last year when no one was really loving the retail vacancy, with COVID. And we like to purchase buildings close to us because we have so much invested in the area. So the former Toys R Us came available in April, and before this Shopko, unfortunately, closed its doors, but our operation is right next door. So our intent, long-term, one, is, as our business expands, we want to stay in this area, and these two properties give us that growth. But too, we wanted economic, to have a lot of economic viability here. And we would like this site redeveloped. What we have been talking with Neil and David and Paul and Wendy about is how do we get there, specifically to the Shopko property, because the Toys R Us property at Mason Street moved quickly with Planet Fitness being leased to have that building. And you will see two outlots in front of, probably a similar meeting here, coming up, That'll be two great users. And we'll clean up the area there. But getting back to the Shopko property, what you'd be doing is helping us right now with our business, because right now we have to bring in a lot of flooring material with lead times being as long as they are. So if we have a project, normally we're used to doing purchase orders and then the distributors holding the property, the material. And right now we have to place that order, it gets shipped, we have to hold it in order to hit our deadlines. So we need more warehouse space for that. Secondly, we have about 1,000 installers within the company, and obviously a lot of those people are retiring. So what we are doing and wanting the help with the city is to allow a training center right next door so we can keep training the next generation of installers. Thirdly, we have 10 full-time jobs, 20, including part-time, with the tenant we've been working with on different developments that would bring those jobs to the area, which Neil mentioned would take 30,000 square feet of the building. All of this is. Of redeveloping the site long-term. But this is helping us get there. And by approving a development agreement you would be helping us get there as well. And we think what we're doing is better than a vacant building. And if you look at the other Shopko sites, they are vacant. We're up keeping the building. We're making sure the parking lot is maintained. And you have our full commitment, with all of the retailers that we know, that we're gonna work, if it's a regional person, or if it's a national retailer, we're gonna do everything we can to bring the right tenants to Military Avenue. Anything?

- I did talk to our tenant, and they do have retail people coming in there and they are considering a sort of retail front, in the front section. However, the code, I think the retail code is 60%, either 60 has to be retail and 40 in the back of house, or the opposite way. I can't recall off my head. But. they are willing to put up a nice storefront there. And even if they don't have them, people come in and look at their products and so forth. It's not on view, for assembly, whatever, they're bringing their wheel chairs and stuff in there, cleaning them, and then they're, people put in their stuff in there, their equipment and maintenance and so forth. So they really do need a retail storefront there, but that might help too.

- Questions for the Martins?

- Yeah, just a quick one. And this is either David or Ed, and it's maybe a little bit more broad. The specific site you're talking about, but I know you guys are getting national exposure, retail happening nationally, right? Lots of vacancies. And what are you seeing. As trends about what areas are doing to repurpose broad amounts of retail space that are just kind of sitting open nationally?

- A lot of the retailers used to take up 80 to 90,000 square feet. to your point, Matt, and now they're reducing their square footage. But also they call it, BOPUS. buy online pickup in store, utilizing the omni-channel side of things, where you could place an order with your app and then pull up and it's delivered either to your car or you pick it up inside the store. So we're seeing a lot of that right now. with a lot of the home improvement locations, department stores, and grocery. For repurposing sites, before COVID, the restaurants, movie theaters, a lot of those were overtaking the mall sites, things that would drive traffic. But we've got a good heartbeat on everything else.

- Well, the leases, they're shrinking, they're shrinking that square footage, So what David did was, got Burlington to, David's very aggressive and has good foresight. And so through the industry channels, we hear they're shrinking their stores, so David went out and go PetCo to take part of that Burlington site. So instead of having it empty, we're gonna have PetCo. We just signed up Burlington, Michael's, Toys R Us, I mean Planet Fitness, and then we have another application. So that was a really dirty corner. You guys, you know, you guys, and I drive by it every day. So my main objective is to bring Military back to when my grandfather and father bought all of Military Avenue in the fifties. So we have a long history here that maybe many of you might not know. So with David aboard we've acquired 40-1/2 acres on Military Avenue, which is significant, and West Mason. We're moving, Neil knows what we're doing. And so we have some really good, good prospects. We're also moving the Arby's over to a different area. And we have plans on refurbishing that corner of West Mason, south of Burlington. That tile shop that we got.

- Mr. Martins. Alder Johnson. Alderman Johnson?

- Thank you, Chair. David and Ed, first off, thank you for your continual investments in the city of Green Bay. It's obviously very impactful what you've done for our community. And I think, I just want to make sure that we express our gratitude for that. My question for you specifically, when I'm looking at the list here that the staff has compiled for us, is there anything in that list with which you are uncomfortable? It creates any level of uneasiness or concern that, as a city, that we ought to know about and be concerned about?

- The only one, and Neil, did you add the last bullet point, which you emailed about, where, if the developer acknowledges that failure to meet any of these requirements may result in the city immediately taking action and enforcing financial penalties, is that--

- I have not, I did not take that off, guys, just 'cause that was just, the agenda was already up, but we've already talked to Alder Johnson about that one in terms of that, it was more of just, we both understand that that's the situation and it doesn't necessarily need to be spelled out in the agreement. So when we actually prepare a formal development agreement, that specific language will likely be removed.

- Very interestingly, that was the one that caught my attention, simply because I didn't like the idea of retroactively applying things. If it's something moving forward, that's different. But other, if, from the Martins' perspective, I just wanted to, again, verify that you guys are comfortable with this list?

- We are, it's just, long-term, just like how Schreiber had many different buildings, and they found a lot of advantages by being in one building. Here, we're spread out, but at least we're in the same area. It's hard for us to manage if we have multiple building, it's hard to have that same culture. So I guess the only long-term disadvantage if we're made to have this retail, and we would do it in a way, if we need a distribution center, to parcel it off and try to have the majority what the city intends to zone it. But we want to stay here just because we have so much invested in the area and if we're required to move then that would be--

- This is our home area.

