MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2021, 1:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

1. Members: Gary Delveaux, Chair; Matt Schueller, Vice-Chair; Ald. Barbara Dorff, Deby Dehn, Kathy Hinkfuss, Melanie Parma, and Brighid Riordan.
Liaisons: Jeff Mirkes, Leah Weycker, and Brooke Hafs.

Members Present: Barbara Dorff, Kathy Hinkfuss, Gary J. Delveaux, Melanie Parma (excused at 2:50 p.m.), Deby Dehn, Matt Schueller (excused at 3:25 p.m.), and Brighid Riordan (arrived at 1:41 p.m.)
Liaisons Present: Jeff Mirkes and Leah Weycker
Others Present: Ald. Brian Johnson and Mayor Eric Genrich

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

1. Approval of the agenda for the November 18, 2021, special meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to amend the agenda and move regular business Item 1 after Item 5. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the amended agenda. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on an amended development agreement with TWG Development, LLC and DDL Holdings, LLC for Tax Incremental Financing assistance for a project at 419 Donald Driver Way, also known as the Fort at the Railyard.

Item 1 was taken after Item 5.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Matt Schueller to open the floor. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by 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.

Melanie Parma and Matt Schueller were excused from the meeting before the motion was made.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Deby Dehn to direct staff to prepare a formal amended development agreement with TWG and DDL that:

- Incorporates staff conditions to the extent possible:
    - Proceeds with project of 233 units at a mix of 80% at 60% AMI and 20% at market rate.
    - Confirmation by staff and/or Plan Commission and Council that the proposed changes to commercial uses on the first floor are consistent with the PUD zoning for the project.
    - That the original project grant repayment schedule be revisited prior to any PayGo distributions to DDL Holdings, LLC or TWG Development, LLC.
    - That the Developer, DDL Holdings, LLC and the City agree to a formal schedule as to when remaining public improvements are to be completed, and that future PayGo distributions be conditioned on this schedule being followed.
    - Adding language to the agreement regarding PayGo payments being contingent upon the property being adequately managed and maintained, and RDA approval of interior finishes.
- Subject to review by the City Attorney.
- Bring the draft agreement back to the RDA on December 14, 2021 for final review prior to forwarding it to the City Council on December 21, 2021 for their consideration.

Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Deby Dehn, No- Brighid Riordan, Abstain- None.

2. Consideration with possible action on an amended development agreement with Legacy Green Bay, LLC for Tax Incremental Financing assistance for a hotel project at 1004 Brett Favre Pass.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve the amended development agreement as presented, subject to approval by the City Attorney and confirmation by the Plan Commission on the project's compliance with Legends District design codes, and forward to the City Council for their consideration.

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, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Deby Dehn to close the floor. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None.

A vote was taken on the motion. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, No- None, Abstain- None.

3. Consideration with possible action on general terms and conditions for tax incremental financing assistance for a redevelopment project at 216-222 Cherry Street.

*Brighid Riordan arrived during the presentation for this item.

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 Ald. Barbara Dorff, 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 Deby Dehn to approve the general terms and conditions as presented, and direct staff to prepare a formal development agreement with the following conditions:

- City creating a new Downtown TID effective 1/1/2022 that includes the project site
- Agreement between the Developer and the City on leasing parking stalls in the Cherry Street Parking Ramp
- Agreement on evaluating the feasibility, design, construction and cost of a skywalk connecting the Cherry Street Ramp and the Project
- Review by the City Attorney and to present a final Development Agreement to the RDA for a final recommendation prior to forwarding to the City Council for their consideration

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

4. Consideration with possible action on awarding a bid for architectural and engineering services for Leicht Memorial Park Master Planning, Shelter and Stage.

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 Matt Schueller, seconded by Melanie Parma 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 Matt Schueller to approve contract "Parks 4-21 Architectural & Engineering Services for Leicht Memorial Park Master Planning, Shelter & Stage" to ISG for $149,100 and to direct staff to provide additional details supporting the recommendation. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Matt Schueller, Deby Dehn, No- Kathy Hinkfuss, Abstain- Melanie Parma, Brighid Riordan.

5. Consideration with possible action on the MF Housing Partners, LLC request for development subsidies including HOME funding, TIDAH funding, and land disposition to support the development of affordable, multi-family housing on the 1100 Block of East Walnut Street.

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 approve awarding $400,000.00 in HOME funds, $400,000.00 of TIDAH funds in the form of a low interest loan, and selling the property in the amount of $200,000.00 to MF Housing Partners, LLC for the development of affordable, multi-family housing on the 1100 Block of East Walnut Street, contingent on the developer securing Low Income Housing Tax Credits through WHEDA. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Melanie Parma, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Update on Housing Study.

Cheryl Renier-Wigg presented the update.

2. Director's report and project updates.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's report and project updates.

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

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Deby Dehn to adjourn. Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Deby Dehn, Brighid Riordan, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Schueller. Dorff.

- Yes.

- Here.

- Dehn, oh thank you, Matt. Gotcha, thank you. Dehn.

- Here.

- Hinkfuss.

- Here.

- Parma.

- Here.

- And Brighid will be joining us eventually. She's not here right now, but she will be joining us later.

- Great, excellent turnout, thank you. In regard to Brighid, she's very interested in agenda item one, and that is asking us if we could move that down. And so I think we definitely should, I'd like to hear her input.

- I'll make a motion.

- Okay, good.

- I move to amend the agenda to move item one after item five.

- Yes, right, exactly. That'd be very good. So there's a motion to actually move agenda item one to the last agenda item versus the first.

- I'll second that, Kathy.

- Okay, second by Kathy.

- First one was Barb Dorff, sorry.

- Yeah, yeah, that's great. If not, all those in favor of the motion, signal by saying aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed, agenda is changed.

- I move to approve the amended agenda.

- Okay.

- This is Barb Dorff.

- Yeah.

- Second.

- Second by Matt. All in favor of the amended agenda, signal by saying aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried. Very good, thank you. All right, with that in mind, we will go to, now look the first agenda item, which is number two, consideration of possible action and amended development agreement with Legacy Green Bay, LLC, the taxing criminal financing assistance for a hotel project at 1004 at Brett Favre Pass. Yeah, I looked at the material, but go ahead. Who's got that?

- Okay, that'll be me, Mr. Chairman. I'll take that one. Let me go ahead and get the screen share going here. All right, let me get past our first item here and onto our second item. Okay, here we go. Okay, so this item is regard, we're bringing this is the, revisiting the development agreement with Legacy Green Bay, LLC, for assistance for their hotel project at 1004 Brett Favre Pass. It's a couple of project changes. Essentially short version is the project's gotten bigger and better. We're excited to say. So essentially the tip, the financial request is still the same. It's essentially 80% of the increment for a set amount of time. Project's going from 90,000 square feet to 100,000 square feet and will now be six stories tall. So it's adding a floor. It's going from 77 rooms to 100 rooms. So the project has increased in scope. And as such that the tip request essentially is a little bit larger, but it is larger because of the additional increment that's being made. So we did add one year, essentially are adding one year to the PayGo schedule because of the delay in working through some things this year. I've been working with the developer and their team very diligently really these past several months. To kind of finalize some design changes to make sure that it complied with the code of the Legends District and they've been very cooperative and working with us very well. Looking to get construction going early in '22 and hopefully be completed by summer of '23. So very excited about the prospects of the project. Here's a quick view, the image project here. This one was just received this morning. The image on the left was our brand new, the brand new spoke there. And then obviously the other prospective renderings. So we're very excited about the architecture. We think it's a beautiful, beautiful project. Very excited about that. So essentially our recommendation is to recommend approval of the development agreement as presented. Subject to final approval by the City Attorney and confirmation by the Plan Commission on the project's compliance with Legends District design codes and forward to the council for their consideration, I believe on the 14th. So with that, and I have Mr. Delveaux here from the developer, is actually here in my office, if you like. And so if you have any questions for him, he is available to answer any questions.

- And the financing is pretty well lined up?

- Yes.

- Yes.

- Very good, very good. Now this, I believe, would be the last piece for them to be able to move forward, so.

- Excellent. Sounds great.

- Yeah, looks like a great building.

- Nothing beats bigger and better.

- Yeah, well they don't always go this way. We're very appreciative on this one, so.

- So I think the date of the next council meeting is December 7th. That's what I have instead of the 14th. I think that's right.

- We have, I think the next RDA meeting where we would bring the final agreement back here.

- Already is the 14th or yeah. I thought, sorry.

- Let me make sure here.

- Yeah, RDA is the 14th. I thought you meant bringing it to council on the 14th, but.

- Yeah, that's RDA and then there is the council meeting on the 21st.

- 21st, right. Right.

- All right, will there be a motion?

- Oh I move to approve, this is beautiful.

- [Gary] Yes, it is.

- Alder Dorff, Alder Dorff move to approve.

- I'll second that, Kathy.

- The motion and a second with regard to approving the amended development agreement to Legacy Green Bay, LLC. Questions or comments?

- I have a question.

- Great.

- Do we have any kind of study that shows, when we hit like room saturation for all the hotels that we have? Like when are we hitting the point where a project is no longer gonna be viable because there's just too many rooms between all the hotels in Ashwaubenon and in Green Bay?

- Staff has, we've just taken a look at it. Pretty much just conversations really with Brad told in the convention visitors bureau who rely on their expertise certainly for that. I think two points, I think that certainly that we've had conversations with, with Brad and his team on it been, it's not just the number of hotel rooms, it's actually the quality and price point of the hotel rooms as well. We have, we do have, I think a substantial amount of, I think, more basic level rooms in the community that done very well. The higher end ones, I think that are providing a little bit more of an experience. And some additional amenities are a little bit we're a little bit lacking still in terms of some of those types of things. So my interpretation of his conversations we've had with them is that those folks might, if the hotels that aren't making any investments or improvements or investments made, there may be some competitive issues for them in terms of operating and continue to operate successfully if they don't improve their facility. But as we add the newer more additional ones, we'll probably continue to do very well. So I think in terms of, you know, there, there may be some competitive impact over time. I think during football season, that's certainly not going to be a problem. We can't, I don't think we can have enough rooms during football. But you know, for the rest of the year, as we continue to add events and do different things, I think right now there's certainly doesn't appear to be a immediate concern that we're over saturating market. But it is certainly something we wanna keep an eye on going forward.

- Any there questions or comments. And we certainly, if you guys would like Mr. Delvaux, the answer to that question, he is certainly available too.

- Okay, motion to open the meeting, please.

- Motion to open the floor by Alder Dorff.

- Alder, second by Kathy. Okay, all signify by saying aye.

- Aye

- Aye.

- Yeah, please.

- We did have a market study conducted by HBS out of Chicago. And that was one of the issues that was addressed was that, you know, if there was going to be an over-saturation of hotel inventory, it was, it was kind of concluded that it would not be as a matter of fact, even after the, opened up, we were shocked at a Hilton garden Inn didn't miss a beat. I mean, they still maintain their occupancy and rage. And the other piece of this is as, as was mentioned by Neil, this property is going to be a luxury. It's a little more expensive undertaking, but it will serve as an anchor for the Legends District. It will, it'll be a great bookend to what they've done at Titletown and it'll help encourage more, more residential and more food and beverage facilities in that area. So we think that their property will serve Green Bay very well. And we're very confident that that will be successful. Excellent, excellent, very good. Any other questions for the developer?

- Nope.

- Okay.

- I think action has finished. I can't turn it off.

- That's all right, it's okay. Motion to get back to regular business, please.

- Thank you very much.

- Thank you. Great comments.

- Motion to go back into regular order of business by Alder Dorff.

- Okay.

- By Deby.

- Okay, motion in a second to go back to the regular business signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay now, any questions or comments in regards to the motion itself?

- Nope.

- Okay, all in favor of the motion, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed motion carried, thank you. Very good, very exciting. Great, comments with developer. Very much appreciated. Deal number three, consideration possible action on general terms and conditions your tax incremental financing assistance for a redevelopment project. 216-222 Cherry Street.

