



CEDAR LAKE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Cedar Lake Town Hall, 7408 Constitution Avenue

September 20, 2021, at 6:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Nathan Vis called the regular meeting to order at 6:03 PM., on Monday, September 20, 2021, with its members attending on-site. All recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Nathan Vis, President; Eric Burnham, Vice-President; Doug Spencer, Secretary; Randy Niemeyer, Member; and Jolie Covaciu, Member. A quorum was attained.

Also present: Tracy Haskell, Hanover School District Liaison (via Zoom); Robert Carnahan, Town Council Liaison; Rick Eberly, Town Manager; David Austgen, Town Attorney; Corby Thompson, Krohn & Associates Consultant (via Zoom); Ashley Abernathy, Recording Secretary; and Margaret Abernathy, Administrative Assistant to the Town Manager.

Absent: Brian Smith, Crown Point School District Liaison; and Jennifer Sandberg, Clerk-Treasurer.

PRESENTATION OF “EXPLORE EVERYDAY COMMUNITY RECOGNITION” AWARDS

Mr. Vis explained invited Mr. Andrew Bultema to come to the podium. He briefly summarized the history of the “Explore Everyday Community Recognition” award program. Mr. Vis requested that Mr. Bultema speak a little bit about his business, Action Plumbing.

Mr. Bultema thanked the Redevelopment Committee for the nomination and stated that Action Plumbing was a family-owned business that has been in operation since 1985. Mr. Bultema and his family moved to Cedar Lake about 6 years ago. The company currently employs 47 employees and is located at 143719 Wicker Avenue.

Mr. Vis thanked Mr. Bultema investing in the town and contributing to the community. Mr. Niemeyer stated he was looking forward to seeing Mr. Bultema’s vision come together on U.S. 41. Interest in types of businesses going into this property was discussed. Discussion was also had on how many lots would be available for businesses on the property. Mr. Carnahan stated that Action Plumbing did the project for Action Love Food Pantry. Mr. Vis once more thanked Mr. Bultema.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Mr. Vis advised the next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda for approval of the July 19, 2021, and the August 16, 2021, Regular Meeting Minutes, the August 17, 2021 Special Joint Meeting, and approve the monthly claims, Fund No. 404: \$0 (zero) and Fund No. 804: \$71,267.10.

A motion was made by Mr. Niemeyer and seconded by Mr. Spencer to approve the consent agenda. Motion carried unanimously by roll-call vote:

Jolie Covaciu	Aye
Doug Spencer	Aye
Randy Niemeyer	Aye
Eric Burnham	Aye
Nathan Vis	Aye

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Declaratory Resolution

Mr. Vis stated the first order of business for Public Hearing was for the Declaratory Resolution. Mr. Vis asked Mr. Austgen to discuss this item.

Mr. Austgen stated this is the public hearing on the action that was taken by the Town Council, Plan Commission, and the Redevelopment Commission in August. This item was for identifying and expanding the current Town TIFF district, as a consequence of the annexation by Action Plumbing, Bultema Family, of 28 acres. This TIFF district will include a total of 33 acres that will be expanded and added to the current TIFF district by the actions to be considered. Additionally, there will be a consolidation of the current SVT Allocation Area for TIFF purposes. The consolidation is the result of actions taken over the last year. There are two items in front of the Commissioners. The first is the consideration of the Resolution that approves the expansion of the Town's TIFF District. The second is the consolidation of the SVT Allocation Area into the TIFF District, to have a single TIFF district.

Mr. Austgen stated this is a public hearing, and that the notices were timely advertised. The tax impact statement from the Town's financial advisor was provided. The notice of the public hearing and the consideration of the Resolution the overlapping taxing units have been served and acknowledgement received.

Mr. Vis thanked Mr. Austgen for his remarks. Mr. Vis gave a brief review of Resolution 2021-03. Mr. Vis asked if there was any public hearing on this manner. None was had.

Mr. Vis asked if there was any discussion from the Commissioners for Mr. Austgen or for Town Officials regarding the Resolution. Mr. Austgen read Section Two and Section Six of Resolution 2021-03 into the record.

Mr. Vis opened the floor for public comment. Hearing none, Mr. Vis entertained a motion to approve the review of legals, opening remarks, reading of Resolution 2021-03, and open forum for Resolution 2021-03. A motion was made by Mr. Burnham and seconded by Ms. Covaciu to approve Resolution 2021-03. Mr. Vis stated there were no remonstrance or objections for this motion. Motion carried unanimously by roll-call vote:

Jolie Covaciu	Aye
Doug Spencer	Aye

Randy Niemeyer	Aye
Eric Burnham	Aye
Nathan Vis	Aye

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Explore Everyday Community Recognition Nomination:

Ms. Covaciu nominated Niemeyer Milk Transfer. A discussion was had by the Commissioners before deciding to nominate a different business.

