



CITY OF NOVI
Finance and Administration Committee Meeting
November 24, 2025, 5:00 p.m.
Mayor's Conference Room | Novi Civic Center | 45175 Ten Mile Road
(248) 347-0445

CALL TO ORDER: 5:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Mayor Fischer, Mayor Pro Tem Casey, Councilmember Staudt

STAFF LIAISON: Victor Cardenas, City Manager

ALSO PRESENT: Tom Schultz, City Attorney
Jake Austermann, Plante Moran Realpoint
Eric Helzer, Advanced Redevelopment Solutions

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Casey; Seconded: Staudt; Approved: 3:0

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 21, 2025

Motion: Casey; Seconded: Staudt; Approved: 3:0

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

Mayor Fischer opened the meeting by stating that there has been a lot of interest in the Transformation Brownfield Program, including for Mr. Bowman of the Suburban Collection Showplace and his upcoming proposed project in City West. As the City of Novi has not previously been involved with the program Mayor Fischer thinks it is important that there be a core group of Councilmembers who are able to dive into the situation and get information from experts about these programs. He thinks that this Finance and Administration Committee is the appropriate body to make that initial deep dive, with the expectation that City staff will then share the presentation, minutes, and a summary of the subject on an upcoming administrative packet so the rest of City Council is also informed on the topic. This is a fact finding mission, that will include the presentation by Mr. Austerman as well as an informal Question and Answer session. Mayor Fischer then invited Mr. Austerman to begin his presentation.

1. Michigan Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Programs Presentation
with Jake Austermann of Plante Moran Realpoint

Mr. Austerman introduced himself to the group, stating that he works with the Plante Moran Realpoint Consulting Group and that over the last decade he has worked primarily in the City of Detroit with economic development incentive projects there. These include tax abatements and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) in both districts and project specific programs. He has done work on all sides, with large occupiers, non-profits, municipalities, Economic Development Authorities, etc.

There are two forms of TIF in Michigan:

1. Project Specific

Where the project is creating the tax production which it then reaping the benefit of. It is a performance-based incentive and includes the Brownfield TIF, the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) Housing TIF, and the Transformation Brownfield programs. The developer makes an investment, creates new property taxes, and is reimbursed a share of those property taxes as a means of incentivizing that investment. A “pull” incentive to draw investment/development to a community.

2. District

A “push” incentive where a localized tax-increment district is created that can capture property taxes currently being generated there (including the possibility of levying a new millage for that area). The authority then makes investments within the boundaries of that district using those dollars. This is somewhat similar to the Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA) in Novi. The district concept was also used for the Little Cesar Arena.

TIF Programs are used in all US States except Arizona. Mr. Austerman used graphs on page three and four of his presentation to illustrate how the TIF model works. It is effectively a temporary redirecting a portion of tax revenue to a developer, after a set number of years the full portion of taxes again go to the local taxing body. Each program differs on the exact percentages of how the tax revenue is divvied up (between authorities, local, county, state, etc.). It is not permitted to capture debt encumbered millages like bond debt, school debt, or other specifically encumbered millages.

Mr. Austerman provided a breakdown of the three Michigan three TIF programs that would fall under a project-specific designation including a brief description, eligible costs, reimbursement mechanism, and approving authorities for each on page five of his presentation. In summary:

Brownfield TIF - Supports the cleanup of contaminated sites, the development of transit-oriented properties, or the redevelopment of blighted, functionally obsolete, and historic property. The Brownfield TIF essentially supports the cost of cleaning up a contaminated brownfield site so a developer can approach it much as they would a greenfield site. They are reimbursed through a portion of property taxes on eligible costs for up to 30 years OR up to the amount of spend on eligible activities. This program has been used in Novi, Dunhill Park, and Villas at Stonebrook.

MSHDA Housing TIF – a new program enacted in 2023 with the goal of increasing housing production in the State of Michigan, especially of workforce housing. Eligible costs include, among other expanded items, a rent-loss gap which makes up for the difference between where market-rate rents are and the affordable rent that the developer agrees to restrict a building or units to. The number of affordable units varies, and is negotiated between the developer and local municipality.

