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Section 1. Name of Redevelopment Project Area and Contact Information

Refer to chart attached.
### TIF Administrator Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name:</th>
<th>Martin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Name:</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>2100 Ridge Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>847/328-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Evanston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>60202-2798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mlyons@cityofevanston.org">mlyons@cityofevanston.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I attest to the best of my knowledge, this report of the redevelopment project areas in: City/Village of Evanston is complete and accurate at the end of this reporting Fiscal year under the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3 et. seq.] or the Industrial Jobs Recovery Law [65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-10 et. seq.]

Written signature of TIF Administrator

Date

---

### FILL OUT ONE FOR EACH TIF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Redevelopment Project Area</th>
<th>Date Designated</th>
<th>Date Terminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown II TIF District (Research Park)-TIF1</td>
<td>1/28/1985</td>
<td>10/12/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest TIF District- TIF 2</td>
<td>6/25/1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hartrey TIF District - TIF 3</td>
<td>4/27/1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington National TIF District - TIF 4</td>
<td>9/1/1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Ridge TIF District - TIF 5</td>
<td>1/26/2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Evanston - TIF 6</td>
<td>9/1/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempster Dodge TIF District No. 7</td>
<td>6/25/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Main TIF District No. 8</td>
<td>1/28/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All statutory citations refer to one of two sections of the Illinois Municipal Code: the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3 et. seq.] or the Industrial Jobs Recovery Law [65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-10 et. seq.]*
SECTION 2 [Sections 2 through 5 must be completed for each redevelopment project area listed in Section 1.]

### FY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Redevelopment Project Area:</th>
<th>Howard Hartrey TIF 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Use of Redevelopment Project Area*</td>
<td>Retail Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;Combination/Mixed&quot; List Component Types:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under which section of the Illinois Municipal Code was Redevelopment Project Area designated? (check one):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Were there any amendments to the redevelopment plan, the redevelopment project area, or the State Sales Tax Boundary? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (1) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (1)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the amendment labeled Attachment A | |
| Certification of the Chief Executive Officer of the municipality that the municipality has complied with all of the requirements of the Act during the preceding fiscal year. [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (3) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (3)] | No | Yes | X |
| Please enclose the CEO Certification labeled Attachment B | |
| Opinion of legal counsel that municipality is in compliance with the Act. [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (4) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (4)] | No | Yes | X |
| Please enclose the Legal Counsel Opinion labeled Attachment C | |
| Were there any activities undertaken in furtherance of the objectives of the redevelopment plan, including any project implemented in the preceding fiscal year and a description of the activities undertaken? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (7) (A and B) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (7) (A and B)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the Activities Statement labeled Attachment D | |
| Were any agreements entered into by the municipality with regard to the disposition or redevelopment of any property within the redevelopment project area or the area within the State Sales Tax Boundary? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (7) (C) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (7) (C)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the Agreement(s) labeled Attachment E | |
| Is there additional information on the use of all funds received under this Division and steps taken by the municipality to achieve the objectives of the redevelopment plan? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (7) (D) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (7) (D)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the Additional Information labeled Attachment F | |
| Did the municipality’s TIF advisors or consultants enter into contracts with entities or persons that have received or are receiving payments financed by tax increment revenues produced by the same TIF? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (7) (E) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (7) (E)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the contract(s) or description of the contract(s) labeled Attachment G | |
| Were there any reports or meeting minutes submitted to the municipality by the joint review board? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (7) (F) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (7) (F)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the Joint Review Board Report labeled Attachment H | |
| Were any obligations issued by municipality? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (8) (A) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (8) (A)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the Official Statement labeled Attachment I | |
| Was analysis prepared by a financial advisor or underwriter setting forth the nature and term of obligation and projected debt service including required reserves and debt coverage? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (8) (B) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (8) (B)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose the Analysis labeled Attachment J | |
| Cumulatively, have deposits equal or greater than $100,000 been made into the special tax allocation fund? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (2) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (2)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose Audited financial statements of the special tax allocation fund labeled Attachment K | |
| Cumulatively, have deposits of incremental revenue equal to or greater than $100,000 been made into the special tax allocation fund? [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (9) and 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (9)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose a certified letter statement reviewing compliance with the Act labeled Attachment L | |
| A list of all intergovernmental agreements in effect in FY 2010, to which the municipality is a part, and an accounting of any money transferred or received by the municipality during that fiscal year pursuant to those intergovernmental agreements. [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (10)] | No | Yes | X |
| If yes, please enclose list only of the Intergovernmental agreements labeled Attachment M | |

* Types include: Central Business District, Retail, Other Commercial, Industrial, Residential, and Combination/Mixed.
Attachment A       Amendments to the Redevelopment Plan, the Redevelopment Project and/or the Area Boundary

The boundaries of the Redevelopment Project area and certain sections of the Plan were amended in the reporting fiscal year. The amendment ordinances are attached as Exhibit A.
Attachment B  Certification of the Mayor of the municipality that the municipality has complied with all of the requirements of the Act during the reporting Period.
Re: Howard Hartrey TIF District

I, Elizabeth Tisdahl, the duly elected Mayor of the City of Evanston, County of Cook, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the City of Evanston complied with the requirements pertaining to the Illinois Tax Increment Redevelopment Allocation Act during the Fiscal Year beginning January 1, 2013 and ending December 31, 2013.

Elizabeth Tisdahl
MAYOR

7-29-14
DATE
Attachment C  Opinion of legal counsel that the municipality has complied with the Act.
RE: Attorney Review City of Evanston Howard Hartrey TIF District

To Whom It May Concern:

This will confirm that I am the City Attorney for the City of Evanston, Illinois. I have reviewed all information provided to me by the City staff and consultants, and I find that the City of Evanston has conformed to all applicable requirements of the Illinois Tax Increment Redevelopment Allocation Act set forth thereunder for the Fiscal Year beginning January 1, 2013 and ending December 31, 2013, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Corporation Counsel
Attachment D Statement setting forth all activities undertaken in furtherance of the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan, including:

A. Any project implemented during the reporting Period; and

B. A description of the redevelopment activities undertaken.

No new projects were undertaken by the City in the reporting Period. The City continued to monitor the project and apply revenues to outstanding bond payments, as well as the review of area capital improvements. The City undertook an amendment to include vacant industrial property adjacent to the TIF District for redevelopment purposes.
Attachment E  Description of Agreements Regarding Property Disposition or Redevelopment

No agreements relating to property disposition or redevelopment were entered into by the city in the reporting Period.
Attachment F  Additional Information on Uses of Funds Related to Achieving Objectives of the Redevelopment Plan

The City continued to apply incremental taxes to outstanding obligations.
Attachment G  Information Regarding Contracts with TIF Consultants.

The City utilized Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. in order to prepare the TIF annual report. Fees were based upon hourly rates for services rendered and did not include contingent payments. Kane McKenna did not enter into contracts with any entities that were party to City redevelopment agreements.
Attachment H  Reports Submitted by Joint Review Board.

The Joint Review Board met on September 12, 2013 in order to consider the amendments to the plan and boundaries, their recommendation is included in the minutes. Minutes of the September meeting and the annual report meeting of December 5, 2013 are attached as Exhibit B.
Attachment I  Summary of any obligations issued by the municipality and official statements

No new obligations were issued by the City in the reporting Period.
Attachment J  Financial Analysis: TIF Obligations

The City undertook its review of existing TIF obligations throughout the reporting Period. The City continued to monitor the payment of existing obligations and reviewed the tax flows associated with current projects in order to determine coverage. Outstanding principal amounts, as well as future interest payments, associated with existing debt are summarized in Section 3.3 below.
Attachments K and L.

For special tax allocation funds that have experienced cumulative deposits of incremental tax revenues of $100,000 or more, a certified audit report reviewing compliance with the Act performed by an independent public accountant certified and licensed by the authority of the State of Illinois. The audit report shall contain a letter from the independent certified public accountant indicating compliance or noncompliance with the requirements of subsection (q) of Section 11-74.4-3.

Relevant portions of the City’s audit and the compliance letter are attached as Exhibit C.
Attachment M  Intergovernmental Agreements

Not applicable.
Section 3.1  Analysis of Special Tax Allocation Fund

Refer to table attached.
SECTION 3.1 - (65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (5) and 65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (5))

Provide an analysis of the special tax allocation fund.

FY 2013

TIF NAME: Howard Hartrey TIF No. 3

Fund Balance at Beginning of Reporting Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue/Cash Receipts Deposited in Fund During Reporting FY:</th>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Cumulative*</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Increment</td>
<td>$ 1,122,248</td>
<td>$ 19,148,478</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sales Tax Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Sales Tax Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,641,725</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Utility Tax Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Utility Tax Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 14,087</td>
<td>$ 1,566,333</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Building Sale Proceeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Proceeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 9,069,445</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from Municipal Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify source; if multiple other sources, attach schedule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*must be completed where 'Reporting Year' is populated

Total Amount Deposited in Special Tax Allocation Fund During Reporting Period

| Total Amount Deposited in Special Tax Allocation Fund During Reporting Period | $ 1,136,335 |

Cumulative Total Revenues/Cash Receipts

| Cumulative Total Revenues/Cash Receipts | $ 31,425,981 | 100% |

Total Expenditures/Cash Disbursements (Carried forward from Section 3.2)

| Total Expenditures/Cash Disbursements (Carried forward from Section 3.2) | $ 2,024,926 |

Distribution of Surplus

| Distribution of Surplus |  |

Total Expenditures/Disbursements

| Total Expenditures/Disbursements | $ 2,024,926 |

NET INCOME/CASH RECEIPTS OVER/(UNDER) CASH DISBURSEMENTS

| NET INCOME/CASH RECEIPTS OVER/(UNDER) CASH DISBURSEMENTS | $(888,591) |

FUND BALANCE, END OF REPORTING PERIOD

| FUND BALANCE, END OF REPORTING PERIOD* | $ 3,357,048 |

* if there is a positive fund balance at the end of the reporting period, you must complete Section 3.3

Total Amount Designated (Carried forward from Section 3.3)

| Total Amount Designated (Carried forward from Section 3.3) | $(347,496) |
Section 3.2  Itemized List of Expenditures from Special Tax Allocation Fund

Refer to tables attached.
## SECTION 3.2 A. (65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (5) and 65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (5))

**FY 2013**

TIF NAME: Howard Hartrey TIF No. 3

**ITEMIZED LIST OF ALL EXPENDITURES FROM THE SPECIAL TAX ALLOCATION FUND**

(by category of permissible redevelopment cost, amounts expended during reporting period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Permissible Redevelopment Cost [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3 (q) and 65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-10 (o)]</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Reporting Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Costs of studies, administration and professional services—Subsections (q)(1) and (o)(1)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>144,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional costs/services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cost of marketing sites—Subsections (q)(1.8) and (o)(1.6)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>144,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Property assembly, demolition, site preparation and environmental site improvement costs</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection (q)(5), (o)(2) and (o)(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Costs of rehabilitation, reconstruction, repair or remodeling of existing public or private buildings</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection (q)(3) and (o)(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Costs of construction of public works and improvements. Subsection (q)(4) and (o)(5)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Costs of removing contaminants required by environmental laws or rules (o)(6) - Industrial Jobs Recovery TIF's ONLY</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cost of job training and retaining, including &quot;welfare to work&quot; programs Subsection (q)(6), (o)(7) and (o)(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Financing costs, Subsection (q)(6) and (o)(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>$720,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,720,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Approved capital costs, Subsection (q)(7) and (o)(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cost of Reimbursing school districts for their increased costs caused by TIF assisted housing projects, Subsection (q)(7.5) - Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment TIF's ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Relocation costs, Subsection (q)(6) and (o)(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Payments in lieu of taxes, Subsection (q)(9) and (o)(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Costs of job training, retraining advanced vocational or career education provided by other taxing bodies, Subsection (q)(10) and (o)(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 3.2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Costs of reimbursing private developers for interest expenses incurred on approved redevelopment projects. Subsection (q)(11)(A-E) and (q)(13)(A-E)

15. Costs of construction of new housing units for low income and very low-income households. Subsection (q)(11)(F) - Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment TIFs ONLY

16. Cost of day care services and operational costs of day care centers. Subsection (q) (11.5) - Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment TIFs ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL ITEMIZED EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,024,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3.2 B

FY 2013
TIF NAME: Howard Hartrey TIF No. 3

List all vendors, including other municipal funds, that were paid in excess of $10,000 during the current reporting year.

There were no vendors, including other municipal funds, paid in excess of $10,000 during the current reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook County collector</td>
<td>Surplus Distribution</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Lamp Concrete Contractors</td>
<td>Public improvements</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>$720,611.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>TIF Reimbursements</td>
<td>$144,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3.3  Special Tax Allocation Fund Balance (end of reporting period).

Refer to table attached.
SECTION 3.3 - (65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (5) 65 ILCS 11-74.6-22 (d) (5))

Breakdown of the Balance in the Special Tax Allocation Fund At the End of the Reporting Period

FY 2013
TIF NAME: Howard Hartrey TIF No. 3

FUND BALANCE, END OF REPORTING PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Original Issuance</th>
<th>Amount Designated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,357,048</td>
<td>$ 3,357,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Description of Debt Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Series 2008 D</th>
<th>$ 3,036,826</th>
<th>$ 704,544</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Series 2008 D</td>
<td>$ 430,393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount Designated for Obligations

| $ 3,467,219 | $ 704,544 |

2. Description of Project Costs to be Paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF eligible cost reimbursement</th>
<th>$ 2,500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital improvements</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount Designated for Project Costs

| $ 3,000,000 |

TOTAL AMOUNT DESIGNATED

| $ 3,704,544 |

SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)

| $ (347,496) |

* NOTE: if a surplus is calculated, the municipality may be required to repay the amount to overlapping taxing
Section 4.0  A description of all property purchased by the municipality within the Redevelopment Project Area including:

A.  Street Address
B.  Approximate size or description of property
C.  Purchase Price
D.  Seller of property

Refer to table attached.
SECTION 4 [65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (6) and 65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (6)]

FY 2013

TIF NAME: Howard Hartrey TIF No. 3

Provide a description of all property purchased by the municipality during the reporting fiscal year within the redevelopment project area.

__X__ No property was acquired by the Municipality Within the Redevelopment Project Area

Property Acquired by the Municipality Within the Redevelopment Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property (1):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate size or description of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property (2):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate size or description of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property (3):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate size or description of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property (4):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate size or description of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller of property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5.0  Review of Public and Private Investment.

Refer to table attached.
**SECTION 5 - 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-5 (d) (7) (G) and 65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-22 (d) (7) (G)**

**FY 2013**

**TIF NAME: Howard Hartrey TIF No. 3**

**SECTION 5 PROVIDES PAGES 1-3 TO ACCOMMODATE UP TO 25 PROJECTS. PAGE 1 MUST BE INCLUDED WITH TIF REPORT. PAGES 2-3 SHOULD BE INCLUDED ONLY IF PROJECTS ARE LISTED ON THESE PAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL:</th>
<th>11/1/99 to Date</th>
<th>Estimated Investment for Subsequent Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Estimated to Complete Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Investment Undertaken (See Instructions)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment Undertaken</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Private/ Public Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project 1:** *IF PROJECTS ARE LISTED NUMBER MUST BE ENTERED ABOVE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Investment Undertaken (See Instructions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment Undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Private/ Public Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Investment Undertaken (See Instructions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment Undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Private/ Public Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Investment Undertaken (See Instructions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment Undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Private/ Public Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Investment Undertaken (See Instructions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment Undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Private/ Public Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project 5:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Investment Undertaken (See Instructions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment Undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Private/ Public Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project 6:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Investment Undertaken (See Instructions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Investment Undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Private/ Public Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optional: Information in the following sections is not required by law, but would be helpful in evaluating the performance of TIF in Illinois. *even though optional MUST be included as part of complete TIF report

SECTION 6
FY 2013
TIF NAME: Howard Hartrey TIF No. 3
Provide the base EAV (at the time of designation) and the EAV for the year reported for the redevelopment project area
Year redevelopment project area was designated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Base EAV</th>
<th>EAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$7,034,353</td>
<td>$20,277,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List all overlapping tax districts in the redevelopment project area.
If overlapping taxing district received a surplus, list the surplus.

The overlapping taxing districts did not receive a surplus.

SECTION 7
Provide information about job creation and retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlapping Taxing District</th>
<th>Surplus Distributed from redevelopment project area to overlapping districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook County Collector distribute</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro rata to all districts</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 8
Provide a general description of the redevelopment project area using only major boundaries:

Optional Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal description of redevelopment project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AN ORDINANCE

Amending a Tax Increment Redevelopment Plan
and Redevelopment Project for the
Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the best interest of the citizens of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois (the "City"), for the City to implement tax increment allocation financing pursuant to the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, Division 74.4 of Article 11 of the Illinois Municipal Code, as amended (the "Act"), for a proposed First Amendment to the Howard Hartrey redevelopment plan and redevelopment project (the "Plan" and "Project") within the municipal boundaries of the City within a proposed amended redevelopment project area (the "Area") described in Section 1A of this Ordinance, which Area constitutes in the aggregate more than one and one-half (1.5) acres; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 11-74.4-5 of the Act, the Mayor and City Council of the City (the "Corporate Authorities") called a public hearing relative to the amended Plan and Project and the amendment of the Area under the Act for October 28, 2013; and

WHEREAS, due notice with respect to such hearing was given pursuant to Section 11-74.4-5 of the Act, said notice being given to taxing districts and to the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity of the State of Illinois by certified mail on or about August 21, 2013, by publication on October 3, 2013, and October 10, 2013, and by certified mail to taxpayers within the Area on or about October 10, 2013; and
WHEREAS, the City has heretofore convened a joint review board as required by and in all respects in compliance with the provisions of the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Corporate Authorities have reviewed the information concerning such factors presented at the public hearing and have reviewed other studies and are generally informed of the conditions in the amended Area that could cause the Area to be a "conservation area" as defined in the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Corporate Authorities have reviewed the conditions pertaining to lack of private investment in the amended Area to determine whether private development would take place in the amended Area as a whole without the adoption of the proposed Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Corporate Authorities have reviewed the conditions pertaining to real property in the amended Area to determine whether contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon in the amended Area would be substantially benefited by the proposed Project improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Corporate Authorities have reviewed the proposed amendments to the Plan and Project and also the existing comprehensive plan for development of the City as a whole to determine whether the amended Plan and Project conform to the comprehensive plan of the City,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, THAT:

SECTION 1: Findings. The Corporate Authorities hereby make the following findings:

A. The amended Area is legally described in Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference. The general street
location for the amended Area is described in Exhibit B attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference. The map of the amended Area is depicted on Exhibit C attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference.

B. There exist conditions that cause the amended Area to be subject to designation as a redevelopment project area under the Act and to be classified as a conservation area as defined in Section 11-74.4-3(b) of the Act.

