2004 Annual Report

69th/Ashland 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 69th/Ashland 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

Ernst + Young LLP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNUAL REPORT – 69^{th} /ASHLAND REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION (d) OF 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5.

		PAGE
LE'	TTER 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 69th/Ashland 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 November 3, 2004. The Project Area may be terminated no later than November 3, 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 69th/Ashland 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: 69th/Ashland

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,

Travas Georges Mara S. Georges Corporation Counsel

SCHEDULE 1

(Exception Schedule)

((X)	No	Exce	ptions

() 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.

(7)(E) - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5(d)(7)(E)

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)

TABLE 7(G)

PROJECT BY PROJECT REVIEW OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INVESTMENT AND RATIO OF PRIVATE TO PUBLIC INVESTMENT *

Projects Estimated To Be Undertaken During 2005	Private Investment Undertaken	Public Investment Undertaken	Ratio of Private/Public Investment
Project 1: Food 4 Less	\$10,901,878	\$977,000	11.2:1
Project 2: Finch Development	\$5,471,268	\$948,000	5.8:1
Total:	\$16,373,146	\$1,925,000	n/a

Each actual or estimated Public Investment reported here is, to the extent possible, comprised only of payments financed by tax increment revenues. In contrast, each actual or estimated Private Investment reported here is, to the extent possible, comprised of payments financed by revenues that are not tax increment revenues and, therefore, may include private equity, private lender financing, private grants, other public monies, or other local, state or federal grants or loans.

CITY OF CHICAGO JOINT REVIEW BOARD

Report of proceedings of a hearing before the City of Chicago, Joint Review Board held on August 6, 2004, at 10:15 a.m. City Hall, Room 1003, Conference Room, Chicago, Illinois, and presided over by Mr. Mark Thomas.

PRESENT:

MR. MARK THOMAS, CHAIRMAN

MR. JOHN McCORMICK

MS. KAY KOSMAL

MS. SUSAN MAREK

REPORTED BY: Accurate Reporting Service

200 N. LaSalle Street

Chicago, Illinois

By: Jack Artstein, C.S.R.

1 MR. THOMAS: For the record my name is 2 Mark Thomas. I'm the representative of the 3 Chicago Park District which, under Section 11-74-5 of the Tax Increment Allocation 4 5 Redevelopment Act, is one of the statutorily 6 designated members of the Joint Review Board. Until election of a Chairperson 7 8 I'll moderate the Joint Review Board meeting. For the record there will be a meeting of the 9 10 Joint Review Board to review the proposed 69th 11 and Ashland tax increment financing district. 12 The date of this meeting was announced at and 13 set by the Community Development Commission 14 of the City of Chicago at its meeting of July 15 13, 2004. 16 Notice of this meeting of the 17 Joint Review Board was also provided by 18 certified mail to each taxing district 19 represented on the Board which includes the 20 Chicago Board of Education, Chicago Community Colleges District 508, the Chicago Park 21 22 District, Cook County and the City of Chicago 23 as well as the Public Member.

1 Public notice of this meeting was 2 also posted as of Wednesday, August 4, 2004 3 at various locations throughout City Hall. Our first order of business is to select a Chairperson for this Joint Review Board. Are 5 6 there any nominations? 7 MS. MAREK: I'll nominate Mark Thomas. 8 MR. MCCORMICK: Second. 9 MR. THOMAS: Are there any other 10 nominations? Let the record reflect there 11 were no other nominations. All in favor of 12 the nomination please vote by saying aye. 13 (Chorus of ayes.) 14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: All opposed please 15 vote by saying no. Let the record reflect 16 that Mark Thomas has been selected as 17 Chairperson and will now serve as the 18 Chairperson for the remainder of the meeting. 19 As I mentioned, at this meeting 20 we will be reviewing a plan for the 69^{th} and 21 Ashland tax increment financing district 22 proposed by the City of Chicago. Staff of 23 the city's Department of Planning and

- 1 Development and Law and other departments 2 have reviewed this plan amendment which was 3 introduced to the city's Community 4 Development Commission on July 13, 2004. 5 We will listen to a presentation 6 by the consultant on the plan. Following the 7 presentation we can address any questions that the members might have for the 9 consultant or city staff. The recent 10 amendment to the TIF Act requires us to base 11 our recommendation to approve or disapprove 12 the 69th and Ashland plan and the designation 13 of the 69th and Ashland TIF area on the basis 14 of the area and the plan, satisfying the plan 15 requirements, the eligibility criteria 16 defined in the TIF Act and objectives of the 17 TIF Act. 18 If the Board approves the plan 19 and the designation of the area, the Board 20 will then issue an advisory non-binding 21 recommendation by the vote of the majority of
- 23 recommendation shall be submitted to the city

those members present and voting. Such

22

1 within 30 days after the Board meeting. 2 Failure to submit such 3 recommendation shall be deemed to constitute 4 approval by the Board. If the Board 5 disapproves the plan and the designation of 6 the area, the Board must issue a written 7 report describing why the plan and area failed to meet one or more of the objectives 9 of the TIF Act and both the plan requirements 10 and the eligibility of the TIF Act. 11 The city will then have 30 days 12 to resubmit a revised plan. The Board and 13 the city must also confer during this time to 14 try and resolve the issues that led to the 15 Board's disapproval. If such issues cannot 16 be resolved or if the revised plan is 17 disapproved, the city may proceed with the 18 plan but the plan can be approved only with a 19 three fifths vote of the City Council excluding positions of members that are 20 21 vacant and those members that are ineligible 22 to vote because of conflicts of interest. And we'll move on to the