Mr. Helzer added that an "affordable unit" is at or below 120% of the area median income. Typically a minimum of units across the state is about 20% of the development but it varies by authority. Some communities set it up so that the developer is only financed on the affordable proportionate amount of the eligible costs or even further tailored local policy. The cities of Ann Arbor, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Traverse City have further requirements to force more affordability. It allows for a large amount of negotiability. Mr. Austerman stated that, from the State's perspective, this program has been hugely successful with ~\$800 million in housing investment projects (~3,000 units) approved through the program to date. It is also supported by property taxes for up to 30 years

Transformation Brownfield Program –

** Additional information was provided for this program on page 6 of the presentation*

Supports large-scale mixed-use developments on brownfield sites that have a transformational impact on a City's population, commercial activity, and employment. Eligible plans must exceed \$75 mil in one or more "contiguous" buildings. In addition to property taxes for up to 30 years this TIF also includes incentive resources of Sales tax exemption on Michigan-based construction materials, a percentage of State Income, Withholding, and Sales tax for up to 20 years.

Councilmember Staudt asked why the limitation on State Income, Withholding, and Sales tax were set at 20 years instead of 30 like the State/County/Local Property Taxes? Mr. Helzer said that the state policy has always been proportionality on real property taxes so they are maintaining that under law. Through the additional tax resources the State is putting in more money than the original proportionality.

Mr. Austerman added that there are caps on the resources as allocated under State legislation. It is an incentive brought by the state to encourage local investment/development. It is significant in getting a project that might have a gap in financing to close that gap. It operates under that understanding that if not for these incentives the development would not be able to start construction, get financing, or get the proper returns to attract outside capital. The Property Tax portion operates the same as it would under the Brownfield or MSHDA Housing TIFs but the biggest difference is that this program makes almost all construction costs eligible for reimbursement (IE tradition brownfield work plus any "vertical" construction).

Councilmember Staudt expressed that he struggles with the inclusion of for-sale units and doesn't think they should be included in a TIF, he thinks it makes it a long-term investment strategy for wealthy developers. Mr. Helzer said that he too has struggled with this but that he has come to understand that there a lot of hybrid options for the financing, it all comes down to numbers. Sometimes residential is excluded from any cost eligibility but the revenue is captured to accelerate the payment and reimbursement, allowing the financing on the rest of the project. Where the money is placed and what it is captured from can be hybridized so that the entire project can be financed.

Mr. Austerman added that there are controls and governors around the profit-making mechanisms. The state does an underwriting analysis on the rate of return the developer is set to make, and there are caps in place on what they can make. The developer has to prove the need for the incentive requested and there is a lot of negotiability built-in for the local authority, for the duration and the eligible components and where costs are directed. The City has to sign off on a project before it gets to the State level. The reimbursement is fully performance based and all income/revenue is included within the TIF financial model.

Councilmember Staudt asked if segments of the development can be sold off during the TIF capture period and where the selling price goes (to pay off debt)? Mr. Austerman said that yes, segments can be sold and that ultimately the TIF would be assigned to the new buyer or the debt holder, therefore remaining part of the program for its duration. Ultimately because you have the State resources it encourages the viability of the project throughout the life cycle. If they sell it will potentially do so at a higher price, so property taxes can be reimbursed quicker and the value placed on it after it sells on tax rolls is higher.

Mr. Austerman then went over why Cities use TIF including the identified need for workforce housing, the documented change in work patterns (IE more working from home which has effected commercial office vacancy and impact to property tax valuations on office properties), municipalities looking to create more vitality in their urban cores, converting vacant land or vacant office buildings to housing, encouraging the spend in major retail centers that need sufficient foot traffic to be viable, etc. A 1% increase in vacancy can reduce a property's value by 2 - 3% so as Cities have struggled with office vacancies you see lagging inflation on property tax valuations, some of which if overcome by Headlee, but that will ultimately hit a city's bottom line.

He then spoke on Developer use of TIF is in part because Michigan has a high property tax burden (14th highest in the country for effective property tax rates with Oakland County among the top 20% of counties nationwide) and construction costs have significantly outpaced rent growth in many markets. The TIF programs are a means to offset that.

