MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GREEN BAY

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2022, 1:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 604 - THE HARRY MAIER ROOM

A. ROLL CALL.

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

Members Present: Matt Schueller, Kathy Hinkfuss, Gary J. Delveaux, Randy Scannell, Debra Dehn,
Excused: Melanie Parma
Liaisons Present: Leah Weycker
Others Present: Mayor Eric Genrich

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

1. Approval of the agenda for the May 10, 2022, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve the agenda. Motion Passed. Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the April 12, 2022, meeting of the Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Debra Dehn to approve the minutes. Motion Passed. Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action to approve an amendment to extend the development

agreement with Giveadaam Ventures for the property located at 320 S. Webster Avenue (Parcel 14-750) from May 31, 2022 to July 31, 2022.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the extension of the development agreement with Giveadaam Ventures, LLC to complete work at 320 S. Webster Avenue by July 31, 2022. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Consideration with possible action to approve a nine-month planning option for the property located at 1162 Day Street (Parcel 7-62) and 1164 Day Street (Parcel 7-63) to Neighborworks Green Bay for the development of a single-family, owner-occupied house on each parcel.

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve a nine-month planning option for the property located at 1162 Day Street (Parcel 7-62) and 1164 Day Street (Parcel 7-63) to Neighborworks Green Bay for the development of two single-family, owner-occupied, affordable housing homes for the Bridges Construction Student Build Program. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

3. Consideration with possible action to approve a development agreement for the purpose of building a single-family, owner-occupied, market-rate home on the vacant lot located at 421 4th Street (Parcel 2-181).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Debra Dehn to approve a development agreement with NeighborWorks Green Bay for the development of single-family, owner-occupied, market-rate housing at 421 4th Street. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

4. Consideration with possible action to approve a 60-day planning option for the development of single-family, owner-occupied, affordable housing located at 1308 E. Walnut Street (Parcel 14-244).

Moved by Kathy Hinkfuss, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve a 60-day planning option to Neighborworks Green Bay for the development of single-family, owner-occupied, affordable housing at 1308 E. Walnut Street. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

5. Consideration with possible action to extend the planning option with MF Housing Partners, LLC for the 1100 Block of East Walnut Street to May 31, 2022.

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to extend the planning option with MF Housing Partners, LLC for the 1100 Block of East Walnut Street to May 31, 2022. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

6. Consideration with possible action to approve a contract with Honeywell International to replace the RTU controllers at the KICC for $98,700.00.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve a contract with Honeywell International to replace the RTU controllers at the KICC for $98,700.00. Motion Passed.

Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

7. Consideration with possible action to purchase 720 Doty Street (Parcel 14-456) using TIDAH funds for the purpose of developing single-family, owner-occupied, affordable housing.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the purchase of 720 Doty Street (Parcel 14-456) for $13,154.92 using TIDAH funding for the development of single-family, owner-occupied, affordable housing. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

8. Consideration with possible action on a development agreement for financial assistance for a redevelopment project located at 216-222 Cherry Street.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to open the floor. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Matt Schueller to close the floor. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Kathy Hinkfuss to approve the Development Agreement as presented for financial assistance for a redevelopment project located at 216-222 Cherry Street and forward it to the City Council for their consideration, subject to final review by the City Attorney. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

9. Consideration with possible action on a term sheet with Impact Seven for the redevelopment of 420 S. Broadway.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Matt Schueller to approve the preliminary term sheet for Impact Seven for the site located at 420 S. Broadway, and to direct staff to prepare a formal development agreement for RDA consideration. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

10. Consideration with possible action on an amendment to Development Agreement 18-02 between the City of Green Bay and the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority regarding improvements to the Shipyard.

Moved by Matt Schueller, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve amending Development Agreement 18-02 between the City of Green Bay and the Redevelopment Authority regarding improvements to the Shipyard to 1) reflect the current project description and costs for Phase I, and 2) increase the borrowing limit by $2.65 million, and forwarding the agreement to the City Council for their consideration, subject to final review by the City Attorney. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Financial report and check register.

2. Director's report and project updates.

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

3. Next Regular Meeting: June 14, 2022 at 1:30 PM

A special meeting may be needed next week. Members will be contacted for a quorum.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Matt Schueller to adjourn. Motion Passed.
Yes- Gary J. Delveaux, Kathy Hinkfuss, Matt Schueller, Debra Dehn, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Roll call please. Make sure we're recording, looks like we are. Okay. Delveaux.

- Here.

- Stechschulte.

- Here.

- Cisneroz.

- Here.

- Dehn.

- Here.

- Hinkfuss.

- Here.

- Parma.

- Parma is excused.

- Yep.

- Very good. Approval agenda please.

- So move?

- Second.

- It was Renier first.

- And then Alder, Cisneroz .

- All those in the favor of this to say, aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose motion carries. Minutes from April 12th.

- So moved.

- Alder Barb, Cisneroz

- Second

- Dehn Deby. All in favor of this to say, aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose motion carries. Regular business consideration of possible action to approve amendment to extend the development agreement with Giveadaam Ventures for the property located at 320 Southford Webster Avenue, parcel 14475 OH from May 31st, 2022 through July 31st, 2022.

- Yep. So we had 320 Southford Webster Avenue which is Giveadaam Ventures. She started this development back in 2020 when the pandemic started and she ran into a couple of hiccups with the cost of construction then. So we gave her an extension to the end of this month. Unfortunately in December, her builder Burton Resnick passed away. So the business has now been taken over by his son and daughter in there just asking for that to be extended to July 31st so that they can complete that building.

- Yeah, based on the pictures you supplied-

- Yeah, they're making great progress.

- Sounds like a very tragic

- I give a damn, I approve.

- All right.

- I will second.

- We're gonna have an actual . There's a lot of energy

- I did.

- Motion to a second in regard to the motion. Is there any questions or comments? If not all in favor of the single thing say, aye.