23

- 1 presentation by S.B. Friedman.
- MR. LITTLES: Thank you. Good morning
- 3 everyone, my name is Jewell Littles. I'm
- 4 with S.B. Friedman & Company. I work as an
- 5 Associate there. We've been hired actually
- 6 by, this is more of a developer driven TIF
- 7 and we've been hired to do the eligibility
- 8 and redevelopment plan for the 69^{th} and
- 9 Ashland RPA. The RPA is mostly rectangular
- in shape. It also includes just a small
- 11 portion extending to Justine Avenue.
- 12 It generally covers from
- Marshfield Avenue to the east alley right of
- 14 way of Ashland Avenue, 69th Street to the
- 15 north and 71^{st} Street to the south. The RPA
- 16 consists of 63 pins and also 12 primary
- 17 buildings and that excludes all ancillary
- 18 structures including garages and sheds.
- 19 It does include 20 vacant parcels
- of the former CTA bus line site. The
- 21 existing land use for the study area is
- 22 mostly vacant and also consists of
- 23 commercial, residential, institutional and

1 utility uses. Vacant land is pretty much 2 distributed throughout the RPA. It includes 3 the CTA bus barn parcels as well as vacant parcels at the southwest corner of 69th and 4 5 Justine, the southeast corner of 70th and Ashland and also mid-block on the east side 7 of Ashland between 70th Street and 71st Street. Commercial uses consist of six 8 9 businesses which are mostly auto related. It 10 includes a gas station, auto sales and auto 11 repair. The residential uses within the RPA 12 includes one mixed use building at the corner of 69th and Ashland which is all vacant. 13 14 also includes two single-family units and two 15 multi-family units. 16 Together the RPA has six advertised residential units. There's one 17 institutional use. There's a church near the 18 19 next to the gas station here at the corner. 20 So the church is located about in here. 21 there are also two utility uses in the name 22 of two communication towers. There's one

23

between 70th and 71st Street. And there's also

- 1 one at the southwest corner of 71^{st} and 2 Ashland on the CTA bus line site. 3 This RPA qualifies as a blighted 4 area under the Illinois Tax Increment 5 Allocation Redevelopment Act. To the south side of the blighted area, these five 6 7 eligibility factors should be found and it should be present at a meaningful expense. 8 9 And our research found that six of the 10 thirteen eligibility factors were present. 11 In terms of improved land 12 factors, obsolescence supply, we found that 13 48 percent of the parcels, as well as 5014 percent of the buildings had obsolete structures. One of the main obsolete 15 16 structures is located again at 69th and 17 Ashland, the completely vacant mixed use 18 building. 83 percent of the parcels were
- found to show some deterioration and that includes also 90 percent of all parcels.

 Some of the factors identified were cracks in building facade, sidewalks, parking areas and

- 1 broken and missing curbs. 2 Deleterious land use and layout was found in 28 percent of the improved 3 4 parcels. And it included incompatible land 5 uses including utility towers abutting 6 residential structures and improper use of 7 yards as parking facilities. 8 33 percent of the buildings had 9 code violations between 1997 and May of 2004. 10 And also the buildings that are currently 11 vacant had past records of code violations 12 which exhibits progressive deterioration. 13 The fifth factor was inadequate utilities and 14 we found through the research of water and 15 sewer lines, that 3,900 linear feet of water 16 mains needed to be replaced and additional 17 sewer lines also needed to be replaced to
- Our sixth factor for our improved
 parcels was lack of EAV growth. 100 percent
 of the parcels lagged behind the growth of
 the city as well as the township. Additional

serve the area. Most of the water sewer

mains in this area are over 100 years old.

18

19

```
1
      criteria we looked at was the vacant land
 2
      within the RPA and found that three of the
      five factors were present to an equal extent.
 3
                   100 percent of all the vacant
      land exhibited deterioration of adjacent
 6
      structures in the area. Diversity of
      ownership was attributable to 41 percent of
 7
 8
      the parcels and environmental contamination,
 9
      which is primarily the entire CTA bus barn
10
      site, is environmentally contaminated.
11
      had their leaking underground storage tanks
12
      letter but the site was still found to have
13
      leaking gasses at the site.
14
                   To define our required findings
15
      and tests we analyzed the lack of growth and
16
      proper investment within the RPA and the only
      significant building permits that were issued
17
18
      between 1997 and 2004 were the demolition of
19
      buildings and also there were two building
20
      permits for the establishment of the
21
      communication towers within the RPA and that
22
      did not exhibit meaningful investment within
```

the study area.