A motion was made by Ms. Covaciu and seconded by Mr. Burnham to nominate Strack & Van Til as the next Explore Everyday recipient. Motion carried unanimously by roll-call vote:

Jolie Covaciu	Aye
Doug Spencer	Aye
Randy Niemeyer	Aye
Eric Burnham	Aye
Nathan Vis	Aye

B. Façade Grant Extension – #21-3 Henn, 13212 Wicker Avenue

Mr. Vis stated the next order of business was for the façade grant extension for Henn at 13212 Wicker Avenue.

Mr. John Henn with Henn & Sons Construction stated they were looking for an extension of the façade grant, of at least 60 days. The current deadline is set for November 1, 2021. Material and unforeseen delays have given cause for getting close to the wire for the grant deadline. They are hoping for a deadline of the end of the year, beginning of January, with hopes of being ready for final at that time.

Mr. Niemeyer made a motion to extend the deadline to December 31, 2021. The motion was seconded by Mr. Burnham. Motion carried unanimously by roll-call vote:

Jolie Covaciu	Aye
Doug Spencer	Aye
Randy Niemeyer	Aye
Eric Burnham	Aye
Nathan Vis	Aye

C. Façade Grant Extension – #20-13 Lindemulder, 12634 Wicker Avenue

Mr. Vis stated the next order of business was for the façade grant extension for Eric Lindemulder at 12634 Wicker Avenue. Mr. Eric Lindemulder was hoping to have the finishing touches done to the outside over the next 30 to 60 days.

Mrs. Abernathy stated that Mr. Kubiak did verify that they did quite a bit of turf work over the weekend and there was additional work done. Mr. Vis asked Mr. Lindemulder how much more time he was going to need. Mr. Lindemulder stated he hoped to be done within 30 to 60 days.

Ms. Covaciu made a motion for an extension to December 31, 2021. Mr. Burnham seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by roll-call vote:

Jolie Covaciu	Aye
Doug Spencer	Aye
Randy Niemeyer	Aye
Eric Burnham	Aye
Nathan Vis	Aye

D. Façade Grant Extension – #21-6 Lindemulder, 13050 Wicker Avenue

Mr. Vis stated the next order of business was for the façade grant extension for Lindemulder at 13050 Wicker Avenue. Mr. Lindemulder stated he hopes for the same finishing time of the end of the year. Windows are behind, and the company is hoping the window trim should be in by November 3, 2021, but it keeps getting pushed back.

Mr. Vis asked with the windows is it reasonable for 90 days. Mr. Niemeyer stated that no one knows what is going on with the supply chain currently.

Mr. Lindemulder stated asphalt is the other thing. If they do not get it in by the cut off date, then the asphalt will be put off until next year. He is trying to get them to get out there. Mr. Niemeyer asked if he doesn't get the asphalt back in, what he would do. Mr. Lindemulder stated he would have to come back to inform them about the asphaltting.

Mr. Niemeyer made a motion to grant an extension to the end of the year. Mr. Burnham seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by roll-call vote:

Jolie Covaciu	Aye
Doug Spencer	Aye
Randy Niemeyer	Aye
Eric Burnham	Aye
Nathan Vis	Aye

E. Financial Planning / Budgeting – Corby Thompson

Mr. Vis stated the next order of business was for financial planning and budgeting and invited Mr. Corby Thompson to speak. Mr. Thompson asked if Mr. Niemeyer had anything to discuss regarding this item.

Mr. Niemeyer stated this was something he had asked for them to do. He thinks that one of the things that the Council misses when considering budget is looking full scale at all of the budgets, including the Redevelopment Commission budget. He thinks it would be useful for the Redevelopment Commission to properly manage its funds. That it is important to have an understanding of the budget, especially with

the lake eco-restoration project taking effect. This came into effect with wanting to help gain a realistic and sustainable approach.

Mr. Thompson discussed the TIFF money and some of the economic development money that is identified to help with the ecosystem restoration project. Any time additional appropriations that were not planned for in the beginning, it cuts down on either potential bonding capacity or cash available. Being conscious of money that the Redevelopment Commission decides needs to be spent or appropriated needs to be compared with the Town's Sustainability Plan. Mr. Thompson discussed the Summer Winds Community payment that was agreed to for 7 years of \$38,500 and the impact that it may have on other projects.

