



Community Development Authority
Meeting Minutes
Friday, January 8, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.
via Tele/Video-Conference

Present: Chair Peter Hammond, Tr. Davida Amenta, Michal Dawson, Jon Krouse, Joe LeSage, Desty Lorino and Tr. Kathy Stokebrand

Also present: Village Manager, Rebecca Ewald; Planning and Development Director, Bart Griepentrog; BID Executive Director, Steph Salvia; Assistant Village Manager, Tyler Burkart; Finance Director Mark Emanuelson; and, Michaela Huot (Baker Tilly), Katie Gnau, Victoria Ross, and Ann McCullough McKaig.

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 am.

2. Consider December 4, 2020 meeting minutes.

Ms. Dawson motioned to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Tr. Stokebrand. Vote 7-0.

3. Consider Policy 40 – Tax Increment District (TID) creation and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) assistance.

Chair Hammond noted that the CDA had already gone through the policy twice and suggested that this would be the final review to make sure all previous comments were incorporated. Chair Hammond confirmed with Village Manager Ewald that the next step would be Village Board consideration.

Tr. Stokebrand questioned if the TIF Cap Waiver, which required Village Board approval, would first receive a recommendation from the CDA. Village Manager Ewald confirmed that it would. Tr. Stokebrand requested that the policy be updated to reflect that in both items 10c and 10e. Chair Hammond noted that he was fine to reference that.

Tr. Amenta discussed the public input and transparency aspects listed in Phase 2, noted that TIF projects can impact the entire village and questioned who determines what efforts are adequate. Village Manager Ewald noted that in addition to the Village's blanket communications, the developer would need to submit written communication plans within both application phases for the CDA's review. Tr. Amenta reiterated that communication is key. She commented that inclusion within the Village Manager's Memo does not mean that everyone gets it, opens it or reads it. Chair Hammond responded that the developer would give the plan to the CDA for review and response, and did not want to tie anyone's hands with too many details within the policy. Mr. Krouse and Ms. Dawson agreed. Tr. Amenta suggested that it may be better for staff to be able to advise the developer on drafting their plans, but that it didn't have to be in the policy. Tr. Stokebrand noted that it was not staff's job to write their plans. She suggested that the Village Manager's Memo link to the developer's website. Chair Hammond reiterated a desire to look at the policy with a 10-year lens and allow the administration and bodies at the time to review the proposal, further suggesting that we might not know what works best in the future. Mr. LeSage and Tr. Stokebrand agreed.

Tr. Amenta noted that reference to “look back” clauses had been removed. She questioned if the “claw back” references were assumed to include it. Ms. Huot noted that “look back” had been replaced with “claw back” in Phase 3 #11. She stated that it makes sense to do the financial review first and later confirm if the assumptions became real numbers. Adjustments to the amount of eligible increment could be made based on those actuals. She summarized that the review was still in, but was just reorganized. Tr. Amenta confirmed that this reporting would take place for all projects. Within the same paragraph, Tr. Stokebrand questioned if the policy should be reworded to say “it will reduce or require request of repayment of amount of assistance provided.” Ms. Huot agreed to the revised language.

Tr. Stokebrand noted that the organizations listed within Section 5 were all great agencies, but questioned if it was an exhaustive list. Village Manager Ewald noted that she would update it to include that others would be considered.

Mr. Krouse motioned to approve the policy as presented with the minor edits discussed within the meeting; seconded by Mr. LeSage. Vote 7-0.

Chair Hammond noted that this policy would be a good thing for future CDAs and that it has been requested for a long time. He stated that he will be interested to see how the Village Board reviews the policy and suggested that it could come back to the CDA for additional edits. Village Manager Ewald noted that the Village Board’s review would be scheduled for January 20, 2021.

4. Review and recommend receipt of annual Housing Affordability Report.

Planning Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the report, noting that it is required by State Statute to be updated annually. He stated that the report had been drafted by Novogradac last year as part of the larger Housing Study effort and that this year’s report simply updated numbers from 2020. He suggested that the report was likely intended for growing communities with more available land or subdivision opportunities. As a built-out community, the updated numbers from 2020 were not much different.

Chair Hammond stated that the report had a lot of good and interesting information and questioned if there were any conclusions that could be made or whether it was intended to simply provide data. Planning Director Griepentrog noted that the report is required to be provided annually for reference and that any suggestions or conclusions would be a next step discussion, if or as desired.

Tr. Stokebrand questioned what housing gaps were not included within this year’s report. Planning Director Griepentrog noted that Novogradac included discussion of housing gaps for groups such as senior, affordable units or young families in last year’s report, but that those were not required to be included in the annual update by State Statute. He noted that Novogradac believed their analysis would be relevant for up to five years, so that reference to those gaps could be found in last year’s report.

Tr. Amenta questioned what the S.B. Friedman Duplex Strategy Report was within the Comprehensive Plan Implementation section. Planning Director Griepentrog noted that it was a study that in part led to the duplex conversion loan program, but that it was quite old at this time and not actively being referenced or engaged.

Tr. Amenta stated that Table 10: Forecast Housing Demand was probably intended to be the most important data set with respect to understanding whether or not the Village will be able to meet future housing demand, and if not, what does that mean. Planning Director Griepentrog agreed that he believed it was the primary driver in presenting the report to policy makers. He also questioned the accuracy of the projections with respect to the Village’s built-out nature. Tr. Amenta noted that the

Village has actually added a significant amount of housing units within recent years, and although options are limited, if demand remains high and new units are not added, that affordability will continue to be an issue. She stated that if the Village wanted to remain a community that has a range of affordability, it needs to think about increasing housing supply.

Tr. Stokebrand moved to recommend that the Village Board receive the annual update to the Housing Affordability Report at their January 20, 2021 meeting; seconded by Mr. Lorino. Vote 7-0.

5. Adjournment.

Tr. Amenta motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:34 am; seconded by Tr. Stokebrand. Vote 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director