- Yeah, that would be tough.

- But you know we, we really don't intend to keep it like that. If you look at our track record on Waube Lane and on West Mason, but we can't promise we're gonna have a tenant in three years. I can promise we'll have something in five years. And on the four years and 11 months, we're gonna want to have a plan, you got my word on that. But as far as having a detailed plan in three of the years, I'm sure that, I'm confident that, but it might take three years and two months, you know what I mean? And I know that we would abandon the building if we don't have a use for it after the five years, but three years is a little aggressive to have a, we can make them a plan, but you don't want to make up plans that aren't. So we'll have something, but in 36 months, I don't know if we could meet that deadline. That's up to David, right?

- Alder Dorff, please.

- Thanks. I thought I saw that there could be two one-year extensions, that it did total up to five years. Am I reading that incorrectly?

- We did have that in there, Alder Dorff. that essentially, if they, similar to what we've done with other projects, if they've showed good progress towards achieving redevelopment, that we would certainly be willing to extend it to five, absolutely. So I think it is, it comes down to probably final language that we've gone in there. I certainly understand where Ed's coming from and the uncertainty in this market. And we certainly don't want to kind of box them in unnecessarily. But if we can, we've certainly had a couple of conversations already that we think there's probably a way to get to a conceptual redevelopment plan without actually again, having a developer on ready to go, financing

ready to go. We're certainly not, while we'd love to have that, and that'd be great, we're certainly not gonna, we understand that we're not gonna be able to necessarily hold them to that. So we've kind of got three years out there as kind of a, I guess, a benchmark, to see how things are going. And if we continue to work as we are, have been up to this point, I think that we'd certainly be more than willing to extend that out up to the five-year mark.

- Yes, Kathy?

- I'm going back to where Barb was, because what I'm reading in the background is that it is temporary use for a five-year period and I'm from the west side, so I've seen what H.J. Martin has done and what you guys have all done for the community. So thank you, as Brian said. And keep improving Military.

- Yeah. Honestly, this is probably the cleanest area in Green Bay. I mean, we keep it spotless.

- Yeah.

- Definitely.

- It'll be really different. We really take pride in this. We're gonna make it right, believe me.

- Questions? if not--

- Motion to close the floor.

- So is it five or a three?

- It's both.

- I'm sure David will exceed my expectations.

- Okay, a motion by Alder Dorff to get back to regular business.

- Second.

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

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? We are back to regular order of business. I will definitely entertain a motion.

- I move to approve this plan.

- Second.

- Second.

- Alder Dorff, I think Matt was second, right Matt? I believe you were?

- I think Melanie, might've gotten that one.
- Melanie got it, okay. I'm sorry.
- I'm willing to share it. Correct.
- Alder Dorff, and a second by Melanie. Any questions or comments?
- Nope, I just, thanks.
- Yep.
- Thank you very much.
- All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Good luck, David and Ed. I think things will go quite well. And again, great to see in Green Bay. Thank you. Item number two. Consideration with possible action on a request by Impact Seven for a Planning Option Extension on 420 South Broadway. Is that you again, Neil?
- Yes, sir. If you folks remember, Impact Seven came in and requested a planning option, I believe it was back in Spring. Essentially, what we're looking for is that if they provided good communication with us, and showed progress--
- What's going on around here?
- Towards achieving their financing. Whoop. Hear everybody okay? It was simply a matter of if they were communicating and showing progress that they could come back and request an extension. They have been in very good communication with staff. They are making progress on their concept. They also have demonstrated clear progress on their financing. As such, staff is essentially recommending approving the planning option be extended to March 1st, 2022.
- Questions, comments?
- I think this is great. And I would, if we want a motion, just let me know.
- Okay. I will entertain a motion.
- [Brian] Chair?
- Yes, please. Matt?
- Brian Johnson.

- [Gary] Oh, Brian, great.

- Yeah. I just wanted to comment. I've had an opportunity to. Tough times on this project. And just for the Commission's own edification here, we did that Shipyard Corridor Master Plan study, which really called out the different types of uses that we're pursuing there. And this property absolutely aligns with that objective. The renderings that they provided. Strong retail presence along that corridor. Four to five story structure. So I just kind of wanted to point that out, that it's in alignment with the Master Plan that's been created for that area. And so planning option, obviously, is where we're at right now. This is a slam dunk to me. And I'm really eager to see the development agreement come forward.

- Those comments coming from you mean a lot. Thank you, Alderman Johnson.

- I move to approve.

- Alder Dorff.

- Second.

- Deby, I think, did Deby second?

- Deby?

- Okay.

- Alder Dorff made a motion, Deby second. Any questions or comments before we call for the vote? All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. Excellent comments. Very good amendment. Consideration with possible action on an amendment to the development agreement with Toonen Properties for an expanded project at 2540 University Avenue. Neil, is that you again?

- Yep, if this one seems vaguely familiar, it's because it is. We did spend a considerable amount of time here with the RDA here, kind of getting this and dialing this in. When we first did this, essentially, the determination and just kind of the status of negotiations at that point was that the property would exclude the two existing properties that had already been constructed by T & B Properties. So the rest of the development site, so if you remember the previous development agreement had a lot of references to the master parcel versus the property and all kinds of different things going on. Well, in good news, is that discussions have continued. Toonen Properties is now interested in acquiring those two buildings as a part of the project, and also making some additional improvements probably to those structures going forward. So this is simply a request to modify the agreement to reflect that. Here's the, these are the structures here on your screen. These are the two existing buildings that are up there. So they're just looking to incorporate those as part of their project. Some of the specific references, which are in kind of the marked up version of the agreement in your packet. Essentially, because of this, it's kind of delayed their improvement a little bit because of the additional complications with adding these two structures to their overall project. So they're

looking at slowing down their start just a little bit and extending out the period from 2038 to 2040 in terms of TIF. But there is no additional funding requested at this time. It's primarily a schedule change and then subject to kind of refining the exact language that we have related to the construction of the bike path. So a fairly minor change, but I think a very substantial one, in terms of the overall quality of the project going forward. And we were very, staff was very pleased to be able to bring this forward. So with that, available to answer any questions you might have.

