

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Plan Commission Offices
Manitowoc City Hall

Regular Meeting
Manitowoc City Plan Commission
Wednesday
November 16, 2011
6:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the City Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Justin Nickels at 6:30 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Dan Hornung
Justin Nickels
Jim Brey
Val Mellon
Jim Muenzenmeyer
David Diedrich
Steve Alpert

Members Excused

Maureen Stokes

Staff Present

David Less
Paul Braun
Michelle Yanda
Elizabeth Werdermann

Others Present

See Attached Sign In Sheet

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the Regular October 12, 2011 Meeting.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer

Moved that: the minutes be approved as presented. _____ Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

- A. PC45-2011: Homes for Independent Living; Request for Exception to 2,500' Separation Requirement Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 62.23(7)(i)1. for Establishment of an 8-Bed Community Based Residential Facility (CBRF) at 4705 W. Whitetail Court

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Mr. Less explained that tonight's public informational hearing was in regard to a request from Tom Singleton, Regional Director of Homes for Independent Living of Wisconsin LLC, (HIL) which was a provider of group homes and associated services for challenged individuals. Mr. Less added that they were requesting that the City grant an exception to the 2,500' spacing requirement under Wis. Stat. § 62.23(7)(i)1.

Mr. Less stated that the subject property was a former Community-Based Residential Facility (CBRF) at 4705 W. Whitetail Court, which had operated as an 8-bed, CBRF for individuals with infirmities of aging (also known as Lot 14, Block 3 in Doneff's Addition No. 2 and Tax Parcel # 236-003-140).

Mr. Less explained that a CBRF was a facility for 5+ adults who were not related, and didn't require care above intermediate level nursing care, treatment or services that were above the level of room and board, but included no more than 3 hours of nursing care per week per resident.

Mr. Less stated that the former CBRF was for the advanced aged (60+ years), and was classified as a Class A Semiambulatory (AS) facility serving only residents who were ambulatory or semiambulatory, and were mentally and physically capable of responding to an electronic fire alarm and exiting the facility without any help or verbal or physical prompting.

Mr. Less stated that HIL was requesting that the City grant an exception to the 2,500' provision contained in Wis. Stat. § 62.23(7)(i)1 which stated that the City, at its discretion, may grant an exception to this statute to permit a Community Living Arrangement (CLA) to locate within 2,500' of an existing CLA. Mr. Less continued that the proposed CBRF was located approximately 850' south of an existing CBRF at 910 River Bluff Drive; a facility for which the City granted the 2,500' exception back in 1998.

Mr. Less noted that HIL was currently the licensee for several support facilities in the City for developmentally disabled clients:

- A. HIL North Wind, 2410 Knuell (4-person AFH)
- B. HIL Sierra, 2021 Kellner (4-person AFH)
- C. HIL South Wind, 2408 Knuell (4-person AFH)
- D. HIL Yorktown Home, 2136 S. 13th (4-person AFH)
- E. HIL Lighthouse, 1301 N. 24th (6-person CBRF)
- F. HIL Wisconsin Home, 1348-1350 S. 39th (6-person CBRF)

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Mr. Less stated the subject parcel was currently owned by ORP Real Estate Holdings LLC, the holding company for HIL, which acquired title to the property by Warranty Deed in February, 2011. Mr. Less added that the property had been previously owned by Whitetail Estates, Inc., which acquired it from Doneff Building Systems back in 1996.

Mr. Less noted the subject parcel was a corner lot that measured 83' on River Bluff Drive x 126' on W. Whitetail Court, and included a 1-story, 7-bedroom ranch home with 3 full bathrooms, measuring approximately 2,800sf in area. Mr. Less continued that the property had an open and unfenced yard, was currently zoned "R-4" Single and Two Family Residential District, had an estimated fair market value of \$261,300, and generated over \$5,300 in real estate taxes. Mr. Less noted that there was a wooden fence along the south side of the property which belonged to the property to the south at 724 River Bluff Drive. Mr. Less added that there were no overnight or winter parking ban restrictions on either River Bluff Drive or W. Whitetail Court.

Mr. Less continued that under the "R-4" zoning, a CBRF for 8 or fewer individuals was a permitted use, and didn't require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and added that should HIL contemplate exceeding a capacity of 8, they'd have to first apply to the City for a CUP.

