### 2004 Annual Report

## 47<sup>th</sup>/State Redevelopment Project Area



Pursuant to 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)

JUNE 30, 2005



■ Ernst & Young LLP Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60606-6301 ■ Phone: (312) 879-2000 www.ey.com

June 30, 2005

Ms. Denise Casalino Commissioner Department of Planning and Development 121 North LaSalle Street Chicago, Illinois 60602

#### Dear Commissioner:

Enclosed is the annual report for the 47th/State Redevelopment Project Area, which we compiled at the direction of the Department of Planning and Development pursuant to Section 5(d) of the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq.), as amended. The contents are based on information provided to us by Chicago Departments of Planning and Development, Finance, and Law. We have not audited, verified, or applied agreed upon accounting and testing procedures to the data contained in this report. Therefore, we express no opinion on its accuracy or completeness.

It has been a pleasure to work with representatives from the Department of Planning and Development and other City Departments.

Very truly yours,

Ernst & Young LLP

Ernot + Young LLP

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ANNUAL REPORT –  $47^{th}$ /STATE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION (d) OF 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5.

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| LETTER TO STATE COMPTROLLER                                     | 1    |
| 1) DATE OF DESIGNATION OR TERMINATION                           | 2    |
| 2) AUDITED FINANCIALS   | 3    |
| 3) MAYOR'S CERTIFICATION  | 4    |
| 4) OPINION OF LEGAL COUNSEL                                     | 5    |
| 5) ANALYSIS OF SPECIAL TAX ALLOCATION FUND                      | 6    |
| 6) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY                                      | 7    |
| 7) STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES                                      | 8    |
| 8) DOCUMENTS RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED BY THE MUNICIPALITY | 12   |
| 9) ANALYSIS OF DEBT SERVICE                                     | 13   |
| 10) CERTIFIED AUDIT REPORT                                      | 14   |
| 11) GENERAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP                                 | 15   |



City of Chicago Richard M. Daley, Mayor

Department of Planning and Development

Denise M. Casalino, P.E. Commissioner

City Hall, Room 1000 121 North LaSalle Street Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 744-4190 (312) 744-2271 (FAX) (312) 744-2578 (TTY) http://www.cityofchicago.org June 30, 2005

The Honorable Daniel Hynes Comptroller State of Illinois Office of the Comptroller 201 Capitol Springfield, IL 62706

Dear Comptroller Hynes:

We have compiled the attached information for the 47th/State Redevelopment Project Area (Report) pursuant to 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d).

Sincerely,

Denise Casalino Commissioner





### (1) DATE OF DESIGNATION AND TERMINATION - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(1.5)

The Project Area was designated on July 21, 2004. The Project Area may be terminated no later than July 21, 2027.

Note: Incremental tax revenues levied in the  $23^{rd}$  tax year are collected in the  $24^{th}$  tax year. Although the Project Area will expire in Year 23 in accordance with 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(n)(J)(3), the incremental taxes received in the  $24^{th}$  tax year will be deposited into the Special Tax Allocation Fund.

### (2) AUDITED FINANCIALS - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(2)

During 2004, no financial activity or cumulative deposits over \$100,000 occurred in the Project Area. Therefore, no audited statements were prepared pertaining to the Special Tax Allocation Fund for the Project Area.

### (3) MAYOR'S CERTIFICATION - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(3)

Please see attached.

| STATE OF ILLINOIS | ) |
|-------------------|---|
|                   | ) |
| COUNTY OF COOK    | ) |

#### CERTIFICATION

TO:

Daniel W. Hynes Comptroller of the State of Illinois James R. Thompson Center 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 15-500 Chicago, Illinois 60601 Attention: June Tallamantez, Director of Local Government

Dolores Javier, Treasurer City Colleges of Chicago 226 West Jackson Boulevard, Room 1125 Chicago, Illinois 60606

Gwendolyn Clemons, Director Cook County Department of Planning & Development 69 West Washington Street, Room 2900 Chicago, Illinois 60602 Attn: Jackie Harder