- It'll be nice to be able to be dealing with one owner. I think that's gonna simplify things. One of our follow-ups, way back when, was in regard to a water supply, in particular for fire protection. How'd that follow-up go?

- Yes, sir. At this point, so we've put the developer's engineers in touch with the Water Utility to see if there's a discussion and to let us know if there were any issues. We have not heard anything back, Mr. Chair. We'll certainly keep that on the list in terms of, I think, that will remain in there, in terms of when they bring forward their actual development concept, that that we'll be verifying that at that time. Because until we actually have a hard unit count and where they're actually going to be placed and elevations, I think it's difficult for our water engineers to actually fully be able to say, "Yes, it's good to go for sure." So we will be confirming with the Water Utility when we have a set of conceptual plans.

- Questions or comments? If not, I will certainly entertain a motion.

- Gary, I would certainly make the motion to approve the proposed changes, subject to a final review by the city attorney and prepare a formal revised development agreement.

- Motion made by Matt.

- [Kathy] I'll second that.

- And I think a second by Kathy.

- [Kathy] Yes.

- Questions or comments with regard to the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. Like I said, I think it's gonna be nice to be dealing with one owner. I think that's gonna simplify things. Thanks.

- [Neil] Absolutely.

- Number four. Consideration with possible action on providing financial assistance to Hotel Northland to pave the parking lot at 330 North Adams Street.

- Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll take this one as well. Staff has been in regular communications with Mr. Kenny Didier, the manager at the Northland, who is on the call here, if you have any specific

questions for him. In terms of, this lot has been around since, well since the project has opened. Code generally requires that lot to be paved and fully kind of finished off. We have not really been overly active in pursuing it at this point, simply because of the COVID-19 restrictions and income restrictions that we know the hotel and hospitality industry is dealing with right now. And in terms of even, the number of staff at the Northland has had to kind of let go and is slowly rehiring back, kind of trying to get back to full operations here. Even in light of additional COVID concerns coming up here again this fall, as we're dealing with right now. So through several discussions with the Northland, came up with the option of trying to provide some temporary financial assistance for them to actually get this work done by May 1st, by next spring, and then allowing them the ability to pay the city back over five years. Essentially the terms that we're looking at would be, some design approval on the city's end, just to make sure that it's done in accordance with what we would expect a standard to be. But then, again, just allowing that to then be paid back over time. So we're looking at about \$150,000 over a five-year term. We were suggesting 2% interest. Again, not necessarily, I think, really the main objective is to get this lot paved and to get it back into accordance with code and to do so in a manner that is not a financial burden, certainly, an additional one, to the Northland at this point. So with that, certainly available to answer any questions folks may have. I believe Mr. Didier is also on the phone, if anyone would like to ask him any questions.

- [Kenny] I am here. Thank you.

- [Gary] Alder Dorff, please?

- I don't have any questions. I just will say that this is great. This is a great use of the 150,000. And it'll make that lot paved. It'll make it all look much nicer. And I'm completely 100% in favor of doing this. Thank you.

- Neil, this is gonna be done on one of the TIFs, is that correct?

- That's correct. We're looking at, I believe it's TIF 13, is the source of funds we're looking at for this one.

- And TIF 13 is in good shape?

- It is. I've been working with Diana, obviously, in our Finance Department to assume that that would be the proper source for these funds. We were looking at a couple of different possibilities for this one, but again, with just the number of demands for funds, we felt TIF 13 was the most appropriate use for this one.

- [Gary] Okay, good.

- Yeah, and that will definitely make a big difference. So I agree.

- I don't think there's any particular reason to open the meeting. Any other questions or comments?

- No.

- No.

- No? All right, then I'll entertain a motion. Kathy?
- I will make a motion to, I'm trying to read this right here.
- Probably, Kathy, you could probably say refer to staff.
- To pave the parking lot of the Northland Hotel.
- [Neil] Per staff recommendation, would be great, Kathy.
- Motion made by Kathy.
- [Brighid] Second. Brighid.
- Is that Melanie? I'm sorry, who?
- That was Brighid.
- Oh, Brighid. Oh, sorry. Thank you, Brighid.
- Mm hm.
- I didn't have a full screen there. Okay, a motion by Kathy, second by Brighid. Any other questions or comments to the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion will signify by saying aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you.
- [Kenny] Thank you.
- And I agree. I think it's gonna really make the lot nicer and cleaner, if you will. Number five. Consideration with possible action on the allocation of State of Wisconsin Community Development Block Grant Coronavirus Round 2 funding, CDBG-CV. This is the one we talked about last meeting?
- [Barb] Mm hm.
- [Gary] Alder Dorff?
- Yep, just, I guess I'll just go ahead and just give a quick intro on this one. This was presented and referred back to staff at council. As we had time before our next council meeting next week, we decided that we would also just maybe bring it back to this body, just for an update, to show exactly kind of where we were at. The staff memo, essentially, that was provided as part of your packet, I think provides additional information in terms of why the staff recommendation was what it was. We are certainly open to any other suggestions if folks would have any. We would be happy to take a look at them. But, essentially, wanted to provide that as a courtesy back to the RDA just to provide. So again, that's the staff memo that's going to city council in response to the referral. So I just wanted to see if there were any additional questions or any suggestions?

- Appreciate it very much. Alder Dorff, I'll get to you in one second. But Brigid, I very much would like to hear your opinion on this, please?

- Yeah, so Mike and I did not get to connect, but I'm hoping we still can. It was mainly, my schedule was a challenge to be reckoned with. But I learned a little bit more in talking with some of the aldermen and the mayor a little bit. But this has kind of a multifaceted approach. And it's not simply for internet in the park, which helped me understand it. I still think it makes sense for Mike and I to connect and make sure that we're being as creative as possible to fit the city's needs.

