City of Wayzata Housing and Redevelopment Authority
Meeting Agenda

Friday, August 8, 2014

7:30 am – 8:30 am
Wayzata City Hall Community Room
600 Rice Street East
Wayzata, MN 55391

1. Call to Order – Chairman Shaver

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes of April 24, 2014

4. Old Business
   a. Review Draft Business Subsidy Criteria & Public Financing Policy
   b. Update on Downtown Parking

5. New Business
   a. Introduce Don Uram, New Administrative Services Director

6. Next Meeting Date: October 23, 2104

7. Adjournment

HRA members present: T. Shaver, B. Ambrose, D. McGill, B. Petit, R. Wothe
HRA members absent: None
City Staff/HRA Executive Director present: Heidi Nelson
City Staff present: Becky Malone, Bryan Gadow
Also Present: Stacie Kvilvang of Ehlers & Associates, Jason Aarsvold of Ehlers & Associates

Chairman Shaver called the meeting of the HRA to order at 7:35 am.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
McGill motioned to approve the April 24, 2014, meeting agenda as presented, seconded by Ambrose The motion passed 5/0 by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES OF January 23, 2014
Wothe motioned to approve the January 23, 2014, minutes as presented, seconded by McGill. The motion passed 5/0 by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Review Parking Study and Financing Background Information

Gadow reviewed the Parking Study prepared in 2012 by SRF Consultants. This study includes the use of traffic models and on site evaluations in October and July. At this time the City has an overall surplus of parking spaces in the downtown area even though some areas may have a deficit. Depending on what could happen with the redevelopment of Zone 10, this could trigger a significant deficit in parking. Now that the study has been completed, the City needs to look at what financing solutions may be available and designs and capacity.

Shaver stated the study did not provide the same level of detail for both the east and the west side.

Gadow stated SRF did a scan of the whole community in October but the City felt there were key pieces missing including the bike travel in the western part of town. The City asked SRF to look at the western end more closely during July to get a better picture of peak usage in that area and also to look at different redevelopment scenarios specifically in Zone 10.

McGill stated the middle paragraph on page 9 of 28 indicates the City has assisted other communities in funding their public parking ramps. He asked if this was a matter of using the bonding capacity.

Stacie Kvilvang stated Ehlers & Associates has worked with other communities that equally have public parking facilities in their downtown areas. She stated this is a public financing method and there is typically two (2) ways to do this. One is tax abatement bonds and the other is statutory authorities that are specific for public owned parking. The City will need to look at what financing options they want to do including special assessments, use cash to buy down some of the debt or other sources such as the Presbyterian Homes development tax increment. The City could also consider assessing the benefiting properties in the area. There are some policy discussions the Council will need to have regarding charging for parking as well.

Shaver asked if the $1.3 million adjustment for the City owned lot was an appraised value.

Nelson clarified the amount is not an appraisal amount. It was more a market rate based on other sales in the area and the value used for establishing the TIF for Presbyterian Homes. There have been other entities interested in this lot but Presbyterian Homes has first right to the property. At this time they are interested in the property but not immediately.

Wothe asked what they would use the property for.

Nelson stated Presbyterian Homes has the first option until 2016. It could be used as small office/retail space to compliment the businesses across the street.

Shaver stated using the proceeds from the City owned property and a draw down on a portion of the City's funds on the TIF for the Presbyterian Homes project but 5% of this TIF was to be used for services that would support the density. He asked if there had been any study on what value the City could get from this TIF project to allow the City to continue to administer the burden and what is available.

Kvilvang stated the tax increment that is generated off this cannot be utilized for basic City services. They have to be reinvested for redevelopment purposes within the community. If the City wanted to use that 5%, the City would have to send it back to the County for redistribution and the City would only get their set percentage back to the general fund.

Shaver clarified it would be more beneficial to maximize these proceeds and use for redevelopment opportunities.

Nelson stated the TIF projections have been updated based on the first year of assessments. Once this has been evaluated it will be brought back to the HRA for further discussions.