Dan Donovan, Comptroller Forest Preserve District of Cook County 69 W. Washington Ave. Suite 2060 Chicago, IL 60602

Martin J. Koldyke, Chairman Chicago School Finance Authority 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3800 Chicago, Illinois 60603 Tim Mitchell, General Superintendent & CEO Chicago Park District 541 North Fairbanks Court, 7th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60611

Arne Duncan, Chief Executive Officer Chicago Board of Education 125 South Clark Street, 5th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60603 Attn: Linda Wrightsell

Jacqueline Torres, Director of Finance
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of
Greater Chicago
100 East Erie Street, Room 2429
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Attn: Joe Rose

Wallace Young
South Cook County Mosquito Abatement
District
155th & Dixie Highway
P.O. Box 1030
Harvey, Illinois 60426
Attn: Dr. Khian K. Liem

I, RICHARD M. DALEY, in connection with the annual report (the "Report") of information required by Section 11-74.4-5(d) of the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS5/11-74.4-1 et seq, (the "Act") with regard to the 47th /State Redevelopment Project Area (the "Redevelopment Project Area"), do hereby certify as follows:

- 1. I am the duly qualified and acting Mayor of the City of Chicago, Illinois (the "City") and, as such, I am the City's Chief Executive Officer. This Certification is being given by me in such capacity.
- 2. During the preceding fiscal year of the City, being January 1 through December 31, 2004, the City complied, in all material respects, with the requirements of the Act, as applicable from time to time, regarding the Redevelopment Project Area.
- 3. In giving this Certification, I have relied on the opinion of the Corporation Counsel of the City furnished in connection with the Report.
  - 4. This Certification may be relied upon only by the addressees hereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed my official signature as of this 30th day of June, 2005.

Richard M. Daley, Mayor City of Chicago, Illinois

### (4) **OPINION OF LEGAL COUNSEL - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(4)**

Please see attached.



City of Chicago Richard M. Daley, Mayor

#### **Department of Law**

Mara S. Georges Corporation Counsel

City Hall, Room 600 121 North LaSalle Street Chicago, Illinois 60602 (312) 744-6900 (312) 744-8538 (FAX) (312) 744-2963 (TTY)

http://www.cityofchicago.org

June 30, 2005

Daniel W. Hynes Comptroller of the State of Illinois James R. Thompson Center 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 15-500 Chicago, Illinois 60601 Attention: June Tallamantez, Director of Local Government

Dolores Javier, Treasurer City Colleges of Chicago 226 West Jackson Boulevard, Room 1125 Chicago, Illinois 60606

Gwendolyn Clemons, Director
Cook County Department of Planning &
Development
69 West Washington Street, Room 2900
Chicago, Illinois 60602
Attn: Jackie Harder

Dan Donovan, Comptroller Forest Preserve District of Cook County 69 W. Washington Ave. Suite 2060 Chicago, IL 60602

Martin J. Koldyke, Chairman Chicago School Finance Authority 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3800 Chicago, Illinois 60603 Tim Mitchell, General Superintendent & CEO
Chicago Park District
541 North Fairbanks Court, 7th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Arne Duncan, Chief Executive Officer Chicago Board of Education 125 South Clark Street, 5th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60603 Attn: Linda Wrightsell

Jacqueline Torres, Director of Finance Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago 100 East Erie Street, Room 2429 Chicago, Illinois 60611 Attn: Joe Rose

Wallace Young
South Cook County Mosquito Abatement
District
155th & Dixie Highway
P.O. Box 1030
Harvey, Illinois 60426

Attn: Dr. Khian K. Liem

Re: 47th /State

Redevelopment Project Area (the "Redevelopment Project

Area")

#### Dear Addressees:

I am Corporation Counsel of the City of Chicago, Illinois (the "City"). In such capacity, I am providing the opinion required by Section 11-74.4-5(d)(4) of the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq. (the "Act"), in connection with the submission of the report (the "Report") in accordance with, and containing the information required by, Section 11-74.4-5(d) of the Act for the Redevelopment Project Area.