- Aye

- Oppose motion carries, thank you. Number two, consideration with possible action to approve a nine-month planning option for the property located at 1162 Day Street, parcel 7962 and 1164 Day Street parcel 7963 Street to NeighborWorks Green Bay for development of single family owner drive coast on each parcel.

- Yep. Okay.

- Both of these parcels were purchased in 2013, used in CDBG funds that the NeighborWorks is working with their Bridges Construction program again with the student builds and with this one, they're actually wanting both of these parcels for the 2324 build season. However, FEMA is in the process of changing their flood maps. Therefore they would like to go into a nine-month planning option with the intent that these two parcels would come out of that floodplain. And then they could proceed with the build for the 2324 school year. Staff reviewed everything and we don't see any problem with them being able to hold up for nine months.

- Questions, comments?

- Does this thing ever come out of the floodline?

- There is actually quite a few that are coming out.

- Okay.

- It was supposed to be early spring that we are supposed to hear. So it's kind of gotten moved back to fall. I'm not even gonna say early fall. Fall that they're supposed to be making those announcements and stuff like that. But that is one of the properties that is on the list.

- And that's why you want the nine months.

- Yep.

- To cover that.

- Yep.

- Which versus a six.

- Yeah.

- That makes sense.

- And Jerry is here from NeighborWorks. So if anyone had any questions regarding any of their things 'cause the next couple of items are gonna be associated with NeighborWorks.

- Okay.

- I was gonna say I don't see a regional meeting her motion by second by questions or comments in regard to the motion. Now all in favor of the things signals that just say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose motion carries, thank you. Number three, consideration of false election to approve a developer agreement for the purpose of building a single penalty owner occupied market raise home on this vacant land located at 421 fourth street parcel 2-1801. Is that you?

- Yeah, that's me.

- Okay.

- This is for the 2022/23 Bridges Construction program. We acquired the property back in 2015 using neighborhood enhancement funds for the purpose of developing single family owner occupied home. They are requesting this lot to be deed to them at no cost. This would actually go into a development agreement. They're not asking for a planning option on this one. They're not asking for any additional funding at this point. And the home would be sold at market rate. I have attached the house plan that they have. They doubt that they will have to apply for a conditional use permit as well on there. And staff has recommended that we approve the development agreement for the 2022/23 Bridges Construction program.

- The design sure fits into the neighborhood, whatever that's what I was gonna ask for

- It does.

- Questions or comments, all the based motion to approve?

- I second,

- Second by Deby. Questions and comments in regard to the motion? Now all those appears gonna say aye?

- Aye.

- You guys are making this very easy today .

- Consideration for first right refusal to approve a 60-day planning option for development of a single family owner occupied affordable housing located at 1308 East Walnut parcel 14-244.

- This too is for the Bridges Construction student build program for the 2022/23 school year. However this time NeighborWorks is asking for a 60-day planning option. We purchased this property back in 2015 using federal funds. So they wanna just make sure that they're in that to create a plan that they can resell at the affordable rate. So they're just asking for a 60-day planning option to be able to create that. They are asking the lot to be donated to them and they do not anticipate any additional funding at this time. Staff did review it and we see no problem with them having a 60-day planning option to create their detailed cost analysis, to complete the affordable housing.

- It looks like the same design as the previous.

- It is. Yeah.

- Careful of it.

- Come on, there we go.

- They're far enough.

- We should move quickly.

- Second.

- Second by . Questions or comments with regards to the motion.

- Using Bridges on this one too, or?

- Bridges on this one. So for the first time we're doing two new builds every year because the program's expanding. Which is why we wanted to go with the same plan 'cause the students will be going back and forth between the sites. So that'd be a little easier that way.

- Makes sense.

- It's a great program.

- High school students, yep.

- That's so awesome. Are there any questions or comments? If not all in favor of the motion say, aye?

- Aye.

- Oppose motion carries, thank you. Number five, consideration of possible action to extend the Walnut partners, LLC Group to approve the planning option, but now they're looking to extend. Is that correct?

- That is correct. Good afternoon.

- Good.

- So you're right. We granted them a six-month planning option so that they could apply for tax credits through FEMA. So to the points of publishing this we didn't know. And they didn't know.

Which is why we asked that we extend this to the end of the month. We got a voice message. Yeah, at 6:30 PM last night. An email this morning notification that they actually did not receive the tax credits for the project. They missed, it was close one point. The cut off at one point.

- I can't believe how many of them, like literally one point.

- Yeah. So naturally we're still like reacting from this out of just finding out and they just found out as well. They would like some time just to explore alternatives and also just with how crazy, so to say the market is right now with the cost of building, there may not be a chance that a project awarded could fallen through or may not be able to move forward. And that maybe that would open up a spot for them to, receive tax credits that way. But we still would support an extension to the end of the month just to allow them time to explore if there are any alternatives to make this work. But yeah, it was really disappointing. I don't know any other way to say it. It's just devastating then 'cause this is the second developer and good developer that we've had interested in this site and put forward an application and didn't get approved and missed pretty close as well with that one so-

- How much influence you still have at the State? In fact, a lot of people that were in multi-family last year are no longer there

- So anyway, if you still like you to expect-

- We would still, yeah, we would still be in supportive extending the planning options at the end of this month. Just to give them enough time to take a look, if there are the other alternatives and you staff would still need to. We haven't even discussed the team yet staff on, how we're going to proceed if they can't make this work. If we're looking at another RFP process or if we want to look at alternatives to get development on this site. 'Cause there are interested developers out there, but it's just a matter of figuring out determining what our next steps are with this property.

- Neil, please.

- Along those lines Chairman, one point out obviously certainly the original request was for me end of the month that's just the lawful tight timeframe for somebody to kinda reset capital stack.

- Yes.

