# INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD <br> MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES SUMMARY <br> John P. Franklin Sr. City Council Building <br> Chattanooga, Tennessee <br> for <br> January 18, 2023 <br> 11:00 AM 

## SUMMARY

Present were Jimmy F. Rodgers, Jr. (Chair), Althea Jones (Vice-Chair), Patrick Sharpley (Secretary), Gordon Parker (Assistant Secretary), Ray Adkins, and Jim Floyd. Absent was Kerry Hayes. Also Present were: Attorney for the Board, Phillip A. Noblett; Helen Burns Sharp (ATM); Jason Payne (City Engineering); Janice Gooden, Joseph Paden, and Michael Gilliard (CALEB); Gail Hart (Real Property); Paul Boylan; Mike Pare (Times Free Press); Mark Mamantov (Bass Berry \& Sims); and Jermaine Freeman (Economic Development).

Chairman Rodgers called the meeting to order, established that the meeting was duly advertised, and a quorum was present with six board members to conduct business.

MINUTES SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT - December 5, 2022, meeting - Adkins/ParkerUnanimously Approved.

## PUBLIC HEARING AND COMMENTS

- Jermaine Freeman and Mark Mamantov gave a summary of TIF policies and procedures changes.
- Helen Burns Sharp (ATM) gave her comments regarding not adopting the resolution on the agenda today and coming back at another meeting. Topics included were school taxes, stormwater fee policy, Application Review Committee, Third Party Review, Maximum Percentage of Project Cost, and City-Initiated TIF.
- Janice Gooden (CALEB) spoke regarding a Community Benefits Agreement.
- Michael Gilliard (CALEB) would be happy to work on a proposal for the Community Benefits Agreement.
- Joseph Paden (CALEB) spoke about Third Party Review, transparency, economic justice, and equity issues.


## RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING TAX INCREMENT FINANCING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, A COPY OF WHICH IS SUBSTANTIALLY ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF BY REFERENCE - Request to postpone discussion to March meeting and request to come back with redline and changes. Topics of changes discussed were Third Party Review, Application Review Committee, and value of incentive and guardrails.

## OTHER BUSINESS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR THE MARCH AGENDA

- Bylaws
- Website
- HomeServe e-mail
- PILOT policies and procedures

After further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 12:40 PM.


APPROVED:


# INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD OF THE CITY OF CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2023 @ 11:00 A.M. 

## BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

JIMMY F. RODGERS, JR., Chair RAY ADKINS
JAMES FLOYD
ALTHEA JONES, Vice Chair GORDON PARKER, Assistant Secretary

PATRICK SHARPLEY, Secretary

## ALSO PRESENT:

JERMAINE FREEMAN, City Economic Development Officer
MIKE GILLILAND, Community Organizer, CALEB JANICE GOODEN, Economic Mobility Task Force, CALEB G. MARK MAMANTOV, Attorney, Bass, Berry \& Sims MARIA MANALLA, City Attorney's Office, Legal Asst. PHILLIP A. NOBLETT, Deputy City Attorney
JOSEPH PADEN, Economic Mobility Task Force, CALEB
HELEN BURNS SHARP, Founder, ATM HARRY VELA, City Information Technology

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Good morning, everyone.
It's time to get started here, so I'm going to call this meeting of the Industrial Development Board to order. We have five members here present, so we just have a quorum. We do have a quorum. And the meeting has been duly advertised. Mr. Noblett, do you agree?

MR. NOBLETT: Yes, sir, it has.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right. Thank you very much. A11 right. Everybody has been sent out the minutes from the City Attorney's Office. Maria and Phil, thank you for those. Were there any changes or problems with those minutes?

MR. ADKINS: Move they be approved.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Motion for approva1.

MR. PARKER: Second.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: And second. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 in favor, say aye.
(Unanimous response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGER: A11 oppose?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: The ayes have it. If there is anyone here that would like to address the board
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on any matter, other than the TIF policies and procedures, you're welcome to come up to the podium now, state your name and your address, if you would.

If you are here to talk about the TIF policies and procedures, please hold off on that for a moment.