- Well thank you, Delvaux. This one would be me as well. Mr. Chair. I'll take this one again. This is a project I'm excited about the possible redevelopment here of this particular site. This is the, here's the area in question here. This is the boss's retail shop is here. This is the Cherry Street parking ramp here. So folks kind of get an idea on where this is. This formerly I believe was certainly asked about this was the Masonic temple or whether there actually used to be a couple of additional stories on top of this building, but fire took them down. And so essentially when they rebuilt or they just kind of redid the first story, they did not re restore the previous, the higher levels of the building going forward. But the good news was is that the current owner and that perspective did that and actually done some architectural work and discovered that architecturally, that that building can still support additional floors again. So they are actually looking at adding and expanding those floors, maintaining the first floor commercial, but then actually adding at least, at least three stories of residential on top pending some additional architectural work. There may be additional story or to be added to the project as well. Just the details on that soul, but construct three, six more stories of market rate, residential apartments that that count would be 39 to 65 units above the existing structure. Essentially expanding that first floor would be main commercial. The units will be a combination of one and two bedroom units, again, market rate. Construction, budget of seven and a half million to $12 million probably. Finalized depending on the result of the final architectural survey and the number of units that can be created there. So we're in preliminary estimate by our, our department was another, an additional four to $9 million. That would be certainly confirmed and verified by our assessing department. Once we actually have a full business plan for the project and knowing how much rent we're coming in to the site. Essentially there you'll be this probably the most interesting and probably somewhat challenging, but interesting part of this project would be using, utilizing the Cherry Street parking as part of the project, it seems like it's all the parking for this particular project. To the point of actually adding a skywalk between these parking structure and this building for residents to be able to utilize and access the structure directly. So that's obviously something we would need to have kind of reviewed and designed by department public works. So they have been made aware of the request and certainly are open to doing that. Excited, obviously, certainly in terms of having a list available to parking especially in after hours. A lot of these, a lot the time that these people will be needing will be kind of evenings and weekends, which is certainly opposite of when they decrease. So we think there's definitely some good possibilities here of making, leveraging that space and being able to use that for this particular project. Is this something that has been considered in other projects in this immediate area has also looked at connecting to the cherry street ramp in other locations. So might be something we try to connect a couple of the buildings downtown. If we really wanna take the effort to kind of make that work and kind of make some willows downtown spaces, a little more viable with the skywalk. But at a minimum, we're looking to work with this developer and connecting his project to that building.

- What TIF is this?

- This is right now, this is actually in five, which is closing. So we'll actually we'll require a new one to be created actually. So let's go ahead and get.

- We are talking of , right?

- Yes, sir. Right now we're looking at RDA approving development, concepts, city creating a new district effective of January one next year. We can do that after the beginning of the year. It just make sure that it's effective as of January one. And they're looking at 75% of the annual increment from 2025 to 2041. Like estimate that to just be about $1.1 million for the project. And obviously we would need certainly the city to review and approve the skywalk design and any lease for parking stalls in the ramp. So that we'll be working with our public works department and our park utility to verify that with something we can do. Again, these are just general terms and conditions. Essentially, we're looking for direction to bring back a formal development agreement to the RDA. So approving general terms that come with creating the tip district, including the site specifically in the, in the parking lease, evaluating the specific feasibility and design of the skywalk, and then obviously review by the city attorney to present it finally back to this body, as soon as it's ready and it can be done. I don't believe, I believe Mr. Peter Nugent is, and some of his development team are here. If there are any specific topic like the ask them, I believe they are present on the meeting.

- Here, this is Peter Nugent. And with me here is Kip Golden. Kip is owner of CR Structures, the construction and development company that has been contracted to do this work.

- Another exciting project. Questions or comments. And also if somebody wants us to go to open session, but whatever the group desires. It's all exciting.

- I'm ready to just make a motion. But if other people have questions, we can open the floor. I only have one question, and that is.

- Move to open the floor. Open the floor. Okay, motion to open the floor.

- [Deby] I'll second.

- And second by Deby.

- Melanie.

- Melanie, sorry Melanie. All those signify by saying, aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed, okay we are in open session. Yes, go ahead, Kathy.

- So and I'm going back to the housing study, you know, that we keep in the back of our mind as things are coming through and they, you know, the one thing that always caught my eye is the fact that we have very little three bedroom and we have a new development here. And I'm just curious, there must be a reason why the, you know, the developers don't look at the three, moving to three bedrooms or adding I'm just curious. Is there that big of an impact on either the taxes costs or, you know, ultimately what you can make on, you know, rent on wanting to.

- Developers? Will you answer that one?

- I think Kip can definitely get that.

- We do have some of our mixed use projects that do have some three bedrooms in. The reason for that there was some additional space honestly. Typically when you're putting a performer together, the difference between putting enough two or three bedrooms or having maybe, you know, one bedroom instead of the three bedroom or even two bedrooms, possibly the incremental increase in rent doesn't necessarily cover the difference. So you can't increase the right so much on a three bedroom to make up the difference that you would get on a one bedroom or two bedrooms. So it's really the economics of it, but certainly when time, but we have had three bedrooms and there, so once we do the final design on this, there could possibly be some three bedrooms in there. There's not many out there and we have had luck putting people in those. The other thing is typically you don't get necessarily the families that are coming down there that would have the need for three bedrooms. At least not yet and I guess in our area but like I said, we didn't have much of a problem getting those, those three bedrooms. So we'd certainly look at that in our final design once we put this whole thing together.

- Okay, 'cause that was one of the big things within the housing study that, you know, three bedrooms are in need out there, so.

- I think that's a good point Kathy, just from my own experience, I tried to get all of my friends to move to downtown and nobody would because of the three bedroom issue. And I, you know, I made sure that mine had three and I think it's a good thing to keep in mind. Depending where you are.

- Definitely, when we do that final design we'll, we'll see how we can incorporate some three bedrooms in there.

- Are there questions or comments for the developer? If not, I'll take a motion back to regular business.

- Motion by Alder Dorff to go back to regular order of business.

- Second by Kathy.

- Okay, your motion, the second venue, All signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. Back to regular business. By the way you're welcome Brighid.

- [Brighid] Thank you.

- I'm glad you made a speech as you did. You're probably aware of this, but we, we moved to agenda item one to the agenda item number five.

- Oh, thank you.

- Yes, well we very much as always reach your dreams, but all right. So is there a motion or I'd entertain a motion of sorts so that whenever anybody wants to do. In regard to general terms and conditions for taxing district financing assistance, where you need development project at 216-222.

- I'll make a motion for the tax financing assistance to the redevelopment project at 216-222 Cherry Street.

- Okay, a motion by Kathy.

- [Deby] Second.

- Second by who?

- [Deby] Deby.

- Okay, second by Deby. Questions or comments in regard to the motion. If not all those in favor say by saying aye.

- Aye

- Aye.

- Oppose, very exciting project, congrats guys. And good luck, it's very exciting, thank you.

- You're appreciated.

- All right, number three, consideration of possible action on awarding the bid where architectural engineering services for light Memorial park, master planning, shelter and stage. It's moving along fairly quickly because we just talked about last meeting remember correctly.

- Knock on wood, Mr. Chair. So we'll see who else we got. I believe we have some of our park staff here to provide quick comments on this one.

- Excellent.

- We have, I could be wrong.

- Yes, hi Kaure Mihm. I'm Kaure Mihm, I'm the park planner with the parks department.

- Yes.

- Oh great, and you have the summary of quotes. So yeah, the parks department recently issued an RFP for architectural and engineering services for light Memorial park for master planning, which would be for the Southern portion of the city owned portion of the park, a new shelter with restrooms and then for a new stage. And that would basically these amenities, and the master planning would help to accommodate the programming for the park. So the city sent that RFP to seven firms and we received four proposals. As you can see here on the screen, you can also see the quotes, you know, that we received as far as there was a range from the, you know, the 95,180 up to the 282,500. And so what we ended up doing was we had a team of three park staff members, Alder Johnson, and then another representative from on Broadway Inc, who reviewed and evaluated the RFPs, or I'm sorry, the proposals. So each member of the team, as they were doing the review were considering the total fee, the creativity past project, stage design, understanding of the work and schedules. And so after the reviewing of the team, felt that although all of the consultants understood the scope and were qualified to do the work. You know, that we were tasked with having to provide one form for recommendation to the RDA. And so we decided to narrow it down to the top two consultants, they send that review criteria. We had a couple of questions that came out of. That we wanted to ask those top two consultants just for clarification. And so we had some remote interviews with those firms for clarification's and there were no red flags that came out of anyone either. Was with that information the team met again. And, you know, after talking through again, you know, the interview, the criteria, the teams felt that again, both firms can adequately do the work, but felt that ISG had the best proposal. And basically that the past projects that they shared in the proposal and with us best met the vision for what we saw happening at Leicht Park. So therefore the review team's recommendation to the RDA would be to award the contract to ISG.

- Well, questions and comments.

- Well, I guess chair, can I just comment? I certainly I'm disappointed on, obviously I represent Somerville and feel that we were certainly qualified to do the work, you know, as a local firm, area and did very similar work over at the botanical gardens, which I think is a great amenity here in the community. I just think voice, certainly my disappointment in seeing the recommendation for another firm. So felt it necessary at least to, to comment on that as well.

- Yes, do we really want more detail as far as the reasons why or whatever, Alder Dorf?

- I would like more detail as far as three reasons why it was a really good overall explanation, but why? What was different? I mean, and the range of prices were so huge, right. That's very confusing to me.

- Are they bidding on the same thing?

- Yeah, are they bidding same thing.

- I mean, this is just to have the, like the numbers in front of us doesn't tell us a lot.

- Great.

- Because to me it looks like they've created four different projects. That range that high.

- I can comment if I may. So the proposal was for design services and master planning, right. So this, this is purely your design fee. So we haven't gotten into design. So really it's just looking at making sure that you're comfortable with the firm that you're gonna move forward with, and as Cory mentioned, right, looking at the fee, the proposal, the qualifications of the firms was how they would make their recommendation. So you're just seeing your fee range on, you know, design services in different firms. And, you know, I can personally say again, and I would abstain from voting on this, of course, just to keep impartial. But, you know, I do normally again, our, our firm is very interested in, you know, see the value of this in our community and put together a very competitive proposal.

- I know some other situations like this groups had a very specific matrix and awarding points per area, is that sort of thing that was done through this time? It was very specific items and then awarding points per item or not really.

- Yes, so the RFP wasn't necessarily set up in that fashion, but once we received the RFPs, we felt that that might be a good way to take a look at it. And so that criteria that I mentioned, the total fee creativity past project stage design understanding of the work and schedules were basically given a numerical value from each of the team members. And then from that is how we decided on, you know, with the top two consultants would be and how we would proceed from there.

- So when you judged creativity, they weren't giving you a plan. You just re looking at creativity of past projects.

- Correct, yes, that were in the proposal. And of course creativity can be somewhat subjective. You know, we try and set these up so that you can do the best apples to apples comparisons. And sometimes that's difficult to do. I mean, obviously the bottom line fee, you know, I think a pretty easy way to evaluate comparatively apples to apples. But I think to just some of this other criteria is somewhat subjective, really, to the reviewers opinions of, you know, where the consultants fall in those areas.

- And is ISG a local company or?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- They have one of their offices here. I'll just comment that.

- Questions, comments.

- I'll just say this. I don't feel as though I have enough information to support any of them. I mean, I just, when you have beds that are this big, and we're talking about, you know, a plan for design and master planning, we didn't even get into the design yet. I don't know. I just, I don't inside my heart doesn't feel good 'cause I don't feel like I understand the differences between these, if that makes any sense. And I trust the people who evaluated them, but isn't that what we're here for is not just to be a rubber stamp.

- So is the issue that we have to spend, is this the money that we have to spend by the end of the year or something? Is there a time table on this?

- That is correct. We do have, I believe it's, I think it's a December 21st timeline that where we have to have funds expended. Director, Ellen Becker if that's the correct date or not, but we do have a, these are ten five funds that we are looking to basically committed by the end of the year.

- So being a newbie, I can still be a newbie. What, like, what do you really need from us to move forward? Is RDS responsibility to approve the design firm or are we able to approve money and direction on choosing a firm by the end of the year? Or I don't know.

- Yeah, I think essentially we were looking for the selection of the firm and approval of the quote, essentially as this essentially as a result of the the advertised bid process that has conducted by staff. I believe there is, you know, we do have the December reading it's coming up and it does, that is certainly cutting it a little close in terms of convening our requirements. It would be, you know, we certainly would like to see if at all possible to get direction today, if there was one way or the other, but certainly if there's additional information needed, we can certainly have that, bring it back, one more meeting.

- And I see, I, you know, I see Brian showed up here and it sounds like you're a part of this. Maybe Brian, do you have any more light to shed on what.

- Make a motion to open the floor. I don't think brand is here under color of office. I think he's here as a different person. So I am going to make a motion on the floor so Brian can speak. Although normally as an Alder he'd be able to speak, because he is representing himself as an alder.

- A second, someone?

- Move to second, Kathy.

