

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Tuesday, December 5, 2017 @ 5:30 pm., Council Chambers

Economic Development Members Present: Neal (C), Rasmussen, Gehin & Peckham.
Others Present: Schock, Plaisance, Sippel, Jacobson & Mielke.

In accordance with Chapter 19, Wisc. Statutes, notice of this meeting was posted and sent to the Daily Herald in the proper manner.

The Economic Development Committee meeting was called to order by Chairperson Neal at 5:30 pm.

Approval of the Minutes from 11/16/17

Peckham commented that there was no response written to Rasmussen's question regarding if the note to the foundation would need to be paid off immediately from the purchase of that land by the City or if we could continue to make payments until it was paid off. Schock replied that he had talked to the Foundation and we could continue paying off as we have been. This will be fixed in the 11/16/17 minutes.

Motion by Rasmussen, second by Wagner to approve minutes once the above change is made. Motion passed 5-0

Discussion and Possible Action on the Disposition Strategy for Thomas Street Properties.

This discussion has happened in the past and we are now at a point where we can start analyzing the next steps.

Sippel presented research on the 28 parcels along Thomas Street that could potentially be redeveloped. The map indicates that the blue parcels include storm water after the new right of way. There are six narrow or oddly shaped lots that could possibly be combined with other properties.

Neal asked Sippel if there are any specific properties that should be RFP versus a bid. Schock believes we should take all parcels to an open RFP so that the developers see the vision of combining the properties. Neal also questioned if the City could retain any of the oddly shaped properties for amenities. Sippel thinks that we could wait and with the properties left over we could make green space and/or amenities. Rasmussen commented that historically the bidding process included current property owners to see if they were interested in adjacent properties. She believes the TID money that we can use for these properties brings in higher tax and land use. Alternative commercial or mixed use buildings on the developable sites would be what we owe the taxpayers. She also asked about the timeline of the RFP process and believes we should move ahead with the bid process because it is faster and we could ask them to give us the end use and process of their parcel. If there are no acceptable bids after the deadline we could move to an RFP and open the communication channel to potentially interested developers. Wagner then asked about the properties on Sherman Street from years ago and how many we had left. His suggestion was asking the homeowner if we could "give the adjacent land to them" when an oddly shaped or undeveloped parcel. He would like to figure out a way to get people (developers or current owners) to see the vision of combining the parcels. Peckham also wants the wording of the RFP to be reviewed and encourage creative combinations of adjacent properties that the city does not own. Schock replied that there are a lot of semantics and the RFP could be a shorter, simplified process by asking for their intended use/vision to start with. He also asked the committee who should review the submissions and when they should be brought back to ED for recommendations and then CISM and Public Works. Peckham asked what the timeline would be for the streamlined RFP, with an answer of 4-6 weeks submission deadline. Rasmussen believes we should run the RFP until the end of January and then bring it back to the February 6th ED meeting. ED will retain the decision making control because of the mission when looking at the use of land. Neal then asked Sippel if any of the other surrounding parcels were for sale currently because if they are they may look more attractive to combine them. All committee members believe the RFP process should be streamlined and enhanced with the map of for sale properties and that we should exhaust all options at the next ED meeting.

Motion made by Rasmussen, second by Peckham to pursue the RFP process and agrees that there should be a discussion at the next ED meeting on Sherman Street and 17th Avenue - Motion passed 5-0.

Discussion and Possible Action on the Proposed Cooperative Request for Proposals for the Properties at 2220-2222 and 2202 Grand Avenue.

The Community Development Department is currently working with the land owners of these properties on a Cooperative RFP process which makes it available to combine the parcels. The owners have formally approved the

release of the RFP in which they will review all submissions in the beginning of February. There has been some interest in these specific properties already.

Peckham appreciates Schock's work in this process and believes this will benefit the neighborhood and the City as a whole. Wagner questioned if this was a service that we are now offering. Schock replied that the City invented this Cooperative RFP process so that we could help the owners look at potential development possibilities and help market the sale and development in a more friendly way. Rasmussen agrees with Schock and thinks that with us helping with the redevelopment visions will certainly help these high visibility areas, such as this specific corner.

Motion made by Rasmussen, second by Peckham to move ahead with the Cooperative RFP. Motion passed 5-0.

Discussion and Possible Action on the Proposals Received for the 2018 Economic Development Marketing Plan.

Community Development has received four proposals for the broad marketing RFP. The goal is to suggest potential ideas and implementations for 2018.

Neal was glad to see four responses and found them all as more of introductory pieces with no specific economic development details, targeting and/or tactics. Peckham thinks CD should pick two and get more detailed information. He would like to see a detailed response including expectations, missions, results, etc. Wagner has the same thoughts and wants to know how they compete for us and how we evaluate them. Rasmussen is also glad to see the number of proposals and sees a good diversity in the offerings. She is excited to see the social media and online aspect and thinks that by embracing our local public access channel we can showcase the uniqueness of the community. Neal agrees, he wants to see the Economic Development aspect of marketing and wants to create the buzz to enhance our community's economy. Rasmussen believes these strategic marketing ideas can act in unison and they can both initiate the brand of Wausau both commercially and work force related. Peckham had a question on what marketing we are doing with Aplomb versus the marketing we are currently talking about. Schock explained that Aplomb was more of an external marketing and this strategy would be more internal. He believes there's rational to do both. Rasmussen also added that there is different messaging to business owners, employees and the community as a whole. These projects can work parallel and we need to work with different people sourcing, age differences, interests, etc. Neal agrees and believes we need a rich outreach to a range of audiences and Rasmussen added that we need to showcase things we have to do here for all of these audiences when they are not at work.

Motion made by Wagner, second by Peckham to move forward with Neal's assistance on strategy and achievement evaluations to be brought back to the next meeting. Motion passed 5-0.

Special Instructions or Directives to Staff:

Schock relayed that Sara M. will send an email out to the committee to see if a meeting will need to be held on December 21st. Sara will also send out options for the January meeting, as the schedule date is January 2nd and Chris will not be here.

Motion by Peckham, second by Gehin to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed 5-0.

Adjournment Time: 6:22 p.m.