Shaver stated one of the big questions that needs to be looked at is if this will be a pay for parking facility because this will have an impact of funding. He asked what the time frame is for the Council to resolve this issue.

Nelson stated there have been discussions with the Council. There are models throughout the Metro area regarding these types of facilities. She stated the expectations are that you do not pay for parking in the suburbs. The option of permitted spaces for employees is also being looked at.

Shaver stated the financing portion of this project will depend on the decision regarding free parking or paid parking. He stated the timing of this decision could have significant impact.

Petit stated there are a lot of pieces being presented but not a clear overall picture of the plan for the area. He asked if the Council had a big picture view of the project area so the HRA could provide more focused discussions and recommendations. He stated this is a critical junction in providing direction for the City. He stated the City needs to determine if they want to increase density in this area or not.

Ambrose stated in the past the City has always told businesses that they need to provide their own parking but if the larger community vision involves increasing the attraction to the City with the lake effect then there is more responsibility for the City to provide a place for these people once they come.

Petit asked what the Committee should be considering at this time.

Nelson stated for the Presbyterian Homes project, many of the improvements that are being constructed around that project were part of studies to analyze the traffic impacts and parking demand. One of the components of the Lake Effect project is a parking structure to add capacity to downtown. At this time it is difficult to know what will happen out of the Lake Effect Plan.

Petit asked if changes are the best solutions or if they are the best the City can do given what they have. He expressed concerns about the getting to the destination because the City will find a way to fund it. There are areas in town that use to be easy to get around but have gotten increasingly difficult due to traffic.

Gadow clarified Petit's concerns were regarding the street pattern getting from the north side of town to the lake front.

Petit clarified this is a large piece of his concerns.

Shaver stated with large project the City does require a traffic study. If the City continues to develop and grow it will take more time to get places, but the questions is what is considered acceptable time. The City is gearing up for more densification of the lake front. When Presbyterian Homes was done the traffic study at that time showed steps the City has already taken. He stated Petit's concerns lie in the Lake Effect study and the overall grand plan, what is the vision for the City and how are we going to do this. He stated the overall question would be "What do we want Wayzata to be?"

Nelson stated the City is looking at how to move forward and what implementation would look like. She stated there would be a design process that would include what the City wants it to look like and what the traffic and parking impacts would be of the designs. It is hard to know what the streets should be without knowing what the project will be for the area.

McGill stated at some point the City will need to figure out how to get people from Hwy 394 to the downtown area as well as getting around downtown.

Gadow stated this is preliminary at this time. The Lake Effect project would not be successful without letting people know and getting people to the area. The final destinations need to be designed before the infrastructure can be determined.

Shaver stated according to the study the City does not have a parking issue at this time but long term there is an issue. He asked the committee if this was something they wanted to continue to bring forward.

Petit asked if they City was going to have an aggressive parking idea, how much does the City really need, how much will fit in this area, and how to finance it. The size of the parking lot would affect the saturation of traffic in the area.

Shaver asked Staff what feedback they have received from the municipality.

Nelson stated the comments and questions brought up will be taken to the Council for consideration as they look at the next steps. There are significant impacts to the Muni operation because they have people there every day watching traffic and parking patterns. There will be a significant impact to the liquor store because people will not walk a significant distance to get these products. The City will have to make sure that this stays viable given the pressure of parking down there. The new restaurant opening will also put additional pressure on the parking. There are people from Presbyterian Homes not familiar with the on-site parking there so they are parking in front of the Muni. She stated as people become more familiar with this the parking will get better.

Shaver stated if the City ever sold the corner piece then something would have to be done otherwise nothing will work.

Petit clarified that the size of the parking ramp takes into account that this corner will be redeveloped.

Shaver clarified that it did.

Wothe asked if a City could have too much parking. If the City provides enough parking it will precipitate change because a developer would have their parking concerns addressed.

Petit restated that his concern is not the parking itself but rather the getting to the destination.

