



MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 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 Hafs.

Members Present: Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Barbara Dorff, Melanie Parma, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, Excused:

Liaisons Present: Jeff Mirkes, Leah Weycker

Others Present: Ald. Brian Johnson, Mayor Eric Genrich

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the November 9, 2021, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff 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 October 12, 2021 and October 19, 2021, meetings of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Deby Dehn, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the minutes. 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 a change order for professional services from Stantec Consulting Services related to the Shipyard redevelopment project in the amount of \$285,000 on a time and materials basis.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Melanie Parma to approve the proposed change order from Stantec in the amount of \$285,000 subject to final authorization 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.

2. Consideration with possible action to approve contract "Parks 3-21 Leicht Park Fenders and Mooring" to Michels Foundation for \$743,507.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Brighid Riordan to approve contract "Parks 3-21 Leicht Park Fenders and Mooring" to Michels Foundation for \$743,507. 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 a request from Habitat for Humanity to provide HOME funding for site improvements for a new home build at 1696 Deckner Avenue.

This item was held until the next meeting.

4. Consideration with possible action to award a planning option for the redevelopment of 158 N. Maple Avenue (tax parcel 4-95).

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Melanie Parma 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 Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff 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 Kathy Hinkfuss 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 Brighid Riordan, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss 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 Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Brighid Riordan to approve for staff to proceed on a

partnership project with UWGB to rehab 158 N. Maple Avenue and report back to the RDA in three months with an update as discussed. Motion Passed.

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

5. Consideration with possible action to approve an amendment to extend the development agreement with Giveadaam Ventures for the property located at 320 S. Webster Avenue (tax parcel 4-750) from July 17, 2021 to May 31, 2022.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the extension of the development agreement with Giveadaam Ventures to complete work at 320 N. Webster Avenue by May 31, 2022.

Motion Passed.

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

6. Consideration with possible action to approve a substantial amendment to the 2021 Annual Action Plan to add \$96,540.42 in closed out Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) income funds.

Moved by Deby Dehn, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve a substantial amendment to the 2021 Annual Action Plan to add \$96,540.42 in closed out Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) Income funds. 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 to award the 2021 Fair Housing Services contract to Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council in the amount of \$20,000.00.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Deby Dehn to award the 2021 Fair Housing Services funding in the amount of \$20,000.00 to Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council.

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 the acceptance of the transfer of ownership of 901 Main Street (tax parcel 9-48), and the assignment of the rights, title, interests and obligations of the development agreement dated December 12, 2018 from GB REAL ESTATE INVESTMENTS, LLC to GB 901 MAIN, LLC.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Brigid Riordan to approve the transfer of ownership, and execute the necessary documents subject to the final review by the City Attorney. 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 a likely planning option request on one or more RDA or City-owned properties in TID 5.

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 2:55 p.m.
Motion Passed.

Ald. Barbara Dorff read the closed session language.

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

Ald. Barbara Dorff left the meeting during the closed session.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Matt Schueller to return to regular session at 3:31 p.m.
Motion Passed.

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

No action was taken.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Update on Housing Study.

This item was held until next meeting.

2. Financial report and check register.

3. Director's report and project updates.

4. Next Meeting: Special Meeting to be scheduled between November 16th & November 23rd
(subject to a quorum)

Next Regular Meeting: December 14, 2021 at 1:30 PM

The special meeting will be November 18 at 1:30 p.m.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Matt Schueller to adjourn. Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Roll call, please.

- Delveaux.

- Yes.

- Schueller.
- Here.
- Dorff.
- Here.
- Dehn.
- Here.
- Hinkfuss.
- Here.
- Parma.
- Here.
- Riordan.
- Here.
- We have a full crew today, sir.
- Wow, fantastic. All right, and a full agenda. So we're gonna rock and roll here. A motion to approve.
- Motion to approve.
- Alder Dorff was it? Or Kathy?
- Kathy.
- Second, but .
- By saying aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Opposed, motion carried. Approval of the minutes from October 12 and October 19 meetings of the Redevelopment Authority. We had two sets of minutes. Hope everybody had a chance to glance at those.
- Move to approve.

- Deby?

- Yep.

- Second.

- All in favor of the minutes from the October 12 and October 19 signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried. Regular order of business. Number one, consideration of possible action on a change order for professional services from Stantec Consulting Services related to the Shipyard redevelopment project in the amount of \$285,000 on a time and materials basis. Neil, that must be you.

- Yes, sir, it is. This is obviously related to the Shipyard project. Obviously, I think RDA members are aware of the changes that this project has kind of gone through here over the past several years. Most recently was the change from the breakthrough, kind of office, corporate office concept, to the merge, residential, mixed use concept, essentially, for the site. Which we certainly are excited about, and is moving forward and is actually giving us more valuation and pretty much we're excited about the opportunities there. However, basically the change that occurred kind of mid-stream on that one, Stantec had actually made some considerable efforts in terms of moving down the path, designing for the earlier project, the Breakthrough project, and it essentially resulted in several changes based on the type, based on the change in land use, and the anchor tenant and the needs just being different. So part of that is certainly there's been some things that were done verbally authorized with Director Vonck while he was here, in terms of kind of moving some budget around and allocating some scope to keep the project moving and kind of deal with that change. However, we are just simply at a point where we need to kinda rectify the task order and the contract that Stantec. The example that was probably a great example of one of the things that was happening with new to the merge project was the additional time that was required with staff to try to figure out how to exactly get fire vehicle access and additional planning in and around all of the multi-family buildings. That certainly was not an issue with the previous project. So, there were some additional challenges with there. There was also some additional coordination that was done with Ace Marine in terms of the waterfront improvements, specifically, in terms of where there, basically their anchor points are on the shoreline for when they bring in for when they do, when they have a product being delivered to that site. So there was some additional coordination that was there. So, staff has actually met, Buchanan and myself, have met with Stantec, and discussed this about two or three different times and kinda gone through it. And we do believe that the changes are warranted at this point. Certainly not excited, never excited about having to spend more money just on design. We'll be much more excited when we get to actually spending things and moving dirt and getting some things to happen in the ground. But we knew, we have been assured that, in conversations with Stantec, that this, proving this change order will basically allow us to stay on schedule for basically getting the phase one improvements hopefully designed and bid early this year, probably in January, early '22 construction then in '22.

- Staying on schedule, so what is the schedule? I mean, as far as their involvement.

- We're really kind of rocketing towards trying to get the phase one improvements, the waterfront

improvements specifically , this area, some of the dock wall, the fishing pier, some of the other improvements, specifically related to the waterfront, the public areas, I guess I should say, Mr. Chair, are kind of the areas we're looking at. Ideally we're coordinating the construction on those with Merge Urban Development as they're proceeding on their site, which as of right now, we're assuming is also going to be in 2022 at some point, certainly subject to verification from them. But that is what their current agreement with them says. They may be looking at some delays and some design and work that we're waiting to hear back from them on. However, at this point we have no reason to believe that it would be different than 2022 to begin those construction, hopefully next year.

- Budget? And how much is that is left? And where are these funds coming from?

- Yeah, good question, sir. Absolutely, this is essentially, I believe the city council and the RDA have an agreement that essentially establishes an overall project for this budget, and I think we were looking at originally about a million dollar-

- Yes.

- Budget for design. So this does put us over that. This would put us at, basically at about \$1.28 million. But again, it was because of the change, obviously, that we've discussed here previously. So obviously any design dollars that goes in, that takes away from what we can actually do project wise if we don't do some degree of value engineering or some other ways. One of the things that staff has actually pursued to try to, again, try to recover, again, some of this cost. Stantec did make the suggestion that as we were coordinating with Merge in a particular, one particular aspect of where the waterfront is going to be, where their a patio is going to encroach a little bit into the public area, is that we'd actually just let them do the design work for that. Still subject to approval by the city, but actually let them do the design work because of their encroachment that they're doing there. So that's a cost we would not have to incur for that particular section. We would be doing the sections both to the left and right of this particular area where they would be doing this patio. However, that would be savings on our end that we would not have to incur that design cost. So we were looking for additional opportunities like that, and Stantec is also looking for additional opportunities to do that, to kind of, basically, hopefully recover some of that. We are also essentially going to be recommending, probably not till, not certainly throughout the end of this year, but early next year that the agreement between the RDA and the city council will be revisited, that originally that still has the old scope of work including Breakthrough. And I think even some of the things with the baseball stadium are still in that . That is the Badger Sheet Metal site that's immediately to the, across Broadway for this project. It's no longer part of the Shipyard project, but that scope of work still has redeveloping and doing work on that site as part of the Shipyard budget. That was, I think that was around a million dollars. Well, that's no longer really part of this project. There's, in fact, seven is a separate project. That's gonna be happening, and it's gonna have its own development agreement and its own TIF arrangement, but it is no longer part of the Shipyard deal. Well, according to our original documents, it still has that included as part of that. But we are confident that once we take a look at that, and then we reallocate the budget, that is funds that I think that Director Ellenbecker has did some borrowing for originally. Not something we like to do originally without projects moving forward. In this case, we're still confident that Merge Urban Development is moving forward on schedule. So we feel a little bit better about getting that design work updating and keeping us on schedule to allow that to happen.