Mr. Less commented that the CBRF which formerly operated at this property was included in the City's annual review of CLA's as of January 1, 2010, but disappeared sometime thereafter, and was not on the January 1, 2011 annual review. Mr. Less explained that the original CBRF which was operated as "Whitetail Estates Inc." was licensed as a maximum 7-person, Class "A", semiambulatory facility with a specialty identified by the State as advanced aged.

Mr. Less stated that the HIL proposal would be for a maximum of 8-persons, and the facility would operate as a Class "A", Ambulatory facility for the developmentally disabled -- slightly different from the previous clientele in this facility when it operated as a CBRF, in that the current proposal would limit its population to only residents which were ambulatory.

Mr. Less continued to explain that the proposed CBRF would be known as "Whitetail Court", would provide residential care in a community setting, and would have 24-hour awake staff coverage, with at least 1 staff person present any time clients were in the home.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Mr. Less noted that he had explained in past Commission meetings the purpose of the 2,500' spacing requirement -- to disperse CLA's throughout the community, and to avoid over intensifying the location of such persons' into limited geographic areas.

Mr. Less explained that CBRF's were regulated under Wis. Stat. § 62.23(7)(i) which included the following provisions:

1. (7)(i)1. was in regard to the 2,500' separation requirements and the granting of an "exception"; and
2. (7)(i)3 which stated that a CLA with a capacity for 8 or less was entitled to locate in any residential zone without being required to obtain "special zoning permission", except for the annual review provision under (7)(i)9. of the statute.

Mr. Less stated that he didn't believe the statute under subd. (3) prohibited the City from regulating the 2,500' provision for facilities with a capacity of 8 or less, and that was why the matter was proceeding tonight. Mr. Less stated that CBRF's were regulated by the State's Department of Health Services, and were further required to meet the requirements under Wisconsin Administrative Code DHS 83. Mr. Less added that the Division of Supportive Living was responsible for the licensing of all CBRF's in Wisconsin.

Mr. Less concluded his overview by stating that the subject parcel was surrounded by "R-4" Single and Two Family Residential zoning and land uses on all sides. Mr. Less advised further that notices were mailed from Planning on November 9th to property owners within 200' of the subject property, and that there were no responses to the mailing.

Mayor Nickels asked for public input. There was no public input.

Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend that Council grant an exception to the 2,500' spacing requirement as requested to Homes for Independent Living of Wisconsin LLC a/k/a ORP Real Estate Holdings LLC (together "HIL") pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 62.23(7)(i)1. with the understanding that if HIL did not secure all required licenses from the State by March 31, 2012, this exception would be deemed void and terminated effective April 1, 2012.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve
the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Hornung
Upon Vote: the motion was approved
unanimously.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

B. PC47-2011/PC27-2011: Shady Lane, Inc. - Proposed Amendment No. 1 to a 2011 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Pursuant to Section 15.370(27) of the Manitowoc Municipal Code to Authorize a Hospital Clinic at 1235 So. 24th Street

Mr. Less explained that tonight's public informational hearing was in regard to a request from Shady Lane, Inc. as the owner and operator of an independent senior living complex at 1235 So. 24th Street. Mr. Less commented that Shady Lane was requesting that the City grant them a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Section 15.390(3)(n) of the Manitowoc Municipal Code for locating an off-site clinic as an accessory use in a portion of their existing facilities. Mr. Less explained that the CUP process was governed by Section 15.370(27) of the Code.

Mr. Less explained that under a CUP, the Commission and Council had to determine if the proposed use was reasonably necessary for the convenience and welfare of the public, was in harmony with the character of the surrounding area, and would have a minimal or no effect on surrounding property values. Mr. Less added that the Commission and Council could affix conditions to the CUP to provide assurances that the proposed use would not have a negative impact on the surrounding area.

Mr. Less stated that the City, in July, 2011, issued Shady Lane a CUP for the operation of a nursing home and a maximum 88-bed community based residential facility (CBRF), and that they were now requesting that the CUP be amended so as to clearly authorize and permit a clinic to be located on their property. Mr. Less continued that the clinic would be operated by Holy Family Memorial by virtue of a soon to be signed lease for approximately 3,300sf of first floor area, in the south wing of its 4-story building, with the lease effective January 1, 2012.