C. The amended Area on the whole has not been subject to growth and development through investment by private enterprise and would not be reasonably anticipated to be developed without the adoption of the Plan.

D. The amended Plan and Project conform to the comprehensive plan for the development of the City as a whole, as reflected in the City's zoning map.

E. As set forth in the amended Plan it is anticipated that all obligations incurred to finance redevelopment project costs, if any, as defined in the Plan shall be retired within twenty-three (23) years after the Area is designated.

F. The parcels of real property in the amended Area are contiguous, and only those contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon that will be substantially benefited by the proposed Project improvements are included in the amended Area.

SECTION 2: Amended Plan and Project Approved. That the amended Plan and Project, which were the subject matter of the public hearing held on October 28, 2013, are hereby adopted and approved. A copy of the amended Plan and Project is set forth in Exhibit D attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference.

SECTION 3: Invalidity of Any Section. That if any section, paragraph, or provision of this Ordinance shall be held to be invalid or unenforceable for any reason, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance.
SECTION 4: Incorporation. The findings and recitals contained herein are declared to be prima facie evidence of the law of the City and shall be received in evidence as provided by the Illinois Compiled Statutes and courts of the State of Illinois.

SECTION 5: Superseder and Effective Date. All ordinances, resolutions, motions, or orders in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict, and this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage by the Corporate Authorities and approval as provided by law.

AYES 4 NAYS 0 ABSENT 2

Introduced: December 11, 2013
Adopted: November 11, 2013

Approved: November 13, 2013

Elizabeth B. Tisdahl, Mayor

Attest:
Rodney Greene, City Clerk

Approved as to form:
W. Grant Farrar, Corporation Counsel
EXHIBIT A

Legal Description

THAT PART OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 13 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER;
THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER
TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN HOWARD-HARTREY SUBDIVISION,
BEING A SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE
PLAT THEREOF RECORDED SEPTEMBER 1, 1893 AS DOCUMENT NO. 93606916;
THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 9 TO THE
SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 2 IN BRUMMEL PLACE SUBDIVISION, BEING A
SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE PLAT
THEREOF RECORDED JULY 26, 1856 AS DOCUMENT NO. 16850693;
THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 2 TO THE NORTHWEST
CORNER OF SAID LOT 2; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID
BRUMMEL SUBDIVISION AND ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION THEREOF TO
A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF SAID NORTHWEST
QUARTER; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO A POINT ON THE
SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF THE CHICAGO NORTH SHORE AND MILWAUKEE
RAILROAD; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE TO A
POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF HARTREY AVENUE; THENCE
SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND SOUTHERLY
EXTENSION THEREOF TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST
QUARTER OF SECTION 25; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE TO
THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXHIBIT B

General Street Location

The proposed amendments to the Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area consist primarily of vacant industrial property located to the north of the existing Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area (and north of Brummel Place/Shure Drive) bounded by the shopping center and Howard Street on the south, Hartrey Avenue to the east, and the rail right of way to the north. The "Vineyard" property located to the west of the former Shure facility is not included.
EXHIBIT C

Map of Amended Redevelopment Project Area
EXHIBIT D

First Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan and Project
CITY OF EVANSTON

TIF REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

HOWARD-HARTREY TIF DISTRICT
1st AMENDMENT

"Redevelopment plan" means the comprehensive program of the municipality for development or redevelopment intended by the payment of redevelopment project costs to reduce or eliminate those conditions the existence of which qualified the redevelopment project area as a "blighted area" or "conservation area" or combination thereof or "industrial park conservation area," and thereby to enhance the tax bases of the taxing districts which extend into the redevelopment project area as set for in the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3, et. seq., as amended.

Prepared for: City of Evanston, Illinois
Prepared Jointly by: Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc.

and

The City of Evanston

Original TIF Plan – March 1992
Draft 1st Amendment – July 2013
CITY OF EVANSTON
TIF REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
HOWARD-HARTREY TIF DISTRICT—1ST AMENDMENT
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I. INTRODUCTION

In 1992, the City of Evanston adopted the Howard and Hartrey Redevelopment Plan and Project (the "Original TIF Plan," contained in Appendix 1). The purpose of this report is to update and amend the Original TIF Plan principally by adding two (2) parcels to the TIF District. A secondary goal is to revise the Original TIF Plan to ensure that it complies with statutory changes made to the TIF Act after 1992. The City is pursuing the proposed amendment as part of its strategy to promote the continued revitalization of key under-utilized properties located within the Howard-Hartrey TIF District, as amended.

Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. (KMA) has been retained by the City of Evanston to assist the City in drafting this amendment to the Plan.

Objectives. The City's general economic development objectives are to enhance residential, commercial, retail, industrial and mixed use opportunities within the City, including the proposed Howard-Hartrey TIF District, as amended. To achieve this overarching objective, the City has issued the following guidelines identified in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan that would apply to the Howard-Hartrey TIF District. (Refer to Exhibit 1 below.)

Exhibit 1

Components of Comprehensive Plan Applicable to Howard/Hartrey TIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Policies/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote the growth and redevelopment of business, commercial, and industrial areas</td>
<td>* Encourage the location of new or expanding businesses in existing commercial and mixed-use locations that would benefit from redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain and attract businesses in order to strengthen Evanston's economic base</td>
<td>* Support a cooperative marketing effort (with external entities) to attract new businesses to vacant storefronts and commercial spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and support the strong role neighborhood business districts play in Evanston's economy and its identity</td>
<td>* Protect and enhance the traditional character of neighborhood business districts; carefully examine proposed design changes using the Zoning and Sign Ordinances, and site plan and appearance review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Develop strategies where feasible for addressing parking and circulation concerns of merchants and surrounding residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and encourage efforts at employment assistance and linkages</td>
<td>* Promote and support job readiness and training programs as well as small business start-up assistance programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Evanston Comprehensive General Plan, 2000
Given the City's goals as well as the conditions described in this report, the City has made a determination that it is highly desirable to promote the redevelopment of the proposed Howard-Hartrey TIF District, as amended. Without an implementation plan for redevelopment, City officials believe adverse conditions will worsen. The City intends to implement such a plan in order to restore, stabilize, and increase the economic base of the TIF District and provide better roadway and alley access to and within the area. These activities will not only benefit the community as a whole but also generate additional tax revenues to support municipal services.

Because of the conditions observed in the Howard-Hartrey TIF District, as amended, and the required coordination for future land uses, the City is favorably disposed toward supporting redevelopment efforts. The City has determined that redevelopment should take place through the benefit and guidance of comprehensive economic planning by the City. Through this coordinated effort, the TIF District is expected to improve and development barriers will be eliminated.

The City affirms the following findings:

- The TIF District, as amended, 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 the TIF Redevelopment Plan, as amended;

- Redevelopment currently planned for the Howard-Hartrey TIF District, as amended, is feasible only with public financial assistance; and

- The TIF Redevelopment Plan, as amended, conforms to the comprehensive plan for the development of the City as a whole, as reflected in the City's zoning map.

By the establishment and utilization of a TIF redevelopment plan, as amended, the City intends to continue efforts to provide the assistance required to eliminate conditions detrimental to successful redevelopment of the TIF District.

The use of TIF relies upon induced private redevelopment in the Howard-Hartrey TIF District to create higher real estate values that would otherwise decline without such investment. By so doing, it would result in increased property taxes compared to the previous land use (or lack of use). In this way, the existing tax base for all tax districts would be protected and a portion of future increased taxes pledged to attract the requisite private investment.

It is found, and certified by the City, in connection to the process required for the amendment of this Plan and Project pursuant to 65 ILSC Section 5/11-
74.4-3(n)(5) of the Act, that this Plan and Project will not result in the displacement of 10 or more inhabited residential units. Therefore, this Plan and Project does not include a housing impact study. If at a later time the City does decide to dislocate more than ten (10) inhabited residential units, this Plan would have to be amended and a housing impact study would be completed.
II. THE PROPOSED TIF DISTRICT, AS AMENDED

The purpose of this report is to amend the TIF Plan principally by adding two (2) parcels to the TIF District. A secondary goal is to update the TIF Plan to conform to recent statutory changes made to the TIF Act after the Original Plan was put into effect.

The TIF District, as amended, is generally located northwest of the intersection of Howard Street and Hartrey Avenue. At the time the Original Plan was adopted in 1992, the area was an obsolete industrial area; subsequent to the adoption of TIF financing, the City facilitated the conversion of the area into a successful retail shopping center. In contrast, the adjacent Amendment Area has remained an obsolete industrial area, and has not been revitalized relying on solely private sector resources. As a result, the City again seeks to use TIF financing to help bring about a similar conversion to a modern use in the Amendment Area.

Currently, the TIF District Amendment Area suffers from a variety of economic development impediments, as identified in the TIF Act. As indicated in the original TIF Redevelopment Plan, it suffers from various "conservation area" factors as defined in the TIF Act. Appendix 4 identifies additional redevelopment impediments that limit redevelopment of the Amendment Area.

The Original TIF Plan contained in Appendix 1 also provides a boundary map and legal description of the TIF District.
III. AMENDMENTS TO THE TIF PLAN

In this section, amendments to the Original TIF Plan are presented. For reference, relevant excerpts from the Original TIF Plan are shown, with amendments showing additions and deletions to the original language. Collectively, the amendatory language comprises the "nth Amendment."

Amendment A

Page 6 of the Original TIF Plan

Ultimately, the implementation of the Redevelopment Plan and Project will benefit the City and all the taxing districts which encompass the RPA in the form of a significantly expanded tax base.

It is anticipated that the implementation of the Redevelopment Plan and Project will have a minimal financial impact on most of the affected taxing districts. It is expected that the actions taken by the City to stabilize and encourage growth of its tax base through the implementation of this Redevelopment Plan and Project will have a positive impact on the affected taxing districts.

Strategies will be encouraged to promote growth via private investment within the area. Specific objectives are geared to stabilize the RPA's existing strengths and revitalize the RPA's redevelopment potential. The City may consider the declaration of sufficient surplus funds (as long as those funds are not already obligated to TIF projects) on an annual basis.

Any surplus Special Tax Allocation Funds, to the extent any surplus exists, will be proportionately shared, based on the appropriate tax rates for a given year, with the various taxing districts. Including the City, after all TIF-eligible costs either incurred or incurred as an obligation by the City have been duly accounted for through administration of the Special Tax Allocation Fund to be established by the City as provided by the Act.

Amendment B

Page 15 of the Original TIF Plan

1. Professional Service Costs - Costs of studies, surveys, development of plans, and specifications, implementation and administration of the redevelopment plan including but not limited to staff and professional service costs for architectural, engineering, legal, marketing, financial, planning or other special services, provided however that no charges for professional services may be based on a percentage of the tax increment collected; except that on and after November 1, 1996 (the effective date of Public Act 91-
478), no contracts for professional services, excluding architectural and engineering services, may be entered into if the terms of the contract extend beyond a period of 3 years. After consultation with the municipality, each tax increment consultant or advisor to a municipality that plans to designate or has designated a redevelopment project area shall inform the municipality in writing of any contracts that the consultant or advisor has entered into with entities or individuals that have received, or are receiving, payments financed by tax increment revenues produced by the redevelopment project area with respect to which the consultant or advisor has performed, or will be performing, service for the municipality. This requirement shall be satisfied by the consultant or advisor before the commencement of services for the municipality and thereafter whenever any other contracts with those individuals or entities are executed by the consultant or advisor:

* The cost of marketing sites within the redevelopment project area to prospective businesses, developers, and investors;

* Annual administrative costs shall not include general overhead or administrative costs of the municipality that would still have been incurred by the municipality if the municipality had not designated a redevelopment project area or approved a redevelopment plan;

* In addition, redevelopment project costs shall not include lobbying expenses.

(2) Property Assembly Costs — Property assembly costs including but not limited to acquisition of land and other property, real or personal, or rights or interests therein, demolition of buildings, site preparation, site improvements that serve as an engineering barrier addressing ground level or below ground environmental contamination, including, but not limited to parking lots and other concrete or asphalt barriers, and the clearing and grading of land;

(3) Improvements to Public or Private Buildings — Costs of rehabilitation, reconstruction, repair, or remodeling of existing public or private buildings, fixtures, and household improvements; and the cost of replacing an existing public building if pursuant to the implementation of a redevelopment project the existing public building is to be demolished to use the site for private investment or devoted to a different use requiring private investment; including any direct or indirect costs relating to Green Globes or LEED certified construction elements or construction elements with an equivalent certification;

(4) Public Works — Costs of the construction of public works or improvements, including any direct or indirect costs relating to Green Globes or LEED certified construction elements or construction elements with an equivalent certification, except that on and after November 1, 1999, redevelopment project costs shall not include the cost of constructing a new municipal public building principally used to provide offices, storage space, or conference facilities or vehicle storage, maintenance, or repair for administrative, public safety, or public works personnel and that is not intended to replace an existing public building as provided under paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of Section 11-74.4-3 unless either (1) the construction of the new municipal building implements a redevelopment project that was included in a redevelopment plan that
was adopted by the municipality prior to November 1, 1999 or (ii) the municipality makes a reasonable determination in the redevelopment plan, supported by information that provides the basis for that determination, that the new municipal building is required to meet an increase in the need for public safety purposes anticipated to result from the implementation of the redevelopment plan.

(5) **Job Training** -- Costs of job training and retraining projects, including the cost of "welfare to work" programs implemented by businesses located within the redevelopment project area:

(6) **Financing Costs** -- Financing costs including but not limited to all necessary and incidental expenses related to the issuance of obligations and which may include payment of interest on any obligations issued pursuant to the Act accruing during the estimated period of construction of any redevelopment project for which such obligations are issued and for a period not exceeding 36 months thereafter and including reasonable reserves related thereto;

(7) **Capital Costs** -- All or a portion of a taxing district's capital costs resulting from the redevelopment project necessarily incurred or to be in furtherance of the objectives of the redevelopment plan and project, to the extent the municipality by written agreement accepts and approves the same;

(8) **School-Related Costs** -- For redevelopment project areas designated (or redevelopment project areas amended to add or increase the number of tax-increment-financing assisted housing units) on or after November 1, 1999, an elementary, secondary, or unit school district's increased costs attributable to assisted housing units located within the redevelopment project area for which the developer or redeveloper receives financial assistance through an agreement with the municipality or because the municipality incurs the cost of necessary infrastructure improvements within the boundaries of the assisted housing sites necessary for the completion of that housing as authorized by the Act, and which costs shall be paid by the municipality from the Special Tax Allocation Fund when the tax increment revenue is received as a result of the assisted housing units and shall be calculated annually.

(89) **Relocation Costs** -- To the extent that a municipality determines that relocation costs shall be paid or is required to make payment of relocation costs by federal or State law or in order to satisfy subparagraph (7) of subsection (n) of the Act;

(10) **Payment in lieu of taxes**:

(119) **Other Job Training** -- Costs of job training, retraining, advanced vocational education or career education, including but not limited to courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment, incurred by one or more taxing districts, provided that such costs (i) are related to the establishment and maintenance of additional job training, advanced vocational education or career education programs for persons employed or to be employed by employers located in a redevelopment project area; and (ii) when incurred by a taxing district or taxing
districts other than the municipality, are set forth in a written agreement by or among
the municipality and the taxing district or taxing districts, which agreement describes
the program to be undertaken, including but not limited to the number of employees to
be trained, a description of the training and services to be provided, the number and
type of positions available or to be available, itemized costs of the program and sources
of funds to pay for the same, and the term of the agreement. Such costs include,
specifically, the payment by community college districts of costs pursuant to Sections 3-
37, 3-38, 3-40 and 3-40.1 of the Public Community College Act and by school districts of
costs pursuant to Sections 10-22.2a and 10-23.3a of The School Code;

(1246) Developer Interest Cost — If deemed prudent by the City Council of the City for
the redevelopment project, interest costs incurred by the redeveloper related to the
construction, renovation or rehabilitation of a redevelopment project provided that:

(a) such costs are to be paid directly from the special tax allocation fund
    established pursuant to the Act;
(b) such payments in any one year may not exceed 30% of the annual interest
costs incurred by the redeveloper with regard to the redevelopment project
during that year;
(c) if there are not sufficient funds available in the special tax allocation fund to
    make the payment then the amounts so due shall accrue and be payable when
    sufficient funds are available in the special tax allocation fund;
(d) the total of such interest payments paid pursuant to the Act may not exceed
    30% of the total (i) cost paid or incurred by the redeveloper for the
    redevelopment project plus (ii) redevelopment project costs excluding any
    property assembly costs and any relocation costs incurred by a municipality
    pursuant to the Act;
(e) the cost limits set forth in subparagraphs (B) and (D) of paragraph shall be
    modified for the financing of rehabilitated or new housing units for low-income
    households and very low-income households, as defined in Section 3 of the
    Illinois Affordable Housing Act. The percentage of 75% shall be substituted for
    30% in subparagraphs (B) and (D);
(f) instead of the eligible costs provided by subparagraphs (B) and (D), as
    modified by this subparagraph, and notwithstanding any other provisions of the
    Act to the contrary, the municipality may pay from tax increment revenues up to
    30% of the cost of construction of new housing units to be occupied by low-
    income households and very low-income households as defined in Section 3 of
    the Illinois Affordable Housing Act. The cost of construction of those units may
    be derived from the proceeds of bonds issued by the municipality under the Act
    or other constitutional or statutory authority or from other sources of municipal
    revenue that may be reimbursed from tax increment revenues or the proceeds of
    bonds issued to finance the construction of that housing. The eligible costs
    provided under this subparagraph (F) shall be an eligible cost for the
    construction, renovation, and rehabilitation of all low and very low-income
    housing units, as defined in Section 3 of the Illinois Affordable Housing Act,
    within the redevelopment project area. If the low and very low-income units are
    part of a residential redevelopment project that includes units not affordable to
low and very low-income households, only the low and very low-income units shall be eligible for benefits under subparagraph (f).

(3) Payment in lieu of taxes;

The TIF Act prohibits certain costs:

* Unless explicitly stated herein the cost of construction of new privately-owned buildings shall not be an eligible redevelopment project cost.

* The statute prohibits costs related to retail development that results in the closing of nearby facilities of the same retailers. Specifically, none of the redevelopment project costs enumerated in the Act shall be eligible redevelopment project costs if those costs would provide direct financial support to a retail entity initiating operations in the redevelopment project area while terminating operations at another Illinois location within 50 miles of the redevelopment project area but outside the boundaries of the redevelopment project area municipality.