Attorneys, past and present, in the Law Department of the City familiar with the requirements of the Act have had general involvement in the proceedings affecting the Redevelopment Project Area, including the preparation of ordinances adopted by the City Council of the City with respect to the following matters: approval of the redevelopment plan and project for the Redevelopment Project Area, designation of the Redevelopment Project Area as a redevelopment project area and adoption of tax increment allocation financing for the Redevelopment Project Area, all in accordance with the then applicable provisions of the Act. Various departments of the City, including, if applicable, the Law Department, Department of Planning and Development, Department of Housing, Department of Finance and Office of Budget and Management, have personnel responsible for and familiar with the activities in the Redevelopment Project Area affecting such Department(s) and with the requirements of the Act in connection therewith. Such personnel are encouraged to seek and obtain, and do seek and obtain, the legal guidance of the Law Department with respect to issues that may arise from time to time regarding the requirements of, and compliance with, the Act.

In my capacity as Corporation Counsel, I have relied on the general knowledge and actions of the appropriately designated and trained staff of the Law Department and other applicable City Departments involved with the activities affecting the Redevelopment Project Area. In addition, I have caused to be examined or reviewed by members of the Law Department of the City the certified audit report, to the extent required to be obtained by Section 11-74.4-5(d)(9) of the Act and submitted as part of the Report, which is required to review compliance with the Act in certain respects, to determine if such audit report contains information that might affect my opinion. I have also caused to be examined or reviewed such other documents and records as were deemed necessary to enable me to render this opinion. Nothing has come to my attention that would result in my need to qualify the opinion hereinafter expressed, subject to the limitations hereinafter set forth, unless and except to the extent set forth in an Exception Schedule attached hereto as Schedule 1.

Based on the foregoing, I am of the opinion that, in all material respects, the City is in compliance with the provisions and requirements of the Act in effect and then applicable at the time actions were taken from time to time with respect to the Redevelopment Project Area.

This opinion is given in an official capacity and not personally and no personal liability shall derive herefrom. Furthermore, the only opinion that is expressed is the opinion specifically set forth herein, and no opinion is implied or should be inferred as to any other matter. Further, this opinion may be relied upon only by the addressees hereof and the Mayor of the City in providing his required certification in connection with the Report, and not by any other party.

Very truly yours,

Mara S. Georges Corporation Counsel

mara & Georges

### **SCHEDULE 1**

(Exception Schedule)

- (X) No Exceptions
- ( ) Note the following Exceptions:

### (5) ANALYSIS OF SPECIAL TAX ALLOCATION FUND - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(5)

During 2004, there was no financial activity in the Special Tax Allocation Fund.

### (6) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(6)**

During 2004, the City did not purchase any property in the Project Area.

#### (7) STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)

- (A) Projects implemented in the preceding fiscal year.
- **(B)** A description of the redevelopment activities undertaken.
- **(C)** Agreements entered into by the City with regard to disposition or redevelopment of any property within the Project Area.
- **(D)** Additional information on the use of all Funds received by the Project Area and steps taken by the City to achieve the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan.
- (E) Information on contracts that the City's consultants have entered into with parties that have received, or are receiving, payments financed by tax increment revenues produced by the Project Area.
- **(F)** Joint Review Board reports submitted to the City.
- (G) Project-by-project review of public and private investment undertaken from 11/1/99 to 12/31/04, and of such investments expected to be undertaken in year 2005; also, a project-by-project ratio of private investment to public investment from 11/1/99 to 12/31/04, and an estimated ratio of such investments as of the completion of each project and as estimated to the completion of the redevelopment project.

SEE TABLES AND/OR DISCUSSIONS ON FOLLOWING PAGES.

#### (7)(A) - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)(A)

During 2004, no projects were implemented.

