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As was noted earlier, the Area has not been subject to growth and development by private enterprise, but the adoption of this Plan will make possible the development of this Project. Implementation of this Plan will benefit the City, its neighborhood and all the taxing districts in the form of a significantly expanded tax base, employment opportunities and stimulation of other neighborhood improvements.

Finding No. 3: The Redevelopment Project Area on the whole has not been subject to growth and development through investment by private enterprise and would not reasonably be anticipated to be developed without the adoption of this Redevelopment Plan.

Finding No. 4: This Redevelopment Plan and Project conform to the comprehensive plan for the development of the City as a whole.

V. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS

Redevelopment Project Costs (the "Costs") are those costs which will be paid for with tax increment revenues or TIF bond proceeds. These Costs are to make the public improvements*which are necessary for the completion of this Project. These Costs include but are not limited to: costs of studies, surveys, plans and specifications, professional service costs including, but not limited to architectural, engineering, legal, financial, planning and special services, interest, capitalized, if any, on TIF bonds, and the cost of site preparation and construction of public works improvements (on and off site) and job training.

The total estimated Redevelopment Project Costs are $3.3 million. (See Exhibit No. 8.) Within this limit, adjustments may be made in line items without amendment of this Plan. However, the total Costs will not exceed $3.3 million.
VI. MOST RECENT EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION OF PROPERTIES
IN THE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA

To provide a basis for the financial analysis of the Project and to ascertain the most recent equalized assessed valuation of the Area, the Cook County Clerk’s files were reviewed. Based on the Cook County Assessor’s records, the most recent assessed valuation for the Area (see Exhibit 9, tax parcel map) is $158,135, after application of the equalized multiplier to the assessed value as assigned to Cook County by the State of Illinois.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL</th>
<th>ASSESSED VALUATION</th>
<th>EQUALIZED VALUATION</th>
<th>1985 TAXES LEVIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-9-419-032</td>
<td>$4,523.00</td>
<td>$8,180.00</td>
<td>$795.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-420-035</td>
<td>1,431.00</td>
<td>2,588.00</td>
<td>251.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-420-036</td>
<td>827.00</td>
<td>1,496.00</td>
<td>145.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-420-037</td>
<td>3,314.00</td>
<td>5,993.00</td>
<td>582.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-420-038</td>
<td>4,148.00</td>
<td>7,502.00</td>
<td>729.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-420-039</td>
<td>1,428.00</td>
<td>2,583.00</td>
<td>251.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-421-027</td>
<td>2,788.00</td>
<td>5,042.00</td>
<td>490.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-421-033</td>
<td>63670.00</td>
<td>115,147.00</td>
<td>11,191.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-421-034</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-421-037</td>
<td>3,374.00</td>
<td>6,102.00</td>
<td>593.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9-421-038</td>
<td>4,148.00</td>
<td>7502.00</td>
<td>729.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cook County Clerk’s Office.

The most recent equalized assessed valuation for the Redevelopment Project Area indicates that approximately $15,757.90 in real estate taxes have been levied and would be available to all applicable taxing jurisdictions if the tax bills were paid.
VII. **ANTICIPATED EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION AFTER REDEVELOPMENT**

Assumptions which underlie property tax increments projections are:

1). The cost approach was selected as the method to determine the amount of taxes generated, after evaluating the income and comparable approaches. It was selected because it is the initial assessment practice used by the Cook County Assessor's Office.

2). The Project will be developed to include buildings ranging in size from approximately 1,500 to 82,000 square feet. All buildings will total approximately 100,000 square feet.

3). The Cook County assessment ratio of 39.5 percent for tax year 1986, 39% for tax year 1987, 38.5% for tax year 1988 and 38% for tax year 1989 and thereafter for improved commercial properties expected to be completed by 1989 was applied to determine assessed valuations. For 1986, the vacant land is assessed at 22%. A 1985 State Equalization Factor of 1.8085 was applied to determine the Equalized Assessed Valuation. A 1985 tax rate of $9.719 per $100 of Equalized Assessed Valuation was applied to determine taxes generated. Each of these was held constant throughout the projection. No adjustments were made to account for inflation or to reflect inflationary increases resulting from quadrennial reassessments.

4). Completed construction and full occupancy of the project are anticipated by December 31, 1988. The 1989 tax bill is anticipated to reflect taxes from the full equalized assessed value of improvements.

5). Current real estate taxes levied are $15,757.90.
Based on the above assumptions, the following property tax increment revenues can be anticipated:

**TABLE C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION</th>
<th>TAX RATE</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED REAL ESTATE TAX REVENUE</th>
<th>INITIAL TAX BASE</th>
<th>NET TAX REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>$162,135.00¹</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>$15,758.00</td>
<td>$15,758.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>220,000.00²</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>21,382.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>5,624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2,611,022.00³</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>253,765.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>238,007.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3,865,669.00⁴</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,865,669.00</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>375,704.00</td>
<td>15,758.00</td>
<td>359,946.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NET REAL ESTATE TAX REVENUE:** $6,362,713.00

1. Reflect initial equalized assessed valuation.
2. Reflects 22% (rate applied to vacant land) applied to fair market value of land of $1,000,000.
3. Assumes a 50% occupancy rate of a center constructed for $7,500,000, assessed at the commercial rate of 38.5% with an equalizer of 1.8085.
4. Assumes a 75% occupancy rate of a center constructed for $7,500,000, assessed at the commercial rate of 38% with an equalizer of 1.8085.

The last quadrennial assessment for this property was in 1982. Based upon Cook County ordinance, Lake Township (in which the Ryan Garfield Community Redevelopment Project Area is located) is scheduled for reassessment in 1987.
VIII SALES TAX REVENUE AND STATE ELECTRIC OR GAS TAX CHARGES

Pursuant to Public Act 84-14-17, the City is authorized to certify to the Illinois Department of Revenue and cause to be paid certain incremental sales tax revenues as identified therein.