- Okay. Alder Dorff, please?

- I just guess I want to express that I'm mildly irritated that this had to come back again. I think we talked it to death at RDA last time. We came up with a good recommendation to council. And the majority of council then moved it to come back, but some did not. And I think this is still a great plan. Very creative. Lots of things can be happening because of this. So again, I'm going to be very much in favor of it. And I'm hoping that at council next week it will be passed. And I'd love to hear from Alder Johnson.

- Alder Johnson, are you still aboard?

- Yeah. So I guess I'm not mildly irritated that this was kicked back. I'm the one that pulled it at council. And it was referred on a nine to three vote. A significant number of the members on council just wanted more information. And that's what staff has provided. And so we appreciate that, because the information that was provided in the report was information that wasn't necessarily talked about publicly. So I think there were some concerns about spending a quarter of a million dollars on providing Wi-Fi to four parks, that there wasn't really a compelling case made that it would see high usage. And so we just wanted more information around that. I personally spent some time talking to Will Peters as well as Mike Hronek and Director Stechschulte. We were inquiring about secondary and tertiary benefits, and I think some of those were detailed and those weren't articulated during the meeting. And so now that those are articulated in the report, I think that's very useful and very helpful with making the decision. I think the other component of this was understanding what other uses were possible. And so that also was documented. Now, after my conversations, I feel much more comfortable with where it's at and what they're doing. I would say, when you look at the other nine council members, there were eight others who voted to send it back. I think it's incumbent upon them to do their research, understand these other uses, and if they want to reallocate, they can do that. But where my conversations have landed, I feel comfortable with the additional information, and the recommendation as well.

- Nothing beats additional information. Nothing wrong with that at all. Any other questions or comments?

- I still like Alder Dorff. I just want to point that out.

- And Alder Johnson's still on my prayer list.

- I just have to echo what Brian is saying, though. I did catch some raised eyebrows after the article ran and stuff. "Why are you putting internet in a park for the summer?" So, like Brian, I feel like I got

more information and I think there's a multi-use. It might even be helpful to discuss with the public as well, just as far as, I got a lot of questions, as to why we would do that.

- Brigid, are you comfortable? It's a very, very tough question for you to answer, but are you comfortable with the dollar amount for what's gotta be done?

- Yeah, the dollar amount does not surprise me at all.

- Okay. Very good. Thank you, Brigid.

- Yeah.

- Any other questions or comments? If not, I will entertain a motion.

- I have one question. You can hear me, right?

- Yes.

- Okay. So is this year-round, these parks? Or is this just, I wasn't here for last meeting. So I apologize. So just tell me that.

- Mr. Chair, Gary do you want me to answer that one?

- Yes, please.

- I can answer that. Yeah, the position we're working on with Director Hronek on this, Kathy, is that the internet access would be available year-round. But the idea is to make sure that it stretches far enough so that it actually reaches into like parking areas at these park facilities. So if someone needed to get in to get internet access, they don't have to stand out in the middle of the park in the middle of winter. 'Cause there's an idea that, I think, eventually, as we continue to look down at some of these things, I think we're also looking at the possibility of, as additional shelter facilities may come online in these areas, or other improvements, that the access to provide more of an indoor facility where that could be available would also be considered. But, right now the idea was to make sure that it was located in such a manner as to provide maximum access year-round, if at all possible.

- And the, my last question is, the system that you're looking at to do that, is it scalable to go to other parts of the city so that we aren't building it, and that that system is, we can continue to grow it?

- Yeah, absolutely. I think a considerable amount of the investment that we'll be looking at here, Kathy, is actually the fiber that needs to go in the ground to service these Wi-Fi locations. And that will be part of the city's network, it will actually expand to several options. I think we identified in the staff memo regarding to traffic cameras, intersections along that same route, security cameras at park facilities or police facilities. There are multiple, multiple benefits beyond just the Wi-Fi internet access in these individual areas, which we feel are very beneficial, not only to the actual, possible residents needing access in there, but service providers providing different things in those park facilities, but there are also very clear secondary benefits to expand the city's fiber network along with this project.

- Okay. Now I'll entertain--
- Move to approve.
- Alder Dorff, a motion made by Alder Dorff.
- I would second that.
- And Matt, second. Questions or comments in regard to the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Neil, when I think about this, real quick comment, totally unrelated, but I always enjoy the face-to-face with the committee. Is that gonna happen?
- Me too.
- Is that gonna happen? When?
- That's a good question, Mr. Chair, and I'll talk about that as part of my director's report.
- Okay, yeah. Sorry about that.
- Okay, no problem.
- I digress. Okay, number six. Consideration with possible action on a request to execute an agreement with West Shore Pipeline Company to abandon an existing petroleum gas pipeline at 420 South Broadway.
- Mr. Chair, I'll take that.
- Yes, please.
- Close to our Badger Sheet Metal building that we own.
- Yes, yes yes.
- Over the entire city of Green Bay, and this is a section that actually falls on Redevelopment Authority property. So really, they're not excavating, they're kind of digging down, uncapping, and filling the pipe with a grout material. The pipes haven't been used for, I think, 18 years. So this is a standard agreement that's been reviewed by the Law Department, and I would recommend that we execute it.
- Okay.
- So--

- So, okay?

- [Kathy] Motion to approve.

- A motion by Kathy to approve. And a second by Alder Dorff. Any other questions or comments?

- Chair?

- [Gary] Yes, please.

- Thank you. So actually of all the items, this is the one I was just most curious about. If someone from staff, if it's Cheryl, if you could just explain. When we sort of abandon, I mean, these pipelines in place, can you just maybe help explain, does the pipeline stay there? So if it ever needs to be removed later, does that become the city or the RDA's responsibility?

- Talking to the West Shore representative, the pipe has been there, first of all, for about 18 years. It has been purged of all gasoline product. So they really want to just complete the project by filling the line completely. They leave it there. The company is gonna be responsible. If there is any type of environmental issues, West Shore remains responsible for that. The rights will be extinguished by West Shore. And we will have the ability to use the site, drive on it, do whatever we want over the site. We probably would've had an issue with that before, I'm thinking, but, because it hasn't been abandoned. So again, they mentioned that landowner will be able to install driveways, fences, sheds, anything above that grouted pipeline. So they've been doing this work, I think, at a number of spots in the city. I asked our Public Works Department, like, "Hey, is this okay, does this work? "Does the agreement work?" And it does. So I don't know if that helps out at all?

- Yeah. And I'm just thinking about some of the development work that's in play over in that Shipyard area, whether it's the private site. I, obviously, it's a small map. But if it extends over into the other Shipyard area, are there any concerns there that we might need to dig where this pipeline lies?

- I guess we won't know that until we see some type of a development plan of where they're actually gonna go down. I don't think, I guess, in talking with the West Shore folks, I don't think it would be an issue if we needed to take it out for some reason. I think it's just, they're just abandoning it at this point. I guess I don't have the answer to the question with regards to what might happen in the future, if that needs to come up.

- Is there maybe a question of, is there an option to fill it in or remove it? Are those, is that kind of what you're getting to, Brian?

- Yeah, I just want to understand that if there's a future need for that land, and this pipelines in there, whose responsibility is it?

- Is that clear in the agreement? Cheryl, is it clear?

- Oh, I'm looking, I'm checking it out.

- Good question.

- Yeah, I guess I'm not sure. I have to go through this.
- I would agree that if you're doing any construction, you would want to remove it. You wouldn't leave it in under a foundation. You'd have to cut it out if your foundation wall went through it, et cetera. So your best case would be to get rid of it, if there was any development there.
- I would think with the proximity to the railroad there, I'm not sure.
- Right, it might not interfere at all. So it might not be, it might be non--
- Option, since it was so close to the railroad, but I don't know the answer to that with regards to them pulling it out. 'Cause really the agreement is for them to abandon it in place.
- And so what you're thinking is this may have such close proximity to the railroad tracks that it becomes kind of a moot point anyway?
- Mm hm.
- Right.
- Okay. And we can, I mean, if you would just maybe internally check with legal. I mean, if this was in the middle of a field, I wouldn't be as concerned, right? But it's in an area where we're planning for some major development, and I just want to make sure that it doesn't emerge as issue, as we're pursuing some of those projects. So, if you have time, Cheryl, between now and the council meeting, to verify that, that's great. And then I don't think we need to discuss it any further.
- [Cheryl] Okay. I'll check.
- And just knowing about installing broadband to fiber, we have to go under railroads and I don't know if that would cause an additional obstacle, I'm not sure. But it's not just buildings, it's fiber too.
- I will check on that before the council meeting.
- We could certainly make a motion based on our findings, or based on Cheryl's findings or whatever. It would be good if we could move it along so it could go to council, though.
- Because, in reading the document, it sounds like they're filling the whole pipeline. And there's just a piece of it that's on RDA property.
- Right.
- But it does say that after the work is completed, that it's to be abandoned in place and becomes a permanent part of the property.
- Matt, it sounds like, I need.
- No, well, I would make the motion that we execute the Pipeline Access and Abandonment Agreement subject to the check that Cheryl is doing with the Law Department.

- Okay. Matt made a motion. Is there a second?
- I'll second that.
- And Melanie second. Any other questions or comments in regard to the motion and second? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. Number seven. Consideration with possible action on awarding, additional CDBG and HOME funding to the Home Improvement Loan Program contract with NeighborWorks Green Bay. Who's got this one?
- That's me, Gary.
- Oh great.
- This one, yeah.
- Please.
- Okay, so this item is to award some additional funding. We received our 2021 CDBG and HOME Entitlement Funding last month. And last year we subcontracted our HOME Improvement Loan Program to NeighborWorks Green Bay. And in that contract, we only had the 2021 funding. So that contract, or that RFP, was awarded for a three-year period. And each year we would have to bring back the additional funding based on our annual action plan that we are going to supply to that HOME Improvement Loan Program. So that is essentially what this item is doing. In our 2021 we allocated 50,000 in CDBG funds to the HOME Improvement Loan Program and 150,000 in HOME funding. Along with those two additional fundings, in our annual action plan, we allocate our program income back to the HOME Improvement Loan Program. So I'd like to add the additional \$134,800.00 that we received in 2021 program income.
- And staff concurs with all of this, Neil and Cheryl?
- [Neil] Yes sir.
- Okay. Other questions or comments? I guess I'll entertain a motion.
- I'll make a motion to authorize the award of the additional CDBG and HOME funding to the HOME Improvement Loan Program contract with NeighborWorks Green Bay, as noted.
- Motion made by Melanie.
- I'll second.
- A second by Kathy. Any other questions or comments in regard to the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. Number eight. Consideration with possible action on a request by Bicycle Collective for permission to hold a fundraiser at 418 4th Street and adjacent parcels owned by the RDA.

- This is me, Gary, Ronda.

- [Gary] Ronda.

- The Bicycle Collective is looking for doing a fundraiser. They have applied and approved for a special event, permitting them to hold the fundraiser on September 26th, from noon to 4:00 PM. They do have, I did attach a diagram, of how they would like to place these things. The things that they are including are tents, a stage for live music. They do have the sale of beer and seltzer with licensed bartenders. Portable bathrooms, two bounce houses, and the Lil Jamaica food truck.

- Wow.

- Wow.

- Wow.

- I'll be there.

- They have provided us with a copy of their insurance binder, and, as I said, the diagram of how they're gonna place it. This is actually one of their largest fundraisers. They usually do a different location every year. But this year they wanted to do it at the actual garage where they currently rent from us, just to kind of show what the bikes are, what the education and things they have there, versus doing it at another location. We as staff do recommend that we do give them the ability to be able to hold this fundraiser, contingent on the fact that they sign a hold harmless agreement by all parties.

