**Please note that due to the ongoing COVID-19 public health emergency, some or all members of this governing body may attend via telephone or internet.**

The City Council Chambers will be open to the public but limited to 10 attendees due to social distancing. (Use the lower level doors.) Overflow space may be provided but may not accommodate all those wishing to attend the meeting in public. Be advised that the building may not be open until 6:15 p.m. and those wishing to speak in person will be required to wear a mask, sign in, and may be asked to wait in overflow space, hallways, or outside the building until called.

For your personal safety and the safety of our community, interested persons are invited to watch from their homes in lieu of attending the meeting in person. The public may view and/or participate in the meeting by:

- Calling Toll Free 1-844-992-4726; Access code: 132 324 9340
- Visiting the web link: https://tinyurl.com/yax7j94v
- Viewing the City’s YouTube Channel: https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofriverfalls

Those wishing to speak during “public comment” or “public hearing” (either remotely or in person) may do so at the discretion of the presiding officer (the Mayor). Please be advised that the Mayor may set time limits or limit repeat comments.

**Persons wishing to make a public comment** should contact Sam Wessel at swessel@rfcity.org or 715-426-3424 prior to 4 p.m. on the day of the meeting in order to ensure they are added to the list and can be accommodated during the meeting.

AGENDA BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE
CALL TO ORDER – 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
1. Minutes of the March 9, 2020 Plan Commission meeting
2. Minutes of the July 23, 2020 Extraterritorial Zoning Committee meeting

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Non-Agenda Related Topics

PUBLIC HEARING
3. Consideration of a Resolution Designating Proposed Boundaries and Approving a Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 16
4. Consideration of a Resolution to Amend the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS
5. Consideration of a Resolution to Approve a Specific Implementation Plan for Milltown Residences (previously known as DeSanctis Townhomes)

REPORTS
6. Director’s Report

ADJOURNMENT

Council members may be in attendance for informational purposes only. No official Council action will be taken.
MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
MARCH 9, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers

Members Present: Dan Toland, Lisa Moody, Patricia LaRue, Hal Watson, Craig Hinzman
Members Absent: Bill Stuessel, Michael Woolsey (both excused)
Staff Present: Amy Peterson, Crystal Raleigh, Brandy Howe, Sam Wessel, Keri Schreiner, Sarah Karlsson
Others Present: Sean Lenz (Ehlers), Ben Fochs, Matt Hieb (Auth Consulting), Mark Sylla (E.W. Homes), Gary Moelter, Scott Morrissette (Councilman)

CALL TO ORDER
Meeting convened at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
LaRue made a motion to amend the minutes to add a sentence related to the community benefits of having sidewalk on both sides of the street.

M/La Rue, S/Watson – motion carried 5-0

Watson moved to approve the minutes.

M/Watson, S/Moody – motion carried 5-0

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Scott Morrissette, 2137 Rushmore Drive, spoke regarding agenda item #3, the consideration of a subdivision review waiver in the extraterritorial subdivision jurisdiction in the Town of Troy. He noted he wanted to speak about this item at this meeting because there is no public hearing per the process outlined in the municipal code. He reminded the Plan Commission that they represent the City of River Falls, not the Town of Troy. With that in mind, he questioned the advantage or benefit of approving this waiver. He noted there is a notion of goodwill between the City and the Town; he respectfully disagreed that any goodwill could be built with the Town of Troy. Furthermore, there is no financial compensation to the City to cover staff time. There are fees for other things, special use permits and so forth, however, a fee has never been contemplated for a waiver, so it is not on the fee schedule. He noted that the staff report indicates that based on the geographic location of the parcel, it would possibly not be included in a potential boundary agreement between the City and the Town if there ever was one. The fact is, this parcel is in the subdivision review boundary. The City was very deliberate when they established the boundary. He added that he was on the Plan Commission at the time the boundary was drawn, and he recalls studying the parcels considered to be within boundary by driving around to each. To allow this request would further demotivate the Town from having discussions with the City about a boundary agreement. To waive this authority
puts the City further from that goal, not closer to it. The report also mentioned the possibility of litigation if the City denies the request. He noted that litigation is always possible as the City has been party to two lawsuits by the Town of Troy. Acting under duress of legal action is a terrible way to govern; he urged the Plan Commission to take that under consideration. Ultimately, the residents of the Town of Troy need to approach their elected representatives and urge them to come to the table for boundary agreement discussions. If a new boundary were agreed to, these types of requests (subdivision review waiver) would no longer be an issue. He then thanked the Plan Commission for the consideration of his comments.

Ben Fochs, 2529 Powell Avenue, also spoke in regard to the subdivision waiver. He described a fatal traffic accident that occurred on Radio Road in November 2008 prior to its reconstruction into an interchange. He noted that there have been conflicts with pedestrians and cars near the Glover Road and Highway 35 interchange. He requested that the Town of Troy have a study of how that intersection might be impacted by a new development in the vicinity. If the WISDOT closes off that intersection, the traffic would route down to Powell Avenue or head north. He then thanked the Plan Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING

Public hearing regarding the proposed project plan, boundaries, and creation of Tax Incremental District No. 15

TID No. 15 is proposed to be created at 1300 S. Main Street, which is also funded partially by WHEDA, to construct a 50-unit multifamily redevelopment project. Sean Lenz from Ehlers gave a presentation on tax incremental financing as a tool for redevelopment, and then walked PC members through the timeline for the creation of TID No. 15. Watson asked for clarification on a point in the presentation where Lenz indicated that the property could become tax exempt in 2040—what is the trigger for this to happen? Lenz responded that there would have to be an ownership change. In the developer’s agreement, the Gerrard Corporation will sell the property to a nonprofit. From that point forward it would no longer have a taxable value, but the development agreement includes a PILOT agreement (Payment in Lieu of Taxes) that will extend in perpetuity.

No public comments were made for this item.

CURRENT ITEMS

Consideration of a “Resolution Designating Proposed Boundaries and Approving a Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 15, City of River Falls, Wisconsin”

M/Watson, S/Moody – motion carried 5-0.

Consideration of a request for a waiver of subdivision approval jurisdiction in the Town of Troy

Peterson presented the staff report. The Municipal Code offers an option for City Council to waive its review authority in the extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) if more than half of the proposed subdivision lies outside of the ETJ. Approximately 80% of the proposed subdivision lies outside of the ETJ, 20% lies within the ETJ. The process includes an application, Plan Commission review, and City Council decision. There is no public hearing or notification requirement built into the Municipal Code nor is there an application fee in the fee schedule.

Peterson provided some history on the ETJ boundary. In 2006, River Falls became a Third-Class city at which time the ETJ was extended to 3 miles beyond its corporate boundaries per statutory authorization. Later that year, the city formed an Extraterritorial Subdivision Control Advisory Committee (ESCAC) to
analyze the 3-mile boundary. The ESCAC studied section lines, environment, transportation, infrastructure, commerce, and existing plans and regulations. Based on the ESCAC’s recommendations, the City Council approved an ordinance in January 2007 to amend the Official Map to reduce the ETJ. The approved ETJ extends anywhere from 1 mile to over 2.5 miles from the municipal border and covers approximately 36 square miles (down from 72 square miles).

Peterson described the proposed subdivision, which is located at the northernmost edge of the City’s ETJ. The project would develop 119 acres, north of Glover Road and west of Hwy 35. The subdivision could create 63 new single-family lots ranging in size from 1-2 acres. Five outlots are included, one of which is 37 acres of wetlands and open space and one of which is 5-acres identified for future development. The “future development” outlot is located within the ETJ boundary. The project is designed as a cluster subdivision where smaller lots are clustered leaving a bulk of open space. Peterson noted that in a black and white world this subdivision would likely receive a simple denial based on the City’s ETJ. However, the drafters of our ordinance, even back then had the forethought to draft in a waiver option.

Peterson noted that it is arguable whether this area would likely be included within a boundary agreement with the Town of Troy. If the City Council approves the requested waiver, no litigation is likely to result based on that decision. Approval of a waiver may send a signal to developers that the City is amenable to larger lot rural subdivisions near its eventual border. Allowing this development to move forward outside of a binding agreement may reduce the motivation for the Town of Troy to work toward a cooperative boundary agreement in the future. As stated above, the City promotes denser more compact development with water/sewer, which is arguably more sustainable than larger lots on well and septic. Litigation is always an option with a denial. Staff has provided draft resolutions for either approval or denial.

The Mayor asked for questions or comments. Watson stated that his initial reaction is that he honestly doesn’t like it. The City should not be allowing this type of development on the edge of the ETJ boundary. The whole point of the boundary is to provide options for the City in the future. It would send a signal to developers and the City would likely see more requests like this all over the ETJ. He added that the City does have a goal to have a boundary agreement with the Town of Troy.

Hinzman added that the City should be careful with setting precedents. He questioned if the developer would need to come back to the City for another waiver to subdivide outlot 5, which is shown as future development on the concept layout of the subdivision. Peterson responded that it was her assumption that future development within this area would be covered by this waiver.

Moody commented that if the City hadn’t reduced its ETJ boundary from 3 miles down to the current boundary, then this subdivision would clearly be within the ETJ and a waiver would not be an option. Moody asked if there is any benefit to the City if the waiver is approved. Peterson responded that there are pros and cons either way; the biggest benefit is that it might keep the City out of litigation. Watson asked if the City would gain any tax benefit with this development. Peterson answered, no.

The Mayor indicated the he agrees with Watson and Councilman Morrissette but is not in favor of holding a landowner and developer hostage over a situation that can be resolved by a boundary agreement. He added that for this one request, he will vote in favor, but in the future, he looks to the Town of Troy to come to the table to discuss a boundary agreement.

Matt Hieb and Gary Moelter addressed the Plan Commission. Hieb noted that it is a compact development and that he took the City’s subdivision and stormwater ordinances into account when laying out the concept. Moelter provided some history on the property. The land is very sandy and is not
practical for farming except as pastureland, which he has used it for, but it has become impractical to continue to do so. He added that he feels like he is in the middle of a tug of war between Troy and the City. He added that it is his belief that the waiver option was included in the City’s subdivision ordinance for situations such as this one. He thanked the Plan Commission for their consideration.

The Mayor called for a motion to recommend approval a resolution to waive the City’s subdivision review authority in the extraterritorial subdivision area in the Town of Troy for the proposed Moelter subdivision.

No motion received.

The Mayor then called for a motion to recommend approval of a resolution to deny a waiver of the City’s subdivision review authority in the extraterritorial subdivision area in the Town of Troy for the proposed Moelter subdivision.

M/Watson, S/Moody – motion carried 4-1.

**Consideration of a resolution to vacate a portion of River Street right-of-way**

Howe presented the staff report. This item dates to October 2015 when the City Council purchased land at 110 W. Division Street. As part of that purchase agreement and approval process, Council also requested that staff initiate a “paper” clean-up of the block to prepare it for future redevelopment. One of the clean-up items was the rezoning of the block between Cedar and W. Division Street and Clark Street and the Kinnickinnic River. The rezoning was initiated last fall and finalized in January. The second clean-up item is to vacate ROW within that same block. The ROW was originally platted in 1856, but staff has not found evidence that it was ever paved as a street. Further, the City does not intend to establish a road in this location due to the presence of wetlands and indicator soils, neither of which are appropriate for developing impervious surfaces such as roads or buildings. The ROW vacation concludes the city’s obligations based on the 2015 purchase agreement.

The Mayor then called for a motion.

M/Moody, S/Watson– motion carried 5-0.

**REPORTS/DIALOGUE**

**Director’s Report**

Peterson noted that the next Plan Commission meeting is April 7th and staff is anticipating a workshop on shoreland zoning after the meeting. Staff started work on a comprehensive outdoor recreation plan and drafted an RFQ to hire a consultant to assist with the plan. Mann Valley preliminary design is underway. The Hoffman Park jug handle connection will be under construction this fall. Finally, the Community Development Department has promoted Keri Schreiner to Economic Development Manager.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Watson made a motion to adjourn at 7:31 p.m.