Mr. Less noted that Shady Lane, Inc. was a non-stock, non-profit Wisconsin corporation that operated a nursing home complex in Block One (1) of Shady Lane Subdivision that began in the early 1950's when Manitowoc County constructed a health care center on what was today "Harbortown".

Mr. Less explained that Shady Lane took title to this property in 1993 from Manitowoc County, and that 5 years later, satisfied its debt obligation with Manitowoc County. Mr. Less also noted that the improvements on the south 515' of Block 1 were part of a condominium declaration that was created by Manitowoc County in 1988 in the name of "Park Lawn - Shady Lane Condominium" (Park Lawn Nursing Home was the predecessor to Shady Lane, and was a 99-bed nursing home). Mr. Less continued that

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

the southernmost tract which included the nursing home complex was tax exempt and had a total building area of approximately 142,000sf. Mr. Less added that the unimproved northern parcel had an assessed valuation of \$28,500, and that the entire Block 1 (bordered by Hamilton, Shady Lane, So. 22nd and So. 24th Street) measured 527' x 893' or 10.8-acres in area.

Mr. Less explained that Shady Lane included the Laurel Grove Assisted Living Center, and in total, was licensed according to State records as follows:

- A. Laurel Grove - a 52-bed CBRF for advanced aged.
- B. 10 Residential Care Apartment Complex (RCAC) beds that were part of the Laurel Grove Assisted Living Center.
- C. 161 skilled care nursing home beds in the Shady Lane Nursing Care Center.

Mr. Less clarified the differences between these types of licensed facilities:

- A. CBRF - place where 5+ adults resided, who didn't require care above intermediate level nursing care treatment or services that are above the level of room and board, but that are limited to not more than 3 hours of nursing care/week.
- B. RCAC - place where 5+ adults resided that consists of independent apartments, and not more than 28 hours/week of services that are supportive, personal and nursing services.
- C. Nursing Home - place defined more by its skill level, but with direct patient observation and monitoring on a continuous basis.

Mr. Less stated that the request from Shady Lane reflected a further complement to its current array of senior services, and a less restrictive, more integrated and home-like environment, and would allow for the establishment of a clinic on the first floor of the complex that was currently used as the RCAC, nursing home rehab units, and part of the recently expanded CBRF. Mr. Less noted that the clinic would likely not be used primarily for Shady Lane residents; that it would have between 3 and 6 staff persons; and that there would be no physical expansion of the facility planned. Mr. Less added that the building plans for the 3,300sf remodeling project were conditionally approved by the Wisconsin Department of Health Services on October 27, 2011.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Mr. Less explained that Shady Lane currently employed approximately 225 persons, with no more than 75-80 at any single time, and that the site provided approximately 151 off-street parking spaces. Mr. Less stated that Shady Lane was surrounded on all sides by residential development, and itself was zoned "R-6".

In closing, Mr. Less stated that notices were mailed from Planning on November 9th to property owners within 200' of the nursing home complex. Mr. Less noted that there was a single phone call from an unidentified person that was received in response to the mailing, and that while not opposed to the modification, the conversation was more a series of questions regarding why they received the notice, whether or not the Shady Lane proposal would be an expansion of the building footprint, and whether or not it might cause a diminution of their property values. Mr. Less added that there was no objection to the proposal after the project was explained to the caller.

Mayor Nickels asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Diedrich wanted to confirm that the clinic would not only be for residents of Shady Lane, but would also be open to the general public, and questioned whether it would have a negative impact on the current parking situation. Mr. Less confirmed that the clinic would be for both residents and the general public, and that there shouldn't be any negative impact on the existing off-street parking situation. Mr. Less stated that there was roughly a 3:1 ratio of off street parking spaces to employees.

Mayor Nickels opened the discussion up to the public for input.

Dan Burton, 2315 Shady Lane stated he has no objection to the proposed CUP, but did have concerns with the existing on street parking along Shady Lane. Mr. Burton stated that the employees parked on both sides of the street, and noted that during this past winter, it was very difficult for the City snow plows to get through the area, adding that the City crews had to come back with additional equipment to widen the street when the on-street vehicles were not present.