Mayor Fischer asked why the State doesn't focus on the effective property tax rate being too high and working to do something there as opposed to throwing money at "a couple winners and losers." This helps very little in the grand scheme of property taxes so it rubs him the wrong way a bit. Mr. Austerman agrees with Mayor's comment though noting that he would love to see statewide property tax reform but that this current state is why developers are asking for TIF. It is a tool developed to deal with the issue. Mayor Fischer remarked that it is frustrating to see a structural problem with a program that will only help a few developers. He asked how many projects have gone through the Transformational Brownfield process, Mr. Austerman guessed 12 -15 plans. Mayor followed up to ask how many developers, if any if it is a smaller number compared to the plans. Mr. Austerman said that he

doesn't believe anyone has "double dipped" at this point though there is at least one applying for a second time.

Councilmember Staudt asked if the process is possible without the residential component and for an example of a plan that did so. It is allowed under the program as the plan must be for mixed-use developments but that mixed-use does not have to include residential, however, all of the plans that have gone through to date have included a residential component.

Councilmember Staudt said that it would be a quandary as to how to explain the TIF program to residents, and how it benefits them.

Mr. Austerman said that it can be a concern for municipalities that they are contributing the "allowance" for the developer to capture local taxing jurisdictions, leaving the jurisdiction with no new revenue to address the needs (additional staff, road burden-based repair needs, other services, etc.) that arise from the new development. Some ways to offset this concern are the following mechanisms:

Municipal Services Agreement

An direct agreement between the Developer and the City for the developer to fund a specific use (operations, Police/Fire personnel, etc.) for the duration of the TIF. Less common in Mr. Austerman's experience.

Community Benefits Agreement

The more common mechanism in Mr. Austerman's experience, because it helps to directly reflect what the voters think. It is an agreement between the Developer and a local community group/neighborhood action committee outlining contributions to be made by the Developer to the community to offset concerns.

Mayor Fischer asked for an example of this. Mr. Austerman said that the Henry Ford Hospital Expansion included the agreement to build an urgent care, establish a greater presence of care for Detroit residents throughout the neighborhoods, to contribute land to city uses – specifically the Community Land Trust (an affordable housing concept the city was focused on). It could include things like an affordable housing fund, a small business fund, etc. City Attorney Schultz noted that a Municipal Services Agreement would potentially be of more interest to Council, so it could pay for things like public safety personnel or vehicles. Mr. Austerman said that Community Benefits Agreements are often very political as a negotiation between residents and developer with the City as an arbiter. They are very specific agreements with often expansive process including many meetings and public information sessions. Mayor Fischer agreed with Mr. Schultz that a Municipal Services Agreement, especially towards public safety, would be the option of choice. Mr. Schultz also said that neither the Municipal Services or Community Benefits Agreements are referred to in the statute, they developed as allowable local mechanisms (IE not necessarily endorsed by the state but allowable in that they will not say no to a project that includes them). Mr. Austerman said that the State essentially wants to see the local municipality bought-in to the project. If the state sees the local approval and the project plan meets state

criteria then they will commit their funding to the project. These agreements are realistically how the local municipality identify way to offset the new costs associated with new development.

Application Fees

Fees charged by the Local Municipality to offset the cost of review

Brownfield Redevelopment Authority

An authority established by the Local Municipality or the County that can charge fees on the captured TIF to be used for various administrative costs. This can be set up at the local level, there is already one at Oakland County. There are a lot of existing practices, policies and procedures and therefore a real cost associated with it. They can charge administrative fees that can go to the benefit of the city authority.

Local Brownfield Revolving Fund

A fund established by the Local Municipality or the County that can charge fees on the captured TIF to be used for various land development costs specific to brownfield development.

Mayor Fischer summarized that these last three (Application fees, Brownfield Redevelopment Authority, and Local Brownfield Revolving Fund) are essentially a way for the City to skim a bit of the TIF to keep. Mr. Austerman agreed. Mr. Helzer Brownfield Redevelopment Authority and Local Brownfield Revolving Funds can be significant. Some municipalities have as high as 20% going to those buckets, it just has to be justified that it can be spent. There is real opportunity for the city there.

Mr. Austerman also offered a few case studies, the approved projects of Bedrock (Hudson's Detroit, the Book Building, Campus Martius Expansion, and Cadillac Square) and Grand Rapids (Acrisure Amphitheater, Amway Soccer Stadium, and a mixed-use development).

City Manager Cardenas asked about the incentives reporting mechanism, acknowledging that it has to show profits made for the length of the agreement. For example, the lease agreement has to be divulged to...? Mr. Austerman said yes, divulged to the state and the state manages that from the reimbursement process standpoint.