Mr. Vis asked what constitutes an appropriation, and used an example of the façade grant with the budget. Mr. Thompson stated instead of appropriation he should use the terminology expenditures. The appropriation is a projected expenditure, an amount set aside for specific use. Mr. Thompson stated it was his understanding that he was to address the consequences of what the \$38,500 had on impacting the bonding capacity and the effect on other projects.

Mr. Vis stated that he was more concerned with the global understanding as to how the budget can be constructed. Mr. Vis asked Mr. Thompson if it made sense to have less of a budget to maximize bonding capacity going forward. Mr. Thompson responded that he was trying to get the understanding of the budget out there. It's a question of completing major projects and allowing for bonding capacity or spend the cash that is on hand for major projects around the town. The RDC is unique with the TIFF money available. There is not an official budget for these funds, but with planning it all ties together.

Mr. Niemeyer discussed why the Sustainability Plan was created. What is being done from a finance standpoint is trying to conservatively project growth numbers to have opportunities to invest tax dollars in needed projects, throughout the community. Mr. Niemeyer discussed his thoughts and ideas that he has to help create a financial plan for projects in the community. The possibility of cutting the façade grant improvement program funding was discussed to protect financial capabilities. Mr. Niemeyer suggested creating some projections to determine bonding capacity and basing spending on real projections.

Mr. Vis asked Mr. Thompson what advice he had for the RDC so that they had the coverage capacity needed. Mr. Thompson responded that when creating the Sustainability Plan, a large portion was making sure all necessary coverage was maintained on current debt service. The bonding capacity had been looked at based upon certain assessed value growth assumption. There is a base in the Sustainability Plan of what the growth might be and potential revenue. This may be something that requires an annual review of any changes or deviations from the updated Sustainability Plan. Mr. Thompson stated his suggestion is keeping on top of it any time there is a change, look at the financial impact of the change.

Mr. Niemeyer discussed reviewing the Sustainability Plan as each year ends. The advantage of doing this is if a proposal comes in front of the RDC for development, there is an idea on how to spend the money.

Mr. Vis stated they invested \$200,000 in the façade grant improvements to date. Mr. Vis asked Mr. Thompson if there are other municipalities that start to base the amount put back into a program like this based upon the return on investment that they get on the back end of taxes of the following year or look back in general, and if this is something that would be suggested as well. Mr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Thompson explained this would be a good thing to look at in trying to project the benefit that the Town receiving from them, as well. Not only is the Town being improved, there is going to be a return for the RDC. Mr. Vis asked what is a good amount of time to go by to assess the fact. Mr. Thompson it would depend on the projects getting done. Once the project has been finished and they have the new assessed value, they should in theory be able to look at the parcel and figure out the economic impact there. Discussion ensued about when to discuss the assessed value of façade grant projects and having a good financial pro forma. Discussion also ensued about having a living financial plan and projects within TIFF districts and thinking about what is next.

Mr. Eberly stated he liked the idea of trying to track how the impact of the assessed valuation of the façade grant is benefiting the town by, but he feels that will be difficult. Mr. Eberly used the money given through the grant to Mr. Lindemulder as an example. If the money granted was less than 50 percent of the projects he was doing in town, it could make tracking the impact more difficult. Mr. Eberly asked Mr. Lindemulder what the percentage is of the grants given for his projects. Mr. Lindemulder responded that it was way below 50 percent. That there are benefits that cannot be gauged with this program, such as people updating their façades that don't apply for the grant. Discussion ensued about the potential difficulties in tracking and potential on how to track improvements in assessed values.

Mr. Vis thanked Mr. Thompson for his time and suggested making this a conversation piece for the October meeting to assess how to go about some of the metrics and ideas.

Mr. Austgen asked if Mr. Thompson and his firm have done projects like this in the past. Mr. Thompson responded in the affirmative. That in the past they have done TIFF and fiscal impact reports, including establishment of the TIFF district, expenditure of the dollars, and the like. Mr. Austgen suggested using that as a template for the Town as a starting point to begin assessing the Town's data. Mr. Thompson stated they could maybe provide one that has been used in another community and use that as starting point.

F. Crosswalk Request – 13115 Lake Shore Drive

Mr. Vis stated the next order of business was for a crosswalk request at 13115 Lake Shore Drive. Mr. Vis stated that they had received this request back in March of 2020 from Pete Blagojevic in regards to a crosswalk near Hunley's. At that time the request had been submitted, he was told to hold off due to road improvements. Mr. Eberly stated that he did not speak to Mr. Blagojevic personally, but he received get a message that Mr. Blagojevic was inquiring about it once again. He checked with Mr. Oliphant on pricing, and Mr. Oliphant stated that it would be approximately \$3500 plus approximately \$1000 more for signage. All together it would be approximately \$4500 to put in the crosswalk with thermoplastic striping. Mr. Eberly stated that it could still be done this year from a time standpoint due to using the thermoplastic.