#### (7)(B) - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)(B)

Redevelopment activities undertaken within this Project Area during the year 2004, if any, have been made pursuant to i) the Redevelopment Plan for the Project Area, and ii) any Redevelopment Agreements affecting the Project Area, and are set forth on Table 5 herein by TIF-eligible expenditure category.

#### (7)(C) - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)(C)

During 2004, no agreements were entered into with regard to the disposition or redevelopment of any property within the Project Area.

### (7)(D) - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)(D)

The Project Area has not yet received any increment.

During 2004, no contracts were entered into by the City's tax increment advisors or consultants with entities or persons that have received, or are receiving, payments financed by tax increment revenues produced by the Project Area.

### (7)(F) - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)(F)

Joint Review Board Reports were submitted to the City. See attached.

### (7)(G) - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)(G)

Since November 1, 1999, no public investment was undertaken in the Project Area. As of December 31, 2004, no public investment is estimated to be undertaken for 2005.

#### CITY OF CHICAGO JOINT REVIEW BOARD

Report of proceedings of a hearing before the City of Chicago, Joint Review Board held on March 5, 2004, at 10:08 a.m. City Hall, 121 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, and presided over by Mr. Dennis Kelleher-Hernandez.

#### PRESENT:

- MR. DENNIS KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ, CHAIRMAN
- MR. JOHN McCORMICK
- MS. SUSAN MAREK
- MR. KAY KOSMAL
- MR. LUIS A. MARTINEZ

REPORTED BY: Accurate Reporting Service

200 N. LaSalle Street

Chicago, Illinois

By: Jack Artstein, C.S.R.

ACCURATE REPORTING SERVICE (312) 263-0052

- MR. DENNIS KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: State
- our names and the agencies that we represent.
- MS. MCCOY: My name is Maddie McCoy.
- 4 I live at Robert Taylor Homes and I'm the LAC
- 5 President.
- 6 MS. KOSMAL: Kay Kosmal of Cook
- 7 County.
- 8 MR. MARTINEZ: Luis Martinez --
- 9 MS. MAREK: Susan Marek, Board of
- 10 Education.
- MR. MCCORMICK: John McCormick, City
- 12 of Chicago.
- MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: For the
- 14 record my name is Dennis Kelleher-Martinez.
- 15 I'm the representative of the Chicago Park
- 16 District which under Section 11-74.4-5 of
- 17 the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment
- 18 Act and one of the statutory designated
- 19 members of the Joint Review Board.
- 20 Until election of the
- 21 Chairperson, I will now make the Joint Review
- 22 Board meeting. For the record there will be
- 23 a meeting of the Joint Review Board to review
- the proposed 47<sup>th</sup> and State Tax Increment

1 Financing District. The date of this meeting

- was announced at and set by the Community
- 3 Development Commission of the City of
- 4 Chicago at its meeting of February 10, 2004.
- 5 Notice of this meeting of the
- 6 Joint Review Board was also provided by
- 7 certified mail to each taxing district
- 8 represented on the Board which includes the
- 9 Chicago Board of Education, Chicago
- 10 Community Colleges District 508, Chicago
- 11 Park District, Cook County and the City of
- 12 Chicago and the Public Member.
- Notice of this meeting was also
- 14 posted as of Wednesday, March 3, 2004 in
- various locations throughout City Hall. The
- 16 proposed redevelopment plan would result in
- 17 displacement of residents from ten or more
- inhabited residential units or would include
- 19 75 or more inhabited residential units.
- The TIF Act requires that the
- 21 Public Member of the Joint Review Board must
- 22 reside in the proposed redevelopment project
- 23 area. And with us today we have Maddie
- 24 McCoy. Commissioner McCoy, are you familiar