The Project Area is currently vacant and therefore generates no sales tax revenues or state electric or gas tax charges imposed on owners or tenants of properties located within the Redevelopment Project Area. The Ryan Garfield Community Shopping Center will include about 15 stores which are expected to generate an annual sales volume of $25,875,000 when completed and fully occupied. Merchandise will include food and drug products as well as hard and soft wares with a projected mix of 30% of food and drug items and 70% of non-food and drug products and services. Sales tax revenues are projected at $310,500 for 1987, $139,725 for 1988 and $279,450 for subsequent years.

Finding No. 5: The Redevelopment Project Area would not reasonably be developed without the issue of incremental revenues utilized pursuant to section 8(a)(1) and 8(a)(2) of the Act.

Finding No. 6: Incremental revenues generated pursuant to section 8(a)(1) and 8(a)(2) will be exclusively utilized for the development of the Redevelopment Project Area.

IX BONDS

Bonds, secured by the special tax allocation fund, may be issued in one or more series. Such bonds may be issued as taxable or tax exempt securities. Illinois law permits the City, but the City is not required, to pledge additional collateral, including its full faith and credit, to secure the bonds. Any bonds issued will mature within 20 years of the date of issue and in any event, within 23 years of the date of approval of this Plan.

X. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
I. INTRODUCTION

Background

During the past several years, the City of Chicago, has undertaken a variety of programs in cooperation with the private sector to facilitate the development, redevelopment and rehabilitation of structures and areas to provide for improved housing, commercial and industrial facilities. These efforts have included activities such as the acquisition of land and structures, relocation of residents and businesses, demolition of buildings, sale of cleared land, resale of structures for neighborhood improvements rehabilitation, job training, capital improvements, and financing and technical assistance.

One available source of public funding for certain components of joint public-private redevelopment efforts is provided under "Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act", Illinois Revised Statutes, Ch 24, par. 11-74.4-1 et seq. (the "Act"). Briefly stated, the Act provides that a municipality may segregate the increased real estate and sales tax revenues generated from new development, and use those funds to finance redevelopment costs. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) was designed to assist projects which could not be economically viable if the costs required to make the necessary infrastructure improvements and related costs had to be financed privately. As a result of the Act, a municipality may identify a redevelopment project area, freeze the initial real estate and sales tax base of the land within the area, implement a Redevelopment Project, and use the tax increment (the difference between the taxes paid before the redevelopment and taxes paid after the redevelopment) realized as a result of the redevelopment to finance the public improvements within the Redevelopment Project Area.

The Project

The Ryan Garfield Community Redevelopment Project Area is located on a ten acre site in one of the poorest neighborhoods in Chicago. The site is bounded by the Dan Ryan Expressway to the west, and Robert Taylor Homes to the east. Robert Taylor is a Chicago Housing Authority complex which houses thousands of families with income well below the poverty level.
Data from the 1980 census demonstrates the extreme poverty of the project area; 43% of the population was below the poverty level; the median family income from the three census areas surrounding Ryan Garfield Community Redevelopment Project Area was $8,633; and less than 18% of the population completed high school. Juxtaposing these indices with a more affluent Chicago community such as the Lincoln Park neighborhood accentuates the poverty of the Ryan Garfield Community Redevelopment Project Area. In Lincoln Park, the median family income was $24,508; only 13% of the population was below the poverty level; and nearly 60% of the population have completed high school.

The neighborhood surrounding the Ryan Garfield Community Redevelopment Project Area has been dying economically at a steady rate. Commercial developers have had little motivation to move into the area; despite the fact that the 10 acre site which comprises the Ryan Garfield Community Redevelopment Project Area is located on one of the most travelled expressways in Chicago, it has sat vacant for over ten years when it should have been a coveted site for commercial redevelopment.

II. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

The Redevelopment Project Area (the "Area") is generally bounded on the north by the east west alley between west 53rd Street and west 54th, on the east by the Rock Island Railroad, on the south by west Garfield Boulevard and on the west by the Dan Ryan Expressway. The Area is comprised of approximately 10 contiguous acres. (See Exhibits 1A and Exhibit 1B.)

Finding No. 1: The Redevelopment Project Area qualifies in size as required by Section 11 -74.4-3 (h) of the Act, and the Area includes only those contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon substantially benefited by the proposed Redevelopment Project improvements.
Originally, the City of Chicago's Comprehensive Plan (as adopted in 1966) had designated the Area as an industrial Area. In order to implement the Ryan Garfield Community TIF Program, this designation must be changed to designate the Area as commercial. Once this is accomplished, Redevelopment Project will conform with the City's comprehensive plan.

REDEVELOPMENT GOALS

The goals and objectives of the Ryan Garfield Community TIF Program are:

1). To eliminate those conditions which qualify the areas as a Blighted Area.

2). To provide a net benefit in the tax base to the City of Chicago and other taxing bodies.

REDEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

1). To construct a shopping center.

2). To improve of the infrastructure in the Project Area.

3). To increase job opportunities, particularly for the community.

4). To provide stimulus for other improvements in the community.

5). To encourage participation of minorities and women in professional and investment opportunities involved in the development, construction, management and operation of the project.
III. FINDINGS OF ELIGIBILITY OF AREA FOR TAX INCREMENT FINANCING

The Redevelopment Project Area lies within the Boundaries of the Slum and Blighted Area Redevelopment Project Garfield-LaSalle which was designated as such by the Chicago Department of Urban Renewal (the "Department") on October 29, 1965. The Chicago City Council approved this designation on December 7, 1965. Subsequent to that approval, the Department acquired most of the structures, relocated the families and businesses and then demolished the buildings. As a result, the Area, immediately prior to becoming vacant, qualified as a Blighted Improved Area.

In making the determination that the area was a Slum and Blighted area, the Department found that the following then existing conditions for the then existing 53 structures were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsolescent</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Adequate Ventilation or Light</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Land Coverage</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleterious Layout</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and that the Area was "detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare..." (See Exhibit No. 2.)