M/Watson, S/Moody; motion carried 5-0
Respectfully submitted,

Brandy Howe, AICP, Sr. Planner
ETZ Members Present: Lisa Moody (Chair), Patricia LaRue, Craig Hinzman, Dan Pearson, Jason Kjos, Lowell Enerson
Members Absent: None
City PC Members Present: Craig Hofland, Rebecca Prendergast
Staff Present: Brandy Howe and Sam Wessel (City of River Falls), Wendy Sanders (Town of Troy staff consultant)
Others Present: Jon Smits (City IT Technician), Mr. Hetchler (Applicant), Joel Schlitz (Applicant’s attorney)

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL
Meeting convened at 6:30 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

PUBLIC HEARING

Consideration of an ordinance to amend the Extraterritorial Zoning Map of the City of River Falls at 5 County Highway U (formerly 5 Mann Lane) from Exclusive Agricultural to Highway Commercial
Howe presented the staff report. Howe reported that Mr. Hetchler applied to rezone two parcels in the Town of Troy. Both front County Highway U (formerly Mann Lane); combined, both parcels measure 0.8-acre. The existing zoning is Exclusive Agricultural. Permitted uses in this district include farming, agriculturally-related dwellings, and farm-related structures and buildings. Note that single family homes that are not occupied by someone that earns a substantial portion of their livelihood from farming are not a permitted by right use or even by special use. The agricultural district, just to the south of CTH M is slightly less restrictive in that single family homes are permitted (no farming requirement) as well as limited other non-agricultural uses such as schools, churches, parks, and civic uses. As mentioned, the current zoning for both parcels is Exclusive Agriculture. A single-family home was an existing non-conforming use in this district before it was destroyed by a fire in November 2018. The remains of the house were later demolished in 2019. Had Mr. Hetchler elected to rebuild the house at the same location and dimensions, staff would have permitted it; however, because the structure was demolished and the nonconforming use is no longer present, it cannot be reestablished. This is because nonconforming uses expire after one year of destruction or discontinued use. Staff did consult with the City attorney on this matter and he agreed with our assessment. Therefore, under the current zoning, Mr. Hetchler is not permitted to build another single-family home unless it meets district specifications (i.e. the site must also be actively farmed). In light of staff’s findings, Mr. Hetchler has requested to rezone his property Highway Commercial, which happens to be the only commercial zoning district in the ETZ. It is staff’s understanding based on conversations with Mr. Hetchler that he does not have a specific use
in mind for the site; he is simply seeking a zoning designation that will allow him to use the property since the Exclusive Agricultural district is considerably more restrictive. It is his understanding that the Highway Commercial district provides the most flexibility in terms of setbacks, land uses, and salability of the property. The list of permitted uses in the Highway Commercial is broad given it’s the only commercial district in the ETZ. Note, though, that most of the uses in the district would require a substantially larger piece of property in order to make them work. As mentioned, Mr. Hetchler has not yet identified a specific use, but he is seeking to build an approximately 50’ x 90’ building. If the rezoning is approved, staff will work with Mr. Hetchler to site the building in conformance with the Highway Commercial zoning. The ETZ ordinance lists several items for the City Council to consider when making decisions on whether to rezone land out of exclusive agricultural. From staff’s perspective, there will be very few if any negative impacts to the Exclusive Ag zone given the fact that the land isn’t currently farmed and several of the neighboring properties are also not actively farmed. Staff reviewed the proposed rezoning against the Official Map, Comprehensive Plan, and the preferred conceptual layout for the Mann Valley Corporate Park. The land with within the sewer service area boundary and planned for either future commercial or business park per the Mann Valley concept plan. It is staff’s interpretation that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the City’s future plans for this area. Staff recommends the ETZ Committee move to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning of the subject site from Exclusive Agricultural to Highway Commercial. Howe noted that per 62.23(7a)(c), Wis. Stats., the governing body (City Council) may approve the proposed rezoning unless it receives a favorable vote by a majority of the ETZ Committee (4 members).

Chair Moody asked if the applicant would like to make a statement. Mr. Schlitz spoke on Mr. Hetchler’s behalf. He indicated that they agree with the staff report and that it reflects that Mr. Hetchler’s request fits within the City’s plan for the area. Mr. Schlitz asked the ETZ Committee to approve the request which would give Mr. Hetchler an opportunity to gain economic value from the property.

Pearson asked Mr. Hetchler what his intended use is if the property is to be rezoned commercial. Mr. Hetchler responded that he’d like to have an electrical business on the site. He noted that he would tear down the existing garage to then build a 50’x90’ structure on the site.

Hofland asked if Mr. Hetchler anticipates additional traffic. Hetchler indicated that he does not plan to have a storefront on the site and there would not be any negative traffic impacts.

Enerson asked what Mr. Hetchler plans to do with the other existing building on the site. Hetchler responded that he would keep it to store personal items. The smaller of the two buildings would be removed.

Chair Moody asked for public comments.

Doug Black, 674 County Rd M, addressed the Committee to present a petition on behalf of himself and the neighbors to request that the Committee deny the rezoning. He asked that the Committee consider the families that live in the area. He suggested that the City should reconsider its position and allow Mr. Hetchler to rebuild his home on the site.

Ryan Brill, 670 County Rd M, addressed the Committee to emphasize Mr. Black’s request for denial. He noted he feels this way for two reasons: 1) Mr. Hetchler’s past practices related to burning commercial waste and renting without leases, and 2) concern for a loss in property value due to commercial business in close proximity. These worries are amplified by the lack of a firm known future use for the property.

Chair Moody asked for any additional public comments, hearing none, she closed the public hearing. Chair Moody asked for a motion to begin discussion.
Pearson asked to modify the meeting format to allow discussion prior to a motion being placed on the table. It was agreed to move forward in the less formal manner.

Pearson noted that moving from Exclusive Ag to Highway Commercial is moving from one extreme to another. He asked staff if there is another option. Howe responded that the Highway Commercial district is the only commercial zoning in the ETZ and the only other district that would allow the use that Mr. Hetchler has proposed is the industrial district. Pearson asked a follow-up on whether restrictions could be placed on the property with the Highway Commercial zoning to prevent something like a gas station being built. Howe responded that district standards and limitations on the size of the lot would limit, or more likely, preclude, the applicant’s ability to build a gas station or similar commercial use. Pearson added to his concerns that this request feels like a spot zoning. Mr. Schlitz offered that Mr. Hetchler would not be opposed to having restrictions placed on his property if rezoned to prohibit certain uses, like gas stations. Sanders commented that contract zoning is not permitted, meaning conditions or restrictions cannot be placed on the type of use permitted in that zone. Hinzman noted that the southerly parcel isn’t conducive to construction of a building given the setbacks; he asked if the applicant would build on the northerly parcel. Mr. Schlitz responded that Hetchler has not sited the building yet; he was waiting to see if the rezoning would be approved.

LaRue stated that she feels sorry for Mr. Hetchler, but she is not sold on the idea that this should 0.8-acre parcel be rezoned.

Chair Moody asked for a motion.

*MOTION:* LaRue made a motion that the ETZ Committee deny the rezoning of 5 County Highway U (formerly Mann Lane) and land adjacent to the north. Pearson seconded.

Chair Moody asked for further discussion. Hearing none, a roll call vote was called.

M/LaRue, S/Pearson – motion carried 6-0.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Pearson made a motion to adjourn at 7:15 p.m.

M/Pearson, S/LaRue – motion carried 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Brandy Howe, AICP, Sr. Planner
PLAN COMMISSION
AUGUST 4, 2020
STAFF REPORT

ITEM: Resolution Designating Proposed Boundaries and Approving a Project Plan for Tax Increment District No. 16

APPLICANT: N/A

OWNER: Multiple

STAFF: Keri Schreiner, Economic Development Manager

BACKGROUND
A proposed new tax increment district (TID) which encompasses approximately 100 acres including the 7-acre City owned parcel adjacent to W. Division Street is scheduled for a public hearing at the Plan Commission on August 4. Staff will be at the meeting to present the proposed plan to the Plan Commission and answer questions. After the public hearing, the Plan Commission will consider the resolution designating the district boundaries and approving the project plan. If approved, the plan will be forwarded to the City Council for review, then to the Joint Review Board for final approval. The proposed mixed-use district would have a 20-year life and would be scheduled to terminate in 2041.

The City purchased the 7-acre parcel from the Ryan DeSanctis Trust in April 2018 for $200,000. In June 2018, a local developer proposed purchasing the parcel for a townhome development, but the property did not redevelop. In 2019, the City solicited proposals for multifamily housing on the 7-acre parcel. The proposed TID also encompasses a portion of the Mann Valley Corporate Park, which was annexed into the City in 2016, and property owned by the River Falls School District and Dwayne W. Johnson which was annexed into the City in 2018. Also in 2018, the City completed a Preferred Concept Plan for the Mann Valley Corporate Park.

ANALYSIS
In January 2020, the City received seven proposals for multifamily housing on the 7-acre City owned parcel. The City selected the proposal from Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions, LLC. In July 2020, the City and Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions agreed on a Term Sheet and signed a Letter of Intent for the project. Three Sixty Real Estate
Solutions have proposed four multifamily buildings, each one consisting of 21 residential units, for a total of 84 units. The residences will be a mix of one, two, and three-bedroom market-rate apartments. The development will include garage parking, community space for their residents including grills, bike racks, and a new walking path. Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions will operate the facility after development.

Along with the multifamily housing development, the design and installation of public improvements for DeSanctis Park will also occur. Public improvements for the park include the realignment of Dry Run Road, the extension of utilities to Glover Schoolhouse, construction of a public parking lot, sidewalk infill, and the construction of a secondary emergency services access to serve the adjacent neighborhood and the proposed development.

Projects anticipated for the area of the proposed district include the cost of development incentives, DeSanctis Park improvements, infrastructure improvements, property acquisition, and design, planning and engineering for the Mann Valley Corporate Park.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS
Tax increment districts are created to provide incentives for new development and must meet the “but for” test. The district, once created, will use the tax revenue from new development to repay upfront costs to provide infrastructure and other expenses to serve the development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends adoption of the enclosed resolution recommended Council approval to designate proposed boundaries and approve the project plan for TID #16.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Draft Project Plan
2. Resolution
July 20, 2020 (DRAFT)

Project Plan

Tax Incremental District No. 16

City of River Falls, Wisconsin

Organizational Joint Review Board Meeting Held: Scheduled for August 4, 2020
Public Hearing Held: Scheduled for August 4, 2020
Approval by Plan Commission: Scheduled for August 4, 2020
Adoption by Common Council: Scheduled for August 25, 2020
Approval by the Joint Review Board: Scheduled for: TBD
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SECTION 1:
Executive Summary

Description of District
Tax Incremental District (“TID”) No. 16 (“District”) is a proposed Mixed-Use District comprising approximately 100 acres bounded by County Road M to the north, Dry Run Road to the east, and County Road U to the west. The District will be created to pay a portion of the costs of needed to assist the Milltown Residences Project (“Project”) to be developed by Three Sixty (“Developer”). The Milltown Residences Project includes market rate apartments which are needed to expand housing options in the City of River Falls.

Authority
The City is creating the District under the provisions of Wis. Stat. § 66.1105.

Estimated Total Project Cost Expenditures
The City anticipates making total expenditures of approximately $4,320,000 (“Project Costs”) to undertake the projects listed in this Project Plan (“Plan”). Project Costs include estimated Utility and infrastructure improvements, developer incentives, property acquisition, improvements to DeSanctis Park, streets reconstruction, and planning and engineering professional services.

Incremental Valuation
The City projects that new land and improvements value of approximately $13,800,000 will result from the Milltown Residences and other development. Creation of this additional value will be made possible by the Project Costs made within the District. A table detailing assumptions as to the development timing and associated values is included in the Economic Feasibility Study located within this Plan.

Expected Termination of District
Based on the Economic Feasibility Study located within Section 9 of this Plan, the City anticipates that the District will generate sufficient tax increment to pay all Project Costs within its allowable 20 years.

Summary of Findings
As required by Wis. Stat. § 66.1105, and as documented in this Plan and the exhibits contained and referenced herein, the following findings are made:

1. That “but for” the creation of this District, the development projected to occur as detailed in this Plan: 1) would not occur; or 2) would not occur in the manner, at the values, or within the timeframe desired by the City. In reaching this determination, the City has considered:
The substantial investment needed to provide the public infrastructure necessary to allow for development within the District. Absent the use of tax incremental financing, the City is unable to fully fund this program of infrastructure improvements. The City solicited proposals for Multi-Family Housing on the 7-acre City owned parcel adjacent to West Division Street in 2019. The area is located on the southeast portion of the proposed tax increment district and represents the initial development area of the district. The site is currently zoned residential. The City desires a planned unit development and hopes to activate improvements to DeSanctis Park as a part of the overall development of the site. To achieve the City's development goals in this area, tax increment financing will be necessary to incentivize the higher density development and achieve the improvements consistent with the City's high standards.