Mr. Niemeyer stated that some council members and staff members would be going to French Lick for the annual Accelerated Indiana Municipalities Conference in October. In French Lick they have installed crosswalks across main thoroughfares that allow for a pedestrian to come up, push a button, and as a safety mechanism, there is a flashing light to indicate a pedestrian is crossing. One of the difficulties that is occurring currently in Cedar Lake is that a crosswalk can be installed, but is it really a public safety improvement. Are the pedestrians and the customers patronizing the businesses safer. Mr. Niemeyer discussed a crosswalk without having a public safety measure leading up to the crosswalk with using the Dairy Belle crosswalk as an example.

Ms. Covaciu discussed that she has expressed that she has not seen a difference in the way people drive by the Dairy Belle. She does not think it is effective at all and explained her reasoning. Ms. Covaciu stated she agrees with Mr. Niemeyer that this has to be done right, that it is not going to be done by stoplights and stop signs and the like. It is time to put something in place to protect the pedestrians. Discussion ensued about using crosswalks wherein they decided to come up with something better for next year.

Ms. Covaciu asked if they need the \$4500. Mr. Burnham asked if the RDC paid for the whole strip by the Eagles, or if the Eagles split the cost with the RDC. Mr. Spencer stated he believed Mr. Burnham was correct and they split the cost. Mr. Burnham stated that their parking lot is across the street from their business, they own the parking lot, and wouldn't they be liable to provide safe passage for their customers.

Mr. Niemeyer asked if they sponsored the entire crosswalk by the Dairy Belle. Mr. Vis stated they did the one by the Dairy Belle due to the high density of pedestrians and the amount of businesses there. Discussion ensued about the crosswalk in that area.

A motion was made by Ms. Covaciu and seconded by Mr. Spencer to pay \$2250 to pay for half of the total and for Hunley's to split the bill. Motion carried unanimously by roll-call vote:

Jolie Covaciu	Aye
Doug Spencer	Aye
Randy Niemeyer	Aye
Eric Burnham	Aye
Nathan Vis	Aye

Mr. Vis asked Mr. Eberly to get in touch with Hunley's to discuss the decision of the Commission. Mr. Eberly agreed to do so.

PROJECT UPDATES:

Clerk-Treasurer's Funds Report: Submitted in writing. Commissioners were satisfied with said report.

Hood – LUST Damages: None.

Industrial Park Property Roadway: None.

Façade Grants Updates: The Commissioners reviewed the report document and were satisfied.

Light Pole Banners: Mr. Eberly stated that he had contacted Mr. Jack Adams due to the fact that the company he had received a previous quote for increased their prices quite a bit since receiving the original quote. Mr. Eberly stated that Mr. Adams is able to provide the banners and hardware for approximately \$500 less than the original quote. They are able to use a local business to do this project.

Mr. Eberly stated he asked Mr. Adams to get the hardware to them as soon as possible as they have 120 poles to get the banners up on. Mr. Eberly stated that Mr. Adams expressed that he saw no problem in getting both items to the Town in a timely fashion.

Mr. Vis asked if they approved the funds for this already. Mr. Eberly responded in the affirmative. They had stated not to exceed \$6300 and they will be coming in approximately \$500 under that amount.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None was had.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Covaciu stated that she had a comment and announced that after seven years of serving on the Redevelopment Commission she will be resigning from her position. She was thankful to be appointed to the board and hopes to continue to help the community in which she and her family are moving to. Mr. Vis thanked Ms. Covaciu for her service on behalf of the board and commented that she would be missed.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Vis adjourned the meeting at 7:19 P.M.

TOWN OF CEDAR LAKE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Nathan D. Vis, President

Eric Burnham, Vice-President

Doug Spencer, Secretary

TBD, Member

Randell C. Niemeyer, Member

ATTEST:

Ashley C. Abernathy, Recording Secretary

The Minutes of the Cedar Lake Plan Commission Meeting are transcribed pursuant to IC 5-14-15-4(b) which states:

(b) As the meeting progresses, the following memoranda shall be kept:

(1) The date, time, and place of the meeting.

(2) The members of the governing body recorded as either present or absent.

(3) The general substance of all matters proposed, discussed, or decided.

(4) A record of all votes taken by individual members if there is a roll call.

(5) Any additional information required under section 3.5 or 3.6 of this chapter or any other statute that authorizes a governing body to conduct a meeting using an electronic means of communication.

Cedar Lake Redevelopment Commission: Minutes of September 20, 2021

The Town of Cedar Lake is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, please contact the Town Hall at (219) 374-7400.