McGill stated there are people who think of solutions to problems before they are even identified so there would be solutions to Petit's concerns as well.

b. <u>Discuss Policy for Public Assistance for Redevelopment Projects</u>

Nelson stated this policy was to establish priorities so Staff can have good discussions with developers about what the City might consider participating in and what they are not interested in participating in. This would also keep the City in line with State law regarding what they should and should not be doing. She pointed out the memo outlines what criteria applicant must meet before the City would consider participating on page 28.

Shaver stated the priorities are a good initial filter process. He stated he understands the recommendation that the project offer some diversification to the City.

Petit stated in the past the City has accommodated developers so that they can do what they feel they must in order to pay for the land value and the City needs to determine if this is in the best interest of the City.

Ambrose stated there should not be assistance available for overpayment of land.

Kvilvang stated there are landowners that have unrealistic expectations of what their land is worth. Taking these landowners through the process will show them that it is not worth the amount they think so it will not get developed. Land is a function of what will be built there.

Petit asked if there were any loophole in the must meet criteria 1-10 on page 27.

Ambrose stated he would not like to see definitive yes and no answers for Item #1 but would like to see full reports. The HRA trusts Staff to do some screening when it comes to Item #2.

Shaver clarified this would provide a filter tool for Staff so they can determine if the project would even be considered.

Wothe stated the policy should provide some built in flexibility to handle things as they change.

Shaver suggested they discuss each of the items listed under Issues to consider on page 28. He stated based on discussion the HRA would like to see some flexibility in the policy. He stated he would like to see Staff filter projects prior to bringing them to the City for consideration. He asked for discussion regarding Item #3.

McGill stated overpayment of land and meeting design standards are already included in the 10 criteria the project must meet. He asked if the City would want to provide more public assistance for affordable housing.

Wothe stated the City currently has over 50% rental units and there is not a need for additional at this time.

The HRA discussed affordable housing and if they could restrict public assistance for these projects. It was the consensus of the HRA that they could not enact regulations that prevent affordable housing but the City did not have to provide public assistance for any rental projects including affordable and market value.

Nelson explained Item #8 would be reviewed in accordance with the Zoning Code.

Ambrose suggested not allowing public assistance for financial services buildings as well.

Wothe stated he would not agree with this as a limiting factor because this would be against what the community is.

Shaver asked if the City would waive or flex in the payment of fees. He suggested providing this flexibility to Staff. This is something that can be looked at as part of encouraging development.

Nelson stated flexibility in how these fees are paid would be good for the City.

Petit suggested eliminating this because it will put the City in a corner.

It was the consensus of the HRA to eliminate Item #4.

Shaver suggested the City continue to stay less than the statutory limits for the number of years assistance can be limited to.

It was the consensus of the HRA to continue to stay within the statutory limits for the number of years assistance can be limited to and use this as an additional negotiation tool.

Wothe stated he did not agree with Item #6 even though it already exists.

Nelson stated this was a way to pull in higher wage earners with higher disposable incomes in order to support our businesses.

Kvilvang stated State Statute requires the City to establish a minimum job requirement and wage floor. She suggested keeping the minimum job requirement number low. There is flexibility in this based on the development. The minimum wage is increasing and by 2016 it will be $9.00 per hour. She recommend not setting this high but to keep it realistic. This is just the base floor.

Shaver clarified this had to be set as policy in order to provide assistance.

Nelson stated this was correct.

It was the consensus of the HRA to set the minimum job requirement at 1 and use 150% of minimum wage as the wage floor.

Nelson stated Staff will work on a draft policy and bring back to the HRA in July.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Shaver asked what date would work in July for the HRA to meet.

It was the consensus of the HRA to schedule the July meeting to July 29, 2014.

