

JOHN R. MCNAMARA, P.E., L.S.  
County Surveyor  
SKY K. MEDORS, P.E.  
County Engineer  
WILLIAM S. SCHALLIOL, ESQ.  
Executive Dir. of Economic Development  
ABBY E. WILES, AICP  
Executive Dir. of Area Plan Commission



DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING & GROWTH

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
ANDREW T. KOSTIELNEY  
District 1  
DEREK D. DIETER  
District 2  
DEBORAH A. FLEMING, D.M.D.  
District 3

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**May 11, 2021, at 9:00 a.m.**

**REDEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION**

**Members Present: Larry Beehler; By Zoom: Brian Pawlowski, Dennis Jordan,  
Shirley Rynearson, Thomas Gryp, Jason Critchlow**  
**Staff Present: Bill Schalliol, Chris Brown, Jamie Woods, Samantha Keultjes**

**MEMBERS**

**Brian Pawlowski**  
President  
Board of Commissioners Appt.

**Dennis Jordan**  
Vice-President  
Board of Commissioners Appt.

**Shirley Rynearson**  
Member  
Board of Commissioners Appt.

**Thomas Gryp**  
Member  
Council Appointment

**Jason Critchlow**  
Member  
Council Appointment

**Larry Beehler**  
Advisory Member  
PHM School Corporation Appt.

**Jamie Woods, Esq.**  
Counsel

1. Meeting Called to Order by Brian Pawlowski at 9:00 a.m.
2. Approval of Minutes
  - a. April 13, 2021 – Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission

Upon a motion by Jason Critchlow, being seconded by Dennis Jordan and unanimously carried, the April 13, 2021 Redevelopment Commission meeting minutes were approved.

\*JUMP TO AGENDA ITEM 4a.\*

3. Economic Development Area Updates (Audio Position: 13:00)
  - a. General Redevelopment Commission
    - i. Budget Information (April report)
      1. Wyatt EDA – Fund 4300
      2. New Carlisle EDA – Fund 4301 (AA #2)
      3. New Carlisle EDA – Fund 4302 (AA #1)
      4. New Carlisle EDA – Fund 4303 (Special Taxing District)
      5. Capital Avenue EDA – Fund 4401
      6. Northwest Cleveland Road EDA – Fund 4402
      7. General Redevelopment Commission – Fund 4403
      8. Double Track Bond – Fund 4404

Chris Brown: Before you is the budget for April. When we look at the budget narrative, I've broken it down into those major categories again. So, the allocation area, there were some legal services, financial services for prospect modeling, some work regarding the FAARPZ application that we have in for the realignment of the South Shore. There's been a lot of work being done on Capital Avenue with the Capital Avenue Corridor Trailways visioning. We had a couple of higher priced consultant items on that contract this month. Then just kind of general Redevelopment Commission disposition and easement requests for Outlots B & C at the airport as well as some work on the tax abatements that are going through right now. If there are any questions, I'd be

PLANNING & ZONING | PUBLIC WORKS | SURVEYOR | DRAINAGE | ENVIRONMENTAL | ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

happy to answer them.

Jason Critchlow: Do you have an update on the Capital Avenue Trail project?

Bill Schalliol: Yes, we have two different projects out right now. One is some design elements for specific elements of the trail so Capital Avenue between the bridge and Jefferson, those plans and specs should be completed shortly. A little segment of trail next to Lincoln Way, from Capital to Riviera Dr and then also Capital to Currant Road on McKinley. Both of those we had to do some additional survey work so that work is done. So, we should have at least plans and specs for the section from bridge to Jefferson done, the other segments are in the process of being finished up. We've got a neighborhood meeting we want to set with the neighbors in the Riviera Dr neighborhood to talk with a couple different alternatives there. We're meeting with the City on Thursday to talk through that concept a little bit. So, we should be in a position to have some conversation about next steps for funding of that project. Right now, we have several Capital Avenue projects that we'll talk about late that talk about funding, so we'll need to talk about priority of next steps of funding some of those things. The other piece of that is a visioning study that we were working on. Information is being gathered with that and I know that they're in the process of getting GIS maps put together so that they can start doing some predevelopment on the visioning study.

- ii. Request approval to provide notice to taxing units for Overlapping Taxing Units Presentation (June Meeting) (Audio Position: 15:55)

Bill Schalliol: Every year the Redevelopment Commission is required to make a presentation and make an offer to all of the underlying taxing units. Last year we did it in December. Typically, we do it in June. So, I would request for your permission to advertise to the underlying taxing units for a presentation for the June meeting. Mr. Dalton would be making that presentation.