The northern portion of the proposed district (Mann Valley) is anticipated to be developed primarily for business park uses, including office and light industrial/manufacturing uses. The City completed a Mann Valley Development Concept Plan in 2018. Significant roads and other city services will need to be constructed to fully develop the Mann Valley. This area of the proposed district is anticipated to develop at a slower pace than the southern area but faces many of the same challenges that necessitate financial assistance from tax increment financing.

2. The economic benefits of the District, as measured by increased employment, business and personal income, and property value, are sufficient to compensate for the cost of the improvements. In making this determination, the City has considered the following information:

Following completion of the Milltown Residences Project, the estimated taxable value is $10,800,000. This new value is projected to generate over $230,000 in annual tax revenue.

The Developer intends to build a market rate apartment complex, which the City believes will be an integral part of the housing needs of the City residents and the surrounding area. In 2018, the City conducted an analysis of housing needs for River Falls, which determined that there is a minimum demand for 292 for-sale multifamily units, 542 for-sale single-family units, and 274 market rate rental units by 2030. As of July 2020, there is a minimum demand for 258 for-sale multi-family units, 394 for-sale single-family units, and 164 market rate rental units by 2030. Additional senior, shallow, and deep subsidy housing is also needed by 2030.
The Developer is likely to purchase goods and services from local suppliers in construction of the Project, and induced effects of employee households spending locally for goods and services from retailers, restaurants and service companies.

3. The benefits of the proposal outweigh the anticipated tax increments to be paid by the owners of property in the overlying taxing jurisdictions. As required by Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(4)(i)4., a calculation of the share of projected tax increments estimated to be paid by the owners of property in the overlying taxing jurisdictions has been prepared and can be found in this Plan. However, because the Project would not occur without the use of tax incremental financing, these tax increments would not be paid but for creation of the District. Accordingly, the City finds that the benefits expected to be realized as set forth in this Plan outweigh the value of the tax increments to be invested in the Project.

4. Not less than 50% by area of the real property within the District is suitable for mixed-use development as defined by Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(2)(cm). Lands proposed for newly-platted residential development comprise no more than 35% of the real property area within the District. Costs related to newly-platted residential development may be incurred based on the proposed development having a density of at least three (3) units per acre as defined in Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(2)(f)3.a. OR being located in a conservation subdivision as defined in Wisconsin Statutes Section 66.1027(1)(a).

5. Based on the foregoing finding, the District is designated as a mixed-use district.

6. The Project Costs relate directly to promoting mixed-use development in the District, consistent with the purpose for which the District is created.

7. Improvements to be made in the District are likely to significantly enhance the value of substantially all of the other real property in the District.

8. The equalized value of taxable property in the District, plus the incremental value of all existing tax incremental districts within the City does not exceed 12% of the total equalized value of taxable property within the City.

9. The City estimates that less than 35% of the territory within the District will be devoted to retail business at the end of the District’s maximum expenditure period, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(5)(b).

10. The Plan for the District is feasible and is in conformity with the Master Plan of the City.
SECTION 2: Preliminary Map of Proposed District Boundary

TID #16 Proposed Boundary

- City of River Falls
  PIN: 276-1153-05-000
  45.6 acres

- School District of River Falls
  PIN: 276-1156-04-000
  3.1 acres

- Dwayne W Johnson
  PIN: 276-1156-05-000
  1.4 acres

- School District of River Falls
  PIN: 276-1156-03-000
  37.5 acres

- City of River Falls
  PIN: 276-1056-20-000
  7.1 acres

Total: 100 acres 7/15/2020

City Parcel Boundaries
Draft TID Boundary
Corporate Limits

0 200 500 1,000 Feet

Legend:
- City Parcel Boundaries
- Draft TID Boundary
- Corporate Limits
SECTION 3:
Map Showing Existing Uses and Conditions

TID #16: Existing Uses and Conditions

Vacant/Agricultural 45.6 acres
Vacant/Agricultural 3.1 acres
Vacant/Agricultural 1.4 acres
Vacant/Agricultural 7.1 acres

City of River Falls
# SECTION 4: Preliminary Parcel List and Analysis

## City of River Falls, Wisconsin

**Tax Increment District # 16**

### Base Property Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Equalized Value Ratio</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>District Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>276-1153-05-000</td>
<td>City of River Falls</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276-1156-04-000</td>
<td>School District of River Falls</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276-1156-03-000</td>
<td>School District of River Falls</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276-1156-05-000</td>
<td>Dry Run Road</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2,800 0 0 2,800</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2,800 0 0 2,800</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276-1056-20-000</td>
<td>W Division St</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Acreage**: 94.70

**Equalized Value**: 2,800

**Estimated Base Value**: 2,800

---

**Note**: The Equalized Value Ratio column indicates the percentage of the property's value that is contributed by the land, improvements, and personal property. The District Classification column lists the types of properties within the district, including industrial, commercial/business, existing residential, newly platted residential, institutional/other, and suitable for mixed use.
**SECTION 5: Equalized Value Test**

The following calculations demonstrate that the City expects to be in compliance with Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(4)(gm)4.c., which requires that the equalized value of the taxable property in the proposed District, plus the value increment of all existing tax incremental districts, does not exceed 12% of the total equalized value of taxable property within the City.

The equalized value of the increment of existing tax incremental districts within the City, plus the base value of the proposed District, totals $67,848,200. This value is less than the maximum of $130,122,948 in equalized value that is permitted for the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of River Falls, Wisconsin</th>
<th>Tax Increment District # 16</th>
<th>Valuation Test Compliance Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Creation Date</td>
<td>1/1/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation Data</td>
<td>Dollar Charge</td>
<td>Percent Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Available 2019</td>
<td>1,084,357,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EV (TID In)</td>
<td>1,084,357,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Test</td>
<td>130,122,948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment of Existing TIDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Increment</td>
<td>67,845,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Base of New or Amended District</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Value of Any Underlying TID Parcels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value Subject to 12% Test</td>
<td>67,848,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>PASS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 6:  
Statement Listing the Kind, Number and Location of All Proposed Public Works or Improvements Within the District

Project Costs are any expenditure made, estimated to be made, or monetary obligations incurred or estimated to be incurred as outlined in this Plan. Project Costs will be diminished by any income, special assessments or other revenues, including user fees or charges, other than tax increments, received or reasonably expected to be received in connection with the implementation of the Plan. If Project Costs incurred benefit territory outside the District, a proportionate share of the cost is not a Project Cost. Costs identified in this Plan are preliminary estimates made prior to design considerations and are subject to change after planning, design and construction is completed.

With all Project Costs, the costs of engineering, design, survey, inspection, materials, construction, restoring property to its original condition, apparatus necessary for public works, legal and other consultant fees, testing, environmental studies, permits, updating City ordinances and plans, judgments or claims for damages and other expenses are included as Project Costs.

The following is a list of public works and other tax incremental financing eligible Project Costs that the City expects to make, or may need to make, in conjunction with the implementation of the District’s Plan. The map found in Section 7 of this Plan along with the Detailed List of Project Costs found in Section 8 provide additional information as to the kind, number and location of potential Project Costs.

**Property, Right-of-Way and Easement Acquisition**

**Property Acquisition for Development**

To promote and facilitate development the City may acquire property within the District. The cost of property acquired, and any costs associated with the transaction, are eligible Project Costs. Following acquisition, other Project Costs within the categories detailed in this Section may be incurred to make the property suitable for development. Any revenue received by the City from the sale of property acquired pursuant to the execution of this Plan will be used to reduce the total project costs of the District. If total Project Costs incurred by the City to acquire property and make it suitable for development exceed the revenues or other consideration received from the sale or lease of that property, the net amount shall be considered “real property assembly costs” as
defined in Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(2)(f)1.c., and subject to recovery as an eligible Project Cost.

**Property Acquisition for Conservancy**

To promote the objectives of this Plan, the City may acquire property within the District that it will designate for conservancy. These conservancy objectives include: preserving historic resources or sensitive natural features; protection of scenic and historic views; maintaining habitat for wildlife; maintaining adequate open space; reduction of erosion and sedimentation by preserving existing vegetation; and providing adequate areas for management of stormwater. The cost of property acquired for conservancy, and any costs associated with the transaction, are eligible Project Costs.

**Acquisition of Rights-of-Way**

The City may need to acquire property to allow for installation of streets, driveways, sidewalks, utilities, stormwater management practices and other public infrastructure. Costs incurred by the City to identify, negotiate and acquire rights-of-way are eligible Project Costs.

**Acquisition of Easements**

The City may need to acquire temporary or permanent easements to allow for installation and maintenance of streets, driveways, sidewalks, utilities, stormwater management practices and other public infrastructure. Costs incurred by the City to identify, negotiate and acquire easement rights are eligible Project Costs.

**Relocation Costs**

If relocation expenses are incurred in conjunction with the acquisition of property, those expenses are eligible Project Costs. These costs may include, but are not limited to: preparation of a relocation plan; allocations of staff time; legal fees; publication of notices; obtaining appraisals; and payment of relocation benefits as required by Wis. Stat. Chapter 32 and Wis. Admin. Code ADM 92.

**Site Preparation Activities**

**Environmental Audits and Remediation**

If it becomes necessary to evaluate any land or improvement within the District, any cost incurred by the City related to environmental audits, testing, and remediation are eligible Project Costs.
Demolition

To make sites suitable for development, the City may incur costs related to demolition and removal of structures or other land improvements, to include abandonment of wells or other existing utility services.

Site Grading

Land within the District may require grading to make it suitable for development, to provide access, and to control stormwater runoff. The City may need to remove and dispose of excess material, or bring in fill material to provide for proper site elevations. Expenses incurred by the City for site grading are eligible Project Costs.

Utilities

Sanitary Sewer System Improvements

To allow development to occur, the City may need to construct, alter, rebuild or expand sanitary sewer infrastructure within the District. Eligible Project Costs include, but are not limited to, construction, alteration, rebuilding or expansion of: collection mains; manholes and cleanouts; service laterals; force mains; interceptor sewers; pumping stations; lift stations; wastewater treatment facilities; and all related appurtenances. To the extent sanitary sewer projects undertaken within the District provide direct benefit to land outside of the District, the City will make an allocation of costs based on such benefit. Those costs corresponding to the benefit allocated to land within the District, and necessitated by the implementation of the Project Plan, are eligible Project Costs. Implementation of the Project Plan may also require that the City construct, alter, rebuild or expand sanitary sewer infrastructure located outside of the District. That portion of the costs of sanitary sewer system projects undertaken outside the District which are necessitated by the implementation of the Project Plan are eligible Project Costs. The improvements to the wastewater treatment facilities, although not within the ½ mile radius, is an eligible project cost under Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(2)(f)1 k.

Water System Improvements

To allow development to occur, the City may need to construct, alter, rebuild or expand water system infrastructure within the District. Eligible Project Costs include, but are not limited to, construction, alteration, rebuilding or expansion of: distribution mains; manholes and valves; hydrants; service laterals; pumping stations; wells; water treatment facilities; storage tanks and reservoirs; and all related appurtenances. To the extent water system projects undertaken within the District provide direct benefit to land outside of the District, the City will
make an allocation of costs based on such benefit. Those costs corresponding to the benefit allocated to land within the District, and necessitated by the implementation of the Project Plan, are eligible Project Costs. Implementation of the Project Plan may also require that the City construct, alter, rebuild or expand water system infrastructure located outside of the District. That portion of the costs of water system projects undertaken outside the District which are necessitated by the implementation of the Project Plan are eligible Project Costs.

**Stormwater Management System Improvements**

Development within the District will cause stormwater runoff. To manage this stormwater runoff, the City may need to construct, alter, rebuild or expand stormwater management infrastructure within the District. Eligible Project Costs include, but are not limited to, construction, alteration, rebuilding or expansion of: stormwater collection mains; inlets, manholes and valves; service laterals; ditches; culvert pipes; box culverts; bridges; stabilization of stream and river banks; and infiltration, filtration and detention Best Management Practices (BMP’s). To the extent stormwater management system projects undertaken within the District provide direct benefit to land outside of the District, the City will make an allocation of costs based on such benefit. Those costs corresponding to the benefit allocated to land within the District, and necessitated by the implementation of the Project Plan, are eligible Project Costs. Implementation of the Project Plan may also require that the City construct, alter, rebuild or expand stormwater management infrastructure located outside of the District. That portion of the costs of stormwater management system projects undertaken outside the District which are necessitated by the implementation of the Project Plan are eligible Project Costs.