- So certainly at the discretion of this body, if you would like to actually give them a little bit more time, we just make sure that's certainly within the purview of this.

- We gotta do that. Appreciate that, yeah.

- How much more time do you think would be reasonable?

- Three months I think would be appropriate in this case.

- End of July or?

- I would say end of July.

- Does it make more sense to just let's go with the proposal as it is to the end of the month. That doesn't mean the firm buzzer hits, but I don't know if they're gonna say, Hey, we want to walk away. Well and I don't want to be locked up then until end the July.

- So a full disclosure, housing partners expressed interest in applying again to the next round. I think that there's a way that they could retool their application to get a couple extra points out of it in the next round. But historically speaking, I can't recall time we already granted essentially another year long planning option to allow them to apply for another round. So again, like I said, we as staff, we haven't together reacted to this yet to determine, what we would like to support moving forward. But certainly to director Stechschulte's point less than a month is really tight turnaround to give them to explore alternatives, but they are willing to, try to find a way 'cause they put their own money and resources into submitting an application, putting together plans, wanting to make this work.

- Right.

- It costs a lot of money to put in a tax credit application. It really does. I think by granting an extension for three months, they could possibly look at 4% tax credits, not have to go through the round. There might be other options that they can explore. But I don't think we're gonna have another developer jump on it that quick.

- Yeah. We're anticipating probably a special meeting being needed. Most definitely. Probably within the next week and a half .

- To make sense to Matt's point just to move forward with the date that we have on the agenda and then potentially revisit after staff has a chance to-

- Sure.

- Talk internally and potentially connect with the developer.

- Absolutely.

- Sure. We can always add on extend it again.

- Sure. Mark that motion.

- Yeah, that would be my motion to just as is stated on here to extend the planning option to May 31st and we'll be-

- Come back in July and yeah.

- Okay.

- Second.

- We're doing the motion in second to extend the planning option to May 31st, 2022. Any questions or comments in regard to the motion? If not all in favor of this motion, say aye?

- Aye.

- Opposed motion carries, thank you.

- Thank you very much.

- Number six, consideration of possible action approve a contract with Honeywell international to replace the RTU Controllers at the Convention Center for $98,700.

- So you probably are aware we've been dealing with these RTU Controllers for a while.

- Yes.

- Staff at the HighEd actually has to physically go on top of the building to control them on super hot days and super cold days. So it's been a real problem, but Trista has been working with me at Public Works and we went out for a bid. Actually, we didn't go out for bid. We did a separate contract with Honeywell because they're the only gig in town who understands these RTU controllers. So what we're doing is we're replacing 10 of them and then we're also providing the system, the platform that goes along with it. So the RTU controllers are $65,000, the platform's about 337, I think. So our recommendation is to get these all replaced. So staff don't have to go up on the roof.

- Right To make the adjustments.

- Your maintenance funds in good shape. They contribute to maintenance funds on a monthly basis that-

- Yeah.

- It's very good shape.

- Okay. Questions or comments in regard to the request? We don't want them getting hurt up themselves in the roof.

- Motion to approve?

- Motion matter own . Any questions or comments, if all in favor of this motion say, aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose motion carries, thank you. Number seven, consideration of possible actually purchase of property 720 parcel 1456, using, how you pronounce that Lisa? for the purpose of the golfing single family owner occupied affordable housing. Who's got .

- That's me again. Okay. This was recently a posted as a Brown County tax deed Foreclosure. It is zoned our one in January of '21, a permit was issued to raise the building work was completed in May of 2021 per Paul Zeller. We have the ability to purchase this property from the County for the amount of 13124.92 plus the cost of recording. The County administration is still scheduled to discuss this sale further to see if there's any further interest with the County on May 12th. After that point, if we are given the go ahead, staff is recommending that we purchase the 720 Doty Street using our TIDA funds for the purpose of building a single family owner occupied affordable housing.

- Okay.

- Strictly out of curiosity. What is the status of our TIDA funds? There is our balance, if you will.

- Well, we had allocated dollars for MF Partnership on their project. So depending how that goes, we had about 700,000. If that doesn't go through, I think we're back up to over a million.

- Oh, okay. So after we buy we're I'm not quite sure.

- It's a vacant lot right now.

- Oh, it's just a vacant lot.

- Right, so it's hard to see.

- Yeah, we'll be marketing it for single family owner occupied.

- And using TIDA funds we'll request that it be marketed for affordable housings.

- Okay.

- Motion to approve.

- Hold a second,

- Second amendment. Any questions or comments? All those in favor of this motion say, aye.

- Aye.

- Proposed motion, carries thank you. Number eight, Consideration of possible actually development agreement for financial assistance for the redevelopment project located at 216-222 Cherry Street.

- Mr. Chairman.

- That's me.

- Yes.

- This agreement was brought before this board previously at the end, there were a couple of minor updates to it at the discretion of the City Attorney decided it would be important enough changes to bring them back to you one more time to make sure you are accepted.

- Okay.

- Okay with that. The key changes again identified right here in, the staff report officially adding five storeys with 57 market rate apartment units replaced. It was originally adding at least three storeys with the unit council. They just kind of refined that. More importantly, the project values now at 13 million up from $6 million. So obviously a nice step in the right direction on that one. And then-

- How dare they need?

- Yeah, I know. Maybe it made the project bigger? Oh my goodness. And the last item, I think there was some discussion about the incorporation of some affordable housing units into the project. The developer did meet with Cheryl. They discussed some program options and see a super easy path forward, but it certainly has remained open to include possible voucher using some vouchers on the project, but that has not been incorporated in the agreement, but that if they have had that conversation. So those are the key changes, not the actual assistance percentage and everything else remains the same as well as the project timeline. So we'll certainly be available to answer any questions that Mr. Nugent is here. If anyone has any questions for him.

- He also added a three bedroom I noticed. So that's really nice. Still connecting to the Cherry Street ramp I'm sure.