* No cost shall be a redevelopment project cost in a redevelopment project area if used to demolish, remove, or substantially modify a historic resource, after August 26, 2008 (the effective date of Public Act 95-934), unless no prudent and feasible alternative exists. "Historic resource" for the purpose of this item means (i) a place or structure that is included or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places or (ii) a contributing structure in a district on the National Register of Historic Places. This item (3) does not apply to a place or structure for which demolition, removal, or modification is subject to review by the preservation agency of a certified local government designated as such by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Actions/Improvements</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition and Assembly Costs including Demolition and Clearance/Site Preparation</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Public Facilities and Buildings, Rehabilitation, and Related Public Improvements Including the Relocation of Existing Utilities and the Provision of Utility Service</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Remediation</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Improvements Including, But Not Limited to, Water, Storm, Sanitary Sewer, and the Service of Public Facilities</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Reconfiguration of Parking Rights-of-Way and Street Improvements/Construction, Signalization, Traffic Control, Lighting, Landscaping, Buffering and Streetscaping</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Costs Pursuant to the Act</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Legal, Engineering, Administrative,</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reporting, Marketing, and Other</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous/Contingencies</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments Pursuant to Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS</td>
<td>$8,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All project cost estimates are in 2002 dollars. Costs may be adjusted for inflation per the TIF Act.
2. In addition to the above stated costs, any bonds issued to finance a phase of the Project may include an amount of proceeds sufficient to pay customary and reasonable charges associated with the issuance of such obligations, interest associated with such obligations, and refunding interest and reasonably required reserves.
3. Adjustments to the estimated line-item costs above are expected. Adjustments may be made between these within the total, subject to increasing or decreasing fixed-item costs for redevelopment. Each individual project cost will be reevaluated in light of the projected private development and resulting tax revenues as it is considered for public financing under the provisions of the Act.
4. The costs of the line-item set forth above are not intended to place a total limit on the described expenditures, as the specific items listed above are not intended to preclude payment of other eligible redevelopment project costs in connection with the redevelopment of the RPA—provided the total amount of payment for eligible redevelopment project costs shall not exceed the overall budget amount outlined above.
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Anticipated Equalized Assessed Valuation

Upon completion of the anticipated private development of the RPA by the year 1992, it is estimated that the equalized assessed valuation of the property within the Redevelopment Project Area will be increased by approximately $25,500,000 to $27,000,000. The estimate assumes a constant Cook County equalization factor (multiplier) of 1.933 and 1992 dollars.
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This Redevelopment Project and retirement of all obligations to finance redevelopment costs will be completed on or before a date 23 years from the adoption of the ordinance designating the Redevelopment Project Area. Actual construction activities are anticipated to be completed within four (4) years. The actual date for such completion and retirement of obligations shall not be later than December 31 of the year in which the payment to the municipal treasurer pursuant to the Act is to be made with respect to ad valorem taxes levied in the twenty-third calendar year after the ordinance approving the RPA is adopted.
Amendment F

Appendix A of the Original TIF Plan (Legal Description)

The Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 25, Township 41 North, Range 13, East of the Third Principal Meridian (except the North 150 feet lying West of the East 33 feet thereof) and the West 33 feet of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 25, (except the North 183 feet thereof) all in Cook County, Illinois, and including the amended legal description attached as Appendix 3.

Amendment G

Maps 2, 3 and 4 of the Original TIF Plan

The TIF District boundary maps, existing land use map, and intended land use map (Maps 2, 3 and 4 of the Original TIF Plan) are replaced by the maps enclosed herein as Appendix 2.
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I. INTRODUCTION

General Background – City of Evanston

The City of Evanston, Illinois is a community of approximately 72,000 (as of the 1990 Census) and is bordered on the east by Lake Michigan, on the south by the City of Chicago, on the west by the Village of Skokie and on the north by the Village of Wilmette. The City lies in Cook County and is located approximately twelve (12) miles north of Chicago’s Loop. Incorporated in 1863, the City today is one of the largest, oldest and most diverse suburbs of Chicago, with many amenities such as an established business environment, quality housing stock, a vast public transportation system, and excellent public schools. The City of Evanston is the home of Northwestern University as well as three (3) other institutions of higher education.

The City has grown through the years primarily due to annexation (the Villages of North Evanston and South Evanston were annexed prior to 1892) and the increased enrollment and employment at Northwestern University (the City’s largest employer). The extension of the Chicago rapid transit system to Evanston and north to Wilmette added to the population growth throughout the early and mid-1900’s.

In 1921, the Evanston City Council adopted its first zoning ordinance which was the first in the State to prevent over-crowding of land and to include provisions to separate business and industrial areas from residential neighborhoods. Today, Evanston has retained its residential character, yet it has grown with respect to its commercial and industrial base. Once the key retail center for the North Shore, north Chicago and the northwest suburbs, much retail space has since been converted to office and residential space, which contributes to a more service-oriented environment in the City’s downtown. Today, downtown Evanston is considered viable and well-maintained, having escaped much of the deterioration and abandonment that has impacted other older urban communities.
Decline of Industrial Area - Southwest Area of the City

An area of the City that has been considered for potential redevelopment is generally known as the City's southwest industrial corridor (SWIC). This portion of the City's industrial base had gradually begun to deteriorate by the early 1980's. Its decline has primarily been due to a number of factors including the periodic and recurring vacancies by various industrial and retail/commercial enterprises adjacent to the industrial uses and the establishment of incompatible uses within and surrounding the industrial area. Overall, many developments find that the ability to expand operations is hampered due to the barriers of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (MWRD) canal, existing rights-of-way and the neighboring residential area. The 1985 abandonment of the Mayfair Railroad rail line running through the area also contributed to irregular parcel shapes and layouts. Overall, the lack of meaningful plans and investment by both the public and private sectors in maintaining the area has hampered the ability to create a safe, pleasant, integrated and functional business environment.

The entire area suffers from uncoordinated, sporadic development. Existing development has been primarily limited to some retail, outdoor storage, heavy and light industrial, and automotive uses. Many of the uses have been low density, lower value uses such as storage yards or junkyards. A Redevelopment Project Area (RPA) has been adopted for a portion of the property within the SWIC corridor (approximately 12 acres) and redevelopment proposals have been submitted for review.

The larger area under consideration for redevelopment also includes the site of the former Rust-Oleum Corporation facility, which has been demolished, and the partially vacant Bell & Howell facility located at Howard Street and Hartrey Avenue. These facilities are examples of buildings that have become outmoded, underutilized, or left vacant as corporations have consolidated operations, changed technologies, or downsized business operations.

The absence of a significant development within the overall SWIC Corridor will likely prevent the City from achieving a 'highest and best use' of the land, as well as from realizing increased potential real estate tax receipts from any incremental increases in assessed valuations within the area. Incremental sales tax receipts may also be foregone if a development plan is not initiated. The lack of such a plan will likely lead to the continued overall blight existing in the area with a high likelihood that such conditions will worsen.
The City, with its large numbers of residents desirous of eliminating blighted conditions and preserving existing employment as well as the creation of new local job opportunities, is determined to address these concerns.

**The Howard and Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area (RPA)**

The proposed Howard and Hartrey RPA is located south of the larger southwest industrial area studied by the City and its consultants in a 1988 Tax Increment Finance (TIF) eligibility analysis. In terms of the RPA property’s uses and physical configuration, the property is affected by many of the same problems identified in the prior eligibility analysis. The presence of the sanitary canal nearby, site access and egress considerations, and an older industrial structure all detract from the RPA’s redevelopment potential. However, the RPA’s location near major arterials and the commercial/retail frontage availability serve to distinguish this property from other study area property. Market interest and potential reuse would appear to favor retail and/or commercial use, given the frontage availability along an arterial road. While the balance of area property, including the Southwest TIF district, may favor industrial use or redevelopment, the proposed RPA offers an opportunity for modern, retail redevelopment.

The structure within the proposed RPA was constructed in 1946 for the Hibbard Spencer Bartlett & Co., a wholesale distributor of hardware and other supplies. Prior to the construction of the facility, greenhouses and a nursery occupied the site (which was annexed to the City in 1913). Hibbard Spencer Bartlett & Co. received goods by truck and rail service, then distributed products nationally to its customers. Reshipment of goods was also made by rail and truck. The property was sold to Bell & Howell in 1984. The building has, since its construction, been under single ownership.

As a result, the property’s reuse options and marketability have been limited. Bell & Howell at one time operated at full capacity within the building, but consolidations and divestitures have resulted in an increasing amount of vacant space. Bell & Howell continues to lease space to tenants within the building; most of these tenants have been divisions of Bell & Howell or are currently part of the corporation. The vacancy rate for the structure is expected to increase as certain key tenancies expire, while the past several years have witnessed partial occupancy of the building.
The area to be designated as a TIF District has been found to qualify for RPA designation, as evidenced in the Qualification Report included as part of this Redevelopment Plan and Project. The Report concludes that the area as a whole qualifies for such blighted designation by consideration of all relevant evidence within the meaning of the TIF Statute. A general description of the RPA follows:

Beginning at City’s western border at the northern Bell & Howell property line, then easterly to the western edge of Hartrey Avenue, then northerly to the Skokie Swift right-of-way, then southerly approximately 20 feet, then easterly to the eastern edge of the Hartrey Avenue right-of-way, then southerly to the center line of Howard Street (the City’s southern boundary), then westerly to the City’s western border, then northerly to the point of beginning.

The proposed RPA includes an area which encompasses approximately 23.65 acres of land and one approximately 740,000 sq. ft. structure. (See Map 1 and Appendix A for a legal description, attached hereto and made a part of this Plan).

The majority of the improvements in the proposed RPA have become obsolete and demonstrate conditions of depreciation or lack of physical maintenance. There is evidence of deleterious land use/layout in the area’s development, inadequate utilities, obsolescence, excessive vacancies and an absence of effective community planning for the area. Taken in total, these specific factors contribute to the overall blighting of the area. (A more detailed examination of qualification factors is found in Appendix B).

The City is desirous of attracting significant private market redevelopment of this area primarily due to the location of the proposed RPA to nearby residential neighborhoods. It is also important to the economic goals of the City to attract and retain enterprises which strengthen Evanston’s overall economic base, as well as to expand the City’s manufacturing and retail bases.

The Redevelopment Plan would serve to address, on an area wide basis:

- the obsolescence of industrial improvements and property;
- coordinated access and circulation patterns;
- coordinated planning processes and area wide review relating to uses;
- area appearance; and
- provision of necessary public improvements and services.
It is expected that the distribution of TIF benefits would be area wide and would serve to stem conditions of blight and underutilization.

In summary, the proposed Howard and Hartrey RPA on the whole has not been subject to significant growth and development. The area would not reasonably be anticipated to be developed without the adoption of a Redevelopment Plan. The City has prepared this Plan to use tax increment financing in order to address its needs and meet its redevelopment goals and objectives.

**The Redevelopment Plan**

The City of Evanston and its Economic Development Committee have carefully reviewed the potentials and constraints associated with the proposed RPA property. The City has determined that well planned retail/commercial uses fronting Howard Street would serve to maximize the RPA property's economic potential and would provide retail services to City residents. The attraction of top quality retail users and the encouragement of a modern, efficient retail property are key to the City. The location of the property and its size have presented unique opportunities for an attractive, well designed redevelopment effort. The effort would utilize both public and private resources in order to stabilize and enhance area property values (e.g., properties located within or proximate to the RPA), create new jobs, and to provide for a market reuse of currently underutilized property. The proposed redevelopment of the RPA property would serve to encourage interest in the surrounding industrial area's property.

Private and public investment would act as a positive signal, generating renewed interest in surrounding property opportunities. The RPA designation addresses the necessary public assistance/improvements required to induce the intensive redevelopment of the property.

The needed public investment will be possible only if tax increment financing is adopted pursuant to the terms of the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (the "Act"). The qualification of the entire area as blighted makes possible future developments not now anticipated, carrying on the intention of the Act. Such blighting factors, together and in combination, have restrained or prevented successful development from occurring within the area. Other public resources may have to be made available to attract the very needed private investment to develop the proposed area. The public resources would be required to address blight factors. Property and local sales tax incremental revenue generated by the development may play a decisive role in encouraging the private development of the RPA.
Conditions of obsolescence and underutilization that have precluded and/or retarded intensive private investment in the past will be addressed. Through this proposed Redevelopment Plan and Project, the City will serve as the central force for marshalling the assets and energies of the private sector for a unified cooperative public-private redevelopment effort. In this regard, the City will serve as a catalyst for coordinating a successful redevelopment of the area. Ultimately, the implementation of the Redevelopment Plan and Project will benefit the City and all the taxing districts which encompass the RPA in the form of a significantly expanded tax base.

On November 11, 1991, the Evanston City Council adopted a Resolution (Resolution No. 88-R-91) indicating its intent to use Tax Increment Financing (TIF) for the redevelopment of the area described herein. Redevelopment of the RPA is taxable only if a portion of the improvements are funded by tax increment financing.

The adoption of this Redevelopment Plan and Project makes possible the implementation of a comprehensive program for the economic redevelopment of the area. By means of public investment, the RPA will become an improved, more viable environment that will attract private investment and diversify the City's tax base.

Pursuant to the Act, the RPA includes only those contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon substantially benefitted by the redevelopment project. Also pursuant to the Act, and which can be evidenced above, the RPA is not less in the aggregate than 1 1/2 acres.
II. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA LEGAL DESCRIPTION

The Redevelopment Project Area is legally described in Appendix A.
III. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals of the City for the RPA (as expressed in this Plan), conform to the Evanston Comprehensive General Plan, adopted in April, 1986. (Note: elements of the City zoning ordinance are in the process of being revised, and the RPA's proposed uses are to be conformant with the revisions). A broadened, diversified tax base is necessary to maintain essential public services to the City and strengthen its economy. The Redevelopment Plan will also provide for expanded retail opportunities and developments to be undertaken within the City.

General Goals

1) Strengthen Evanston's economic position, thus improving the quality of life provided through services and personal prosperity of residents.

2) Provide and maintain an attractive community that creates a positive public image and encourages individuals, families and businesses to locate and remain within the community.

Specific Objectives

1) Attract and retain enterprises which strengthen Evanston's economic base.

2) Establish and maintain a safe, pleasant, and functional environment in the City's commercial and retail areas while encouraging new economic development.

3) Create additional local job opportunities.

4) Provide quality retail services to Evanston residents and capture additional sales tax revenues to the City.

5) Identify, maintain and enhance the positive physical elements of Evanston which create Evanston's visual character.

6) Strengthen the positive image of the community by emphasizing attention to design in development.
IV. BLIGHTED AREA CONDITIONS EXISTING IN THE AMENDED
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA

Findings

The Redevelopment Project Area was studied to determine its qualifications as a
"blighted area" with respect to the improved portions of the area as such terms are defined
in the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (the "Act"), Illinois Revised Statutes,
Section 11-74.4-3. Refer to Appendix B for a Qualification Report which includes a
summary of blighting factors, findings for this RPA, and a list of existing qualification
factors for the area. Such findings include the age factor, obsolescence, excessive vacancies,
lack of ventilation, light, or sanitary facilities, deleterious land use or layout, inadequate
utilities, depreciation of physical maintenance, and lack of community planning.

Eligibility Survey

The entire designated Redevelopment Project Area was evaluated in June, 1991 -
November, 1991 by representatives from the City of Evanston, Kane, McKenna and
Associates, Inc. and a professional planning consultant, Chicago Associates, Planners and
Architects. In such evaluation, only information was recorded which would directly aid in
the determination of eligibility for a tax increment finance district.
V. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

A. Redevelopment Plan and Project Objectives

The City of Evanston proposes to realize its goals and objectives of encouraging the development of the RPA and encouraging private investment in commercial/retail redevelopment projects through public finance techniques including, but not limited, to Tax Increment Financing. The following represents the general project goals for tax increment financing districts as defined by the Act and represent the general objectives for the City. These components are all inclusive and may exceed the City’s specific actions as planned for this time.

(1) By implementing a plan that addresses the redevelopment costs of land acquisition and assembly, street vacation, site preparation, demolition/removals, and provision of infrastructure improvements or rehabilitation of existing facilities that may be necessary for adaptation to a market oriented reuse of sites in the RPA, improving the City’s tax base and diversifying the local economy.

(2) By improving public facilities that may include, but not be limited to:

- Street improvements
- Utility improvements (including water, stormwater management and sanitary sewer improvements, detention/retention ponds, if necessary)
- Landscaping and/or streetscaping
- Parking improvements (which may include structures/public facilities)
- Signalization, traffic control and lighting

(3) By entering into redevelopment agreements with developers for qualified redevelopment projects.

(4) By improving existing structures or site improvements.

(5) By utilizing interest cost write down pursuant to provisions of the Act.
(6) By considering the payment of interest costs of a redeveloper related to the construction, renovation or rehabilitation of the redevelopment project.

(7) By exercising other powers set forth in the Act as the City deems necessary.

B. Redevelopment Activities

Pursuant to the foregoing objectives, the City of Evanston will implement a coordinated program of actions, including, but not limited to, land acquisition, site assembly/preparation, demolition/removals, infrastructure improvements and upgrading, and provision of public improvements such as landscaping or buffering and parking, where required. Land acquisition may be undertaken based upon specific redevelopment proposals. The City may directly undertake the activities described below, or when appropriate, cause such activities to be undertaken in a manner conformant with this Plan.

Public Improvements

In accordance with its estimates of tax increment and other available resources, the City of Evanston will provide public improvements in the proposed RPA to enhance the immediate area as a whole, to support the Redevelopment Project and Plan, and to serve the needs of Evanston residents. Appropriate public improvements may include, but are not limited to:

-- vacation, removal, resurfacing, paving, widening, construction, turn islands, construction or reconstruction of curbs and gutters, traffic signals, and other improvements to streets, alleys, pedestrianways, and pathways: including the acquisition of rights-of-ways for construction, reconstruction and/or extension of street, alleys and pedestrian ways;

-- site preparation costs (including addressing any environmental concerns);

-- reconfiguration of existing rights-of-way and/or creation of new rights-of-way;

-- demolition of any obsolete structure or structures;

-- improvements of public utilities including construction or reconstruction of water mains, as well as sanitary sewer and storm sewer, detention ponds, and streetlighting;

-- beautification, landscaping, lighting, buffering, parking improvements and signage of public properties;
Recommended public improvements are found in Section E. The City may determine at a later date that certain improvements are no longer needed or appropriate, or may add new improvements to the list. The type of public improvement and cost for each item is subject to City Council approval and to the execution of a redevelopment agreement for the proposed project, in a form acceptable to the City Council.

Acquisition and Clearance

The City may determine that to meet redevelopment objectives it may be necessary to participate in property acquisition in the Redevelopment Project Area or use other means to induce transfer of such property to a private developer.

Clearance and grading of existing properties to be acquired will, to the greatest extent possible, be scheduled to coincide with redevelopment activities so that parcels do not remain vacant for extended periods of time and so that the adverse effects of clearance activities may be minimized.

Property which has been acquired may be made available for temporary public or private revenue producing uses which will not have adverse impacts on the redevelopment area, until such time as they are needed for planned development. Such revenues, if any, could accrue to the proposed Redevelopment Project Area.