Upon a motion by Jason Critchlow, being seconded by Dennis Jordan and unanimously carried, the request to provide notice to taxing units for Overlapping Taxing Units Presentation was approved.

- b. New Carlisle Economic Development Area (NCEDA) (Audio Position: 17:00)

- i. Request permission to rezone RDC owned properties (56340 Willow Road, 56458 Willow Road, 31917 SR 2) and file Written Zoning Commitments

Bill Schalliol: This is a request for permission to rezone three properties owned by the Redevelopment Commission. Those properties are at the northeast corner of Willow and SR 2. We had previously gone through a rezoning process with those properties and it was unsuccessful six months ago. Conditions have changed and we believe that a rezoning for those properties would be favorable this time around. We have included a set of written zoning commitments that would be similar to all the other rezonings being done out in that area. We ask for your permission to file the rezoning request and the written commitments for the June Area Plan Commission meeting and final discussion and approval in July.

Tom Gryp: Did you say that going back we changed certain things in the request?

Bill Schalliol: So, we added more detail in the written commitments. That was one of the complaints, is that the written commitments didn't match the other written commitments in the area. That was more an oversight between the Council and us with what they were asking for so we believe this

time around with that change and some changes in the larger conversation about what's happening in the IEC, that adding these three properties to this larger rezoning area should move favorably through. The reason we're seeking to rezone these is as we have nearly finished all the information that we need for site certification, having these properties zoned properly to I would be consistent with the site certification request that we would seek to file this summer.

Jason Critchlow: One of the comments I heard come from the Council during that meeting was that there was an overall feeling of "there's a lot of property out there zoned properly right now, why don't we have developers there before we rezone more property." If that's the same response that you get, what will you respond with?

Bill Schalliol: I think one of the things we've seen here recently with lead requests that have come through, one of the concerns is having that buffer of ag land in the corner creates complications for some of the lead response. If we were going to include those properties in a sale to a prospect, it creates some complications as far as mixed uses that are noncompatible. So, having everything zoned the same makes the larger IEC site more compatible for development. It's 24 acres so it would add 24 more acres to that industrial zoning but it makes the area more consistent and blocks it in.

Tom Gryp: Are there any additional rezoning necessary to achieve what you're trying to get to with this one?

Bill Schalliol: No, so this would be the final rezoning that really is necessary in the block of rezonings. We do have a rezoning in front of the Council tonight for some property at the southwest corner of Edison and Larrison that would finish off the IEC Site 2 Area. This would finish off IEC Site 1. So it really is the last request that we would anticipate filing for rezoning in the near term.

Upon a motion by Dennis Jordan, being seconded by Brian Pawlowski and carried 4-1, the request permission to rezone RDC owner properties and file Written Commitments was approved.

- ii. Professional Service Proposals (Audio Position: 21:20)  
(Parcels 1,2, and 4, and 51650 Larrison Boulevard)
  - 1. Appraisal Services – Various Properties (Iverson Grove)
  - 2. Appraisal Services – Various Properties (Appraisal Specialists)

Bill Schalliol: These are both appraisal service requests. Back in 2016 the Redevelopment Commission pre-IEC was working on two main projects. One was a study of Regional Detention in the New Carlisle Economic Development Area. The second project was a rail study and the ability to introduce Norfolk Southern Rail into the New Carlisle Economic Development Area. As part of work done back then, Norfolk Southern, in addition to Ken Hersing and Associates, now Donahugh & Associates, and their Redevelopment Commission were under contract to work together to design a rail, a lead track into the development areas. Part of that work, we had appraised several properties. Three properties in particular now rise to a point as we look to introduce rail into the area. Parcel 1,2 and 4. These were properties that were appraised back in 2016 but due to economic conditions and acquisitions around the area, we would need to do updated appraisals if we were going to seek to acquire those properties. Specifically, in Parcel 1 and Parcel 4, we only actually received one appraisal and then we did a review appraisal. State Law would require the Redevelopment Commission to obtain two independent appraisals if it was to seek to acquire property. So the proposal is

to seek new appraisals on those three properties. We're using two new appraisers than we used in 2016. Then a related request is to update a valuation of 51650 Larrison Blvd. There are two proposals. One from Iverson Grove and one from Appraisal Specialists and if there are any questions about those appraisals, I would be happy to answer them.

Tom Gryp: How did you choose those two?