- with the boundaries of the proposed 47<sup>th</sup> and
- 2 State Tax Increment Financing redevelopment
- 3 project area?
- MS. MCCOY: Well, I have --
- 5 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: And you're
- 6 not familiar with it?
- 7 MS. MCCOY: Yes.
- 8 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: What is your
- 9 primary address?
- MS. MCCOY: My primary address is 4429
- 11 S. Federal.
- 12 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: And is such
- address in the boundaries of the proposed
- 14 redevelopment project area?
- MS. MCCOY: Yes.
- 16 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: Ms. McCoy,
- 17 are you willing to serve as a Public Member
- 18 for the Joint Review Board for the 47<sup>th</sup> and
- 19 State TIF redevelopment project area?
- MS. MCCOY: Yes, I am.
- 21 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: I will
- 22 entertain a motion that Maddie McCoy be
- 23 selected as the Public Member. Do I hear a
- 24 motion?

- 1 MR. MCCORMICK: So moved.
- MS. MAREK: Second.
- 3 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: All in favor
- 4 of such motion, vote by saying aye.
- 5 (Chorus of ayes.)
- 6 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: All opposed,
- 7 vote by saying no. Let the record reflect
- 8 that Maddie McCoy has been selected as the
- 9 Public Member for the 47<sup>th</sup> and State TIF
- 10 redevelopment project area.
- 11 Our next order of business is to
- 12 select a Chairperson for this Review Board
- 13 meeting. Are there any nominations?
- 14 MR. MCCORMICK: I nominate Dennis
- 15 Kelleher-Hernandez.
- MS. MAREK: Second.
- 17 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: Are there
- any other nominations? Let the record
- 19 reflect there were no other nominations. All
- 20 in favor of such nomination, vote by saying
- 21 aye.
- (Chorus of ayes.)
- MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: All opposed,
- vote by saying no. Let the record reflect

- that Dennis Kelleher-Hernandez has been
- 2 elected as the Chairperson and will now serve
- 3 as the Chairperson for the remainder of the
- 4 meeting. As I mentioned in the beginning of
- this meeting, we will be reviewing the plan
- for the 47<sup>th</sup> and State Tax Increment
- 7 Financing District proposed by the City of
- 8 Chicago.
- 9 The draft of this city's
- 10 Department of Planning and Development and
- 11 Law Department and other departments have
- 12 reviewed this planned amendment which was
- introduced to the city's Community
- Development Commission on February 10, 2004.
- We will listen to a presentation
- 16 by a consultant on the plan. Following the
- 17 presentation, we can address any questions
- that members might have for the consultant or
- 19 city staff. The recent amendment to the TIF
- 20 Act requires us to base our recommendation to
- 21 approve or disapprove the 47<sup>th</sup> and State plan
- and the designation of the 47<sup>th</sup> and State TIF
- area on the basis of the area and the plan
- satisfying the plan requirements, the

- eligibility criteria, the planned TIF Act
- 2 and objectives of the TIF Act.
- If the Board approves the plan
- and the designation of the area, the Board
- 5 will then issue an advisory, non-binding
- 6 recommendation by the vote of the majority of
- 7 those members present and voting. Such
- 8 recommendation shall be submitted to the
- 9 city within thirty days after the Board
- 10 meeting.
- 11 Failure to submit such
- 12 recommendations shall be deemed to
- 13 constitute approval by the Board. If the
- 14 Board disapproves the plan and designation
- of the area, the Board must issue a written
- 16 report describing why the plan and the area
- failed to meet one or more of the objectives
- of the TIF Act and both the plan requirements
- and the eligibility criteria of the TIF Act.
- The city will then have thirty
- 21 days to resubmit a revised plan. The Board
- 22 and the city must also confer during this
- time to try to resolve the issues that led to
- the Board's disapproval. If such issues

- cannot be resolved or if the revised plan is
- disapproved, the city may proceed with the
- 3 plan but the plan can be approved only with
- 4 three-fifths vote of the City Council
- 5 including those positions of members that
- are vacant or those members that are
- 7 ineligible to vote because of conflicts of
- 8 interest.
- 9 Now I'd like to introduce the
- 10 consultants. The consultants are from
- 11 Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises with the
- 12 assistance of PGAV Urban Consulting.
- MS. SAWYER: Good morning everyone. I
- apologize, my voice isn't what it should be
- but this is Courtney Dpggic, he's on our
- development team and my name is Mishaune
- 17 Sawyer.
- 18 What I'd like to do this morning
- is I want to give you a brief overview just
- to set the description of what the boundaries
- 21 of the area are and the adjacent TIF District
- relevant then I will highlight impressions
- of the eligibility study and Courtney will
- speak with you regarding budgeting issues.