Finding No. 2a: The Redevelopment Area qualifies as a Blighted area under Section 11-74.4-3 (a) because the Area prior to becoming vacant qualified as a Blighted Improved Area.

In addition to the fact that the Redevelopment Project Area was a Blighted Improved Area immediately prior to becoming vacant, the Area is approximately 10 acres in size consisting of 115 debris filled vacant lots, vacated streets and alleys which have partially been removed, and vacated streets (west 54th Street and south LaSalle Street). Many of the lots are 29 feet by 100 feet and are therefore platted in a way which makes the Area obsolete for commercial development. (See Exhibit 1A.)
In addition, there are 11 tax parcels in the Area, and for the past two years, over 75% of the real estate tax revenues owed on the property have not been paid. The following lists the tax delinquencies as of the date of this Redevelopment Plan (the "Plan"): 

**TABLE A**

REAL ESTATE TAX REVENUES	
Paid and Delinquent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Taxes Levied</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Unpaid</th>
<th>% Unpaid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$15,757.90</td>
<td>$3,461.21</td>
<td>12,296.69</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>18,209.71</td>
<td>4,222.56</td>
<td>13,987.15</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cook County Clerk’s Office, Cook County Treasurer’s Office

Finding No. 2b: The Redevelopment Area qualifies as a Blighted area under Section 11-74.4-3 (a) because of current obsolete platting and tax delinquencies.

IV. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Since 1965 when the Department of Urban Renewal made its determination of Slum and Blight, the Area has continued to deteriorate. In its original redevelopment plan for the area approved by the Chicago City Council on June 17, 1966, a number of structures had been identified as structures "to be acquired." (See Exhibit No. 3.) It was anticipated that the area would be developed by private enterprise. However, the reverse happened. Over the years, even those structures "to be acquired" became dilapidated and were demolished. No development has occurred in the project area. It is anticipated that the joint effort by the City and the private sector to redevelop this project through the Ryan Garfield Community TIF Program will finally facilitate strong economic development.
The City and the Developer, in order to further the objectives of this Plan, will, upon consent of the City Council, enter into a finance agreement with the Developer. This financing agreement will generally provide for the City's obligation to issue bonds, will allocate the responsibility of making the planned public improvements, and will require the Developer to build a retail shopping center consisting of approximately 100,000 square feet of retail commercial space and support facilities, such as off-street parking.

The Redevelopment Project (the "Project") includes the construction of the Ryan Garfield Community Shopping Center which will include approximately 100,000 square feet of retail space. There will be a primary structure containing eight to ten stores or more, which will provide 80,000 to 85,000 or more square feet of retail space. There will also be seven additional retail outlets comprising 15,000 to 20,000 square feet of retail space.

The assistance provided by the Ryan Garfield Community TIF Program to make the necessary public improvements and pay related costs will make the development possible. These improvements and costs will include, but not be limited to: site preparation, at and below grade; utility relocation; sidewalk, street and security improvements; traffic signalization; job training; and the planning, legal, financing and engineering support required to plan and implement these improvements. (See Exhibits 4, and 5.)

The total cost of this development will be approximately $8 million. The Project delineated in this Plan will be completed within 2 years from the date of adoption of this Plan; the bonds used to finance the improvements in this project will be paid within twenty years of the date of issuance, but in any event within 23 years of approval of the Plan by the City of Chicago. (See Exhibit No. 6, "Land Use Map," Exhibit No. 7, and "Illustrative Site Plan"). Upon completion and occupancy this center is expected to employ from 200 to 250 persons. It will be developed under the Planned Unit Development provisions of the Chicago Zoning Ordinance.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

No. 1: The Redevelopment Project Area qualifies in size as required by Section 11-74.4-3 (h) of the Act, and the Area includes only those contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon substantially benefited by the proposed Redevelopment Project improvements.

No. 2a: The Redevelopment Area qualifies as a Blighted area under Section 11-74.4-3 (a) because the Area prior to becoming vacant qualified as a Blighted Improved Area.

No. 2b: The Redevelopment Area qualifies as a Blighted area under Section 11-74.4-3 (a) because of current obsolete platting and tax delinquencies.

No. 3: The Redevelopment Project Area on the whole has not been subject to growth and development through investment by private enterprise and would not reasonably be anticipated to be developed without adoption of this Redevelopment Plan.

No. 4: This Redevelopment Plan and Project conform to the comprehensive plan for the development of the City as a whole.

No. 5: The Redevelopment Project Area would not reasonably be developed without the issue of incremental revenues utilized pursuant to section 8(a)(1) and 8(a)(2) of the Act.

No. 6: Incremental revenues generated pursuant to section 8(a)(1) and 8(a)(2) will be exclusively utilized for the development of the Redevelopment Project Area.

PROVISIONS FOR AMENDING THE TAX INCREMENT PLAN

This Tax Increment Redevelopment Plan, Redevelopment Project Area and Redevelopment Project may be amended pursuant to the provisions of the Act and applicable City Ordinances.
EXHIBIT 1B
RYAN GARFIELD COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A tract of land in the Southeast quarter of Section 9, Township 38 North, Range 14 East of the Third
Principal Meridian, in the City of Chicago, County of Cook, Illinois, bounded by a line as follows:

Beginning at the point of the convergence of the center line of the East-West Alley as extended lying south of
West 53rd Street, and the west line of south Wentworth Avenue; thence East along the center line of said
East-West alley to the West line of the right-of-way of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad; thence
South along said line to the southerly line of Garfield Boulevard; thence West along the southerly line of west
Garfield Boulevard to the West line of south Wentworth Avenue; thence North on West line of south
Wentworth Avenue to the point of beginning.
Michigan Avenue between E. 30th Street and E. 31st Street, and