- Yes.

- As far as the foundation, can you build a top of the first storey?

- No issues with this design versus-

- I would certainly defer Mr. Nugent on that. But my understanding is that we were kind of waiting for his architectural study to get done, to make sure that that was actually possible. So that's why it went from at least three. Now he's sure his architect has said yes, they can definitely do five storeys now at this this point.

- So that's amazing.

- Which is very exciting. So obviously a lot of the other projects are certainly. This body is reviewing as we talk about we're doing foundations and environmental work and we don't have to dig into the ground on this one. That's already there. So this is kind of a nice one to certainly be able, just to add to the existing structure.

- From a curiosity perspective, how high was it originally many years ago.

- I believe was it four storeys on top of it? I believe it was four storeys on top of the single storey right now. So this is actually taking it up an additional storey, I believe.

- Actually I wouldn't mind opening it to me. I hear a little more about the analysis and study that been completed.

- Motion to open the floor Stechschulte and Kathy. All those in favor say, aye.

- Aye.

- Proposed. Please come forward. Tell us a little bit more, please go forward.

- Well, thanks.

- Yes

- Well I'll answer any questions that you have. The due diligence process because of the uniqueness of the property. It took a little bit longer than, what we originally intended. There was a lot of engineering work and architectural work that was done in the basement just to determine what the existing structure and footings campaigning from a load stand. And that's how we end up at that rendering right there, as opposed to we were thinking potentially through new storeys, maybe four, but we're happy to say that we're gonna, get five storeys out of this, but that additional work certainly took more time and it was actually expensive too.

- Yeah. Thank you.

- Impact to the Cherry Street ramp? Obviously more storeys, more apartments.

- Yeah, specifically, will need be worked out with department of Public works to proceed and move that forward. But from a design standpoint, there's at least been a preliminary conversation on how the design would work and actually director, Erin when I first brought this up to him, he is said, oh yeah, it's gonna work like this. Then one side in, then I go lower it down. He already had it already worked through a large set of how the construction was actually going to go. And the design worked. So we're not anticipating in the issues that way. And we do know that that ramp does have capacity at this time. So right now we're not anticipating any significant issues.

- Okay.

- And we also did get some feedback as well from City Hall to say kind of let the residents pick themselves if they want to have lease, if they want to take a spot, they don't need a spot. Let them kind of directly coordinate with City Hall, which I think that's an option too.

- Sure.

- Mostly like a nice addition to downtown.

- I hope so. We're really excited about it.

- Once we get the grocery store downtown and yell at that's gonna nice. And the biggest thing to hear about is that we are looking forward to grocery start as we bring more and more people downtown.

- All right, questions or comments for the developer?

- Motion to get back to regular business.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion to close the floor all in favor, say, aye?

- Aye.

- Closed. We are back to regular business. Neil, you like the design?

- Absolutely. I think it's good. Certainly it's more modern design, but not over the top. I think it will actually fit in quite well with the area. I guess the one line I did wanna make a note of is I think staff originally recommended 70% on the tip on this, but Erin recommended 80. So it is presented at 80. That is where it is at the agreement. So just to be clear that was made and where it was. And we're comfortable with that because certainly the way the agreement is written, any improvements related to the development of the connecting to the ramp is the cost of the developer.

- Good.

- And we need to create a new tid for this project.

- That is correct.

- And will it literally be just that project?

- We have about a block and a half I think it's two blocks that we're looking at. So it'll encompass a couple of other properties in the median area, so we are keeping it relatively small to be conservative, just to avoid, any potential losses in value the district. So we think by doing that, we always have the ability to march it.

- Okay.

- Another project comes along.

- We feel that's a good-

- Be concerned with there about creation of a tid and how long does that takes.

- I don't think so. I mean our experience obviously with joint board and especially in a case like this, and I think by taking a more conservative approach and actually having some closures here in the last couple years, I think that we have a pretty good track record, our trying view board. And we're confident in that they'll be supportive with this project.

- Are you confident?

- Yes. That's most important. Right.

- Didn't even see her hide.

- I think I want you to approve.

- Second.

- This is just a really awesome improvement.

- Absolutely.

- Biggers the cherry on the top. That's good. Any questions or comments with to the regard to motion, if not all those in favor of this motion say, aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose motion carries, thank you. Number nine, consideration of possible action on the term sheet would impact seven for the redevelopment of 420 South Broad Street.

- That is also me Mr. Chairman that says, this is also known as the Manager Sheet Metal site. Just to be sure everybody knows exactly which building we're referring to here. We have had this. This has been under planning option for trying to think exactly how much long and how long we had this for six months. I can't tell exactly much. A little bit longer than that at this point, that planning option is actually set to expire, I believe at the end of this month. So they are requesting, I actually brought it under requesting a preliminary term sheet. And that has been included in your packet for review and approval. At some point, obviously if the terms favorable for the RDA, we would proceed with preparing formal development agreement. Just some highlights. I think this is actually in your packet. So I'm certainly looking at this as an existing district in '22. So nothing linked there, rough project schedule was, certainly getting in and getting completed by 24 months after starting, which I think they wanted to get in the ground here possibly at the end of this year, first quarter of next year, according to their schedule. So that was kind of what they're shooting for. Overall construction costs is about 60 million. That's actually increased twice in our conversations with them over time, because obviously it is including some affordable units. We don't know exactly how much that's gonna translate into assessed value at this point, but that is something, once they've finalized their design, we'll be asking our assessing office to take a closer look at that. Right now they at least have given the preliminary construction cost at 60 million. So it would be a PAYGO model. We're looking at at a 70% to the developer with 30% staying at the City. Duration of the tid payments would be through the expenditure period 2042 in this district, which means we would have five years, at the end of the district then to capture all of the increment for the district solely going all to the City. And I think they're looking at qualified expenditures we'll certainly be dialing those in as they give us a detailed construction budget. So we're anticipating some of the usual things, any site work, any unusual enhanced architecture. So one of the things that we've used in the past for those projects. So with that, and certainly we're excited about that. This is also a mixed use project. They've got a couple of commercial spaces that they're looking to continue as part of the project overall. So again, this is simply their scaling model. This is not the architecture of the building. This is just their scaling model. But certainly the staff has been very excited with the progress that they have made and the communication that they have made to the point, especially the last three or four months. So we are very confident that they're gonna be able to move this project forward. They are evaluating still final financing options in terms of any tax credits, other programs, certainly some of the City's housing programs as well. They are a nonprofit actually, and asked if the state of a nonprofit, was going to be a problem as well. if you're asking for chief assistance, that could be an issue, even though they said they would be willing to discuss a pilot. They said they were probably at this point or proceeding with trying to create it as a taxable project.