Mr. Schultz asked how the 30-year period works (IE approval, construction start, construction completion, reimbursement period). Mr. Austerman said that the program gives 5-years from the date the plan is approved for the project to conclude. Mr. Helzer added that it is a deferred start of capture, typically written as start of construction OR 5-years (whatever is sooner). After those 5-years you start to eat into your period of capture. If no investment or construction is started then there are termination from both the City and State standpoints. Mr. Schultz asked for clarification if it is 5-years from the start of the 1st part for the entire project or for individual nodes of it. Mr. Austerman said it is nodes, there is a build-period allowed through the reimbursement agreement

for each component. Mr. Helser added that that would be created in a phased build and revenue plan.

He also showed the potential project of Novi City West, being proposed by Mr. Bowman of the Suburban Collection Showplace (page 13 of presentation).

Mr. Schultz asked why there isn't a slide regarding what the City West project will ask of the City and Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA) as far as investment/infrastructure needed. Mr. Austerman said that this session for the Committee was designed as educational on TIF programs, not for a specific project. There is still a lot of discussion to be had regarding City West. Mr. Cardenas noted that the State would want to see the City have a stake in the project though.

Councilmember Staudt asked if the County would get involved due to Grand River, Mr. Cardenas said that the current plan does not appear to impact Grand River, just some smaller local roads.

Following brief discussion of potential financing through the City and/or the CIA Councilmember Staudt asked how much the CIA gets from the TIF. Mr. Austerman said it would likely be more than ½ the capturable amount. Mr. Austerman further noted that this is one mechanism that can help keep the City funded in this dynamic. If the CIA is extended, then that capture extends through the full term of the brownfield plan because it's encumbrance supersedes the developers (IE they are in 1st position because the CIA was established prior to the transformation brownfield project). Mayor Fischer asked what the formula is for that. Mr. Austerman said there is a formula where the CIA gets 50% of the taxes for specific jurisdictions with new taxes generated. Mayor Fischer if the table Mr. Austerman provided could be updated for those capturable – Mr. Austerman said yes. Councilmember Staudt asked if, after 12 years the CIA isn't renewed does the developer get it all? Mr. Austerman said that there is precedent in recent brownfield approvals to believe they would then flow to the City rather than the developer. There is room for difference there though.

Councilmember Staudt and Mr. Schultz asked why the CIA would be interested if the CIA got all the public infrastructure it wants paid for through the project?

Mr. Austerman said that if the CIA is extended then it gives a new 30-year cycle on top of the current 12-year cycle. This would require Oakland County to extend the CIA, in part on basis that this project was never contemplated previously. Once the developer capture has stopped the CIA's can still extend outward, being the benefactor of those taxes, continuing to incent projects long after the developer's benefit has ended. The group briefly discussed the viability of the County extending the CIA. Mr. Austerman noted that the County would also be part of the Transformational Brownfield Process, approached in much the same way the City is. Councilmember Staudt asked who makes the legal determination if, at the termination of the brownfield

authority, the funds go back to the City? Mr. Helzer said they have to go back to the City, it is statutory. Mr. Cardenas said that it is similar to the CIA in that way.

Mayor Fischer asked why in the Bedrock Case Study if it was a 2 billion dollar investment why the incentive is only 600 million? Mr. Austerman said it was because they "maxed out" production. The total value of the incentive over 30 years was 600 million, they only got as much reimbursement as they could produce. The governor is cost and/or duration.

Mayor Fischer asked for some clarification of the math on slide 4, asking if the City didn't have a CIA it would be likely that you could have a 100 Mil project with 100 Mil back incentive. Mr. Austerman said no, what he provided was a simplified math example. Because property taxes on a per unit basis are about \$5,000 per year, a new unit takes \$250,000 to build and is assessed for \$100,000 a unit, you aren't going to be able to fully reimburse the value of the unit on that \$5,000 (5% on 50% of the value). Mayor noted then that on the example all the numbers should then be cut in half and Mr. Austerman agreed.