Todd Meerdink, Shady Lane, 1235 S. 24th Street, stated that the issue wasn't that there was not enough off-street parking available, but that Shady Lane was a smoke-free campus, and employees parked on the street so they could smoke in their vehicles during their breaks. Mr. Meerdink asked if there was some way that the City could assist Shady Lane in encouraging the employees to park in the off-street parking lot.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Pauline Burton, 2315 Shady Lane, added to her husband's comments regarding the parking issue, and stated that she wrote a letter approximately a month ago to the City explaining the on-street parking issue.

Mr. Brey noted that he hadn't seen this letter.

Ms. Burton continued that she had given the letter to Dennis Lippert from the Police Department. Mrs. Burton suggested that the City not allow parking on the south side of Shady Lane to ease the traffic issues and allow snow plows better access.

Mr Brey stated that he would stop at the Burton's house the next day to pick up a copy of the letter, and have it placed on the Council's upcoming agenda, and advised that the issue would be referred to the Safety, Traffic and Parking Commission for discussion.

Mayor Nickels closed the public input portion of the meeting and asked for Mr. Less' recommendation.

Mrs. Mellon asked if there was a way Shady Lane could make a portion of their off-street parking lot an area that was available to smokers?

Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend to Council the following: (i) amend the July, 2011 CUP to approve and authorize the siting of an off-site clinic at Shady Lane pursuant to Section 15.390(3)(n) of the Manitowoc Municipal Code; and (ii) that the proposed Holy Family clinic at Shady Lane be included as a "support facility" which would meet that definition as that term was defined in the amended terms and conditions of the 2011 CUP as provided.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve
the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Hornung
Upon Vote: the motion was approved
unanimously.

V. REFERRALS FROM COMMON COUNCIL

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

A. PC46-2011: Manitowoc County; Tax Foreclosure Property at 2406 So. 14th Street

Mr. Less explained that the property at 2406 S. 14th Street was foreclosed on for tax reasons and that the County had asked for sealed bids on the property by November 4th. Mr. Less noted that since the bid date has already passed, the City would have no interest in the property.

Mr. Less recommended that the Plan Commission recommend to Council to place the communication on file.

Motion by: Mr. Brey

Moved that: the Commission approve the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer

Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

B. PC48-2011: Wenzel/Weichert Realtors; Amendment No. 1 to Temporary Access Easement Agreement Over Unopened Street" at 1919 E. Spruce Drive

Mr. Less explained that this property was off of E. Spruce Drive, and that back in 1986 the City issued a temporary access easement over a 20' strip of City-owned property. Mr. Less advised that the property had an accepted Offer to Purchase on it, with some contingencies that would need to be worked out.

Mr. Braun explained that the property was a flag lot with 20' of legal access off of Woodland Drive, but the useable access came off of E. Spruce over the 20' City-owned strip of land.

Mr. Less explained that the existing house was in the City, but was not serviced by City water or sanitary services, and that the buyer would like to extend the services over the 20' City-owned parcel. Mr. Less noted that the current easement only allowed for access, and did not authorize the extension of utilities. Mr. Less added that the closing date in the Offer was scheduled to occur by February 24, 2012.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer commented that there currently was a zoning issue with the property, in that it was zoned "I-1" Light Industrial, and the existing residential structure was legal and nonconforming. Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that the buyer intended to live in the house, and would eventually have to petition the City to correct the zoning, and then clarified that tonight's issue was only in regard to the easement amendment.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend to Council to instruct the City Attorney to contact and work with the current property owner to negotiate and complete an amendment to the current easement authorizing the extension and improvement of the easement area for the extension of utilities.

Motion by: Mr. Alpert

Moved that: the Commission approve the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mrs. Mellon

Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

C. PC49-2011: KB Brothers, LLC; Sidewalk Privilege Agreement at 2000 Clark Street

Mr. Less stated the item was referred to the Plan Commission by the Council, and that the document needed to be corrected. Mr. Less explained the needed corrections, and noted that the grantee listed in the document was not the property owner of record.