- Okay, So yes. If they are gonna do a big It needs to be the taxable project.

- Yeah, exactly. So otherwise it'd be very small increment to check that going down. That's for sure . So with that's certainly available to answer any questions regarding this.

- Just this a bit, this is the first adults people are in the shipyard, isn't it?

- We have merged. We actually have that one and that one is in place. That one actually is in place there. So this will do by our second one kind of in this tip district specifically. So we're anticipating that one being the first one being around, I think that was merges around 21 million. This is about 21, 22 million. We're trying to conserve the mean at a $60 million construction cost. Conservatively, we're assuming the same value for both projects. So we be about a 43, 45 million increment for this chief tip if everything goes according to schedule.

- I don't see a problem with the request 70% to line what we like.

- And obviously this is just simply the term sheet that we would just direct staff essentially prepare formal agreement to bring back to this body.

- Right. Great. That was good to me, don't it? I approve, okay.

- All schedule project.

- We had an active

- I will second that motion.

- All right. Motion to second with regard to the term sheets. Questions or comments? If not, all those appear single say, aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose motion carried, thank you. All right. Number 10, consideration of possible action amendment to development agreement 182 Green Bay and Redevelopment Authority regarding improvements to the shipyard. Good.

- Okay, that is also me Mr. Chair, Hand these out. Could you please? So casual reading apologize for not meeting these two in the pack a little earlier, but we've been kind of working on some, financing numbers here for this overall project here. Up till even this morning, we're working on some of these. So essentially what this is doing, if folks remember, certainly folks have been on the RDA for a while. The development agreement between the RDA and the City, essentially to actually establish the borrowing limit in the budget for the phase one. And actually, the entire project was about $10 million was established originally in that first original agreement. Since then that project, that was 2018, when that was done, this project has changed three times. At least if that folks remember right, there was certainly the original Bull Frog Stadium and then went to kind of the soccer. Had the soccer field and then it was breakthrough. Now we are obviously on merge, it's kind of the key anchor tenant for private sector tenant on this project. So all those three iterations, this agreement between the City and RDA was never updated. So one of the things we felt was important to do is try to bring this forward and get that current. Certainly to reflect the current project as we go, not only from the private sector project, but also for the actual improvements that are going to be made that the City's working on. So on the staff report, we did try to kind of identify what those costs have been to date. Originally, the original agreement anticipated 10 million in costs with a $500,000 grant from the stadium district tax, I believe is what it was. So number one, that project is probably not at least readily available $500,000. So we were at the nine and a half million. This is kind of our working number that was going to be allocated from the City essentially through T22 is the primary source for that. But today we have, the City has borrowed 7.5 million out of the authorized 9.5 million is what it's been in the account. And approximately about $3.5 million has been spent in those three key areas of what has been land acquisition, including the badge of sheet metal site was the main one on those site engineering, which obviously member here members all the work and change order discussed with Stantec here this past year, and then actual the full site grading for the entire site front of the shipyard. So that was about $1.1 million. So there's about $4 million remaining from that original borrowing that is sitting there and available. So we have $4 million available. Plus the additional two that we are very authorized to borrow. So we have $6 million available as we've kind of come through, we're getting ready to kind of review and consider awarding the bids for phase one improvements. That cost is just under $8 million for those improvements right now. So obviously we're in need of, of getting approval for the remain borrowing for the last 2 million to make that happen. So staff is certainly obviously in reviewing the options and considering everything we've gone through here, several reasons why we are so in support of pursuing that. One, we are actually obligated, certainly in our merge development agreement to complete these improvements. So that's a pretty large quota fair to get those things done. Second of all, the borrowing is planned to be funded through TI Funding, not necessarily an impact on the General fund. So it would be a tax commit district funded borrowing. So I think the overall assessed valuation for this area, obviously we mentioned in the previous report, is dramatically increased. I think the original numbers being considered were closer to $8 million back in the original project. Now we're closer to 43 million. We hope that's very conservative and it's actually considerably more than that, but we are obviously seeing a considerably more increment in the round than we are anticipated originally in the very first agreement plus to date much to the efforts of Mr. Buchanan here and among from our staff, the City's actually received more than $1.8 million in grant funding as well towards various improvements on this project, which we are very excited about and obviously are certainly continuing to pursue opportunities, but certainly that has certainly made a nice impact on the overall project across to that. So with that the phase one improvements are kind of have been described in the actual document has been handed out to you as the first amendment document is the key one, certainly want you guys to take a look at, try essentially wanted to make update the recitals and the project description to reflect kind of what has been described in the staff report. The one thing I would make a note on in terms of the staff report to update that it was at $2 million, we actually would wanna put that about 2.65 million to include right now the option of including the reconstruction of Art Street, which we may or may not have to do, but also including some budget for construction inspection for the engineering work to actually be done on phase one, which was not included in the original estimate. So the staff court recommends 2 million. We would actually be asking for borrowing, it's about to 2.65 million to cover that cost.

- This is additional to what we originally thought it was.