| 1   | Briefly, the project area is  |
|-----|---|
| 2   | irregularly shaped as you can see and it's                            |
| 3   | adjacent to these big things and the proposed                         |
| 4   | Tax Increment Financing redevelopment areas                           |
| 5   | located to the north, east and west. You've                           |
| 6   | got the 40 <sup>th</sup> on the north. You've got the                 |
| 7   | 40 <sup>th</sup> and State redevelopment project area                 |
| 8   | that's proposed and hasn't been completed                             |
| 9   | yet, the 47 <sup>th</sup> and Halsted redevelopment                   |
| 10  | project area, the Ryan Garfield                                       |
| 11  | redevelopment project area is on the west and                         |
| 12  | the 47 <sup>th</sup> and King Drive redevelopment                     |
| 13  | project area is on the east.  |
| 14  | The area is generally bounded by                                      |
| 15  | the Chicago Rock Island Railroad which is                             |
| 16  | over that way on the west and the Garfield                            |
| 17  | Boulevard and Garfield Place on the south.                            |
| 18  | There's an irregular line formed by State                             |
| 19  | Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Drive on                            |
| 2 0 | the east and portions of 43 <sup>rd</sup> Street and 51 <sup>st</sup> |
| 21  | Street on the north here.   |
| 2 2 | The project area boundaries are                                       |
| 23  | delineated on this map here. And you can                              |
| 2 4 | also see here where the adjacent TIF                                  |

- 1 Districts are. Now we found that this area
- 2 is eligible for Tax Increment Finance
- 3 because six areas are present, six factors
- 4 are present with regard to the improved
- 5 portions.
- The first one is obsolescence.
- 7 What we found that obsolete buildings
- 8 comprise fifty-six percent of the 345
- 9 buildings that are located within the
- 10 project area. There was deterioration that
- was recorded on sixty-four percent of the 345
- 12 buildings within the study area.
- 13 Inadequate utilities were found
- 14 to be present on a very large portion. It's
- present on the majority of the existing
- sewers. The majority of the existing sewers
- 17 within the study area were installed between
- 18 1884 and 1907. So the Department is planning
- 19 new sewers in 2004 as part of the CHA
- 20 redevelopment plan.
- 21 And this would also cover
- 22 reconstruction of water mains and other
- things that are needed within the area. And
- 24 this affects much of the, the majority of the

- 1 project area, both up here where the Robert
- 2 Taylor Homes are currently located and down
- 3 here, this area here.
- 4 There's dilatory land use and
- 5 layout factors that have been found present
- and that's located on eighty-two percent of
- 7 the 33 sub areas. What we did for the
- 8 purposes and I regret to tell you I don't
- 9 have an actual map of the sub areas but we
- 10 divided it into 33 different sub areas so
- 11 that we could discuss different factors.
- 12 And basically what we found is
- 13 because of the irregularly shaped lots that
- 14 are there and the super blocks that were
- 15 formed when they created the Robert Taylor
- 16 Homes, they got rid of a lot of the alleys
- 17 and thruways, the cut offs. They got rid of
- 18 the Chicago Street bridge. It no longer
- 19 exists in that area. And so basically in
- 20 order for this area to be developed, we find
- 21 that those need to be put back in the order
- that they were before the Robert Taylor Homes
- 23 were developed.
- There was a lack of community

```
1 planning. We found lack of community
```

