

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Official Minutes
April 7, 2014
6:00 P.M.

Present: President Roanhouse and members Gil Amborn, Jerry Filut, Craig Kosut, Bil Luth, Tim Denman and Steve Denman.
Also present: Rebecca Ewald, Tina Chitwood, Joe Eberle and Steve Wurster, Ruekert-Mielke.

Roanhouse called the meeting together at 6:03 p.m.

Filut moved and Denman seconded to approve the March 3, 2014 meeting minutes. Luth noted that the third bullet point in the northeast section should include a statement that Luth felt the parcel north of Trailside should not be heavy industrial. It was also noted that Mr. Kosut's first name should be added to the list under those present. Motion carried.

Chitwood explained that she was unsuccessful in collecting cost estimates for conceptual plans for the two areas ID'd by the CDA during its 3/3/14 meeting. Three responses were received; each of the firms followed up with phone calls advising staff that they had concerns that the sites ID'd for this phase of the project would have challenges if designed as industrial parks due to the areas comprised by wetlands, issues with WisDOT access onto State Highways, etc. Staff invited Joe Eberle, Ruekert-Mielke to the meeting to present additional information about the recommended "next steps" from a firm that has designed multiple industrial parks throughout southern Wisconsin with the goal of assisting the CDA in determining their next steps.

Eberle noted that he considers the following when looking at the area the CDA desires to consider developing into an industrial park: wetland, access to/ from STH 164 and 36, yield from a particular area of land in net acres, shape of possible lots, and the wellhead protection district (as it prohibits specific industrial uses within a distance of the municipal wells). He is suggested looking more specifically at the parcels of land desired by the CDA by speaking with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) on expanding the sewer service area and DOT regarding the likelihood of state highway access. DOT bought the access rights on STH 36 when they expanded the road to four lanes. Racine County would also need to be consulted if County highways are involved for providing access to the possible development. The Village will need to consider the constraints from all agencies. While the land being reviewed would be brought into the Village, the environmental corridor restrictions applied to the land prior to becoming a part of the Village will need to be reviewed, as the new land use cannot be less restrictive than what would have been allowed if developed outside of the Village. Eberle emphasized that the Village needs to maximize their investment by identifying the restrictions associated with each piece of land and what it would cost to make the site development ready. Eberle also suggested the Village review these lands with some developers to identify what their restraints would be as well.

Amborn inquired as to whether Eberle's proposal included additional land other than those proposed in the information he has received from Chitwood. Eberle noted that he would need specific areas identified by the CDA. Amborn asked the CDA whether they would be willing to consider land on the west side of the Village. Eberle noted he believe the best sites in the Village will be along the STH 36. Eberle noted that Mike Mooney, developer would be willing to meet with the CDA. Tim Denman noted that the increasing industrial on the east side would hopefully also increase the likelihood of businesses desiring to occupy the Westerra business park.

Chitwood overviewed some of the approaches reviewed by some other communities in Racine County:

- Traditional route: Renaissance Business Park, Mt. Pleasant, Hwy. 20. Total build out of roads and infrastructure with lot layouts.
- Non-Traditional route: HSA development where Seda Mfng. operates, Mt. Pleasant (Hwy. 20). Community conducted a "soft touch" environmental and infrastructure study and determined that development makes sense from a market perspective and firms should be ok building on the site. Mt. Pleasant finished their land use plan and then sent developers the plan, a development RFP, and a present regarding the site with "huge potential".
- Traditional parks are a challenge to do today since the up-front financial commitment from the developer and the community isn't usually financially feasible. Non-traditional development of just building a road, and if development occurs then the community extends infrastructure under a development agreement, seems more the "norm".
- The County and RCEDC have created a committee to ID where the next appropriate land development sites will be in in the I-94 corridor. They are compiling representatives from the public sector, development firms, the manufacturing industry and financial institutions to determine the 3 or 4 pockets that would be best for development in the corridor.

The process will most likely accumulate in a package of engineering and market studies to developers through an RFP process.

- In Burlington the City wanted a spec building constructed in their industrial park. They sent an RFP to a dozen developers and got only three responses, with only one response that the community considered as viable. In the end the City determined that they could construct a building themselves for nearly the same cost as requested from incentives by the development firm; no contract was awarded.
- SEWRPC Absorption Rate Study may be finished by the end of April.

Roanhouse noted that the Village could also consider constructing a building and leasing it for buy back over a period of time. The Village Board/Plan Commission/CDA directed the Village engineer to review our current water and sewer infrastructure, evaluate and develop options for industrial land development outside of the Village borders. This information was provided and presented to the CDA at their meeting on 3/3. Total cost for this review was \$4,495. This review was not a budgeted item for 2014; however, the Village Board has discussed utilization of general fund balance at two meetings prior to provide development incentives and to review a possible industrial park location. Tim Denman moved and Amborn seconded to recommend the funds be allocated from the general fund. Motion carried.

Filut noted that he would like to see a developer come in for an educational session with the CDA. The Committee discussed inviting MLG, Bear Realty, Peter Schwabe and Majestic. Chitwood would consult with the firms and see how long they would need to discuss these areas proposed for industrial development with the group at their next regularly scheduled meeting in May.

Filut moved and Steve Denman seconded to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Ewald
Village Administrator