- Okay. That's key right there, hold harmless.

- [Kathy] Mm hm. Hold harmless.

- Yep.

- Questions, comments?

- I really love what the Bicycle Collective is doing. I would be in full support of this and ready to make a motion to approve it.

- It sounds like a motion. Thank you, Brigid.

- Mm hm.

- I'll second her motion.

- And Alder Dorff seconds it. Any other questions or comments? If not, all in favor of the motion signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. Number nine. It sounds like a good time. I want to see if I can attend that. Number nine. Consideration with possible action on awarding a CD 21-02 Seymour Park Pedestrian Crossing and Alley Resurfacing to the low qualified bidder, Peters Concrete, in the amount of \$177,483.00. How many people bid, just out of curiosity? Were there very many bidders?

- There was only one bid.

- Oh. Okay, it's the best bid, right? Anyway, it's competitive, as far as staff's concerned?

- Yes, yeah, it is competitive. Last month you gave us authority to approve, staff approved in order to expedite this contract.

- [Gary] Yes.

- But the one bid came in higher. DPW staff reviewed it and does recommend the additional funding towards this contract.

- Okay. Questions or comments? If not, I'll entertain a motion to, I'll just entertain a motion, period.

- I'd make the motion that we award the contract to Peters Concrete in the amount of \$177,483.00.

- Thank you, Matt.

- I'll second that.

- And I think that's Melanie, yes it is. Thank you, Melanie. Any other questions or comments with regard to the motion? If not, all in favor of the motion signify by saying aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. We had a lot of things on the agenda. We did well, especially since we've got a big group. Thank you, guys and gals. All right. Sorry. Informational. Update on the Housing Study. Cheryl?

- Okay. So I guess what I wanted to update you this month on is one of our goals from the Housing Study was talking about establishing a housing committee. And I'm not sure if everyone's aware of how much work is being done, really, by the community and by staff and local governments with regards to affordable housing. So I just wanted to tell you some of the committees that have been formed as a result of this. First of all, we just have our internal department committees, neighborhoods, land development, project committees, that are always seeking out housing developments internally through our office. And then we also have staff that sit on the Brown County

Homeless and Housing Coalition, so we contribute with regards to that initiatives. But then we also have some new committees that were formed. And I have to tell you about this, because I was talking to the neighborhood team, and I'm like, wow, we have a lot of committees that are going on, dealing with housing, which is great. We have a new team that we've put together with Green Bay Planning staff and Development staff and Brown County Planning and Development staff, to look at land within the city and actually county, that can be used for development purposes. So that's new to us. We also have, I sit on this newly formed Brown County Housing Authority Subcommittee, which was formed as a result of, I think, some work the city council did when we were talking about finding ways to incentivize landlords to using our Housing Choice Voucher Program in the county. So we're working on that, which is great. We also have something called a HOT Team, which is led by the Police Department. We have a staff person that sits on that, which is really boots on the ground issues, dealing with homelessness. The Green Bay Chamber has a Housing Working Group, because housing is important to business as well. People want to come to a city where there's places for their employees to live. So Neil and I sit on that Chamber Housing Working Group. There's also an internal group that meets with the Mayor. We've got our city staff, our Police Department, our Parks staff, and then we also have some representatives from the county that meet regularly to talk about how to deal really in real time with some of our homeless issues. The program that's operating out of St. John's Park, for example, that comes out of this committee. And then, just recently, there's a team that's putting together a community conversations to engage the community on affordable housing discussions. What does the city do? What does the county do? How to explain all of this? And that's coming up in November. And there's gonna be a panel discussion and then open conversation, trying to just work out the issues in the community with housing. So that one little, establish a housing committee, right? It's really, we've done a lot of that, which is great. People are really interested in and working on finding ways to bring more housing to Green Bay. So I just wanted to report out some of that.

- Wow! Lots of activity. Cheryl, way back when the study came out, it said, low-income housing, you need 3,700 by 2040, market rate apartments, we need 3,700 by 2040. Still feel those are the right numbers that we're at that much of a shortage?

- Well, from what I hear from the community, yes. I think it's still hard to find, especially very low-income housing with supportive services. So we're concentrating on those efforts. But yes, I think we still, we're at the point yet where we've got to the hump, where we can hold off above that.

- Okay.

- But we still need more.

- That's fine.

- But we--

- Thank you.

- As reported out, how many units we've created, which is, I think we're gonna look the numbers as phenomenal.

- Yes.