Mr. Less recommended that the Plan Commission recommend to Council that the sidewalk privilege agreement not be acted on, that it be placed on file, and that a new sidewalk privilege agreement be drafted by the Attorney's office to reflect the required change.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung

Moved that: the Commission approve the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich

Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

D. PC1-2011: Lakeshore Mini Storage, LLC; Quit Claim Deed to the City of Manitowoc for .10-Acres for Johnston Drive Purposes

Mr. Less explained the above described Quit Claim Deed. Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend to the Council approval of the deed.

Motion by: Mr. Brey

Moved that: the Commission approve the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer

Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

- A. PC43-2011: RTM Real Estate LLC; Request to Rezone Property at 940 N. 11th Street from "B-2" Neighborhood Business District to "B-3" General Business District Pursuant to Section 15.270(2)(uu) of the Manitowoc Municipal Code

Mr. Less explained that the RTM request had gone through the processes of the public informational hearing in front of the Plan Commission, and the required public hearing in front of the Council. Mr. Less stated that no one spoke at the Council public hearing on this matter.

Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend to Council approval of the zone change and adoption of the ordinance.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung
Moved that: the Commission approve the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich
Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

- B. PC37-2011: City of Manitowoc; Vacation for Portion of an Alley Under Wis. Stat. § 66.1003(4) and Official Map Amendment Under Wis. Stat. § 62.23(6) in Block 6 of Reed Lawn Subdivision

Mr. Less began by stating his recommendation to the Commission that they recommend to Council approval of the Resolution for the vacation of the alley for utilities, and approval of an Ordinance for amending the Official Map. Mr. Less recommended further that the Resolution and Ordinance should only get adopted by Council concurrent with approval of an agreement for the "Vacation of Alley for Utilities Agreement" between the City and Michael J. Arendt which was yet to be finalized and signed by both parties.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve the Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Alpert
Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Discussion Regarding City Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) District - Consideration of Establishing Donor:Recipient and Distressed TIF Designations

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Brad Viegut from Baird was invited to give an introductory presentation to the Commission regarding the concept of establishing donor:recipient, and distressed TIF designations in the City.

Mayor Nickels stated to the Commission that the discussion tonight was only for the purpose of introducing the donor:recipient and distressed TIF concepts, and that the Commission would not be asked to take any action on the topic at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Viegut stated that as the audited City financials for 2010 were being completed, it came to light that there were significant pressures on the City's undesignated and unreserved fund balances. Mr. Viegut provided Commission members with a handout outlining some options to address the deficit balances in these funds. Mr. Viegut continued that the City had taken some measures to address some of these issues, but the options discussed tonight were part of a longer term solution.

Mr. Viegut handed out a packet to the Commissioners for discussion purposes.

Mr. Less then handed out a sheet summarizing the existing TIF districts which identified district creation dates, expenditure periods, and statutory termination dates.

Mr. Viegut stated that there were currently 11 active TIF districts in the City, and on a cumulative basis, the City had advanced over \$4.5 million to support the TIF districts. Mr. Viegut noted that when TIF's are created, a project plan is prepared with a feasibility analysis that is based on a set of financial assumptions. Mr. Viegut continued that these assumptions included assumptions about tax rates over the life of the district, inflation, cost of capital, and property valuations, which were all factor negatively impacting the revenue side of several City TIF districts. Mr. Viegut stated that with the current economic downturn, TIF districts which had been performing well, were not being negatively affected by a variety of local, state and national forces, some of which were controllable and some that were mandated changes. Mr. Viegut discussed the changes in local tax rates in the 1980's and 90's to the present, and noted that the school aide formulas had changed, and these changes had significantly reduced property taxes generated in the area of 30 - 40 per cent. Mr. Viegut sited levy limits put into place by the State beginning in 2005 and which continued through the present period as another relevant factor, and noted that all of these actions had put downward pressure on the City's TIF districts.

Mr. Viegut continued to state that as projections were made on a 20-year basis and as the inputs changed in the 20-year period there were significant changes to these future revenue stream estimates. Mr. Viegut noted that it was not that the City was

sloppy in creating TIF's, it was just a result of many negative economic factors beyond the City's control. Mr. Viegut continued that this situation was not unique to Manitowoc, as many other WI municipalities were having this problem as well.

