From: DARLENE GAKOVICH
To: Alex Saloutos
Cc: Figueroa Cole, Yannette; Tishler, Bill; All Alders
Subject: RE: City budget and Breese Stevens "Investment"
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2024 1:33:12 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from dgakovic@wisc.edu. Learn why this is important

After exchanging emails with Alder Cole, I thought she might vote NO. Tonight I found out that her vote was YES. Thankfully, Bill Tishler (my alder) voted NO and even tried to send it back to the finance committee. Bonnie Roe again did a masterful job of exposing the shenanigans of Mayor Satya and her staff. They received Roe's email pointing out the shameful way they had tried to cover up the lies over the timing for applying for the state matching grant. Your comments below to Alder Cole's statements clearly show that even the more fiscally responsible alders do not grasp the cost of Breese Stevens' improvements.

It is astounding how they're getting away with their wasteful agenda and scare tactics! According to Satya, it is irresponsible not to put the tax increase on the fall referendum! No accountability to the taxpayers…it's her way or the highway! I have lost all trust.

My head, too, is exploding!

Darlene

From: Alex Saloutos <asaloutos@tds.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 6:13 PM
To: DARLENE GAKOVICH <dgakovic@wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: City budget and Breese Stevens "Investment"

Thanks for forwarding the emails with alder Cole, Darlene! On a positive note, it is good that alder Cole is engaging with you, and you can have an adult conversation with her. Many alders ignore emails on city business from their constituents, including alder Vidaver who is my alder. And I wonder what difference it makes if the information came from Next Door? After reading alder Cole's email, I must respond.

"The $4 M grant for parks requires matching, and the matching funds come from TIF & Impact Fees, which neither impact the operating budget nor tax levy. A balance of $200K is coming from the repairs 2024 budget already approved."

- The $2 million in TIF funds are contingent on approval by the TIF joint review board, which isn't a sure thing. I can see affordable housing advocates making a good case that investing the $2 million to create affordable housing is a better use of funds, than using it to inflate Big Top's profits and keep their ticket prices artificially low.
- The park impact fees by law are intended to create and improve "parks, playgrounds, and land for athletic fields" that serve the whole neighborhood where the development occurred that generated fees, parks that provide free and open access year-round to all residents, offering essential recreational spaces and promoting community well-being. Investing these funds in the facilities Breese Stevens Field, which financially benefits a specific set of users and events, appears to contradict the purpose of park impact fees.

In essence tax payers are making an investment of $200K for a $4M grant proposal. For a landmark facility owned by the city for repairs that need to be completed.

- How much of the $8 million is for needed repairs and how much of it is for the upgrades? Staff is on the record stating most of it is for the improvements.

Most people don't just invest on a mortgage and let the house which is a capital investment just crumble.

- This is a false equivalency. Breese Stevens is a commercial rental property. A small part of the funds are being used to make repairs to what is better described as a rental property that isn't cash flowing, and most of the funds are being used for upgrades that will inflate Big Top's profits and artificially keep ticket prices low.

I can't help myself. This makes my head explode.

--Alex

From: Darlene Gakovich <dgakovic@wisc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 at 2:15 AM
To: Yanette Figueroa Cole <district10@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Tim Gruber <district11@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: RE: City budget and Breese Stevens "Investment"

Hello Yannette!

Yes, my information did come from Nextdoor. Bonnie Roe, a member, posted the information and comments. She is a journalist, keenly interested in city government. Thus far, her data has been factual, so I trust her.

I know that upkeep is important in maintaining a home or any property that one invests in. In case of Breese Stevens, the city arrangement, as it stand now, is a sweetheart deal for the "for profit" enterprises. How did they get this

lucrative deal, which gives the city very little in return for upgrading the facility? Satya projected the cost would be around $30 million! Is this not correct? How will this staggering amount be paid? TIF & Impact Fees? Savings? Other investments? Borrowing?

I am not familiar with all the ways the city finances its obligations. It doesn't matter to me that this sweetheart deal doesn't affect the operating budget or the tax levy. I love horses but if someone wanted to give me one, I wouldn't be able to afford its upkeep! When the grants dry up, the taxpayers will be left holding the bag.

Home ownership in Madison has become a huge burden to many, especially the retirees. My pension is small. My home is my equity but its increased value doesn't pay for living expenses and huge tax bills. I'd have to sell it and move away. At my age, the thought of leaving Madison after having lived here for over 60 years is unbearable!

If the Alders approve a referendum on hiking property taxes even more, they must look at making cuts elsewhere. NOT cutting essential services, reducing hours or even closing libraries…certainly NOT reducing services to the poor… these are scare tactics. Some non-essential projects should be put on hold or scuttled. A symbolic gesture would be a 10% across-the-board salary cut to the top city administrators, and to reduce the number of mayor's assistants. They earn enough to part with some of their disposable income.

Thank you for responding to my email and for listening!

Regards,
Darlene

From: Figueroa Cole, Yannette <district10@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 8:38 AM
To: DARLENE GAKOVICH <dgakovic@wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: City budget and Breese Stevens "Investment"

Hello!