WHEREAS, The City of Chicago is the owner of the property on the east side of said S. Michigan Avenue between the above referred to streets; now therefore,

Be it Resolved by the Council of the City of Chicago:

That the following described property shall be opened for use as a part of S. Michigan Avenue:

The West Sixty (60) feet of Lots One (1) to Eight (8), both inclusive, together with the West Sixty (60) feet of the vacated alley North of and adjoining said Lots Eight (8) and that part of Lots (9), Ten (10) and Eleven (11) taken as a tract, lying West of a line Sixty (60) feet East of and parallel with the West line of said Lot Nine (9), all in Thomas Atkinson's Subdivision of Block Eighty (80) in Canal Trustees' Subdivision of the West Half (W.H.) of Section Twenty-seven (27), Township Thirty-nine (39) North, Range Fourteen (14) East of the Third Principal Meridian; the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots Two (2), Three (3), Six (6), Seven (7), Ten (10), Eleven (11), Fourteen (14), Fifteen (15), Eighteen (18), Nineteen (19), Twenty-two (22), Twenty-three (23) and Twenty-six (26) in J. H. Lyman's Subdivision of the West Half (W.H.) of Block Eighty-three (83) in aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision; the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots One (1), Two (2) and Eight (8) to Thirteen (13), both inclusive, together with the West Sixty (60) feet of said E. 30th Street South of and adjoining said Lot Thirteen (13) in Laflin and Smith's Subdivision of Blocks Eighty-six (86) and Eighty-nine (89) in aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision, and the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots One (1) to Seven (7), both inclusive, in Assessor's Division of Block Thirty-three (33), Four (4), Five (5), Six (6) and Seven (7) in Laflin and Smith's Subdivision of Blocks Eighty-six (86) and Eighty-nine (89) aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision.

Also

- West Sixty (60) feet of Lots Sixteen (16) Twenty (20), both inclusive, and the West (60) feet of the South Fifteen (15) feet of Twenty-One (21) in E. Smith's Subdivision of Three-fourths (3/4) of the West Half of Block Ninety-two (92) in aforesaid Trustees' Subdivision, and the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots One (1) to Eleven (11), both inclusive, in John Lonergan's Subdivision of the Northwest corner of Block Ninety-two (92) in aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision; the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots Six (6) to Ninety (99), both inclusive, in County Clerk's Division of Lot One (1) of Assessor's Division of Block Ninety-five (95) in aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision: the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots One (1) to Five (5), both inclusive, in Superior Court Commissioner's Subdivision of the South Half (S.H.) of the North Two-thirds (2/3) of that part of Block Ninety-five (95) North of the South Thirty-three (33) feet thereof, in aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision; the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots Three (3) to Eight (8), both inclusive, in County Clerk's Division of Lot Three (3), except the East One Hundred Twenty-three (123) feet of the South One Hundred (100) feet thereof of Assessor's Division of Block Ninety-five (95) in aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision, and the West Sixty (60) feet of Lots Sixty-three (63) to Seventy-eight (78), both inclusive, together with the West Sixty (60) feet of vacated E. 30th Street lying North of and adjoining said Lot Seventy-eight (78), in Thomas and Boone's Subdivision of Block Ninety-eight (98) in aforesaid Canal Trustees' Subdivision.

Be it Further Resolved, That the City of Chicago (Department of Urban Renewal) shall file or cause to be filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of Cook County, Illinois, a certified copy of this resolution.

Board of Local Improvements Requested to Institute Special-Assessment Proceedings for Paving of Certain Alleys.

The Committee on Local Industries, Streets and Alleys submitted a report recommending that the City Council pass the following proposed ordinance therewith (as a substitute for the proposed orders which were referred to the committee on November 29, 1965):

Ordered, That the Board of Local Improvements is hereby requested to institute the necessary proceedings for the paving with concrete, by special assessment, of the roadways of the following described alleys:

- L-shaped alley in the block bounded by N. Central Park Avenue, N. Drake Avenue and W. Waveland Avenue (petition attached);
- Alley in the block bounded by W. Madill Avenue, N. Sayre Avenue, N. Newland Avenue and the railroad tracks.

On motion of Alderman Sain the foregoing substitute proposed order was passed.

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND HOUSING.

Approval Given to Determination of Department of Urban Renewal to Acquire for Redevelopment Slum and Blighted Area Redevelopment Project Garfield-La Salle.

The Committee on Planning and Housing submitted the following report:

CHICAGO, December 6, 1965.

To the President and Members of the City Council:

The Committee on Planning and Housing having had under consideration a proposed ordinance transmitted with a communication signed by Honorable Richard J. Daley, Mayor (referred on November 15, 1965) to approve the determination of the Department of Urban Renewal to acquire the area designated therein as Slum and Blighted Area Redevelopment Project Garfield-LaSalle for Slum Clearance and Redevelopment, as approved by the Department of Urban Renewal by Resolution No. 65-UR-124, adopted on October 29, 1965, is certifying that such area will not be used as public parks or playgrounds.
leave to recommend that Your Honorable Body pass
the said proposed ordinance, which is transmitted
herewith.

This recommendation was concurred in by 11
members of the committee, with no dissenting vote.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) ARTHUR V. ZELEZINSKI,
Chairman.

On motion of Alderman Zelezinski the proposed
ordinance transmitted with the foregoing committee
report was passed, by yeas and nays as follows:

Yeas—Aldermen Parrillo, Metcalf, Holman, Des-
pres, Miller, Bohling, Condon, Lupo, Buchanan,
Danaher, Zelezinski, Healy, J. F. Burke, Kraska,
Murray, Fitzpatrick, Campbell, Takai, Janousek,
Tourek, Collins, Marzullo, Zydlo, Sain, Provenzano,
T. F. Burke, McMahon, Keane, Sulski, Sande, Las-
kowski, Aiello, Casey, Culik, Lauroino, Kaplan,
Scholl, Rosenberg, Fiffelski, Kerwin, Hoellen,
O'Rourke, Wigoda, Sperling—44.