Land Assembly and Disposition

Certain properties to be acquired by the City, and certain properties presently owned by the City (e.g., street rights-of-way and public facilities) may be assembled into appropriate redevelopment sites and/or rights-of-way. Property assembly activities may include use of the City’s eminent domain power. These properties may be sold or leased by the City to a private developer in whole or in part, for redevelopment subject to invitation for proposal requirements of the Illinois tax increment law.

Relocation

Any businesses occupying properties to be acquired may be considered for relocation, advisory and financial assistance in accordance with provisions set forth and adopted by the City and other governmental regulations, if any.

Terms of conveyance shall be incorporated into appropriate disposition agreements, and may include more specific restrictions than contained in this proposed Redevelopment Plan or in other municipal codes and ordinances governing the use of land.
Demolition and Site Preparation

Certain buildings located within the proposed RPA may have to be reconfigured to accommodate new users. Partial demolition or total demolition may be necessary as well as removal of debris. Additionally, the Redevelopment Plan contemplates site preparation or other requirements necessary to prepare the site for new uses. All of the above will serve to enhance the site for the desired redevelopment.

Interest Cost Write-Down

Pursuant to the Act, the City may allocate a portion of incremental tax revenues to reduce the interest cost incurred in connection with redevelopment activities, enhancing the redevelopment potential of the proposed RPA.

Job Training

Pursuant to the Act, the City and/or other training providers, may develop training programs in conjunction with the redevelopment efforts.

Redevelopment Agreements

Land assemblage shall be conducted for (a) sale, lease, or conveyance to private developers, or (b) sale, lease, conveyance or dedication for the construction of public improvements or facilities. Terms of conveyance shall be incorporated in appropriate disposition agreements which may contain more specific controls than those stated in this Redevelopment Plan.

In the event the City determines that construction of certain improvements is not financially feasible, the City may reduce the scope of the proposed improvements.

C. General Land Use Plan

Existing land uses in the proposed RPA are primarily industrial land, as shown in Map 3. Map 4 designates the intended general land uses identified for the Redevelopment Project Area, which includes retail uses. The overall coordination and area wide emphasis provided by this plan shall serve to address blighted conditions present within the RPA.

The Redevelopment Project shall be subject to the provisions of the City of Evanston Zoning Ordinance as such may be amended from time to time.
D. Additional Controls and Design Criteria

Design guidelines shall be consistent with City standards, and if feasible, may be expanded to include local concerns.

1. Pedestrian Access

Where appropriate, design layout shall facilitate internal pedestrian circulation and movement between major traffic generators and parking facilities.

2. Streetscapes/Building Facades

The Redevelopment Project Area will be designed consistent with contemporary retail/commercial facilities. Design importance will be stressed in the treatment of streetscapes, and the relationships of building facades.

3. Parking and Buffering

Development should provide for an adequate supply of appropriately located short-term and long-term parking spaces. Buffering, screening, or landscaping should be used to make parking facilities as attractive as possible.

4. Signs

The design and use of signs shall be in keeping with the area's overall architectural character and shall be coordinated in type, size and location with those in nearby developments, all in accordance with the City's sign ordinance.

5. Utilities

Wherever possible, all utility lines should be located underground.

Additional planning and design controls may be included in each land disposition and/or redevelopment agreements with developers.
E. Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs

Redevelopment project costs mean and include the sum total of all reasonable or necessary costs incurred or estimated to be incurred, as provided in the TIF statute, and any such costs incidental to this Redevelopment Plan and Project. Private investments which supplement "Redevelopment Project Costs" are expected to substantially exceed such redevelopment project costs. Eligible costs permitted under the Act which may be pertinent to this Redevelopment Plan and Project to be considered by the City may be:

1. Costs of studies and surveys, development of plans and specifications, implementation and administration of the redevelopment plan including, but not limited to, staff and professional service costs for architectural, engineering, legal, marketing, financial, planning, other special services, provided, however, that no charges for professional services may be based on a percentage of the tax increment collected.

2. Property assembly costs, including but not limited to acquisition of land and other property, real or personal, or rights or interests therein, demolition of buildings, and the clearing and grading of land;

3. Costs of rehabilitation, reconstruction or repair or remodeling of existing buildings and fixtures;

4. Costs of the construction of public works or improvements;

5. Costs of job training and retraining projects;

6. Financing costs, including but not limited to all necessary and incidental expenses related to the issuance of obligations and which may include payment of interest on any obligations issued pursuant to the Act accruing during the estimated period of construction of any redevelopment project for which such obligations are issued and for not exceeding 36 months thereafter and including reasonable reserves related thereto;

7. All or a portion of a taxing district’s capital costs resulting from the redevelopment project necessarily incurred or to be in furtherance of the objectives of the redevelopment plan and project, to the extent the City by written agreement accepts and approves such costs;
8. Relocation costs to the extent that the City determines that relocation costs shall be paid or is required to make payment of relocation costs by federal or state law;

9. Costs of job training, advanced vocational education or career education, including but not limited to courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment, incurred by one or more taxing districts, provided that such costs (i) are related to the establishment and maintenance of additional job training, advanced vocational education or career education programs for persons employed or to be employed by employers located in the Redevelopment Project Area; and (ii) when incurred by a taxing district or taxing districts other than the City, are set forth in a written agreement by or among the City and the taxing district or taxing districts, which agreement describes the program to be undertaken, including but not limited to the number of employees to be trained, a description of the training and services to be provided, the number and type of positions available or to be available, itemized costs of the program and sources of funds to pay for the same, and the term of the agreement. Such costs include, specifically, the payment by community college districts of costs pursuant to Sections 3-37, 3-38, 3-40 and 3-40.1 of the Public Community College Act and by school districts of costs pursuant to Sections 10-22.20a and 10-23.3a of the School Code.

10. If deemed prudent by the City Council of the City for the redevelopment project, interest costs incurred by the redeveloper related to the construction, renovation or rehabilitation of the redevelopment project provided that:

(a) such costs are to be paid directly from the special tax allocation fund established pursuant to the Act; and

(b) such payments in any one year may not exceed 30% of the annual interest costs incurred by the redeveloper with regard to the redevelopment project during that year; and

(c) if there are not sufficient funds available in the special tax allocation fund to make the payment pursuant to this paragraph (10) then the amounts so due shall accrue and be payable when sufficient funds are available in the special tax allocation fund; and
(d) the total of such interest payments incurred pursuant to the Act may not exceed 30% of the total redevelopment project costs excluding any property assembly costs and any relocation costs incurred pursuant to the Act.

11. Payments in lieu of taxes.

In the event the City of Evanston issues debt pursuant to its general obligations under the Act or pursuant to its home rule powers, the proceeds of which are used to pay redevelopment project costs:

(a) In any year during which said obligations are outstanding and funds in the special tax allocation fund are insufficient to pay principal and interest when due, the City shall cover such shortfall in payment in accordance with the terms of the obligations, and any such payments made by the City shall be repaid in full to the City from the special tax allocation fund from subsequent available tax increment revenues from improved taxable lots or parcels of real property prior to the creation of any surplus funds.

(b) In any year during which said obligations are outstanding and funds in the special tax allocation fund are sufficient to pay the next due principal and interest, but it is anticipated that in subsequent years funds may be inadequate to make the current payments of principal and interest, then the City may create such reserves from the funds as it may deem appropriate to enable it to make future payments of principal and interest under said obligations. Amounts in any such reserve shall not be deemed to be surplus funds. Real estate tax increment revenues which constitute funds in the special tax allocation fund for the purpose of this paragraph include only tax increment revenues from improved taxable lots or parcels of real property.

Estimated costs are shown in the next section. Adjustments to these cost items may be made without amendment to the Redevelopment Plan. The costs represent estimated amounts and do not represent actual City commitments or expenditures. Rather, they are a ceiling on possible expenditures of TIF funds in the redevelopment project area.
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT - ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS ELIGIBLE UNDER ILLINOIS TIF STATUTE. THESE ARE POTENTIAL COSTS TO BE EXPENDED OVER A PERIOD OF 23 YEARS BUT TO BE SOLELY DETERMINED BY THE CITY TO FUND AS NEEDED. (Note: This summary does not include private redevelopment costs, and each cost item is based upon standard amounts for other similar-type projects.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Action/Improvement</th>
<th>Estimated Costs (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition and Assembly Costs</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including Demolition and Clearance/ Site Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construction of Public Facilities and Buildings, Rehabilitation, and</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related public improvements including the relocation of existing utilities and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provision of utility service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Utility Improvements including, but not limited to, water, storm, sanitary</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer, and the service of public facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Construction and Reconfiguration of Parking Rights-of-Way and Street Improvements/</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Signallization, Traffic Control, and Lighting, Landscaping, Buffering and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interest Costs Pursuant to the Act</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Planning, Legal, Engineering, Administrative and Other Professional Service Costs</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relocation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job Training</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Miscellaneous/Contingencies</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) All project cost estimates are in 1992 dollars. In addition to the above stated costs, any bonds issued to finance a phase of the project may include an amount of proceeds sufficient to pay customary and reasonable charges associated with the issuance of such obligations as well as to provide for capitalized interest and reasonably required reserves. Adjustments to the estimated line item costs above are expected. Each individual project cost will be re-evaluated in light of the projected private development and resulting tax revenues as it is considered for public financing under the provisions of the Act.
The totals of line items set forth above are not intended to place a total limit on the described expenditures. Adjustments may be made in line items within the total, either increasing or decreasing line item costs for redevelopment.

Adjustments to these cost items may be made without amendment to the Redevelopment Plan as long as the total project expenditures remain unchanged.

F. Sources of Funds to Pay Redevelopment Project Costs Eligible Under Illinois TIF Statute

Funds necessary to pay for public improvements and other project costs eligible under the TIF statute are to be derived principally from property tax increment revenues, proceeds from municipal obligations to be retired primarily with tax increment revenues and interest earned on resources available but not immediately needed for the Redevelopment Plan and Project.

"Redevelopment Project Costs" specifically contemplate those eligible public costs set forth in the Illinois statute and do not contemplate the preponderance of the costs to redevelop the area. The majority of development costs will be privately financed, and TIF or other public sources are to be used only to lever and commit private redevelopment activity.

The tax increment revenues which will be used to pay debt service on the tax increment obligations, if any, and to directly pay redevelopment project costs shall be the incremental increase in property taxes attributable to the increase in the equalized assessed value of each taxable lot, block, tract or parcel of real property in the proposed RPA over and above the initial equalized assessed value of each such lot, block, tract or parcel in the RPA in the 1990 tax year.

Among the other sources of funds which may be used to pay for redevelopment project costs and debt service on municipal obligations issued to finance project costs are the following: certain local sales taxes, special service area taxes, the proceeds of property sales, unlimited property taxes if the obligations are general obligations of the City, certain land lease payments, certain Motor Fuel Tax revenues, certain state and federal grants or loans, certain investment income, and such other sources of funds and revenues as the City of Evanston may from time to time deem appropriate.

The proposed Redevelopment Project Area would not reasonably be expected to be developed without the use of the incremental revenues provided by the Act.
G. Nature and Term of Obligations to be Issued

The City may issue obligations secured by the tax increment special tax allocation fund established for the Redevelopment Project Area pursuant to the Act or such other funds or security as are available to the City by virtue of its powers pursuant to the Illinois State Constitution.

Any and/or all obligations issued by the City pursuant to this Redevelopment Plan and Project and the Act shall be retired not more than twenty-three (23) years from the date of adoption of the ordinance approving the Redevelopment Project Area. However, the final maturity date of any obligations issued pursuant to the Act may not be later than twenty (20) years from their respective date of issuance. One or more series of obligations may be issued from time to time in order to implement this Redevelopment Plan and Project. The total principal and interest payable in any year on all obligations shall not exceed the amounts available in that year, or projected to be available in that year, from tax increment revenues and from bond sinking funds, capitalized interest, debt service reserve funds and all other sources of funds as may be provided by ordinance.

Those revenues not required for principal and interest payments, for required reserves, for bond sinking funds, for redevelopment project costs, for early retirement of outstanding securities, and to facilitate the economical issuance of additional bonds necessary to accomplish the Redevelopment Plan, may be declared surplus and shall then become available for distribution annually to taxing districts overlapping the RPA in the manner provided by the Act.

Such securities may be issued on either a taxable or tax-exempt basis, with either fixed rate or floating interest rates; with or without capitalized interest; with or without deferred principal retirement; with or without interest rate limits except as limited by law; and with or without redemption provisions.

H. Most Recent Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV) of Properties in the Redevelopment Project Area

The equalized assessed valuation of the property within the RPA is approximately $7,034,353, which is the 1990 equalized assessed valuation, the most recent EAV available. The Boundary Map, Map 2, shows the location of the proposed RPA.
I. Anticipated Equalized Assessed Valuation

Upon completion of the anticipated private development of the Redevelopment Project Area by the year 1995, it is estimated that the equalized assessed valuation of the property within the Redevelopment Project Area will be increased by approximately $5,700,000. The estimate assumes a constant Cook County equalization factor (multiplier) of 1.9133 and 1992 dollars.
VI. SCHEDULING OF REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

A. Redevelopment Project

An implementation strategy will be employed with full consideration given to the availability of both public and private funding. Such strategy will contribute to a realistic approach in funding the Project while assuring the City the ability to fund the Projects it deems to have the highest priority.

The Redevelopment Project will require an estimated four (4) years to complete.

The Redevelopment Project will begin as soon as the development entity (or entities) have identified market uses for the sites and such uses are conformant with City zoning and planning requirements. Depending upon the scope of the development as well as the actual uses, the following activities may be included:

Land Assembly and Disposition: Certain properties in the RPA may be acquired by the City and may be assembled into an appropriate redevelopment site. These properties may be acquired by the City or the City may cause such property acquisition, subject to City Council approval, and subsequently sold or leased by the City to the developer for redevelopment of the site.

Demolition and Site Preparation: The existing structures located within the RPA may have to be reconfigured or prepared to accommodate new uses. Partial or total demolition may be necessary as well as removal of debris. Additionally, the redevelopment plan contemplates site preparation, or other requirements necessary to prepare the site for the desired redevelopment.

Landscaping/Buffering/Streetscaping/Parking: The City may undertake, or cause to be undertaken, certain landscaping and parking which serve to beautify and improve access to public properties or rights-of-way and provide buffering between land uses.

Water, Sanitary Sewer, Storm Sewer and Other Utility Improvements: The City may extend or re-route certain utilities (or cause such extension) to serve or accommodate the new development. Upgrading of existing utilities may be undertaken. The provision of necessary detention or retention ponds may also be undertaken or cause to be undertaken by the City.
**Roadway/Street/Parking Improvements:** Widening of existing roads and/or vacation of roads may be undertaken or cause to be undertaken by the City. Certain secondary streets/roads may also be improved. Related curb, gutter, and paving improvements could also be constructed as needed. Sidewalk and parking improvements ancillary to the above may also be carried out.

**Traffic Control/Signalization:** The City may construct or cause to be constructed necessary traffic control or signalization improvements that improve access to the RPA and enhance its redevelopment.

**Public Safety Related Infrastructure:** The City may construct or cause to be constructed certain public safety improvements including, but not limited to, public signage, public facilities, and street lights.

**Relocation:** The City may pay for certain relocation costs, conformant with City policies and regulations.

**Interest Cost Coverage:** The City may pay for certain interest costs incurred by the redeveloper for construction, renovation or rehabilitation of the redevelopment project. Such funding would be paid for out of annual tax increment revenue generated from the RPA as allowed under the Act.

**Professional Services:** The City may use tax increment financing to pay necessary planning, legal, engineering, administrative and financing costs during project implementation. Eligible costs undertaken on behalf of the City may also be paid by the City.

**B. Commitment to Fair Employment Practices and Affirmative Action**

As part of any Redevelopment Agreement entered into by the City and the private developer, both will agree to establish and implement an affirmative action program that serves appropriate sectors of the City of Evanston.

With respect to the public/private development's internal operations, both entities will pursue employment practices which provide equal opportunity to all people regardless of sex, color, race or creed. Neither party will countenance discrimination against any employee or applicant because of sex, marital status, national origin, age, or the presence of physical handicaps. These nondiscriminatory practices will apply to all areas of employment, including: hiring, upgrading and promotions, terminations, compensation, benefit programs and educational opportunities.
Anyone involved with employment or contracting activities for this Project will be responsible for conformance with this policy and the compliance requirements of applicable state and federal regulations.

The City and the private developers involved with this Project will adopt a policy of equal employment opportunity and will include or require the inclusion of this statement in all contracts and subcontracts at any level for the project initiated within the RPA. Additionally: (a) any public/private partnership established for the development project in the RPA will seek to ensure and maintain a working environment free of harassment, intimidation, and coercion at all sites, and in all facilities at which all employees are assigned to work; (b) it shall be specifically ensured that all on-site supervisory personnel are aware of and carry out the obligation to maintain such working environment, with specific attention to minority and/or female individuals; and (c) the partnership will utilize affirmative action to ensure that business opportunities are provided and that job applicants are employed and treated in a nondiscriminatory manner.

Underlying this policy is the recognition by the partnership that successful affirmative action programs are important to the continued growth and vitality of the City of Evanston.

C. Completion of Redevelopment Project and Retirement of Obligations to Finance Redevelopment Costs

This Redevelopment Project will be completed on or before a date 23 years from the adoption of the ordinance designating the Redevelopment Project Area. Actual construction activities are anticipated to be completed within four (4) years.
VII. PROVISIONS FOR AMENDING THE TAX INCREMENT REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROJECT

This Redevelopment Plan and Project may be amended pursuant to the provisions of the Act.
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Legal Description
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

The Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 25, Township 41 North, Range 13, East of the Third Principal Meridian (except the North 150 feet lying West of the East 33 feet thereof) and the West 33 feet of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 25, (except the North 183 feet thereof) all in Cook County, Illinois.
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1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to document in a comprehensive manner the extent to which the factors of "blighted" for an area with structures (therefore, "improved") may be found in the area in southwestern Evanston, generally located at the northwestern corner of Howard Street and Hartrey Avenue and to determine the eligibility of this area for such status pursuant to the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, Illinois Revised Statutes, Section 11-74.4-3 (the "Act").

The Act addresses the elimination or reduction of blighted area factors within Illinois communities through the implementation of redevelopment measures. The Act authorizes the use of tax increment revenues derived from the tax rates of various taxing districts in a Redevelopment Project Area (the "RPA") for the payment of costs related to the undertaking of redevelopment projects. In order to qualify for redevelopment eligibility under this legislation, an RPA must contain conditions which warrant its designation as a "blighted area". The following sections of this report will describe conditions of blight which exist in the proposed RPA conformant to the provisions of the Act.