- 2 planning for similar reasons present on
- 3 sixty-seven percent of the 33 sub areas, for
- the same reasons that I just listed. Also
- 5 there was steady or declining equalized
- 6 assessed value that was found present in
- 7 three of the years that we studied and we
- 8 studied from 1998 to 2002. And during those
- years, the PAV produced at a rate of
- 10 substantially lower than what happened in
- 11 the rest of the city.
- 12 Now with regard to vacant land,
- the findings and the document planning, due
- 14 to the irregular size and shape of the plots
- 15 as we talked about before, that was present
- 16 on ninety-seven percent of the sub areas that
- 17 we looked at. There was deterioration of
- 18 structures and site improvements in adjacent
- 19 land which goes where the vacant land is
- located, there was generally deteriorating
- 21 structures that was adjacent to it or right
- 22 nearby. And then again the decline PAV as we
- found with the improved property.
- 24 And because of this we found that

- this area more than qualifies for Tax
- 2 Increment Financing. And within the
- 3 guidelines of the CHA plan for
- 4 redevelopment, along with the city and the
- state's ideas, that we have determined and
- 6 proposed that what we would believe would be
- 7 great would be mixed used residential,
- 8 commercial and institutional in the areas
- 9 that are, I guess I'll call this purple and
- the areas that are down here that are
- 11 highlighted in yellow, would be primarily
- all residential with the exception of that.
- 13 That zoning would allow for schools and
- 14 churches and things like that that are
- 15 already within the area to remain.
- 16 PARTICIPANT: Good morning. We'll
- 17 discuss the budget. Based on our analysis --
- MS. MAREK: I have just one question
- 19 about the legends. Outside of the Robert
- 20 Taylor Homes, is any of that other property
- 21 tax exempt?
- MS. SAWYER: Yes. Here what we have
- institutional, in the light blue, all of
- those and the parks of course are tax exempt.

```
1 MS. MAREK: Okay. In the housing area
```

- 2 is there any --
- MS. SAWYER: There are churches,
- 4 there's a school down here where you see the
- 5 blue colored in here, many of those are
- 6 churches. A few of them are schools. I
- 7 think there's a boy's club, a boy's and
- 8 girl's club. Those organizations are tax
- 9 exempt as well as schools.
- MS. MAREK: Okay. And then the Robert
- 11 Taylor Homes?
- MS. SAWYER: Right, correct. They
- 13 didn't build them for the Robert Taylor Homes
- 14 now, at least that are still here in the
- 15 yellow. It's residential. And they're not
- 16 blue.
- MS. MAREK: Thank you.
- 18 PARTICIPANT: As it's zoned, the
- 19 CHA's plan for transformation, the area's
- going to be redeveloped over the twenty-
- 21 three year life of the TIF beginning with the
- 22 Robert Taylor portion, again 43<sup>rd</sup>, 55<sup>th</sup>. The
- 23 CHA is proposing 2,000 units, a third, a
- 24 third, a third. Within the existing land,

```
1 existing homes go up between 51<sup>st</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup>
```

- with State on the west, King Drive on the
- 3 east. You're looking at another 1,500 units
- 4 of housing being developed over the life of
- 5 the twenty-three life of the TIF.
- As a result of the redevelopment
- 7 plan the A and B for the project area is
- 8 going to be excavated between two hundred and
- 9 four million dollars over that time period.
- 10 Federal taxes would be generated around two
- 11 hundred and eighteen million dollars. The
- budget for the project is approximately
- 13 180.5 million consisting of sixty million
- for analysis and project redevelopment.
- Twenty-five million for site
- 16 preps like acquisition, environmental calls.
- 17 Another fifty million dollars for housing
- 18 development. Two million dollars for
- 19 daycare centers. Seventy-five million
- 20 dollars for public works. Relocations,
- 21 another two million dollars for CHA
- 22 residents and other factors that may need to
- 23 be relocated.
- 24 Interest subsidy is about ten

```
1 million dollars and the job training council
```