- Bond for this? Or how did we borrow the million dollars? And secondly, since we're gonna be going

over, would this be going back to Council as well?

- This is absolutely, we are recommending that, we're asking for approval by RDA, but then sending it to the City Council for final okay. In addition, like I said, eventually, in light of knowing we need to review that entire agreement we are asking to go ahead and do this now before that, just to keep the project moving and on schedule. But I believe, there was original borrowing that had already been done. So the city has funds sitting in its account, but they are borrowed funds to kinda move forward on this project and get this design work doing, going forward. So it isn't, from a TIF standpoint, it is important to keep the project moving and getting some increment in the ground so we have some revenue coming in to basically to help offset that cost.

- Questions, comments from the rest of the group, please.

- So, with the change in scope of the project, and I may not be tracking, I'm still new, will that save money there, then? Is that what you're saying.

- We should see some... We have to look globally at all of the different changes in the scope. We are aware of certainly the Metal site not being part of the scope. So that should be a significant savings. Now, we are seeing some additional design work, and obviously, until we actually bid some of the work we don't know exactly what that net savings, or hopefully, will end up being. But right now we are projecting at this point, if we keep the same scope of work, that's the other thing we're gonna need to take a look at. If we analyze that and show that there's some sort of cost exceeding that we weren't aware of, we may need to revisit the project and take a look at some of that. We always obtain the option of doing that. But right now we are confident that even with this design order we think there's probably some value engineering that can be done to pretty much mitigate the change order here.

- [Gary] Yes, please, Kathy.

- Brighid, do you have any follow up? I'm sorry.

- Oh, nope, that was it.

- In looking at what the original project was, and then adding 285,000, that's like an increase of 25% in overall cost to the project. So maybe you can, I guess, as a lay person here, are we, the design has changed that much that, is this for materials? Is this time? 25% is nothing to sneeze at. And I understand that we made changes. And it's actually more than that.

- It is more than that. I was gonna say, it's over 50% of that original contract.

- 50? I have one million here.

- As you look at all of those change orders that were listed, is that correct?

- I think the-

- Right, the original contract 799,200?

- Oh, you're right there.
- And we're an additional 421,600?
- Yup, let me bring up the-
- And so I guess-
- Yup, I'm opening up the...
- Yeah, so I guess to tag onto Brighid's point, not to, I apologize, Kathy, and-
- No, go ahead. I was adding them all up, so I just took a million.
- No, and this is the world I work in every day.
- Oh, absolutely.
- And I get time. Like I feel for Stantec, they're a good firm. And, I mean, as they look at the changes that have been made, but a couple things come to mind, first of all, disappointed that they would do work that was verbally authorized and then come back and look for a change order and cost increase. They should know well enough to get any authorization in writing so that there's gonna be cost increase. It's easy to say, now, previous director authorized that, and we proceeded, and... I'm just concerned with the amount of work that's been done without that prior authorization, some duplication of services. I'm just, and again, I'm not we've got the change from Breakthrough to Merge, and I'm sure there is design work that was throw away work that they did, and probably things moving forward. But I'm also thinking, what are the duplicated services? Merge has their design team have been looking at the fire access route if their design is causing heartache for the overall implication of the master plan. So those things are certainly disheartening. And then to Brighid's point on if there is scope that has changed from the overall contract with Stantec, so not even just overall budget of the project, and Badger Sheet Metal site, or whatever the case may be, is its own project, was that design scope that Stantec had that they are no longer working on that we should be getting a credit there, right?
- Yeah, absolutely.
- There's just no details on the change orders.
- [Neil] Well, correct.
- Now I have to say that the additional, the fire vehicle access design throws me a little.
- Well, I guess if I could comment on that one specifically, that was essentially, again, because this is not, this is a project that is directly on the riverfront. So the initial position of the fire department was that they need vehicle access all the way around all of the buildings. As we went down the basically design work to analyze that, trying to figure out, we realized that would actually require us to do a much more intensive survey of the actual riverfront wall and the soil conditions and everything there to ensure that structurally there was actually going to be enough room to handle a

firetruck to move on that particular frontage there. So it was unlike a regular site. So, I guess in terms of having that concern up front. So there was additional delay, not necessarily on Stantec's part, but in terms of the city's part, trying to actually, working with the fire department, and actually getting the fire department to willing to consider a shorter access, in terms of what basically what they came up with was more of a hammerhead approach that would allow the trucks to access that for a part of the riverfront, but not the entire frontage. So in that regard, it did save considerable efforts and funding to kind of have to do that. The engineering it would have been required to make that full access route. In addition, it would've cost us considerable issues and concerns with in terms of the landscaping and other right of way issues that we were gonna have with the overall concept design that we had had. So, that did throw it, and that was not necessarily on Stantec, that was actually on staff in terms of working through exactly what was gonna be absolutely necessary to meet fire code and to provide safety services on that. But that was, there was some back and forth and uncertainty on staff's part in terms of working with the fire department to try to exactly, identify exactly what would be an acceptable access route for the trucks and equipment. So that was not solely all on the consultant. There was some additional work that the consultant had to wait for the city to kinda make some decisions in terms of being able to make that happen, so.

- Neil, I can't imagine that there isn't, we talk about verbal agreements for them to go forward with some of this. I can't imagine there isn't any documentation, emails or something that somebody approved this other than verbal?

- We did have, we found a couple of emails between them. I think Matt Buchanan did identify a conversation on a couple of the change orders here that did identify conversation between director Vonck and Stantec. Just be clear, we certainly, from my standpoint, shared the same frustration. We have shared that concern with Stantec and basically said, going forward all of these even if the budget has not changed, if we are reprioritizing or moving around scope work, that's still counts as a scope of work change that needs to be approved, formally approved. So we've asked for that and notified them of that, and let them know, and I think going forward there certainly won't be an issue with that. Certainly, again, part of the issue, and, again, not making excuses, but certainly there was also a time, obviously there was no director and there was nobody in this position. So Stantec was largely managing the project in absence. Matt Buchanan and my staff was doing his best, certainly to keep an eye in key projects and keeping an eye on certain things, but there was certainly no one really kind of overseeing that at my . Director, Deputy Director, Rick Cheryl was certainly involved and kept an eye on things, but not to the level that someone in this position would normally be expected to take a take on. So, I think-

- I think, Neil, I think I distracted you with the fire question. I think if you can maybe address Melanie's design scope change. I think she was talking about, should that-

- For the original one, yep. I believe the original one, yeah, we're actually talking about two significant use changes in terms of design. So obviously there was originally was the baseball, athletic stadium, fields, and streets, and parking lots, and things designed related to that. So there was considerable work started with that. Once that project left and we kinda started down a road with Breakthrough, and there was probably some overlap on when some of that infrastructure that could apply to both, Kathy, but in terms of some areas there was certainly, I think an example is Pearl Street. That was, I think, originally going to be designed and intended to be designed fully by Stantec and ready to go as part of that . There may have been some work that was started on that, but there should be some savings that we can achieve from that, from not having that particular piece of infrastructure moving

forward. Similar to the Badger Sheet Metal site, since we're not doing the full design and construction of a full parking lot area, I think originally that was meant to be additional overflow parking for the baseball facility, was I think was what that was looked at. So again, while there was probably some initial work done on that, at some point that stopped, and there was certainly some allocated budget from that as well. So there should be some offset on some of those things, but again, it is not just simply a matter of, being able to say, even a roadway was in one design phase or another, depending on the end use and end project, there still may be some changes in design that had to be accommodated for those particular projects.

- Neil given us an estimate, which I think they should, as far as what the remaining work is, what the additional, I mean...

- From phase one this 285 is to get us through the completion of phase one. And they have assured us they believe they can do this with this budget and on time.