The RPA as a whole is approximately bounded by the following:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the City limits, at the center line of Howard Street, then northerly along the City limits to the northern boundary of the Bell & Howell property line, then easterly to the western edge of Hartrey Avenue, then northerly to the southern edge of the Skokie Swift embankment, then easterly to the eastern edge of Hartrey Avenue, then southerly to the center line of Howard Street (the City's southern boundary), then westerly to the point of beginning.
The survey was undertaken during August-November, 1991 and also includes the findings of previous studies, plans and inventories conducted by various firms and City agencies which were available and are pertinent to the evaluation of this area. Said studies, plans, etc., are not, however, viewed as a basis for the findings made herein.

Area Background

The proposed RPA was annexed into Evanston in 1913, at which time the land use was farming with a greenhouse structure.

The existing Bell & Howell structure was originally constructed in 1946 by the Hibbard Spencer and Bartlett Company, a producer and distributor of hardware. Bell & Howell began to lease the building in 1975 and then purchased the facility in 1984, at which time the company occupied the entire building for its own use.

As Bell & Howell began to divest itself of some of its divisions, Bell & Howell leased an increasing amount of space to subsidiaries or outside firms. Due in part to the structure's obsolescence, the total building area utilized/leased over time has decreased and the vacancy rate for the building is currently at 45%. Within the next two (2) years, a major tenant will be vacating its space, leaving the building 64% vacant.

As discussed in detail in a subsequent section, industrial use of the property is no longer economically viable. The potential costs associated with land acquisition and demolition of existing structures are important determinants of the price charged to new users of the site, effectively limiting the possible redevelopment uses. For example, if single family dwellings were constructed, the proportional site costs that would be charged to individual lots would drive up the price of the new houses far beyond the market for comparable housing. Higher residential density could be an alternative use, but the density would be considerable in order to generate the revenue flow necessary for needed redevelopment costs.
The property has been marketed for industrial or commercial reuse for several years, with a reduction in sale price over this time. Site costs have precluded redevelopment, even though these higher intensity uses can typically bear higher costs than residential. A current commercial redevelopment proposal is only feasible with public assistance to defray the costs of acquiring and preparing the site.

Even with City assistance, the practicable reuses of the site are limited and often not feasible. To make a TIF work, a development must have a higher value for property taxes than the previous use, since only taxes from new value are captured. Within the RPA, the current valuation is relatively high, at nearly 40% of market value. The value of single family homes would not generate the same level of taxes to support (and justify) public assistance.

In fact, costs of redevelopment described herein are so high that TIF alone is inadequate to support the public contribution required by the proposed commercial redevelopment. Local sales taxes, which are only generated by retail uses, are also needed to spur the redevelopment of the site, and to supplement TIF property taxes.

In summary, the proposed redevelopment uses (commercial) present certain advantages related to the characteristics of the site and existing market conditions:

- Lower density (residential) uses and lower tax assessment (16% vs. 36%) limit property tax increment available to offset redevelopment costs.
- Industrial reuse or sale of the building/site has met with no viable market acceptance in recent years. The building is functionally obsolete.
- Costs attributable to land acquisition and site preparation (including demolition) prohibit low density use of the site.
- A commercial retail redevelopment presents a higher tax revenue option.
- Incremental local sales taxes are necessary to finance a portion of public assistance.
The RPA designation is being pursued to address blighted conditions and permit the reuse of the property. Without public intervention and a change in the land use, the area’s obsolescence and underutilization due to the blighting conditions would not be resolved.

Timely redevelopment would prevent a loss of the City’s real property tax base, and commercial reuse would create new jobs, provide new shopping opportunities for community residents, as well as prevent retail dollars from being generated in neighboring communities (as opposed to within Evanston), thus expanding the City’s sales tax base.
II. QUALIFICATION CRITERIA USED

With the assistance of City of Evanston staff, and an independent planning consultant, Chicago Associates Planners and Architects (CAPA), Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. (KMA) examined the proposed redevelopment project area (RPA) to determine the presence or absence of appropriate qualifying factors listed in the Illinois "Real Property Tax Increment Allocation Act" (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), as amended. The relevant sections of the Act are found below.

The Act sets out specific procedures which must be adhered to in designating a redevelopment project area. By definition, a "redevelopment project area" is:

"an area designated by the municipality, which is not less in the aggregate than 1 1/2 acres and in respect to which the municipality has made a finding that there exist conditions which cause the area to be classified as a blighted area or a conservation area, or a combination of both blighted area and conservation areas."

The Act defines a "blighted" area with improvements as follows:

"any improved ... area within the boundaries of a redevelopment project area located within the territorial limits of the municipality where, if improved, industrial, commercial and residential buildings or improvements, because of a combination of 5 or more of the following factors: age; dilapidation; obsolescence; deterioration; illegal use of individual structures; presence of structures below minimum code standards; excessive vacancies; overcrowding of structures and community facilities; lack of ventilation, light or sanitary facilities; inadequate utilities; excessive land coverage; deleterious land use or layout; depreciation of physical maintenance; lack of community planning; is detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare."

The presence of factors must be reasonably distributed throughout the RPA and be present to a meaningful extent. The analysis herein indicates that the factors are present to a meaningful extent.
III. STUDY AREA

The proposed RPA consists of an approximately 740,000 square foot industrial structure at 2201 Howard Street owned free and clear and operated by Bell & Howell. The building is located on an approximately 24 acre site comprised of two (2) parcels. The building was constructed in 1946 and has had rehabilitation improvements made to it over the years, most notably in the period between 1982-1988. Since the Bell & Howell building covers greater than 90% of the area, its character and condition dominates the area.

Public rights-of-way surrounding the Bell & Howell building are included in the RPA. These include the northern half of Howard Street, and all of Hartrey Avenue including easements on the eastern side of the street. The streets are an integral component of the site and impact the patterns of use of the site significantly.
IV. METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

In evaluating the proposed RPA's qualification, the following methodology was utilized:

1) Site surveys of the proposed RPA were undertaken by representatives from Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. and Chicago Associates Planners and Architects primarily from August through November of 1991. The interior of most areas of the Bell & Howell building were inspected, including tenant spaces.

2) The entire proposed RPA was examined to determine the applicability of the fourteen (14) different criteria for qualification as improved land for TIF under the Act. The following findings are presented to the best of our current knowledge according to the available information.

3) The entire area was studied in relation to review of available planning reports pertaining to the City, water and sewer atlases, City ordinances, 1990 tax levy year information from the Cook County Clerk's Office, Street tax plat maps, discussions with City officials regarding local history, City building permits, architectural plans, environmental reports, and an evaluation of area-wide factors that affected the area's decline (e.g., deleterious land use or layout, obsolescence, etc.). KMA reviewed the area in its entirety. City redevelopment goals and objectives for the entire area were also reviewed.

4) Evaluation was made by reviewing the information collected and determining how each parcel and the structure measured as to the prevalence of each factor.

Summary of Area Findings

The following is a summary of relevant qualification findings:

1) The entire RPA comprises approximately 26 acres. The area is contiguous and is greater than 1-1/2 acres in size, as required by the Act.
2) The Study Area can be categorized as a "blighted improved area" (a discussion of the basis for qualification of the RPA follows in the next section). Factors necessary to make these findings are present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the area as a whole.

3) All property in the RPA would benefit by the proposed redevelopment project improvements.

4) The sound growth of the tax base for taxing districts that are applicable to the area, including the City, had been impaired by the blighting factors found present in the area and as outlined in the Act.

5) For approximately the past two (2) years, the Bell & Howell building has been actively marketed for sale by commercial brokerage firms. Several potential redevelopers have expressed interest in the property. However, after undertaking careful study of the feasibility of industrial or commercial redevelopment, the City has concluded that the private sector economics were not viable for industrial reuse. It is thus concluded that the area would not be subject to redevelopment without the investment of public funds, including property tax increments.
VI. QUALIFICATION OF AREA FINDINGS OF ELIGIBILITY

Age

The existing Bell & Howell structure was originally constructed in 1946 according to City building permits and appraiser's estimates by the Hubbard Spencer & Bartlett Company. The building is 45 years old.

Obsolescence

The RPA as a whole suffers from economic and functional obsolescence. The Bell & Howell building, since its original construction, has been a single ownership structure. The market for large single use industrial property has narrowed. Mixed use (retail, office, service) or multi-tenant developments have been increasingly utilized in recent years in order to allow for the redevelopment of large sites.

Development plans and concepts for larger, single user industrial facilities/complexes have shifted over the years. There is a limited demand for single-use structures over 300,000 square feet and extremely limited demand for those buildings approaching 1.0 million square feet. As many industries have downsized operations or consolidated operations, the market for large complexes has narrowed. As a result, many complexes have been considered for mixed use or multi-use developments. Redevelopment often entails partial/total demolition of existing facilities or adaptive re-use of existing facilities, as in this case.

Over the last decade, the economy of the Chicago metropolitan region has experienced structural changes which has caused the loss of manufacturing and industrial users. For example, Evanston and other northern suburbs have lost many larger industrial users including the recent departures of Mark Controls, Rust-Oleum, Tinkertoys, and AT&T.

Adaptive industrial/commercial reuse of large, single user facilities has worked best in buildings that roughly range from 150,000 to 300,000 square feet, according to local
industrial brokers. Many larger facilities have had to be razed in order to sustain redevelopment.

The Bell & Howell building remains obsolete even though its conversion to a multitenent building has been relatively recent. The owner has had to deal with the building’s obsolescence but not in a very successful manner. The economic incentives and developer pro forma standards have not had to meet the test of the market place because Bell & Howell has rented areas in the structure to related entities. Lower standards of improvements have therefore been more acceptable to the building’s occupants. Bell & Howell had made decisions over the years to utilize the building for its various divisions, companies or subsidiaries. The cost (or appropriateness) of improvements that were undertaken were not dictated by market factors. Rather the building was being transformed into a variety of different types of uses and configurations without regard to market/development guidelines or standards, as ownership located corporate divisions into the building.

According to real estate brokers interviewed, the building suffers from many conditions that contribute to its obsolete character. Problematic for current development standards, this building was designed for larger, more industrial-type users (including a single user). The Owner is also losing money on the building, is desirous of a different location in which to operate, and the building is outdated for Bell & Howell’s current operations.

Problems encountered during the last five (5) years of trying to lease or sell the building include:

1) The building has a very large footprint that has made it difficult to subdivide to accommodate the more plentiful smaller users desirous of adequate natural light and easy access to truck docks;
2) Low ceiling heights (14.5' clear) existing throughout the majority of the building are problematic for modern warehouse-type users since many prefer to stack products higher as opposed to horizontally, which takes up more space and takes longer to move the product;

3) The heating system, though recently upgraded, is so designed that tenants are required to pro-rate the costs, which is not always perceived as an equitable distribution by tenants/users;

4) The majority of the flooring within the building is apparently undesirable (asphalt over concrete floors) for smaller use tenants, according to leasing brokers;

5) The interior parking garage has elicited a mixed reaction on the part of existing and potential users, since it occupies a large amount of space and has natural lighting/good access which some users would prefer to have as part of their own facilities -- this location may prevent a natural flow throughout the building from front to back and side to side;

6) The western truck docks have been converted from railway docks (since railway is no longer available), and other pre-existing truck docks throughout the building (except for the northeast corner) were designed for smaller vehicles. Further, such docks do not all have capabilities to accommodate the "18-wheelers", which current industrial users would require;

7) Today’s smaller, mid-size and larger tenants require trucking access, while the building’s location (away from major transportation arteries) does not help distribution-oriented tenants; and

8) Today’s tenants also are desirous of office exterior facades which have been uplifted and updated -- the subject building cannot accommodate most of these requirements (due in part to the high costs associated with such improvements).
Areas within the Bell & Howell building that have received substantial investment and upgrading are nonetheless functionally obsolete. The improvements made in both the DeVry space (about 190,000 s.f.) and Bell & Howell’s own ISD Data Center (40,000 s.f.) are geared to the needs of the specific individual tenants. According to real estate brokers, more investment would be needed in order to make these spaces marketable to other potential tenants in the current marketplace environment.

The building itself suffers from an outdated facade and is considered "unattractive" within the marketplace. Brokers felt that the building did not conform to a potential user’s idea of a modern image, particularly those users looking for a distribution/office location.

The platting is obsolete in that it reflects the arbitrary separation (subdivision) of the vacant Hubbard Spencer and Bartlett land (now Bell & Howell property) from the improved building portion. Because of this, the streets and alleys are not fully improved or under public ownership to provide for equal egress and access to the individual users in the area as an industrial/commercial subdivision.

The character of the improvements is not conducive to the variety of types and sizes of uses. For example, Hartrey Street (to the east) services as a collector street for other residential and industrial traffic, yet it is improved to a residential character. It also is a dead end street due to the closure of the viaduct at the Skokie Swift Embankment. Emnumal Street to the north of property is a private street so that users of the facility must access the rear of the building through a parking lot. No public street access exists at the western or northern edge of the proposed TIF/RPA.

**Excessive Vacancies**

According to Bell & Howell, the vacancy rate for this structure, calculated on the basis of rentable area (739,118 s.f.) over the past five (5) years, has ranged from 33% to 52% and is currently at 46%. The existing owner’s policy toward this building has contributed to its vacancy rate by being inconsistent regarding whether they should sell.
or rent, build out or leave the various spaces undeveloped. This perception of the market and policy of the owner has caused better than 30% of the building to be vacant at any one time over the last years.

All but one of the current tenants (Cloud being the exception) were divisions of Bell & Howell or are currently affiliated with the company. According to Bell & Howell officials, if these leasing arrangements had not been made, the vacancy rate would very likely have been much higher, for Bell & Howell would have been competing for tenants in a general market that has experienced high vacancy rates.

The largest tenant in terms of both income and space utilization (accounting for 19% of total square footage) is DeVry, which has announced its intention to relocate when its lease expires in 1994. This situation will leave Bell & Howell with only one small income producing tenant (Eiki) and the income will be minimal compared to operating expenses. The net result of the current leasing program leaves a large, poorly configured space for multiple tenants to be released in a very competitive market. Given the unsuccessful marketing history, demolishing the property and redeveloping the site is the only alternative to prevent any future decline of the tax base.

Lack of Ventilation, Light or Sanitary Facilities

Due to the depth and window arrangement of the building, several areas have a significant lack of natural light and ventilation.

The building is approximately 974 feet wide and 704 feet deep without any interior courtyards or skylights. There are six (6) ventilator locations running along the center of the building, approximately 3 feet by 3 feet each. Under the 1987 BOCA building code utilized by the City of Evanston, not less than 8% of the floor area is to be devoted to exterior glazing (windows) and a minimum of 4% of the floor area is to be operable (i.e., must be able to be opened). This means 54,356 square feet of exterior glazing and 27,420 square feet of operable area is required. The actual exterior glazing is
approximately 9,282 square feet, 2,475 square feet of which is operable, falling far short of standards adopted by the City.

**Inadequate Utilities**

**Water Supply System**

The City of Evanston Water Department has provided evidence to the existence of three (3) water mains serving the RPA. One is a 6" main in Hartry installed in 1926; another is an 8" main in Brummel 884 feet west of Hartry, installed in 1950; and another is a 10" main installed in 1960, running south from Oakton through James Park to a point near the above mentioned 8" line. There are City plans to extend this line to the south to complete the loop with a main in Howard Street.

The inadequate condition that is present is one of an adjacent service system of an old undersized 6" main, an incomplete looed larger 10" main and a long dead-end stubbed 8" main.

All of these factors contribute to the water supply to the RPA being deemed inadequate.

**Street System**

The standard for streets used for industrial and commercial purposes is a Portland Cement Institute (PCI) rating of 70.

Howard Street's average rating adjacent to the property is PCI 66 and the rating of the stations adjacent to the intersection of Hartry and Howard are 45, 61 and 51—well below the standard followed by the City.

**Sewer System**

The following factors indicate the inadequacy of the sewer system:

1) There exists a combined 10" to 21" diameter sanitary/storm sewer in Hartry. The City policy is to separate storm from sanitary.

2) The area to the east of the RPA has experienced basement flooding.
3) The area (described as S13) is scheduled for improvements of the sewers to include a new relief sewer system, with a 54" storm main in Hartrey leading to a 72" trunk line parallel to the Skokie Swift, dumping into the canal.

4) Also, a sewer line is scheduled for installation along Brummel Street (PRT).

The October 1990 City Sewer Study report confirms the condition and describes the remedy for the RPA and the adjacent (S13) area.

Deleterious Land Use or Layout

The use of Hartrey as an individual access street has caused the alley access of the adjacent residential use to be controlled by traffic signage. Also, because Brummel is a private street serving Shure, Inc., all tenants on the north side of the Bell & Howell building have no public street access or exposure. There are only two (2) public access entrances on the 740,000 square foot four sided building, which is not considered adequate for today's marketplace. The existing tenants also have building entry and delivery through the parking lots. Vehicles have to travel at least 700 feet through parking lots to reach these entries.

Depreciation of Physical Maintenance

The site improvements on the Bell & Howell property show evidence of depreciation. There are cracked and broken sidewalks, driveways, paving and curbing in all the various perimeter parking areas and areas with vegetation growing in them. On the east side of the building, the sidewalk has separated from the wall leaving a broken and exposed joint.

On the building, metal window mullions and overhead loading dock doors show evidence of paint deterioration, rusting and peeling. The masonry wall is also bowing out at the line where the second story ceiling posts would be.
Additionally, the closed off Hartrey viaduct and Skokie Swift embankment are visually unpleasant. There is also evidence of gang graffiti and construction debris contributing to the depreciation of the viaduct embankment area.

Depreciation and deferred maintenance is found with the sprinkler system. The existing sprinkler main shows evidence of breaks during required testing in the last six years. In addition, there has been a fire hydrant replacement.

Lack of Community Planning

Evanston did not have a formal plan for the area at the time the RPA developed. Therefore, issues of incompatible land use relationships, inadequate street layout, or improper subdivisions were not adequately resolved, especially in relation to contemporary development standards.
VI. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF AREA QUALIFICATIONS

The primary cause of the RPA's stagnation relates to the interplay of a number of blighting factors found to be present. The Bell & Howell property and adjacent streets are characterized by age, obsolescence, excessive vacancies, deleterious land use or layout, depreciation of physical maintenance and lack of community planning, all of which inhibit redevelopment.