Bill Schalliol: Part of the challenge is, there really is a limited pool of appraisers that do work in St Joe County, but just that are available to do work. A lot of them are doing bank appraisal work and so as we've approached the appraisal community, they're very few that have capacity to do work. The other thing with both of these appraisers, they're both MAI appraisers so they have a higher level of certification than some of the other appraisers. We've used these two appraisers in the past and they consistently have valuations that are at a tolerance point that we feel they do very good work and do good value for the Redevelopment Commission.

Jason Critchlow: The owners of the land, they're all privately owned. Well, one is publicly owned by the Town of New Carlisle.

Bill Schalliol: Correct.

Jason Critchlow: So if we were to develop these, would we be purchasing them at some point?

Bill Schalliol: That would be the next step in the process, yes. And we actually have had conversations with all four of the property owners. The three in the rail corridor we've worked with for years and have never pulled the trigger on those. We tried on Parcel 2 but just couldn't get to a valuation that made sense for either party. So, it's just a matter of with the Town and with shared assets, just getting updated numbers so that everybody is comfortable with current values.

Jason Critchlow: Are these all inside the core development area?

Bill Schalliol: So they're not only within the core development area, but they're also on our acquisition list. So, in both situations they're covered in planning.

Upon a motion by Dennis Jordan, being seconded by Shirley Rynearson and unanimously carried, Appraisal Services with Iverson Grove and Appraisal Specialists were approved.

b. New Carlisle Economic Development Area (NCEDA) – Continued

iii. Request approval to study potential boundary changes to the NCEDA (Audio Position: 26:00)

Bill Schalliol: One of the things that staff is required to do before its able to legally present any proposed boundary changes to a development area is request approval to study those potential boundary changes. We have a couple of boundary changes for the New Carlisle Economic Development Area that may be necessitated by development projects or by other development goals in the area. The staff would request the ability to study potential boundary changes and then

make a report to the Redevelopment Commission if there is a need to move forward on those. Staff would request approval to do that.

Jason Critchlow: Why do you need approval to study boundary changes as a staff?

Bill Schalliol: It's based on the way that State Law is that that's the first step in the process so instead of just us bringing you a Resolution that says here's a change to the development area, we have to ask for that approval to make that consideration.

Tom Gryp: So obviously you're doing this in order to prepare to change the boundaries. Can you give us a sense of what the big picture plan is please?

Bill Schalliol: There's one development project on the northern end of this site that may require being included into the development area for purposes of a development agreement. On the southern end along SR 2, as we continue to get design improvement concepts for the intersection of 2 and Larrison, the development area ends before it gets all the way to Snowberry Road, so there's the potential to need to add some property to the development area for that purpose. So again, we're going to study the area, if after study we deem that there's a need to do that, we would give you a report that would highlight those needs and then that would allow us then to move forward if we find a reasonable need to make those changes.

Jason Critchlow: This is outside of the Comprehensive Plan?

Bill Schalliol: Correct.

Upon a motion by Brian Pawlowski, being seconded by Dennis Jordan and carried 4-1, the request to study potential boundary changes to the NCEDA was approved.

- c. St. Joseph County Economic Development Area No. 3 (AM General EDA) (Audio Position: 28:55)
  - i. **Resolution 2021-11** – Resolution of the St. Joseph County Redevelopment Commission Approving Sublease and Assignment of Ground Lease Related To 12900 and 13200 McKinley Avenue Mishawaka Indiana

Bill Schalliol: Before you today is Resolution 2021-11 and a Consent of Landlord Agreement. These are both related to Electric Last Mile Solution, pending purchase of the SF Motors property which is the former H2 facility on McKinley Ave. Years ago back in 2000, as part of the larger project to lure General Motors to build the H2 in St. Joe County, the Redevelopment Commission purchased 52 properties and aggregated those properties to serve as a parking area and vehicle storage area on the eastern side of the site. The Redevelopment Commission has held onto that property and leased that property to the owners of the site. We actually have a 50-year lease so our current lease expires in 2051. That lease, before 2017 was with AM General and transferred to SF Motors, now Series Motors. In 2017-2018 it looked like SF Motors was going to build cars at that facility. SF Motors is in the process of selling the land to Electric Last Mile Solutions as part of a series of steps that are occurring this month. These actions before you today are necessary for their acquisition process. SO basically what needs to happen is SF Motors will retain the property, but is asking for a sublease of the property to be able to sublease the property to Electric Last Mile Solutions until such time, I believe it's 23 months, as the land contract between ELMS and SF Motors is completed. At any point in time if ELMS purchases the property in total before the property then would transfer to