- Correct. So within the actual authorizations that were done in that original agreement. So we are, yes. And so again, we have the three allocations, what we've, there's a existing balance. We have preapproved for existing balance of $4 million preapproved to borrow an additional $2 million. And then this would actually be authorizing the last 2.65 to be able to cover all of the phase one costs. There are some reasons that some, we been able to come back in and make that not have to borrow that entire amount, which I'm sure would make director Ellen Becker and folks in the council, much happier. But at this point we wanted to make sure we're incorporating those costs in the event that we need to cover those. So there is a time to constraint on this one. We are looking at, we have an active bid out there for the phase one improvements. Those need to be awarded by June 10. So obviously, getting information out and getting an approval from the RDA and then taking that to council and then coming back to RDA, actually for an authorization then to let that bid is kind of where we're at.

- Can you help me understand the grant money. Where did that come in 1.8 million.

- Yeah, the 1.8 million has been applied to various projects in phase one. So we have actually applied for those matter if any, have any specific questions on those. Certainly Mr. Buchanan can ask about the specific grant programs. Those actually, qI think we did highlight them actually in the updated revisions. I'm trying to find exactly other grants. So the bottom and third page section P section financing, other grants, EPA Brownfield Cleanup grant, 500,000 WDC Brownfield grants, $1 million and RDA grants, $304,000 and an EPA GRI grant at $565,000.

- And did you say that money's already spent the grant money?

- So those funds have been applied to the project at this point Yes.

- Okay.

- Where are the other two? We see the section P 500 and the million.

- Yep. At the bottom, the third page here. It says section P of the new programs.

- Yeah.

- So P two other grants.

- Only the five pages.

- Yeah.

- Oh, whoops. Oh, oh.

- That's for the Owen.

- Oh it didn't copy for summary. Okay, well I apologize for that. So this is why they don't let me operate the copy machine apparently. So yeah. So they are listed. I'll have to go print that different section back out to you. So yeah, those are the EPA Cleanup grants, WDC Brownfield grants, then our RDA grants and the EPA grants.

- So we can send that all actually that up.

- I will email that to you Mr. Bucks. We can actually put that up on the screen here.

- So a lot of those actually, all of those grants are reimbursable. So we need to borrow funds first incur those costs, and then we get those reimbursed.

- Okay.

- But through the grant.

- We spent about a million of those grants so far on the psych rating to be applying the rest of 'em to complete these phase one construction improvements, storm water improvements, additional heart service capping for remediation.

- Right. Neil, just to make it clear.

- Just shut off track change. We no mark up there.

- There you go.

- So the specific grants were... There we go other grants keep going. Yeah, switch it too.

- Neil, a quick recap. Okay, so 10 million was approved by the RDA and

- Correct.

- Spent how much of that?

- Neil spent.

- Want me to make copies of this? Do you want to copy this for everyone?

- Fine.

- That's fine, yeah. Are you okay with this?

- Yeah.

- Okay.

- So we've actually spent about 4 million.

- Okay.

- Oh, I gotta take three and a half million has been spent. And now it's been primarily on land acquisition, site grading and design engineering, the three major categories for that. So that leaves us an original $4 million of available balance of what it was originally approved for debt.

- I guess I'm confused. We approved 10 million. You said they spent 3.5 million, but we have four left?

- We've been approved with yeah. City Council approved borrowing of up to 9.5 million.

- Okay.

- We have actually borrowed 7.5 million to date.

- Okay.

- So we have $2 million. We can still access. That's already been approved.

- Got it.

- Then we have out of that money, we had the seven and a half that we've borrowed. We have spent 3.5 million towards those three categories that I just mentioned.

- Okay.

- So that leaves us an available balance then of $4 million in that pool fund. So those two together, we have $6 million available to apply towards the project.

- I understand that. Okay.

- So staff does consider this really as a great opportunity. Certainly always, the additional struggle borrowing is always a little bit, always sort be careful, but certainly the progress that has been experienced by the project and certainly with impact seven, moving along as fast as it has been. In addition to certainly merge getting moving forward. We do see this as an opportunity to really capitalize and keep the value of this project significantly higher than what we thought was gonna be great. And just trying to track the funds here, $4 million has been borrowed sitting in a bank account.

- Yes, sir.

- We have $2 million of additional loan capacity that's already approved. That's just a $6 million.

- Correct.

- We need 7.8.

- So that's for the actual, for the phase one engineering and then the items in this agreement. So that was that 7.8 million. And then we were also looking for the two items I added on here was $450,000 for the Art Street improvements, which we need to do terms of our merge development agreement that may end up being something we actually end up just doing as a General fund, a CIP project, depending on our discussions with the director of Public Works, but we need to make sure and have that capacity just in case. And then the other item that was not included in the original phase one was actually construction in inspection budget for actual staff to be out there on site, as they're actually doing the project, having an engineer actually out there to make sure the big project that was $200,000.

- So with all the phase one improvements and that additional add-ons, that's another 700,000 that gets us to eight five.

- Correct.

- And we've got capacity today for six. And so are you saying we borrow another 2.5?

- That is what we're requesting.

- Yes, sir.

- And then after we do all that, then we can redeem and get those grants of 1.5.

- That is correct.

- It's just over 1.8. Okay.

- So none of those have been reimbursed at this point with phase one cost or anything?

- No.

- But they've all been approved?

- Yeah.

- Those are all secured grants that I have included.

- Yes.

- Those are all been award.

- And then on the merge project, where is that at from and when will it start?

- Right now the current agreement says, they're looking to start this fall. They did come in for an extension. I think that was actually something the RDA approved here a couple months ago.

- Right.