OLD BUSINESS
None.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business; Wothe motioned to adjourn at 9:00 a.m., McGill seconded the motion and the motion carried 5/0.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Malone
Deputy City Clerk
City of Wayzata

Drafted by Tina Borg, *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

Memo

To: Heidi Nelson, City Manager

From: Jason Aarsvold, Ehlers

Date: July 24, 2014

Subject: Business Subsidy Criteria and Public Financing Policy

---

On April 24, 2014, the HRA met to provide feedback on the key provisions that would serve as the basis for creation of a formal Business Subsidy Criteria and Public Financing Policy for redevelopment projects in Wayzata. The consensus from that meeting was to create a Policy that meets statutory requirements, contains best practices and also includes the following:

- Flexibility, recognizing the unique nature of redevelopment projects and avoiding a one size fits all approach
- Appropriate guidance for staff and advisors to act as a filter for proposed projects, ensuring they meet the spirit and intent of the policy before bringing them forward to the HRA or City Council
- A willingness to use the maximum number of years allowed by statute for TIF districts when warranted
- No elaborate job and wage goals, since this is not the primary public purpose of redevelopment in Wayzata. Job and wage goals should meet the statutory requirements and provide for flexibility.

In addition, direction was given on specific issues, statutory requirements and areas of request as follows:

- Statement that public assistance will not be provided where project costs are inflated as a result of overpayment for land
- Public assistance will not be provided for rental housing
- Forgiveness of city fees would generally not be considered
- The statutory wage floor should be set at 150% of federal minimum wage

EHLERS
LEADERS IN PUBLIC FINANCE

www.ehlers-inc.com

Minnesota
Offices also in Wisconsin and Illinois

phone 651-697-8500
fax 651-697-8555
toll free 800-552-1171

3060 Centre Pointe Drive
Roseville, MN 55113-1122

Attached to this memorandum is a draft policy that incorporates the feedback above as well as standard and customary language that is typical for this type of policy. Once the HRA has had a chance to review and provide any further comments/changes, we would recommend that they formally approve it at their next meeting. Following the HRA's approval, the City Council is required to hold a public hearing to formally adopt the policy. Upon formal approval, Ehlers will submit the policy to the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) as required by Statute.

Please contact me at 651-697-8512 with any questions.

City of Wayzata
Business Subsidy Criteria and Public Financing Policy
DRAFT July 24, 2014

INTRODUCTION:

This Policy is adopted for purposes of the business subsidies act, which is Minnesota Statutes, Sections 116J.993 through 116J.995 (the “Statutes”). Terms used in this Policy are intended to have the same meanings as used in Statutes. Subdivision 3 of the Statutes specifies forms of financial assistance that are not considered a business subsidy. This list contains exceptions for several activities, including redevelopment, pollution clean-up, and housing, among others. By providing a business subsidy, the city commits to holding a public hearing, as applicable, and reporting annually to the Department of Employment and Economic Development on job and wage goal progress.

1. PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

A. The purpose of this document is to establish criteria for the City of Wayzata for granting of business subsidies and City public financing for private development within the City. These criteria shall be used as a guide in processing and reviewing applications requesting business subsidies and/or City public financing.

B. The City's ability to grant business subsidies is governed by the limitations established in the Statutes. The City may choose to apply its Business Subsidy Criteria to other development activities not covered under this statute. City public financing may or may not be considered a business subsidy as defined by the Statutes.

C. Unless specifically excluded by the Statutes, business subsidies include grants by state or local government agencies, contributions of personal property, real property, infrastructure, the principal amount of a loan at rates below those commercially available to the recipient of the subsidy, any reduction or deferral of any tax or any fee, tax increment financing (TIF), abatement of property taxes, loans made from City funds, any guarantee of any payment under any loan, lease, or other obligation, or any preferential use of government facilities given to a business.

D. These criteria are to be used in conjunction with other relevant policies of the City. Compliance with the Business Subsidy Criteria and City Public Financing Guidelines shall not automatically mean compliance with such separate policies.

E. The City may deviate from these criteria by documenting in writing the reason(s) for the deviation. The documentation shall be submitted to the Department of Employment and Economic Development with the next annual report.

F. The City may amend this document at any time. Amendments to these criteria are subject to public hearing requirements contained in the Statutes.