ELMS. They would then be our lessee for the remainder period of the lease. We get approximately \$72,000/year for the lease of the property. We've had conversations with ELMS that once they own the property, they would seek to purchase the property so that we wouldn't have to go through a yearly collections process to get that check. Instead we'd be able to just sell the land and get out of land ownership on that parcel. This is an exciting step because this step, again, is a series of steps. They anticipate having this property deal in total closed by the end of the month, going public by the end of the month. Once they have possession of the property, then they can move into the building and start hiring employees and be able to be in the building, bring product in and start producing vehicles. They anticipate producing the first round of vehicles yet this year, early fall. There are no other incentives that the County is offering for this project so back in 2018 when the Redevelopment Commission and Council and Board of Commissioners did a development agreement with SF Motors, we did a fairly short-term, but fairly healthy tax abatement for the 20 plus million dollars being invested to personal property into the site because there will not be a tax abatement on that site. New investment will then be collected by the TIF, and so that will end up providing new revenue for the development areas. So, this is a \$238 million project where the County's only commitment is to transfer a piece of land that we have a 50-year lease on. So, it's a huge win for the area. Ultimately could in total, once they're up to full production have 900 plus employees so this is a great win for the community and all we're asking for is for your approval of this Resolution and consent. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. Both Jamie Woods and Phil Garrett were instrumental in putting these documents together so they would be able to answer and technical/legal questions you may have.

Tom Gryp: Would there be any possibility of charging a transfer fee to accommodate this request?

Jamie Woods: You could certainly ask for a transfer fee as part of the transaction if that's the will of the Commission.

Tom Gryp: I'm just throwing that out in that it is a good project, there might be an opportunity for the tax payers to benefit from it even if it's in a modest way.

Jamie Woods: That would be an economic policy decision that this Commission would need to make as to if it wanted to proceed with a request of a transfer fee and discuss that with the folks at ELMS since they would ultimately be paying it.

Brian Pawlowski: That would require redoing the development agreement I imagine?

Jamie Woods: I'm not certain. I think as part of the consent, that we could have language in the consent agreement that upon the closing of the transaction and the purchase of the building by ELMS upon completion of the purchase, then an addition to the consent of the landlord, there would be a payment to the County in x amount for said consent. I think that's how it would be structured. I don't think it would require redoing the development agreement necessarily with SF Motors.

Tom Gryp: What to the other Commissioners think? I just threw that out there.

Brian Pawlowski: As far as incentives go, I would just say in past experiences, this is a pretty good deal from a County perspective, given what's at stake currently. I think if there were other incentives at play, I'd be much more inclined to push for that. But, in the current circumstance, I

don't know that it's as necessary as it might be in others.

Jason Critchlow: How likely is it that they'd say no?

Bill Schalliol: I think that we'd have to figure out how that transfer fee is valued. The other thing too from a timing standpoint, they need this action to close this week so we'd need to get back to them and schedule a special meeting if that was the direction that the Redevelopment Commission wanted to go.

Jamie Woods: The way we understand the transaction is there are certain securities and exchange commission filings that they need to have submitted expeditiously and part of those filings will be showing that they have the ability to have control over this land upon payment of the purchase price. Which is substantial by the way.

Brian Pawlowski: This is a very interesting idea and I wonder if it's not better put into some sort of policy rather than having it be a one off or ad hoc action. I might just say that as we go forward with these types of transactions that we look at that and if it makes sense to have a policy in place, setting up what that transaction fee would look like, how it would be valued and what the steps would entail so that it's not something that's just perceived as arbitrary by developers or business communities. I would say that should be something we should look at.

Shirley Ryneanson: Agreed.

Tom Gryp: Totally agree. We need to consider it on all deals going forward when there is an opportunity to extract value for the taxpayers.

Brian Pawlowski: I might just ask that we make a note for the June meeting, that maybe if there's any conclusions you've reached with respect to a policy of that nature that maybe we have an update or discussion on that. For present purposes, I would entertain a motion to approve the Resolution as it is today.