Nays—None.

The following is said ordinance as passed:

ORDINANCE

To Approve the Determination of the Department
of Urban Renewal that Slum and Blighted Area
Redevelopment Project Garfield-LaSalle be Ac-
quired for Redevelopment.

WHEREAS, The Urban Renewal Consolidation Act
of 1961, Illinois Revised Statutes, 1963, Chapter
677/6, Section 91.101 et seq., hereinafter referred
to as the “Act” authorizes a Department of Urban
Renewal, hereinafter referred to as the “Depart-
ment”, with federal, State and City grant funds,
to provide for the eradication and redevelopment
of slum and blighted areas; and

WHEREAS, The Department has made a study of
a tract of land on the south side of the City of
Chicago, said area being hereinafter more fully
described, and found that the area is a slum and
blighted area of not less in the aggregate than
two (2) acres where buildings or improvements,
by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowd-
ing, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventila-
tion, light and sanitation facilities, excessive land
condition of which has land use or layout, or any
combination of these factors, are detrimental to the
public safety, health, morals or welfare; and

WHEREAS, Redevelopment of said area will be
in accordance with a redevelopment plan or plans
to be approved by the Department and the City
Council of the City of Chicago; and

WHEREAS, Section 91.111 of the Act provides that
whenever a Department determines that a particu-
lar slum or blighted area, as defined in said Act,
should be acquired pursuant to the provisions of
said Act, such determination shall be evidenced by
a resolution adopted by the Department, and a
certified copy thereof shall be delivered to the
governing body of the municipality in which the
area concerned is situated, and that no such deter-
mination shall be of any force or effect until it
has been approved by the governing body of the
municipality in which the area is situated; and

WHEREAS, The Department has by Resolution
No. 65-DUR-124, adopted October 29, 1965, a cer-
tified copy of which has been delivered to the City
Council of the City of Chicago, determined that
said area should be acquired pursuant to the pro-
visions of the Act, and has designated said area
as Slum and Blighted Area Redevelopment Project
Garfield-LaSalle; and

WHEREAS, The Department desires to obtain the
approval by the City Council of its determination
to acquire the aforesaid area in accordance with
the provisions of the Act, and the City Council
desires to give such approval, all to the end that
the eradication and redevelopment of slum and
blighted areas may proceed; now, therefore,

Be It Ordained by the City Council of the City of
Chicago:

SECTION 1. Having been advised that the De-
partment of Urban Renewal found that the area
subsequently referred to in Section 2 of this ordi-
nance as Slum and Blighted Area Redevelopment
Project Garfield-LaSalle is a slum and blighted
area and has determined that said area should be
acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Urban
Renewal Consolidation Act of 1961, such deter-
mination having been evidenced by a resolution
adopted by said Department, a certified copy of
which has been delivered to the City Council, and
the City Council having been advised by the De-
partment of Urban Renewal that it desires to ac-
cquire said area for slum clearance and redevelop-
ment, the City Council hereby approves said deter-
nation of the Department of Urban Renewal to
acquire the area herein designated as Slum and
Blighted Area Redevelopment Project Garfield-
LaSalle for slum clearance and redevelopment in
accordance with the provisions of the Act.

SECTION 2. The area to be acquired by the De-
partment of Urban Renewal, pursuant to the ap-
proval of the City Council hereinabove conferred
in Section 1 of this ordinance has been designated
as Slum and Blighted Area Redevelopment Project
Garfield-LaSalle and is described as follows:

A tract of land in the Southeast quarter of
Section 9, Township 38 North, Range 14 East
of the Third Principal Meridian, in the City of
Chicago, County of Cook, Illinois, bounded by
a line as follows:

Beginning at the point of the convergence of
the center lines of 53rd Street and Wentworth
Avenue; thence East along the center line of
53rd Street to the West line of the right-of-way
of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad;
thence South along said line to the center line
of Garfield Boulevard; thence West along the
center line of Garfield Boulevard to the center
line of Wentworth Avenue; thence North on the
center line of Wentworth Avenue to the
point of beginning;

all as shown on the map attached hereto and made
a part hereof.

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be effective
upon its passage.

APPROVED

CHICAGO, DECEMBER 6, 1965.

To the President and Members of the City Council:
Your Committee on Planning and Housing,
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EXHIBITS

Existing Land Uses
Existing Structures
1. INTRODUCTION

The area discussed in this statement and hereinafter referred to as the Garfield-LaSalle Area, comprised of 16.2 acres, and located approximately 7 miles south of Chicago's Central Business District, is bounded on the north by West 53rd Street, on the east by the right-of-way of the Rock Island and Pacific Railroad, on the south by West Garfield Boulevard, and on the west by the Dan Ryan Expressway. Those boundaries are shown on the exhibit entitled "Existing Land Uses", and in the legal description, which is attached to this statement.

From the data shown below, it is clear that the Garfield-LaSalle area is a slum and blighted area and is eligible for redevelopment under the Urban Renewal Consolidation Act of 1961. That Act defines a slum and blighted area as "any area of not less than Two (2) acres...where buildings or improvements, by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light and sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, deleterious land use or layout or any combination of these factors, are detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare."

The existing uses of the land and structures in the proposed project, the condition of the structures, and population estimates were obtained on a field survey conducted by qualified staff of the Department of Urban Renewal in August and September of 1965. The results of this survey are summarized below and are shown in greater detail in the attached tables.

II. EXISTING USES OF LAND AND STRUCTURES

The amount and percentage of land in the area used for various purposes is shown in Table 1, entitled "Land Uses". The gross area of the Garfield-LaSalle area is 16.2 acres, of which 5.5 acres or 34.0 percent are used for streets and alleys, and 10.7 acres or 66.0 percent are used for residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial purposes. Of the net area of 10.7 acres, 3.2 acres or 29.9 percent are used for predominantly residential and related purposes, and 7.5 acres or 70.1 percent are used for non-residential and related purposes. One and three-tenths acres or 12.1 percent of the net area are vacant, and 9.4 acres or 87.9 percent are improved with buildings.