2. BUSINESS SUBSIDY PUBLIC PURPOSE REQUIREMENT

A. All business subsidies must meet a public purpose with measurable benefit to the City as a whole. Public purpose may include, but not be limited to: diversification of the local economy, creating needed services or facilities not currently available, redeveloping and removing blight and encouraging redevelopment in the commercial areas of the City in order to encourage high levels of property maintenance and private reinvestment in those areas, retaining local jobs, increasing the job base, and providing diversity in that job base, enhancing existing jobs through increased wages, encouraging additional unsubsidized private development in the area, either directly, or through secondary "spin off" development, offsetting increased costs of redevelopment over and above those costs that a developer would incur in normal urban and suburban development, and meeting other uses of public policy, as adopted by the Council from time to time including the promotion of quality urban design, quality architectural design, energy conservation, decreasing the capital and operating costs of local government, etc.

B. Job retention may only be used as a public purpose in cases where job loss is specific and demonstrable. The City shall document the information used to determine the nature of the job loss.

C. The creation of tax base shall not be the sole public purpose of a subsidy.

D. Unless the creation of jobs is removed from a particular project pursuant to the requirements of the Statutes, the creation of jobs is a public purpose for granting a subsidy. Creation of at least one Full Time Equivalent (FTE) job is a minimum requirement for consideration of assistance.

E. The wage floor for wages to be paid for the jobs created shall be not less than 150% of Federal Minimum Wage. The City will seek to create jobs with higher wages as appropriate for the overall public purpose of the subsidy. Wage goals may also be set to enhance existing jobs through increased wages, which increase must result in wages higher than the minimum under this Section.

F. After a public hearing, if the creation or retention of jobs is determined not to be a goal, the wage and job goals may be set at zero.

3. SUBSIDY AGREEMENT

A. In granting a business subsidy, the City shall enter into a subsidy agreement with the recipient that provides the following information: wage and job goals (if applicable), commitments to provide necessary reporting data, and recourse for failure to meet goals required by the Statutes.

B. The subsidy agreement may be incorporated into a broader development agreement for a project.

C. The subsidy agreement will commit the recipient to providing the reporting information required by the Statutes.

4. CITY'S OBJECTIVE FOR THE USE OF PUBLIC FINANCING

A. As a matter of adopted policy, the City may consider using public financing which may include tax increment financing (TIF), tax abatement, bonds, and other forms of public financing as appropriate, to assist private development projects when such assistance complies with all applicable statutory requirements to:

1. Remove blight and/or encourage redevelopment in designated redevelopment/development area(s) per the goals and visions established by the HRA and City Council.

2. Diversify the local economy and tax base.

3. Encourage additional unsubsidized private development in the area, either directly or through secondary "spin-off" development.

4. Offset increased costs for redevelopment over and above the costs that a developer would incur in normal urban and suburban development (determined as part of the But-For analysis).

5. Facilitate the development process and promote development on sites that could not be developed without this assistance.

6. Retain local jobs and/or increase the number and diversity of quality jobs

7. Meet other uses of public policy, as adopted by the City Council from time to time, including but not limited to promotion of quality urban design, quality architectural design, energy conservation, sustainable building practices, and decreasing the capital and operating costs of local government.

5. PUBLIC FINANCING PRINCIPLES

A. The guidelines and principles set forth in this document pertain to all applications for City public financing regardless of whether they are considered a Business Subsidy as defined by the Statutes. The following general assumptions of development/redevelopment shall serve as a guide for City public financing:

1. All viable requests for City public financing assistance shall be reviewed by staff, and, if staff designates so, a third party financial advisor who will inform the City of its findings and recommendations.

2. The City shall establish mechanisms within the development agreement to ensure that adequate checks and balances are incorporated in the distribution of financial assistance where feasible and appropriate, including but not limited to:

   a. Third party review of the “but for” analysis

   b. Establishment of “look back provisions”

   c. Establishment of minimum assessment agreements

3. TIF and abatement will be provided on a pay-as-you-go-basis. Any request for upfront assistance will be evaluated on its own merits and may require security to cover any risks assumed by the City.

4. The City will set up TIF districts in accordance with the maximum number of statutory years allowable. However, this does not mean that the developer will be granted assistance for the full term of the district.

