



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES (PILOT) TASK FORCE

Tuesday, January 15, 2013

2:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Room 108 (City-County Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 8 -

Joseph R. Clausius; Michael G. Heifetz; Jay Robaidek; Mark Elsdon;
Timothy J. Conroy; Rachel E. Krinsky; Andrew M. Reschovsky and Roger
Goodwin

Absent: 4 -

Jill Johnson; Darrell L. Bazzell; Jean A. Bachhuber and Robert H. Keller

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Elsdon, seconded by Reschovsky, to Approve the
Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no registrants.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

AGENDA

1. 28780 Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) Task Force 1-15-13 Agenda

1. Comments from the Task Force Chair

2. Task Force Member Comments

3. Follow-up from Boston Presentation

Member Elsdon asked how Boston determined property value in reference to the first of the five recommendations made by the Boston Task Force.

Mr. Hanson explained that on a survey, the institutions were asked to provide a value and then that value was also checked by the assessor for validity.

Chairman Goodwin asked if they are required by state law to provide documents including value.

Mr. Hanson responded that Massachusetts has filing requirements in their statutes requiring tax exempt property owners to file every year and provide information that verifies that they should be exempt and information about their property, such as property value. Wisconsin doesn't have those types of requirements. If you went to an assessor in Massachusetts, they could tell you a lot of information on a tax-exempt property. In Wisconsin, the assessor wouldn't be able to give you much information about a tax exempt property because there is not a filing requirement. Because a city isn't taxing a property, an assessor isn't going to spend a lot of time and money to collect that property information when there isn't a reason to have it.

Member Reshovsky mentioned that New York is another state that requires annual filing by tax exempt property owners.

Mr. Hanson explained that Wisconsin only has required filing for nonprofits for tax-exempt status.

Chairman Goodwin asked Mr. Hanson if during his discussion with Mr. Englander if Mr. Englander gave any indication as to how long it took the committee to survey and process the evaluation forms the non-profits submitted.

Mr. Hanson responded that they allowed for 1-2 months for the process but it only took 2-3 weeks.

Chairman Goodwin asked if Boston decided not to request PILOT's from those organizations that the City provided funds to.

Mr. Hanson responded that he believes that to be true.

Chairman Goodwin asked if that included any of the organizations over the \$15 million.

Mr. Hanson responded that he doesn't know.

Mr. Reshovsky asked if we wanted to replicate what Boston did, would it require a state statute or could a city ordinance do it.

Attorney Staffaroni responded that she has not researched it, but she suspects it would probably require a change to State Statutes.

Mr. Elsdon asked if currently the city has a way to require valuation

information be provided.

Mr. Hanson responded no.

Mr. Conroy asked what information is requested now from nonprofits.

Mr. Kurth explained that there is a required form that is sent to him on even numbered years. It basically gives information on what the organization does to verify that it continues to operate as a tax exempt organization. It provides you a value range to check off, information about leasing any part of your property or have any unrelated income.

Chairman Goodwin asked if the information that Mr. Kurth collects is used to verify that the business is tax exempt or does someone else make that determination.

Mr. Kurth explained that the form was originally developed for the State Legislature to determine how much tax-exempt property is in the state. More information is provided at the initial request for tax-exempt status.

Chairman Goodwin asked if an organization files paperwork with the municipality and there is a dispute on the determination, what happens.

Mr. Kurth answered that it could go to the Circuit Court, then the Court of Appeals and to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Goodwin asked if there is a state agency that does a review.

Mr. Kurth answered that no state agency does a review. There is a manual that assists in determining exemptions and lists some of the court cases. Dependant on the ability of a municipality to have attorneys, you would have access to it. Because no state agency reviews the exemptions, the exemption determination varies across the state. Many municipalities may not challenge exemptions because they can't afford the legal fees. Madison has staff attorneys so we are more detailed than many municipalities.

Chairman Goodwin asked if the Board of Review has a role in any of this.

Mr. Kurth answered that the Board of Review doesn't have any jurisdiction over tax-exempt status.

Chairman Goodwin asked if we know why Boston picked the \$15 million threshold.

Mr. Hanson answered that they began at \$10 million and noticed that some of the organizations they wanted excluded fell into the category so they raised the threshold to \$15 million.

Mr. Reshovsky asked if they may have used a higher threshold so they would deal with fewer institutions.

Mr. Hanson replied that he didn't think so.