Mr. Viegut went on to say that with the \$4.5 million advanced to date, the City simply could not afford to continue to support the TIF's to that extent. Mr. Viegut noted that steps were taken by the Council last month to restructure the existing TIF debt, but noted that other changes would need to occur. Mr. Viegut continued that the State had changed the TIF law to allow cities to designate an underperforming district as distressed, and to allow successful TIF's to donate revenues to underperforming districts. Mr. Viegut added that the State made these changes to the TIF law because it recognized that the actions they took were having an adverse impact on municipalities.

Mr. Viegut explained a chart he handed out that showed cumulative TIF increments over time, and which demonstrated that cumulative TIF balances were not enough to pay for the investments the City has made until approximately 2018, which would be the year the City would be made whole.

Mr. Viegut said the TIF's currently were not strong enough to support the repayment of the investments if the donor:recipient, and distressed TIF options were not used by the City. Mr. Viegut noted that designating a TIF as distressed extended the life of the district up to 10 additional years. Mr. Viegut then explained the amendment process required.

Mr. Viegut continued to explain some of the nuances of the distressed TIF law, and the procedures that would need to occur to attain the designation. Mr. Viegut discussed some of the major restrictions that would occur if the donor:recipient and distressed TIF relationships were created such as: (i) the City would not be able to make any additional expenditures beyond the original expenditure; (ii) there could not be any amendments to the project plan to add more projects; (iii) the boundary of a district could not be expanded; (iv) the TIF cannot become part of a TID with overlapping boundaries; and (v) the distressed TID could not become a donor TID in the future.

Mr. Viegut recommended that the distressed TID designation be placed on TIDs 8, 11, 12, 14, and 16, and the donor designation be placed on TIDs 10, 13, 15, and 17. Mr. Viegut noted that the accumulation of funds in the donor TIDs could then be used to help cover the expenditures in the distressed TIDs. Mr. Viegut explained what the next steps would be if the Council decided to move forward with the donor:recipient and distressed TID plans.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

Mr. Less stated that it would be approximately a 90-day minimum period to amend a TIF project plan after all the documents had been drafted and reviewed. Mr. Less also stated that if the amendments were adopted prior to September 30, 2012 the effective date of the amendment would be January 1, 2012; if the amendments were adopted on or after October 1st, the effective date would be January 1, 2013.

Mr. Hornung questioned how extending the life of a TID would improve a district's financial health, and asked for clarification regarding how a district's cash flow would improve based on the graph?

Mr. Viegut responded that the graph showed conditions after the donor:recipient and distressed TID plans were in place, estimating that under current economic realities, the TID cumulative balances would be in the black in 2018. Mr. Viegut noted that if these amendments didn't occur, he felt that the cumulative balances might never become positive.

Mr. Hornung commented that his impression was that the donor:recipient and distressed TID plans were in essence robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. Less stated that was not the case, as the re-structuring would provide the City a longer maturity date by which to recover the expenditure costs. Mr. Less noted that the other taxing jurisdictions would continue to levy taxes up to the certified base value of the districts, and that the only taxes they would not receive would be their portion of the positive increment tax growth above the certified base value.

Mr. Viegut stated that the TIF Joint Review Board was made up of a representative from each overlying taxing jurisdiction, and that they would have to vote to approve the amendments.

Mr. Diedrich asked how involved it was to change the project plans?

Mr. Less asked Mr. Viegut how much Baird would charge to write the amended project plans if it was not done by City staff?

Mr. Viegut stated that Baird would charge \$15,000 to do all the work for all of the amendments, with the exception of the mapping requirements which Baird would be unable to do.

Additional discussion was held as to what the next step would be. It was determined to wait and see what occurred with the 2012 budget.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 11/16/2011

No action was taken.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Manitowoc County Activities:

1. None

B. Certified Survey Maps (CSM):

1. None

C. Summary of Site Plans 9/8/2011 - 10/5/2011:

1. SP11-2011: Lakeshore Mini Storage, LLC, 2424 Johnston Drive - New Construction (approved).
2. SP12-2011: City of Manitowoc, Proposed Transit Center, 915 So. 11th (approved).

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Less
City Planner