- And phase one is the contract we have with them.

- Yes.

- And if they haven't shared any design savings, I think we have to assume there aren't any?

- Well, I mean, other than, just the kind of the one I verbally shared with you, Brigid, in terms of identifying the possibility of letting the development team actually do some design work on what that particular aspect of the project, we're still looking to see if there's other opportunities for that to do that. But even then they'll still be some review and things required to take a look at that, even if we identify a couple of other areas to do that. The other aspect is that we are looking at this, obviously, there are considerable grant funding that we actually do have already sitting, waiting to be deployed and refund some of this to the city. And I don't know if Mr. Buchanan is on. He could probably provide some questions, answer some questions on that, but we were trying not to rely on those things. We're trying to make sure that this kind of balances on its own. And if we end up getting some grant funds to assist in that, that's great. We obviously, we would prefer that those grant funds be used to actually build the actual project, not for design work, if at all possible. So we are still trying to on looking forward on this. So it is, again, we have met with Santec probably three different occasions and three different conversations with them on this. We think that the work they have done.

- [Deby] Oh, that's better.

- Ope, okay.

- [Deby] I'm sorry.

- That's okay . So I hope you're talking about the project here. That would be great . So obviously, again, we're confident that there will be some additional savings that we'll be able to be seen in this at this point, either in terms of either adjusting the project scope or adjusting the design as we go forward here for a couple of areas. But we do feel at this point that this request is warranted. But we still are certainly going to be looking for additional ways to kind of counter the additional costs.

- I'd very much like hear Cheryl's thoughts on this. She might have some communications as interim director. Cheryl, are you out there?

- I am. I am, Chairman. I was just thinking about this. I worked a lot with Matt Buchanan at the time. So, I think everything we've done was within the original parameters of the scope. But Matt, if you're online, if you wanna jump in.

- I can say that, the project was on hold for quite a while, while Kevin was out, between directors, because we were waiting for, this was after Breakthrough had left, but before we had officially signed a development agreement with Merge. So in order prevent any additional costs, we kinda put the design of the Shipyard on hold during that interim period between developers. But once Merge did ramp up, we started our plans up again, to try to get this project, phase one of the project done by early 2023, started in '22 done by '23. And I can also share that, we have secured over \$1.6 million in grant funds towards the Shipyard project, which will help offset our costs. We also have at least two or three additional grant applications currently under review, which could hopefully secure us a few additional million dollars to help get this project constructed and off the ground.

- Other questions and comments from the group?

- I guess I'll just make another comment, Chair. I mean, it is, it's hard for us to know at RDA because we're not in it day to day. I mean, we trust staff like Director Stechschulte said, met with Stantec three times. It has been a project, certainly understand that it's hard for us to understand if Stantec has done design work and then those components have been scrapped. We still have to pay them for the work that they've done. I think the frustration that we feel, obviously, is that fees have gone up. We were in a difficult position with not having a director for some of that time, but as Matt mentioned, project was on hold for a chunk of that time as well. So, it's kind of different things that we're certainly hearing, but I think we wanna make sure that we are being a good client. If, indeed, there was work that was done and Stantec should get paid for it, then they should get paid for it. I mean, we shouldn't be asking them to do work and so it's just frustrating. And I guess from our perspective, we just need to see, what is it that we can learn from it? Whether staff or RDA, and are we, was it a scenario where we were too far ahead in the design and we didn't have that, a commitment. We lost one, changes with the ball field, changes with Breakthrough. Are there things that we should've learned with our timing that were we being too aggressive in paying for design services when we didn't have 100% guarantee on what that was gonna that that is, but just trying to, I guess, learn something from this scenario, if we can.

- Neil, response.

- No, I absolutely agree, Melanie, again, I certainly, in my consulting time, would prefer to have, it's never fun to bring a task order forward to a client it's never fun , but if it's warranted and justified and the communication has been open, and certainly would wanna reiterate that, that Matt and I have been meeting with Stantec team, checking in in terms of monitoring progress and going back and forth. We plan to continue that and continue to manage the project in that fashion, so we have a good idea of what's going on. I think the going forward, I certainly, your point about past costs incurred, Melanie, is well received. I think our opportunity is now is it's gonna be up to staff to look for opportunities to maybe find some value engineering and some savings going forward, and all the grants coming in and saving the day, which is just not a responsible thing to look at the project. So if we could see some additional to reduce our design costs or find some cost savings in terms of what

we actually may end up doing without compromising the quality of the project. I think that's the key aspect of what we're really looking at here at the end of the day. I'm looking at it as trying to figure out preserving budgets going forward, to as much as we can for the actual construction of the projects that we need to be involved in. 'Cause we are still dealing with a large amount of uncertainty related to bidding these projects in terms of availability of labor, material costs, schedule for contractors, when they can actually get in. I mean, there's a lot of X factors still to be done once we get past the design phase. So there's gonna be plenty of work that's gonna still need to be done in terms of managing this going forward. And I suspect this will be something we will be probably coming back to this body with in terms of some of those questions, as those opportunities or issues arise going forward. So, I would expect this to be more of a, more of a regular update item going forward.

- Any other comments or questions?

- And how, do we do a lot of other work with Stantec? Have we had this issue? I mean, 'cause I'm still struggling with the amount of the increase and the change orders.

- Certainly .

- When I would sign a contract with somebody, if I came back and said, I'm gonna raise 30%, even if there were issues, well, it's over that, but that's, I struggle with that.

- Yeah, I think there was, in terms of being responsible to try to keep, certainly being responsive to the changes in project that they were being positioned with, and continuing to try to keep things on schedule, was certainly probably desirable from the city standpoint, at least in terms of discussing it going forward and keeping the project moving, regardless of whether the end user changed or not. So certainly in terms of Merge, that's certainly not an excuse, but I think that's probably what happened. They were trying to, and we have worked with them, I think in other projects very successfully, and they have been a good partner for us, and actually landing some of the grants that Mr. Buchanan has talked about. So we do have an excellent working relationship with the consultant. Knowing the amount of work we have done and will probably continue to do in the future, I certainly think it would be in Stantec's best interest to certainly make sure that we're being taken care of in terms of a client. So I certainly do not feel that the city is being taken advantage of in any way. My understanding is that they were simply trying to continue to move the project forward at the pace that was being requested of them, by both the end user and of the city.

- Okay, is Stantec on the line by chance?

- Not sure, let's see.

- Because in the future, maybe we could have the developers on and they'll speak to a little more detail when we're talking this high of an increase.

- I was thinking the same thing. I mean, where I work we'd want to understand why, the why .

- Yes, I guess, and that's where I'm at Brigid, too. I'm like, okay, even through all of this I'm not understanding the why.

- Actually I thought, I actually thought we were going to have someone here today, but I'm not seeing anyone here right now. So I'm certainly, if there are questions for us to send back we will have other opportunities to discuss this going forward. So again, we're gonna be asking for a special meeting here at the end of this meeting. So if there's specific questions you would like us to have that address or have them come in, we're happy to do that.

- I guess my comment would be that if you've done that and you feel comfortable and that these change orders are based on change of scope and design work that they've done, then, I feel comfortable if the staff team feels that this is a valid change order. I don't know that... Because we haven't been involved, I don't know that they could, they could say anything more. I would appreciate if they were on today, that we would listen to them, but they're gonna indicate things, and we're gonna have to then look back to you and say, "Is that true?"

- Right, right, I would agree with you, Melanie.

- I'm with you, Melanie, and I, the only thing that I'm a little concerned about, and again, I'm new, but it sounds like there's been a lot of change orders. This is another big one. This is not a pattern we can sustain.

- [Gary] Right.

- How do we know this is... When's the end?

- Right, right.

- I think a fair question, Brighid, and as long as we don't lose Merge on the site, I have a feeling we can see the finish line. I think we're doing well in terms of proceeding with this particular end user. We have a signed development agreement with them, which is farther along than we've gotten with I think the previous two. So we're confident this was going to move forward, to the extent that we can. Again, that's assuming that the economy cooperates and things will move, and certainly, things can still happen. So, I can't sit here and be, I wouldn't be being truthful if I said, "This is absolutely 100%, this is gonna be it. "We're all done. "This has been great." We are confident in terms of, based on our conversations with Stantec, that they have, and they were adamant in stating that, they said, this will get us through our phase one commitments that we have to do.

- [Gary] Very good.

- So then . Oh, go ahead, Alder Dorff.