**Electric Service**

To create sites suitable for development, the City may incur costs to provide, relocate or upgrade electric services. Relocation may require abandonment and removal of existing poles or towers, installation of new poles or towers, or burying of overhead electric lines. Costs incurred by the City to undertake this work are eligible Project Costs.

**Gas Service**

To create sites suitable for development, the City may incur costs to provide, relocate or upgrade gas mains and services. Costs incurred by the City to undertake this work are eligible Project Costs.
**Communications Infrastructure**

To create sites suitable for development, the City may incur costs to provide, relocate or upgrade infrastructure required for voice and data communications, including, but not limited to: telephone lines, cable lines and fiber optic cable. Costs incurred by the City to undertake this work are eligible Project Costs.

**Streets and Streetscape**

**Street Improvements**

To allow development to occur, the City may need to construct or reconstruct streets, highways, alleys, access drives and parking areas. Eligible Project Costs include, but are not limited to: excavation; removal or placement of fill; construction of road base; asphalt or concrete paving or repaving; installation of curb and gutter; installation of sidewalks and bicycle lanes; installation of culverts, box culverts and bridges; rail crossings and signals; utility relocation, to include burying overhead utility lines; street lighting; installation of traffic control signage and traffic signals; pavement marking; right-of-way restoration; installation of retaining walls; and installation of fences, berms, and landscaping.

**Streetscaping and Landscaping**

To attract development consistent with the objectives of this Plan, the City may install amenities to enhance development sites, rights-of-way and other public spaces. These amenities include, but are not limited to: landscaping; lighting of streets, sidewalks, parking areas and public areas; installation of planters, benches, clocks, tree rings, trash receptacles and similar items; and installation of brick or other decorative walks, terraces and street crossings. These and any other similar amenities installed by the City are eligible Project Costs.

**Community Development**

**Cash Grants (Development Incentives)**

The City may enter into agreements with property owners, lessees, or developers of land located within the District for sharing costs to encourage the desired kind of improvements and assure tax base is generated sufficient to recover Project Costs. No cash grants will be provided until the City executes a developer agreement with the recipient of the cash grant. Any payments of cash grants made by the City are eligible Project Costs.

**Contribution to Community Development Authority (CDA)** As provided for in Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(2)(f)1.h and Wis. Stat. § 66.1333(13), the City may provide funds to its CDA to be used for administration, planning operations, and capital costs, including but not limited to real property acquisition, related to the
purposes for which it was established in furtherance of any redevelopment or urban renewal project. Funds provided to the CDA for this purpose are eligible Project Costs.

**Revolving Loan/Grant Program (Development Incentives)**

To encourage private development consistent with the objectives of this Plan, the City, through its CDA, may provide loans or grants to eligible property owners in the District. Eligible improvements will be those that are likely to improve the value of the property, enhance the visual appearance of the property and surrounding area, correct safety deficiencies, or as otherwise specified by the CDA in the program manual. Any funds returned to the CDA from the repayment of loans made are not considered revenues to the District, and will not be used to offset District Project Costs. Instead, these funds may be placed into a revolving fund and will continue to be used for the program purposes stated above. Any funds provided to the CDA for purposes of implementing this program are considered eligible Project Costs.

**Miscellaneous**

**Projects Outside the Tax Increment District**

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(2)(f)1.n, the City may undertake projects within territory located within one-half mile of the boundary of the District provided that: 1) the project area is located within the City’s corporate boundaries; and 2) the projects are approved by the Joint Review Board. The cost of projects completed outside the District pursuant to this section are eligible project costs, and may include any project cost that would otherwise be eligible if undertaken within the District. The City intends to make the following project cost expenditures outside the District: Possible Property Acquisition, DeSanctis Park Improvements, possibly a portion of the infrastructure improvements along Division Street, and some of the Planning & Engineering Services related to Mann Valley Design.

**Professional Service and Organizational Costs**

The costs of professional services rendered, and other costs incurred, in relation to the creation, administration and termination of the District, and the undertaking of the projects contained within this Plan, are eligible Project Costs. Professional services include but are not limited to: architectural; environmental; planning; engineering; legal; audit; financial; and the costs of informing the public with respect to the creation of the District and the implementation of the Plan.
**Administrative Costs**

The City may charge to the District as eligible Project Costs reasonable allocations of administrative costs, including, but not limited to, employee salaries. Costs allocated will bear a direct connection to the time spent by City employees relating to the implementation of the Plan.

**Financing Costs**

Interest expense, debt issuance expenses, redemption premiums, and any other fees and costs incurred in conjunction with obtaining financing for projects undertaken under this Plan are eligible Project Costs.
SECTION 7:
Map Showing Proposed Improvements and Uses

Milltown Residences Project Elevations
TID #16 Proposed Projects

Total: 100 acres | 7/15/2020

- TID 16 Half Mile Buffer
- City Parcel Boundaries
- Draft TID Boundary
- Corporate Limits
- City parcels within 1/2 mile of TID #16

Project | Location
--- | ---
Property acquisition for development | Throughout TID #16
Design, planning, and engineering | Mann Valley Corporate Park
Park improvements | DeSanctis Park
Road reconstruction with sidewalks | West Division Street

*TID #16 expenditures shall only occur within the City's municipal boundary, depicted in this map as of TID #16's creation date.*
TID #16 Proposed Uses

- Proposed TID #16 Boundary
- Municipal boundary
- Existing City Parcel Boundaries
- Proposed Business Park: 45.6 acres (46.2%)
- Proposed Institutional: 40.6 acres (41.1%)
- Proposed Mixed Use (0 acres, 0%)
- Proposed Mixed Use and Institutional: 2.4 acres (2.4%)
- Proposed Residential: 6.3 acres (6.4%)
- Proposed Dry Run Rd right-of-Way

Remaining acreage: existing and proposed right-of-way

Total: 100 acres

7/15/2020
SECTION 8:  
Detailed List of Estimated Project Costs

The following list identifies the Project Costs that the City currently expects to incur in implementing the District’s Plan. All projects identified and related costs reflect the best estimates available as of the date of preparation of this Plan. All costs are preliminary estimates and may increase or decrease. Certain Project Costs listed may become unnecessary, and other Project Costs not currently identified may need to be made. (Section 6 details the general categories of eligible Project Costs). Changes in Project Cost totals or the types of Project Costs to be incurred will not require that this Plan be amended. This Plan is not meant to be a budget nor an appropriation of funds for specific Project Costs, but a framework within which to manage Project Costs.

City of River Falls, Wisconsin  
Tax Increment District # 16  
Estimated Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Name/Type</th>
<th>Phase I 2020</th>
<th>Phase II 2035</th>
<th>Total (Note 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utility and Public Infrastructure</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development Incentives</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>385,000</td>
<td>385,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DeSanctis Park Improvements</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Division Street Reconstruction and Sidewalks</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Planning and Engineering Professional Services</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Note 1: Project costs are estimates and are subject to modification
SECTION 9:
Economic Feasibility Study, Description of the Methods of Financing Estimated Project Costs and the Time When Related Costs or Monetary Obligations are to be Incurred

This section includes a forecast of the valuation increases expected within the District, the associated tax increment collections, a summary of how Project Costs would be financed, and a projected cash flow demonstrating that the District is economically feasible.

**Key Assumptions**

The Project Costs the City plans to make are expected to create $13,800,000 million in incremental value by 2041. Estimated valuations and timing for construction of the Project are included in Table 1. Assuming the City’s current equalized TID interim tax rate of $21.45 per thousand of equalized value, and no economic appreciation or depreciation, the Project would generate $4,840,208 in incremental tax revenue over the 20-year term of the District as shown in Table 2.
### Table 1 – Development Assumptions

**City of River Falls, Wisconsin**

**Tax Increment District # 16**

**Development Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Housing Project</th>
<th>Add. Res./Com.</th>
<th>Annual Total</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>8,300,000</td>
<td>8,300,000</td>
<td>16,600,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 – Tax Increment Projection Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Value Added</th>
<th>Valuation Year</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>Total Increment</th>
<th>Revenue Year</th>
<th>Tax Rate</th>
<th>Tax Increment</th>
<th>NPV Calculation</th>
<th>Taxable NPV Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2020</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>$53,613</td>
<td>53,613</td>
<td>53,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2021</td>
<td>8,300,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>285,223</td>
<td>285,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>516,832</td>
<td>516,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>748,442</td>
<td>748,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>980,051</td>
<td>980,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2025</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>1,211,660</td>
<td>1,211,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>1,443,270</td>
<td>1,443,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 2027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>1,674,879</td>
<td>1,674,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>1,906,489</td>
<td>1,906,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2,138,098</td>
<td>2,138,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 2030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2,369,708</td>
<td>2,369,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2,601,317</td>
<td>2,601,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 2032</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2,832,926</td>
<td>2,832,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 2033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>3,064,536</td>
<td>3,064,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 2034</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>3,360,481</td>
<td>3,360,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 2035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>3,656,427</td>
<td>3,656,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 2036</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>3,952,372</td>
<td>3,952,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 2037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>4,248,317</td>
<td>4,248,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 2038</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>4,544,263</td>
<td>4,544,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 2039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>4,840,208</td>
<td>4,840,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** | **13,800,000** | **0** | **Future Value of Increment** | **4,840,208**

**Notes:**
- Actual results will vary depending on development, inflation of overall tax rates.
- NPV calculations represent estimated amount of funds that could be borrowed (including project cost, capitalized interest and issuance costs).
**Financing and Implementation**

In order to facilitate development in the District, the City has agreed to provide up to $1,900,000 to the Developer for the purposes of reimbursing development related expenses. The City will dedicate up to 90 percent of the tax increment revenue generated by the Milltown Residences portion of the District each year until the balance of $1,900,000 has been paid.

The City will also allocate $800,000 for additional infrastructure which are required for suitable development in the District. Such infrastructure includes, but is not limited to utilities for water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer, sidewalks and streets, and landscaping. The City anticipates issuing a General Obligation Debt to fund these infrastructure projects.

Upon paying the final balances to the Developer and the G.O. Debt listed above, the City may initiate additional projects in the District using any available tax increment revenues. These projects may include land acquisition, parks improvements, sidewalk reconstruction, and engineering services. The current estimated cost for these improvements is approximately $1,500,000. Table 3 provides a summary of the District’s financing plan.

Based on the Project Cost expenditures as included within the cash flow exhibit (Table 4), the District is projected to accumulate sufficient funds by the year 2041 to pay off all Project Cost liabilities and obligations. The projected closure is based on the various assumptions noted in this Plan and will vary dependent on actual Project Costs incurred and the actual amount of tax increments collected.
## Table 3 – Financing Plan

City of River Falls, Wisconsin
Tax Increment District # 16
Estimated Financing Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G.O. Bond 2020</th>
<th>Municipal Revenue Obligation (MRO) 2020</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility and Public Infrastructure</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Funds</strong></td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Finance Related Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Advisor</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Counsel</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Agency Fee</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwriter Discount</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financing Required</strong></td>
<td>852,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Interest</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rounding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Issue Size</strong></td>
<td>855,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>2,755,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 – Cash Flow

City of River Falls, Wisconsin
Tax Increment District # 16

Cash Flow Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax Increments</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
<th>G.O. Bond 855,000</th>
<th>Municipal Revenue Obligation (MRO) 1,900,000</th>
<th>Repay General Fund for Advance</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Principal Outstanding</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>53,613</td>
<td>53,613</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>48,613</td>
<td>28,613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>30,089</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>31,565</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>33,041</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>34,517</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>35,993</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>37,469</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>38,945</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>40,421</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>41,897</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>43,363</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>44,839</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>46,315</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>208,448</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230,133</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>47,791</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>290,245</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>295,245</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>255,649</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>290,245</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>295,245</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>227,800</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>290,245</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>295,245</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>228,810</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>290,245</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>295,245</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>229,510</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>290,245</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>295,245</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>230,245</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>290,245</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>295,245</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>231,945</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,840,208</td>
<td>4,840,208</td>
<td>855,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,729,057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>4,797,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) The column Repay General Fund for Advance assumes the City's loans the $1,500,000 in additional TID 16 costs to the District and is repaid with interest.
SECTION 10:  
Annexed Property

A tax incremental district cannot include annexed territory unless at least three years have elapsed since the annexation, or certain other requirements are met. The District does include parcels that have been annexed in the last three years. The City will comply with all requirements allowing the recently annexed parcels to be included in the boundaries of Tax Increment District No. 16.
SECTION 11:
Estimate of Property to Be Devoted to Retail Business

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(5)(b), the City estimates that none the territory within the District will be devoted to retail business at the end of the District’s maximum expenditure period.
SECTION 12:
Proposed Changes of Zoning Ordinances, Master Plan, Map, Building Codes and City Ordinances

Zoning Ordinances
The proposed Plan is in general conformance with the City’s current zoning ordinances. Individual properties may require rezoning at the time of development.