Mr. Elsdon asked if they asked religious organizations to participate.

Mr. Hanson answered that religions organizations are a type of organization that primarily benefits the city.

Chairman Goodwin asked if they only exempted churches or also the other enterprises that the churches are involved in.

Mr. Hanson replied that he believes it is just churches.

Alder Clausius asked if we have a copy of the guidelines to the community benefits questions. He thinks that will be a key part of our plan.

Mr. Hanson replied that he doesn't have that information but thinks we could probably obtain it.

Alder Clausius asked if with our current PILOT's we do any sort of offset for community benefits.

Mr. Hanson replied no.

Chairman Goodwin asked if we currently receive information about an organization's community benefits.

Mr. Kurth answered that currently we receive information such as the number of people who get free or partially free services. He doesn't think there is a dollar amount tied to that.

One benefit could be the reduction in public sector costs related to of the exemptions and whether the organization should be tax-exempt. The City does not have consistent data for community benefits. The City does receive all of the tax-exempt reporting forms but it's unclear if that information is on them.

Member Krisnky replied that it asks for an organizations programs and financials, but it doesn't ask for a dollar figure on the services provided.

Chairman Goodwin explained that if we decide to solicit more information, it will be up to the committee.

Ms. Miley asked Mr. Heifetz if he found more information on the 990 form. Mr. Heifetz stated no. The health side of it has changed over the last few years. He thought that there might be more robust information available for healthcare organizations.

Ms. Krinsky responded that it depends on what you are looking for. All of our gross numbers are on the 990 form. There is a chart to state how much was administrative, how much was fundraising and how much was services.

Mr. Kurth responded that he is not sure how we would break that information out into what we need.

Ms. Krinsky explained that is the reason she asked exactly what the Boston institutions filled out, because she doesn't understand how they determine the value they are using.

Ms. Miley mentioned that it appears that Boston arbitrarily granted 50 % to all of the organizations.

Member Krinsky explained that if we see what they are or aren't submitting, the information may or may not be arbitrary.

Member Elsdon does not think that they did it arbitrarily as on the chart a handful of the institutions are not at 50%.

Member Robaidek suggested that if you look at the column of the chart "Less Community Benefits Credit" he think they are all at 50%.

Member Krinsky asked if they really drill down to what services are local and which aren't and how do they define that.

Mr. Hanson stated that he will do more research on the benefits credit.

Member Robaidek stated that his impression was that they approached this so wide open that they were going to accept everything and cut each in half.

Chairman Goodwin mentioned that initially it sounded like they were trying to find a range of values and then at some point the taskforce decided to do a 50% cut across the board.

Mr. Kurth responded that he believes they were trying to be fair to the institutions by setting it at 50%.

Member Robaidek mentioned that if an organization can't reach the threshold, they probably aren't really a nonprofit. There are some nonprofit hospitals in Illinois that are being challenged because they offer no community benefit.

Member Elsdon asked about the phase-in process. Mr. Englander mentioned that it was going to be in 5 years. What did that look like? How successful will they be 4 years from now?

Member Krinsky responded that there were some slides that explained how the phase-in process will work.

Mr. Hanson replied that they wanted to do the phase-in process in not less than 5 years to allow the institutions to adjust their budgets.

Member Krinsky believes that if it was a new PILOT it was collected a fifth at a time and if it was an existing PILOT the difference of what was owed was collected a fifth at a time.

Member Elsdon commented that there was some mention as to what a community benefit is but it is uncertain to him what exactly a community benefit is. Certain organizations will have an easier time putting dollar amounts on their services. Cultural and religious organizations may have a more difficult time than others putting dollar amounts on their services. How do you quantify those numbers?

Member Reshovsky stated that one question that could be asked is if they weren't there, what would the services they were providing cost if they would

fall to the city and the tax payers. Obviously nonprofits do more than that. They are providing services in the public domain that otherwise might fall onto the taxpayers

Member Elsdon mentioned that there are some services the public sector wouldn't pick up.

Member Reshovsky clarified that his point was that the substitute for public services is just part of the quantification of public services.

4. Review Existing Estimated Values for Non-profit/tax -exempt Entities

Chairman Goodwin asked for clarification of Sisters of St. Mary's who are listed twice on the spreadsheet. There are two separate parcels classified as nonprofit hospitals and they are range 10 which would mean over \$25 so each parcel is valued at \$25 million. Is that correct?