- No, I just, I'm just saying that we are taking 34 minutes on this, which is fine, but I have heard the opinions. I would agree with the opinion that this is a surprisingly large amount of money. And I trust staff, I trust our director, and if he believes that this is something that he's recommending, then I will, when the time is right, make a motion to approve this. So, please continue talking. Go ahead, Melanie.

- Oh, no, no I was just gonna say, I think that it just involves project management on our end and then I was gonna make the same motion, so I will second your motion, Alder Dorff.

- Thank you very much.
- We have a motion and a second. Any other questions or comments in regard to the motion?
- [Committee Member] Nope.
- All those in favor, signal by saying aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Opposed. Good luck, Neil, and keep us informed. Obviously we don't expect this to be the norm. This is the exception, so whatever, but good luck, and stay on top of this. Thank you.
- [Neil] Thank you.
- Agenda item number two, Consideration with possible action to approve contract Parks 3-21 Leicht Park Fenders and Mooring to Michels Foundation for \$743,507. Please, Neil, and we talked about this. I'm excited about it, actually. Go ahead.
- Here we have, I believe, Trista from our Public Works Department might be on. Is she here? Yes, she is. Hobbs, do you want to address this item please?
- [Trista] Yeah, so what this is is with the Great Lakes Cruise Line, they have identified Leicht Park as a potential stop on their Great Lakes Cruise venues. So in doing that, we wanted to make sure that we were being as possible. Some funds were available with the TID5, I believe it is. So we went ahead and got a design put together that could accommodate the full range of vessels that we might expect in the future there. Got this bid out. It needs to be allocated by the end of the year. The bids came back favorable. A difference in the two, but we're comfortable with Michels. The largest difference in the bids was due to concrete work, which we feel confident that Michels can do the work with what they bid it for. So it is our recommendation that we move forward to have Michaels complete that work.
- There are no guarantees that we're gonna get any cruise lines that come in, but without this there's probably a guarantee we will not.
- That is a fair statement, Mr. Chairman, absolutely. I know the, Brad Toll and the Convention and Visitors Bureau is working hard to make sure that that happens. I know they've been in communication with, I believe On Broadway as well a little bit. In terms of kind of about their intentions. Certainly the pandemic has thrown a bit of a wrench in the works on that, on some of that, but it has opened up an opportunity for us to get this work done and completed before they do ramp back up again.
- And those are nice ships. I can't believe that they wouldn't come down to Green Bay based on where they're out of. I've been following them for years.
- Good.
- Great if we could get 'em.

- I have a question. Chair.

- Alder Dorff, please.

- Is this using the money instead of the other project proposal for Leicht Park or is that still out there?

- That is still out there, Alder Dorff. That's a separate allocation. That is actually regarding I think the architectural design and for the restrooms, the stage, and the closet area. That's actually a separate project that will also be coming through to this body here, probably, I think maybe at our next meeting, so.

- Yeah, I think, doesn't it have to come through it next week? 'Cause isn't there a deadline?

- We're trying to get, these TID5 funds need to be, what we refer to as being committed before the end of December. So, we would like to have basically an awarded bid prior to that so we can actually state that those funds have been formally committed and are eligible to be used.

- That was my question, in regard to TID5, where we're at with that. But you answered it. Thanks, Neil.

- And then, Neil, with this particular project, we go ahead, we do this, we improve the docking space so these cruise lines come in. How does the city derive economic benefit, then, from that? 'Cause I'm just trying to make sure I'm not assuming how this works. If you could just walk me through that.

- Essentially for whether it would be these users, I believe there is actually like a dockage fee that is paid when they connect and they are moored here. There is actually when they connect to city facilities, there is actually a dockage fee. So there is some revenue costing them there. Certainly from an economic development and a tourism standpoint, it's probably the largest benefit we would be looking for, probably, in the community. I think obviously being able to park right there, get off, and spend your day kind of walking around the Broadway district, or doing some different things that way, certainly seems to be the largest opportunity, I think, for folks to be there. There is also the opportunity for other vessels, other events Tall Ships Festival is an example that I know comes to Green Bay every so often, and kind of increases the likelihood of being able to have larger vessels participate in those types of events. There is still technically some port work that is being looked at up and down this stretch of water. Now that would not be the intent here at Leicht Park, but technically with the improvements, could actually be, provide some overflow capacity, if we, for some reason we had multiple ships trying to get in and get in and out of the channel would provide some additional technical resources to us to do that if we had to. So there is the immediate revenue certainly of having them dock, paying that fee for us to do that. But there is also, I think that more or less related to tourism and economic development benefit of bringing those visitors to downtown.

- 'Cause, certainly I'm aware when we do any kind of TIF financing, we're kinda able to look that, hey, we're puttin' out two million bucks up front and our property taxes are gonna go up by X. We'll get our payback in seven years. Do we have any sense like that on this project or is a little bit more diffuse economic development and tourism?

- I think because it's not going to certainly be, there may be some positive property value impacts, I would suppose, to the area around, immediately around Leicht Park, by having this use happening there, but not to the point where it would certainly be something that we were hanging our hat on in terms of a measurable economic output, I think for this one. I think this is really one that is a rare opportunity that we probably would not have directly funded it, had we not had the opportunity of the funding from TID5 to make this happen. We've talked about doing basic improvements to Leicht Park in the project plan as other aspects. And certainly the project Alder Dorff referred to is certainly one we're looking at, making it more of a community festival grounds, with some new restrooms, a better shelter, better stage area, some more amenities for the local residents, certainly as well, but that's a separate project from this one. This is specifically really is more of a, primarily, I think is a tourism benefit, I think, going forward.

- And does doing this project in any way jeopardize that one?

- No, it does not.

- Okay, they're completely independent and could both be funded, okay.

- [Neil] Yes, sir.

- One more question, Neil, 'cause we're setting up for possible cruise ships that would come in, with or without them, will we be able to dock larger boats there that that, you would have revenue overnight?

- Yes, I certainly, I don't have the engineering expertise or the nautical expertise to tell you exactly how large a ship we could probably take on there, but certainly compared to the capacity that is there now, this will provide a much safer, much more solid, mooring facility, or any sort of, I think, I'd say those Great Lakes size cruise ships would give you an idea on what could be there. So most definitely, those would be the primary anticipated use, but there could always be the possibility of others. That would open up itself by having that facility there that could dock there.

- Absolutely, and I think it could even bring in tourism from people that come over from Michigan. They're always going to Door County, but the bigger boats have nowhere to dock down here.

- Absolutely.

- In the city.

- Kathy, how big is your boat?

- Yeah, yeah .

- Hey, hey, hey, hey, hey no, we've been down here on our boat, but-

- I'm teasing, I'm teasing.

- Remember, we have a sailboat, and you it's very narrow. It takes like two hours to get in. You can't even put your sails up when you're drawing like six feet, so. So it'd just be nice to bring more

tourism.

- Yeah, this would be a situation where- The city being proactive for potential opportunities down the road. At a cost of course. Anyway, other questions or comments, otherwise I'll entertain a motion.

- I'll make a motion that we approve the contracts Parks 3-21, Leicht Park Fenders and Mooring to Michels Foundation for \$743,507.

- Second.

- Second.

- Brighid, you're second it? That was you?

- Yep, mmhmm.

- Okay, questions or comments with regard to the motion. If not all those in favor of the motion, signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried, thank you. Excellent. Number three, consideration with possible action on a request from Habitat for Humanity to provide HOME funding for site improvement for a new home build at 1696 Deckner Avenue. That's for a new home to be built or is it already built?

- It's for a new home to be built, but actually I'd like the RDA to hold this agenda item until the next meeting. Speaking with Habitat, there are, they're actually they're gonna put two houses on that site on Deckner. And I think they're finding that there's a need for the second house as well for some funding. So we're gonna bring both of the houses back at the next RDA meeting, so.

- Very good, thank you Cheryl.

- Yep.

- Item number four, consideration with possible action to award a planning option, development of 158 North Maple Avenue, tax parcel 4-95. We've had a lot of fun with North Maple Avenue. It sounds like this is another saga. Please.