- Okay, a motion Alder and second by Kathy, all those in favor signify by aye open up the meeting.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Motion carried. Broadway, on Broadway, please.

- Yeah, I thank you Alder Dorf and that was a very good observation because obviously I'll need to abstain from this vote. And the reason I'll need to abstain from this because we are pursuing and working with the city on this, in the form of a public private partnership we're on, on Broadway while undetermined, what that role will be, will likely play some sort of role either with, with fundraising programming, different types of agreements. And so, because of that, we did have multiple representatives from our organization. We actually have a subcommittee that we have created to help with this process. And this was certainly the first, but probably the biggest decision that we'll need to make on the project. And I think collectively as a group, there was a lot of discussion. I think, Corey, we've met maybe six times on this. And so it was a very thorough process I feel that we went through. We did narrow it down. And you know, for us, when you're talking about a $50,000 difference on a project that could potentially cost millions of dollars, the design is the decision that, that again is really critical. Normally in these projects, your I mean 10% is not uncommon to spend on design engineering, right. And so 50,000 is a really small margin of error if you will. And even when you look at the decision that this group made, if you recall, when we selected Stantec as the engineering firm on the shipyard, they were hundreds of thousands of dollars, more than the next bidder. In this and this group supported that decision. And they supported that decision because the recommendation of the staff at that time was that given the vision of that particular facility, that park, they just felt that Santek had area of expertise that and the design capability that was just better in alignment with what that park needed. Didn't mean that the second, third, fourth place bidders were not qualified. And I think the same holds true here. They are all very, very fine firms and they've all have a rich legacy of doing terrific work here in our community. And so it's by no means a reflection of that, but it was recognizing that there are a lot of development projects going around in Northeast Wisconsin, right now, it particularly in our suburb areas. And quite frankly, a lot of those projects look the same. And so this was as a group we discussed was an opportunity for us to have an urban design that was more reflective of the city of Green Bay of a downtown metropolis that, you know, could really take advantage of a riverfront, a Waterfront Park that has probably been under utilized for a very long time. An ISG in particular brought a lot of master park planning experience that we felt was very directly relevant to this. The names of the communities are gonna escape me, but they shared in their proposal, a number of parks on waterfronts that they have developed including pavilions that were not your traditional pavilions, Green Bay botanical garden as an example, very beautiful facility. But probably fundamentally different than what we'd like to see in the waterfront. Because again, every suburb around us has that same type of facility, Voyager park is about to bring in the same type of facility. So we're trying to identify something that's just distinctly unique and different and can really allow us to create that waterfront, amenity that in a, within the context of a master park, proposal, master plan proposal for a park. That we, again, just ISGs background and history and examples that they provided at the table. We just felt aligned with that vision very, very well.

- Right, how many folks were on this selection committee?

- There were, was five of us Cory, right, five.

- And was it unanimous amongst all pipe recommendation?

- I don't know that we really went down that road of a straw poll. We didn't have a final straw poll if you will.

- Okay.

- I mean, there's scoring criteria and different things that we looked at. You know, the price is obviously one of them, but it's also important to recognize that price was not the only one and creativity experience, vision. I mean, there were a number of other categories that were also evaluated.

- A question, please.

- You had mentioned Stantec. And I do remember when we were going through that, and if I remember correctly, there was like a team like you have, but there was, we had it for the RDA we went through and maybe it's a different project. But ultimately when that came to us, we laid out why, or it was all laid out why we wanted one over the other. It wasn't just, I mean, right now all we have is numbers. We don't have, you're telling us that they're better, but that's all we have. And in past we, you know, it's been laid out so that we could understand it.

- Yeah, and I appreciate that feedback, Kathy, you know, unfortunately I guess, I mean, I obviously don't represent staff in that context and how certain information is presented. So I would need to defer to Corey on, on maybe some additional perspective there. I will tell you though, that's in my aldermanic capacity sitting on other committees that is very common when we get bids and finance committee improvement in services, parks, where we are just given numbers and that's it. So this wouldn't be out of character with what we've seen in other committees, but your point is also understood in well-taken.

- I mean, because we may be 100% behind you, but like I said, I look at the bids going 95 to 282, wow. That's a big spread. What are, what are the differences?

- Well, one alternative and I'm not necessarily recommending this, but we could put this to the next RD meeting. And then the a closed session language, where we could get into details as far as what the spreadsheet number say. And I'm not necessarily recommending that at all. I'm just saying that could be one alternative.

- Well, I mean, cause we want us to be able, I personally want to be able to support it 100% but I also want to know what I'm getting and why. Because we're also out in the community selling these things and it was easy to do, but right now, you know, I guess I don't know what this means.

- Alder Dorf, please.

- The only thing I wonder does this one have to be passed by council because counselors that meet till the 21st to the night of the 21st. So if the date is the 21st, I think we can wait.

- I don't think this goes to council?

- I'm actually director Ellen Becker with this dollar figure. Are we okay in wording that here I think, or does that actually have to go to council?

- You know, I don't know the exact answer. I can tell you just a little more on the dates, yes. Expenditure period for ten five ends on December 21st of 21. And I can just explain what state statute says and what Wisconsin department of revenue says. Your expenditure period, you no longer can create a new project in the, after the expenditure is closed. So existing projects may be finished, but no additional improvements can be added during the last five years. So it's not black and white. It just says the project has to be already in the works. So you know, we certainly it'd be nice to have a contract, a purchase order. Something locked in by December 21st, but that is the reason why we're shooting for that date. But if it doesn't happen, one would say this project is a really in the works. It's already been discussed, we're moving forward with it. So I just wanted to kind of share that with you, what they consider is a project, something that's in place, they're talking either your financing has to be established. You have to assign the contract, or you have to have a signed development agreement. A contract could also be a purchase order. So that's kind of where we were, where we're leaning toward. And so I just want to kind of give you an answer. That's kind of what we're shooting for the date. But I'm sorry unfortunately, director I'm not exactly sure if this one dollar wise it is, I don't know if it has to go through finding like finance committee because it is really, it's not general fund money. It is really RDAs and it's TID dollar, I think typic RDA typically discusses it.

- I think that's, yeah, I believe that's, I think based on previous actions that we've done since I've been here, that this because this is essentially, we're doing this as, as an extension of a tit, a project that's already been approved in the tit project plan. That's already been approved by council that this would probably just require RDA approval. However, would like to be certain of that to make sure we're following the proper procedure on that.

- Okay, any other questions for on Broadway, Brian Johnson, questions or comments? Otherwise we're going to go back to regular order of business.

- Is there anyone else that wanted to speak? Did we ask that question?

- No we don't. Does anybody else want to speak in this regard? Okay, if not I'll entertain a motion go back to regular business.

- Make the motion. Okay, Matt and second by Melanie. Okay, all in favor, signify by saying, aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- We're back to regular business. You get on, I'll just start off and seeing that we really have two options here in my mind, we can either approve the recommendation or we can see what we need to get more detail. And we'll do look at the 14th and going to add some closed session language. So what did the group desire? And that's, I'm missing another option but to me those are the two options.

- Well, here's my other option. I'd like to approve something today. I'd like to approve the recommendation today and for our sakes, get a more complete explanation just so that we know what to say at the meeting, but then it's safely approved so that we meet our dates.

- I second that.

- Oh, thank you.

- Yeah, I agree with you.

- I just feel like I trust the people that made the decision and I understand what Kathy is saying because we don't have, you know, more of the information. It would be nice to get that more of the information, but in the meantime, like it sounds like they put some good study into it and I would feel comfortable voting on it.

- Yeah, and the other one other thought though, I'm on on Broadway Inc. Board. I was not involved in this. I did ask if I'm able to vote. I don't think Vanessa ever got back to me. So maybe I'm not the best of second it, but I don't know if I can vote on that.

- Yeah, I would probably, I think probably to be on the safe side. I said I would recommend abstaining just to be on the, just to be conservative, I think would probably be the, probably the best option.

- I agree.

- And you shouldn't.

- But the I don't second it.

- Do we have just a motion right now.

- I will second Alder Dorff's motion.

- Okay.

- Can we do a roll call vote?

- Sure, but before we do that, my only comment would be basically when we get more detail, can we reverse this decision? That'd be the only thing that I did. And I think it's fair to say that we put, just so everybody realizes that we're making a motion, but we could be versus with more detail, right.

- I don't know if that's what Barbra was saying. Barbara was saying I just want the reasons to be able to clearly say the justification. I'm pretty much trusting that a good process was used to make this determination. So I'm not saying that, you know.

- But you do, but you do want additional information, right. Okay.

- Right.

- Everybody understand the motion?

- No.

- No.

- So is it a conditional approval? I mean, it's, I'd make the motion that we move to get the additional information and then go from there. There's a motion that we meet today.

- There's a motion but there's no second.

- Second to that.

- Okay in a second. I'm sorry, I missed that. Questions or comments in regard to the motion.

- Mr. Chairman Corey, is this something that you could prepare a more detailed memo in terms of the process that was used and the criteria that would, that basically made you pick one over the other and that you put together?

- And it's so range from all four companies. Because my issue with this as being part of the RDA, we're authorizing, you know, a bid when there's one, 150,000 higher and another one 50,000 lower, I appreciate what Brian says. But there's gotta be difference in these beds. And I think as responsibility committee, we have to understand that. Things in the past and then they blow up. So I just feel better if I have the detail.

- Does everybody understand the motion, and the second? That we'd actually be approving the recommendation, but we'd also be asking for additional details at our next meeting to support the recommendation of the group. That clear statement what the motion is.

- Oh, I understand Gary.

- Okay, very good. Any other questions or comments in regard to the motion in a second, if not all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- Me.

- That's okay.

- I know I'm.

- Abstained.

- No shifting, thank you. Melanie, you probably have seen through then, right. Okay, so we should only get four of us, five of us I'm sorry. And so Mr. Chairman, do you wanna do a roll call?

- That's what I asked for.

- Okay, go ahead. It's the roll call. Alder Dorf.

- Yes.

- Chair Gary.

- Yes.

- Deby.

- Yes.

- Matt.

- Yes.

- Kathy.

- No.

- Okay, motion carried. Very good.

- I just noted that Melanie and Brighid are abstaining.

- Yes, very good thank you. Good discussion like always. Number four, deal number five consideration possible action. On the MF housing partners, LLC requests for dividing subsides and including HOME funding, TIDAH funding and land disposition to support the to support development, affordable multifamily housing under 1100 Block of East Walnut street. Yes, please. Who's got that?

- Thank you, that would be me. It's quite the mouthful, big item there, but it made sense to put all of this together in one package. So if you recall lasts or second to last RDA meeting, we awarded a planning option to MF housing partners for the development of affordable housing on the 1100 block of East Walnut street. This is a project that is going to be funded by a low-income housing tax credits through WEDA. So right now, MF housing partners is putting together their application to submit to WEDA and finalizing their capital stack. They currently have a gap of $800,000 that they are looking to the city to help meet. So they originally made a request for $500,000 of home funds and $500,000 of TIDAH staff has reviewed and underwritten the both home application entered out application. The, it did their home application did pass our underwriting. It was eligible for home funds. The TIDAH application also really met the expectations and the qualifications to receive those fundings as well for this project. So staff met and discussed their requests and came back and spoke with MF housing. And I came with the recommendation of awarding $400,000 in home funding as a grants, $400,000 of TIDAH funds as low interest, Most likely 15 year or a, you know, a shorter term loan. And then looking at the sale of the property disposition at $200,000. So just to clarify, we wouldn't be deeding the property they'd be paying the, the RDA for the they'd be purchasing the land from the RDA for $200,000.

- Okay.

- Pretty clear cut.

- I think, but let's hear comments and questions.

- And then the developer is here with us as well, or sit downs this year from the, the development group. If you have any questions for them as well.

- What's the timeline as far as they have to develop it?

- Sure, well the timeline for the application, we're not going to hear back. All this is contingent on, the recommendation is contingent on them receiving Leicht grants, which we won't know until April. But correct me if I'm wrong here I believe it is 2023. So we were looking at for construction.

- Right, hopefully I can break ground by the end of 2022, and then we would, it would take about 12 months to finish.

- Okay.

- We have additional questions for the developer. We'd open it up, but it's not put the question. Yes, please.

- First I have a question for Will, and it's about TIDAH funds as a low interest loan. And you kind of just ask strict and said, right, the duration of the financing to be determined, the interest rate is subject is, is the duration and the interest rates something we can control or is that defined somewhere? Just give me some context on what that guideline.