5. The City will elect the fiscal disparities contribution to come from inside applicable TIF district(s) to eliminate any impact to the existing tax payers of the community.

6. Public financing will not be used to support speculative commercial, office or housing projects. In general the developer should be able to provide market data, tenant letters of commitment or finance statements which support the market potential/demand for the proposed project.

7. Public financing will not be used in projects that would give a significant competitive financial advantage over similar projects in the area due to the use of public subsidies. Developers should provide information to support that assistance will not create such a competitive advantage. Priority consideration will be given to projects that fill an unmet market need.

8. Public financing will not be used in a project that involves a land and/or property acquisition price in excess of fair market value.

9. TIF and Abatement will not be utilized for the construction of new rental housing units.

10. The developer will pay all applicable application fees and pay for the City and HRA’s fiscal and legal advisor time as stated in the City’s Public Assistance Application.

11. The developer shall proactively attempt to minimize the amount of public assistance needed through the pursuit of grants, innovative solutions in structuring the deal, and other funding mechanisms.

6. PROJECTS WHICH MAY QUALIFY FOR PUBLIC FINANCING ASSISTANCE

A. All new applications for assistance considered by the City must meet each of the following minimum qualifications. However, it should **not** be presumed that a project meeting any of the qualifications will automatically be approved for assistance. Meeting the qualifications does not imply or create contractual rights on the part of any potential developer to have its project approved for assistance.

6.1 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS:

A. In addition to meeting the applicable requirements of State law, the project shall meet one or more of the Public financing objectives outlined in Section 4; and shall either:

1. Remove blight and/or encourage redevelopment in the City in order to encourage high quality development or redevelopment and private reinvestment in those areas; OR

2. Facilitate the development process to achieve development on sites which would not be developed without this assistance.

B. The developer must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that the project is not financially feasible "but for" the use of tax increment or other public financing.

C. The project must be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinances, Design Guidelines or any other applicable land use documents.

D. Prior to approval of a financing plan, the developer shall provide any requested market and financial feasibility studies, appraisals, soil boring, private lender commitment, and/or other information the City or its financial consultants may require in order to proceed with an independent evaluation of the proposal.

E. The developer must provide adequate financial guarantees to ensure the repayment of any public financing and completion of the project. These may include, but are not limited to, assessment agreements, letters of credit, personal deficiency guarantees, guaranteed maximum cost contract, etc.

F. Any developer requesting assistance must be able to demonstrate past successful general development capability as well as specific capability in the type and size of development proposed. Public financing will not be used when the developer's credentials, in the sole judgment of the City, are inadequate due to past history relating to completion of projects, general reputation, and/or bankruptcy, or other problems or issues considered relevant to the City.

G. The developer, or its contractual assigns, shall retain ownership of any portion of the project long enough to complete it, to stabilize its occupancy, to establish project management and/or needed mechanisms to ensure successful operation.

6.2 DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS:

A. Projects providing higher than a 3 to 1 ratio of private investment to City public investment will receive priority consideration. Private investment includes developer cash, government and bank loans, conduit bonds, tax credit equity, and land if already owned by the developer.

B. Proposals that significantly increase the amount of property taxes paid after redevelopment will receive priority consideration.

C. Proposals that encourage the following will receive priority consideration:

1. Implementation of the City's values and vision for its lakefront, as detailed in the Lake Effect Design Framework

2. Adding needed road, access and multi-modal improvements

3. Contributes additional public parking

4. Alleviates the need for additional public parking

5. Provides significant improvement to surrounding land uses, the neighborhood, and/or the City

6. Attracts or retains a significant employer within the City

7. Provides significant rehabilitation of an existing apartment complex or significant rehabilitation and/or expansion of existing office or commercial facility

D. Preference will be given to projects that meet good public policy criteria as determined by the City Council, including:

1. High project quality (e.g. sound architectural design, quality construction and materials, sustainable building practices)

2. Projects that meet financial feasibility criteria established by the City

3. Projects that provide the highest and best desired use for the property

7. PUBLIC FINANCING PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS

A. The following methods of analysis for all public financing proposals will be used:

1. Consideration of project meeting minimum qualifications

2. Consideration of project meeting desired qualifications

3. Project meets "but-for" analysis and/or statutory qualifications

4. Project is deemed consistent with City's Goals and Objectives

Please note that the evaluation methodology is intended to provide a balanced review. Each area will be evaluated individually and collectively and in no case should one area outweigh another in terms of importance to determining the level of assistance.