Upon a motion by Brian Pawlowski, being seconded by Jason Critchlow and unanimously carried, Resolution 2021-11 was approved.

ii. Consent of Landlord (ELMS Project)

Upon a motion by Brian Pawlowski, being seconded by Jason Critchlow and unanimously carried, Consent of Landlord was approved.

iii. Elkhart & Western Railroad Crossing Project – project update (Audio Position: 38:19)

Bill Schalliol: We've worked with Elkhart & Western Railroad since they came to the community. New ownership bought the railroad, Pioneer Railroad bought the Elkhart & Western Railroad line. Back in late 2019 as part of an increase in activity on the line, they added stop signs to all the crossings along the corridor area which is really from Bittersweet east to the County Line. As part of an agreement with Elkhart & Western Railroad, we agreed to participate in crossing upgrades at County Line or Ash and Bittersweet. Those improvements will start Monday at the Bittersweet crossing and take a little less than a week and then move over to the Ash Road crossing. We'll add

bells and lights and improved crossing structures so the crossing itself will be improved. So that work is set to get underway. Since they moved to the community, they originally were a three day a week railroad that operated, they're now five days a week. We've seen increased activity on the line, a couple of businesses move into the corridor and development area to use their rail services, so this partnership is a good opportunity. Having a rail service site is a real win for the area so we're excited to see this move forward. I wanted to give you that as a project update.

iv. Penn Township Fire Station – project update (Audio Position: 39:58)

Bill Schalliol: At our last Redevelopment Commission meeting, we had a Resolution to approve up to \$500,000 of funds for the fire station project. The work was going to be used to do site work as well as infrastructure improvements as part of the design of the site. It was determined that the fire station, based on County Engineering codes, could exit to McKinley but needed to have a return that was not necessarily part of the footprint to the site. What ended up happening was Candice Lane which sits just a little east of the fire station site, was determined to be a good cross intersection that would allow trucks to return into the site and allow for development to occur. So, the Redevelopment Commission picked up a lot of the predevelopment costs to do the site work at this site. Picked up the design cost tot design Candice Lane as well as future traffic signal improvements at Candice Lane and McKinley. As part of the work, agreed to cover some of the site expenses for the site development and for the construction of the roadway. That amount came to \$479,000. The Redevelopment Commission at its last meeting approved \$500,000 for those improvements. We knew that there were some additional costs that needed to be covered for the site. We had known that we were going to have additional conversations about ways that could be paid for. In partnership with Penn Township, one of those ways is the American Rescue Plan, there's the opportunity to use some of those costs to cover public safety and public health costs. As recently as last night, the Federal government released some additional guidelines in how American Rescue Plan money can be used. So, we're examining additional ways that that money could move forward to pay for additional costs, perhaps in this project. So, the Redevelopment Commission approved the Resolution, it went to the Board of Commissioners on April 20, 2021. Due to some additional information gathered thirteen hours before the meeting, the Board of Commissioners tabled the agenda request. We have not gotten all the additional information we need. We need to get some clarification on some numbers, and we will be working with our partners at Penn Township to get some clarification on some of those numbers. Just wanted to let you know that at this point in time, we're still working on some funding issues on this project and just trying to get some clarity on what final costs may be needed to move that project to completion. If there are any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

Jason Critchlow: I'm sure everybody has been hearing from our friends in Penn Township and it seemed to be that they were concerned that we were not going to fulfill our commitment that we passed last month and it sounds like there might be some confusion on their end and they're just not clear of the process. So, in the end, our commitment for the \$500,000 is fulfilled on our end, now it's up to your work with the Commissioners to see it through?

Bill Schalliol: That's correct. So, you approved your action on Tuesday, April 13, 2021, we got the information on April 19, 2021. We would have had to table the item anyway and send it back to the Redevelopment Commission if we were going to ask for your approval of additional funds. The Board of Commissioners couldn't have made that approval. So, we're going to work through some of their numbers and try to figure out where we can get some cost efficiencies and get some of these

things paid for. We'll bring you back a report in June and work to get this all clarified so that project can be completed.

Jason Critchlow: Ok, but our commitment as the Redevelopment Commission at this point is sort of fulfilled unless they come back and there's more things?

Bill Schalliol: That's correct.

Brian Pawlowski: So I think my understanding, the \$500,000 that was appropriated by the Commission in April, that can still be taken up and approved by the Commission as it is. The challenge would be any new funding that would be sought from a TIF would have to come before the Redevelopment Commission as a separate and new appropriation. My understanding is that the Federal dollars in the American Rescue Act are those that can be pursued for this and obviously any chance we have to use Federal dollars first, that would make much more sense. And that wouldn't be a decision we would necessarily make, but those would be dollars that you and the Commissioners could spend as you saw fit.