- Right, so this is something that, that staff can define the terms on. You know, of course, what we want to do is we want this to work both for the developer and the city, right. We want there to be, to be something that, that works for both parties, but we also want to make sure looking at what, how the rest of their funding works together. We just wanna make sure that they're the terms of this loan for the TIDAH funds works well with the rest of their financing. Neil, does that sound sound right?

- Yeah, absolutely. Just be clear, we wanted to make sure when we actually knew what the duration of their other financing options, we just wanted to simply have the flexibility to essentially coordinate that with that. If we needed to go one way or the other, to make sure that the financing would line up and not present a problem saying like all the initial payments all came in at once, and that was going to cause a cashflow problem. We were just looking to figure out how to, how to be able to schedule that with some flexibility to make sure that that doesn't happen.

- Okay, good thank you.

- Questions, comments in regard to the proposal. I don't feel as he needed to open up the meeting unless someone else does. If not, I will then entertain a motion.

- Alder Dorff move to approve.

- I would second that.

- Okay, motion made by Dorf, seconded by Matt, questions. Is there any other questions or comments with regard to the motion? If not all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed, motion carried, sounds exciting. We get a lot of exciting projects going on, without a doubt.

- Thank you.

- Now, item number five which was deal number one consideration of possible action on the amended development agreement with TWG development, LLC and DDL holdings, LLC, for tax incremental finance assistance for your project at 419 Donald Driver Way, also known as the Fort at the Railyard. Very good, wow. I want your material there's a lot there.

- No casual reading Mr. Chair yet. So certainly thank you, sir, with that, we certainly, this will be a little bit, probably our longest presentation in the meeting. So I apologize in advance, but there's a lot of information, certainly review as we go through this and make this consideration. Just start off, Mr. Michael Taft representative from the developer is available and online. And I believe also Mr. Paul Belcher and Josh Smith from DDS from base company, DDL properties is also available if there are questions after we get through the staff overview here. So just wanted to make sure folks were aware that they were there and wouldn't be available to answer questions. And I think Michael may have a brief presentation, I think to just kind of give a recap of how we got to where we are, but let me just kind of get through. Here's some of the summary of where we were out of the project. So key changes to the project was this essentially been the two main areas where staff and the developer had been spending a lot of time in discussion on were two key changes to the project. Well, originally it was about a 225 market rate units with studio one bedroom and two bedroom units. Essentially, now the project has changed to be about 233 units. 80% of the units that we're referring to work more workforce housing, which is the 60% of area median income. And then about 20% of those are at market rate. And I think one of the key factors behind that change in the breakdown is that Mr. Taft we'll speak on this later. Project has been awarded we to tax credits the 4% they were notified yesterday that they have been qualified for their tax credits 4%, I believe the non-competitive credits. So I think that was kind of a basis of that program is that kind of requires this breakdown. So certainly the change in units is one thing we've been certainly having much discussion on, the other aspect of the project that it had changed limit. There was originally 7,000 square feet of commercial space on the first floor that has been reduced to about 1300 square feet. But a lot of the other area of I'm actually in the space and that the math is no longer right at 2,700, it's actually larger than that. It has been more than the common space amenities related to the facility. So like community kitchen, meaning space, a co-working space, some entertainment spaces that are trying to the main concern here was the activation level really being achieved by the first floor of the project. So the change in uses kind of reducing to reduce that possibility. So the developer has been working with staff Mr. David on our staff to really evaluate live work options in terms of residential units and other ways of trying to maintain that act of that activity level on that ground floor. So primary staff, you know, concerns that we have certainly been raising as we go through evaluating this project is certainly the perception that there's less than street activation from the first floor. The general concentration of affordable units in the immediate area. This just being immediately next to Broadway lofts, especially that particular project, which we'll talk a little bit more about those in a moment. Certainly as a general rule there's there can be concerns over time that concentrating too many affordable units in an immediate area can present challenges overtime for a community. So we're trying to figure out, you know, it's really what, what is the acceptable level of those, of the number of units in a particular area. And then finally, there's also, there's several public improvements that still need to be remained and to complete it for this immediate project area. So those are certainly things that staff had raised throughout the conversation, as we've been revisiting with the developer. And speaking with Gary prior to the meeting here, we wanted to make sure we kind of revisited. And I think it came up here earlier, Kathy, your comments on the status of the housing study, just kind of re you know, re-emphasize, this is essentially directly, this text is pretty much directly right out of the housing study information in terms of what we X, what the city is actually needing. So over the next 20 years, we're looking at the, you know, the 3000 to 7,500 units. So total rental units needed. And then these kinds of the rent areas that they were looking for to kind of have for the community as a whole. So what, based on that, you know, kind of that thing, that's just kind of a benchmark for us to take a look at. We also took a look at trying to kind of identify really what is in the pipeline right now. Gary asked me, he says, you know, where are we at in terms of achieving the goals of the actual studies? Like, well, at this point we haven't, we haven't started building any units since we've gotten the study done. We have multiple projects in the pipeline in various stages of approval and moving forward. But we do not have anything actually under construction. So officially one could say the answer is we have made zero progress towards the units. However, we think it's actually, that's probably not a fair conspirator discussion since we do actually have several projects that are already in the pipeline. So we wanted to kind of come through and identify, you know, really what those, these projects are. I'm sharing that with the RDA. So, you know, certainly we've had these first three projects, a hundred percent market rate looking to get construction in and get going right away. Those are been, you know, certainly were. Starting to look at some of the additional AMI units here, impact seven, looking at their under planning option right now. In addition to MF housing partners, who you just approved, some finding financing for their project. Again, making some impacts in terms of the various income levels there. So kind of wanted to get some breakdown to where we're at. So looking at baseline in that entire pipeline and what we did not include the areas that are going to RFP here in early 22. So we don't really know what those unit mixes will be, what we wanted to at least kind of identify here in terms of, you know, the number of market units coming on is about 885. That's about 68% of those units. We're estimating really between between 50 and 60%. That's about 30% of those units. And then only 1% of those units is really at that 30% level, which is really where we really are, according to our housing strategy, to where we really need to see the impact. So we're not really needing meeting that end of the spectrum yet with our projects in terms of what's available out there but at least one of the at least provide again, kind of a, at least a distribution for the RDA to look at in terms of what we're looking at. While these numbers seem pretty significant. You know, so we're certainly meeting, you know, we're making progress towards our market rate units, but really the affordable units we are probably either arguably at, or certainly in the middle range, we're probably, you know, still not quite keeping up, but the low range we're certainly behind on, I would say based on our needs for the housing study. So just to kind of give again, kind of a benchmark for folks to kind of take a look at it and consider, as we were discussing these various, these various projects. Talk about the Fort of the Railyard, specifically their addition of what they're looking at. Obviously making probably the largest contribution really to those, to that AMI level, really out of any of the size project. This is the one larger project outside of the Broadway lofts that is really making a contribution towards those ranges. So the important note, I think and Mr. Taft can speak to this more directly, what gives he makes his comments is that they had received notice of their award for their 4% credits. They have been sounds like they are qualified and ready to go. Which means their financing is essentially set. All their other areas have kind of fallen into place. So our really our options in terms of staff looking at the project, we kind of really see three options. Proceeding with the project as presented, obviously, cause everything's kind of in place and would move forward. Some of the concerns staff has still would certainly remain with that, but maybe there would be some ways to address some of those things in the agreement as we proceed forward. We certainly could go back and require a change to the unit mix or retains the commercial uses on the first floor. We feel the best case scenario under this option probably delays the project six to 12 months at best if not longer. And probably disrupts their financing to the point that it could threaten the project. Certainly on a delayed process, if not permanently caused the project to go away. The third one was, did not approve any amendment. We are under a current development agreement with TWG on this project. However, that would promote likely result in the project as being in default. And that's probably starting over again on the project site. Possibly with a new developer, possibly in a two to three year window to get a new project going. Probably require it would probably require most likely it would be taking down of the existing structures that are there right now. And again, just kind of, not a, generally not a, really an attractive situation in any stretch of the imagination. And just wanting to put a note on there that obviously for a $21 million project, which is what is kind of the number of being looked at that's approximately $518,000 in tax imprint that would be available. And that is not coming in every, this over half a million dollars of taxes, but that does not come in. So just kind of, those are what we see as the three main options. In your particular, in the packet and then the conditions we had been provided in the staff report. We said, you know, considering amending the unit mix to a more market rate, higher market rate ratio, we feel that maybe that we did tax credit award has maybe kind of made that certainly more difficult if not, probably a detriment to the project, if we requested and required that. Certainly the confirmation by staff and planning commission and council, but the pros changes are, are consistent with the PUD zoning for the project. That process is also going forward right now that is going forward through to the planning commission in the next month or so, but also we can, that also creates problems in terms of the approved project. I think with WEDA, if any changes could occur there that also could affect their tax credit, or if too many changes are made. Also wanted to make note that we talked about, there is the, the city does have there's a, a significant project grant about $2.1 million that the city has invested in this particular project already in trying to get increment in the ground to get that paid back. The issue is obviously we would like to see that be, you know, the projects we have done recently this last year, we've made sure that that project rent gets repaid first, prior to any other PayGo disbursements going on. That would be the ideal situation. However, we feel that creates some problems with both the project financing for not only for TWG, but also possibly for DDL in terms of their overall project on there. So that may not be a feasible option. In relation to the actual public improvements. We mentioned, we think that we probably need to have kind of an updated schedule done between I probably TWG and DDL in the city. In terms of, you know, what needs to still meet needs to be done. And what's scheduled, would those be completed on. We didn't want to put an absolute hard and fast date requirement on that as yet, without having further conversations with both the developer and with DDL. In terms of, you know, really what the impacts could be of this. If folks remember if you guys remember this, and if you actually took the time to read the existing agreement, it is probably one of the more complicated TIFF disbursements that we have. I think if I tried to break it down in the most simple way possible, it was essentially that there is a first amount that is gold, that goes back to the city to cover that service related to the project grant. After that, then there is essentially a distribution between both TWG and DDL for the remainder of anything above and beyond that payment. But then over time that project, those funds get distributed accordingly. So it is a little bit of a complicated schedule on that. So without knowing the real impacts in terms of really what the projected increment was going to be on both of those entities, we figured that having some sort of discussion onto how those may be final improvements would get funded and paid for, would certainly be necessary to the future version of the agreement. And then finally this last one assembly staff really literally in the last day or so. Coming up with, we would at least recommend adding language to the agreement that basically says PayGo payments are contingent upon the property being adequately maintained. Which we don't think is going to be a problem. If for any, for certainly for a qualified developer and manager of properties. This really isn't the question. But we want to see some standard language to go forward on most of these really on any of these, any multi-family projects that are receiving assistance. We think including some language on this and we're willing to work with the developer on the appropriate language that would work. I think we'll just the other lesson I keep clicking on that. The other thing I think that comes back was that the one requirement discussion, I think, and maybe ask Mr. Taft to address this. I think they were talking about maybe trying to re you know, alter some of the finishes on the inside of the project to try to save some money. In terms of making sure that the RDA has an okay over what those internal furnishes might be. So just an opportunity to kind of finalize and approve those, to make sure that it's a quality level that everyone can be comfortable with. So at this point, we're just, you know, preliminary recommendation subject. Again, these are, this is essentially a kind of an, almost a terms and conditions direction. We were looking for the RDA. This is that we are not, we have not brought back a formal amendment to you at this point as part of this meeting. We were asking for direction on how to amend that agreement. If you were to dissolve, you would desire to do that. So these would be essentially incorporate the staff conditions to the extent possible. And then so, you know, review by the city attorney for final language approval and then bringing it back draft agreement to the RDA on the 14th prior to reviewing it with the city council then on the 21st. Would be in a situation where we're at at this point.

- Any questions for Neil before we open up the meeting, I want to hear Mr. Taft.

- Yeah, just a couple full 'cause I wanna make sure I understand the facts correctly before we open up to the director, you had referenced Neil a $2.1 million grant. So I'm interpreting that as funds that the city has already spent. What were those funds spent on and what are the conditions tied to that in the development agreement?

- That is in, in our master, I believe is our master agreement with DDL properties, essentially. So that had to do primarily with, I believe the infrastructure related to those over the public. So I think the streets, the storm water, I think some of the signage, I think some of the sidewalks and pedestrian areas was largely the public infrastructure related with the kind of the establishment of the Fort the Railyard specifically.

- Okay.

- So this was not all, the 2.1 road was not solely tied to this project, but it was really tied to the overall, the overall Railyard project.

- Okay, so in other words, you know, it's the things we can see there, the streets in the storm water that stuff stays. It was the money was spent kind of based on, hey, we're going to drive some value from this project. But it's not like that's lost money.

