



11333 N. Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53092
Phone: 262-236-2902
Fax: 262-242-9655

www.ci.mequon.wi.us

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD
Tuesday, September 24, 2024
8:00 AM
North Conference Room

Minutes

1) Call to Order, Roll Call

Present:

Chair Timothy Carr
Alderman William Gebhardt
Board Member Colin Boyd
Board Member Daniel Gannon
Board Member Michael Kramer
Board Member Tracy Johnson
Board Member Jeff McLean
Board Member Inge Plautz
Alt. Board Member Dennis Engel -- **Absent**

Chairman Carr called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from June 25, 2024

Action

Board member Gannon made a motion to approve the June 25, 2024, meeting minutes.
Board member McLean seconded the motion.
A voice vote was taken; vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	Approved [Unanimous]
MOVED BY:	Board Member Gannon
SECONDED BY:	Board Member McLean
AYES:	Carr, Gebhardt, Boyd, Gannon, Kramer, Johnson, McLean, Plautz
ABSENT:	Engel

3) Approving a Development Agreement Amendment

Approving a Development Agreement Amendment related to ownership from Blue Ribbon Storage to Extra Space Properties Two LLC for the TID No. 5 incentive for the Life Storage development located at 10448 N. Port Washington Road.

Director Kim Tollefson stated that because the development agreement (“DA”) is tied specifically to the owners it needs to be amended to reflect the new ownership. The project as well as the development team is in compliance with all the regulations of the DA. A partial incentive was issued last year and just a few weeks ago the first full incentive payment was issued. Staff recommends the modification of the DA and DA Amendment.

The applicant, Michael Kelly from Blue Ribbon Storage explained that they are selling the property to Extra Space (formally Life Storage). They are the current manager of the property and they are the largest storage company in the country.

Action

Board member Johnson made a motion to approve the modification to the DA.

Board member Kramer seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	Approved[Unanimous]
MOVED BY:	Board Member Johnson
SECONDED BY:	Board Member Kramer
AYES:	Carr, Gebhardt, Boyd, Gannon, Kramer, Johnson, McLean, Plautz
ABSENT:	Engel

4) SW Industrial sewer analysis

Director of Public Works/City Engineer Kristen Lundeen stated that the analysis was structured to have various stop points so that the city could review and make policy decisions as needed before moving forward. This is a stop point as two steps have been completed to date and the next steps would include:

1. Define how the area could be served with sewer or identify areas that could not be served by sewer.
2. Go through the various options of constructing the infrastructure and paying for it.
 - Structure of the policy of how it would be served. The city operates on a build and contribute basis where each developer is responsible for installing the utilities and on acceptance dedicating those utilities back to the city.

She explained that at this location, the upstream properties are at a disadvantage because they would have a significantly higher cost than the rest of the properties.

She stated that the study indicates that there is a portion of the area that can only be serviced by a lift station, which also puts those properties at a disadvantage from a cost perspective. This leads to a policy discussion as to whether there would be an equal cost distribution across all the properties in the area.

The technical memo included in the packet does conclude that there is sufficient planned capacity in the city sewer service area. There is limitation of the flow, so expansion of the

flow would eat into the capacity to service other areas, so the policy decisions would be regarding whether this is the area of the city to dedicate that flow capacity.

Dir. Lundeen explained that the map included in the packet shows that the majority of the study area can be served by gravity, which is usually more economical than serving with a lift station and forced main.

She commented that the next conversation would focus on the varying options of the physical path of the sewer. Connection points were identified and confirmed that the connection point can be met. Additionally, further steps can be taken in the analysis as it relates to zoning decisions and to how public sewer would be served.

There was discussion amongst the Board regarding the technical findings. Dir. Lundeen offered that it does not need to be an all or nothing decision as a smaller subset could be the only area included as there are capital fees and real costs to the property owners whether they connect to sewer or not if they are included in a designated sewer service area.

Director Tollefson agreed that it would be a good opportunity to check in with the property owners in the study area to see whether anything has changed in interest or plans for their properties since her conversations with them a year ago. She commented that the property owner feedback does not need to be the whole basis driving the decision going forward. She stated that the next steps of the analysis are related to cost estimates and these findings as well as property owner interest will be considered; multiple variables will be evaluated and included in the decision making.

Dir. Tollefson answered that the next steps would be:

- To look at the master plan for the facilities.
- Do some cost estimates of both the infrastructure and the potential value of what development might be.
- The sizing of the pipe, the depth of the pipe and the route need to be decided.
- The Common Council would decide about the mechanism to best serve the area. They would need all the data before making a decision.

There was consensus among the Board to move forward with the next steps of the analysis

Action

Board member Plautz made a motion to move forward with the next steps of the analysis.

Board member Kramer seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	Approved [Unanimous]
MOVED BY:	Board member Plautz
SEONDED BY:	Board member Kramer
AYES:	Carr, Gebhardt, Boyd, Gannon, Kramer, Johnson, McLean, Plautz
ABSENT:	Engel

5) Port Washington Road Market Analysis Update

Assistant Director Jac Zader stated that the market analysis is getting close to completion. The Phase 2 report was included in the Board packet. The final report will be presented to the Common Council in either October or November. He explained that there is a lot of data provided; much of it was anticipated, but there are a few surprises. One example is the total number of visits (packet page 51). The Gap Analysis was not a surprise as many of the services/industries listed have not been a desired/allowed use in the city. He concluded that Staff are reviewing the recommendations.

Dir. Tollefson stated that Staff does not want to sway the consultant's recommendations but want to ensure that the analysis addresses as many options as possible. She talked about some of the areas that the consultant has been directed to look at and Staff hope to best leverage her input with the Council. Although the corridor appears to be performing better than may be publicly perceived, Staff want to ensure the analysis provides meaningful recommendations.

The Board discussed the analysis data provided and the steps that the consultant has already taken in collecting the data. The Board was encouraged to send any additional feedback to Dir. Tollefson.

Asst. Dir. Zader shared with the Board that the Planning Commission had done an architectural design survey of 19 properties in the city; mostly redeveloped properties that have been built in the past 10 years. He stated that there is basically no census from the Commission, which makes it difficult to create design guidelines.

6) Staff Updates

Staff gave an update of recently approved developments from the previous evening's Planning Commission meeting and there was some discussion and questions to Staff from the Board about various projects and developments.

7) Announcements

The Board discussed rescheduling the next meeting from October 22nd to October 29th. Staff will send an email to the Board to poll the members regarding their availability and whether a quorum can be achieved for an October 29th meeting.

8) Adjourn

Action

Board member Johnson made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Board member McLean seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; vote passed (8-0)

The meeting concluded at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Tollefson

Director of Community Development