Bill Schalliol: Yes, absolutely, and that's why I made the comment earlier as it relates to the Capital Avenue improvements, until we can look at the full budget and understand where we may seek to use additional Redevelopment Commission funds to help the fire station project move forward, we're going to look comprehensively at the budget and give you a full report in June.

Jason Critchlow: That's helpful and that makes total sense. I just think the message got muddy and they thought that we were soft on the project all of a sudden and it sounds like you're fully committed to it, seeing it through, it's just a matter of where's it going to come from. I think it's good for folks to hear that everybody is still on board with it.

- d. Wyatt Economic Development Area No. 1 (Wyatt EDA) (Audio Position: 45:48)

None at this time.

- e. Northwest Cleveland Road Economic Development Area (NWCR EDA) (Audio Position: 45:48)

None at this time.

#### 4. Additional Business

- a. SJC County Comprehensive Plan Project – Request for Funding (Audio Position: 1:00)

Abby Wiles: Last December, the Redevelopment Commission passed a Resolution committing financial support to the new Comprehensive Plan for St. Joseph County. On February 2, 2021 the Board of Commissioners approved the release of the RFP. A total of 12 proposals were received for consideration on March 16, 2021. After proposals were received, we formed a selection committee to read and score them. We interviewed the top firms. We've gone through that process and the selection committee is in the final stages of making their recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for the final consultant. That has not yet been finalized. I am here before you to request the actual appropriation of \$250,000. In December, you approved it as part of your budgeting process but didn't actually appropriate the funds and that's what the request is today. I just want to note that Brian participated on the selection committee on behalf of the Redevelopment Commission and was a tremendous asset to the whole

process. Thank you for your consideration, I am happy to answer any questions.

Brian Pawlowski: Abby really created a very nice process that allowed not only the Commission, but the Council, as well as staff from the County to really participate in the process. I was surprised at the number of proposals we got and the level of thoroughness. There were a lot of companies and firms really chomping at the bit to get in the game here. So that was great because that level of competition really gave us more option than we otherwise would have had. We narrowed it down to a few. Did some onsite interviews in the Council Chambers and were able to do back and forth questions, listen to presentations, ask more targeted pointed questions and I just thought it was a very well-run process.

Jason Critchlow: Can you describe what the process will be?

Brian Pawlowski: Will be going forward?

Jason Critchlow: Yes, as they create the plan?

Brian Pawlowski: Maybe I'll defer to Abby, but essentially the top firms, there was a range between 12-18 months of timeframe there for the entire Comprehensive Plan, so that's beginning data gathering, stakeholder engagement, all the way through to zoning recommendations, changes stuff like that way down at the end of the line.

Abby Wiles: As part of the request for proposals when we drafted that, we stated from the beginning that we wanted to have a steering committee for this process. We had the selection committee that we formed to read the proposals, score, interview and make a recommendation to the Commissioners. Then we'll have a steering committee for the process that will be a lot broader than the selection committee. Basically, providing input on an ongoing basis to the consultant as they prepare for public engagement and as a sounding board to really ground their recommendations as we go along the way. So, they'll work the steering committee and staff, we'll have public participation, there will be a virtual component. Many of teams mentioned that public input by online engagement, often exceeds what you can do when you get people in a room. There's obviously a need to do in person engagement. So, it will involve both forms and there will be surveys, stakeholder groups, interviews with focus groups. They range from 12-18 months so the beginning stages will just be data gathering, meeting with staff, meeting with the steering committee and then public engagement will ramp up a couple months into the process.

Jason Critchlow: Can you say who you chose?

Abby Wiles: That has not been finalized yet.

Brian Pawlowski: I would say after the three interviews, I think there were clearly a top two and it's really just parsing through the final details of either of their proposals.

Jason Critchlow: Next month you'll have that decision made?

Abby Wiles: I anticipate that the decision will be made within the next week.

Jason Critchlow: But I mean at our next meeting you'll know?

Abby Wiles: Absolutely. I'll just note that as part of the process, the selection committee will be issuing a memo or a report that will go to the public, but County Council, County Commissioners, the

Redevelopment Commission and Area Plan Commission outlining the process from when we started the work to release the RFP to the recommendation to the County Commissioners of which consultant to select. That will be made public.

Brian Pawlowski: From an appropriations standpoint, maybe you just want to give the range of the proposal costs?