- Correct, and it's still a cost. There are borrowing costs for the city for making that investment. And certainly obviously, you know, staff's position is trying to position the city to recover that as quickly as possible in any way we can, without obviously doing damage to the actual private financing aspects of project.

- Okay, thank you, Neil.

- Any questions or comments before we open up the meeting?

- I guess my question is, you said the grant was for those infrastructure things, but not everything is done what needs to be done yet? The money was, I mean, given.

- Yeah, part of it was essentially that was a was awarded. There are some certainly there's been some things that have gone on in terms of trying to coordinate improvements for lineage at this particular site. I think there's some sidewalk and some signage and some stormwater things that still may be to be done in the immediate area of this project site that would essentially, wouldn't be tied to this project. Obviously not with that project. You don't want to install those sidewalks and all those different things when there's going to be construction equipment driving over on top of it. A lot of times, so there are some things that still need to be done. I think there might be a couple of improvements actually elsewhere in the Railyard that needs still be finalized. But again, obviously without an increment stream or our cash stream, do that, the developer has been hesitant to kind of finalize some of those things. Yeah, my understanding is probably if I had to put a number on it, it's probably for the overall site, it's probably 80 to 85% completed. They're solely, probably 10 to 15% of things that need to be finalized for this particular area. And they're essentially kind of requiring, I think it would probably be, I guess, probably both staff's opinion and probably the developer's opinion that, that additional imprints required essentially to finalize and get those projects completed.

- Okay, questions or comments for staff Neil, staff before we open it up?

- I have a couple of comments. This is Deby. And I realized the project has, has shifted, but WEDA would have looked at the concentration of poverty when a market analysis was supplied to be able to get the tax credits. And I do have, I do have, you know, some flags going up with the concentration power being in the downtown. But the mix, this is like the best mix you're gonna get out of a WEDA tax credit project I think right now. When most of the, when you don't have any 50% below, mid 50% or below 30% mixed in here, which I know is desirable to us. You're still having people that have incomes over about $38,000 a year in a one bedroom. So it's not that much of a burden on that person, you know, to be able to live there, plus you don't want, I don't think you want bigger units because there's no green space. There's no green space. There's no place for families. So this is definitely a workforce housing project. And as I said, I think the mix is as good as it's going to get to be able to get tax credits. That's my comment.

- Okay.

- Thank you, Deby. You know, we agree and that's, again, I think my, you know, certainly my comment of, you know, any change to this mix, it has to be certainly something that is certainly at the discretion of this body to request that and take a look at that. But I want to be very clear that it certainly would have a significant impact probably to the ability to finance this project, certainly through WEDA and in terms of what delay that could cause going forward and certainly an unknown and maybe Mr. Taft can address that.

- Okay, of course, we're gonna ask more staff questions later, but I think we're ready to open up the meeting to hear from Mr. Taft

- Motion to open up the floor by Alder Dorf.

- Okay.

- Second.

- Second by Matt, I think. Motion by Dorf, second by Matt open up the meeting, all those piercing and saying aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, good meeting is open. Mr. Taft, please give us, give us your perspective.

- Great, thank you very much. Again, my name is Michael Taft. I'm a development associate here at TWG. I've been working on this project since day one, several years ago now. And kind of walking through the day-to-day project management. We also have our vice president of tax credit development, as well as our president of development on the call here. Neil, if you don't mind, I'm going to share my screen for some accompanying slides.

- Yeah, let me know if for some reason it's not letting me do that. I'm like, well, we get, there we go. Looks like it's working, okay, perfect. Oops, it was working. You disappeared there, you had it up.

- I can see it, I can see it.

- Got it, great. Yes, so to just very briefly go over some basics. TWG again is based in Indianapolis. We started in 2007 and at this point are in 15 states. A little over a billion dollars in total value developed. Today we do both market rate, mixed income and affordable and mixed use generally in both suburban and urban areas. We're probably actually close to 300 employees now and been going pretty quickly. And this would be our second project in Wisconsin. This is what we're talking about today is the latest phase and the railer and development. Obviously you guys are very familiar with that. More specifically, we were brought in originally and our relationship with Green Bay and with the Railyard was formed primarily to bring housing in to the Larson cannery redevelopment. So that initially as phase one was Broadway lofts in the housing component. We did complete that I believe in January of this year. And it is already, it's 170 units and it's already full. So that is a mix of incomes between I believe 30% and 80% AMI. And we saw incredible demand, at least approximately twice as fast as we would typically expect an affordable housing project in this sort of area. So we were extremely happy with that. It is generating increment for the tid. And I think just from all stakeholders, we've heard great things. Secretary Carson toured it, I believe last year. So it's brought some good press, that sort of thing. And so we're really happy with that development. Looking forward a little bit, the next thing kind of from our perspective that occurred was that we were looking at, okay, how do we develop more housing in the Railyard? And specifically looking at this development area A in the PUD and looking at higher density and more of a turn towards market rate. We went through our traditional market rate channels. There's this new opportunity zone financing mechanism that we saw as a really good opportunity to do a pure market rate project. Even though the re the rents weren't maybe quite good enough to typically finance that sort of project with that kind of boost to equity returns. We are confident that there was financing in place. This kind of confidence was primarily informed by receiving a huge commitment. I believe it was something like $14 million of equity commitment from an investor that had an opportunity zone fund that had already funded one previous project that was a large urban mixed use scale project. With that confidence, we kind of towards the end of 2020. We knew that we would be able to close with the equity partner, but that winter was coming soon. And if we did not have the site ready, we would not be able to, we would lose almost really six to nine months of construction progress. With that situation we did choose to out of pocket do site improvements. So doing remediation of the soil, getting the pad prepped, we did start doing some hard infrastructure like foundation footings and the stair towers. At that point, it basically came to a situation where that equity partner came back to us and said they were no longer had confidence that opportunity zone funds were available out in the open market. And they had been looking for months and we are not able to secure those funds with the returns that the rents in the Railyard would give. So we were putting the situation of, we had this project, we had promised division to the RDA, to the neighborhood. We had promised housing to the railroad and development, and we spent months and months looking at different options. I mean, we, there is not an option we did not look at we wanted to be a good partner. We want to evaluate every possible option we talked to, I mean, like I said we've done almost a hundred development now. We talked to every market rate investor that we could look for opportunity zone funds. What we heard over and over again was that there were not opportunities zone funds for this kind of project available. And so there was just no market rate financing mechanism for that. At the same time I don't know if you remember hearing in July and that kind of time window or spring and summer lumber prices and pretty much everything else started spiking quite a bit. We did reprice this project and its costs have gone up even more kind of ensuring that the market rate approach just was not feasible anymore. With that knowledge, we also had been looking simultaneously at the tax credit approach. There's an increase in funding for tax credits, essentially in December, 2020 housing bill. And we saw this opportunity to get non-competitive tax credits, which would allow us to move quickly and confidently to get this project done. It would still allow us to do mixed income. So that is the choice we pursued. We immediately contacted city staff and said that that was the option on the table. We started talking to WEDA. Our desire from the outset was that we wanted as much market rate as possible while still keeping the project feasible with affordable units and tax credits that come from those pretty early on we set on the current affordability mix. And I'm happy to talk about that more, but I just wanted to cover initially that is kind of the history that got us to this point is that we looked at all the options on the table. We looked at the goals, we looked at the housing study and we looked at okay, how can we take the site, deliver the density, deliver the housing, deliver what the market study is calling for, and importantly deliver the increment that is needed to pay back this infrastructure loan and deliver taxes for over another couple of decades. So that's kind of what got us to today. We're really proud that you'll all go here. We're really proud that this is the rendering I showed you, you know, a year ago. And it's the same. I mean, this project still looks great and we have not value engineered it in a meaningful way. And it's a great asset to the community. Still has 46 market rate units. That's just as many as the cherry street development mentioned. It has additional affordable units. I believe there's a deficit currently of, I think 1200 units around 60% AMI were identified as the existing deficit, not the feature deficit, but the existing deficit for green bay. So this would be, you know, I think 170 some affordable units for an existing deficit, 1200. So we looked at that and we thought this was a really faithful delivery of mixed use retail, same design, same urban scale, same tax increment, and are pretty proud of the ability to pivot in a moment, we realized that this is not the pure market rate project that was originally the hope, but we do think that is by far the best option moving forward. Again, this project is the same scale, the same infill, same housing units, same public art factor. We did not cut that. We thought that was important to get into the details a little bit more, same generally saying unit design, full balconies in-unit laundry. We're not doing granite, but it's still like perfectly good laminate countertops. If you walk through Broadway lofts, it'll be basically the very, very similar unit level of finishes that look really good. We still have these 11, 10 foot ceilings on several of the floors retail space stalls, this 26 foot lofted glass box ceiling. And then you can see the rents here, which are still, you know, as I think somebody mentioned the, I think the income and income levels for this 60% AMI is, you know, over 34,000 for a single resident and over 48,000 for a family of two parents and two kids. So that is not, you know, a concentration of poverty. In fact that's the median income of existing neighborhood. So it's, we think it's a really important delivery of quality density, quality housing at multiple income levels, including 46 markets market rate units. Again, the site plan is not changed. We think it's a really good use of the space that fits in really well with the scale of the existing development along Broadway specifically, you can see Broadway would be along the top of the page here. This is this community room that is built out as co-working space. And so you'd have the retail here and then the coworking space, which still has full glass facing Broadway and would still be this activated non-residential use that would continue kind of the energy up to the further north on Broadway is still there. And then you can see that the development costs have gone up, I believe about $5 million again, tax credits helping to subsidize that we were proposing the exact same incentive. You'll notice that the, you know, the 43 units on the previously talked about tax credit project it looks like a great project.

They're receiving $800,000 of, of home funds and the other funds. And we're not coming back to request more affordable housing funds. We're just requesting the existing tid that we're gonna follow through on and create that increment. Again, we're really proud of the ability to move forward quickly and without additional subsidy on this project. Project schedule, thankfully we, we have our bank and equity investor lined up. We they're ready to go as soon as we get city approval on 1221 is what we're hoping for right now from a city council. And as soon as that hits, obviously it's winter. So you won't see a lot of activity initially, but we'll have full financing secured in a way that cannot drop out again. And as soon as, you know, March, April, when it's warming up, framing would begin almost immediately. And that would allow us to finish the project by December, 2024, which would allow it to be assessed that following January and start really creating meaningful increment without a significant delay to the tid. So I know that was a lot to deliver. Again, it's a complicated project and, but I did want to just share that the full detail there. I would be happy to answer more questions or dig into, or the affordability or the design changes, but we are here to, to answer your concerns and questions.

- Okay I can start the Broadway lofts. As you say it's a hundred percent full. Is there a waiting list?

- Yes, there is.

- Okay and has there been any issues, I guess I'm asking us people in the city have any issues with that, with that project.

- And I think not that we're aware of Mr. Chairman in terms of anything, I mean, other than we've heard some, you know, anecdotally some activity on the site, because it's just an open site, you know, kids being in there, there probably shouldn't be, we have had, you know, anecdotes of, I think of some activity being on site too, in terms of securing construction equipment or materials, having some issues taking that out there, there've been, maybe I think there was an earlier report before it was really under construction of, you know some construction materials being, being taken off the site, mostly because it's just the lack of activity on the site. And it's being a big open area.

- I think the question was more in regard to not at school.

- Yeah, absolutely Mr. Chair, in terms of having that project right next door to that, I said, we have not seen, I think in many of the activity we have seen has been more to the fact that it's just been an open construction site rather than anything that has been directly caused by the Broadway lofts.

- That was my question.

- Yeah.

- Question in the group, please very good.

- Briefly that really what affordable housing comes down to is the quality of management and we'll own this property for at least 15 years, most likely over 30. And I mean, we want to have a good reputation in town. We have two properties next to each other. That's a significant investment. And you know we'd also wants to hear good things. They've heard good things on Broadway lofts. So they're giving us another allocation and we have extensive experience managing mixed income properties is another specialty. And there are some unique aspects to that, but we have dozens of mixed income properties across the Midwest. And so we feel really confident that we can maintain the space to a pretty high degree. And I think that the, the market rate units also hold the development to account them some degree where if you really want to get good market rate rents you're gonna keep it looking good. And so we have a pretty strong incentive there.

- Kind of unrelated question to some degree. Could we maybe get into details on the project itself, but Neil, I'd be curious to the, the older men in this area or the mayor have a opinions on this.

- I believe the mayor is on by believe all the government. I believe Dave Buck Dave, I believe has spoken with Alder Scanal. I believe on this project.