- Yes, yes. The saga continues. Thank you. So if you recall the RDA purchase purchased 158 North Maple as a blighted property in hopes of redeveloping it for housing purposes in the Fort Howard neighborhood. House was six rental units when we purchased it, very large, I think it's over, well over 3,000 square feet, but still has many of its beautiful features, and characteristics still in place, the molding, the built-in cabinetry. So the RDA issued a planning option in the past for a single house, single family house redevelopment. And then also we received a request for a potential artist in residence. Both of those didn't pan out. So we left the RFP. We left it open, and since then we received two proposals. So the first is a proposal. It says a partnership between the city and the University Wisconsin Green Bay and their Center for Civic Engagement. And for those of you may

not know, the Center for Civic Engagement is the University of Green Bay fosters a culture of public service and engagement, by providing programs and resources that facilitate the development of civic identity for students, faculty, and staff, and community members, and the sustainability of mutually beneficial partnerships aimed at greater justice in the world. And city staff and UW-GB have been working with a concept of rehabilitating the house to provide housing for low-income students who are participating in their Civic Scholars Program. And the Civic Scholars Program has civic-minded students focus on initiatives related to community engagement. The students in this program would be able to reside in a property at reduced rents, and in turn would be engaged in neighborhood and community projects, potentially with the city or on Broadway or the Neighborhood Association. And this project will require the RDA to provide the majority of the funding with UW-GB potentially assisting with fundraising. And they have already indicated that they have some potential donors in mind who would really appreciate a project like this. And then the RDA would retain the property ownership, though, of the site and would manage the property after the rehabilitation is completed. The second proposal we received is from Deals and Development, LLC each for a development agreement to rehabilitate the property into a multifamily home of three units. Their request includes deeding the property at zero cost, and then awarding a grant of up to \$70,000 to support the project. So staff really, and these are two, these are really different proposals right here. So we, staff took some time to really weigh out the pros and cons of each proposal. They UW-GB certainly will be a more costly project for the RDA compared to the proposal that Deals and Developments submitted. But realizing this, it's been a number of years, decades, even, I'd say, that the city has, in cooperation with the university, tried to find ways to partner to increase that relationship, improve that relationship between the university and the city. But then also understanding the fact that many of the students who go and attend in person at the university will oftentimes spend the majority of their education, their academic career, not leaving campus. So really trying to develop that relationship and that connection with the students that attend the university and hopes to help retain those students here in the city to find work and employment. So with that being said, staff believes that a partnership with university to rehabilitate the house as well as provide a source of community volunteerism and civic engagement is the better option for the neighborhood and the city. So staff is asking the RD to allow three months, not necessarily a planning option, but just allowing us staff three months to work with the university, to scope out this project, to set up a timeline and budget, and then report back to the RDA in February with a more defined plan.

- There are a number of people, Chairman Delveaux, that are here that would, I think, like to speak. The developers are here I know for sure. And some from UW-GB is here, and I think potentially a neighbor or two might be here as well. So if you would be so kind as to open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second by Parma.

- The motion and a second to open the floor. All in favor signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried. We are open. Let's go with the developer first and then UW-GB. Developer.

- Hey, I'm Ken. I'm sorry, my voice is out. I was at a wedding this weekend and had some fun. Yeah,

so a little bit about myself. I'm a licensed general... I'm a licensed, bonded, and insured general contractor. I'm also a licensed realtor with EXP Realty and the sole owner of this corporation. Pretty much, I do believe that UW-GB is a great pillar in our community, and they, whoever they choose to do this project would probably be more than competent enough to get it all done in budget and have a great partnership with you guys. However, I do believe this is a great opportunity for you guys to show support for an upcoming African American development company in the area by a person from the area. And I pretty much, this project is contingent on at least 50,000 in funding, because that's the gap that would be there for this project. I can bring in a lender at 150,000, bring in 35,000 of my own money, and 16,000 from other investors in the area and family. And my plan would be to refi this place, cash out on it, give my, as much as my funds back as I can, but I believe there'll be like 35,000 left back in the deal, and just keep it for a rental property and hire management. I think the facts say that GB does need more housing units. So that's pretty much my proposal, pretty much.

- Okay, very good. Someone from UW-GB, please.

- Yes, I think that would be me. Hello. Can you hear me okay?

- Yes.

- My name is David Coury. I'm a faculty member here at UW-Green Bay. I'm the co-director of our Center for Civic Engagement. And this project is something unique, and it's not going to be something that we're going to probably replicate wanted to state that we're not in the business of owning rental properties. Rather, this is a unique opportunity that we feel that we can partner with the city to help engage our students more downtown. As Will, who sits on our board for the Center for Civic Engagement. We have a sophomore program Civic Scholars that we introduce to a nonprofits, organizations in the city. And what we're really looking to do is develop a stronger partnership with the city, broadly speaking, not just Green Bay, but a lot of the different organizations, and through programs like Public Administration, Environmental Affairs, our Urban and Regional Planning, have students been committed to working on a semester, a year-long project, and living in the city so that they can use spaces like the Urban Hub. I know that Chancellor Alexander is looking to also have an additional space downtown that would be a board room or a classroom to really then bring student learning to the community. So, the idea is that, again, the RDA would own this property. We would have five or six, however many apartments, students living there. Potentially also we have an AmeriCorps Vista Fellow that would help coordinate a lot of these activities and then identify particular projects with organizations. As Will said, it could be on Broadway, downtown Green Bay, it could be the city, it could be the chamber, it could be any other organization that would really give them this kind of practical community-based learning in exchange for reduced rent. So, it's part of a bigger project and plan that we have that we really want to get our students more engaged in the community so then when they graduate, they have established connections in the community and then they'll look to stay in the community to look for a job here rather than say, I wanna move to Milwaukee or Madison or back to their hometown. And if they have this kind of hands-on learning, community-based learning, which our Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, we have a new coordinator for high-impact practices. We're all gonna be working together to try and get this off the ground, to really help establish these kinds of mutually-beneficial partnerships with a variety of organizations in the city.

- Excellent, excellent points. And then we have some neighbors that would like to speak? Is there anybody else out there that would like to make some comments?

- If I could, Gary. I would like to say .

- Good, how are you doin'?

- Excellent, good to see ya.

- Ken Rovinski, 520 Hubbard Street, Green Bay, right across the street from this property. As you guys know, I did some work on this with the city and then in the private sector here as well. I really like the UW-GB project here. And it's different than where the scope that we originally, when we bought this property with the city, of getting it back to a single family home. But one thing I see with the UW-GB opportunity is that the way they could design it is, say, in the future of this property, maybe the program changes or there's funding that maybe goes away, it could be designed in a way where you can keep the integrity of the single family home, where if you were to go to the route of splitting it up into a three-family home that kind of cements this house into three family, indefinitely then after that. As you see with this project already, it's kinda difficult to get where we're at right now. And from that three family and anything that's recognizable in the current state, I think would be just pretty hard to do. It's a unique opportunity with UW-GB as well. I agree with everything Mr. Coury had said here about getting students engaged with the city. Our campus is kind of a unique one where it's secluded, and getting these students downtown and engaged I think is so important. I didn't realize it when I was in college, and I moved away to go to college. And then when I came back and started working for the city is when I actually realized what the unique downtown and the unique city that we have. So I think getting those students engaged is just such an important thing. On a side kind of concern that I would have with that. I mean, it does have more density. And one of the things that I just would like to see in any of the proposals would be to, with the parking on the side of the structure, right now when you're looking at this building it's very obviously multifamily, and to re-establish the home into its grandeur that the RDA has seen the report that staff had put together on this property. It has a cool history. And I think getting that history back and kinda re-establishing the property the proper way, I think UW-GB can do that, has an opportunity to do that. With that, seeing maybe a garage added to this, eliminating the parking stalls that are there, possibly partnering with the city to do some off-site parking for the students, if they should need it. There is the parking lot right up the block from there that, if you look at like Platten Place, their tenants can rent from the city. So, I just, I see some opportunities there that I don't wanna see go away. So, that's my comments on it. Thanks for lettin' me speak.

- Thanks. Good to see ya.

- Yeah, good to see you.

- Anybody else from the public who'd like to make a comment? If not, I'll entertain a motion to go back to regular business. Kathy made a motion and?

- Second.