The presence of the factors herein impairs the value of existing and any proposed new private investments thereby threatening the sound growth of the tax base of taxing districts in the area. The City's contemplated TIF designation for the area is consistent with the intent of the TIF legislation.
EXHIBIT 1

BOUNDARY MAP
EXHIBIT 2
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

The Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 25, Township 41 North, Range 13, East of the Third Principal Meridian (except the North 150 feet lying West of the East 33 feet thereof) and the West 33 feet of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 25, (except the North 153 feet thereof) all in Cook County, Illinois.
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TIF District Maps as Amended
Appendix 3

Legal Description for the TIF District as Amended
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

THAT PART OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 13 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN HOWARD-HARTREY SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED SEPTEMBER 3, 1983 AS DOCUMENT NO. 93696936; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 9 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 2 IN BRUMMEL PLACE SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JULY 26, 1956 AS DOCUMENT NO. 16650663; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 2 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 2; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BRUMMEL SUBDIVISION AND ALONG THE EASTERN EXTENSION THEREOF TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF THE CHICAGO NORTH SHORE AND MILWAUKEE RAILROAD; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE TO A POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF HARTREY AVENUE; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND SOUTHERLY EXTENSION THEREOF TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. ("KMA") has been retained by the City of Evanston (the "City") to conduct an analysis of an area that would result in the addition of two (2) tax parcels to the existing Howard-Hartrey Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District (the "Amendment"). The City seeks to add the parcels to the TIF District as part of its strategy to promote the revitalization of key under-utilized properties located within the City. The 2 parcels are defined herein as the "Amendment Area."

The Howard-Hartrey TIF District was established in 1992, and succeeded in encouraging private developers to convert a former industrial area into a thriving retail shopping center. The City has two aims in pursuing the addition of the parcels to the TIF district. The first goal is to promote redevelopment of certain parcels that have experienced certain impediments such as obsolescence and excessive vacancies (similar to the problems confronting the City in 1992). The TIF District formation would enable the City to address these ongoing impediments to redevelopment.

Secondly, TIF establishment would address the limited opportunities the City has to encourage new industrial, commercial and mixed use growth within a community. Industrial uses within Evanston are particularly limited, due to a combination of factors: physical barriers to growth such as the lakefront, competing uses (e.g., recreational uses and higher education uses), scarcity of large vacant sites suitable for industrial and warehouse uses, and competition with other communities that have advanced their industrial capabilities (e.g., certain municipalities in Will County and portions of Cook County). Consequently, the targeted area within the Howard-Hartrey TIF District presents a unique opportunity for industrial development.

Furthermore, the City is limited in terms of annexation opportunities, and it has an unusually high number of tax-exempt properties. Because the City (a) is a mature community that can no longer grow through annexation, (b) has few parcels of undeveloped land remaining within City limits, and (c) has few clusters of properties served by major roadways, the targeted redevelopment area provides a rare opportunity to undertake major new reinvestment projects. By so doing, it would support the City’s strategy for the encouragement of growth through the reuse and redevelopment of older or under-utilized properties.

Based upon the analysis completed to date, KMA has reached the following conclusions regarding the qualification of the TIF District:

1) The Amendment Area proposed for inclusion within the TIF District qualifies as a "conservation area" pursuant to the Act – The Amendment Area qualifies as a conservation area under the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq., as amended; hereinafter referred to as the "TIF Act" or "Act"). This condition prevents, or threatens to prevent, the healthy economic and physical development of properties in a manner that the community deems essential to its overall economic health.
2) **Current conditions impede redevelopment** – The existence of certain conditions found within the Amendment Area present impediments to the area’s successful redevelopment. This is because the factors negatively impact coordinated and substantial private sector investment in the overall TIF District. Without the use of City planning and economic development resources to mitigate such factors, potential redevelopment projects (along with other activities that require private sector investment) are not likely to be economically feasible.

3) **Viable redevelopment sites could produce incremental revenue** – Within the TIF District including the Amendment Area, there are parcels which potentially could be redeveloped or rehabilitated and thereby produce incremental property tax revenue. Such revenue, used in combination with other City resources for redevelopment incentives or public improvements, would likely stimulate private investment and reinvestment in these sites and ultimately throughout the TIF District.

4) **TIF amendment recommended** – To mitigate redevelopment area conditions, promote private sector investment, and foster the economic viability of the TIF District, KMA recommends that the City proceed with the amendment of the existing TIF District.

Because the City will not be considering the redevelopment of residential parcels, and it will certify that it will not dislocate 10 or more residential units within the TIF district, the City will not conduct a housing impact study pursuant to the TIF Act.
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In the context of planning for the amendment of the Howard-Hartrey Tax Increment Financing District, the City of Evanston has evaluated certain parcels in the vicinity of Howard Street and Hartrey Avenue to determine whether they qualify under the TIF Act for amendment into the district. Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. has agreed to undertake the study of the Redevelopment Project Area (RPA) on the City’s behalf.

Economic Development Goals.
The redevelopment of the proposed RPA is consistent with the City’s overarching land use objectives, which are contained in the Comprehensive Plan, zoning ordinance and other land use planning elements. In the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2000, the City has articulated a number of economic development objectives which would be supported by the City’s amendment of the TIF District to include the Amendment Area parcels. For example, a goal is to promote “growth and redevelopment of businesses, commercial, and industrial areas.”

Given the gap between the City’s goals for the area versus the current conditions described in this report, the City has determined that the redevelopment of the proposed RPA would be highly beneficial to the community. With a redevelopment strategy in place, the economic base of the RPA would be stabilized and increased – thereby benefiting the community as a whole. Without such a redevelopment strategy, the adverse conditions identified in this report would likely worsen.

The City has further determined that redevelopment (including industrial development) is feasible only with public finance assistance. The creation and utilization of a TIF redevelopment plan is intended by the City to help provide the assistance required to eliminate conditions detrimental to successful redevelopment of the TIF District.

The use of TIF relies upon induced private redevelopment in the RPA to create higher real estate values that would otherwise decline without such investment. This would result in increased property taxes compared to the previous land use (or lack of use). In this way, the existing tax base for all tax districts would be protected and a portion of future increased taxes pledged to attract the requisite private investment.

Current Land Use.
The existing TIF District is in the vicinity of the Howard-Hartrey Avenue intersection, situated on the north side of Howard Street (the south side is part of the City of Chicago). Historically, the area has had mostly a variety of for-profit, non-residential land uses, such as industrial, retail, and commercial uses. Prior to the establishment of the Howard-Hartrey TIF District in 1992, the area was used primarily by industrial tenants. However, given market trends at the time, the area and the end users (Shure and Bell and Howell) became non-competitive and the end users eventually closed operations.

The City responded in 1992 by establishing the existing TIF District. The TIF District has succeeded in catalyzing the conversion of the area from an obsolete industrial use to
a successful commercial use, producing public benefits such as the reuse of underutilized properties, diversified tax revenue for the City (and for school district when the TIF District is retired), and a modern, aesthetically pleasing set of structures for residents to shop at. Consequently, the City is seeking via the addition of the Amendment Area to replicate the success of the existing TIF District by making a similar conversion from obsolete industrial to a modern use that enhances the tax base of the City.

The City believes that there are redevelopment opportunities, if the City were to pursue tax increment financing and coordination of redevelopment strategies for the Amendment Area. Despite these opportunities and despite certain advantages (discussed in Section III) that could be leveraged, many parcels in the area remain underutilized. The TIF District as a whole suffers from a variety of economic development impediments as identified in the TIF Act, such as excessive vacancies and obsolescence. Section V of this report identifies other impediments to redevelopment.

General Scope and Methodology.
KMA formally began its analysis by conducting a series of meetings and discussions with City staff, starting in the summer of 2013 and continuing periodically up to the date of this report’s issuance. The purpose of the meetings was to establish boundaries for the TIF District and to gather data related to the qualification criteria for properties included in the TIF District. These meetings were complemented by a series of field surveys of the entire area to evaluate the condition of the TIF District on a parcel-by-parcel basis. The field surveys and data collected have been utilized to test the likelihood that various areas located within the TIF District would qualify for TIF designation.

For the purpose of the study, properties within the TIF District were examined in the context of the TIF Act governing improved areas (separate provisions of the TIF Act address unimproved areas). The qualification factors discussed in this report qualify the area as a conservation area, as the term is defined under the TIF Act.

During the course of its work, KMA reported to key City staff its findings regarding TIF qualification for the area under study. Based on these findings the City (a) made refinements to the TIF District boundaries and (b) directed KMA to complete this report and to move forward with the preparation of amendments to the Redevelopment Plan and Project for the TIF District.

For additional information about KMA’s data collection and evaluation methods, refer to Section IV of this report.
II. QUALIFICATION CRITERIA USED

With the assistance of City staff, Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. evaluated the TIF District to determine the presence or absence of qualifying factors listed in the TIF Act. The relevant sections of the TIF Act are found below.

The TIF Act sets out specific procedures which must be adhered to in designating a TIF District/Redevelopment Project Area. By definition, a Redevelopment Project Area is:

"An area designated by the municipality, which is not less in the aggregate than 1 1/2 acres and in respect to which the municipality has made a finding that there exist conditions which cause the area to be classified as an industrial park conservation area or a blighted area or a conservation area, or a combination of both blighted areas and conservation areas."

Under the Act, "conservation area" means any improved area within the boundaries of a Redevelopment Project Area located within the territorial limits of the municipality where certain conditions are met, as identified below.

TIF Qualification Factors for a Conservation area.
In accordance with the Illinois TIF Act, KMA performed a two-step assessment to determine if the proposed RPA qualified as a conservation area. First, KMA analyzed the threshold factor of age to determine if a majority of structures were 35 years of age or older.

Secondly, the area was examined to determine if a combination of three (3) or more of the following factors were present, each of which is (i) present, with that presence documented to a meaningful extent so that a municipality may reasonably find that the factor is clearly present within the intent of the Act and (ii) reasonably distributed throughout the improved part of the redevelopment project area. Per the TIF Act, such an area is not yet a blighted area but because of a combination of the following factors is detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare and such an area may become a blighted area.

(A) Dilapidation. An advanced state of disrepair or neglect of necessary repairs to the primary structural components of building or improvements in such a combination that a documented building condition analysis determines that major repair is required or the defects are so serious and so extensive that the buildings must be removed.

(B) Obsolescence. The condition or process of falling into disuse. Structures become ill-suited for the original use.

(C) Deterioration. With respect to buildings, defects including, but not limited to, major defects in the secondary building components such as doors, windows, porches, gutters, downspouts, and fascia. With respect to surface improvements, that the condition of roadways, alleys, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, off-street parking
and surface storage areas evidence deterioration, including, but limited to, surface cracking, crumbling, potholes, depressions, loose paving material and weeds protruding through paved surfaces.

(D) **Presence of Structures Below Minimum Code Standards.** All structures that do not meet the standards of zoning, subdivision, building, fire and other governmental codes applicable to property, but not including housing and property maintenance codes.

(E) **Illegal Use of Individual Structures.** The use of structures in violation of applicable federal, State, or local laws, exclusive of those applicable to the presence of structures below minimum code standards.

(F) **Excessive Vacancies.** The presence of buildings that are unoccupied or under-utilized and that represent an adverse influence on the area because of the frequency, extent, or duration of the vacancies.

(G) **Lack of Ventilation, Light, or Sanitary Facilities.** The absence of adequate ventilation for light or air circulation in spaces or rooms without windows, or that require the removal of dust, odor, gas, smoke or other noxious airborne materials. Inadequate natural light and ventilation means the absence of skylights or windows for interior spaces or rooms and improper window sizes and amounts by room area to window area ratios. Inadequate sanitary facilities refers to the absence or inadequacy of garbage storage and enclosure, bathroom facilities, hot water and kitchens and structural inadequacies preventing ingress and egress to and from all rooms and units within a building.

(H) **Inadequate Utilities.** Underground and overhead utilities such as storm sewers and storm drainage, sanitary sewers, water lines and gas, telephone and electrical services that are shown to be inadequate. Inadequate utilities are those that are: (i) of insufficient capacity to serve the uses in the Redevelopment Project Area; (ii) deteriorated, antiquated, obsolete or in disrepair; or (iii) lacking within the Redevelopment Project Area.

(I) **Excessive Land Coverage and Overcrowding of Structures and Community Facilities.** The over-intensive use of property and the crowding of buildings and accessory facilities onto a site. Examples of problem conditions warranting the designation of an area as exhibiting excessive land coverage are: (i) the presence of buildings either improperly situated on parcels or located on parcels of inadequate size and shape in relation to present-day standards of development for health and safety and (ii) the presence of multiple buildings on a single parcel. For there to be a finding of excessive land coverage, these parcels must exhibit one or more of the following conditions: insufficient provision for light and air within or around buildings, increased threat of spread of fire due to the close proximity of buildings, lack of adequate or proper access to a public right-of-way, lack of reasonably required off-street parking or inadequate provision for loading service.
(J) **Deleterious Land-Use or Layout.** The existence of incompatible land-use relationships, buildings occupied by inappropriate mixed-uses or uses considered to be noxious, offensive or unsuitable for the surrounding area.

(K) **Environmental Clean-Up.** The Redevelopment Project Area has incurred Illinois Environmental Protection Agency or United States Environmental Protection Agency remediation costs for (or a study conducted by an independent consultant recognized as having expertise in environmental remediation has determined a need for) the clean-up of hazardous waste, hazardous substances or underground storage tanks required by State or federal law. Any such remediation costs would constitute a material impediment to the development or redevelopment of the Redevelopment Project Area.

(L) **Lack of Community Planning.** The Redevelopment Project Area was developed prior to or without the benefit or guidance of a community plan. This means that the development occurred prior to the adoption by the municipality of a comprehensive or other community plan or that the plan was not followed at the time of the area’s development. This factor must be documented by evidence of adverse or incompatible land-use relationships, inadequate street layout, improper subdivision, parcels of inadequate shape and size to meet contemporary development standards or other evidence demonstrating an absence of effective community planning.

(M) **“Stagnant” or Lagging BAV.** The total equalized assessed value (BAV) of the Redevelopment Project Area has declined for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the Redevelopment Project Area is designated, or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the balance of the municipality for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years, for which information is available or increasing at an annual rate that is less than the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the United States Department of Labor or successor agency for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the Redevelopment Project Area is designated.
III. THE TIF DISTRICT

The Howard-Hartrey TIF District as proposed for amendment contains parcels located northwest of the intersection of Howard Street and Hartrey Avenue. The existing TIF District parcels front Howard Street, whereas the 2 parcels proposed for inclusion (via amendment) are behind the frontage parcels and the existing shopping center. Please refer to Exhibit A which contains a map showing the boundaries of the TIF District.

As mentioned, the existing TIF District has been successfully converted from an aging industrial/commercial area to a viable commercial shopping center. In contrast, the Amendment Area has yet to experience any redevelopment based on private resources only. Instead it has languished as an obsolete, vacant site, with unsuccessful efforts to find new private, for-profit tenants for the site “as is.” It should be noted that the site continues to be classified by the County as a taxable site (Class 5 industrial) and hence it still produces tax revenues, but the City endeavors to improve the site to ensure that it contributes to and solidifies the City’s tax base.

Despite the obsolescence and distressed condition within the TIF District as proposed for amendment, the area has a number of assets that could be leveraged for modern uses:

- Both Howard Street and McCormick Boulevard are major arterial roads and as such have the traffic counts necessary to support commercial and/or retail uses.
- The Howard/Hartrey intersection is near the Howard/McCormick gateway to Evanston, so it serves as a welcoming point for visitors/shoppers/suppliers entering the City from nearby Skokie, Lincolnwood and Chicago;
- Any redevelopment of the Amendment Area would potentially benefit from the proven drawing power of the retailers within the existing TIF District; and
- The size of the property would allow for its reuse by a local commercial enterprise.
IV. METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

In evaluating the Howard-Hartrey Amendment Area for inclusion within the existing TIF District, the following methodology was utilized:

1) Site surveys of the TIF District were undertaken by representatives from Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc., supplemented with photographic analysis of the sites. Site surveys were completed for each parcel within the TIF District.

2) KMA performed EAV trend analysis to ascertain whether EAV growth in the TIF District underperformed EAV growth in the remaining part of the City.

3) KMA conducted evaluations of exterior structures and associated site improvements, noting such conditions as deterioration and obsolescence. Additionally, KMA reviewed the following data: 2006-2012 tax information from Cook County, tax parcel maps, site data, local history (based on discussions with City officials and staff), documents indicating historical uses of the site, and an evaluation of area-wide factors that have affected the area’s development (e.g., lack of community planning, code violations, obsolescence, etc.).

4) Existing structures and site conditions were initially surveyed for the purpose of comparing said conditions against the TIF Act criteria, to the best and most reasonable extent possible.

5) The TIF District was examined to assess the applicability of the factors required for qualification for TIF designation under the TIF Act. KMA evaluated parcels by reviewing the information obtained for each factor against the relevant statutory criteria. Improved land within the RPA was examined to determine the applicability of the thirteen (13) different conservation area factors for qualification for TIF designation under this statute (referenced in Section II of this report).
V. QUALIFICATION FINDINGS FOR TIF DISTRICT

Based upon KMA's evaluation of parcels in the TIF District and analysis of each of the eligibility factors summarized in Section II, the following factors are presented to support qualification of the TIF District as a conservation area. These factors are found to be clearly present and reasonably distributed throughout the TIF District, as required under the TIF Act. The factors are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Possible Factors per Statute</th>
<th>Minimum Factors Needed to Qualify per Statute</th>
<th>Qualifying Factors Present in TIF District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5: Excessive Vacancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Lagging BAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Deterioration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Deteriorous Layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Obsolescence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings for Conservation Area.

The TIF District is found to qualify as a conservation area under the statutory criteria set forth in the TIF Act. As a first step, KMA determined that the one structure in the Amendment Area is 35 years in age or older. It is 56 years old per Cook County Assessor data, and the adjacent parcel (classified as a minor industrial improvement pertaining to the parking lot) is listed by the Assessor as 46 years old.

Secondly, KMA reviewed the 13 statutory criteria needed to qualify the area as a conservation area, determining that 5 factors were present:

1) Excessive Vacancies.

The Act states that this finding is characterized by the presence of unoccupied or underutilized buildings that represent an adverse influence on the area. The only building within the Amendment Area is vacant (i.e., 100% vacancy). Moreover, according to City staff and based on City documentation, the structure has been vacant since 2002 — i.e., has not recently been vacated pending the closing of a real estate transaction, but has remained unoccupied for an extended period of time.

In addition, the vacant building and adjacent surface improvements generally exhibit greater deterioration (relative to other buildings within the TIF District or adjacent to the TIF District) and appear to need corrective maintenance. Because of the reduced economic activity associated with vacancy and the relatively poor physical condition — in conjunction with the large size of the building — it represents an adverse influence on the overall TIF District and surrounding area.
1) **Lagging or Declining EAV.**
The EAV of the Amendment Area has registered absolute declines in three (3) of the past (5) years (refer to chart below). Additionally, the area EAV has lagged the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for 3 of the past 5 years. Overall, the $1.49 million EAV as of the most recent tax year is lower than the initial base year ($1.89 million). Therefore, a finding of lagging BAV is made pursuant to the TIF Act.