- I think we're gonna do a great job, but we can do better.
- Okay. Questions for Cheryl? Thank you, Cheryl. You guys have been busy. Keep up the great work.
- Yeah, thanks, Cheryl.
- Financial report and check register. I have no questions. I don't know if anybody else did? RDA loan update. Matt, are you still chair of that committee. Is that, well, who's doing the loan update, first of all? Somebody's doing it.
- Is that Wendy?
- [Stephanie] Nope, that's me, that's Stephanie. I couldn't get myself to unmute. I am sorry about that. So we did this, unfortunately, it's been over a year since we've done this, because of the pandemic. So this is just an update on where we are with the loans that we have through the CDBG and HOME, and a couple other funding sources. So this is just an update to let you guys know. We have had a couple of bankruptcies and foreclosures, which is not unforeseen with the current circumstances. So I just wanted to bring this back to you guys so you could see where we're at.
- Good. Any questions at all? Thank you, Stephanie.
- Mm hm.
- Director's report and project updates. Neil, you've got the--
- A couple of quick ones, yep. A couple of quick ones here. Let me share my screen here. I usually try to get this written up, but I just kind of kept going with slides today to kind of, that was the mode I was in, so I just went in and added some things here. I just want to highlight a couple of things that are probably coming to the next RDA meeting or two. One, we're looking at, we had 1901 to 1971 Main Street. This was developed for, Garritt Bader had sold this project to another developer, which is certainly within his rights to do so, and the agreement requires a written notice to be done. We're pretty sure that this was previously verbally authorized by Director Vonck when he was here, but we didn't have a record of it, a written record of it. So we're essentially trying to go back and clean that up and provide that. Garritt has provided written notice to us that that is in fact the case, and the City Attorney has advised us that you guys do need to actually take action on that. So it was meant to go on this agenda and I just missed it. But I've talked to Garritt, we're gonna be bringing it back for the October meeting to get it formally reviewed and recommendation will be for approval to process that PayGo payment. It's just essentially accepting the transfer of ownership notice, is the main item there. A couple of other ones that we're working with Mr. Bader on is in terms of doing some pedestrian improvements related to the Main and East Town Way area. This is subject to further conversation with our director of public works, but we certainly liked the way Garritt is thinking right here, in terms of enhancing some pedestrian access in the area, as well as adding some aesthetics, some lighting, and some landscaping and some other things to the area. So staff is currently evaluating that. Looks like the budget we're looking at probably is around the \$500,000.00 mark for a contribution towards that. But again, in concept, we're very excited about that. We just need to make sure that there's gonna be an adequate cashflow available to maybe make that come in. So staff is currently evaluating that. We like the concept. It's just making sure we've got the

appropriate funds available to assist with what Mr. Bader is considering. Similarly, Garritt is never known to be shy about his requests in terms of heading for the stars. When he swings for the fence, he really swings for the fence. He has had some conversations with our DPW about possibly doing some alterations to the frontage road in this particular, the Main Street region, where he's looking at. Obviously it's a major infrastructure change and major design change to that intersection if that was to be considered. But there are certainly currently activity by Brown County looking to making improvements in this area, as well as well as our own Department of Public Works is already considering some improvements as well. So he was kind of proposing some public, and actually looking at some traffic impact analysis for this area, about what would it take to either eliminate that frontage road or provide alternative access to this area to try to maybe clean up the intersections in this particular area. There hasn't been a dollar figure set upon this yet. And again, this is certainly a very preliminary level here in terms of discussing that. Again, this is obviously, we have several areas like this within the city that where these frontage roads do exist. I think some of them work fairly well. Some of them not so well, in terms of when traffic gets busy, trying to navigate some of those intersections. So this is maybe kind of a first kind of look at this and maybe making some future improvements to this area. Are there things we should be looking at differently? So certainly to be determined on that one, but again, probably a worthy, he's probably correct in terms of it would be functioning better. It probably is going to come down to a cost benefit analysis in terms of what the overall investment requirement would be to make those specific types of improvements. So likely to be coming forward in a report to this body here soon. We have an active request for some, basically some facade improvements assistance to the East Town area, specifically the Hobby Lobby building, as well as the overall acquisition. Again, the overall percentages of overall increment coming in is certainly very competitive compared to other projects we've looked at. It's simply a matter of kind of really going through and evaluating exactly what sort of improvements are being proposed and then what is the actual cashflow available then to fund those improvements? So staff is currently evaluating those things. Again, likely to try to bring back, hopefully, a recommendation, with some additional information to you in October. With that, here's just some of the last highlights. The WPS site is under contract by Base Companies. We're anticipating meeting with them, hopefully, probably in the coming month or two, to start discussing exactly what sort of improvements and intentions and plans they have for the WPS site.

- This is the office complex, right?

- Yes, sir. That's absolutely.

- Okay.

- Yeah. This is all just kind of off of the north of downtown, I guess actually an extension of downtown and right along the river. So that's probably the largest redevelopment site that we'll be dealing with probably here for the foreseeable future, looking at this particular area. So it will be interesting to see exactly what that could involve, what sort of uses are gonna be going in there? Is there going to maybe be a relocation of city parking facilities to that area if we take another one down? And we know we need to build a new one in the future. There's gonna be lots of, obviously, riverfront access. That's gonna be one thing to look at. Is there gonna be docking and other things available for this particular area on the river? There's all kinds of things that need to be vetted out for this. So hopefully some good initial discussions to have, and then kind of really decide exactly how that's going to proceed forward. This one, Mr. Chair, you had requested. Bourneman's Senior Care facility has closed, and it's potentially been sold. We have not been able to verify that at this point.

But right now what we're hearing is that another healthcare provider has potentially acquired the facility. And I know the reason, Gary, you asked, is I think we have an investment. We, the RDA has an investment in that building. We helped make some improvements there.

- [Gary] That's right.

- So we'll certainly be needing to go back and review our agreements there and see exactly what may need to be carrying forward on that, depending on who the buyer is and what the intentions of that facility going forward. So hopefully gonna have more of an update for you at our next meeting, but we are aware of it and we are trying to kind of track down exactly what the new purchase, if it in fact has been acquired, what the new intentions for the facility might be.

- Good. Thank you.

- Continue the site discussions with Merge. Mostly with our DPW and our Fire Department, in terms of fire access and how the site works with those items. Also, still waiting for an updated submittal from TWG at the Fort. They're still working on kind of revising their capital stack and moving forward. That involves some potential use changes in the building. We've been promised that a couple of different times now and it has not yet arrived. We're hopefully still, in the next couple of weeks, we see something to bring forward. JBS site meeting, we're gonna be meeting with residents, kind of a public information meeting, in the Imperial Lane neighborhood. Tentatively set for September 23rd, just to kind of show them the site and what kind of things the city may be taking a look at as part of that RFP process, when we go out for the redevelopment of that site. Obviously housing was a key factor to why JBS donated that property to us. But there's also an urban farm concept. There is a community park concept that's being discussed. Some other things that we need to figure out exactly, what is the interest of the neighborhood and what sort of things do they want to see here. Hopefully some improved connection, other things to that, to this immediate neighborhood. So this will be kind of kicking off that process prior to us sending out the RFP for that particular site. We are proceeding with bond refinancing at the KI Center. Obviously this body provided the resolution to proceed on that. We're still going through that process with our bond counsel right now. We may be actually going out to an alternative rating to try to see if we can actually get a little bit better rating. We're good with the one we got, but there's a slight chance, in terms of another one, may give us a slightly higher one. So we are looking just to see if that is going to be achievable. And then, just to note, that staff participated in the InDevelopment Conference that was held at the KI center on September 9th. The poor people had to listen to me present for 15, 20 minutes and just kind of talk about, I did a comparison between what I'm seeing here in Green Bay versus my time down in the Madison market, and kind of what are some of the differences between the two. Supposedly, Gary, there is a recording of it somewhere.