- Second Alder Dorff. All those in favor signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed, we're back to regular order of business. Will, number, Will, you there? Will.
- Will, you're muted.
- Sorry, I had to find my mute button. I have like three screens up right now. So a little ways from my mouse, my cursor to travel.
- So Will, one of my concerns, several of us toured this building, and some of us actually thought we should knock it down. I just, I'm just sayin'. So the bottom line, my number one question is, is it physically got a good structure, a good bones, if you will?
- It does, yes, yeah. It certainly does. I think what has made it difficult in the past with getting a development agreement underway in getting building to commence and rehabilitation, it's just the size of the building. It's quite large. So there are good bones, good structure to the building. It's just gonna require a lot of material and then the labor to do it. So it was more or less the size of the building that I think that made it a little bit more challenging than a typical rehab of a 1500 or 1800 square foot home.
- And all you're really asking for right now is a planning option, a three-month planning option to come up with a budget and a plan and a strategy, but you're recommending the UW-GB alternative, is that correct?
- Yeah, and really. Oh, Cheryl.
- So, really, if you go with, if you go with the partnership between the city, or the RDA, and GB, we wouldn't get a planning option on our own property. So it really would just giving us three months to try to put a framework together to bring back to the RDA to say, yay, we're on board, we've got some donors, things are moving forward, compared to, or to open it back up to RFP and invite the developer back in at that point. I wanted to say, though, three of the things that I think we looked at as staff, as well is that the redevelopment authority retains ownership of the building when we partner with UW-GB. They don't wanna own the building. So we'll retain ownership of that. So we'll have control of it. So if, let's say this program goes away in 10 years, we still have the ownership of this fully remodeled building, which is a plus. One of our goals, of course, looking at the pictures, is that we're gonna try to maintain the historic significance of the building. There are some really nice things on the inside that we'd like to make sure are maintained throughout this remodel. And the students that are going in here will be low-income students. This will be an affordable housing student project, which I like as well, partnering with GB. So, those are kind of three pluses that we thought we really wanna explore this a little bit further.
- Okay. Questions and comments for Will, Cheryl .
- I have a comment.
- [Gary] Deby, please, Deby.
- So, the one thing I do really like is my daughter is a graduate of UW-GB and is also an AmeriCorps Vista volunteer. So to hear that partnership between UW-GB and the Vista program, this has received just a small stipend to be able to find housing. And it's very hard for them to find housing

within the city with the money that they have to be able to do that. So this offers an opportunity, and also they're able to earn some extra income, and being close to the Broadway district where you might be able to find a part-time job on top of that is also a plus. On the other hand, I really hope that we continue to work with Mr., it is Kendrick Wilson, correct? Yes? And, yeah, letting him know what other projects that are available. Thank you.

- And the comment that I would add is the, for 30 years I've served on various committees and boards, and one of the things that comes up is how can we bring, UW-GB closer to Green Bay. This seems like a great partnership. And Mr. Wilson, I really do, we all appreciate. So we hope that we see you in the future on other.

- [Gary] Alder Dorff, please.

- Thank you. This is probably for Cheryl, but, and I can't find, I just saw where the rents were going to be, if it was developed into a three tenant or three different apartments, but I think it was like between 900 and... There it is. 950 to 1250, what, what, I guess area are those market rents? Are they low? Are they kinda high?

- I think they're closer to market. I think they're closer to market rents. I mean, it would, I'm thinking, and the developer can answer this, but I'm thinking his goal is, as a project, to get as much rent as he can on the units without a and correct me if I'm wrong, Kendrick, if your goal is to get market rents on this project.

- Yes, my goal is to get market rents on this project.

- Okay, that's what, that was just a question that I had about the rents, 'cause I really wasn't sure where they fell. So thank you.

- Gary, a question. Maybe Cheryl, you can answer this, and Mr. Wilson, some of this may go to you as well, and I'm looking at the proposal from Mr. Wilson of Deals and Development, and I'm saying, hey, this one looks to me, like it gets property back in the hands of private enterprise. It's on the tax rolls. The city starts generating cashflow from that, and it has the least outlay for us. And I'm just trying to understand why it, I feel like I'm missing something, 'cause it seems like most people are leaning towards the UW-GB looks quite expensive to me. It doesn't look like gets on the tax rolls. And so I'm like I'm missin' somethin'.

- I don't think you are.

- You're absolutely right.

- Well, you know, we cross that bridge a lot when we look at development, on whether or not a project is good or not. I mean, I think sometimes just getting a property back on the tax rolls might not be the best deal for the city and the neighborhood that we're working in. So, I totally hear you. And that's why we kind of looked at them and thought, look, this, the UW-GB project is a unique project, and if we have the ability to put this together, I think that's a better project for the neighborhood and the staff agreed with that. A private developer coming in for a three-family there, I think, looking at Mr. Wilson's other remodels, he does a great job from what I can see. It's pretty kind standard stuff. I'm not sure he's gonna spend the extra dollars, maybe, in some of the historical

restoration of the property. And then it's a three-family rental we just really felt the UGB, and to have the opportunity for student volunteers in the neighborhood, activating the neighborhood, working with the association, with On Broadway, would actually be a more, more of a benefit at this point than just the straight market rate units.

- Cheryl, a three-month planning option, even though it's internal it's within the city, you'd be coming back with some income streams, right? A charitable income streams or something?

- Yes.

- To help make this happen.

- Yes. It'd still be a benefit to the city. I mean, that's part of this, right?

- Well, right. So really in three months, the RDA can say, no, too pricey, this isn't a good project. We don't wanna go with it. We wanna go back to the developer, and give him a shot with the planning option, absolutely.

- I feel kind of torn.

- Sorry, go ahead Brigid.

- I feel kind of torn on this, too. I love the concept of the GB project. I think that's fascinating, but I guess my question is, does it have to be in this spot? Aren't there other spots that we could weave UW-GB in? And so I'm wondering if the historic part of this is kind of what's making it a target for both parties. I don't know.

- It's the only house we own. So I think that was part of the draw, was that it was a structure that was already there, compared to building something new from the ground up. I think that's, so low-hanging fruit, and the fact that we might be able to save it, some historic significance to the building, if we could, in the remodel.

- Okay, so the RDA owns this house.

- We own this house, yep.

- And we don't own any other houses.

- We do not.

- Okay, gotcha.

- And I'll just tag onto that, too, 'cause Brigid might not know that the earlier proposals even included an artist kind of residence. So it's kind of been this unique property that we've been talking about for-

- Okay, what do we wanna best do with it, okay, gotcha.

- And probably location, makes sense for in the city and to the comment to being near Broadway and-

- Absolutely.

- Bringing young people down, and I'm assuming any income streams would go to the RDA?

- Yes.

- Correct. And that's what we're working out with UWG, but yes, we would maintain ownership, property manage it. The income would come back.

- Cheryl, if we give you these three months, what I'd love to see come back is income streams that you are able to generate through donations or whatever, but also on the other side, on the same spreadsheet, what does it mean if we had a developer. You're gonna have to come up with some numbers with the developer, what does that mean to the RDA and the city from an income stream with that alternative? So I'd love to see a spreadsheet with both of those on there after your three-month internal planning option. Is that fair?

- That's fair.

- [Brian] Chair.

- Yes, please.

- If I could, this house obviously located in my district, this is one of those where I do support the UW-GB project for a couple reasons. And I think anytime you're looking at the leveraging of public money, I think there's a couple things that ought to be evaluated. One is, does it bring a public use to our community? The second thing would be, does it grow increment? Does it grow tax base? And I think at least one of these projects checks one of those boxes. If there's one thing that I would say, I think we oughta not limit ourselves to having the RDA own this property. I do think we oughta try to find a way, even with the UW-GB sponsored program there, I think we oughta try to find a way to put this back on the tax roll. Even if you UW-GB doesn't wanna own it, is there another partner that could perhaps own and manage the facility so that it does become taxable? So I would encourage staff to, if that's the option that's approved, that that be considered through their diligence period. But if you were to look at the hierarchy of uses for this property, I personally don't see a purpose, in any circumstance, why the city would want to spend public money to purchase a retrofitted rental unit, to turn it into a retrofitted rental unit, and then return it back to the market at a high cost. It just doesn't make a lotta sense to me. I don't see the future of this property as a multifamily unit. I don't see that making sense. If that's what the endgame is, why did we even get involved in the first place? So if there is an opportunity for a public use in the facility, that makes more sense to me in terms of why the city would invest, but much to what Kathy had mentioned, and Deby did, too, I think if there's a way that we can continue to work with Mr. Wilson and find some opportunities for him and leverage that desire to do something in Green Bay, we absolutely should do that. But I think right now, our focus and attention really oughta be on what is our desired use of this property with respect to that neighborhood and its location immediately adjacent to that commercial corridor.

- Okay, good comments, Alderman Johnson. Thank you. Other questions and comments from the

group.

- Excuse me, I don't mean to interrupt, but I believe there were some points that you guys said that I didn't address. Would it be okay if I address that quickly?

- Well, we'd have to open it-

- Motion, motion to open the floor.