- We are working through them, some soil condition issues with them at right now. So anticipating in reality, probably starting sometime, in early next year, we believe is probably when the actual start date's gonna be. So right now it's a contamination issue in terms of trying to figure out structurally how to put the foundation of the building in and what they were proposing could have caused problems with the environmental cap. That's already on the site, imagine a giant squeegee, putting a bunch of weight on it and pushing the contamination down into the groundwater. So we don't want that to happen. And that was certainly the Geotech folks on from both the developer and from the City are working through an alternative to try to figure out the best way to address that.

- In our agreement with them, is the pay go as well, right?

- Yes, sir. Yeah, that's correct. And we do have some costs upfront project grant on that one already is part of obviously acquiring the site and so forth. So there are some upfront funds that've already been invested that we would like part of the agreement is re repaying those funds in addition as part of that PAYGO going forward, okay. And so the risk for the City is we kick off phase one and merge doesn't go forward, correct?

- Oh, and impact seven. I would throw both of those projects in there. So both 12-22, but in this economy, certainly a fair scenario to bring up.

- And is there a reason for us to kick off the phase one before something there is more secure?

- Our development agreement with merge requires those phase one improvements to be put in as part of the project. So the timing in before they start, correct.

- So the timings are specifically defined in the agreement that those things need to be in there. Okay.

- So it's not a total pay go, then there are some upfront investment.

- Well we have for public improvement costs.

- Absolutely, right. So from an infrastructure standpoint, this includes-

- That's what this body improved in 2018.

- Yep. Was the 9.5 million. So there was already got upfront that was authorized.

- Okay.

- So I mean, I would say it is, the reason that has selected and is interested and impact seminars interested in this site because of those amenities that are being, and they put in for the waterfront.

- The 9.5 million was authorized without any development guaranteed, right. At that point, there was no assigned development agreement never signed the development agreement. And that was, as Neil said, $8 million. And so now you're looking at a conservative estimate of ballpark of 43 million?

- Absolutely.

- In comparison to 8 million. So it's a fivefold plus increase in the dollar value created here.

- And the initial investment was all part of in order to make shipyard goal. We had to make that investment and we knew that.

- Correct.

- That's right.

- And I would also put it in, but certainly to Matt's question, I think they also, in terms of if doomsday scenario, both projects fall, don't move forward. We have had contracts from at least two other developers interested in the impact of in the manager sheet metal site. And I think nobody's really inquired about the merge site because they're assuming it's under contract could be built. However, I would imagine that there would be interest in that if we actually ended up going out and marketing it. We've had enough contracts regarding those two sites that I think someone would be fairly interested in that.

- That's exciting area.

- Obviously we're gonna do everything we can to make sure merge and impact seven keep going forward. That's obviously we've already got investments into those two projects and we'd like to see them continue. There are absolutely certainly our preference. And right at this point, we certainly will. Other than dealing with some of the things Matt and I were discussing one of the meeting in terms of just general material shortages, labor thing that every developer's dealing with really right now, as long as we can mitigate that and help them manage that we feel that both projects will move forward.

- I followed you with all the numbers, except in the beginning, it just something about we're gonna go for 2.65, million instead of 2 million.

- That was the 2 million was to get us to the 8 million. I think that Matt was referring to for just the overall phase one.

- Okay

- When I went back and looked at it, the two things that were missing from that is, the $465,000 or $450,000 for the construction of Art Street and then $200,000 for the construction inspection that would be required to actually oversee the project.

- I follow it.

- Thank you.

- Right, and that went through that TW agreement. I mean, that was part of that correct. That we developed Arne street.

- It's correct.

- Right. Absolutely.

- Yes, that makes sense.

- And we have to some other ways of funding that we could certainly be a little less than that and do something like that. but this is to make sure we have funds to actually. The important thing obviously for right now is that is awarding that phase one bid. So we don't have to, if we go past that June 10th deadline we have to rebid, which I would certainly not only delay the project, but very likely would come in a higher cost.

- Were there several bidders then?

- I believe that we had seven or eight bids come in and actually they were a little high, but not nearly as high as we were hearing, they would be. We feel it is very important to certainly wanna get this bid.

- The conclusion.

- Yeah, and Neil, my questions weren't at all about whether or not we should do the project .

- Absolutely.

- Completely about, is there a way for us to mitigate some risk?

- Absolutely. And it was so much more of a timing question that should we, or should we not, but if we are right, contractually agreed with merge, right. That we are doing these improvements before they need to break ground, then yeah. I'll be fully in support.

- Is that a motion?

- That can be a motion.

- I'll second it, okay. So basically the motion is to amendment development agreement, 18-2, between the City and redevelopment third regarding improvements to ship here.

- Yes.

- Just, to be clear to speak that, to please make sure that is the 2.65, I spoke the staff board had 2 million. It's authorizing additional borrowing of up to 2.65 million.

- Thanks sir.

- Okay. All right. Mr. Stechschulte is still making second.

- I did.

- Okay. Questions or comments in regard to the motion or second?

- So when will we start?

- The phase one improvements. If the bid is awarded on June 10th. I think the contractor will be out there prior to the before end of June.

- And we'll actually be working. They're chopping at the bed to get going.

- So we'll see some real progress.

- People will be excited to see some dirt moving out there. Absolutely this June.

- And those improvements should take, how long do you think Matt?

- Hopefully substantially completed by the end of this year, they'll be some landscaping, some final touches will go on next spring.

- Very good.

- And then I don't know if it's appropriate, but it's on their website. So we might be able to break some news, Matt, if you want to let the RDA know.

- Sure. So we-

- No, he deserves the credit.

- So absolutely.

- Thanks. National park service has preliminarily awarded us a the 5 million grant to construct phase two of the shipyard.

- Wow.

- National park.

- Not even quite that far, but-

- Looking for rent.

- That's awesome.

- That is, congratulations.

- Thank you. You'll have to explain that one someday. How the national park-

- Right now.

- I don't want it.

- Any questions or comments in regards to the motion? If not all in favor of the motion, please say aye.

- Aye. Oppose Motion carries, thank you.