Mr. Kurth responded that is how they reported each parcel. However, the question is, "are they recording each parcel or the entire entity twice"? Because of the quality of the form, the reporting and the usefulness over the last 15 years, it hasn't been a major concern. So, whether that means there is over \$50 million dollars of worth is a good question.

Member Reshovsky asked how a nonprofit determines its value. Is it from insurance values?

Mr. Kurth responded that many of them call and ask him how to do it. He responds that they can go to their insurance company, but if they have land that value won't be included in the insurance value. Some have appraisals done. Most of what we have is probably related to insurance values more than anything else.

Alder Clausius asked if these are all of the tax exempt parcels in the city.

Mr. Kurth responded that it is all of those that are required to fill out the form.

Alder Clausius asked if the ones with a dollar amount in the PILOT's column are organizations who are making voluntary PILOT payments.

Mr. Kurth responded that some are voluntary and some are paying because of a condition of zoning. This is not a complete list. It is only lists about half of the nonprofits.

Member Elsdon asked how accurate he thinks these values are.

Mr. Kurth responded that they are not very accurate. The process began around 10-20 years ago. More information used to be required, but the City received complaints so we cut down to very little information being requested. Many municipalities don't even file this form with the state. The accuracy and extent of the information varies around the state.

Chairman Goodwin mentioned that as an organization, they are going to be careful about how they fill out a public document. They are going to make it as accurate as possible.

Mr. Kurth responded that one would think so because the law states there could be consequences if the form is not filled out accurately. The City could have an appraisal done at the owner's expense and possibly take away their tax-exemption.

Chairman Goodwin added that they don't want to report too high in case they may be taxed some day. They don't want to report too low in case they need to file an insurance claim.

Member Reshovsky asked what would be involved if the Assessor's office decided to assess the current nonprofits?

Mr. Kurth replied that they are often times larger properties and very hard to assess because we don't have the information we need. We have the size of the property, wall heights, and other similar details. We could do a computerized cost approach on it and go from there. We could do it without depreciation and probably come up with a number that is fair across the board for those properties.

Member Reshovsky asked if the criteria and accuracy would be at the standard you would like it to be at to assess the organization for tax-exempt status.

Mr. Kurth replied probably not. If we knew the square footage, how they were built and the lay out we would have the mechanicals to do a cost approach. We probably could have a very fair valuation for the purposes of this committee. There is a lot of data we would need that we don't have.

Member Elsdon added that most of those properties aren't bought and sold.

Mr. Kurth responded that is why we would only be able to state that this is how much it would cost to build or to replace the property. With some of these properties that could be a large amount depending on what the market value would be, especially with hospitals or a variety of special use properties.

Member Reshovsky stated that presumably Boston is making assessments.

Mr. Kurth responded that they must have a system that we don't have that they can put a cost approach to it.

Chairman Goodwin stated that under Massachusetts state law, the organizations are required to submit more detailed information and we are receiving a bare minimum.

Member Elsdon added that we have been receiving the bare minimum for years.

Mr. Kurth responded that there is also the issue that if we start basing our decisions on this data and there is a similar property across the street there could be some litigation involved.

5. Discussion of Next Steps

Member Krinsky commented about city funding that we would want to be careful about making the recipient of city funding a determining factor for PILOT's because city funding is arbitrary. If you lose your city funding, which is bad enough news, then you are asked to pay a PILOT. That could be very bad news. Maybe it wouldn't apply because all of the nonprofits will be small enough or local enough that they won't make the threshold, but I think we need to include that thought as we proceed.

Chairman Goodwin mentioned that he thinks that the City of Boston's plan seems to be the most organized and premier model for establishing a PILOT plan. He posed the question to the task force, "Should we consider pursuing something like the Boston plan for the City of Madison"?

Member Elsdon stated that it would be helpful to identify a list of barriers and challenges we face including what the Assessor's office is currently able to do. Also, how do we get buy in from the nonprofits to participate since we don't have a statutory way of obtaining the data. We have multiple levels of challenges; getting the information, getting responses, and what's the motivation for them to participate.

Member Reshovsky mentioned that we should also list the benefits/positives.

Chairman Goodwin stated that we have a framework from the Boston model that we can compare ourselves to when starting this.

Member Reshovsky suggested that there might be other municipalities that may be utilizing PILOTs that have laws more similar to ours. Perhaps we should research those before we decide to use the Boston model for our plan.

Chairman Goodwin responded that Mr. Gawenda, who isn't here today, would be the one to ask about the sophistication of other plans around the country.

Member Krinsky reiterated that she thinks this is a bad idea and that she thinks that this is not going to go away, so one suggestion she has is that maybe some scenarios be created. It is hard to talk about cost benefits and barriers when it is all so theoretical. If we create scenarios such as the threshold is \$15 million, and it doesn't include these, but it does include these, how much money does it raise? Will hospitals pass on the cost to the consumers? I think we have reached the place where we need more specifics.

Member Reshovsky stated that in the context of things, we need to think about what happens if we decide not to move forward on this. We should come up with a few scenarios that are going to raise x, y and z million dollars so we can go back to the people in the city and say "If we have this less money, the consequences would be x.

Member Elsdon mentioned that type of discussion should have been happening way before this task force was formed. You have nonprofits at the table, but you also have us on the menu and that is not a fair position.

Member Krinsky said that no one ever asked this task force if we would like to

do this. I am back to thinking about other options such as having a referendum or raising property taxes.

Member Reshovsky stated if we follow the Boston model, one of the criteria is that this is a voluntary program. I don't think it is really an either or scenario.

Member Krinsky responded that voluntary is a very interesting word.

Member Heifetz added especially in the case of Boston.

Member Krinsky mentioned that she would not like to be the CEO of a nonprofit that is not cooperating with all that a PILOT entails.

Alder Clausius responded that from the elected officials standpoint, if we are going to move ahead on this, even though it is voluntary, we need a complete list of organizations that already participate in the PILOT program. I know this list is not complete because we didn't go down that far. I know the City Council would never vote to cram this down anyone's throat.

Ms. Miley asked Alder Clausius if he is on the Common Council Organizational Committee (CCOC).

Alder Clausius responded that he is not.

Ms. Miley explained that the Common Council is working on a Legislative Agenda and one of the items they are looking at is increasing sources of revenue, including PILOTs. Regardless, this is an issue that is going to stay under discussion. And it goes back to what we have said all along; our over reliance on property taxes.

Member Elsdon asked Ms. Miley to speak more on the Council's agenda.

Ms. Miley responded that they have quite a few items on their agenda for the coming year and beyond. Alternate sources of revenue is just one item. I don't know what their intentions are. They are just beginning the discussion.

Member Elsdon added that as a director of an organization that does pay voluntary payments, we have treaded a bit of dangerous water with the relationship between the city and nonprofits. The idea of a Legislative Agenda is very problematic with respect to nonprofits. The question of being voluntary is a really interesting one and how voluntary is it? Certainly you can't take a voluntary PILOT payment and legislate it because it would no longer be a voluntary PILOT payment. I think the city needs to tread carefully on how it proceeds with this. Otherwise it is going to make the possibility of voluntary payments very difficult, if not impossible. When looking at the list of those currently paying PILOT payments, it looks like besides his organization, the others making payments they are not entirely voluntary. Maybe we are starting further back than Boston did. Maybe we need more public relations work or team building exercises that will generate the kind of dynamic between nonprofits and the city that would be required to make a program like that work. I think if it is approached from the Council, the response will not be very positive. Then it will probably come down to court or legislative battles. I don't think that is what the city or the nonprofits want. Is there an opportunity to have listening sessions with nonprofits? It isn't as if nonprofits are looking

at a pile of cash. The same issue the city is facing of how to generate the revenue to survive is the same issue the nonprofits are facing.

Member Reshovsky mentioned that there is one difference in the analogy. Nonprofits, like everyone else in the city, receive city services. Those city services need to be paid for or we have to cut city services or come up with new sources of revenue. The main sources of revenue are constrained by forces outside the city. That is the vice that the city faces.

Member Elsdon responded that his caution is for us not to fight with each other when there are outside forces at work.

Member Reshovsky responded that we need to find a way for the city, the nonprofits and the Common Council to sit down as partners and collectively solve the problems that we are facing.

Chairman Goodwin stated that his two largest sources of increase in his home expenditures are his property tax and municipal services bill. What the city is facing is either a cut in services or it is going to find another way to assess us. One of the things this committee needs to keep in mind is that there is enough information here already for someone in the city bureaucracy to take the information and run with it. The city is that desperate to find a solution. They are going to get it one way or another. The questions are how to get it and from whom?

Member Robaidek responded that this brings him back to the question about the purpose of the taskforce. What questions are we looking to answer? Is a PILOT a reasonable thing to do? Is that something we support or a direction inherent? Then we take the next step. How are we going to do it? I agree with you that the way to go about it is to not just say no. That isn't going to stop anyone within the city government from going forward with a PILOT plan.

Chairman Goodwin replied that Member Robaidek hit it clearly. Up to this point, we have just been collecting information. Now we are at the point where we need to make some decisions. Is this something we should pursue? If so, how should it look?

Member Robaidek asked if the point has been given to us that this is because the City needs more money. Are there other options such as referendum that should be looked into before going down this path?

Ms. Miley responded that it would be very difficult to pass a referendum.

Member Conroy mentioned that he moved here four years ago from the State of Oregon. You pay for what you get. We had low property taxes and very few services. It was so bad they closed our libraries. As a nonprofit, our funding sources are getting cut. We have to stretch our funds. Our insurance costs are going up so we pass it on to our employees. You read about the infighting of the Council and that they are extending contracts to keep the wages lower. But at the same time, it is harder for the city to pass it on to the employees because of the representation they have. Whereas we just have to do it. We have no choice. Whether we offer it or not. We pay an un-voluntary PILOT of \$38,000. I think that is low. We are a retirement community and the City Fire and Ambulance comes to our site a lot. But at the same time, we offer things.

There has to be a give and a take. That is where it is frustrating.

Ms. Miley said that now may be the scenario time.

Mr. Schmiedicke said that he thinks that scenarios could be helpful, but we found out today that we just don't have enough information to do robust scenarios. If you look at the list, the cutoff is \$25 million. I am sure St. Mary's Hospital or Meriter Hospital has a value that is going to be much larger than that. In terms of trying to calculate what their value is and then trying to calculate what their benefit is to the community would be very difficult.

Ms. Miley mentioned that we should be able to pick a couple of the organizations off of the list.

Mr. Schmiedicke agreed, but stated that we still would need some information. Everything that Mr. Kurth has discussed has been in ranges and we aren't sure that those are accurate. If we are taking a Boston approach, we don't know what their community value is. I think it is a good idea, but in order to get to something we will need some information sharing.

Mr. Kurth explained that in addition to what the values are, I think the communication as to what they provide as a dollar figure we don't know. I don't think the citizens know what is being provided by the hospitals or other nonprofits. I talk to some of the smaller organizations almost daily so I know how much of their money is going where and I don't think a lot of people know that. I think that is an area we need to communicate on. As a staff member I would want to know what they pay and what kinds of programs they offer.

Mr. Schmiedicke responded that we can do a very simple analogy where we could say something is valued at \$100 million dollars is going to pay roughly \$1 million dollars in property taxes to the city alone. That doesn't include the school district, County, or technical colleges. You can step down from each of those levels. Basically 1% of the property's value that they pay to the city in property taxes is what they would pay if they were taxable.

Ms. Miley stated that if we follow the Boston Model, we would say we are only interested in charging for essential services which are fire, police and snow removal. That is about 50%. Cut it again 50% for community benefits and we are at \$250,000.

Member Elsdon suggested that it would be helpful to do an educational campaign of what the need is, what the possible benefits are of joining in on this, and some scenarios of what the impact would be. In our case, we understand that we use the fire department and people drive on the city streets to get to our buildings and feel that it is important for the value of our organization to contribute something to that. That has to be weighed in the mind of the nonprofit. What services are they providing and what is lost? Every dollar you take from a nonprofit is going to take out of some other service the nonprofit is providing. There is no extra money floating around. We provide x less number of scholarships to students because we are paying \$30,000 every year to the City of Madison. That was a decision that our organization had to make and we are happy to do our share. Every organization is going to have to make the decision of how they are going to do it. Whether it makes sense, whether it is possible or, whether it is feasible. I

don't know if it an educational process or a series of conversations. We need to find out what the organizations are dealing with and what is possibly out there. I feel we need to back up a bit. I would argue that we need to do something to get buy in from the nonprofits. I am not sure that throwing the Boston model on the table is the best way to do it.

Alder Clausius agrees with Member Elsdon. He doesn't think we know enough about this and he has learned more than anyone else on the City Council. He is the liaison to the City Council on our progress. He assumes there will be a recommendation from this committee to the Council. Alder Clausius mentioned to Ms. Miley that he and she should meet with Council leadership and ask them to hold off on what they are working on and remind them that there is a working committee with two alders sitting on it and they will report back the recommendations of this taskforce to them.

Chairman Goodwin agrees with Member Elsdon's comments but he also thinks the community needs to have something to react to. Otherwise they aren't going to respond at all. Do we put together a model and go to the community and ask for responses or do we abandon it and take a different approach? There have been communities that have simply sent letters to the nonprofits stating the situation and asked them to throw some money in the hat. They received virtually no response. I don't think we are going to get anyone's attention unless we kick them in the shins. Until they have something to respond to, they aren't going to respond. It would be hard to have that public discussion until they have something to respond to.

Member Reshovsky believes that it needs to be presented in context to the city's fiscal environment. No one is going to respond favorably if they are just asked "Do you want to contribute something"?

Member Goodwin responded that on the other hand if you just send out something that says that the city is hurting financially and is looking at some sort of taxes and a meeting is going to be held, if they don't understand where they sit, they aren't going to respond either.

Member Reshovsky suggested a document that does two things; the fiscal framework showing the need for something like this and then a model that shows how it could impact the nonprofits.

Ms. Miley mentioned that one other big issue is the State of Wisconsin only paying 50% of its revenue share.

Member Elsdon stated that is another public relations issue. From the nonprofit side, why should we shoulder the burden and also, if we did the plan that is on the top of this sheet, what would it raise for the city? How much of a difference is it really going to make to the city vs. how much harm it may cause to the nonprofits?

Ms. Miley stated that we need to do some sort of exercise to see if it is worth it.

Member Krinsky proposed that someone come up with some scenarios that estimate property values. She feels like they are talking in a vacuum and doesn't feel that they can get anywhere besides quitting and go home. They need to have some idea of how much money would be raised, who would be

impacted and how many nonprofits would be involved. We don't want to communicate with all of the nonprofits. We will raise a huge ruckus among a lot of small nonprofits that we have no intention of doing PILOTs with.

Mr. Schmiedicke agreed that we can do that. We need the committee to pick a threshold above a certain amount such as above \$25 million.

Member Krinsky suggested running a few scenarios using \$10, \$15, \$25 and \$50 million dollar thresholds.

Mr. Schmiedicke responded that we wouldn't be able to get at the question that Mr. Elsdon made which is how much money is this really going to raise if we don't know the number of entities that are going to pay and what their value is. We can do scenarios of what it might mean of an individual entity, but to determine what the impact would be on the City budget, we would need to know what numbers we are to use.

Mr. Kurth thinks that we can take a range and determine what it would mean to the city.

Chairman Goodwin suggested that we do scenarios on ranges 8, 9 and 10 using the Boston Model of 50% and 50% parameters.

Member's Elsdon and Heifetz suggested taking out the places of worship.

Motion by Member Krinsky, seconded by Member Alder Clausius to remove places of worship from the scenario parameters. Motion carried.

Motion by Member Krinsky, seconded by Member Heifetz to exempt organizations that provide local services only. Using her organization as an example, almost all of their services are provided to people in the city.

Ms. Miley mentioned that if we are using the Boston model, the Museum of Fine Arts draws people from a big region.

Member Heifetz asked if this would penalize organizations who bring in business from outside the city.

Member Reshovsky added that the distinction is that you are a volunteer, not an organization. You do lots of good work. But you own your house and you have to pay property taxes for services you receive from the city. Contributing to the cost of services is really quite different than saying that you aren't doing good stuff. Should other property owners or low income people in Madison who are getting City services receive fewer services or pay higher taxes to subsidize an organization that provides services to people outside of Madison. That is the way I think we should frame the question.

Chairman Goodwin added that a private education facility like Edgewood College probably serves a lot of people from Madison, but also a lot of people not from Madison. They would have to show that they provide a lot more to the city of Madison to meet the threshold.

Mr. Kurth reviewed the list and came to the conclusion that there aren't many in the categories that are providing services only within.

Member Krinsky withdrew her motion.

6. Scheduling Next Meeting

We will try another poll to select our next meeting. We will include a couple of evenings.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Robaidek, seconded by Krinsky, to Adjourn at 3:38 p.m.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.