

## **MINUTES**

### **Continued Joint Review Board Meeting**

#### **Proposed Prospect Pointe/Muir Park Tax Increment Financing District**

**January 19, 2021, 2pm**

**Prospect Heights City Hall, 8 N. Elmhurst, Prospect Heights, IL**

**Preface to Meeting** - At 2 PM, Board Chairman Wade noted that in the previous meeting, there had been a request to add more time to the process, as more information was needed. Since the January 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the City has contracted with a third party TIF consultant to review the submittals and to analyze the TIF.

Chairman Wade said that he would like to continue the Joint Review Board deadline. Since the deadline would be 30 days from January 7<sup>th</sup>; he was looking to move the deadline to the third week of February. It would give the consultant and the taxing districts more time. Attorney Hess said that the date that is being considered would be outside of the statutory 30-day window. The objective now is to inform the taxing districts of the process, and to let the Board know that the City is not being presumptive until the final meeting – so the City will not presume that because the date limit was past the 30 days. The City would wait until the final meeting to wait for a decision from the Board.

Chairman Wade said that this did not change the City clock – the Public Hearing will still be February 10

Attorney Dalianis said that his concern was that, if action is not taken, there is a legal presumption of approval. He suggested a negative vote, so that another 30-day period could start.

Attorney Hess said that the City would prefer that the City hold off on a negative vote until all the information is disseminated. If the JRB had a negative vote then there would have to be a written decision as to why it did not approve. This would place limitations on final decision. He said the City would prefer waiting to make the final decision at the final meeting, and the City would not presume that the 30-days was a presumption of approval. He said that it was an economy of time decision.

Representative Johnson asked if there could be agreement to do something outside of compliance of the statute? She asked if there should be a vote to restart the clock. She wanted to make certain that an agreed-upon, non-compliance did not have unexpected ramifications. She wanted legal documentation confirming that the non-compliance with the deadline was a viable option.

Attorney Dalianis said that the original 30-day period would allow the action to be February 5. He said that this is an issue that the legal departments needed to discuss further. He would prefer a written document before the deadline that could be agreed upon before the deadline.

Attorney Hess said that it was more agreeable to have a written agreement. Attorney Dalianis would want a written agreement before the 30-day deadline is up.

**Call to Order** – At 2:10 PM, Chairman Wade called to Order the Proposed Prospect Pointe/Muir Park Tax Increment Financing District Joint Review Board.

**Introduction of Representatives and Roll Call** –Chairman Wade asked for a roll call.

**REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT** – Prospect Heights City Administrator (JRB Chairman) Wade; Assistant Superintendent District 23 McPartlin; Associate Superintendent of Finance District 214 Johnson; Executive Vice President Harper College Galick; Executive Director Prospect Heights Park District Ferraro; Fire Chief Prospect Heights Fire District Smith; Prospect Heights Resident Representative Kearns.

**INVITED BUT NOT PRESENT**– CFO Cook County and Consolidated Elections Rizki; Comptroller Cook County Forest Preserve Howell; Financial Director Wheeling Township Stapleton; Executive Director Prospect Heights Public Library Todd; Treasurer Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Boyle; and Director Northwest Mosquito Abatement District Thennisch.

**OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT** – City of Prospect Heights Attorney Hess; Attorney for District 214 and District 23 Dalianis; Assistant City Administrator Falcone; Vice President Lexington Homes Wynsma; Lexington Homes Attorney Burney; City of Prospect Heights Attorney O’Driscoll; City of Prospect Heights Deputy Clerk Schultheis; Prospect Heights Park District Curtis; City of Prospect Heights Director of Building and Development Peterson President of Johnson Research Group Moroney.

**Approval of the Agenda for January 19, 2021 – Representative Kearns moved to approve the Agenda as presented; seconded by Representative Johnson.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** AYES - Kearns, Johnson, Wade, Ferraro, Smith, McPartlin; Galick  
NAYS - None  
ABSENT – None

Motion carried 7 – 0

**Approval of Minutes from January 7, 2021 Meeting** – Deputy Clerk Schultheis suggested the following amendments to the Minutes: Changing the word “Agenda” to “Minutes;” adding Representative Kearns to those present; Attorney Dalianis is representing Districts 23 and 214; and change the title of Amy McPartlin to Assistant Superintendent of District 23.