- I have spoke with Alder Scanal. He didn't really give me a direction where were the other? It was really just kind of an update on what's happening.

- Okay, Mr. Mayor, please. Mr. Mayor do you have an opinion on the project.

- Yeah, I appreciate the question chair, you know, no project is perfect. This is certainly different than what we were expecting when TWG originally presented the Fort to us. But I think you know, you take a look at what they've presented. You take a look at what our needs are with respect to the housing study that you all are very familiar with. I think this is a really good fit for that, that spot and a good fit for the context of our need overall, you know, I would, I'd like to see a little bit more street activation contemplated with some of those units on Kellogg because of the reduction in the commercial space, which I certainly understand, you know, given the fact that this is tax credit reliant, but we'd love to see a little bit more connection to the sidewalk, to the street if that's at all possible on the part of the designers and developers, but all in all now I think this is a, this is a very valid project meets a huge need, not just in the neighborhood, but in our city as a whole. And I think it's very well-designed.

- Mr. Taft, do you have any comments in regards to the mayor's comments?

- Sure yeah a great point would be that just like we previously proposed for this building the units along Kellogg, they would maintain their storefront glass and we'd be absolutely open to doing unit entries directly into there to activate that frontage. But more importantly, that space structurally and code-wise is designed that it could be flipped to commercial. And I did check in that there is a mechanism through WEDA that that would be allowable. So if in 10 years the Railyard is one of the mixed use retail districts with huge demand. We would definitely have incentive and ability to flip that to more retail and commercial use.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for your comments. Rest of the group, please ask some questions, Mr. Taft Please. I'm not surprised.

- I don't know that I've questions but maybe when the floor is closed I comment

- Okay Kathy. Kathy, were you going to say something I'm sorry.

- No I said, I think the development looks awesome. I'm on the understanding the original RFP was, was it for workforce housing or did we just, as my I understand, we just flipped it when we set the RFP.

- Yeah, I believe it was, it was originally the original intent that Kathy was dead. It was definitely gonna be a market rate project.

- Okay, when we put it out, that's what we were looking for. So now we have this proposal okay.

- Yes.

- Matt, you have questions for Mr. Taft?

- No I don't have any questions yeah.

- Anybody else in the group otherwise work in the.

- I would like to share I'd like this ask a question. Mr. Taft. Are you gonna have separate property managers at both sites or are you gonna combine management for both sites?

- Yeah, we will be, there'll be a staff of probably at least six people across both properties. So all onsite management for both the properties, I'd be most likely we would have a property manager overseeing both properties and an assistant project property manager at each individual site. So there would be, and we usually encourage them to live in the development, particularly when there's a market rate ability. So there would be constant supervision there.

- Alder Dorff, Melody, Deby questions for Mr. Taft?

- I think it looks really good. I just have one more question and that is, have we talked to the people around the new proposed development and customer feedback?

- I'm sorry I'm not sure I understand.

- Where it's being built. Whether looking to possibly switch it from market rates to not market rate and we already have the Broadway lofts, which is absolutely fine. But have, I mean had we had any type of hearing for the neighborhood or is this that's something we do later?

- Well, I live there and I, not to my knowledge, I have feedback and that.

- I guess we're, it always helps if you have the feedback, the people that are, you know going to be most impacted because it looks like a free project, but there are other, there are other considerations, so, okay I'll wait.

- Otherwise, Brighid, if you want to make your comments now, maybe Mr. Taft could respond to them.

- Okay yeah so just so for the record, I wanna full disclosure, we did bid our center proposal for telecom services to Broadway lofts. We were turned away. We also tried for this development. We did not win that either. And in the last couple of weeks, Michael has actually contacted our office to ask us to rebid. And I chose not to so that it wouldn't interfere with conflict of interest in this discussion. So I just want to make people aware of that discourse. And we have not as Michael, as you know, we have not responded to you. I struggle with this because I so I lived there. I am an owner of a condo and, you know, the reason I wanted to live there was not only to be downtown, but to have a diverse set of socioeconomics. I am really concerned with this change that they're too much of a concentration of lower income housing. And I think that was the staff's original comments, at least in what I read yesterday. I the other thing I want to say to TWG is I, I think you were very creative in how you've tried to restructure this, obviously the pandemic and, and every everything since then has created curveballs for so many of us. So I think you did a good job of, of trying to repackage it, but I think we have to think about these are long-term you know, impacts. And I am already that there is the weights to low-income housing is already very far to the end. We've got the, you know the the homeless shelter we've got the low income housing, and now we have the, the clinic the public clinic. And I think I'm all for a variety of income housing, but it shouldn't be concentrated too much in one particular area. So I am not in favor of this as one of the very few people who owns a home there, there's two of us, you know, it's just not, I just, I don't think it's a good way to go. And I, not sure what the answer is, but, you know, there are things that are out of our control. There are things that are out of the developer's control, but that doesn't mean that we need to be backed into a corner to make a decision that isn't right for that area. And I'm happy to, if anybody, I mean, I love where I live. I like the, I like the area, but honestly I would consider, and I know Paul, isn't probably interested in this, but I don't know that I'd want to live there if it's going to go all in that direction. And I'd probably look at subletting.

- I'm not sure there's anything there at Mr. Taft. You can respond, respond to.

- I do, actually. I would just say that we share some more concerns with the concentration of affordable housing in cities. We know that impact well. I would say that this is not a concentration of low-income housing. If the range of incomes for this property is between 34 and $50,000. If you look at the neighborhood, the average median income for the neighborhood is $38,000. So it's almost would raise the average income of the neighborhood. You look at the urban area of green bay. It goes up slightly it's maybe in the forties, but again, this is for the average citizen of downtown green bay and it's needed housing and it's not creating poverty. It's actually allowing the existing neighborhood to grow in density and support commercial and support retail.

- And I guess I look at it as somebody who, who moved in knowing the entire picture, and I know Michael you probably don't, but you know, there was going to be another building like ours. I don't think that's looking like it's going to happen. And I again I understand that there maybe there's a hard time selling that higher end product but this is not going to help that if you really want that mix of incomes and there was going to be another building that was developed for very high end. So then again, you get these very varied levels. This is not going to help that this is going to swing it too far in the other direction.

- Alder Dorff you can make a comment.

- I'm just look trying to find those numbers again. Where was that? What were those numbers that show which how much, how much, or how many are at market rate? How many okay. Does somebody know that.

- Alder Dorff talking about the slide that was up earlier with all these projects? I can put that up here hold on one moment.

- I think it's 20% now our market rate and sort of a hundred percent.

- Yes.

- And I would just add that we would be very open to increasing the number of market rate units in the building if we were allowed to Rita has a restriction where the maximum number of marker agents you can put in a building is 20%. So something like 40% would have been ideal, but it's just a hard line that we did push against WEDA to allow more but if this wasn't an option.

- And well, we don't support this project is into the go forward from your perspective that correct?

- Yes yeah we got the full they're full executive board approve the project even after asking some hard questions yesterday.

- Okay other questions or comments please.

- Chair this is Alder Dorff.

- Yes please.

- Is there anything more we can do as an RDA, as far as financial support. I mean, maybe we can't, maybe we can't, but if there's there's anything, because it was originally very different and there was supposed to be a, you know, mixed use or I'm sorry, mixed economic, whatever you, however you say that it is so different. Is there anything that we can do? Any funds that we have available? And I tried to find how much, just read it, put it in. And I can't find it that fast. I don't know but Michael.

- Yeah, I certainly can ask Michael further, you know what do you thinks the proposed value of the tax credits are going to be? But my guess is it's probably going to far out distance. Anything that any existing program we have at the city level to make up directly, you know, certainly obviously tip is, is a difficult tool to use for affordable projects simply because of the affordable nature is because, because the evaluation is based on the rents, which are obviously lowered for the affordable purposes, which is what we want the housing for, but that obviously affects the taxable value and the end of it. So it actually limits our ability then to kind of really generate a TIF going forward. So it can still work. And it does in this case, in terms of, you know, Michael's indication of why they're asking for the same request that they made previously. Now in terms of the overall project and going forward. And, you know, I certainly, you know, we see if Mr. Belscher has any comments on that too. Obviously the more increment that the way that my understanding, the way the agreement is set up is the more increment that is generated beyond what was minimally required to cover the debt service was going to be best, basically income, both to TWG EDS, or DDL properties to actually make additional improvements to their projects and their properties as they go on. So without, without being able to increase the value we are, I think the cities are gonna be somewhat limited in terms of our ability to do additional work.

- But I'm not seeing none increased. I don't think I'm saying that increase the value. If you have more market rate apartments, don't you increase the value.

- It would absolutely Alder Dorff but I my understanding is, again, ask Mr. Taft for what he if he could provide some sort of dollar value on what he thinks the tax credits are worth, my guess is I don't believe we would be able to make that up in terms of using TIF as a tool to make that up. But, but I don't know if Michael, do you have a specific, if you can share a number on what you think the financial value of those tax credits are going to be.

- It's a little bit of an odd analysis, but I mean, the value of the tax credits is about $30 million. So it's over 20. Then I would have to do some math there, but it's an incredible amount to subsidize those rents. I would say the, in terms of providing further subsidy to allow market rate, one of the major drivers for us in this solution is that because it's an a tid, and because it's an a tid that ends full stop at the end of the tid and legally cannot be extended every year that this project is delayed is a loss of over $500,000 in tax income. That goes to both the city and DDL and us. So every year is a significant amount of value lost. And so the idea of going and pursuing at-risk financing while we've already purchased the property and invested significant construction work to the tune of multiple, several million dollars. I think that, that put a heavy incentive to come through with our commitment for the tid, because that's in the best interest of all the partners.

- Is he a Paul Belschner? You're a board, Paul I can't believe you don't have any comments. I'd love to hear your, your thoughts. You'll have to unmute there you go thank you, Paul.

- Yeah, no problem. It's Paul and Brandon, Josh we're all here. So first I guess I would thank TWG for their investment in our community. When we started on the north end of the Railyard, we were focused intently on what that right transition would be from a property boundary immediately adjacent to a homeless shelter. We all agree that it's a well-run shelter. It's a good looking building, but it's still a homeless shelter. There was a lot less in place at the Railyard back then than there is now. Great to see that the 107 units of the Fort project or the loft project, sorry, are filled. We too are hearing a significant amount of concern about the unit mix. And we have our own concerns about the right unit mix. We've had discussions with city staff about the unit mix. I don't know how to predict failure in this regard. I also haven't heard any better solutions. I think Neil laid it out very well with his three options, and we're very anxious to, to watch how the RDA and city council chooses to move forward and select one of those three options that are, that are out there because frankly we see pros and cons throughout those options. Very difficult decision. As Michael said in his presentation, there's a lot going on here. There's a lot going on here. And we're only talking about the fork project. I just like to clarify that in the context of the development agreement, 19-04 when deal is mentioning developer that's TWG development, There's when we started in 2017 with the additional acquisition of property. North of Kellogg street, public works had a bid, in internal estimate back then of $5,777,000 to perform essentially the same amount of public works and infrastructure is what's been done today. And Diane I saw was on the call. You know we've been very fortunate and our team has been working diligently on that for years to get the vast majority of that work done and dedicated back to the city of green bay for a wrong $5 million. There's if you go back to the original development agreement of December 1st, 2017, there was also an infrastructure agreement at the same time that calls out a listed project items and B listed project items. I think we came up with an amazing structure here to share in the risk of something that would have sat blighted for another 10 years. Had we not been able to craft a shared risk approach to somehow saying, how are we gonna get $5 million or $6 million? And those are five-year removed numbers now with cost inflations and they didn't involve environmental remediation either. Well, we said, we'll get a hundred thousand dollars for every million dollars of increment. We started with 2.1 million for some DDL work. We added the Broadway lofts project. Now we added the fourth project and we'll add more projects. They got a lot of great things taking place at the Railyard. That's where all the TIF dollar dollars grant dollars went went in going back to this development agreement. And we're a partner at the same exact level is the city of green bay? As, as Neil pointed out here, we each party, there's a master development agreement that governs essentially the whole Railyard where DDL holdings gets 50% of PayGo. City of green bay gets 50% of PayGo. We contributed our 50% of the Broadway lofts project back to TWG as part of a deal structure that got something going. And I appreciate your, your grid Neil. We always look at a real project in a very different light than a proposed project because to, you know, despite a lot of folks, best intentions and efforts, many times proposed projects at some point in time stumble and don't become real.

- Paul Can I interrupt you just for a minute only because a Matt and to have to leave in a couple of minutes. I just want to hear his perspective if he's, if he's got.

- Okay thank you for the opportunity and thank you for TWG.