Adopted by the Wayzata HRA _____, 2014

Adopted by the Wayzata City Council ________, 2014

City of Wayzata
600 Rice Street East • Wayzata, MN 55391 • Phone (952) 404-5300 • Fax (952) 404-5318

APPLICATION FOR PUBLIC FINANCING

Applicant Information

1. **Applicant Name:** ______________________________

   (Name should be the officially registered name of the business entity.)

   Address: ______________________________

   Telephone: ______________ Email Address: ______________

2. **Name of Person Completing the application:** ______________

   Address: ______________________________

   Telephone: ______________ Email Address: ______________

3. **Names and Addresses of Architect, Engineer, and General Contractor for this project:**

   Attorney Name: ______________________________
   Address: ______________________________
   Telephone: ______________ Email Address: ______________

   Architect Name: ______________________________
   Address: ______________________________
   Telephone: ______________ Email Address: ______________

   Engineer Name: ______________________________
   Address: ______________________________
   Telephone: ______________ Email Address: ______________

   General Contractor Name: ______________________________
   Address: ______________________________
   Telephone: ______________ Email Address: ______________

4. **If the applicant is a corporation, please name officers, directors, or stockholders holding more that 5% of the stock of the corporation. If the corporation is not formed, provide as much information as possible concerning potential officers, directors, or stockholders:**

   ____

4a. If the applicant is a general partnership, name of the general partners and if a limited partnership, state the general partners and limited partners with more than 5% interest in the limited partnership. If the partnership is not formed, provide as much information as possible concerning potential officers, directors or stockholders.

4b. Has the applicant ever been in bankruptcy? If yes, please describe the circumstances.

Yes (please Explain): ______

No: ____

4c. Has the applicant ever been convicted of a felony? Is yes, please describe the circumstances.

Yes (please Explain): ______

No: ____

4d. Has the applicant ever defaulted on any bond or mortgage commitment?

Yes (please Explain): ______

No: ____

Project Information

1. PID#'s, legal description, address, and size of project site:

PID#: ______

Address: ______

Legal Description: ______

Size of Project Size (Acres): ____

2. **Current ownership of the site:**________________________________

3. **Do you have current control of the site:**

   Yes: _______

   No: _______

4. **Project description.**

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

5. **If property is to be subdivided or replatted, please describe.**

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

6. **Estimated project costs: (Please enclose detailed sources and uses and 15-year operating *Pro Forma*).**

   a. Land Acquisition: $_________________________

   b. Environmental/Soil Corrections: _________________________

   c. Surveys: _________________________

   d. Public Improvements: _________________________

   e. Site Development: _________________________

   f. Demolition: _________________________

   g. Building(s): _________________________

      Shell (if applicable) _________________________

      Tenant Improvements (if applicable) _________________________

   h. FF&E: _________________________

   i. Architectural & Engineering Fees: _________________________

   j. Legal Fees/Other Consulting Fees: _________________________

   k. Financing Costs: _________________________

   l. Construction Interest: _________________________

   m. Title Insurance: _________________________

   n. Mortgage Registration: _________________________

o. Bank/Borrower Legal: ____________________
p. Recording/Closing: ____________________
q. Construction Loan Fees: ____________________
r. SAC/WAC: ____________________
s. Park Dedication: ____________________
t. Appraisal: ____________________
u. Taxes: ____________________
v. Contingencies (construction): ____________________
w. Contingencies (soft): ____________________
x. Other: ____________________