**Exhibit 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAV Trends for Amendment Area</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total EAV for TIF District</td>
<td>$1,675,790</td>
<td>$1,485,795</td>
<td>$1,651,563</td>
<td>$1,686,846</td>
<td>$1,880,927</td>
<td>$1,895,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAV Change (%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-wide EAV (Net of TIF)</td>
<td>$3,512,945,562</td>
<td>$2,725,803,698</td>
<td>$3,045,233,234</td>
<td>$3,394,332,332</td>
<td>$3,926,419,136</td>
<td>$3,770,406,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAV Change (%)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* Represented years are asterisked.
** Years are highlighted when EAV registered absolute declines.
Source: Cook County and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

2) **Deterioration.**
As noted in Section II, a municipality can make a finding of deterioration with respect to structures and the surface improvements present within a TIF District. In this case, both the structure and privately-owned surface improvements within the Amendment Area evidence deterioration and deferred maintenance. In particular, the parking lot is in poor condition and would need repair.

3) **Deleterious Layout.**
A municipality can make a finding of deleterious layout or land use when there exists (a) incompatible land-use relationships, (b) buildings occupied by inappropriate mixed-uses or uses considered to be noxious, or (c) uses offensive or unsuitable for the surrounding area. Most of the problems in the area reflect incompatible land-use relationships.

The primary deleterious layout issue is the poor ingress/egress to and from the area. The Amendment Area is simply inadequate to accommodate modern industrial operations where (ideally) internal, off-street circulation of trucks and vehicles is done with wide, easily traversed streets to reach loading bays etc. There is no direct northerly, southerly or westerly right-of-way access to the 2 parcels. The only access is as follows: turning in from the south via Howard Street, "looping" around the eastern side of the Howard/Hartrey area or looping...
around the western side. Approaching from the western side requires navigating around a church rather than an open area or traffic lane dedicated for industrial users. If looping around from the eastern side, a truck or other vehicle would need to travel past the Target parking lot and then execute a sharp turn to gain access to the site.

The ingress/egress problems can be illustrated by comparing the Amendment Area industrial layout versus a modern industrial park (e.g., industrial parks in Northbrook, Romeoville, or in the O'Hare Airport trade area for example). Modern industrial parks typically have (a) well-marked ingress/egress points for trucks and other vehicles, (b) an efficient internal/off-street circulation pattern and (c) wide roadways to accommodate a variety of larger trucks that require more space for executing turns.

4) Obsolescence.
The Act states that obsolescence is the condition or process of falling into disuse or structures that have become "ill-suited" for their original use. The area exhibits both economic and functional obsolescence.

Economic obsolescence is evidenced primarily by the excessive vacancies described above. The vacant structure in particular results in the literal "disuse" of the building. Although other uses have been proposed for the former industrial structure, the original use is now obsolete with the departure of Share (the original tenant) in 2002. Furthermore, it appears that market demand for the site as an industrial area is severely hampered by the site conditions, evidenced by City documentation showing the last transaction was written down from $4.15 million in 2005 to $2.8 million in 2008 for a non-industrial use and by Evanston appraiser Sam Salvi identifying defects that cause the site to be diminished in value. Also, Cook County Assessor data shows only 17% of the assessed value of the former Share building is connected to the building (83% is tied to the land). By comparison, parcels 402-025 and 402-026 associated with the adjacent Target and Jewel stores list building values as 35% and 38% of overall assessed value. The foregoing data is supported by the overall RAV valuations as discussed above, which show declines in RAV both annually and over the 2007-2012 period.

Functionally, the area is experiencing obsolescence related to its general age. As mentioned, the building is over 50 years in age, according to Cook County Assessor data. The combination of age and certain evolving standards in commercial and industrial building design limits the competitiveness of the older buildings — i.e., limits their utility as efficient, marketable workspace. For example, as mentioned above the structure has inadequate circulation and poor ingress/egress for delivery vehicles/trucks. Lastly, the industrial building is outmoded relative to modern warehouse-type structures in competing communities (e.g., newer industrial buildings tend to be larger, with fewer internal building supports otherwise limiting usable floor space and with higher ceilings to accommodate greater space needs).
VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS / GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF QUALIFICATION

The following is a summary of relevant qualification findings as it relates to the City's potential amendment of the Howard-Hartrey TIF District.

1. The area is contiguous and is greater than 1½ acres in size;

2. The RPA Amendment Area will qualify as a conservation area. Further, the qualification factors found in the Amendment Area are present to a meaningful extent and are reasonably distributed throughout the area. A more detailed analysis of the qualification findings is outlined in Section V of this report;

3. All property in the area is expected to substantially benefit by the redevelopment project improvements;

4. The sound growth of taxing districts applicable to the area, including the City, has been impaired by the factors found present in the area; and

5. The area would not be subject to redevelopment without the investment of public funds, including incremental property tax revenue.

In the judgment of KMA, these findings provide the City with sufficient justification to consider designation of the Amendment Area for inclusion within the Howard-Hartrey RPA.
Alderman Rainey moved and Alderman Jendam seconded the motion that said ordinance as presented and read by the City Clerk be adopted.

After a full discussion thereof including a public recital of the nature of the matter being considered and such other information as would inform the public of the nature of the business being conducted, the Mayor directed that the roll be called for a vote upon the motion to adopt said ordinance as read.

Upon the roll being called, the following Alderman voted AYE: Jendam, Prover, Rainey, Currias, Fiske, Wayne, Wilson

The following Alderman voted NAY: —

Whereupon the Mayor declared the motion carried and said ordinance adopted, approved and signed the same in open meeting and directed the City Clerk to record the same in full in the records of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, which was done.

Other business not pertinent to the adoption of said ordinance was duly transacted at the meeting.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned.

[Signature]
City Clerk
MINUTES of a public meeting of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, held at the Evanston Civic Center, Evanston, Illinois, in said City at 7:00 o'clock P.M., on the 11th day of November, 2013.

The Mayor called the meeting to order and directed the City Clerk to call the roll.

Upon roll call, the following answered present: ________, the Mayor, and Alderman: Jenkem, Brover, Rainey, Burris, Fiske, Wynne, Wilson

The following Aldermen were absent:

Breathwaite, Holmes

Alderman Rainey presented and the City Manager explained an ordinance, which was laid in words and figures before the Mayor and Alderman as follows:
STATE OF ILLINOIS

COUNTY OF COOK

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE AND MINUTES

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I am the duly qualified and acting City Clerk of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois (the "City"), and that as such official I am the keeper of the records and files of the Mayor and City Council of the City (the "Corporate Authorities").

I do further certify that the foregoing is a full, true and complete transcript of that portion of the minutes of the meeting of the Corporate Authorities held on the 13th day of November, 2013, insofar as same relates to the adoption of an ordinance entitled:

An ORDINANCE of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, Amending a Tax Increment Redevelopment Plan and Redevelopment Project for the Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area.

a true, correct and complete copy of which said ordinance as adopted at said meeting appears in the foregoing transcript of the minutes of said meeting.

I do further certify that the deliberations of the Corporate Authorities on the adoption of said ordinance were conducted openly, that the vote on the adoption of said ordinance was taken openly, that said meeting was held at a specified time and place convenient to the public, that notice of said meeting was duly given to all of the news media requesting such notice; that an agenda for said meeting was posted at the location where said meeting was held and at the principal office of the Corporate Authorities at least 48 hours in advance of the holding of said meeting; that said agenda described or made specific reference to said ordinance; that said meeting was called and held in strict compliance with the provisions of the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois, as amended, and the Illinois Municipal Code, as amended, and that the Corporate Authorities have complied with all of the provisions of said Act and said Code and with all of the procedural rules of the Corporate Authorities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto affix my official signature and the seal of the City, this 13th day of November, 2013.

[Signature]
City Clerk

(SEAL)
121-O-13

AN ORDINANCE

Designating the First Amendment to the
Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area
Pursuant to the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the best interest of the citizens of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois (the "City"), for the City to implement tax increment allocation financing pursuant to the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, Division 74.4 of Article 11 of the Illinois Municipal Code, as amended (the "Act"), for a proposed amendment to the redevelopment plan and redevelopment project (the "Plan" and "Project") within the municipal boundaries of the City and within a proposed amendment to the redevelopment project area (the "Area") described in Section 1 of this Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council of the City (the "Corporate Authorities") have heretofore by ordinance amended the Plan and Project, which Plan and Project were identified in such ordinance and were the subject, along with the amended Area designation hereinafter made, of a public hearing held on October 28, 2013, and it is now necessary and desirable to designate the Area as a redevelopment project area pursuant to the Act,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, THAT:

SECTION 1: Area Amended. That the Area, as legally described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference, is hereby designated as an amended Redevelopment Project Area pursuant to Section
11-74.4-4 of the Act. The general street location for the Area is described in Exhibit B attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference. The map of the amended Area is depicted on Exhibit C attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference.

SECTION 2: Invalidity of Any Section. That if any section, paragraph, or provision of this Ordinance shall be held to be invalid or unenforceable for any reason, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3: Incorporation. The findings and recitals contained herein are declared to be prima facie evidence of the law of the City and shall be received in evidence as provided by the Illinois Complied Statutes and courts of the State of Illinois.

SECTION 4: Superseder and Effective Date. All ordinances, resolutions, motions, or orders in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict, and this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage by the Corporate Authorities and approval as provided by law.

AYES 7       NAYS 0       ABSENT 2

Introduced: November 11, 2013
Adopted: November 11, 2013

Approved: November 13, 2013
Elizabeth B. Tisdahl, Mayor

Attest:
Rodney Greene, City Clerk

Approved as to form:
W. Grant Farrar, Corporation Counsel
EXHIBIT A

Legal Description

THAT PART OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 13 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN HOWARD-HARTREY SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED SEPTEMBER 1, 1993 AS DOCUMENT NO. 93696916; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 9 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 2 IN BRUMMEL PLACE SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JULY 26, 1956 AS DOCUMENT NO. 16950663; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 2 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 2; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BRUMMEL SUBDIVISION AND ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION THEREOF TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF THE CHICAGO NORTH SHORE AND MILWAUKEE RAILROAD; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE TO A POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF HARTREY AVENUE; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND SOUTHERLY EXTENSION THEREOF TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXHIBIT B

General Street Location

The proposed amendments to the Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area consist primarily of vacant industrial property located to the north of the existing Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area (and north of Brummel Place/Shure Drive) bounded by the shopping center and Howard Street on the south, Hartrey Avenue to the east, and the rail right of way to the north. The “Vineyard” property located to the west of the former Shure facility is not included.
EXHIBIT C

Map of Amended Redevelopment Project Area
Alderman Rainey moved and Alderman Kendam seconded the motion that said ordinance as presented and read by the City Clerk be adopted.

After a full discussion thereof including a public recital of the nature of the matter being considered and such other information as would inform the public of the nature of the business being conducted, the Mayor directed that the roll be called for a vote upon the motion to adopt said ordinance as read.

Upon the roll being called, the following Alderman voted AYE: Kendam, Brover, Rainey, Parrus, Teske, Wynne, Wilson

The following Alderman voted NAY: -0-

Whereupon the Mayor declared the motion carried and said ordinance adopted, approved and signed the same in open meeting and directed the City Clerk to record the same in full in the records of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, which was done.

Other business not pertinent to the adoption of said ordinance was duly transacted at the meeting.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned.

[Signature]
City Clerk
MINUTES of a public meeting of the Mayor and City Council of
the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, held at the
Evanston Civic Center, Evanston, Illinois, in said City at 9:46
o'clock P.M., on the 11th day of November, 2013.

*     *     *

The Mayor called the meeting to order and directed the City Clerk to call the roll.

Upon roll call, the following answered present: __________, the Mayor, and
Alderman: Jendern, Heaver, Rainey, Burrus, Feke,
Wynne, Wilson

The following Aldermen were absent:
Brincus, Helmes

Alderman __________ presented and the City Manager explained
an ordinance, which was laid in words and figures before the Mayor and Alderman as
follows:
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
COUNTY OF COOK  

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE AND MINUTES

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I am the duly qualified and acting City Clerk of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois (the "City"), and that as such official I am the keeper of the records and files of the Mayor and City Council of the City (the "Corporate Authorities").

I do further certify that the foregoing is a full, true and complete transcript of that portion of the minutes of the meeting of the Corporate Authorities held on the 18th day of November, 2013, insofar as same relates to the adoption of an ordinance entitled:

AN ORDINANCE of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, Designating the First Amendment to the Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area Pursuant to the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act.

a true, correct and complete copy of which said ordinance as adopted at said meeting appears in the foregoing transcript of the minutes of said meeting.

I do further certify that the deliberations of the Corporate Authorities on the adoption of said ordinance were conducted openly, that the vote on the adoption of said ordinance was taken openly, that said meeting was held at a specified time and place convenient to the public, that notice of said meeting was duly given to all of the news media requesting such notice; that an agenda for said meeting was posted at the location where said meeting was held and at the principal office of the Corporate Authorities at least 48 hours in advance of the holding of said meeting; that said agenda described or made specific reference to said ordinance; that said meeting was called and held in strict compliance with the provisions of the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois, as amended, and the Illinois Municipal Code, as amended, and that the Corporate Authorities have complied with all of the provisions of said Act and said Code and with all of the procedural rules of the Corporate Authorities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto affix my official signature and the seal of the City, this 18th day of November, 2013.

(Signature)
City Clerk

(SEAL)
122-0-13

AN ORDINANCE

Confirming Tax Increment Allocation for the First Amendment to the Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the best interest of the citizens of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois (the “City”), for the City to implement tax increment allocation financing pursuant to the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, Division 74.4 of Article 11 of the Illinois Municipal Code, as amended (the “Act”); and

WHEREAS, the City has heretofore amended a redevelopment plan and project (the “Plan” and “Project”) as required by the Act by passage of an ordinance and has heretofore amended a redevelopment project area (the “Area”) as required by the Act by the passage of an ordinance and has otherwise complied with all other conditions precedent required by the Act,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, THAT:

SECTION 1: Tax Increment Financing Confirmed. That tax increment allocation financing is hereby adopted to pay redevelopment project costs as defined in the Act and as set forth in the amended Plan and Project within the amended Area as legally described in Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference. The general street location for the amended Area is described in Exhibit B attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference.
The map of the amended Area is depicted in Exhibit C attached hereto and incorporated herein as if set out in full by this reference.

SECTION 2: Allocation of Ad Valorem Taxes. That pursuant to the Act, the ad valorem taxes, if any, arising from the levies upon taxable real property in the amended Area by taxing districts and tax rates determined in the manner provided in Section 11-74.4-9(c) of the Act each year after the effective date of this Ordinance until the Project costs and obligations issued in respect thereto have been paid shall be divided as follows:

A. That portion of taxes levied upon each taxable lot, block, tract, or parcel of real property that is attributable to the lower of the current equalized assessed value or the initial equalized assessed value of each such taxable lot, block, tract, or parcel of real property in the Area shall be allocated to and when collected shall be paid by the county collector to the respective affected taxing districts in the manner required by law in the absence of the adoption of tax increment allocation financing.

B. That portion, if any, of such taxes that is attributable to the increase in the current equalized assessed valuation of each lot, block, tract, or parcel of real property in the Area shall be allocated to and when collected shall be paid to the municipal treasurer, who shall deposit said taxes into a special fund, hereby created, and designated the "Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area Special Tax Allocation Fund" of the City and such taxes shall be used for the purpose of paying Project costs and obligations incurred in the payment thereof.

SECTION 2: Invalidity of Any Section. That if any section, paragraph, or provision of this Ordinance shall be held to be invalid or unenforceable for any reason, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3: Incorporation. The findings and recitals contained herein are declared to be prima facie evidence of the law of the City and shall be received in evidence as provided by the Illinois Compiled Statutes and courts of the State of Illinois.
SECTION 4: Superseder and Effective Date. All ordinances, resolutions, motions, or orders in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict, and this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage by the Corporate Authorities and approval as provided by law.

AYES 1  NAYS 0  ABSENT 2

Introduced: November 11, 2013
Adopted: November 11, 2013

Approved: November 13, 2013
Elizabeth B. Tisdahl, Mayor

Attest: Rodney Greene, City Clerk

Approved as to form:
W. Grant Farrar, Corporation Counsel
EXHIBIT A

Legal Description

THAT PART OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 13 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN HOWARD-HARTREY SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED SEPTEMBER 1, 1993 AS DOCUMENT NO. 83696916; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 9 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 2 IN BRUMMEL PLACE SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JULY 26, 1956 AS DOCUMENT NO. 16650683; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 2 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 2; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BRUMMEL SUBDIVISION AND ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION THEREOF TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF THE CHICAGO NORTH SHORE AND MILWAUKEE RAILROAD; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE TO A POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF HARTREY AVENUE; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND SOUTHERLY EXTENSION THEREOF TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 25; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXHIBIT B

General Street Location

The proposed amendments to the Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area consist primarily of vacant industrial property located to the north of the existing Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area (and north of Brummel Place/Shure Drive) bounded by the shopping center and Howard Street on the south, Hartrey Avenue to the east, and the rail right of way to the north. The “Vineyard” property located to the west of the former Shure facility is not included.
EXHIBIT C

Map of Amended Redevelopment Project Area
Alderman Rainey moved and Alderman Jendam seconded the motion that said ordinance as presented and read by the City Clerk be adopted.

After a full discussion thereof including a public recital of the nature of the matter being considered and such other information as would inform the public of the nature of the business being conducted, the Mayor directed that the roll be called for a vote upon the motion to adopt said ordinance as read.

Upon the roll being called, the following Alderman voted AYE: Jendam, Grover, Rainey, Burris, Fiske, Wynne, Wilson.

The following Alderman voted NAY: 0.

Whereupon the Mayor declared the motion carried and said ordinance adopted, approved and signed the same in open meeting and directed the City Clerk to record the same in full in the records of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, which was done.

Other business not pertinent to the adoption of said ordinance was duly transacted at the meeting.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned.

[Signature]  
City Clerk
MINUTES of a public meeting of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, held at the Evanston Civic Center, Evanston, Illinois, in said City at 7:40 o'clock P.M., on the [blank] day of November [blank], 2013.

* * *

The Mayor called the meeting to order and directed the City Clerk to call the roll.

Upon roll call, the following answered present: [name], the Mayor, and Alderman: Jendresen, Grover, Rainey, Burris, Teske, Wynne, Wilson.

The following Aldermen were absent:

Breathweite, Helmes

Alderman Rainey presented and the City Manager explained an ordinance, which was laid in words and figures before the Mayor and Alderman as follows:
STATE OF ILLINOIS  )
COUNTY OF COOK  ) SS

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE AND MINUTES

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I am the duly qualified and acting City Clerk of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois (the "City"), and that as such official I am the keeper of the records and files of the Mayor and City Council of the City (the "Corporate Authorities").

I do further certify that the foregoing is a full, true and complete transcript of that portion of the minutes of the meeting of the Corporate Authorities held on the 14th day of December, 2013, insofar as same relates to the adoption of an ordinance entitled:

AN ORDINANCE of the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois, Confirming Tax Increment Allocation for the First Amendment to the Howard Hartrey Redevelopment Project Area.

a true, correct and complete copy of which said ordinance as adopted at said meeting appears in the foregoing transcript of the minutes of said meeting.