23

- 1 schools that are discussion areas included in
- 2 the RPA are Altgeld School, Barton
- 3 Elementary, Bass School, Bonn School, Muncie
- 4 School, Duke's Academy, John's Community
- 5 Academy and Harper High School.
- 6 And according to the Chicago
- 7 Public School's data, most of these
- 8 facilities are currently operating under
- 9 capacity. However, given the small size of
- 10 the TIF and then also the proposed
- 11 development, considering that it's mostly
- 12 commercial and only includes some small
- 13 residential uses, that the TIF more likely
- 14 than not will not generate enough school age
- 15 children to reach capacity.
- 16 Furthermore, provisions in the
- 17 Illinois TIF Act call for reimbursement of
- 18 affected schools for increased costs incurred
- 19 as a result of TIF supported housing units if
- 20 the affected schools are over capacity. The
- 21 major policy of proponents of the
- 22 redevelopment plan are the goals and
- objectives and the future land uses in the

- 1 RPA and the TIF budget.
- 2 It should be noted that the plan
- 3 is putting in place a guide for mechanism to
- 4 facilitate redevelopment. It does not
- 5 determine the ultimate character of that
- 6 development. The primary goal is to
- 7 eliminate the conditions that qualify the
- 8 area as a redevelopment area. In this case
- 9 particularly to facilitate the redevelopment
- 10 of the entire area in a way that reintegrates
- 11 it into the fabric and scale of the
- 12 surrounding community.
- 13 The future land use plan reflects
- 14 the type of development that will be
- 15 supported within the TIF, TIF dollars over
- 16 the 23 year life of the TIF, making it in
- 17 essence a blueprint for development within
- 18 the TIF district. It should be emphasized
- 19 that the future land use plan does not
- 20 supercede current land use or zoning planning
- 21 and that the plan is kept intentionally very
- 22 general and flexible to accommodate any
- changes in the market and future planned

ocations

ssional

caining

e items

osed TIF

ssful

ie RPA

r any

o any of

n the

, there

ng to

r or the

eloper,

for a

er but

- 1 that's not part of this action just relative
- 2 to establishment.
- MS. KOSMAL: No, I understand that. I
- 4 just wanted some information.
- 5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is 70th Street closed
- 6 there?
- 7 MS. LITTLES: Yes only on the CTA
- 8 site.
- 9 MR. MCCORMICK: Any further questions?
- MS. LITTLES: Thank you.
- MS. MAREK: Thank you.
- 12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I entertain a motion
- 13 that this Joint Review Board finds that the
- 14 proposed redevelopment plan, 69th and Ashland
- 15 tax increment financing redevelopment project
- 16 area, satisfies the redevelopment plan
- 17 requirements under the TIF Act, the
- 18 eligibility criteria as defined in Section
- 19 11-7.4-3 of the TIF Act and the objectives of
- the TIF Act and that based on such findings
- 21 approves such proposed plan and designation
- of such area as a redevelopment project area
- 23 under the TIF Act.

1	Is there a motion for approval?
2	MR. MCCORMICK: So moved.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is there a second?
4	MS. MAREK: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Any further
6	discussion? If not, all in favor please vote
7	by saying aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes.)
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: All opposed please
10	vote by saying no. Let the record reflect
11	the Joint Review Board's approval of the
12	proposed 69^{th} and Ashland redevelopment plan
13	and designation of the $69^{ ext{th}}$ and Ashland tax
14	increment financing redevelopment project
15	area as a redevelopment project area under
16	the TIF Act.
17	And I'll entertain a motion to
18	adjourn.
19	MR. MCCORMICK: So moved.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Second?
21	MS. MAREK: Second.
22	(Whereupon the meeting adjourned
23	At 10:40 a.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)

SS.

COUNTY OF C O O K)

I, JACK ARTSTEIN depose and say that I am a verbatim reporter doing business in the County of Cook and City of Chicago; that I caused to be transcribed the proceedings heretofore identified and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the aforesaid hearing.

JACK ARTSTEIN

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

BEFORE ME THIS

DAY OF

A.D. 2004

NOTARY PUBLIC

OFFICIAL SEAL

RENALD LEGRIND JR

NOTANY PARAS - BINNE OF ILLINOIS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 10-11-08

(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 69th/Ashland Redevelopment Project Area is generally bounded on the east by the alley right-of-way of Ashland Avenue and the east side of Justine Avenue, on the north by the north side of 69th Street, on the west by the west side of Marshfield Avenue, and on the south by the south side of 71st Street. 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.