As shown in Table 2, at the time of the survey, 43 or 81.1 percent of the 53 structures in the area were being used or had last been used predominantly for residential or related purposes, and 10 or 18.9 percent were being used or had last been used predominantly for non-residential purposes. Thirty-one or 58.5 percent were being used exclusively for residential purposes, 12 were being used for mixed residential and commercial purposes, 9 were being used entirely for non-residential purposes, and one was occupied by an institutional use.

As shown in Table 3, of the 43 structures containing living units, 9 contained one unit, 31 contained between two and four units, 2 contained between five and ten units, and one contained 12 units. There were no structures in the area containing more than 20 units. None of the structures in this area contained single room sleeping units.
III. CONDITION OF STRUCTURES AND LIVING UNITS

The survey showed that most of the structures and the living units contained in them had deteriorated to a degree where rehabilitation or conservation would not be economic. As shown in Table 5, all structures in the area had one or more of the characteristics listed in the definition of a slum and blighted area in the Urban Renewal Consolidation Act of 1961. As shown in Table 4, 47 or 88.7 percent of the 53 structures in the area were dilapidated; 48 or 90.6 percent were dilapidated or lacked adequate sanitary facilities. (Table 5). As shown in Table 6, 40 structures or 93.0 percent of the residential structures were dilapidated, and 7 or 70.00 percent of the non-residential structures were dilapidated.

As shown in Table 4, 109 or 95.6 percent of the 114 living units in the area were located in dilapidated structures and 109 or 95.6 percent lacked adequate sanitary facilities or were located in dilapidated structures. (Table 5). As shown in Table 5, all of the 114 living units in the area were located in structures which contained one or more of the deficiencies listed in the definition of a blighted area.

IV. EXTENT OF RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION

As shown in Table 8, 19 or 32.6 percent of the 43 structures containing living units have been converted. These conversions have increased the number of living units originally in the area from 91 to 114, or by 25.3 percent. The number of living units in the converted structures increased 100 percent from 23 to 46 units.

None of these conversions resulted in the creation of single room sleeping units.

V. OCCUPANCY AND TENURE

Of the 43 residential structures, 4 were vacant and 39 were wholly or partially occupied. Of the 39 occupied residential structures, 6 were occupied by owners only, 20 were occupied by tenants only, 12 were occupied by the owner and tenants, and one was occupied rent-free.

Of the 10 non-residential structures, 3 were occupied by their owner alone, 2 were occupied by tenants only, and 2 were occupied by the owner and tenants. One non-residential structure was vacant, and tenure could not be ascertained for one non-residential building.

At the time of the field survey, 25 or 21.9 percent of the 114 living units were vacant. Information on tenure could be obtained for 87 of the 89 occupied units. Sixteen or 18.0 percent of the 87 units were occupied by their owners, 69 or 77.6 percent by tenants, and 2 or 2.2 percent were occupied rent free.

VI. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

As shown in Table 11, the estimated number of persons living in the Garfield-LaSalle area is 352 persons, of which 331 are members of two or more person families, 15 are single person householders, 4 are lodgers, and 2 live in group households.

It is estimated that there are 74 families residing in this area, 55 of which contain minors, and 19 consist of adults only.
As shown in Table 12, approximately 14.3 percent of the 84 households reporting length of residence had lived six months or less in the structure in which their living unit was located, 7.1 percent had lived in their structure between six months and one year, 15.5 percent had lived there between one and two years, and 20.2 percent had lived there between two and five years. Almost 43 percent of the households reporting length of residence had lived over five years in the structure in which their dwelling unit was located.

VII. FEASIBILITY OF REDEVELOPMENT

A. ELIGIBILITY

As shown by the data referred to in the preceding sections of this statement and in the attached tables, the Garfield-LaSalle area qualifies as a slum and blighted area as defined in the Urban Renewal Consolidation Act of 1961.

B. FINANCIAL

The estimated net cost of redevelopment of the Garfield-LaSalle area is within local fund limitations, and it is anticipated that federal funds will also be available to reduce local costs.

C. MARKETABILITY OF THE LAND

The land in the area is to be redeveloped with industrial and related uses. Precise plans for redevelopment will be prepared following designation of the proposed project as a slum and blighted area redevelopment project by the Department of Urban Renewal and approval of that designation by the City Council.

It is not anticipated that there would be any problems in marketing the land in the area.

D. RELOCATION

Relocation of the residents of this area would not be more difficult than in other projects of the Department of Urban Renewal. It is estimated that 74 families and 15 single persons would have to be relocated.

If the Garfield-LaSalle area is designated as a project by the Department of Urban Renewal, and if that action is approved by the City Council, redevelopment will proceed at a rate consistent with the Department's policy of not displacing families for whom standard relocation units are not available. Full facilities of the Department of Urban Renewal's relocation service would be available to residents of the area to assist them in relocating into standard living units.
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PROJECT GARFIELD-LA SALLE

Legal Description

A tract of land in the Southeast quarter of Section 9, Township 38 North, Range 14, East of the Third Principal Meridian, in the City of Chicago, County of Cook, Illinois, bounded by a line as follows:

