

**TIF Commission
May 15, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

The TIF Commission met at the Heman Park Community Center, 975 Pennsylvania Avenue, University City, Missouri on Tuesday, May 15, 2018. The meeting commenced at 6:35 pm.

1. Roll Call

Voting Members Present

Paulette Carr
Lawrence Welty
Margaret Hart-Mahon
Thomas Malecek
Gerry Greiman
Lisa Brenner
Chelsea Addison
Dorothy Davis
Glenn Powers
Thomas Curran
Susan Armstrong

Voting Members Absent

Andrew Durkett

Staff Present

Gregory Rose, City Manager
Rosalind Williams, Acting Director of Community Development
Adam Brown, Community Development Specialist

Others Present on City's behalf

Mark Grimm, Gilmore & Bell
Andy Struckhoff, PGAV Planners

2. Old Business

The Commission unanimously approved the minutes from April 4 and April 18.

Ms. Carr spoke about why University City is seeking to use the TIF that the economic engine of the commercial development will provide funding for reinvestment in Olive Blvd and the 3rd Ward neighborhoods.

The commission followed up on the answer to one of the questions by David Harris, a resident, at the last meeting. Ms. Brenner stated that there are currently 12 students of U City schools in RPA 1.

Mr. Grimm updated the commission that no TIF districts remain in University City which would overlap with the proposed TIF.

The commission noted that of the questions by Mr. Harris, question 6 was not answered, and inquired if there was a response from the City. Mr. Rose said the City would be identifying other costs associated with the development.

Ms. Armstrong asked what the city's plan for contracting for the development would be, and whether the contractors selected would reflect the demography of University City. Mr. Rose said

that the Mayor and City Council have goals to have contracts reflect the diverse demography of University City, and that the Council would be updated as to her request. Ms. Armstrong requested a firm recommendation in the minutes for inclusion in contracts during construction.

3. New Business

Andy Struckhoff from PGAV reviewed the changes that had been made to the Redevelopment Plan and Cost Benefit Analyses since the last meeting. The Commission discussed the redevelopment plan and how the City planned to create a redevelopment plan for RPA 2. Mr. Struckhoff clarified the anticipated amounts of revenue for RPAs 2 and 3 out of the total TIF revenues.

4. Public Comment

Patricia Washington, 7040 Plymouth, representing a group of residents advocating for a Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) spoke about the desire of a group of community members to create a legally binding agreement between the community and the developer. She listed some of the requests of the group, including first choice jobs for lower income and minority residents, the inclusion of women and minorities throughout the process, making technology available to more residents, scholarships for U City High School students, programs to assist seniors staying in their homes, community investment boards. She asked that the agreement be specific, enforceable, in plain language, and part of a larger plan.

Linda Johnson, 3rd Ward Resident, asked if there would be incentives to stay in University City for displaced residents. She was also concerned about roads and traffic during construction, and minority employment opportunities. Rosalind Williams, Interim Director of Community Development, said that the relocation plan would help dislocated residents and offer extra incentives for them to remain in University City.

Gary Nell, 850 Warder spoke in support of the mixed-use aspects of the proposed development. He expressed concern over the businesses being displaced, and hoped that the City could help them relocate within U City. He was concerned about large retail in light of recent trends, said the McNair building sale should be entertained by the school district, and also noted that a building boom is currently underway in St. Louis, and that U City should not miss out on this.

David Harris, 8039 Gannon suggested that documents being discussed be projected at the public hearing on May 23, and that new documents added to the City's website should include a summary of the changes made. He asked if the commission needed more details before making a recommendation, and if they would accept or discuss the blight analysis. He asked if council would discuss or accept the blight analysis. He also asked if the commission had the responsibility to address use of eminent domain. He also stated that although the City claims not to have been involved in private negotiations between the developer and property owners, the public statements made by City officials in favor of development in that location effectively place the City's power on the side of the developer.

Mr. Greiman responded that the TIF Commission is a recommendatory body which can only hear and consider the information presented to them, listen at the public hearing, and make a recommendation.

Mr. Rose said that eminent domain would not be used on owner-occupied housing, but that the City would consider it for businesses including rental properties. Ms. Armstrong stated that the proposal should reflect a relationship between the developer and the community.

Jan Adams, resident, spoke about the overuse of tax abatement in general, and a link between use of tax abatements and income disparity. She asked why the City had not surveyed residents about their desire for the development. She asked if the Commission would vote on May 23, and Mr. Greiman said he could not answer that. She asked the developer if he was willing to go forward if eminent domain could not be used and some property owners would not be relocated. Mr. Browne said that if certain owners would not sell it could disrupt the development. Ms. Adams asked if the contracts had contingencies, and the developer stated they were solid option contracts.

Ms. Addison asked if increase in the property taxes would lead to difficulty for people who wish to remain in their homes but are on a fixed income.

Mr. Rose stated that the relocation and incentive plan would be presented at the TIF Commission Public Hearing.

5. Adjournment

Ms. Carr made a motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm.