Rolfs, Daniel

From: Susan Pastor [skpastor@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2013 11:52 AM
To: Gromacki, Joseph; Rolfs, Daniel
Cc: Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva; Clear, Mark; Schmidt, Chris; Verveer, Mike; Ellingson, Susan; Clausius, Joe
Subject: Comments on revised purpose of TIF and community benefits
Attachments: Public Comment 12-20.docx

Dear Mr. Rolfs,
I am sorry for the short timeline in sending these comments for the 1pm meeting.
I must also note that having now had the opportunity to review (what I think is)
the latest document, I am deeply concerned about both the re-writing of the purpose
of TIF and the lack of public access to this process. I regret that I do not have time
to comment on the issue of speculative TIDs, but want to reiterate the impact
of greenfield TIDs on the overlying tax districts -given that this is where development
would most likely occur anyway. If the conversation with MMSD, requested on
multiple occasions by school board member TJ Mertz actually occurred, I am not
aware of it.

Thanks very much for your work and your amazing ability to keep up with the documents and posting.
Sincerely and all the best,
Sue Pastor

From: Susan Pastor <skpastor@sbcglobal.net>
To: Gromacki Joseph <JGromacki@cityofmadison.com>; Rolfs Daniel <DRolfs@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: "District5@cityofmadison.com" <District5@cityofmadison.com>; "District19@cityofmadison.com" <District19@cityofmadison.com>; "District11@cityofmadison.com" <District11@cityofmadison.com>; "district4@cityofmadison.com" <district4@cityofmadison.com>; "District13@cityofmadison.com" <District13@cityofmadison.com>; "district17@cityofmadison.com" <district17@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:50 PM
Subject: Community Benefits - For TIF Policy Review Ad Hoc Committee Today

Dear Mr. Rolfs, Mr. Gromacki and Members of the Committee:

In relation to the pending discussion about community benefits at today's meeting,
I want to encourage the committee to place a higher value on this aspect of TIF proposals.
I also want to convey that the discussion about this should be broader than what is possible in one committee meeting,
and should involve more members of the community. There should be a process for
involving the community project by project, as well as general guidelines; and in general,
community benefits should receive more weight in project consideration -- for example,
20 points instead of 10.

As an example of both a process and particular benefits, please consider
the attached 2010 document, which is a condensed list of community benefits/amenities prioritized
by community members participating in the process around Union Corners.
Perhaps there is a way to link prioritized community benefits to the concerns residents
bring forward in the budget process.

The list below, adapted from the Union Corners process, addresses the dominant concerns expressed during the budget process and also speaks to equity of access to the decision-making process: These community benefits should be reflected in the new policy:

1) Affordable Housing Replacement
2) Public/community space; real public access to amenities such as meeting space, benches, green space, water fountains
3)Robust community input on tenants, traffic and green space;
4) Related to jobs:
   A-Union jobs in construction and operation; and union-based job training such as the START model
   B- Local hiring; priority to neighborhood residents/youth
   C- Attention to transportation needs of employees, e.g. with Metro bus passes
5) Model of water conservation and wastewater management (water catchment, grey water recycling)

Overarchingly and from an equity perspective, I also think steps need to be taken to assure that the public access to this review process is made more substantial.

Sincerely,
Sue Pastor
2502 Green Ridge Drive
Madison 53704