- So we can come back I just want to before Matt leaves. Matt is there any comments you'd like to make before you leave?

- No, I think one of the things that I, you know, we'd love to get into is, is I know, you know we had referenced there, the slide that Neil put up with the three options, and I think that's really important to understand. And is there a time requirement on deciding today? Cause I will say this is one of the more complicated things that's come across our desk until we had this discussion. I was fully under the understanding that there was a market rate development project happening on that site. So this is a huge change in to me. I read a written development agreement that goes back to 2019. And so I'm sitting here in my head trying to sort through, and I understand from what Michael has said, right, they are trying to make lemons or lemonade out of lemons. I get it and I appreciate the way that they've come to that. I'm just sitting here now going foof. What really are our options with this site? And I don't know if it has to be decided today because it doesn't sound like there is a shovel that's gonna hit the ground tomorrow. And, and so that's part of, what's trying to go through my head is really understanding our options and sorting through those because this is just such a curve ball for me right now.

- Thank you great comments like always Matt.

- If I could just jump in.

- Yeah please.

- There is an incredible sense of urgency here. I think, like I said we've had several million dollars invested in this project. This fits 99% of the development agreement, which actually doesn't mention market rate versus affordable. We do think this is an excellent project. It is market rate it looks like a market rate. You will never find another affordable project in the state that looks anything like this. The people who live in it are working and contributing to downtown green bay. They have the same income as the people who live in the neighborhood. It looks excellent again. And I think that actually we need to still procure materials, which is incredibly difficult right now. We have to go through the full bidding process and get staged for constructions that we can begin immediately, as soon as it is warm enough, so that we can finish this project by the end of 23 and generate that increment. And so there's just multiple layers of ways that we have committed here and we're in front of you with financing and with a plan that is good and you're yeah, to delay that would put a lot at risk. And we can't assure that we can do the same thing in a few months.

- I guess I'm with Matt though this seems like to us, this seems very rushed. And Neil had been talking about, he hadn't heard from TWG and was trying to get, you know, so I'm not sure why this timeline is being pushed on us when it seems like there was a lot more time that nothing was being done we weren't aware.

- Okay yes Neil please.

- I wanna be clear on what we're staff is asking for today is essentially direction on how to finalize the development agreement. So this is not approving the project and end all be all at one shot here. What we're asking for is directions to whether or not, you know, we can proceed at least with, with what the unit mix is being posed. If so, we will certainly do our best to go forth and, and represent the city's best interest in the RDAs best interest in terms of updating that agreement to do that. You know, if the other two options are, I mean, I think we have to be very very open to the concept that we have to, if we're go down for either, either something similar to that, a little second or third options, we're basically RDA is going to be saying that we're willing to essentially sit on that property for another six to 12 months at the shortest, possibly a couple of years at the latest, without any other things happening on there. Just to be clear that they know, I guess my one concern, you know, while certainly it was looking at it in terms of having a discussion of, of concentrating, you know, what the number of units are, you know, I would have certainly still share that that same concern that's on our radar. But I do want to kind of, I guess, to put it into perspective, 60% of the area median income is not a significant departure from, I guess if this was, if this was all like 30% or lower, there would be, I think there would be even more concerns in terms of service demands and other things on the community. I think if you're looking at, in terms of Cheryl, I think you have to actually have some income numbers about who, someone who makes 60% a household size in terms of, you know, what kind of funds actually those people are making. Yeah I think we're maybe being a little too, maybe too concerned over on the income levels on this particular project. I think that we need to kind of keep in mind that, you know again, these are people who are working and living downtown. This is probably exactly the income levels though, what the those folks are going to be making and doing in downtown. So certainly I agree. We want to be caught. We want to be careful about that, but there's also, I don't think by one who automatically assume that because the project's at 60%, that there's gonna be poor people that are causing problems in the community. I don't want to make sure I want to make sure that that's absolutely not a, that staff certainly does not want to make sure that that's not a, an opinion being put forward on that. I want to make sure that we understand that, that again, I think that is anything. I mean we I think we've had conversations even in the last week on other projects, we say 80% of area median income is essentially for all practical purposes, in market rate project. So we're only going another 60% going down another 20% around the range on these things on the income for here. So I guess I'm a little on the fence, so yet we certainly should be aware of it, but I think there's things we can do as well as terms of how we write the development agreement, working with Michael in terms of, you know, making certain there's some management protections in there and how the property will be managed over time versus, you know just assuming that there's going to be problems because, oh, somebody had 60% income or less that there's going to be automatically be problems at some point in the future. I don't know if that's necessarily a fair assumption. I think if we can come up with staff can work with them over the next month to kind of say. Hey, here's some extra protections in terms of knowing how that property is gonna be managed here sorts of some guarantees are gonna work. You know, I think staff is certainly comfortable with proceeding that direction. If RDA is comfortable with proceeding on that.

- Yes, please.

- Okay so 60% median income, I think works out to about $18 an hour, if I'm not mistaken. And there's not many employers that are near the downtown area that are paying $18 an hour. So truly this is a workforce housing development. The second thing is is that if you are living in a Leicht project and you're only gonna be charged 30% of your rent, and you're making $18 an hour. That means you have more disposable income that you'll be able to put in the community? So there's different ways of really looking at this. And again, as it was pointed out, the 60% median income is basically the income of that area. And I truly I'm somebody that have, has worked for a long, long time trying to create mixed income neighborhoods. You know, that has really been my focus for many many many years, but we really need these types of units. And I understand we're just concerned. I understand that and I understand that the whole project down there was supposed to be much more of an influx of market rate and higher end, and that just, it's not panning out at this moment. And unfortunately, this project is in front of us. I mean, fortunately, this project is in front of us. This project does fit that need of single people working in our downtown in service areas, people that are making under $18 an hour, $18 an hour. We can't even get the minimum wage up to $15 an hour for heavens sakes. So I just really feel that this is really serving needs of the community down there, but I still do Harbor that concern that we do not do this anymore, that we have reached that concentration level, that any other project can not be within an exit. You know, we've had one on the east side on Monroe, you know, we have to really watch where these projects are going. And that's my final comment.

- Thank you Deby for your fast comments. Brian, on Broadway, please.

- Thank you, director Stechchuite just a question. And I'm kind of spit balling here on the fly, but we've got two other lots over there that are not developed that are relatively sizable and could still, you know, welcome some like I said sizable development. I mean, is there, is there a way that, and this is, you know, I don't, I don't fully have the numbers in front of me, right. Does this, if we guarantee a minimum of $21 million of assessable value on this property, is that enough to service to service the debt on the tid? Or does that kid need additional new increment to fulfill its obligation?

- I believe, I believe the $21 million. And again I'd have to go back and really and confirm to be sure I really read through it to really make, make absolutely sure. I believe the $21 million was kind of the, the number that was going to be required to meet to ensure the coverage of that, of that debt, particularly service on that. And I think that covered most of it with, and I think there was some assumption that anything above and beyond that could be distributed to the developer and then both developed TWG and DDL properties. But in terms of the exact number, I would need to kind of re really dig in with director Alan Becker and really make sure that that number is there. We know $21 million works that was in the original agreement. We know that number is solid and functions, but I think the assumption was maybe I think in terms of the overall master agreement, that there would be additional increment that could be utilized and then divided up between the parties for additional investment beyond, above and beyond what that minimum debt service requirement would be. Okay, go ahead, Michael then.

- Sure, the TID over time, essentially our increment pays approximately half or sorry, double what the existing loan is. So there's plenty of cushion there, but I want to emphasize that $21 million was the estimated assessed value of the market rate project. We would pay less than that in taxes, under normal circumstances. And what we're proposing is to artificially half hike our own taxes in order to give you guys the same level of comfort that the tittle will be fully fulfilled. So that has lost profit every single year for us and a pretty significant margin. But we did that because we wanted to come back with the same building and the same financing agreement.

- Yeah and I appreciate that, that clarity, Michael and I, obviously I was aware of that based on the conversation you and I had and, and where I'm kind of going with this is recognizing the concerns in the room, right about too heavily concentration, too heavy concentration of subsidized housing in that area. Is there a way that the city can sort of guarantee market rate developments on those other two lots, whether it's utilizing the existing TID or perhaps creating an overlapping tid that could encompass some of the other lots that are getting ready for, I think development proposals adjacent to that Railyard area is that a possibility?

- I think absolutely Ryan, we certainly would want to take in after run, you know, we run very specific numbers and I think too, it's two things is one is that we would be, you know, be very hard pressed. I think if that's the direction wanting wanted to go to convince the RDA to make additional assistance to specific projects in that area, that did that. Would add to that count that we feel would put that over, over a certain comfort level? Certainly not by not providing additional tips, assistance, those projects, we protect that one way, but in the flips the flip side of that is to your statement. Brian would be that if there is a bid market rate project that would help that, but there's some costs that would probably be a good candidate then for actual making an investment in TIFF wise, whether that would be, you know, maximizing on creating an overlay, you know whenever we would need to do to make that feasible. But do I have to run the numbers out over however much time we felt it was going to be necessary to generate the increment required to help incentivize that particular or assist that particular project. But yeah, absolutely I think in, you know, back of the napkin without actually running numbers, I think that's certainly an option. We would want to take a look at ups absolutely. Yeah and ultimately, I'm just trying to be a problem solver here right. And, and it's, it's recognizing that there's a concern, but there's also a need in the community. So how can we balance that, you know, with, with somehow guaranteeing market rate developments on the other sites, but that's obviously, you know, the city would have to play, I think an intery role there to figure that out, because if you're DDL holdings, I don't know why you would commit that, but in so it's just what I'm trying to really figure out is if there's a way that we can play that middleman role to ensure that everybody wins here.

- And it certainly

- Responsibly too

- Well absolutely I think sitting down with, with Mr. Belschner and his team, and really taking a look at some of those other sites and kind of maybe updating what we feel projections might be on that, and kind of revisiting, you know, obviously things have changed from the original 2019 plan. Let's sit down and maybe have a good conversation with them on on remaining what they think the development potential is on those other sites. And specifically have a plan on how the city might be involved in terms of either assisting financially or other things that we could do to help ensure that those are, you know, some higher value projects would maybe come in on those particular sites. You know, my guess is I think Paul would probably be pretty, pretty willing to have that conversation. So I think that's, you know, I think that we've certainly worked together on other projects. I think it's in everybody's probably interest to sit down and have that conversation in light of certainly the context, even whether or not this was happening as a market rate project or as a subsidized project. We're probably at the point now coming on with a very unique economic time, that probably would be helpful to sit down and really have that conversation on where we think the current projections for those sites currently are at.

- Oh, any comments, Paul button, a blister, any comments regard to Brian or Neil's comments? We can't hear you Brian.

- Oh, sorry I see I'm on, I mute my microphone and it's hard to have those conversations, obviously without those, those projections right. But I think it is one of those things where if the city is going to say, yes, we're gonna do the subsidized housing because we need to meet that need in our community. Well, then I think there is an obligation on our part, right to, I mean, to play a role in that process and what that is I think it's just really hard to pinpoint in this meeting, but I think it's something that we ought to sharpen our pencils and find a way to be again that obligated partner that can do it in a responsible way to the taxpayer, but in a way that also sort of secures the, the mixed income stability of that neighborhood.

- We would welcome the opportunity to meet with city staff and discuss that. I think I get stopped somewhere around the shared risk. And when I want to just remind folks of is that 520 building, which actually is now at least up it's where the premiers on the front, you know, first floor and Hawkins Ash, and margin ACM and headway that building was constructed with zero direct TIF dollars. And so we're the condos that Brighid lives in and the way that DDL partakes in the shared risk right now, the flip side of that is the city of green bay. Wasn't going to write a $5 million check for infrastructure upfront with no projects is that we partake in PayGo. So that's, we welcome further discussions.

- Okay very good all right. Any other questions or comments for the developer or Paul or anybody?

- Yeah.

- Yeah, please.

- On the topic of Margaret projects, I would just say that when you are thinking about, oh, this there could be more than market rate development. That would be a great asset to the districts, but is it that, I mean, it's the existing condo development is units. And four eight is fairly low density increments, which are good and have a purpose, but we're here with 46 market rate units, which is more than you can pack onto the rest of the available land. So this is the largest market rate punch you could get. And we're here today with that. And with the 60% units, you're still getting excellent tenants. And obviously the commercial development and office development next door, hasn't been scared away from Broadway lofts. There's still market rate people in and out, whether it's a 60% level or more than that in those office development and all kinds of different taxes, not just property tax. So we really think that this is in so many ways a delivery on the potential of the district.

- Okay any other questions for Mr. Taft or comment?

- Close the floor.

- Okay, go back. I'm sorry, who's second.

- Kathy.

- Okay motion by Alder Dorff a second by Kathy I go back to regular business. Thank you everybody for your comments very much appreciate. All those appears signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Okay. Opposed. Okay we are back to regular business. Thank you takes everybody's comments very much appreciated. All right. So now Neil, you know, I'm looking at the recommendation recommendations. We have four bullet items there? Should we be going through each one of those one by one?

- See here, let me, I will share my screen here and bring those up Eric in here. So these were kind of the situation, essentially the recommended conditions we see if we say slick direct staff to proceed, essentially with pursuing a development agreement with, with the use mix and tenant and income mix that is being currently being pried by TWG we started incorporating staff conditions to the extent possible. Those were specifically these here. We know that amending the Martin the unit mix is probably not likely to be earning out because of the WEDA financing. So we're gonna probably not much we can do there with that particular condition. We would probably recommend eliminating that condition because of that. If that is the direction that the RDA decides to go, the second one here related to, you know, confirming the first floor, uses our conditioner with BV zoning for projects that essentially, you know, really it's more, that's actually going to be handled by the planning commission here in the coming weeks. But really, I think what my mission is gonna want to know is if RDA is at least comfortable with even considering the changes as proposed in terms of having limiting the commercial use of the corner with changing the rest of the front of the community spaces, the activated spaces. And I think maybe some of the mayors suggestions on activating Kellogg, which it seems to be Mr. Taft is certainly open to. So I think that that activation is certainly, I think something staff would still like to see it would recommend that that would be part of the final motion to pursue that, you know, talk about, you know, I think that the original pay grant, I think, you know, Mr. Belschner's comments about certainly being in there and working together on that is our interest on that. I think it's just those two go together. Those two next bullets that essentially a schedule on how those things will be paid for going from both the pay, both the actual original pay grant project grant, as it was paid back. And then also future any you'd come up with a formal schedule on how to do those things. And then the last one, essentially adding language to the agreement regarding property maintenance over time, and then, you know, study some RDA approval of some of the interior finishes as a final approval of the project. I think those are the, those are the areas I think we would suggest as general direction again, and that wouldn't be enough to give staff a direction to go back and prepare a final agreement to bring back to this body in December.

- One question, this is Alder Dorff. At what point will we put some requirements in around management of, of the property? Is that too soon yet to do that?

- No actually in fact, that last in fact, then that last bullet here, essentially the, the property being at to adequately maintained, I think is exactly what we're looking at Alder Dorff. I think that we're referring directly to the management of the property and ensuring that, that there are requirements essentially that through the life of the TIF, essentially, while we have that, that, that property is being maintained properly, that there are not long-term outstanding issues related to this related to the property than the it's upkeep. And it's, it's basically it's management. So let's, I think that one we're looking at exactly what you're referring to is, is incorporating some language coming up, working with Michael and his team to really kind of identify things that I'm guessing for the most part they probably knew already, but simply codified that, putting that right into the agreement, that that's an expectation.

- So I would like it add if we do just vote on this to being adequately managed and maintained, may we add that word to it because I, I was looking for it and I couldn't find it. So that would make me feel more comfortable.

- That absolutely.

- Can, can I just make another comment? I just.

- Yes.

- I want to just, just mention something, Deby, I loved your comments. They were very thoughtful. And I just think that there was a comment about, you know, the average wages of people who live downtown. I think I would challenge this group to think about who do you want to attract? And I looked at, I am a huge supporter of downtown. I lived down there. I am one of the biggest cheerleaders. The mayor knows this you guys all know this. And I moved downtown because of what I thought was going to be there as far as a mix of homes, we are in competition with Title Town and we are in competition with all of our suburbs, the Howards, the and all of my friends live in those areas. I chose to come here trying to drive a movement to, you know, color that mix of demographic to be wide ranging. And if you want a vibrant downtown, you want it to be wide ranging and this decision is going to change that significantly. I just can't, I can't say any more than that. And I, again, I appreciate all the work that's done. And I think everybody's trying to do the right thing. This is a bigger decision than you may. I just think this is a huge decision. And I I think changing the market mix without having any other ties to, you know, you must have market rate here or here or here, you're going to deter people like me from living there and whether that's what you want to do or not. That's, I think that the direction you're going, if we look at this proposal, so I will leave it at that. But so.

- I will agree with Brighid. Cause when this was originally pitched and proposed, it was all about having different levels of income. And it does concern me to hear her say that those condos are being built. Is that what you had? Good there's supposed to be multiple.

- Multiple yeah and you know, I think they're having a hard time selling the condos already I think, you know, and I know that there's a lot of talk about this, that, you know I had the opportunity to design mine and I think the product that was made, isn't what people wanted. But you want that. I think you want that mix there that's prime property and this kind of, I mean this will deter that kind of resident even further from moving there and making that mixed use a reality. It absolutely well, I mean, I just it's, you know, I you know you need people and I'm not saying that there's income levels that are more cheerleader for downtown or not, but I know that I go to board meetings now all the time and they're all within where I live. I gave, I had our company give a hundred thousand dollars to baby beach to help with that project. You want more people like this in your downtown that it can make those decisions. I wouldn't have chosen to live here. If I would've seen this coming. I absolutely wouldn't have. And I would make the decision on how this moves forward. I mean, it's just, it's a big decision. It's a significant change. And there are lots of places in the city where you can have different, you know, I look at across the river. I mean, that's beautiful how that's been intermixed there, where you have enough, a substantial market rate. You've got some subsidized housing and you've got, you know, market rates. That's a nice mix. This to me is leaning this way too far to the other side. Oh, not being mixed. Especially because of Broadway lofts, especially because of the whole. And I moved there knowing there's a homeless shelter. I'm not saying that I'm opposed to having those sides of the spectrum. This is too far too much weight in one direction.

- Melody, are you still there let's see. She got like, I haven't heard much on melody. What would happen? Oh, Alder Dorff please.

- I just want to say, is the building going to look the same.

- Yes.

- In my understanding is the building is going to look the same. It is 60% of market and market rate is not lower income. With the building looking the same managed well, well to all outward appearances, what's so different that would drive people away. I'm having a hard time wrapping my head around that. And I understand Brighid's concerns.

- Because it becomes, you know, becomes a low income. It's a low-income housing place. That's what that's it's bar, whether it's react real or not, that that becomes the perception. You know, it just, oh, I guess I thought it was gonna be a mix of things, but I get that. So the other real, really ARDS low-income okay. You know, that's just how things work. Right, that's how people look at things where they were when they weren't located and that kind of thing so.

- And if the Railyard were completely done, I still don't necessarily agree with that. Cause I don't, I don't feel like it's, it's so low income. It, it feels like more of a rage they're homeless shelter. Then 60% market rate, then market rate feels like a big range, but I can't see.

- Cause you don't live there.

- You live there. It's not in my backyard or in your backyard, not my backyard so right.

- Neil, is that actual racial, the 80, 20, 80, 20% of mark of it.

- Correct yeah.

- No and I didn't mean the ratio.

- Was always referring to the district. Was referring to the AMI percentage.

- Understand though.

- I would just chime in real quickly to say, totally appreciate Brighid's comments and her advocacy for town downtown as she mentioned, we do have affordable housing on the east side of the river at flats on the Fox. I think what we have on the east side is what we'd hoped to accomplish on the west side as well, which is a good mix of income levels. As you all know, you've improved market rate housing north Monroe avenue, merge project is market rate as well. Again connecting this back to what our needs are in the community. I think it makes a pretty compelling argument that we're very short on these units that are accessible to working people. And just as a little bit of a factoid, you know, I lived over on division street for 12 years in a home that's mortgage was equivalent to the one bedroom for in the affordable range here, right. So this is $850 that people need to come up with in order to live in this place. And it's accessible to working people that are working hard, but you know, this is not the traditional understanding of low-income housing. So I am very supportive of what's been proposed here. I think Alder Johnson made some good comments, and I think we'll be able to take those to heart and incorporate them when we come back at our next RDA meeting. But I would just encourage people to keep an open mind. This is as Neil said, not a final decision, this is direction to move forward and to get that, that final agreement in place.

- Good, great courage.

- At this time, I'd like to make a motion to do that, to make the recommendation and to, but adding the word management. Which I think director Stechschulte did, because we're not making a final decision, but we are giving you approval to move forward with staff and then we'll be meeting again, I think in December 14th then, and making even more of a decision. So at this time that's the motion that Alder Dorf would like to make.

- Good, is there a second?

- So you moving forward with staff recommendations except for the first bullet point, right?

- Right, exactly. Except for the first, right. We took that one out of there.

- Correct.

- Yeah.

- Okay, is there a second to the motion?

- I'll second.

- Okay, a motion in a second to the motion. Any questions or comments before we go? If not all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed.

- Aye, or nay I'm not sure.

- Okay, Brighid thank you. All right, thank you very much. The motion is moving forward and we'll look forward to more information on the 14th, thank you. Thanks everybody. That's a great comments lead by, Alder Dorff please.

- Was that three, two vote. I just, just for the sake of the record, I couldn't even tell because it was echoing.

- We only saw Brighid holding no, the only person.

- Okay, so it was four to one. Okay, thank you.

- And we still have to do the approval part?

- Yes.

- We've got more work to do. There are a lot of great comments, but a lot of people, as far as how we can proceed with that area in the future with more marketable units. So, all right excellent job. Wow, what a great comments, thank you. Let's see, next agenda item. I think we're down to the end. Informational, Cheryl Renier anything on housing.

- Except for .

- The whole meeting.

- We did have a community conversation about affordable housing that went really well this week on Tuesday. So I can say that. We've probably housing doubt for a while, right.

- Yes, I think so. Okay, very good thank you. Director's report and project updates. Lot of things going on now.

- Well, since we just kind of gave you a rundown last week before this week, just kind of go on, I'll make like a grand pronouncement I'll steal the mayor center and wish everybody a happy Thanksgiving. And we'll bring this back share hopefully in December with some, I'm looking forward to some good conversation. We do appreciate, I know this has been a little bit of a, a long conversation on this, but I just want to say on behalf of staff, you know, we can certainly, you know, we could craft this and get this as far along as we can, but it is really a good use of our time. And we really appreciate the feedback that comes from these groups when we have conversations like this. Because it does, I think it does make the project go a little bit better and results a little bit better. One in avoids us going down a path that maybe there is an interest from the whole group. And it does help us kind of refine some of the concerns and really helps us focus on what we're trying to bring our final product forward. So as much as we love to bring stuff forward with a nice bow on it, that's already to go sometimes this, we do really appreciate this level of conversation from members. So just thank you.

- Yeah, you're welcome. There's a lot of expertise on this committee. And so utilizing it is a great idea. A lot of great comments for everybody. Absolutely Cheryl, please.

- I had one thing before we leave too, I want to let you know that we and our K I convention center contract for electrical and tech, I did execute a change order to that contract, but it actually saved us $70. So it's a change order, they got us more money.

- Those are good change orders. In regard to a project, you talked about last meeting, a Maple Street. I am going to take will for setting up to the tour because I want everybody to actually see that building. I'm going historical as well as physically, the physical building. And Cheryl's agreed that once she gets all the information, we're gonna have a spreadsheet if you will. Looking at both sides, developing it versus going to TWG route, and we can hopefully make a good decision as far as what make sense. But I will, again, thanks for setting up the tour. I think people will neither really see that building. So I think last time we did the tour might have been four years ago. Gary was still around. So I remember that. Anyway, I hope everybody can do that tour. Cause it's very important that we understand that building before we make a decision.

- Right now it's looking like December 9th, but I haven't received a response yet from Brighid or Alder Dorff. I got a bounce back from Brighid had said you were going to be out of the office until August 25th. Are you're out until August 25th?

- Hello vacation.

- That's a great vacation.

- Well, literally here, just not mentally here. We're having some home improvements done and actually have to move up north for a deck.

- Okay.

- No worries, I wanna get it scheduled before I'm on vacation next week. So right now it's looking like the majority of people who voted looking at December 9th over the lunch hour. So I think that's what I'm gonna make it for if that's okay.

- Okay.

- Very good, thank you Will. I really think it's very worthwhile for everybody to physically see that building. Anyway, next meeting is December 14th. With that in mind, I entertain a motion to adjourn.

- Moved.

- Alder Dorff And Kathy.

- Second.

- Or Deby, I'm sorry. Alder Dorff and Deby. All those signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- We're adjourned, thank you very much.

- Thank you everyone.