I do further certify that the deliberations of the Corporate Authorities on the adoption of said ordinance were conducted openly, that the vote on the adoption of said ordinance was taken openly, that said meeting was held at a specified time and place convenient to the public, that notice of said meeting was duly given to all of the news media requesting such notice; that an agenda for said meeting was posted at the location where said meeting was held and at the principal office of the Corporate Authorities at least 48 hours in advance of the holding of said meeting; that said agenda described or made specific reference to said ordinance; that said meeting was called and held in strict compliance with the provisions of the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois, as amended, and the Illinois Municipal Code, as amended, and that the Corporate Authorities have complied with all of the provisions of said Act and said Code and with all of the procedural rules of the Corporate Authorities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto affix my official signature and the seal of the City, this 14th day of December, 2013.

[Signature]
City Clerk

(SEAL)
DRAFT – NOT APPROVED

TIF Joint Review Board
Meeting Minutes
December 5, 2013

Attendees:

Board Members:  Kathy Zalewski - School District 65, Ald. Ann Rainey – City of Evanston, Bill Stafford - District 202, Brian Rosinksy - Ridgeville Park District, Valerie Kretchmer - Member at Large

Board Members Absent:  Carolyn Dellutri - Downtown Evanston, Bob Novak - Oakton Community College, Larry Kaufman - Member at Large, Richard Kwasneski - PAGE, Margaret Lee – Oakton Community College, Kathleen Therese Meany - Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, Robert Berry- North Shore Mosquito Abatement, Mayor Tisdahl – City of Evanston

City Staff:  Johanna Nyden, Martin Lyons, Cindy Plante, Janella Hardin

Others in Attendance:  Bob Rychlicki – Kane McKenna

I. Call to Order by Ald. Ann Rainey, Chair
Chair Ann Rainey called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

II. Approval of Joint Review Board Meeting Minutes of February 21, 2013
Bill Stafford of School District 202, motioned to approve the minutes from February 21, 2013.

The minutes from February 21, 2013 were approved unanimously 4-0.

Johanna Nyden, Economic Development Division Manager, distributed maps to the committee and gave a brief overview of the five TIF districts.

- Chicago Main TIF was established in 2012 (not presented).
- Howard Hartrey TIF was expanded to include 222 Hartrey; Autobarn, located on Chicago Ave is interested in relocating their operations to that property.
- Southwest TIF will close soon; Major activity in this district is Ward Manufacturing.
- West Evanston has included small façade projects; The increment has not grown quickly.
- Downtown TIF completed street improvements; In 2013, the Music Institute of Chicago relocated to 1702 Sherman.
- Howard Ridge TIF borders the south end of Evanston; The City has purchased several properties along Howard Street to rehab in an effort to bring new businesses to Evanston; Peckish Pig, 623 Howard, a restaurant and Evanston's first brewpub will be opening later this month; The property was
purchased using funds that will be paid by to the TIF in increments. Funds from
the TIF are being used for rehab and to bring the building up to code; When the
owners of Peckish Pig purchase the property from the City all the funds used to
pay for the property as well as the rehab will be recouped.

Assistant City Manager Marty Lyons provided a consolidated summary of each TIF,
including projected activity and summary of revenues.

A. Southwest TIF District #2

Marty Lyons provided an executive summary to the Joint Review Board detailing
the revenue and assessed value for each of the TIF Distincts. He brought the
Board's attention to page 19 of the report. He stated that the Southwest TIF District
will terminate in October 2014.

At Ald. Rainey's request, Mr. Lyons confirmed the boundaries of this TIF are
Main/Oakton/McCormick/Dodge. This district includes Ward Manufacturing and
Sam's Club. The TIF went negative to complete the Ward Manufacturing project.
There were not many distributions because the TIF began with a negative balance.
He explained that the TIF is now positive, stable and active. There is one potential
capital project scheduled in 2014 that would encompass the $304,000 in the
balance plus an additional increment of $450,000. Any distributions at the close of
this TIF will be nominal.

Ald. Rainey thought a report from Ward Manufacturing would be helpful in
understanding how they have prospered from this TIF. Ms. Nyden suggested a
tour of the facility.

Mr. Lyons added that the TIF's Equalized Assessed Value has increased from $1
million to $7 million. There are no anticipated changes in value. Ald. Rainey noted
the community is well developed even with the lack of signage.

Mr. Lyons will provide "dates terminated" and "dates to be terminated" for the cover
page of the report in the future. At Mr. Stafford's inquiry, Mr. Lyons confirmed that
all efforts will be made to ensure that all necessary documentation is on file and
the notification is made earlier notification regarding the dissolution of the TIFs.

Mr. Lyons noted that Arlington Heights sued Cook County after closing a TIF and
receiving a bill for a $250,000 refund that happened within the TIF. The City of
Evanston took the opposite position after being charged $180,000 for the
Downtown TIF. The City had been paying down debt on the City's parking garages
using TIF funds. We received a notice from the County 3 days ago and is being
reviewed by Legal.

Mary Gavin, Evanston Roundtable, asked if the school districts will receive a
distribution from the Southwest TIF like they did in the past. Mr. Lyons explained
that the agreement expired. In the last year, $1 million in surplus distributions were
split between all taxing bodies from the Howard Hartrey TIF.
B. Howard Hartrey TIF District #3

The beginning balance as of January 1, 2012 was $5,000,873, expenditures of $1,882,296, for an ending balance as of December 31, 2012 of $4,245,639. Mr. Lyons noted that the boundaries of the TIF have changed. There is also a new development in process with a total value in excess of $10 million, which will be calculated into the assessed value for the remainder of the TIF.

Mr. Stafford thinks this will be a win/win for everyone involved. This TIF will become more valuable and add to the pie for the taxing bodies.

Ald. Rainey clarified that this project includes the shopping center on Howard that houses the Jewel, Best Buy, Target and Office Max. She added that there has never been a vacancy there.

Mr. Lyons confirmed the boundaries of the TIF are Howard/Hartrey/canal. He informed the group of the expansion of the Autobarn auto maintenance and detailing business from the Chicago Ave location. They would bring all of their stock to this area and potentially bring other dealerships into Evanston.

Mr. Stafford added that District 202 has a wonderful relationship with Autobarn. Three of their graduates work as mechanics there. They also host an internship program for students and donated cars to the district’s auto shop classes.

Autobarn confirmed that this opportunity with enhance training for the school districts. They will also hire 30 new employees for the expansion.

Mr. Lyons explained there are still some refinanced 2008D bonds left from the original bond issue. Ald. Rainey reminded the group that bonding in advance is a great way to jumpstart a TIF district.

The TIF started in 1992 starting with $7,034,353 and grew to $21,866,716 as of December 31, 2012. Mr. Lyons also noted page 24, which shows a $1 million surplus.

C. Washington National TIF #4

Mr. Lyons confirmed the boundaries of the Washington National TIF are Church/Davis/Chicago/Elmwood. The fund balance as of December 31, 2012 was $7,291,304.

The Davis Street construction is being partially financed by this TIF. A balance decrease is expected for 2013, which includes $3.7 million in bond payments for Sherman Garage. A transfer is made from the TIF to the Parking Fund where the asset is. The Parking Fund then pays off the bond.

At Ald. Rainey’s inquiry, Mr. Stafford explained that under the TIF Act sales tax generated from businesses within the TIF district can be accessed to reimburse the City.
Ald. Rainey requested reporting sales tax increments generated in districts that have never reported in the past.

Ms. Kretchmer asked about the potential of future developments that could increase the estimated assessed value during the term of the TIF. Ms. Nyden responded that it is unlikely since this TIF is scheduled to terminate in 2018. The Chicago/Main development is scheduled to open and operate in late 2015 or early 2016. The best case scenario is that the assessor would reassess with one year left before the TIF expires.

At Ms. Kretchmer's inquiry, Ms. Nyden explained that the space that used to house the Walgreens is fully leased with a daycare, Naf Naf Grill and a hair salon is relocating to that space. Lyfe Kitchen is relocating to the rotunda.

Mr. Lyons explained that there will still be funds here. The increment is approximately $-$5 million. This TIF was hit by a downward reassessment with its value dropping to $85,241,864 from close to $100 million. We are awaiting a June/July report from the County with a new assessed value.

**D. Howard Ridge TIF District #5**

This TIF is bordered by Howard and Ridge. The balance is $1,055,510 with some debt in the form of a line of credit with First Bank & Trust. The 2012 expenses included a property tax reimbursement for 415 Howard. This development was substantially reassessed downward, which lowered the property taxes from $600,000 to $300,000.

Ald. Rainey asked if the reassessment was based on formula reassessments or if it was based on vacancies. Mr. Lyons agreed to inquire and confirm. The development has confirmed it is 100% occupied.

Ms. Nyden discussed the new developments west of Chicago Ave. There are a few smaller projects in process, including some property acquisition. Ald. Rainey noted that once the properties are rented or sold we will receive reimbursements.

Ms. Nyden confirmed that the cocktail lounge has completed 1 1/2 years of a 3 year lease-to-own portion of a 5 year deal. They will purchase the property in a year and a half. If they choose not to purchase the property between years 3 and 5, the City can sell it to someone else as an investment property.

Peckish Pig has a 7 year lease-to-own deal, which includes 18 months of free rent. After 18 months, payments will ramp up toward the eventual purchase of the property. They will pay back every penny invested.

Ms. Nyden confirmed that Ward Eight has never missed a payment on any of their loans. They have paid rent since June of last year that goes to Community Development. There is a commercial portion that goes to a fund backed by the TIF. They have also been repaying a $30,000 loan for equipment through the Community Development Block Grant since January 1, 2013. Ald. Rainey stated that despite community outcry, Ward Eight will not fail.
E. West Evanston TIF District #6

Mr. Lyons explained that this TIF contributed $600,000 to the Emerson Square residential development. It is currently a short-term line of credit with First Bank and Trust, which is still paying under 2% interest. The current balance is $872,847 with $600,000 as a loan.

The TIF will have a negative increment next year. The highest increment in this TIF was $450,000. The beginning EAV for the TIF area was $37 million and is now $45 million.

There are a variety of deals in the works at Church at Dodge and property east of Dodge. The West Evanston plan will be revisited with Alds. Holmes and Braithwaite. We are awaiting the June/July report from the County with a new assessed value.

At Ms. Kretchmer's inquiry, Ms. Nyden discussed the west side plan implementation. Autobarn has been leasing a portion of the Robinson lot. Once they move to 222 Hartrey, it will set into motion a number of things. There is a plan in place when things become available for redevelopment.

From District 202's point of view, Mr. Stafford feels that West Evanston TIF is very important. It is viewed as a partnership with the City and is well positioned for the future.

Mr. Lyons stated that there is still 16 years left in this TIF. Most of the TIF property is a lot or the right-of-way, which means less demolition and more remediation.

Mr. Lyons thanked First Bank & Trust for stepping up and agreeing to extend a line of credit when the County was late with property taxes.

At Ms. Kretchmer's inquiry, Mr. Rychlicki explained that the TIFs are doing very well compared to other west suburban towns. Overall, these TIFs have done better in Cook County wise than others. Potential issues could arise from the newer TIFs. However, they do not have a lot of debt.

Mr. Lyons explained that the Downtown TIF is a visible success. It is a huge community center.

Ald. Rainey asked if there will be an assessment for the children of the Emerson Square schools. Mr. Rychlicki explained that there must be a redevelopment agreement on file. Mr. Lyons will confirm the assessment due to the funds from the West Evanston TIF in support of the Emerson Square project.

Mr. Stafford motioned to accept the annual report; seconded by Ms. Kretchmer. Vote called and taken.

IV. Adjournment

Mr. Stafford motioned to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Kretchmer. Meeting adjourned at 11:26 a.m.
INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE

To the Honorable Elizabeth B. Tisdahl, Mayor and
   Members of the City Council
Evanston, Illinois

We have audited the basic financial statements of the City of Evanston, Illinois, as of and for the year ended December 31, 2013, and have issued our report thereon dated July 2, 2014. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America.

Compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to the City of Evanston is the responsibility of the City of Evanston's management. As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatements, we performed tests of the City of Evanston's compliance with provisions in Subsection (q) of Section 11-74.4-3 of Public Act 85-1142, "An Act in Relation to Tax Increment Financing", noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of the financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the City Council, management, the State of Illinois, and others within the City and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than the specified parties.

Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP
Oak Brook, Illinois
July 2, 2014
CITY OF EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

Nonmajor Governmental Funds

Combining Balance Sheet - Continued
As of December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>General Assistance</th>
<th>Total Township Funds</th>
<th>Total Special Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and equivalents</td>
<td>$186,989</td>
<td>$439,115</td>
<td>$626,104</td>
<td>$6,823,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>363,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes (net of allowance)</td>
<td>246,331</td>
<td>886,553</td>
<td>1,132,884</td>
<td>1,502,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current year levy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,781,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(90,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>938,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assessments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,543</td>
<td>50,543</td>
<td>528,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid items</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other governments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$433,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,390,657</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,823,977</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,988,627</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liabilities and Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>General Assistance</th>
<th>Total Township Funds</th>
<th>Total Special Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers payable</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$49,100</td>
<td>$52,913</td>
<td>$480,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other governments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other funds</td>
<td>14,446</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,446</td>
<td>283,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,259</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,359</strong></td>
<td><strong>768,575</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deferred Inflows of Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property taxes</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>General Assistance</th>
<th>Total Township Funds</th>
<th>Total Special Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>200,033</td>
<td>751,063</td>
<td>951,096</td>
<td>1,612,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspendable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,312,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency telephone system</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,220,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD approved projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,309,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,600,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>754,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships</td>
<td>215,028</td>
<td>539,951</td>
<td>754,979</td>
<td>754,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed - Economic Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,507,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(149,335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned (deficit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(149,335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balances (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td><strong>215,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>590,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>855,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,607,427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Liabilities, Deferred Inflows and Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>General Assistance</th>
<th>Total Township Funds</th>
<th>Total Special Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$433,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,390,657</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,823,977</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,988,627</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Service</td>
<td>District No.5</td>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>Increment District</td>
<td>Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>43,578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>43,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartrey</td>
<td>4,041,414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>$5,225,867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>$183,302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge</td>
<td>$552,639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>$10,089,874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Debt</td>
<td>$436,605</td>
<td>$480,767</td>
<td>$1,106,614</td>
<td>$4,435,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$850,183</td>
<td>$813,841</td>
<td>$5,148,028</td>
<td>$9,661,515</td>
<td>$845,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$595,826</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$375,298</td>
<td>$469,124</td>
<td>$1,090,980</td>
<td>$4,028,248</td>
<td>$455,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$474,885</td>
<td>$344,717</td>
<td>$3,357,048</td>
<td>$5,037,441</td>
<td>$388,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$474,885</td>
<td>$344,717</td>
<td>$3,357,048</td>
<td>$5,037,441</td>
<td>$388,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$850,183</td>
<td>$813,841</td>
<td>$5,148,028</td>
<td>$9,661,515</td>
<td>$845,282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
## CITY OF E Evanston, Illinois

### Nonmajor Governmental Funds

#### Combining Statements of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances - Continued

For the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2013 and Twenty One Months ended December 31, 2013

for City and Township respectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Revenue</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>General Assistance</th>
<th>Total Township Funds</th>
<th>Total Special Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$503,694</td>
<td>$1,555,480</td>
<td>$2,059,174</td>
<td>$5,250,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>12,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,595</td>
<td>50,595</td>
<td>366,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>503,993</td>
<td>1,607,224</td>
<td>2,111,217</td>
<td>14,209,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General management and support</td>
<td>648,807</td>
<td>2,535,983</td>
<td>3,184,790</td>
<td>3,184,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>922,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>972,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and economic development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,054,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital outlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>648,807</td>
<td>2,535,983</td>
<td>3,184,790</td>
<td>11,133,914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues</th>
<th>Over (Under) Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(144,814)</td>
<td>(928,759)</td>
<td>(1,073,573)</td>
<td>3,075,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Financing Sources (Uses)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of debt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premiums and discount</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in (out)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,523,271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Obligation Debt Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Ridge Tax Increment District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Parking System</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,474,771)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Net Change in Fund Balances | (144,814) | (928,759) | (1,073,573) | 1,600,728 |
| Fund Balances (Deficit) - Beginning | 359,842 | 1,519,253 | 1,879,095 | 14,006,699 |
| Fund Balances (Deficit) - Ending | $215,028 | $590,494 | $805,522 | $15,607,427 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Service District No. 5</th>
<th>Southwest Tax Increment District</th>
<th>Howard Hartrey Tax Increment District</th>
<th>Washington National Tax Increment District</th>
<th>Howard Ridge Tax Increment District</th>
<th>West Evanston Tax Increment District</th>
<th>Total Debt Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 460,062</td>
<td>$ 492,410</td>
<td>$ 1,122,248</td>
<td>$ 4,488,658</td>
<td>$ 194,881</td>
<td>$ 46,252</td>
<td>$ 6,804,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14,087</td>
<td>13,072</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>28,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460,647</td>
<td>492,412</td>
<td>1,136,335</td>
<td>4,501,730</td>
<td>228,239</td>
<td>46,419</td>
<td>6,865,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 340,000</td>
<td>$ 645,000</td>
<td>$ 425,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7,274</td>
<td>$ 240,076</td>
<td>$ 1,410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78,816</td>
<td>$ 75,611</td>
<td>$ 78,375</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 240,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 418,816</td>
<td>423,134</td>
<td>1,880,526</td>
<td>2,793,243</td>
<td>726,232</td>
<td>321,627</td>
<td>5,653,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,831</td>
<td>69,278</td>
<td>(744,191)</td>
<td>1,708,487</td>
<td>(497,993)</td>
<td>(275,208)</td>
<td>302,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29,500)</td>
<td>(144,400)</td>
<td>(331,000)</td>
<td>(120,400)</td>
<td>(60,000)</td>
<td>(685,300)</td>
<td>(685,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(48,500)</td>
<td>(48,500)</td>
<td>(48,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>(29,500)</td>
<td>(144,400)</td>
<td>(3,562,350)</td>
<td>(168,900)</td>
<td>(60,000)</td>
<td>(4,365,150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,831</td>
<td>39,778</td>
<td>(888,591)</td>
<td>(2,253,863)</td>
<td>(666,893)</td>
<td>(335,208)</td>
<td>(4,062,946)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433,054</td>
<td>304,939</td>
<td>4,245,639</td>
<td>7,291,304</td>
<td>1,055,510</td>
<td>872,847</td>
<td>14,203,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 474,885                        $ 344,717                          $ 3,357,048                          $ 5,037,441                          $ 388,617                        $ 537,639                          $ 10,140,347

Continued