Beginning at the point of the convergence of the center lines of 53rd Street and Wentworth Avenue; thence East along the center line of 53rd Street to the West line of the right-of-way of the Chicago Rock Island and Pacific Railroad; thence South along said line to the center line of Garfield Boulevard; thence West along the center line of Garfield Boulevard to the center line of Wentworth Avenue; thence North on the center line of Wentworth Avenue to the point of beginning.
### TABLE 1
**LAND USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Area</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Alleys</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Area</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Area</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Residential and Related Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Institutional</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Residential</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Non-Residential Uses</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial-Residential</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Non-Residential</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Improved parcels used for both residential and non-residential purposes are classified as residential if 51 percent or more of the floor space is used or intended for residential purposes.
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TABLE 2
STRUCTURES BY USE 1/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Structures</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Residential and Related Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entirely Residential</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residential and Commercial</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Commercial-Institutional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Non-Residential Uses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Commercial and Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Vacant structures are classified by the most recent use or by the use for which they were built. Structures with both residential and non-residential uses are classified as residential if 51 percent or more of the floor space is used or intended for residential purposes.
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### TABLE 3

**STRUCTURES BY NUMBER OF LIVING UNITS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF LIVING UNITS IN STRUCTURE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STRUCTURES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Structures with Living Units</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Unit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 Units</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All living units in this area are dwelling units.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of Structures and Living Units*</th>
<th>Total Structures</th>
<th>Total Living Units in Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Structures</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsolescent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulty Arrangement or Design</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Adequate Sanitary Facilities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Adequate Ventilation or Light</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Land Coverage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleterious Use</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleterious Layout</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Any of the Above Deficiencies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All living units in this area are dwelling units.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition Description</th>
<th>Number of Structures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Information Not Available</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Information Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, lacking adequate sanitary facilities, ventilation or light, of deleterious use or layout</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, lacking adequate sanitary facilities, ventilation or light, of deleterious use or layout</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, or lacking adequate sanitary facilities</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dilapidated or lacking adequate sanitary facilities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Without any of the above deficiencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All living units in this area are dwelling units.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of Structures</th>
<th>Residential and Predominantly Residential Structures</th>
<th>Non-Residential and Predominantly Non-Residential Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Structures</td>
<td>43 (100.0)</td>
<td>10 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>40 (93.0)</td>
<td>7 (70.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsolescent</td>
<td>37 (86.0)</td>
<td>8 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulty Arrangement or Design</td>
<td>39 (90.7)</td>
<td>9 (90.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Adequate Sanitary Facilities</td>
<td>12 (27.9)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Adequate Ventilation or Light</td>
<td>18 (41.9)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Land Coverage</td>
<td>34 (79.1)</td>
<td>6 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleterious Use</td>
<td>17 (39.5)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleterious Layout</td>
<td>41 (95.3)</td>
<td>8 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>10 (23.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures without any of the above deficiencies</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRUCTURES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Residential or Predominantly Residential Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, of deleterious use or layout, excessive land coverage, overcrowded, lacking adequate sanitary facilities, ventilation or light</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, of deleterious use or layout, lacking adequate sanitary facilities, ventilation or light</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, or lacking adequate sanitary facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dilapidated, or lacking adequate sanitary facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Structures without any of the above deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Non-Residential or Predominantly Non-Residential Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, deleterious use or layout, excessive land coverage, overcrowded, lacking adequate sanitary facilities, ventilation or light</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, deleterious use or layout, lacking adequate sanitary facilities, ventilation or light</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dilapidated, obsolescent, of faulty arrangement or design, or lacking adequate sanitary facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dilapidated, or lacking adequate sanitary facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Structures without any of the above deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment to Report on Designation
Garfield-LaSalle
October 1, 1965
## TABLE 8

CONVERTED STRUCTURES AND CHANGE IN LIVING UNITS DUE TO CONVERSIONS

### A. EXTENT OF CONVERSION OF STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Structures</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containing Living Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the Time of Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted Structures</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures not Converted</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. CHANGE IN LIVING UNITS IN ALL STRUCTURES IN THE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Living Units for Which All Structures in the Area were Originally Designed</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Living Units in the Area at the Time of Survey</th>
<th>114</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase in Total Number of Living Units in the Area</th>
<th>+23</th>
<th>+25.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>+25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. CHANGE IN LIVING UNITS IN CONVERTED STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Living Units for Which Converted Structures were Originally Designed</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Living Units in Converted Structures at Time of Survey</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase in Number of Living Units in Converted Structures</th>
<th>+23</th>
<th>+100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>+100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
<th>Occupancy of Structures by Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Structures in the Area</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Residencial, predominantly residential and related uses | 43 | 100.0 |
| Vacant | 4 | 9.3 |
| Occupied | 39 | 90.7 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total occupied structures</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by owners only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by tenants and owners</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by tenants only</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied rent-free</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Non-Residential, predominantly non-residential and related uses | 10 | 100.0 |
| Vacant | 1 | 10.0 |
| Occupied | 9 | 90.0 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total occupied structures</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by owners only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by owners and tenants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied by tenants only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 10

OCCUPANCY OF LIVING UNITS
BY TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Units in the Area</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant units</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied units</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied units</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant occupied</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied rent free or</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services in lieu of rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II

ESTIMATED POPULATION IN THE AREA CLASSIFIED BY FAMILY STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>352*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Persons Householders</td>
<td>331*</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodgers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Group Households</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Two-or-more Person Families</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Minors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Adults only</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Family Size: 4.7 persons

*This count includes an estimate of 2 families with minors for two dwelling units which could not be enumerated.
### TABLE 12

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OF HOUSEHOLDS IN PRESENT STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households Reporting Length of Residence</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months or less</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 months and including 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 year and including 2 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2 years and including 5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PARCELS TO BE ACQUIRED
Good news for the 3rd Ward

Under a brightly striped tent between the Dan Ryan Expressway and the Robert Taylor Homes, an event occurred the other day that generally is seen only in more affluent parts of Chicago and its suburbs: A real estate developer and a nonprofit neighborhood organization announced they were going to build the Ryan/Garfield Community Shopping Center.

This 100,000 square foot, $10 million center on two vacant blocks just north of West Garfield Boulevard and east of the Ryan promises to infuse much-needed investment, commercial activity and jobs into one of the poorest neighborhoods in Chicago.

