**TIF Commission**

**April 18, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

The TIF Commission met on the Fifth Floor of University City’s City Hall located at 6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri on Wednesday, April 18, 2018. The meeting commenced at 6:35 pm.

**1. Roll Call**

**Voting Members Present Voting Members Absent**

Paulette Carr Susan Armstrong

Lawrence Welty Thomas Curran

Margaret Hart-Mahon Glenn Powers

Thomas Malecek

Andrew Durkett

Gerry Greiman

Lisa Brenner

Chelsea Addison

Dorothy Davis

**Staff Present**

Gregory Rose, City Manager

Rosalind Williams, Acting Director of Community Development

Andrew Stanislav, Planner

Adam Brown, Community Development Specialist

**Others Present on City’s behalf**

Mark Grimm, Gilmore & Bell

Andy Struckhoff, PGAV Planners

Mr. Greiman stated that this is not the public hearing and that the purpose of this meeting was to question the materials provided at the previous meeting, although the public may ask questions if time permits.

**2. Introduction of new members**

Mr. Greiman introduced two new members of the TIF Commission, Chelsea Addison with the School Board replacing George Lenard and Dorothy Davis with the Library.

**3. Redevelopment Plan/ 4. Proposed RPA 1 project/ 5. Cost Benefit Analysis**

Mr. Greiman called for questions of the Commission regarding the materials provided at the previous meeting.

Questions / Comments / Discussion by TIF Commission:

* The amount of the project cost reimbursed to the developer from TIF was questioned and how it will be paid. Mr. Grimm stated that the documents provided were still in draft form and that a revised version will be provided to the Commission prior to the public hearing. He also stated that the City is currently in the review process and has hired a consultant and Stifel Nicolaus to help in their review. Mr. Grimm noted that the neighborhood programs are driving this whole project and the plan must ensure prompt funding in RPAs two and three.
* The proposed apartments in RPA 1 were discussed as the benefit of using TIF, considering that sales tax revenue would not be generated, was questioned. Mr. Struckhoff stated that the benefit would be from the increased property taxes. It was also noted that the relative increase in population from the apartments would not create a significant benefit in terms of University City being a tax pool city.
* It was noted that the consultants, PGAV, and the developer, Novus, had provided their own separate analyses on revenue generation which explains the difference in some numbers.
* Mr. Struckhoff provided an explanation on how the assumptions used in their analysis were established.
* Some of the numbers provided in the analysis from PGAV, such as the money spent in RPAs two and three from TIF, were explained as well as their relationship to other financial calculations and charts. Mr. Struckhoff was also asked to explain the process of how the TIF funds for all three RPAs were determined. Mr. Grimm noted that the City is still working on the types of programs and funds expected to be available.
* Mr. Struckhoff noted that PGAV does not know all of the potential tenants but based calculations off of the proposed size, location, and other features frequented by certain retailers. He was also asked to explain the financial stabilization process of the tenants and whether an economic downturn or other circumstances were considered. Additionally, he explained that certain taxes generated would not be captured by the TIF.
* It was questioned how the anchor tenant would be established in the timeline proposed to generate 60 percent of the retail sales by 2025. Mr. Struckhoff stated that he will revisit the timeline with the developer.
* The name of the anchor tenant was not disclosed. Developer Jonathan Browne with Novus noted that the anchor tenant will make the announcement when they are ready although it may be after the conclusion of the TIF Commission process.
* A potentially existing TIF at 7327 Olive Boulevard was questioned as to how this would cross with RPA 3. Mr. Grimm stated that he will look into this further and notify the Commission members via email.

Public Comments:

1. Max Tsai, 8612 Olive Boulevard – questioned which businesses will qualify for relocation assistance and if current businesses should be doing anything differently at this time. Mr. Grimm stated that the assistance will vary for each tenant and that the City is currently working on additional incentives to the existing relocation policy. He also stated that it is still early in the process to operate any differently and recommended contacting the Councilmember with any concerns.
2. Linda Johnson, 8531 Richard Avenue – stated that she has lived in her home for 41 years and is concerned with various aspects of the proposed development impacting her home. She stated that construction related to sewage improvements in the area resulted in cracks and other damages to homes in the area and wishes to alleviate these problems in the future. Ms. Williams stated that this proposed project will still be required to go through the typical approval processes where site design and other aspects will be reviewed in more detail and involve a public hearing.
3. David Harris, 8039 Gannon Avenue – presented a list of questions involving various aspects of the proposed redevelopment project including, but not limited to, the anchor tenant, developer subsidy, the cost benefit analysis, and the school district impacts. Some questions were answered at the meeting and Mr. Harris left copies of his questions to be answered at a later time.

It was questioned if the changing buying habits of the retail environment toward increased online sales have been incorporated in the analysis. Mr. Struckhoff stated that his firm has studied this and has found that currently about ten percent of retail sales are online, and he also mentioned that grocery anchored tenants are more stable.

**6. Set date for next meeting**

It was mentioned that the public hearing has been set for May 23, 2018, and the Commission discussed the possibility of an additional meeting prior to the public hearing. It was decided that another meeting will be scheduled if necessary prior to the public hearing upon receipt of revised and additional information.

George Ladura requested to speak and stated that he appreciated Max Tsai’s comments since his father has been a restaurant owner in RPA 1 for many years. He stated that he hopes to keep the wonderful culture of the area alive and incentivize businesses that are currently there.

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.