Master (Comprehensive) Plan and Map
The proposed Plan is in general conformance with the City’s Comprehensive Plan identifying the area as appropriate for residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Building Codes and Ordinances
Development within the District will be required to conform to State Building Codes and will be subject to the City’s permitting and inspection procedures. The proposed Plan conforms to all relevant State and local ordinances, plans, and codes. No changes to the existing regulations are proposed or needed.
SECTION 13: Statement of the Proposed Method for the Relocation of any Persons to be Displaced

Should implementation of this Plan require relocation of individuals or business operations, relocations will be handled in compliance with Wis. Stat. Chapter 32 and Wis. Admin. Code ADM 92.
SECTION 14: How Creation of the Tax Incremental District Promotes the Orderly Development of the City

Creation of the District and the implementation of the projects in its Plan will promote the orderly development of the City by creating new industrial sites, opportunities for mixed use development, providing necessary public infrastructure improvements, and providing appropriate financial incentives for private development projects. Through use of tax increment financing, the City can attract new investment that results in increased tax base. Development will occur in an orderly fashion in accordance with approved plans so that the Projects will be compatible with adjacent land uses. Development of new uses in the District will add to the tax base and will generate positive secondary impacts in the community such as increased employment opportunities and housing options.
SECTION 15: List of Estimated Non-Project Costs

Non-project costs are public works projects which only partly benefit the District. Costs incurred that do not benefit the District may not be paid with tax increments. Examples of non-project costs are:

- A public improvement made within the District that also benefits property outside the District. That portion of the total Project Costs allocable to properties outside of the District would be a non-project cost.

- A public improvement made outside the District that only partially benefits property within the District. That portion of the total Project Costs allocable to properties outside of the District would be a non-project cost.

- Projects undertaken within the District as part of the implementation of this Project Plan, the costs of which are paid fully or in part by impact fees, grants, special assessments, or revenues other than tax increments.

No improvements to be made within the District will benefit property outside the District. Furthermore, there will be no improvements made outside the District that will only partially benefit the District.
SECTION 16: Legal Opinion Advising Whether the Plan is Complete and Complies with Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(4)(f)
Dear Mayor:

As City Attorney for the City of River Falls, I have reviewed the Project Plan and, in my opinion, have determined that it is complete and complies with Wisconsin Statutes Section 66.1105(4)(f).

Sincerely,

Attorney
SECTION 17:
Calculation of the Share of Projected Tax Increments Estimated to be Paid by the Owners of Property in the Overlying Taxing Jurisdictions

The following projection is provided to meet the requirements of Wis. Stat. § 66.1105(4)(i)4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Taxes Data Year:</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1,184,388</td>
<td>14.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>3,391,254</td>
<td>42.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>3,151,737</td>
<td>39.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical College</td>
<td>285,845</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,013,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Year</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Special District</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Technical College</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Revenue Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>7,924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,690</td>
<td>21,087</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,613</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,019</td>
<td>91,096</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,609</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>43,742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,246</td>
<td>116,400</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>43,742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,246</td>
<td>116,400</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>43,742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,246</td>
<td>116,400</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>43,742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,246</td>
<td>116,400</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>43,742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,246</td>
<td>116,400</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>43,742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,246</td>
<td>116,400</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 715,403 | 0 | 2,048,411 | 1,903,736 | 172,658 | 0 | 4,840,208 |

Notes:
The projection shown above is provided to meet the requirements of Wisconsin Statute 66.1105(4)(i)4.
RESOLUTION NO. PC 2020-03

RESOLUTION DESIGNATING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES AND APPROVING A PROJECT PLAN FOR TAX INCREMENTAL DISTRICT NO. 16, CITY OF RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

WHEREAS, the City of River Falls (the “City”) has determined that use of Tax Incremental Financing is required to promote development and redevelopment within the City; and

WHEREAS, Tax Incremental District No. 16 (the “District”) is proposed to be created by the City as a mixed-use district in accordance with the provisions of Wisconsin Statutes Section 66.1105 (the "Tax Increment Law"); and

WHEREAS, a Project Plan for the District has been prepared that includes:

a. A statement listing of the kind, number, and location of all proposed public works or improvements within the District, or to the extent provided in Wisconsin Statutes §66.1105(2)(f)1.k. and §66.1105(2)(f)1.n., outside of the District;
b. An economic feasibility study;
c. A detailed list of estimated project costs;
d. A description of the methods of financing all estimated project costs and the time when the related costs or monetary obligations are to be incurred;
e. A map showing existing uses and conditions of real property in the District;
f. A map showing proposed improvements and uses in the District;
g. Proposed changes of zoning ordinances, master plan, map, building codes and City ordinances;
h. A list of estimated non-project costs;
i. A statement of the proposed plan for relocation of any persons to be displaced;
j. A statement indicating how the District promotes the orderly development of the City; and
k. An opinion of the City Attorney or of an attorney retained by the City advising that the plan is complete and complies with Wisconsin Statutes Section 66.1105(4)(f).

WHEREAS, prior to its publication, a copy of the notice of public hearing was sent to the chief executive officers of St. Croix County, the River Falls School District, and the Chippewa Valley Technical College District, and any other entities having the power to levy taxes on property located within the District, in accordance with the procedures specified in the Tax Increment Law; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the procedures specified in the Tax Increment Law, the Plan Commission, on August 4, 2020 held a public hearing concerning the project plan and boundaries and
proposed creation of the District, providing interested parties a reasonable opportunity to express their views thereon.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Plan Commission of the City of River Falls that:

1. It recommends to the Common Council that Tax Incremental District No. 16 be created with boundaries as designated in Exhibit A of this Resolution.
2. It approves and adopts the Project Plan for the District, attached as Exhibit B, and recommends its approval to the Common Council.
3. Creation of the District promotes orderly development in the City.

Adopted this __________ day of ____________, 2020.

___________________________________
Dan Toland, Mayor

___________________________________
Amy White, City Clerk
EXHIBIT A

LEGAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION OR MAP OF
TAX INCREMENTAL DISTRICT NO. 16
CITY OF RIVER FALLS

A parcel of land located in part of the SE1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 34, part of the NW1/4 of the NW1/4, part of the SW1/4 of the NW1/4, part of the NW1/4 of the SW1/4, part of the NE1/4 of the SW1/4, part of the SE1/4 of the SW1/4, part of the SW1/4 of the SW1/4, part of the SE1/4 of the SE1/4, of Section 35, all in T28N, R19W, City of River Falls, St. Croix County, Wisconsin; also part of the NE1/4 of the NE1/4 and part of the NW1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 2, T27N, R19W, City of River Falls, Pierce County Wisconsin; described as follows:

Beginning at the S1/4 corner of said Section 35; thence westerly along the south line of the SW1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 611.85 feet more or less to the westerly line of that parcel of land described on that deed recorded as Document No. 556032 in the office of the St. Croix County Register of Deeds; thence along said line N01°44'21" E a distance of 397.71 feet; thence along said line N88°11'06"W a distance of 623.12 feet; thence along said line N27°19'55"W a distance of 133.55 feet; thence along said line N39°57'15"W a distance of 311.39 feet; thence along said line N02°42'13"W a distance of 420.66 feet; thence along said line N03°58'22"E a distance of 114.66 feet; thence along said line N25°48'03"E a distance of 40.11 feet; thence along said line N34°55"W a distance of 888.85 feet; thence along said line N00°01'19"E a distance of 1205.37 feet; thence along the east line of said Lot 1 N00°21'28"E a distance of 1415.68 feet to the north line of said NW1/4 of the SW1/4; thence along said line S00°31'57"E a distance of 2230.09 feet to the north line of said SE1/4 of the SW1/4; thence along said line S89°55'54"E a distance of 649.05 feet to the northwest corner of that parcel of land described on that deed recorded as Document No. 528928, in said office; thence along the boundary of that parcel of land described on that deed recorded as Document No. 1023744 a distance of 667.05 feet more or less; thence southeasterly along the boundary of that parcel of land described on that deed recorded as Document No. 1033381, in said office; thence along the southerly line of said Lot 1 N64°31'34"E a distance of 127.65 feet; thence S00°31'57"E a distance of 2230.09 feet to the north line of the SW1/4 of said Section 35; thence along said line S89°55'54"E a distance of 649.05 feet to the northerly right-of-way of Dry Run Road; thence southeasterly, radial to the curve, a distance of 33 feet to the centerline of said Dry Run Road; thence southerly along said centerline of Dry Run Road a distance of 506.9 feet more or less to the
intersection of said centerline and the westerly extension of the south line of Lot 10 of the plat of Cernohous Addition; thence easterly along said extension a distance of 33 feet to the easterly right-of-way of Dry Run Road; thence southerly along said easterly right-of-way of Dry Run Road a distance of 229.34 feet more or less to the north line of Lot 2 of that Certified Survey Map recorded in Volume 10 of said maps, on Page 2920, as Document No. 529174, in said office; thence easterly along said line a distance of 1845.76 feet more or less to the northeast corner of said Lot 2; thence southerly along the east line of said Lot 2 and the southerly extension thereof a distance of 266 feet more or less to the southerly line of West Division Street; thence westerly along said line a distance of 775.6 feet more or less to the east line of the plat of Quail Ridge; thence southerly along said line a distance of 27.00 feet; thence westerly along said south line of West Division Street a distance of 560.31 feet; thence northerly along said line a distance of 10.00 feet; thence westerly along said line a distance of 539.45 feet to the west line of the NE1/4 of said Section 2; thence northerly along said line a distance of 50.00 feet to the point of beginning. Containing 100.8 acres of land more or less.
PLAN COMMISSION
AUGUST 4, 2020
STAFF REPORT

ITEM: Future Land Use (FLU) Map amendment for Mann Valley and 7.09-acre City-Owned Property
APPLICANT: None
OWNERS: Multiple Owners (See Exhibit 1)
STAFF: Brandy Howe, Sr. Planner

BACKGROUND
Staff is seeking Plan Commission review and approval of a Comprehensive Plan and future land use map amendment for the planned Mann Valley Corporate Park as well as a 7.09-acre parcel of land adjacent to DeSanctis Park. The purpose of these amendments is twofold:

1) Update the Comprehensive Plan to align with the “preferred” Mann Valley conceptual land use plan prepared by MSA Professional Services in 2018.
2) Update the Comprehensive Plan to align City goals for its 7.09-acre parcel next to DeSanctis Park.

Each of these purposes are related to the Milltown Residences project (see Agenda Item 3) and are further described in the sections that follow. However, the proposed amendments are also based on their own merit and staff suggest each move forward independent of whether or not the townhome project is approved. Note that the history of both projects that is described below is to the best of our knowledge based a review of Park Board, Plan Commission, and City Council actions and documents prepared by former staff members.

1. MANN VALLEY AREA FLU AMENDMENT

Mann Valley Planning History
Planning for the future development of the west side of the City has been a consideration since at least the 1980s. The River Falls 1987 Master Plan recognized Mann Valley as a growth area for the community and identified the need for water/sewer infrastructure to serve it. In 1989, Steven’s Engineering prepared a study for a future west side sanitary sewer interceptor. At that time, it was assumed that most of the undeveloped land west of the city would grow as single family. This assumption carried through to the 1995 Master Plan which acknowledged that development of Mann Valley could accommodate 5,500 people (the projected population growth between 1995-2018). The 1995 plan suggested moderate-scale single-family housing for this area. The 2005 Comprehensive Plan further evaluated Mann Valley as a future development area, this time as a planned Traditional Neighborhood Development (Figure 1). The
area north of CTH M, south of MM, and east of Mann Lane is approximately 644 acres with 464 acres of that being “developable.” The remaining 200 acres contain existing homes or resource protection areas (RPAs). The Mann Valley TND was planned at that time to develop with a mix of housing types and sizes, a neighborhood commercial center, as well as parkland and institutional land uses.