Tom Gryp: This is our second go at it. I just want to make sure we don't make the same mistakes or perceived mistakes of the first go around. It comes down to the way we get public input. If anything is going to crater this thing, it's going to be the perception by the community that we are more introspective and not outgoing enough to engage with the community in a meaningful way. I'd like to encourage the selection committee as you go through the process, look for the consultant that will attack the public outreach differently, more aggressively and more consistently, to make sure we get more buy-in, broader buy-in, deeper buy-in from the community because this is going to be an emotional topic. If we just do it the same way, using the same processes, we will get the same result. And I don't want to waste a quarter of a million dollars for a product that is not worthy of moving forward.

Brian Pawlowski: There were a number of proposals that the selection committee read through that although they had a public engagement component in it, it just wasn't anywhere near what we felt was necessary. During the interview process for the finalists, Councilwoman Hess and myself were quite pointed and not shy about asking the teams to explain in quite a lot of detail the level to which they were willing to go and needed to go to get that public input. I shared a lot of what we've heard at Commission meetings from members of the public and explained that they're going to come in here to a situation that's already pretty engaged from the public perception and we need to understand where that's coming from, how it's evolved on down the line. I think the teams that we felt were the best were the ones that took those concerns most seriously and had the most robust plan for that engagement which really looks like online component to include surveys as well as meetings in town halls, also an in-person component and then some even had a separate web-component where folks could share feedback in a real-time way. So, there were a host of approaches to engaging the public in an equitable way that wasn't just one part of the county versus another, but as broadly inclusive as possible.

Bill Schalliol: I would note that Abby will be in front of the Council tonight asking for the other half of the appropriations, so today is the funding day for this project.

Tom Gryp: What is the total price?

Abby Wiles: \$250,000 is also being requested from the County Council for a total of \$500,000. I will say that the proposals are significantly lower than that, however, to your point about public input, we want to make sure that whichever proposal we select, we get what we want. So, if there needs to be a little bit of negotiation or an amendment to perhaps increase public input or look more closely at our zoning ordinance, we want flexibility to be able to do that. So the request before you is a do not exceed amount of \$250,000, but in reality, I would anticipate that we wouldn't go the full amount.

Upon a motion by Brian Pawlowski, being seconded by Jason Critchlow and unanimously carried, the Request for Funding for the SJC County Comprehensive Plan Project was approved.

- b. County Owned Land Parcels – project update (Audio Position: 45:56)

Bill Schalliol: At the last meeting there was a request to examine how many County owned land parcels the County has. We started that process through GIS and found that there are 367 parcels at this point in time but are still looking to go through the records. Part of the challenge with the records is that it may be under Board of Commissioners, it may be Commissioners, Board of. So, we're scrubbing the parcel list to come up with everything. What we found in a lot of cases is, for example, the core development area of the IEC, there's 67 parcels we believe that are either owned by the Board of Commissioners or the Redevelopment Commission, several of those are right of way that had just never been dedicated. So, it's a matter of looking at each parcel basically and we're working with the Parks Department to go through the list. So, at the next meeting in June, if we can get through the list, we'll certainly give you a start of a list. We tried to map all of the parcels, but it was just a bunch of big dots on the map that didn't make a lot of sense. So, we're going to start to go through that and get that cleaned up and get you a report on that in June.

Tom Gryp: I think that's great. I look forward to getting that list next month. To keep the problem from repeating, how do we coordinate with the Commissioners and all other parties so that we have a comprehensive list so that we don't have to go scrambling again and we can go to a single source to find out County owned parcels and who actually controls that?

Bill Schalliol: What we found is that there are four different people that had versions of the list. There was a list for mowing, snow plowing, property acquisition so we're trying to find the different lists and figure out who's got what responsibility to add information to the list. So, I think we're going to have to do some internal controls as far as how we can monitor that. We have a lot of properties that we have title to within the City of South Bend and some within the City of Mishawaka, if they don't have a drainage component or other reasons why we should own it, those are properties that should be offloaded in coordination to the cities. I think we're going to find a lot of this kind of stuff and we will use our GIS Department to ultimately be the caretaker of this list as we move forward.

Tom Gryp: So to summarize, at the end of the day the GIS Department will be instructed to manage and keep a comprehensive list of all County owned properties?

Bill Schalliol: That will be the targeted department. We haven't confirmed that at the Commissioner level but it seems like that would make the most sense as they manage our property records for us.

Tom Gryp: It's one thing to clean up a mess, but another thing to keep repeating it so I just want to make sure at the end of this exercise that you guys are putting a lot of time and effort in, you don't have to repeat it again.