- 2 is roughly three million. Any questions in
- 3 regards to the budget or the analysis
- 4 regarding the EAV or property tax iteration?
- 5 MR. MCCORMICK: What's the current
- 6 EAV? Do you know right now?
- 7 PARTICIPANT: Current EAV is roughly
- 8 nineteen million dollars -- 19.8.
- 9 MR. MCCORMICK: Okay, that's fine.
- MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any
- 11 other questions? I will entertain a motion
- 12 that --
- MS. KOSMAL: I just have one question.
- 14 It's not about the budget. I was just
- 15 curious. I don't see anything for parks and
- there's at least one park existing and the
- general land use doesn't show any park in the
- 18 area at all.
- MS. SAWYER: Well, the park area would
- 20 be able to go in any, they could put parks in
- 21 any of these areas. This area that's in
- 22 yellow is residential which allows for parks
- 23 and schools and churches. And this area
- 24 which is mixed use, it includes

```
1 institutional which would also include parks
```

- 2 should anybody ever choose to put a park in
- 3 any of those areas. We tried to leave that
- as open as possible to allow flexibility.
- 5 MR. PARTICIPANT: There's an
- 6 allocation in the budget for public
- 7 services, parks and schools and so forth.
- 8 MS. KOSMAL: Okay, thank you.
- 9 MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: Any other
- 10 questions? I'll entertain a motion that this
- Joint Review Board finds that the proposed
- 12 redevelopment plan for 47<sup>th</sup> and State, TIF
- 13 redevelopment project area satisfies the
- 14 redevelopment plan requirements under the
- 15 TIF Act, the eligibility criteria defined in
- 16 Section 11-74.4-3 of the TIF Act and the
- objectives of the TIF Act and that based on
- 18 such findings, approves such proposed plan
- 19 and designation of such area as a
- 20 redevelopment project under the TIF Act.
- 21 Do I hear such a motion for
- 22 approval?
- MR. MCCORMICK: So moved.
- MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: Is there a

| 1   | second for such motion?                                |
|-----|--|
| 2   | PARTICIPANT: Second.                                   |
| 3   | MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: Is there any                   |
| 4   | further discussion? All in favor of the                |
| 5   | motion, please vote by saying aye.                     |
| 6   | (Chorus of ayes.)                                      |
| 7   | MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: All opposed,                   |
| 8   | vote by saying no. Let the record reflect              |
| 9   | that the Joint Review Board's approval of the          |
| 10  | proposed 47 <sup>th</sup> and State redevelopment plan |
| 11  | and designation of the 47 <sup>th</sup> and State TIF  |
| 12  | redevelopment project area as a                        |
| 13  | redevelopment project area under the TIF               |
| 14  | Act.   |
| 15  | Do I have a motion to adjourn?                         |
| 16  | MS. KOSMAL: So moved.                                  |
| 17  | PARTICIPANT: Second.                                   |
| 18  | MR. KELLEHER-HERNANDEZ: All in                         |
| 19  | favor?   |
| 2 0 | (Chorus of ayes.)                                      |
| 21  | (Whereupon the meeting adjourned                       |
| 2 2 | at 10:37 a.m.)   |
| 23  |  |
|     |  |

(8) DOCUMENTS RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED BY THE MUNICIPALITY - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(8)(A)

During 2004, there were no obligations issued for the Project Area.

### (9) ANALYSIS OF DEBT SERVICE - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(8)(B)

During 2004, there were no obligations issued for the Project Area.

### (10) **CERTIFIED AUDIT REPORTS - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(9)**

During 2004, there were no tax increment expenditures or cumulative deposits over \$100,000 within the Project Area. Therefore, no compliance statement was prepared.

#### (11) GENERAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP

The 47<sup>th</sup>/State Redevelopment Project Area is generally bounded by the Chicago Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Lines on the west, Garfield Blvd. on the south, an irregular line formed by State Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive on the east, and portions of 43<sup>rd</sup> Street and 51<sup>st</sup> Street on the north. The map below illustrates the location and general boundaries of the Project Area. For precise boundaries, please consult the legal description in the Redevelopment Plan.