A shift in thinking occurred around 2009 when the City Council set corporate park development as a major city goal based on economics and real estate market trends resulting from the recession. Corporate park development was included in the approved 2009-2011 Work Plan under Promote Economic Vitality and Identify Additional Business Park Sites. After a comprehensive study of available sites in and surrounding the community, the Mann Valley area was approved as the site for a future corporate park. In 2011, the City purchased 85 acres in Mann Valley and later, in 2013, the City purchased an additional 240 acres bringing its total land holdings in Mann Valley to 325 acres. At that point Council intended to revise the master plan for this area; however, before that happened, in 2016, the City annexed 291 acres of Mann Valley into the City. Later, planning and design for the infrastructure to serve the Mann Valley Corporate Park was included in the 2015-2019 Capital Improvements Plan.

In 2018 the City hired MSA Professional Services to develop conceptual designs for land use (akin to a master plan). The staff-led planning team included the City Administrator, Development Services Director, and City Engineer. In addition, Jerry Wilkens and Jason Fredrickson, both of the River Falls Economic Development Corporation (RFEDC), were involved in developing the concepts. A preferred concept (Exhibit 2) was presented to Plan Commission and City Council in a joint workshop and informally approved on October 23, 2018.

The preferred concept illustrates a road/lot layout that reserves high and low areas for conservancy and stormwater (125 acres) and provides ample flexibility to configure lots based on the needs of businesses that plan to locate in the park. The concept also allows for flexibility in land use to accommodate shifting market demand and landowner interests. As depicted, 214 acres are planned for Business Park uses. Approximately 16 acres is planned for Mixed Use (i.e. commercial and/or medium-high density residential), and an additional 23 acres can flex to either Business Park or Mixed Use. A 39 acre area that is presently owned by the River Falls School District is shown as either future institutional or single family residential, although depending on how the area develops, mixed use may also be determined appropriate. Additionally, approximately 27 acres is reserved for single family, although four of those acres may flex to an alternative use if desired.

Proposed Mann Valley Land Use
Staff recommends amending the Comprehensive Plan to formalize its approval of the Mann Valley Preferred Concept by creating a land use classification to describe the future Mann Valley Corporate Park and update the future land use map to reference the preferred concept rather than a future TND. In addition to demonstrating the City’s land use and policy direction for this area of the City, it is also necessary to amend the Comprehensive Plan and future land use map so that it is consistent with the proposed TID #16, which includes a portion of Mann Valley. The proposed Mann Valley amendments are detailed in Sections 1 - 7 the enclosed Ordinance and depicted on Exhibit 4. The amendments also update several outdated maps.

2. FLU AMENDMENT FOR THE 7-ACRE PARCEL SOUTH OF DESANCTIS PARK

DeSanctis Park Area History
The land that is now DeSanctis Park and the 7-acres to the south of it have a variable history. As early as 1984, the combined area was preliminarily platted (Cernohous 2nd Addition) as large-lot single family lots (Figure 2). This land was also included in the 1987 Master Plan as future single family residential. It wasn’t until 1993 that Peter and Susan DeSanctis, co-trustees of the Ryan DeSanctis Trust, purchased land west of the Cernohous 1st Addition.
They donated approximately 20 acres (Figure 3) to the City as parkland in honor of their son for whom the park is named, and they retained the remaining 8.5 acres to the south for future home sites to recoup the cost of the parkland gift.

In 1995, the City and Trust entered a development agreement outlining the conditions for development of the park as well as the land retained by the Trust. It was agreed that the Trust could sell the 8.5-acre lots to another person or entity for future development and that it would be subject to all applicable state and local regulations and with the exception of one—it is not required to contribute parkland or fees in lieu because the gift of DeSanctis Park satisfies the parkland dedication for this land.

In 1995, the DeSanctis Trust prepared, and City Council approved, a CSM to create three single family home lots at the east end of the future development area. This 3-lot CSM was approved by resolution with the condition that Lots 1 and 2 share driveway access and the driveway for Lot 3 be positioned so it could be shared with a future Lot 4. This requirement was based on 16.12.010 of the subdivision ordinance which discourages driveway access on minor arterials. Note that it does not appear that the lots developed per this condition based on aerial and street images (there are 3 individual driveways to each lot).

A concept plan to develop DeSanctis Park was approved by Park Board, Plan Commission, and Council in 1995. The plan was later amended to include a road through the park to serve future lots along W. Division Street (Figure...
4). The road was deemed necessary based on Section 16.12.010 of the subdivision ordinance, which limits driveway access to individual lots on minor arterials (i.e. CTH M/Division Street is a minor arterial). The proposed road also resolves another conflict with the subdivision ordinance—dead end streets serving more than 30 residential units. Cernohous 1st addition is in violation of this requirement. Connecting Roosevelt Street to Dry Run Road through DeSanctis Park resolves this issue.

As mentioned above, the Trust was able to divide three lots via CSM in 1995 but ended up holding the remaining 7-acres of vacant land for many years. The access restriction to W. Division Street, steep slopes on the site, and the cost to develop the connecting road through the park made development challenging. The City Engineer prepared preliminary cost estimates in 2012 for the park road with utilities. The price tag, at $750,000 was found to be cost prohibitive for single family lot development (~approximately an additional $50k per lot if platted in the same manner as the first three by CSM along W. Division Street).

In 2017, City attempted to find a solution for the DeSanctis family that would allow them to develop land without the issue of access restrictions. Staff was working toward an agreement with the DeSanctis family wherein the City would trade approximately 5.6 acres of parkland for 5.7 acres of Trust-owned land to enable development to
occur more easily on the site (Figure 5). A conceptual layout was prepared by the City (Figure 6) to demonstrate how the land swap might layout; no detailed engineering plans were prepared at this time. Before an agreement had been reached, however, the proposal became public knowledge and a petition was circulated and numerous residents voiced their opposition to the concept at Park Board, Plan Commission, and City Council meetings. The opposition focused on the loss of parkland and development proposed to locate in the rear of lots that had been dedicated as parkland. The City and Trust ultimately did not reach an agreement given the public opposition. In the end, the land swap was dropped as a consideration.

In 2018, the City acquired this 7-acre parcel from the DeSanctis family for $200,000 with the intent to sell to a developer to build at a higher density to defray costs of public infrastructure. Later in 2018, the City entered a purchase agreement and a development agreement with Gerrard Companies, LLC to build 22 twin homes (44 units). The project also included a new road to serve the development (with a future extension to Roosevelt planned), realignment of Dry Run Road, and parking and water/sewer connections to serve the park and the Glover School building. A general development plan (GDP) was approved by Plan Commission in September 2018, but the developer decided to forego the project shortly thereafter and it was never taken to City Council for consideration/approval; however, approval of the GDP by Plan Commission and approval of the development agreement by Council signifies approval of higher density for this site.
In the time that passed since the Gerrard’s looked at the property, several local developers were asked for their interest in developing the site. It was determined to be infeasible for a single-family housing product to be built given the City’s infrastructure requirements for the site. In an attempt to find another developer to take on the challenge, the City issued an RFP in December 2019 to solicit design proposals for high-density housing. The City received six proposals with a variety of densities and housing types (i.e. townhomes, twin homes, apartments). Planning and economic development staff, along with former Plan Commissioner Woolsey, reviewed and evaluated the proposals. The Community Development Director consulted the City Administrator, Mayor, and Executive Team on a recommendation and Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions, LLC was selected. They submitted a GDP in May 2020 (Figure 8) for Milltown Residences, which was reviewed and approved by City Council on June 9, 2020.

Staff is now working with Three Sixty on a specific implementation plan (SIP) for the project/site. This item is also being considered by Plan Commission on the August 4, 2020 agenda.

**Proposed DeSanctis Area Amendment**

Staff recommends the following Comprehensive Plan amendments which are detailed in Sections 8 – 9 of the enclosed Ordinance and depicted on Exhibit 4:

1. Change the land use designation of the 7-acre development site from “single family residential” to “high density residential.”
2. Revise the description of the “high density residential” future land use classification so that it is not capped at 12 units per acre. There are several recent developments that have occurred in the City that are classified as high density that are greater than 12 units per acre (i.e. Depot/City Station, 1300 S. Main Street Apts., and Peregrine Terrace), thus this amendment brings those projects into conformance with the Comprehensive Plan as well.

These changes solidify the City’s intent to develop this land as high-density residential, even if the current proposal by Three Sixty does not come to pass. Note that even though the FLU would be changed to High Density
residential, the underlying zoning is not requested or required to change because the PUD is permitted for multifamily projects in the R1 zoning district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
Staff recommends approval of the enclosed Plan Commission resolution recommending approval of an ordinance to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use map as indicated for the Mann Valley Corporate Park and DeSanctis Park areas.

**NEXT STEPS**
The following steps with known meeting dates remain for this future land use map amendment:

- August 4, 2020 Plan Commission public hearing and consideration of a resolution to recommend the amendments to the City Council.
- August 11, 2020 City Council 1st reading of an ordinance to consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and future land use map.
- August 25, 2020 City Council 2nd reading and action on an ordinance to consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and future land use map.

**EXHIBITS**
1. FLU amendment area ownership map
2. Mann Valley Preferred Concept
3. Existing Future Land Use Map
4. Proposed Future Land Use Map
5. PC Resolution recommending approval of an ordinance to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map
6. Ordinance to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map
RESOLUTION NO. PC 2020-04

RECOMMENDING AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND FUTURE LAND USE MAP FOR MANN VALLEY AND DESANCTIS PARK VICINITY

WHEREAS, staff initiated a Comprehensive Plan and future land use map amendment for the planned Mann Valley Corporate Park as well as the 7.09-acre City-owned parcel of land adjacent to DeSanctis Park. The purpose of these amendments is twofold:

1) Formalize Council approval of the Mann Valley Preferred Concept prepared by MSA Professional Services in 2018, and
2) Solidify the City’s intent to develop the 7.09 acre parcel south of DeSanctis Park as high-density residential.

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission held a public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment on August 4, 2020 and found the amendments to be reasonable, appropriate, and consistent with current City plans for the area in question; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Plan Commission recommends City Council approval to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map as described in Ordinance 2020-07.

Dated this 4th day of August 2020.

____________________________________
Dan Toland, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________________
Amy White, City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO. 2020-__

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND FUTURE LAND USE MAP
FOR MANN VALLEY
AND DESANCTIS PARK VICINITY

THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIVER FALLS HEREBY ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Amend Figure 3-1 Land Policy Overlays to:

1. Update the City limits boundary to include areas that have been annexed to the City since the 2005 adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Update road names as necessary to reflect recent changes in the City and County road networks (e.g. Mann Lane to CTH U).
3. Remove the Traditional Neighborhood Development designation and symbology from Mann Valley Corporate Park and simply refer to it as “Future Growth” as is the designation for growth areas outside of the city limits at are not proposed as future business districts.

Section 2. Amend Figure 3-2 Corporate Limits to:

1. Update the City limits boundary to include areas that have been annexed to the City since the 2005 adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Update road names as necessary to reflect recent changes in the City and County road networks (e.g. Mann Lane to CTH U).
3. Depict annexations that have occurred since 2004, which include the Mann Valley Corporate Park.

Section 3. Amend Figure 3-3 City of River Falls Zoning Map to:

1. Update the City limits boundary to include areas that have been annexed to the City since the 2005 adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Update road names as necessary to reflect recent changes in the City and County road networks (e.g. Mann Lane to CTH U).
3. Update the zoning of lands that have been changed by rezoning since 2005.
Section 4. Amend Figure 3-4 Extraterritorial Zoning Map to:

1. Update the City limits boundary to include areas that have been annexed to the City since the 2005 adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Update road names as necessary to reflect recent changes in the City and County road networks (e.g. Mann Lane to CTH U).

Section 5. Amend Figure 3-6 Urban Area Boundary and Future Land Use to:

1. Update the City limits boundary to include areas that have been annexed to the City since the 2005 adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Update road names as necessary to reflect recent changes in the City and County road networks.
3. Remove the Traditional Neighborhood Development designation and symbology from Mann Valley Corporate Park, depict the area as white and refer to the Mann Valley Corporate Park conceptual land use plan (new Figure 3-7) and the new MVCP land classification.

Section 6 Add the following classification to Chapter Three: Land Use under the Use Classifications section:

Mann Valley Corporate Park (MVCP). A conceptual land use plan for the MVCP was prepared in 2018 (see Figure 3-7) and is intended to provide a general direction for land use within the future corporate park. The concept is flexible to enable adjustment to accommodate shifting market demand and landowner interests. Nothing in the concept is to be construed as a parcel-based designation of uses as the parcels have not yet been created within the corporate park.

