



Community Development Authority

Meeting Minutes

October 27, 2016 4:00 P.M.

Village Hall Committee Room

3930 N. Murray Avenue, Shorewood, Wisconsin 53211

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

Members present: Chair Peter Hammond, Andrea Roschke, Peter Petrie (left 6:15 p.m.), John Florsheim Trustee Tammy Bockhorst, Trustee Allison Rozek

Not present: Michal Dawson

2. Further Discussion by Village Finance Director on procedures to transfer funds from Tax Increment District #1 to CDA and consideration of Memorandum of Understanding between the CDA and Village of Shorewood.

Finance Director Mark Emanuelson provided a summary on the MOU discussing the transfer funds from Tax Increment District #1 to CDA. Chair Peter Hammond summarized the redline changes outlined in the MOU based on the previous discussion(s). There was discussion on the CDA's and the Village Board's role and authority based on the current version of the MOU. There was indication to have Village Manager Swartz to follow up with the Village Attorney to review the CDA and Village Board's role in regards to the Village Board's authority to make modifications and changes to CDA funding.

There was discussion to include or move language regarding the stipulation that the Village Board adopt a revised business improvement loan plan (post February 2016) prior to the expenditure of any business loan funds, to the third whereas clause. There was additional discussion in regards to the work capacity within the \$7,700 compensation fee for Village staff and if additional programs were approved at a later date that incorporated more Village staff time. Mr. Emanuelson recommended addressing this situation at that time should staff's workload change significantly. The CDA briefly discussed the procedural tasks that are included in the Village's role as the fiscal agent (i.e. writing of the checks). There was discussion over ways to streamline the fiscal responsibilities so they are all incorporated under the Village as the fiscal agent. The CDA provided the indication of having the Village Board discuss the Finance Director and Village staff's role involved with the fiscal responsibilities.

Tr. Bockhorst moved to adopt with the MOU between the CDA and the Village of Shorewood to transfer funds from Tax Increment District #1 to CDA with consideration of the changes listed in the minutes and recommended for the Village Board to consider adoption of the MOU. The motion is seconded by Ms. Roschke. Motion passes 6-0.

3. Consideration of business loan program.

The CDA went through the proposed business loan program. There was discussion and consensus from the CDA to strike all language indicating who are the current administering agencies and people involved in case those were to change and use general terminology instead (i.e. administering agency, Village staff). There was suggestion to include additional language in application procedures to provide more direction on the

process in addition to referencing Attachment D. The CDA reviewed the Term Credit Agreement and indicated it needs to be a blank form, and as a result, all information provided in the blanks need to be removed and included as an attachment with the program.

The CDA also evaluated the BID Façade Improvement & Business Loan map to discuss the boundaries of the map along with the title of the map and why the Village of Shorewood isn't included in the title (replacing the Business Improvement District). Some members thought the boundary lines have changed since the last time they saw the map originally. Village staff and the CDA will compare the old map included in the façade program to the map in the business loan program and make sure it is consistent based on the description provided in the façade program on page 2 but striking the word "eastside" on Wilson Drive (only existing commercial properties). In addition, the CDA requested boundaries of the map need to be referenced in the business loan program – similar to how it is referenced in the façade grant program. As a result, the CDA would like to have a new heading labeled "Target Areas" and include a similar description as mentioned in the façade grant program but make sure to change the referenced exhibit to the correct one.

Mr. Petrie presented the business loan program synopsis on management and administration with the CDA. There was a recommendation to add the benefit of job retention or creation due to the program under item C. There was brief discussion about altering the loan agreement or improve the marketing of the program to make it simpler and/or less intimidating for businesses. The CDA agreed to provide the synopsis and the detailed manual to the Village Board for a future Village Board meeting. President Johnson mentioned it would be appropriate for a presentation on the business loan program to be presented to the Village Board, and the CDA should discuss timing of the presentation with Village Manager Chris Swartz.

Mr. Florsheim moved to adopt the business loan program with consideration of the changes outlined in the minutes as well as recommend to the Village Board to consider adoption of the program. The motion was seconded by Tr. Rozek. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

4. Consideration on façade grant program.

Chair Hammond presented a summary of the proposed changes of the recent version of the façade grant program. It was indicated by a subcommittee to alter the language so that "visible from" is removed from the eligible activities on page 2. The CDA agreed that this language should be incorporated in the façade grant program. There was discussion on whether signs approved by the Design Review Board not upholding the sign code but received an exception can be funded by the façade grant program. The CDA determined to leave the proposed language to follow the Design Review Board's ruling on the compliance of signs when determining if a sign is able to receive façade grant funding.

The CDA reviewed a spreadsheet illustrating the façade grant program history dating back to 2004. The CDA discussed the optional maximum grants for the program. The CDA further talked about potentially making funds available for significant interior reconstructions for businesses. Change beginning of section B under the Application Process to read: “The applicant and/or qualified design professional prepares...”

The CDA discussed whether or not to include parklets in the façade grant program. The CDA determined to make parklets and/or patios as an eligible expense to be included in the \$1,500 program limit on those improvements (including new signs and awnings) collectively. In addition, vertical elements of decks are eligible expenses. There is a recommendation to insert the grant application with the façade grant program document. The CDA recommends adding a date line by the signatures to Attachment B when the agreement is signed by each party as well as eliminating the “in witness there of” line. Similar to the business loan program, the CDA would like to strike all language indicating who are the current administering agencies and people involved in case those were to change and have it include general language instead. Village staff and the CDA will change the map included in the façade program to make sure it is consistent with the map in the business loan program and based on the description provided in the façade program on page 2 but striking the word “eastside” on Wilson Drive (only existing commercial properties). An additional recommendation the CDA approved was to amend Item F under the application process to include language stating all applicants need have a minimum of two bids from all contractors and sub-contractors. After the discussion, the CDA recommended to go with a maximum grant of \$10,000 (only exterior improvements), a \$2,000 maximum for concept designs and a \$1,500 maximum for new signs and awnings.

Ms. Roschke moved to adopt the façade grant program with consideration of the changes outlined in the minutes as well as recommend to the Village Board to consider adoption of the program. The motion was seconded by Mr. Florsheim. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

5. Adjournment

Tr. Bockhorst moved to adjourn, seconded by Tr. Rozek. Vote 5-0 to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Tyler Burkart
Assistant Village Manager