The center seems based on a workable and pragmatic plan: a grocery store, drug store and discount department store will be interspersed with smaller stores selling shoes, auto supplies, ice cream and fast food. The neighborhood may be poor but everyone has to buy these basics somewhere. Why not in their own neighborhood?

To proceed, the Matanky Realty Group and the Third Ward Partnership are seeking city council approval for a zoning change from industrial to commercial for the vacant land and a $1 million federal urban development grant. The group also wants the mall designated a tax increment financing district; under that arrangement, tax revenue generated by the increased value of the property would be used to retire bonds needed to build the development.

The city council should look favorably on all three of these requests. Although a tax increment financing has been used extensively elsewhere in the state, the only such district in Chicago was created to help redevelop the North Loop. It's about time this innovative financing mechanism made its way to the neighborhoods.

This project has the solid backing of the community. Ald. Dorothy Tillman, who helped organize the Third Ward Partnership, and the Matanky Realty Group deserve credit for putting it together.
LAND USE MAP
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Commercial

October 20, 1986
Kenric Associates, Inc.
EXHIBIT 8
RYAN GARFIELD COMMUNITY TIF PROGRAM
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS

Off-site Improvements

1. West Garfield median cut & acceleration/deceleration lanes within median $45,000.00
2. Traffic signal (hard-wired) 225,000.00
3. Sidewalks along Garfield & Wentworth (1500'x10') 45,000.00
4. Curb cuts/entry aprons along Wentworth & Garfield 65,000.00
5. Closing of 53rd Street viaduct (both sides) 8,000.00
6. Three (3) 80 foot security lights at 54th & LaSalle, 135,000.00
   54th & Wentworth and LaSalle & alley
7. Perimeter fencing (ornamental iron) on Wentworth, 135,000.00
   Garfield and along alley to north
8. Security perimeter fencing at top of Rock Island viaduct
9. Resurface and modify Wentworth to two-way street 40,000.00
10. Permit fees for off-site work 70,000.00
11. Parking meter relocation on Wentworth 40,000.00
12. Utility pole and street light location on Wentworth Avenue 3,200.00
13. Expressway access ramp modification 10,000.00
14. Bridge deck modifications 125,000.00
15. Median landscape treatment 100,000.00
16. Paving, lighting and drainage of alley at east end of site (alley 40,000.00
   will be dedicated upon completion)

Total Off-site Improvements $1,141,200.00

On-site Improvements

1. Pave Alley to north of property line (480' x 16') $10,000.00
2. Curb cuts/entry aprons along 54th & LaSalle 60,000.00
3. Demolish and remove existing City owned building 25,000.00
4. Sewer, repaving and sidewalks, 54th Street & LaSalle 30,000.00
5. Three (3) 80 foot special security lights on site 135,000.00
6. Public traffic control signage 6,000.00
7. Underground utilities, grading of site, remedy of unusual site conditions 590,000.00

Total on-site Improvements $856,000.00
Soft Costs

1. Job Training Program! $ 125,000.00
2. Traffic studies! 20,000.00
3. Traffic signal design! 20,000.00
4. Engineering for TIF improvements! 280,000.00
5. Surveys of TIF areas! 20,000.00
6. Landscape design! 7,000.00
7. TIF planning consultant! 15,000.00
8. TIF Financial consultant! 70,000.00
9. Bond Counsel! 50,000.00
10. Developer's Counsel (land acquisition, zoning, dedication of land, etc.)! 75,000.00
11. Capitalized interest! 480,000.00
12. Underwriter's fee! 150,000.00

Total Soft Costs! $ 1,312,000.00

TOTAL OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS: $ 1,141,200.00
TOTAL ON-SITE IMPROVEMENTS: 856,000.00
TOTAL SOFT COSTS: 1,312,000.00

TOTAL TIF COSTS $ 3,309,200.00
Soft Costs

1. Job Training Program  $125,000.00
2. Traffic studies  $20,000.00
3. Traffic signal design  $20,000.00
4. Engineering for TIF improvements  $280,000.00
5. Surveys of TIF areas  $20,000.00
6. Landscape design  $7,000.00
7. TIF planning consultant  $15,000.00
8. TIF Financial consultant  $70,000.00
9. Bond Counsel  $50,000.00
10. Developer's Counsel (land acquisition, zoning, dedication of land, etc.)  $75,000.00
11. Capitalized interest  $480,000.00
12. Underwriter's fee  $150,000.00

Total Soft Costs  $1,312,000.00

TOTAL OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS:  $1,141,200.00
TOTAL ON-SITE IMPROVEMENTS:  $856,000.00
TOTAL SOFT COSTS:  $1,312,000.00

TOTAL TIF COSTS  $3,309,200.00
Ryan Garfield

Consultant/Firm: Kenric and Associates

Ward(s)/Alderman: 3rd, Dorothy Tilman

Community area(s): 40, Washington Park

Location: Redevelopment area includes land bounded by the east/west alley between west 53rd Street and west 54th, on the east by the Rock Island Railroad, on the south by Garfield Boulevard and on the west by the Dan Ryan Expressway.

Proposed Land Uses: Commercial/retail development

Acreage and/or Number of Pins: 10 acres, 11 PIN’s

EAV at time of plan (1986): $158,135

Anticipated EAV of TIF District: not listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Budget:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Studies</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Design</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering for Improvements</td>
<td>$ 280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Consultants</td>
<td>$ 85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Counsel</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwriter’s fee</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training &amp; Retraining</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Costs</td>
<td>$ 480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total On-site Improvements</td>
<td>$ 856,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Off-site Improvements</td>
<td>$ 1,141,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,309,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIF Legislative Dates

  TIF expiration date: 12/18/2009
  City Council Approval: 12/18/86
  CDCP Hearing: 11/24/86
Portability: Not Portable

Adjacencies: none

Expiration of adjacencies: n/a

Prior Land Uses: The area consists of vacant land zoned for industrial uses