- Good, thank you.

- So I'm trying to find out who's got it. And as soon as we know, I'll certainly be happy to share that with everybody.

- Yeah, share with the whole committee, please. By the way, Insight magazine, I thought the write-up in regard to Green Bay was extremely well-written and very positive. And I really appreciate the write-up. I thought that was very, very well done. Thank you. If anybody gets a chance to see it, it's in

the Insight magazine, it's very, very positive in regard to Green Bay. And I would imagine, Neil, you had a lot to do with that writing?

- We did provide some notes. It's always nice when you get, the magazine writer actually kind of actually kept what we told them and took it, they kind of matched what we sent in. So it's always nice. Sometimes they get a little bit of creative license on there and have to go back and reign them back in a little bit. But no, they were actually a pleasure to work with and did a very nice job for us.

- Good. I agree. Earlier on when we talked about the gas pipeline, in regard to Badger Sheet Metal property, anything new there? Anything going forward with that piece of property?

- The Badger Sheet Metal project is that Impact Seven project that we actually discussed earlier, Gary. So their planning option is proceeding on there. So yeah, we're excited. In fact, I'm tying it all together. Impact Seven actually participated in the InDevelopment Conference last week. We got to meet with some of their representatives and we're very excited about their progress. So we think that they're gonna hopefully be coming back, I thinking by springtime, with a more fully kind of designed concept and probably kind of, probably, I'm assuming, with their requests for some TIF assistance for that site, probably in the spring.

- Okay. Questions for Neil and staff?

- Just a question. I don't think I know all the lingo from the cool kids yet. TWG at the Fort, is that the Rail Yard?

- No, TWG, is actually the developer, it is the name of the developer. That's their actual corporate name, is TWG. The Fort is the Rail Yard project.

- Okay.

- So it's the location. So yeah. Well, happy to answer that anytime, Brighid. No, anytime you have a question on that, please speak up, happy to do it.

- I know we use a lot of acronyms in our business.

- Government's got most of them, other than the Military, they may, yeah, we take a pretty close second, I think.

- Anyway, I kind of asked about this earlier. As you know, I very much enjoy face-to-face meetings.

- Yes.

- And is it gonna happen anytime soon?

- Yeah, at this point, we're probably gonna be, we're kind of continually keeping an eye on that, Mr. Chair, in terms of kind of looking for our options on that. I know the one situation, again, we do have the option to, I think at this point, to again, for social distancing and so forth, the Council Chambers remains our primary option to doing that. I know our preference has been, at least at the committee level, is to still meet back up in 604, I think is our potential. So we're gonna take a look and see if

there's a way we can social distance better in that particular room. And I think that's kind of where we're at at this point. I know we were kind of counting on that. Being able to spread out more in Council Chambers, but if there's a way for us to spread out more in 604 and maybe make that acceptable, we're kind of taking a look at that right now.

- Okay. I don't know what the preference of the rest of the group, but until we get back to 604, I think the Zoom meetings are fine. Alder Dorff, do you have an opinion on that?

- I think that Zoom meetings are fine, especially with what's happening with the Delta variant and now knowing that we'd be wanting to wear masks throughout the meeting. So Zoom meetings are a little more convenient right now, I think.

- Especially if it's the Council Chambers or 604. I think 604, once we get back to 604, it'd be fine. But Council Chambers, I don't like the different levels, et cetera. That's just me. Any other comments or questions in regard to the staff or Neil?

- Chair?

- Alder Johnson, please.

- Thank you. Just one, Neil, 'cause you alluded to the refinancing of the bond structure on KI. Now I know it's not this simple, but it would be nice if we were able to realize some savings on a bond restructuring deal there, if we could start to consider the installation of an escalator, I think that was one of the biggest misses on the expansion of that project. And if there was sufficient savings from that bond deal that we could evaluate that, I just think that would be a worthwhile thing for us to look at to make that facility a little bit more competitive. So nothing you need to do with it right now, but I just kind of want to toss that out there.

- Good comment. Neil, any?

- No, I think that has actually been brought up in other discussions. I think it's just, it's mostly just a matter of physically figuring out, I mean, if it goes into where the existing stairway is at, and it's certainly taking a look at that and evaluating the feasibility to this point, but, yeah, I think there are some discussions, at least on a very preliminary level, that have actually come up on that. But I think that's something we'll keep an eye on and we'll continue to bring forward if there are savings with this, Alder Johnson. So we'll send that forward.

- Any other questions for staff or Neil? Or comments, anybody got general comments about anything?

- I guess the only comment that I would make is, I do like the in-person meetings and having the dialogue back and forth, and being able to see everybody.

- Excellent. I agree.

- I just think it makes a big difference.

- I agree. I'm looking forward to getting back to that. Absolutely.

- Yes. And there's new committee members that not all of us have met in person.
- Yes.
- Exactly.
- Brigid, in particular. Absolutely. I agree with you. And I know Neil's working on it. I know he is. Anyway, as soon as he can. If there's no other questions or comments, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn, and our next meeting would be October 12th,
- Move to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn.
- By Kathy and Alder Dorff. All those in favor signify by saying aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? We are, and thanks, Alderman Johnson, for providing, and joining our meeting.