Brian Pawlowski: Tom, I 100% agree with that, having gone through GIS nightmares before. I would just say, Bill, it's an opportune time given that the GIS folks are going to be heavily involved with the Comprehensive Planning effort. So, to the extent that we can have a lot of that keyed up and accurate for them, it will be helpful, but then also they might be able to shed some light on how other places across the country do this type of work and where it's housed and who has access to it and the controls. This is an opportune moment to undertake that project, as painful as it might be.

Bill Schalliol: Certainly. I think related to that too, one of the things again we see that a lot of these properties are right of way that just have never been dedicated so as we do construction projects, whether it's Douglas Road or some of these others as we move forward, just completing that last step,

dotting all they i's and crossing all the t's and dedicating the properties so that it's right of way instead of a series of parcels that don't connect to that.

Tom Gryp: I don't know if anybody has an update on the Metronet or the Choicelight project going out to New Carlisle and how we are going to work with other partners to connect hospitals, schools, etc. government buildings to that. Any update on that?

Chris Brown: Just a quick construction update, I provided the EDA with a quarterly and a financial report a couple weeks back. We are at least at that point in time, we were at about 52,000 linear feet of cable laid, I think they were almost done with SR 2, and then earlier last week, I believe they did the underneath around the South Shore and Norfolk Southern lines on Race Street. I think they had flaggers out and everything to do that construction down there. From an EDA standpoint regarding helping out libraries and businesses, we haven't had conversations this past month about that. I know Choicelight is engaging with Surf Broadband, I know we're trying to figure out some business customers and we've provided some residential, kind of where the loop will go, and looking at, especially since we did the bid for the New Carlisle Town Loop, so we're working on what the design looks like, but haven't gone really in depth yet on how we can bridge that gap through funding to help out the libraries and things. We just haven't had time to reach out to those yet.

Tom Gryp: Could I ask that you put it on the agenda for next month please?

Chris Brown: Yes.

#### 5. Public Comment (3 minute limit)

Dan Caruso, 305 Compton St., New Carlisle, IN: In the Resolution to limit the Core Development Area of the IEC to the area between US 20 and SR 2 north to south, and Willow and Snowberry east to west, the County agreed to pull areas north of 20, south of 2 off of the original zoning request last summer. Just to get the Olive Township Trustees, the New Carlisle Town Council to buy into their plans. Now the County has showed their hand and proven they can't be trusted, not just for their word but for a written and signed mutually agreed to contract. I hope our local officials now understand that you can't make deals with people who have no regard for promises and contracts and even less regard for local residents. It's time for this area to make the necessary steps to secede from St. Joseph County. Thank you.

John VanBruane, 15250 Kern Rd., Mishawaka, IN: I'm talking in reference to the fire station project which I have been involved in from the very start and still am as a consultant to the Township. My question is in reference to the additional funding other than the \$500,000 that we talked about and the Candice Lane project, do you have a figure for what funding you may be asking for through that Rescue Act?

Bill Schalliol: The request was for an additional \$540,314. Again, I don't know that we have a good itemized budget of what that \$540,000 looks like so we'll be requesting that of Penn Township over the next couple weeks so that we can bring back some information to you at your next meeting.

John VanBruane: Thank you very much, I appreciate everything that you guys have done for us and look forward to working with you in the future. Thank you.

Martha Ray, 29360 Lynn St., New Carlisle, IN: I just wanted to let you know that I have a friend named Kim who works at Surf Broadband and she told me that residential hookup for this dark fiber that's coming out is free to residents up to 250' and then it's only \$.75/foot after that. I just wanted to let you know about residents, I don't know about businesses, but residents are going to get hooked up for free up to 250'.

Brian Pawlowski: Chris, it'd be nice to confirm that at the June discussion if that is in fact the case.

Chris Brown: Will do.

Andrew Avery, 1515 E Ewing Ave., South Bend, IN: I'd also like to second the Chief of Penn Township's request for us to get together and talk about additional funding for that. It sounds like you guys are on top of it for the additional amount and we appreciate you guys working with us together for the community services and public safety. It's so important to continue to provide these services to Penn Township and we'd like for you guys to continue to work with us and those additional funding for that. Thank you.

#### 6. Adjournment

Upon a motion by Jason Critchlow, being seconded by Brian Pawlowski and unanimously carried, the May 11, 2021 Redevelopment Commission meeting adjourned at 9:58 a.m.

Next Meeting Date: June 8, 2021 at 9:00 am  
(Virtual with In-Person Location TBD)