The MVCP conceptual plan illustrates a road/lot layout that reserves high and low areas for conservancy and stormwater (approximately 125 acres) and provides ample flexibility to configure lots based on the needs of businesses that plan to locate in the park. As depicted, about 214 acres are planned for Business Park. Approximately 16 acres is planned for Mixed Use (i.e. commercial and/or medium-high density residential), and an additional 23 acres can flex to either Business Park or Mixed Use. A 39 acre area that is presently owned by the River Falls School District is shown as either future Institutional or Single Family residential, although depending on how the area develops, mixed use may also be determined appropriate. Additionally, approximately 27 acres is reserved for Single Family, although four of those acres may flex to an alternative use, such as Institutional or Mixed Use if desired.

Section 7. Add the following land use category to Chapter Three: Land Use under the Use Classifications section:

Mixed Use (MU). This designation may include any combination of commercial, institutional, civic, and/or medium or high-density residential uses.

Section 8. Add the Mann Valley Preferred Concept layout as Figure 3-7 in Chapter 3.
Section 9. Amend the High Density Residential (HD) land use category under Chapter 3, Section 3.5.1 as follows:

High Density Residential (HD), 8.1 to $12 + \text{ units per gross acre. Dwelling types may include apartments, condominiums, and other forms of multifamily housing. This classification includes some of the multifamily developments built in River Falls in recent years.}$

Section 10: Procedural Requirements. Council hereby confirms that all procedural requirements for an Comprehensive Plan amendment shall be filed in accordance with §66.1001, Wis. Statutes.

Section 11: Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect the day after passage and publication as provided by law.

FOR THE CITY OF RIVER FALLS

________________________
Dan Toland, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
Amy White, City Clerk

Adopted: _________________
Published: _______________
ITEM: Milltown Residences - Planned Unit Development (PUD) Specific Implementation Plan (SIP)
APPLICANT: Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions, LLC
OWNER: City of River Falls
STAFF: Brandy Howe, Sr. Planner

BACKGROUND
The City has owned a 7.09-acre site south of DeSanctis Park since 2018 when it was purchased from the DeSanctis Family Trust for $200,000 with the intent of selling the property to a developer. An RFP was issued in December 2019 to solicit developer proposals for a housing project on the site. The RFP laid out the following development goals and site challenges:

Goals:
- Realign Dry Run Road to intersect with Bobwhite Street to the south.
- Connect Glover School to water and sewer infrastructure to enable public use of that building as a rentable park facility.
- Create a public parking lot to serve DeSanctis Park and Glover School.
- Address emergency access issues in the Cernohous 1st Addition subdivision to the east.

Site Challenges:
- W. Division Street is a minor arterial, and therefore, no new curb cuts for driveways may be created on the south side of the development site per City regulations.
- The linear nature and depth of the site isn’t feasible for two rows of single-family homes; which is standard and typically necessary to defray infrastructure costs.
- Site topography has a 4-8% slope across the parcel from W. Division Street toward DeSanctis Park.

To achieve the above state goals, staff recognizes that higher density development (i.e. greater than single-family) is needed to overcome the site challenges, justify the infrastructure costs that are necessary to serve the site, and provide the funding mechanism to pay for public infrastructure to serve the park.

The City received six proposals with a variety of densities and housing types (i.e. townhomes, modular homes, twin homes, and apartments). Planning and economic development staff, along with former Plan Commissioner Woolsey, reviewed and evaluated the proposals. The Community Development Director consulted the City Administrator, Mayor, and Executive Team on a recommendation and Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions, LLC was selected to move forward with a proposal for four 21-unit townhome-style apartment buildings based on the design, resident amenities, attention to site limitations, and relevant experience of the developer and their engineer. A general development plan (GDP) was submitted earlier this year and approved by City Council on June 9 (see agenda item #2); a specific implementation plan (SIP) was submitted by Three Sixty on July 1, 2020. Staff has been working with the developer over the summer on a development agreement. The following terms have been agreed to and is anticipated to yield the following public benefits:
**Developer Obligations** | **Project Benefits**
---|---
- Purchase the land for $200,000 | - City recovers the value of its 2018 land purchase
- Design and construct public improvements | - Realignment of Dry Run Road/Bobwhite (key for safety on W. Division Street)
- Design and construct public improvements | - New parking (25 stalls) for DeSanctis/Glover School
- Design and construct public improvements | - Water/sewer connections to Glover School
- Design and construct public improvements | - Provide secondary/emergency access to project site and Cernohous 1st Addition
- Design and construct public improvements | - Path improvements in DeSanctis Park
- Design and construct public improvements | - Sidewalk connection on north side of W. Division St.
- Design and construct public improvements | - Additional park and street landscaping
- Guaranteed a min. assessed value of $10,800,000 | - Places this 7-acre city-owned site on the tax roll with development
- Prepare and record CSM to divide lot | - Dedication of additional right-of-way along W. Division Street
- Prepare and record CSM to divide lot | - Creation of a new lot to the west of Dry Run Road (ownership to be retained by the City) for future use/development

**City Obligations**
- Create a TIF District
- Own and operate the stormwater facility to be located in DeSanctis Park

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
Three Sixty is proposing to build, own, and operate four townhome-style apartment buildings. Each building will include a mix of 1, 2, and 3-bedroom townhomes with 21 units per building (84 units total). Each building will have 22 attached garage spaces and 27 surface spaces for a total of 196 residential parking stalls.

**Site Design**
The development site will be accessed via a new public road set in DeSanctis Park. Parking and a turnaround will be constructed for use by the general public. As previously mentioned, the site has been designed with a realignment of Dry Run Road which will eliminate potential dangerous traffic situations created by misaligned intersections. The land to the west of the realigned road will be retained by the City for future development.
The buildings will be set back 67 to 87 feet from the property line in a staggered configuration. A public comment was raised during the GDP phase of the project regarding the proposed staggering of the buildings; it was suggested that the staggering be reversed to provide a lesser impact to the neighbor to the east of the project. The developer has clarified, and staff supports, that the staggering of the buildings was influenced by the following observations and conditions:

- The easternmost building is setback further away from the private residence. Also, its elevation is approximately 6-7' lower than it would have to be if it were shifted 20' to the south to reverse the staggering.
- This pattern of staggering pushes the westernmost building closer to the main intersection of Dry Run Road and W. Division Street, which is generally considered good urban design. It also opens up the view to the park sooner as you are entering on Dry Run Road or coming into the City from the west.
- The proposed staggering fits the topography, therefore reducing the amount of excavation that needs to take place.

**Density and Building Mass**

The developer has prepared a draft CSM to create the new right-of-way and divide the development site from the remainder of the land to be retained by the City. The development lot will be approximately 4.7-acres which will yield a density of 18 dwelling units per acre. If 7.09-acre site could develop as single family housing (which staff has determined infeasible based on cost and the presence of steep slopes), approximately 15 units would fit on the site at a density of 2 dwellings per acre. The buildings will be three-story with a mass of approximately 480,000 cubic feet. Compared to the Depot project (905,000 cubic feet), which is four-story, this is about half.

**Building Plans, Design and Landscaping**

The placement and building are designed to reflect the street presence of a traditional single family unit, but in a row house design. Units feature walk-up front porches facing W. Division Street and the garages are designed with roof-top patios facing DeSanctis Park to create outside spaces for the residents.

Building materials include textured fiberglass roof shingles, grey lap siding, brick veneer, and white accent features. Sample images of the proposed building colors and textures are provided. The images provided are from similar projects by Three Sixty in Onalaska and La Crosse, Wisconsin.
The site will feature numerous amenities and sustainable site features including:

- The development site will feature outdoor space for residents (e.g. grills, hammocks, gazebo, community gardens).
- Connections to the DeSanctis Park trail system and public sidewalk will provide access to the site and the park behind.
- Tight building envelope that uses best practices for lower energy consumption, sustainable and high-quality materials, and energy efficient designs.
- An environment that highlights and respects natural resources and is designed in a method that connects people to the outdoors.
- Landscaping that will consist of native plants and vegetation which will provide a food source for both people and wildlife and complement the DeSanctis prairie.
- Design that utilizes natural light to reduce energy needs.
- Create a healthy living model with close access to pedestrian resources such as the marsh, bluffs, and local parks.
Utilities and Storm Water
The project includes the design and construction of public water/sewer/electric infrastructure to Glover School. The building site will be served by public water and private sewer system. The project will be served by a regional stormwater pond to be owned and maintained by the City. It will meet the City’s design standards.

Traffic
WisDOT traffic count data shows the average annual daily traffic on W. Division Street near the site to be 2,400 vehicles. Based on the ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) Trip Generation Report, apartments generate approximately seven vehicle trips per day. Based on this data, the project could create an additional 588 trips per day, or 60 per peak hour, which is comparable to the traffic impacts of a 60 lot single-family subdivision. The City Engineer reviewed anticipated traffic counts as they relate to the need for traffic signals and found that a signal is not warranted at this intersection.

Phasing Plan
The project includes four buildings in two phases. Phase 1 includes all public infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, park parking, etc.) and the first three buildings. Phase 2 includes the final building (western side of site) and its associated parking lot. If approved, Phase 1 would begin in September 2020 and Phase 2 in 2021.

Target Market, Organizational Structure, and Housing Need
The target market for the housing units is young professionals and empty nester. The property will be conveyed to a new SPE (single purpose entity). All professional services including property management, legal and accounting will be directly provided by or led by Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions, LLC.

A Comprehensive Housing Needs Analysis was prepared by Maxfield Research and Consulting and was adopted by Council in early 2018. The report shows that River Falls is short on most housing types; whether for sale or rent, the housing market is tight in the City. The study identifies target units required in future years and staff is tracking incoming developments against these targets. The four housing market segments identified in the study include single family for sale, multifamily for sale, multifamily for rent and senior housing. These segments are then broken down further into sub categories based primarily on price point.

The table on the next page shows the estimated study targets and units that have been built in recent years. The DeSanctis development will fall into the shallow subsidy multifamily residential based on the developers target rental rates. These 84 units will add to the 20 units brought on in 2020 for a total of 104 units in this category that is projected to need a minimum of 205 units by 2030.

The product proposed has more of a townhome feel than a typical standard rental development. Architectural features include modified rooflines and entryways, direct front entries to units, attached garages and rooftop patios. The product includes a total of 20 one bedroom units, 24 two bedroom units and 16 three bedroom units. The three bedroom units are increasingly important for families with two or three children that choose to rent rather than purchase a single family home.
NOTIFICATION/COMMENTS
The City received a petition in opposition to the project on July 20, 2020. A copy of the petition is enclosed. Staff is also aware of another petition circulating online at change.org; however, this has not officially been submitted to the City as of the time of this writing.

PROCESS AND NEXT STEPS
PUDs are a two step process, the first step being a General Development Plan (GDP), the conceptual stage to determine if the land use and general design is appropriate for the site. In approving a GDP, several criteria listed in 17.72.070 Municipal Code are considered: community benefits, character and intensity of land use, potential impacts on schools, traffic and municipal services, preservation of open space, and economic impacts. Consistency with the comprehensive plan and official map were also considered.

Per the Municipal Code, the standard process for GPDs begin with a Plan Commission public hearing and recommendation, then City Council review and action. Given the state of emergency due to COVID-19, the Plan Commission did not meet on this item but was instead provided a staff report for comment on May 26, 2020. The City Council reviewed the GDP and staff report, which include PC considerations, and it was approved on June 9, 2020.

The SIP is step two in the PUD process. At this phase the applicant develops detailed architectural and engineering plans that staff reviews against municipal ordinances and other applicable State and Federal regulations and works with the project engineers and site designers to adjust the SIP as necessary.
Staff will work with the applicant to revise the SIP based on this review. The revised SIP will go before the City Council for consideration at the August 25th meeting. Also at that meeting City Council will consider an ordinance to amend Comprehensive Plan for this area, a development agreement for this project, the sale of the property, as well as the creation of a TID district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
Forward the enclosed resolution to City Council with a positive recommendation to approve the SIP for the Milltown Residences with the modifications described above as required by staff to adhere municipal regulations and professional best practices.

**ATTACHMENTS**
1. Petition
2. Resolution to recommend approval of the specific implementation plan for Milltown Residences
June 25, 2020

To: City Council of River Falls

From: Residents of West Division Street

Re: DeSanctis Park development

The development planned for land next to DeSanctis Park is a bad idea. The enjoyment and pleasure that the entire city of River Falls gets from this open area is an asset to the community. It is a benefit as people drive in from the west to see the beauty of all the green space.