- Thank you. Okay I had no questions in regard to the financial report or check register. Anybody else did that? Director's report, Neil.

- So I did mention this in terms of having the project report that we're kind of working on in terms of format. So we have a few final things that we're still adding to this, so it wasn't ready for prime time, but here it is, this is kind of the format we're looking at doing. So, Kathy, I know you certainly have had an interest in this for sure. So we're looking at doing kind of just the address, project developer name, project description. It's kind of a permanent information on the list. So that all will always remind everybody on, not like how many department units it is, what sort of excuse it sort of might be. And then we'll actually have a status update on the right hand side for folks that we'll update on a regular basis.

- What about tax based impact?

- Yeah, we have, usually in most cases we have a description of who you are, construction cost or an assessment . Revised down to 21 million. So we do include that in the key description of the project.

- And do you put it's in there? The date that it came to the RDA and that it was approved?

- I've been working it and that is not in there. We can certainly go back and put .

- That's a big thing for me because we've got a lot of developments we've approved and it's like, I wanna know when did we approve it? When do we think shovels were gonna go in?

- Yeah.

- And since they haven't, when do are we gonna go in

- Yeah, no, that's, an easy topic I can add. So we pull those right out of the agreement. It's not a problem.

- Yeah. I think that's one of the biggest things that, we were we're concerned about is as these are going through, we've had stops and starts so-

- Absolutely

- In the status, as long as we continue to keep the status in there so we can see it historically.

- Certainly easy enough.

- How about saying, we need to, keep bringing these up the City commitment there. What are we bringing to the table for this project there tax base is 10 million, but what are we doing?

- Yeah, right now we've noted if there is a TIF development agreement in place, we haven't, we've made a note of that. We didn't put the exact nature down on. That's something certainly. While that is public record, making it too easy for folks to come in and get a steal from somebody else. And again, certainly the idea is that I think Gary mentioned this to you earlier. Obviously the intention is to have this list on there and available to you guys. So if there is a specific to, at least to very least, if you guys want to ask a questions like, Hey, we haven't heard about this one for a while. What's going on? So we least have that description there to remind everybody that, Hey, it's out. It is out there. And so if we have that date, if it hasn't something hasn't moved forward in a while, hopefully that would trigger something from a member has a specific question on an update on that. It provides that.

- Absolutely.

- Say about this.

- It will actually be using this. This is actually going to go to you guys to RDA EDA plan commission will probably be all part of the director's report. That actually goes to all three good bodies.

- So I just gotta ask about the grocery store.

- We had actually distinctly enough, I guess I'll hop down on this one. Certainly we had the bad news about partners, not receiving tax credits on that, but the gentleman who's actually same developer, affiliated with that project did receive tax credits for 216 Military Avenue. So that one was awarded. So we're hoping that gets them focused on that one. And then back onto this one here, Matt has been working with the developer on kind of completing the environmental review and mitigation plan for that site. They have found there was some petroleum in addition to what else they found on there, bits of additional testing here in this last week. So they had had to kind of step up their mitigation a little bit effort on it, but right now they're still on. According to the last conversation we've had developer, they're still planning on proceeding and being hopefully in the ground by August. So despite some, some construction cost challenges and some additional environmental challenges, they seem to not be overly we're concerned at this point and are still planning on moving ahead. So we like to see that project be underway in August. There is some financial gap that we're wrestling with. I think we're trying to looking at some creative options in terms of helping out specifically with the grocery store component as a minority own business is as a woman owned business. So when you think there's some opportunities there that we might be able to provide a little bit more assistance to make sure that that happens. So knock on wood, but also positive news at this point.

- In your list. How many projects part are there technically relevant?

- Geez. How many? I think we got how many, seven pages worth. There's quite a few of them out there.

- Excellent.

- So we got to working on some of the other housing projects that we're sort of getting those identified down there, but yeah, we key redevelopment projects, major industrial projects, and then other housing projects, I think are the kind of three key categories that we've got in there right now.

- If you've got formatting or detail suggestions, feel free.

- Yeah, absolutely.

- Have Neil receive those, but yeah.

- Absolutely.

- And also for the RDA feel free to just, yeah. I mean, like I said, that's an easy thing like that Kathy's report. That's an easy thing to go back for and absolutely enough to pull in there.

- Absolutely.

- So useful it is for us and sure, it's gonna be very useful for you guys as well. We keep track of all these things.

- It's mainly how many times it be, okay.

- So yeah.

- We reds on the schedule.

- We heard there were a couple oranges.

- A couple of oranges on delays that we're dealing with right now that are-.

- Red green.

- Yeah, so we've got . We did color code them a little bit for delays or oranges. Greens are greens are on schedule and then yeah with no reds . So hopefully that stays that way.

- You're doing a my job.

- Hopefully we get this email out here, at the end of this week. So you actually be able to review it and have any questions for me.

- Fantastic.

- Very nice.

- Very good.

- So just why don't we show you that. So you know that it is, we are working on it. Any other questions?

- Any questions?` For our staff or the mayor? Anybody else? Well, very good. Thank you for your work. Welcome.

- He keeps us moving council.

- So do it here.

- All right. Okay, our next meeting is June 14th, which I should be in Canada fishing.

- So we probably will be reaching out for a special meeting here possibly in the next week and a half. Specifically related to the award of the phase one bids that we mentioned that we just approved this. So this is gonna wanna go to Council on 17th and then probably be reaching out into this week. So to check your schedules, after the meeting this week.

- Maybe we can do a zoom meeting. If that means that's the only way we can get a quorum, whatever. Although I like the face to face meetings,

- My goodness. but you can't come back and unless

- That's the idea, right?

- Yeah.

- I'll stick to grandsons.

- Motion to adjourn?

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- Second by Matt. All those in favor of motion say, aye.

- Aye.

- Thank you. Nice job everyone, that's it.