Councilmember Staudt asked much we should expect from projects if the City establishes a Brownfield Authority. Mr. Helzer said that he sees a lot of authorities get about 5% of all capturable revenue annually. Councilmember Staudt asked why we would let the County capture that money, Mr. Helzer agreed, noting that they recommend that the City establishes their own brownfield authority. Mr. Schultz asked what the City can use the money out of that revolving fund for? Mr. Helzer said it could be used to acquire land that falls under the program's eligibility. It could also be used to set up a fund for low-interest loans or grants to offset costs on other projects, infrastructure improvements, parks, roads etc., as long as they are related to another eligible project. Councilmember Staudt noted that this could be a lot of money. Mr. Austerman noted that there is an administrative process to establish a brownfield authority, personnel to be hired. But it can go into a broader economic development strategy, they can be an incentive for the next project.

Mayor Fischer stated that Novi may be quite different as a community than those that Mr. Austerman and Mr. Helzer have worked with before. Mr. Helzer agreed but said that every authority and city is unique. You can build the program around what you want it to be and the goals the City has. Mr. Helzer noted one Community he is working with is purchasing a Fire Truck under the Community Benefit Agreement under part of the larger TIF.

Mr. Cardenas asked about Central Park South and how far an individual project can be to still be included in the overall development. Mr. Austerman said that if it is part of the continuous plan of development under the masterplan for City West it qualifies. Mr. Helzer continued saying that originally it was narrower, only contiguous properties but it has since been expanded so it can be scattered sites as long as it is part of one development initiative.

Mr. Schultz asked that we be provided with an example of the letter of support that the City would need to submit to the state. He noted he has some concern about submitting a letter like that when we haven't even seen a site plan or reviewed criteria. Mr. Austerman said that it is less defined than a letter of support, the municipality has to be in support in order to bring the application to the state, but they always do the approvals coterminous, meaning there is still a lot to be negotiated between the municipality and developer while they are moving through State approvals. The municipality may use some of the State review in their own approvals, such as on tax projections and underwriting analysis. The letter of support can be drafted so vaguely as "We are excited to consider this project and will be supporting pending our review and negotiation...". Mr. Schultz stressed that it is his job as the City Attorney to preserve the City's right to say "no". Mr. Austerman agreed, saying that realistically it is an uncommitted letter meant to get a conversation going. Mr. Schultz asked for some examples, noting that it would need to be very loose support. Mayor Fischer made the analogy that it is a bit like a mortgage pre-approval letter where you still need to go through the full mortgage application. He then asked how the letter can be crafted in such a way that ALL of City Council, with their various opinions, is prepared to sign off? Mr. Austerman said it doesn't need to be anything binding, just an expression of interest or excitement for the project. Mayor Fischer says he would like clarity on what exactly is needed from Council and the City for Mr. Bowman to apply for the incentive. Mr. Austerman said he believes it is just the letter of support to the State for the program to be extended, Mayor thought there was something more needed based on the previous presentation to the CIA.

Councilmember Staudt asked what the timeline would be for the project. Mr. Austerman said that currently the State hasn't expanded the program and therefore is not a resource for Mr. Bowman to go after. It will require the State Statute to amend and expand the Transformation Brownfield Program. The State Bill is under review in committee but has not yet been scheduled for a hearing, it will mostly likely be heard next year.

Mr. Austerman said that before the State can approve the plan, they will need Local, City and County, approvals (including a resolution from the City of Novi) and the Transformational Brownfield Plan drafted, reviewed, and approved.

Councilmember Staudt noted that MEDC hasn't yet started reviews of the new batch since there are not funds available. Mr. Austerman said yes, though they have looked at a few and expressed interest in the event the program gets refunded.

Mr. Schultz asked about retroactivity, for example if it takes a year to negotiate, can Mr. Bowman approach the City Planning Commission with a plan. Mr. Austerman says that can potentially create an issue with respect to

the "but for" test but that there are dynamics where you can start construction and still apply for incentives at that point.

Councilmember Staudt then asked if Mr. Austerman has other clients applying for these funds and therefore competing for the same pot of money? Mr. Austerman said yes, he had other clients applying but that because the pot of money is so large that they wouldn't realistically be in competition. Councilmember Staudt noted some political concerns about if the program will be renewed. Mr. Austerman said he is not involved with the political side, only the numbers.