Putting up 80+ units to block the view as people drive to town is a bad idea. Overrunning the park with 200+ more people living on top of the park is a bad idea. Having extra traffic at those intersections and up and down West Division is a bad idea. Allowing high density living and the cars / garbage / noise is a bad idea. Permitting those residents who will live there to have patios / parties on top of their garages while residents are trying to take a peaceful walk in the park is a bad idea.

I oppose putting in the 4 high-density apartment buildings at DeSanctis Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Lucy</td>
<td>N8897 106th St R.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Meyer</td>
<td>N8977 106th St R.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Meyer</td>
<td>N8929 1047th St R.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Lucy</td>
<td>552 North Winter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Casey</td>
<td>616 Field Ave. R.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Meyer</td>
<td>221 Lewis St. R.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SIP) FOR MILLTOWN RESIDENCES

WHEREAS, Three Sixty Real Estate, LLC submitted an application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for land adjacent to DeSanctis Park; and

WHEREAS, the PUD was requested to provide zoning flexibility density to allow a four-building (21 units per building) multifamily development in the R-1 zone; and

WHEREAS, the General Development Plan (GDP) was approved by City Council on June 9, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission reviewed the Specific Implementation Plan (SIP) on August 4, 2020, and found it to be in conformance with the approved GDP and recommended it be approved by City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Common Council reviewed the Specific Implementation Plan on August 25, 2020 and has found it to be in conformance with the approved GDP.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Common Council hereby approves the Specific Implementation Plan for the Milltown Residences.

Dated this 25th day of August 2020.

CITY OF RIVER FALLS

_____________________________
Dan Toland, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Amy White, City Clerk
Introduction

This report is provided monthly to update the Plan Commission on Community Development efforts for the past month, as well as to provide a look forward to the upcoming Plan Commission work.

Reporting Period:
April - July, 2020 (Due to Plan Commission meeting hiatus during Covid-19 pandemic.)

Next Plan Commission Meeting:
September 1, 2020

Items to note:
- Due to the pandemic, City strategic initiatives and Capital Improvement Plan revisions resulted in delays in the following key projects:
  - Update the Outdoor Recreation Plan
  - Update the Downtown Master Plan
  - Work on Mann Valley Corporate Park
  - Implementation of the city wayfinding program

Community Development Staff

Left to right: David Hovel, Zach Regnier, Brandy Howe, Crystal Raleigh, Tamarra Jaworski, Angie Bond, Amy Peterson, Sam Wessel, Keri Schreiner, Jason Raverty.
Planning and Zoning

• Current Planning
  o Annexations
    ▪ None
  o Development review
    ▪ 1300 S Main Street – completed
    ▪ Peregrine Terrace – completed
    ▪ Kwik Trip at Cemetery Road/STH 65 – plan review
    ▪ DeSanctis Townhomes – GDP approved 6/9/20; SIP in process
  o Variance – Board of Appeals
    ▪ 641 S. Main Street request for variance to shoreland setback
  o Subdivisions
    ▪ Engineering plan review for Sterling Ponds 2\textsuperscript{nd} Addition - approved
  o CSMs
    ▪ Working on CSM for property owner on 8\textsuperscript{th} Street
    ▪ Working on CSM for 7.09-acre parcel south of DeSanctis Park
  o ROW Vacation
    ▪ None
  o Extraterritorial Zoning/Subdivision
    ▪ Review of a waiver for subdivision review in the Town of Troy – recommended for denial by Plan Commission on 3/9; City Council review 7\textsuperscript{/}28/20.
    ▪ Rezoning of 5 CTH U in the Town of Troy; ETZ Committee 7/23/20 – Request denied unanimously
  o Town of Kinnickinnic Cooperative Boundary Agreement
    ▪ 7/14/20 City Council public hearing for a Special Use Permit request for an event barn at 1165 CTY Rd M – request denied

• Zoning ordinances/map amendments
  o Shoreland and Shoreland – Wetland zoning ordinances. Staff anticipates one more workshop and then sending the ordinance to the commission. [Put on hold]
  o S Wasson Ln Lot 1: request to rezone from R1 Single Family Low Density to R2 Multiple Family Medium Density to accommodate potential 10 townhome units
  o FEMA/DNR- required Floodplain Ordinance Revision to be completed by December 2020

• Plan Commission prep
  o August meeting

• Extraterritorial Zoning Committee (ETZ) meeting prep
  o Rezoning at 5 Mann Ln, Town of Troy

• HPC projects and meeting prep
  o Cancelled until further notice

• BID Board meeting prep
  o BID Board meeting held in July

• Mapping
  o Ongoing updates for the development projects map; Click here for map
  o Produce maps as-needed for various City departments

• Projects
  o Working with developer on 700 S Main Street concept
  o Quarterly tracking of new housing units per the City’s 2018 Housing Needs Analysis.
• Conferences/Trainings/Events
  o Attended Ethics for Planners training (Peterson)
  o All staff attended numerous internal trainings for new software, new phones, computer security
• Grant Writing
  o Exploring options for EDA grant
• Customer Service
  o Complete fence permits
  o Handle customer inquiries and code enforcement items

Economic Development
• Attended online Innovation Center Management Committee Meetings (Schreiner)
• Attended online River Falls Economic Development Corporation meeting (Schreiner)
• Treasurer and Secretary duties as well as Management Committee meetings for the EDC
• Helped to support businesses during COVID-19 (Schreiner and Peterson)
• Coordinated Recovery Revolving Loan Program (Schreiner)
• Finalize TID 15
• Assisted with the May 12 election
• Work on the creation of TID #16
• Worked on creating the Recovery Revolving Loan Program (Peterson and Schreiner)
• Member of the Recovery Revolving Loan Committee (Schreiner)
• Peterson lead Business Support Team during COVID-19
  o Check in calls to City businesses
  o Weekly check in calls to groceries and pharmacies
  o Bi-weekly check in calls to banks
  o Set economic metrics to track during COVID-19
• Continue to work with 360 Real Estate Solutions on the DeSanctis project
• Work with a developer on 700 S Main redevelopment area
• Sent 4 RFIs

Building and Inspections
• Aberdeen Place apartment buildings - completed commercial plumbing inspections on the last 4 buildings
• Accompanied State Inspector, Joe Merchak on inspections of the following;
  o The Garage Bike & Brews
  o The Depot
  o Montessori School
  o Aberdeen Place apartments
• Attended a CVTC Residential Construction advisory board meeting in Eau Claire
• Kinnic Falls ADA – remodel framing inspection for another two rooms
• The Garage Bike & Brews - completed an above ground plumbing inspection
• Westside Elementary – final inspection on bathroom remodel
• March 20th, started working remote 2½ days a week, some inspections completed using facetime technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permits (April – July 28)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142 Building Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 New Home Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Fence Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sign Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Premier River Falls, LLC, Aberdeen Place – insulation has been installed in the first two buildings
• The Depot, 315 River Street – completed 7 commercial plumbing inspections and 3rd floor insulation inspection; completed insulation inspections
• City Station, 308 River Street – multiple plumbing inspections & insulation inspection
• 1300, LLC/Gerrard, 1300 S. Main Street – attended a pre-construction meeting; permit issued and completed footing inspections, foundation walls are being installed
• Did not accompany state inspector to commercial inspection sites due to COVID
• Kristin Nelson Rental code enforcement issue – memo
• City Station, 308 River Street – insulation inspections completed
• River Falls Development, 798 Peregrine Circle – attended a pre-construction meeting; issued a building permit for a 12-unit apartment building
• Inspections for projects in occupied homes are being done virtually
• River Falls High School, 818 Cemetery Road – HVAC inspection completed
• Westside School, 1007 W. Pine Street – plumbing inspection completed
• River Falls Development, 798 Peregrine Circle – 12-unit apartment building, footing & foundations installed and underground plumbing inspection completed
• Westside School, 1007 W. Pine Street – kitchen plumbing inspection completed
• Aberdeen project, 3427, 3431, 3432 Aberdeen Place – Prelim final inspections completed, final/occupancy expected on July 30th

**Engineering**

• Internal Consulting Projects
  o North Interceptor Sewer & St. Croix Street Pond Reconstruction (TKDA 2020-21 Construction) - Delayed
  o Troy-Pomeroy Watermain Relocation (SEH)
  o Sterling Ponds Loop & Water Tower (SEH) – Delayed
  o Mann Valley Preliminary Design – ALTA and wetland only (SEH)
  o River Falls Police Department Building Reconstruction (Wold 2020 Construction)
• WisDOT Projects
  o Hoffman Place jug handle (Low Bidder is A1, Corre Engineering will do Construction Inspection)
  o Cemetery Road Reconstruct (AECOM 2021 Construction)
    ▪ Keeping involved in WisDOT and Kwik Trip coordination for their concurrent, adjacent projects
  o STH 29 between CTH FF and Cemetery Road – Reviewing 90% plans (AECOM 2021 Construction)
• Development review assistance regarding stormwater management, utility design, lot layouts, street and parking layouts, and traffic movements for the following sites:
  o Kwik Trip
  o DeSanctis/360
  o 700 S. Main Street
  o Moody’s CSM
• Stormwater
  o Submitted Annual MS4 Compliance in March
  o City is compliant for TMDL through 2025
  o Regnier doing bi-weekly erosion control inspections on all active construction sites
  o Working with public works for annual storm structure inspection
- Coordinating PW storm structure repairs
- Continuing Rain Barrel & Adopt A Pond programs
- City is compliant for TMDL through 2025, considering infiltration testing of existing ponds as time allows
- Reviewing grading and stormwater management for recently completed development projects

**Utilities**
- 2020 Sewer Line Grouting project has been bid and awarded
- Bidding/Construction for adjustments to accommodate WisDOT projects (Strand 2020 Construction)
- Working on utility adjustments to accommodate WisDOT projects, Pember to begin work on jughandle project week of June 29

**Streets/Traffic**
- Preparing 2020 Pavement Maintenance plan adjusted down due to Covid 19 (Includes mill & overlay, microsurface, chip seal, fog seal, and crack seal)
- Coordinate St. Croix County chip seal work
- Coordinate Powell Avenue bridge emergency repairs with PW and WisDOT

**Construction**
- Residential lateral inspections (ongoing)
- Preconstruction Meetings – Peregrine Terrace, Sterling Ponds – 2nd Addition, Sterling Ponds Cottages, 1300 S. Main Street
- Construction staking for small utility trench for Jughandle
- Utility abandonments for River Falls Montessori project
- Erosion control inspections
- Preparing for final acceptance of infrastructure for Sterling Ponds 2nd Addition and Highview Meadows 5th Addition

**Conferences/Trainings/Events**
- Raleigh and Regnier attended a U of M course on Pavement Preservation Techniques
- Regnier Spring ’20 Professional Engineering Exam delayed due to Covid 19
- All upcoming trainings have been cancelled.
- Staff looking to take advantage of free online ESRI ArcGIS training as time allows
- All engineering staff participated in Trench Safety and Utility Excavation training
- All engineering staff participated in Internet Security training
- Jaworski, Raleigh attended ESRI information sales meeting
- Jaworski did online ArcGIS training

**GIS**
- Mapping newly installed infrastructure
- Meeting with ESRI representatives and consultants to better understand future of ArcMap as it relates to online applications
- Working with RFPD on an online crime tracking map
- Mapping newly installed infrastructure, changes to parcels, and right of way
- Verifying survey data for CSMs and plats

**Capital Improvement Budget (CIP)/Operating Budget**
- Raverty is managing CIP
- All ComDev staff assisting
- Working on 2021-2022 Department Budgets for Bridges & Dams, Engineering, and Stormwater

**Covid 19**
- Worked on project decisions to postpone or delay due to Covid 19
o Regnier worked elections on April 7
o Raleigh to back-up Utilities/Operations team in case of emergency
o Staff is working 75% from remote locations, 25% in office

**Management**

- Moved team to work from home status
- Put staffing plan and new hires on hold
- Participated in Executive Team meetings, FERC meeting, Housing Authority meetings
- Hold weekly staff meetings, weekly individual staff check ins and staff 1:1 meetings
- Complete one staff person review
- Participate in COVID19 Operations Team
- Continue close discussions with developers and banks
- Met with three Plan Commission members
- Put department 60 day plan in place
- Prepared cuts to operating budget
- Assisted Housing Authority in holding a virtual Board meeting
- Began using Hubspot; new customer relations management (CRM) tool
- Continue close discussions with developers and banks
- Prepared ComDev Operating Budget (Schreiner)
- Prepared staff and elected officials for upcoming medical absence; on leave for 4+ weeks