**Representative Johnson moved to approve, as amended, the Minutes from the January 7, 2021 Joint Review Board Meeting; seconded by Representative McPartlin.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** AYES - Johnson, Wade, Ferraro, Smith, McPartlin; Galick; Kearns  
NAYS - None  
ABSENT – None

Motion carried 7 – 0

**Follow-up to Questions from January 7, 2021 JRB Meeting Regarding Proposed TIF District –** Johnson Research Group President Moroney discussed the methodology for student generation numbers and the methodology for calculating the dollar amount.

She said that a multiplier approach was used to determine the number of students that were generated from the proposed 69 units. The source used is a multiplier study from Rutgers University done for the state of Illinois in 2006. There was a total number, and the number broken down by grades.

They were broken down by the 34 and 35 two and three-bedroom units.

Multiplied the units x multipliers = students generated by unit by district.

It's 11.6 students if you use the combined multiplier and 12.3 students if broken down by grade. The analysis used the higher amount.

They also looked at a prorated amount as the development would “ramp up” over the years. Capital cost estimates – according to the TIF Act, methodology requires identification of the per capita tuition charge minus the evidence based funding from state = annual per student capital cost. The most recent per capita interest charge (from the Illinois State Board of Education). Evidence based funding dollar amount per student:  $\$13415 - 1200 = \$12,185$  per student in Upper cap is according to the TIF Act – which 27% of IPT for the elementary and 13% for the high school for a total of 40%. This is the total dollar amount that comes out of the project IPT if the school maxed out in terms of net additional students.

Attorney Dalianis said that the presentation offered an overwhelming amount of information. he asked that the information details be sent to the school districts for review. – **No action was taken.**

**Review of Proposed Ordinances Adopting the Redevelopment Plan, Designating the Redevelopment Project Area and Adopting Tax Increment Financing –** Chairman Wade said that these Ordinances were crafted by Tressler. Attorney Hess said that the Board could wait to review these until the final meeting, or discuss as requested.

Attorney Hess asked if anyone on the Board had any objection to including the items discussed as it related to the continuation dictated into the Minutes. **It was noted that there was no verbal objection, and so that discussion regarding the continuation is included into the Minutes. Attorney Dalianis said it was acceptable for the discussion before the meeting opened to be part of the official Minutes.**

**Public Comment -** None

**Deliberations -** None

**Motion to Recommend to City Council the Approval/Disapproval of the Redevelopment Plan and Project or the Proposed Prospect Pointe/Muir Park Tax Increment Financing District –** Chairman Wade said that the Motion would not be taken at this meeting. **No action was taken.**

## Scheduling, Additional Meetings

- a. **If additional meetings are not necessary a motion to direct staff to prepare a report approving or disapproving the redevelopment plan or any amendment thereto based upon the eligibility criteria defined in Section 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3 and the overall objectives of the TIF Act; OR continue meeting to future date for the submission of the staff report recommending approval or disapproval of the proposed plan and district.**
- b. **In the event the City approves the subject TIF District, the Joint Review Board is to meet annually 180 days after the close of the municipal fiscal year or as soon as the redevelopment project audit for that fiscal year becomes available to review the effectiveness and status of the redevelopment project area up to that date. 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(e).**

Attorney Hess asked if there was any further discussion on a resumed meeting the first week in February. Chairman Wade said that the City would still be looking for a final decision moved to February 22. Attorney Hess said that he would work with Attorney Dalianis to construct an agreement on the timeframe.

**Representative Johnson moved to resume the Continuation of the Proposed Prospect Pointe/Muir Park Tax Increment Financing District Meeting on February 2, 2021 at 2 PM; seconded by Representative McPartlin.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** AYES - Johnson, Wade, Ferraro, Smith, McPartlin; Galick; Kearns  
NAYS - None  
ABSENT – None

Motion carried 7 – 0

Other Business - None

**Adjourn – At 2:34 PM, Representative Johnson moved to Adjourn; seconded by Representative McPartlin.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** AYES - Johnson, Wade, Ferraro, Smith, McPartlin; Galick; Kearns  
NAYS - None  
ABSENT – None

Motion carried 7 – 0

**Approved by TIF Joint Review Board on this the 2<sup>nd</sup> Day of February, 2021.**