- A motion Alder Dorff.

- Second.

- Second by Kathy. All in favor, signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Floor's back open, please, go ahead.

- Okay, so at first, when I looked at this home a few years ago, before I did all of this stuff that I'd done and got experience, my first idea was to turn it into, back into a single family home. There's a perfect comp right across the street from it, a perfect comparable. They sold that place for about around a quarter million. I don't know how they pulled it off. I don't know who would wanna spend a quarter million in a neighborhood in Green Bay like this for a house that cost that much. So even looking at the research from the city, it says that Green Bay needs more units. You know what I mean? And breaking it in into, it seems like it's gonna be more than three units, if you guys go with the UW-GB project, although it is a really interesting project, it wasn't so much about getting higher rents from me. Of course, I wanna keep certain aspects of the historic of it, but it's like, I believe the families in the neighborhood need it more than students do. There's really no housing for families that, and I definitely grew up in the area, and all the housing is ran down, pretty much, most of the housing, and the rents are sky high. So it's not that the rent is super expensive. I'm not trying to get rich off of this thing. It's just that, of course, as an investor, if I'm putting 35,000 bucks and borrowing private money, over 100,000 bucks in private money, I wanna get a return families would need something like this more than students, but that's pretty much my piece.

- Thank you.

- [Kathy] Thank you.

- Any other comments before we go back to, for the developer, before we go back to regular order of business? If not, a motion to go back to regular order of business?

- [Brighid] So moved.

- Brighid I believe, and who else? Alder Dorff?

- Second. Or Kathy, whatever.

- Okay, I'm sorry. Brighid and Kathy, I'm sorry. All those in favor of going back to regular business, signal by saying aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Opposed, we are back to regular order of business. Thanks, we had a lot of great input, wow. And I'm looking for the perfect motion. It is out there somewhere .
- I'll make a motion that we give the three months of, I know you're not calling it planning, but evaluation for this plot of land to UW-GB to evaluate and come back and make a recommendation.
- There's a motion by Kathy.
- Second, Brighid.
- Second by Brighid. Any other questions or comments?
- Would this mean that this developer could also come back at that point?
- What I asked Cheryl to do was to do a spreadsheet. Get enough input from the developer, so we could do a spreadsheet on it as well. So, we're talking about all the numbers, if you will.
- Okay.
- I misunderstood you.
- Cheryl, you still comfortable with that? It's asking you for a lot. Go ahead, Cheryl.
- Yeah, I did not get that from what you said to me, Gary. I'm sorry. I thought you just meant a spreadsheet like tax, no tax, how that would all play out. So you would like me to get all of the information from the developer as well.
- Yes.
- And bring back in three months the side-by-sides?
- And I know the tough part's gonna be to come up with these donations and have to, to make this feasible from UW-GB. But we are in a, this is a business. We were all business people. And so I think we like to have both sides of the equation, if you will. Is that fair? The rest of the group agree with me? Or am I off base?
- I like that. I'd love to kind of also include the non-financial benefits to the community as well. I think both sides have interesting perspectives on that.
- Excellent point. I agree wholeheartedly. We have to look at the bigger picture sometimes. That's a good point. And anybody else make a comment in regard?
- Do we wanna continue to own a house once we would go through this? I mean, that'll be a further

down the road discussion.

- Yeah, with one option we probably would not own it anymore, but, I've kind of lost track. Do we have, oh, wait, we have a motion and a second. And right now we're talking about the motion, aren't we? I'm sorry.

- Right.

- Yeah, okay. Other comments in regard to the motion and the second? Alder Dorff, you think I'm being unreasonable with my spreadsheet?

- I'm not Cheryl, so I don't know how I'd do it. I don't get how to do that, but.

- Cheryl will figure it out. I'm sorry, Cheryl.

- So you have all of the stats from the private development. You just want me to add that, compare it to this proposal.

- Yeah, put that information in a spreadsheet when you're-

- I can do that.

- [Gary] Yep. Great.

- We're ready to vote.

- Yep, questions and comments? If not, all in favor of the motion signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- [Gary] Opposed?

- [Matt] Opposed.

- [Gary] Is that Matt? Oh.

- That was Matt.

- Yep.

- [Committee Member] This is a cool house.

- Yeah. I'll have to ask you a different time, and I would love to know why you're opposed, but since we already the motion and the second and the voting, we'll have to cover it at a different time. Thank you, Matt. All right, sorry about that. Number five, consideration with possible action to approve an amendment to extend the development agreement with Giveadaam Ventures for the properties located at 320 South Webster Avenue, tax parcel 4-750 from July 17th, 2021 to May 31st, 2022. Who's got that?

- I do. We had, RDA had issued a development agreement in July of 2020 for one year to Giveadaam Ventures for this property. They ran into some challenges. They're working with the developer of Barton Designs. He ran into some challenges with getting materials over that year with the COVID and getting subcontractors in to do the work. Once he got them in there and the foundation was completed, they found out that there was a problem with the way it was set, and the four walls did not match. They were not equal. So they had to delay that by having some extra work done in. At this point that has been completed, and Barton Designs is at a point where they wanna begin the framing and the completion of the home, which is all being done by employees of Barton Designs. So we're looking to extend their development agreement to May 31st, 2022. That way they would, with that, we would want them to have their actual occupancy agreement by that time as well.

- Okay, so all we're doing here is just extending the agreement from July 17th to, 2021, to May 31st of 2022.

- Exactly, thank you.

- Questions or comments? Then I'll entertain a motion.

- Move to approve.

- Alder Dorff.

- [Matt] Second.

- By Brighid, I believe.

- No.

- That was Matt..

- That was Matt?

- Yeah.

- [Gary] Sorry- Everybody sounds like me, I don't know.

- Yeah, right. .

- I'm doing my best Brighid impression.

- All right, there's a motion and a second. Any other questions or comments? If not all's in favor of the motion signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried. Thank you very much.

- [Ronda] Thank you.

- Good luck. Consideration with possible action to approve a substantial amendment to the 2021 Annual Action Plan to add \$96,540.42 to close out, in close out Neighborhood Stabilization Program income funds. Yeah, please.

- So the NSP program, you remember, we ran for a while. 10 years ago, we partnered with NeighborWorks. It was a program set up for us to work, to purchase bank owned foreclosures. We'd buy 'em, fix 'em up, and sell 'em. It was a revolving loan program. That program went away. We had a balance of funds of 96,540. HUD said so we're gonna put 19,000 into admin and 77,540 into the cost for our emergency home improvement loan through .

- Okay, and we need to move on this quickly, right? Sounds like.

- Yes, for the Annual Action Plan, correct.

- Everybody understand how we're dividing those funds up?

- Yep.

- [Committee Member] Yep.

- Questions or comments?

- Motion to approve?

- Yep. And I'll second the motion.

- Okay, I think that was Brigid again.

- Nah, that was definitely not me.

- [Gary] Well, who made the first motion?

- I don't know what it is, Brigid, but Gary wants to give you all the credit.

- I don't know either, yeah. All the credit or all the tomatoes can be thrown at me. I don't know.

- Yeah, that's right.

- I know Matt did the second. I'm sorry, who made the motion?

- Deby.

- Deby.

- Okay, Deby. Deby made the motion. Second by Matt. Questions and comments in regard to the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion please signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried, thank you. Number seven, consideration of possible action to award the 2021 Fair Housing Services contract to Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council in the amount of \$20,000. This is, we've been working with them for the last several years, haven't we, Cheryl?

- We have. HUD requires us to provide fair housing services. We go out for contract every year. These guys were the only folks that have bid on it. \$20,000. We should have ordered that. And that will provide us with fair housing services.

- And obviously in the past they've done good work for us? We have no-

- Yep, they do. They report out. They do a great job. We can forward people to that agency to handle any complaints we have for fair housing.

- Okay. Questions, comments, or I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Kathy. Second by...

- Deby.

- Deby.

- I gotta make sure I got all the-

- Not me . Make sure I get all those pictures next time. I gotta figure out what I did wrong here, but I only get one face at a time. I think it was Kathy, and I think it was Debbie.

- [Deby] Yes.

- Okay, questions or comments in regard to the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion please signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried, thank you. Number eight, consideration with possible action on the acceptance of the transfer of ownership of 901 Main Street, tax parcel 9-48, and the assignment of the rights, title, interests, and obligations of development agreement dated December 12th, 2018, from GB Real Estate Investments, LLC, to GB 901 Main, LLC. I take it, Garrett, it's just switching this from one holding company to another? That's what it looked like to me.

- That is our understanding Mr. Chairman, it is essentially. But his agreement requires us to be notified when he does that and subject to approval. So, essentially it is just a note. He is assigning the

rights and title and interests and obligations. However, the TIF payments will still continue to go to, I think, GB Real Estate Investments. But all the other assets, essentially, for the project are being transferred to the different LLC. So it is largely the administrative change from staff's perspective.

- Is that normal, though, that the TIF payments would go to the previous company, yet we're switching it to GB 901 Main, LLC?

- It's certainly up to the individual developer. Obviously, if this was two different parties, that would certainly be something that wouldn't want to be addressed in terms of clearly who was getting that. Most times, if there is an obligation on here, certainly from the city standpoint it is certainly cleaner to maintain it with the original developer.

- Right, right, right.

- Certainly from our standpoint, that's a cleaner thing to do. But in terms of that is always something that, in terms of a purchase agreement, if there is this value of this TIF assistance out there, you're, we're assuming that the private parties are essentially accommodating for that value in whatever doing. But because this is just essentially an internal transfer, it's really not a huge concern at this point.

- Okay.

- So we are recommending acceptance of the transfer and request direction to execute the necessary documents subject to final review by the City Attorney.

- Questions or comments?

- Motion to approve.

- Alder Dorff, motion to approve.

- I'll second.

- Second.

- Second, that time I think I did hear Brighid, I'm pretty sure I heard Brighid on that one.

- It must be like piped right into your microphone.

- Yeah, right. Okay, motion by Alder Dorff, second by Brighid. Questions or comments in regard to the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion, signal by saying aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed? I promise next time I'm gonna get everybody's faces again. I'm not quite sure what happened there, but we'll figure it out next time. Consideration with possible action on a likely planning option request on one or more RDA or city owned TID 5. This must be Neil. Neil, no? Uh-oh.

- You're on mute, Neil.
- Oh is that what it is?
- Neil?
- Thank you, there we go, I'm back. Yeah we would, this is essentially would like to make a request that RDA go into closed session to discuss this project.
- Okay.
- Move to go into closed session.
- Second.
- Okay, a motion and a second to go into closed session.
- I'll read the words, and then we can-
- Yep, go ahead.
- The Authority may convene in closed session pursuant to sections 19.851 E Wisconsin Statutes for the purposes of deliberating or negotiation the sale of public properties, investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons, and section 19.851 G Wisconsin Statutes for the purpose of conferring with legal council for the governmental body who's 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 19.852 Wisconsin Statutes to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda. Roll call please.
- Delveaux.
- Yes.
- Schueller.
- Yes.
- Dorff.
- Yes.
- Dehn.
- Yes.

- Hinkfuss.

- Yes.

- Parma.

- Yes.

- Riordan.

- Yes.

- We just need a moment, Mr. Chair to-

- [Gary] We are back to a open session, regular business around a closed session. That right, Neil?

- [Neil] That is correct. And no formal action will be needed at this time.

- [Gary] Thanks to everybody that's helped us in closed session. It was very informative, to say the least. So now we're into informational. Update on housing studies, Cheryl.

- [Cheryl] If you don't mind, Chairman, I'd like to push this to our next RDA meeting.

- Okay, yep.

- Lack of time.

- Absolutely, yeah, thank you, appreciate that, Cheryl. Financial, I had no problem with the financial report or check register. If I do they usually answer my questions very quickly. Directors report. Neil, you've been busy, young man.

- Yes we are. We're gonna continue to be. As we've kind of indicated we're gonna be, we've sent an email out asking for a special meeting here in the coming weeks. It looks like right it looked like the two best options were either the 16th or the 23rd, afternoon at 1:30. Would like to know if there's a preference. We can talk about that here once we get down to that specific item. But we'll just ask what the RDA's preference is. The items we'll be bringing back, I'll just keep my report kinda focused on those items. We believe we'll be bringing back, finally bringing back the Legacy Hotel development agreement for an update. Their project is expanding. They've gone from, I believe, about 77 units up to about 100 units. So we're a bigger project. So that's the good news. We'll be bringing that project back for further discussion. Believe the Fort at the Rail Yard amendment will also be coming back for the development agreement. They've finally brought forward some additional plans that staff's beginning to take a look at, and we'll be looking at there. I think we mentioned the potential project at 222 Cherry Street, in terms of kind of making that into a single story office building, they're proposing a multiple story building with commercial retail first floor with multiple residential floors on top. Ranging from four to six floors. Bringing back a general term sheet for that project. We'll also be having our first TADA funds request that we'll be evaluating for the Project. I believe that's the 1100 Walnut Street project, Cheryl?

- Correct.

- So that'll be our first TADA project we get to evaluate coming forward. And then we also mentioned the Leicht Park shelter, restrooms, and the stage discussion. That architectural bid award will also be coming back at the meeting. So looking forward to head then into December. Believe we're gonna be trying to bring forward the JBS site RFP, possibly draft of the Adam Street property RFP next to the Baylake Building Center for that site. As well as the I Astor development agreement is coming back. It's been updated. We'll be bringing that forward in December as well. So lots things still to do in these next two months. So, certainly available for any questions if anybody has any.

- One comment, that you mentioned the Fort in the Rail Yard. I'd be very interested as part of that to know the occupancy rate of the developments around them. I know one of them we, the large one, of course, to the north, it was a working person's apartment, if you will. I'd very much, I think that's gonna be very informational in regard to what the Fort on the Rail Yard has to say. I do believe, Gary, that I think it's been reported to staff that Broadway Lofts is actually at 100% occupancy. They're actually full. We can verify that, but that has been what's reported to staff. So, just for that particular project. We looked at some of the other ones in the area, though.

- Okay, yes, very much, okay. Questions and comments in regard to Neil's report?

- Yeah, just Neil, real quick on I Astor Place. I think you said there is a development agreement that is scheduled to come forward next month for the project to move forward.

- Yes, sir, essentially we already have an agreement with them, it's just pretty much gonna be updating the dates in addition to a couple small minor project changes in terms of the assistance. Primarily dealing with more of the infrastructure on the outside, the public infrastructure and the waterfront, rather than the actual project itself, at this point, so.

- Okay.

- Okay. Questions or comments for Neil, staff? Mr. Mayor, are you aboard? He might not be.

- Chairman Delveaux, I've received a message that we are gonna need to end this meeting. I think they're gearing up for the Council Budget meeting.

- Okay, very good.

- I just got the message that we need to wrap it up.

- Okay, we will, we will. So is there a preference on the 16th or the 23rd? They're both options right now for our next meeting, is that correct?

- That's in terms of having the most that we could, we didn't have a date that worked for everybody, but those were the two I think we had at least four members for each of those two times.

- Probably prefer earlier, 16th if we can, but.

- I would agree with ya, Brigid.

- the 18th and-
- Ope, sorry, it's the 18th or the 23rd, actually, sorry.
- But Kathy, I haven't heard back from you yet. So it depends, if you're available-
- 18th works for me or the 23rd. I can do either one. The 16th did not.
- Okay, 18th or 23rd?
- Yeah.
- Okay.
- And the 18th is a problem for me. I was looking at the 16th. But I... Probably not.
- Would it be at 1:30 again?
- Yes.
- Okay. Then that's fine.
- So Lisa, you're gonna look at the responses and get back to us?
- Yes, I already had determined we'd have a quorum on the 18th or the 23rd.
- The 23rd, if that's the preference of most folks here.
- And it's identical, identical number of people, Lisa?
- Kathy you're available on the 18th?
- Yes.
- Then we would have five people on the 18th.
- And how many-
- Was I listed as available?
- I'll have to look back at my-
- 'Cause my calendar changed, so I don't know if.
- You are not, Brigid. You had said the 19th or the 23rd.
- Well, I wanna wrap this up. So how many we have on the 23rd? Obviously the most, whatever it is.

- Four.
- Okay, so the 18th is it.
- Okay.
- Does everybody agree? 'Cause we have five on the 18th and only four on the 23rd. Everybody agree to the 18th? I mean, whatever. We have to come to a conclusion. And I'm always after the most we can get, so whatever that means. Okay. So 18th it is.
- So moved, Mr. Chairman.
- Okay, thank you. Actually a motion to adjourn is next.
- So moved.
- Matt and Kathy. All those in favor signal by saying aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Wow, excellent, thank you. Another great meeting.