To return to the process, Mr. Austerman said that the County would review and approve the plan, including public hearings, the County brownfield authority and board of commissioners, and then would go to the State for approval. During that time the City could be negotiating the Municipal Service Agreement, but it would all need to be completed in advance of moving forward with State approvals.

Mr. Schultz again expressed concern about preserving the City's right to not approve bad plans. He wants to know how this approval can take place prior to the City performing standard Site Plan reviews. Mr. Austerman and Mr. Helzer said that there are callback provisions wherein if the developer does not deliver what the City wants per the development agreement and plan then the incentives don't flow. There are also governors in the plan on how much the program of investment can change (square footage, total investment, etc.) for any project before the developer would have to come back for an amendment. Therefore, City Council gets "another bite at the apple" through the amendment process. Minimums can also be set regarding number of units, square footage, investment, product types, etc. This would be in a concept plan, in substantial form, which would be enough for the brownfield to be approved and then if they don't deliver the incentive doesn't flow. Mr. Cardenas noted that the issue Mr. Schultz has though is that the City has handcuffed themselves to that plan for development that hasn't gone through any kind of site plan approval. Mr. Helzer and Mr. Austerman agreed that was a fair point. Mr. Cardenas further put forward that doing this usurps the legislative authority from the Planning Commission. Mr. Helzer said that City Council is approving the concept plan, product types, and end uses along with a detailed schedule and timing. Mr. Schultz says this is a good conversation, but he is still trying to understand even after having read the statute. In the event a development and brownfield plan with this concept in it is approved and then three years later a public hearing is taking place at the Planning Commission for one of the components (Hotel, apartments, etc.) and the public express that they hate multiple components of the plan. How can the City then say that they have already kind of approved it, how does this mesh with our obligation to follow zoning law. Mr. Austerman said that it is a requirement that the development meets zoning requirements. Mr. Schultz said that it wouldn't be a approval by right site plan but instead the more discretionary Special Land Use. We would hold a public hearing and retain discretion. Mr. Helzer said if these are living documents, it would trigger a Transformational Brownfield Plan amendment that would have to be

approved and go back to the state. Mr. Austerman said that it would have to be in alignment with the City's changes to the project for the special land use and that is something that could be drafted into the development agreement. Mr. Helzer said that the State would agree to that and recognize the zoning in the City of Novi and the Special Land Use process. He also pointed out that the project doesn't mandate things like height, density, etc. which can still go through public hearing. The transformational brownfield plan lays out the end product use, and a change of use would require an amendment.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey said that she doesn't have any comment at this time, but that she has Mr. Austerman's contact information and reserves the right to reach out with questions in the future.

Mayor Fischer thanked Mr. Austerman, stating that this was very useful and a good start to the conversation. The example of City West helped better understand some details. That said, he is still a bit confused as to the next steps for City Council, he expects that Mr. Austerman and Mr. Schultz will continue to discuss and work that out further. He thinks that several at the table have the same concerns/reservations about the proposal currently.

Councilmember Staudt wants to ensure that we keep as much money in the City's pocket as possible. Mr. Helzer reiterated his suggestion of establishing a brownfield authority.

Mr. Austerman would need to submit to the State to start their application review would be a drafted Brownfield Plan, Financial Plan, and other checklist documents (site control, construction drawings, estimates, etc.). The State won't schedule a hearing at the State Strategic Fund until there is a binding resolution from the City Council saying they are in support of the brownfield plan.

Mr. Austerman said that, from his view, the next steps for the City is negotiation between Mr. Bowman and the City on things like a Municipal Service Agreement and Development Agreement. Mayor Fischer expressed that at this point we need all seven voice from the City Council to weigh in. Mr. Austerman said that realistically that may be what Mr. Bowman is looking for, saying that "we support the continued review of this plan by the State while the City continues their own due diligence", something that isn't a binding letter but that involved all parties at the table so we can move forward.

Mr. Schultz asked when an initial review fee is paid for everyone's time on this? Mr. Austerman said it would be up to the City's policy on how that gets set. Mr. Helzer said that for a brownfield of this size it could be six figures between attorney fees, consulting fees, time, etc. It would be another reason to establish a brownfield authority. Sometimes there is a pre-application fee, a brownfield plan application fee, etc.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS - None

ADJOURNMENT: 7:11 p.m.

Motion: Casey; Seconded: Fischer; Approved: 3:0

DRAFT