TOTAL $____________________

7. Source of Financing

a. Equity: $____________________
b. Bank Financing: ____________________
c. Public Assistance:
(TIF or Tax Abatement) ____________________
d. Other governmental loans/grants: ____________________
e. Deferred Developer Fees: ____________________
f. Other: ____________________

TOTAL $____________________

Terms of Financing (years): ________________

Rate of Financing: ____________________

Cap Rate: ____________________________

8. Project Construction Schedule:

a. Construction Start Date: ____________________
b. Construction Completion Date: ____________________
c. If Phased Project :

January 2, (year) ________ % Completed _______

January 2, (year) _________ % Completed _______

9. **Total Estimated Market Value of Project upon completion** $____________

10. **Please indicate how the project would meet one or more of Wayzata's Economic Development Goals (identify goal and state reason):**
    1. Implementation of the City's values and vision for its lakefront, as detailed in the Lake Effect Design Framework
    2. Adding needed road, access and multi-modal improvements
    3. Contributes additional public parking
    4. Alleviates the need for additional public parking
    5. Provides significant improvement to surrounding land uses, the neighborhood, and/or the City
    6. Attracts or retains a significant employer within the City
    7. Provides significant rehabilitation of an existing apartment complex or significant rehabilitation and/or expansion of existing office or commercial facility

    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____

11. **Please explain how the proposed either contributes to or alleviates the need for additional public parking.**

    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____

12. **Will any public official of the City, either directly or indirectly, benefit from the issuance of public assistance within the meaning of Minnesota Statutes, Section 412.311 or 471.87? If yes, please explain the circumstances.**

    Yes (please Explain): ______________________________
    ____
    ____

    No: __________

1. **Amount of assistance and term.**

   Amount: ______________

   Term (years): __________

2. **Describe the purpose for which Public Assistance (TIF or Tax Abatement) is required.**

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

3. **Please submit an itemized list of project costs for which TIF assistance is being requested.**

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

4. **State specific reasons why, "but for" the use of public assistance, this project would not be possible.**

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

Application Process

1. **The following documents must accompany the Application:**

   A. A detailed sources & uses statement and 15-year project *Pro Forma*

   B. Parcel Map depicting the proposed redevelopment area

   C. Site plans and floors plans (as available)

   D. Significant additional information may be requested at any time by the City/HRA and may be in addition to the materials outlined in this application. The Applicant shall be required to submit any and all information as requested by the City/HRA.

2. Applicant acknowledges and agrees to pay the $3,000 Public Assistance Application Fee and is **non-refundable**.

3. At the time of acceptance by staff of the Public Financing Application, the applicant shall deposit $10,000 with the City/HRA to cover attorney and consultant costs incurred as part of establishing a TIF district or abatement, drafting and negotiating a development agreement, and conducting any fiscal analysis that may be required to meet the requirements of utilizing any public financing. If additional expenses are incurred beyond the $10,000, prior to the execution of a development agreement, the City/HRA shall notify the applicant in writing and the applicant will be required to deposit additional funds upon notice.

4. The Applicant shall hold the City/HRA, its officers, consultants, attorneys, and agents harmless from any and all claims arising from or in connection with the Project or Public Assistance Application, including but not limited to, any legal or actual violations of any State or Federal securities laws.

5. The Applicant recognizes and agrees that the City/HRA reserves the right to deny any application for Public Assistance at any stage of the proceedings prior to adopting the resolution approving the public assistance, that the Applicant is not entitled to rely on any preliminary actions by the City/HRA prior to the final resolution, and that all expenditures, obligations, costs, fees, or liabilities incurred by the Applicant in connection with the Project are incurred by the Applicant at its sole risk and expense and not in reliance on any actions of the City/HRA.

   The undersigned, a duly authorized representative of the Applicant, hereby certifies that the foregoing information is true, correct, and complete as of the date hereof and agrees that the Applicant shall be bound by the terms and provisions herein.

______________________________	______________________________
APPLICANT'S NAME	DATE
______________________________	______________________________
CITY ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATION	DATE
$____________________	______________________________
FEE AMOUNT REMITTED	DATE