I am wondering if this information came from Nextdoor. Suppose it did; thank you for exploring other venues for information.

The $4 M grant for parks requires matching, and the matching funds come from TIF & Impact Fees, which neither impact the operating budget nor tax levy. A balance of $200K is coming from the repairs 2024 budget already approved.

In essence tax payers are making an investment of $200K for a $4M grant proposal. For a landmark facility owned by the city for repairs that need to be completed.

Most people don't just invest on a mortgage and let the house which is a capital investment just crumble.

If you have additional questions please reach out!

Thanks! Yannette

Sent from my iPhone

> On May 21, 2024, at 1:12 AM, DARLENE GAKOVICH <dgakovic@wisc.edu> wrote:
>
> > Some people who received this message don't often get email from dgakovic@wisc.edu. Learn why this is important
>
> Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.
>
> Dear Alders,
>
> I have already expressed my opinion on the city's bloated budget and the structural deficit. It looks like tonight you'll be giving your approval to Breese Stevens multimillion dollar project, which subsidizes for-profit businesses that don't pay property taxes or reimburse Madison for their personal use of city property (PILOT). The matching gifts for the $8 million investment seem generous but the mayor has already said that Breese Stevens will need much more. I thought investments are made in hopes of making money. Th Big Top and Frank Productions will be making that money but the

city, paid the measly annual rent, certainly will not!

Who are the people pushing for this “investment”? Where was the bidding process? How much more borrowing will you keep on authorizing?

Why are you hanging this albatross on taxpayers’ necks?

Thank you.

Darlene Gakovich

From: Bonnie Roe
To: All Alders
Subject: Fwd: Item 37 - Process Concerns
Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 10:41:07 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders,

Please see the forwarded message below, which I meant to copy all of you on, but inadvertently did not.

Thanks,

Bonnie

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Bonnie Roe** <bonnie.roe@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, May 22, 2024, 9:14 AM
Subject: Item 37 - Process Concerns
To: Mayor <mayor@cityofmadison.com>, Marsha Rummell <district6@cityofmadison.com>, Vidaver, Regina <district5@cityofmadison.com>, Alder Figueroa Cole <district10@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Bill Tishler <district11@cityofmadison.com>, Haas, Michael R <mhaas@cityofmadison.com>, Dave Schmiedicke <DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com>

Dear Sponsors of #37,

I'm confused. This resolution says it "authorizes the Parks Division TO APPLY FOR this grant. But, according to the Mayor, the City already went ahead and applied for the grant. And apparently that's part of the quandary of why you are in such a rush to pass this and can't even send it back to Finance Committee for a closer look.

The Fiscal Note is unclear and undetermined. It reads, "The Economic Development Division's 2024 Adopted Capital Budget will be amended to **ADD** $2,000,000 in **new City-issued General Obligation borrowing** authorization to the Breese Stevens Field Improvements to support overall project costs. And then there is the big **IF** about replacing that with TIF funding.

I don't really care, as this has already passed. But this seems like a very shady deal to operate and causes me to lose trust in your process.

Excerpts From the Resolution:

"The proposed resolution authorizes the Parks Division to apply for and accept if awarded, grant funding from the State of Wisconsin Grants for Local Projects Program. The grant will fund a portion of the costs of improvements at Breese Stevens Field. The City must demonstrate that it has $4,000,000 in match funding for this project. The Parks Division's 2024 Adopted Capital Budget authorizes $200,000 for Breese Stevens Improvements within

the Park Facility Improvements Major. If the grant is awarded, the Parks Division 2024 Adopted Capital Budget will be amended to reflect a total project cost of up to $8,000,000 and appropriate the grant funding of up to $4,000,000. The Economic Development Division's 2024 Adopted Capital Budget will be amended to add $2,000,000 in new City-issued General Obligation borrowing authorization to the Breese Stevens Field Improvements to support overall project costs. The resolution also directs City staff to pursue an amendment to the TID #36 Project Plan from the TIF Joint Review Board to utilize up to $2,000,000 in TID #36 funding in lieu of GO borrowing. If the Project Plan amendment is approved, TIF funding would replace GO Borrowing. The resolution also amends the 2024 Adopted Capital Budget of the Parks Division to appropriate $1,800,000 in Park Impact Fees ($1,300,000 from City-Wide and $500,000 from North District) to the Breese Stevens Field Improvements Project Munis #15039, within Park Facility Improvements Program MUNIS Major #17443."

The fact that Alders do not understand how GO Borrowing affects the General Fund is of significant concern to me. Debt Service is now the #2 expenditure out of the General Fund (where the $27 million structural deficit is). The more Debt Service our property tax revenue has to pay (to finance our GO Borrowing debt), the less property tax revenue the City has to cover Operating Expenses in the Operating Budget (funded by the General Fund). Do you see how it affects an ongoing deficit now?

Bonnie Roe
District 11

From: stephenaschaak@gmail.com
To: All Alders
Subject: Breese Stevens Project
Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 10:14:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from stephenaschaak@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Do it! Take the grant. Keep investing in this economic engine.

Thank you.

Stephen Schaak
4242 Mandan Crescent