> Anyone? Anyone?
> (No response.)
> CHAIRMAN RODGERS: All right. We will move on to the next item, which is the Tax Increment Financing Policies and Procedures. We have a version for the board that, as I understand it, the version we have for consideration is the version that was passed by the City Council on November 29, 2022. Is that correct, Mr. Noblett?

MR. NOBLETT: Yes, sir, it was.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. And I have sent out by email a copy of the state statute pertaining to TIF policies and procedures in part. It's T.C.A. 9-23-101 through Section 108, and specifically drawing my fellow board members' attention to Section 107 and the definitions in 102, and the reason I did that for my fellow board members was because I want you guys to understand, for all of us to understand, that what we are being presented from City Council is a proposal that they
have adopted. But we are a partner in this process. We are not a subsidiary. We are our own public corporation, and so we have a process. We are partners here.

So this version that is in front of us for consideration certainly can be amended by us, if we so choose. That does not mean the Council will agree with what we're amending, but there is a process here, a back-and-forth, if need be. So please keep that in mind as we move forward.
(Whereupon, Ms. Jones enters the council
room.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mr. Noblett, do you disagree with me, there?

MR. NOBLETT: This is a separate board under state law that's entitled to adopt its procedures in that regard. It makes it a little difficult at times whenever the City Council is funding you and has different processes in that regard, so y'all will have to live up with how you get your funding as well.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay.
MR. NOBLETT: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Thank you. Al1 right.
Does any of the -- good morning, Althea -- does any of the board members want to make any comments here before we open it up to others for comment about the proposal
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that came from the City Council?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: All right. Seeing none, who would like to speak first here? Is there someone from the City or -- I know we have got some folks from the public who would like to speak. Jermaine, were you prepared to go at this point?

MR. FREEMAN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right.
MR. FREEMAN: Jermaine Freeman, Economic Development for the City of Chattanooga. I'm joined today by our externa1 TIF counse1, Mr. Mark Mamantov, who helped us to draft the revisions to the TIF policies that the City Council approved.

You know, we really feel like, from the City's perspective, that we have come to and create a proposal that is much stronger than the previous TIF policy that was adopted in 2015. It is the City's new policy, and I will just sort of go through some slides that I showed you last month before the holiday break.

So let me back up here and just sort of go through the slides. The original TIF policy was adopted in 2015 to provide more transparency to the application process for TIFs.

MR. ADKINS: We're not getting it on our
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screens here.
MR. FREEMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Harry?
MR. VELA: A11 right. Just one second.
There we go.
MR. FREEMAN: A11 right. You all are able to see it now.

At that time, there had only been one TIF approved by the City and the IDB. Since the policy was passed in 2015, the City and the IDB have approved four TIFs.

This is kind of a re-edited slide of the TIFs that have been approved. The first TIF, of course, was approved prior to the adoption of any policies. That's the Black Creek TIF that was approved back in 2012 under the Littlefield administration.

Then the M.L. King Extension TIF, which provided access to the riverfront for West M.L. King Boulevard, that was approved by the Berke -- that was under the Berke administration in 2018, followed by the East Chattanooga Rising TIF which created Hardy Street extension, that was approved under the Berke administration in 2019.

And then, in 2022, there were two TIFs that were approved under the Kelly administration: The North River Commerce Center and the South Broad Project for the
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stadium.
As you can see from the slides, all of the TIFs -- three of the five TIFs are TIFs with 20-year time frames. The M.L. King Extension is a TIF that is 15 years in duration. And, of course, the South Broad District for the stadium is a 30 -year TIF, which the City was able to get special comptroller approval from the state.

So we wanted to really sort of set out in the process to improve Chattanooga's TIF policy. We wanted it to be better aligned with the state's IDB statute. We wanted more clarity and predictability for applicants. But we also wanted to increase the protections and tools for the City and the IDB, which is why we set out to go about sort of beefing up the policy.

So the summary of changes are -- again, we really wanted to align the local policy with the state's IDB statute -- we increased the application fee from $\$ 1,500$ to $\$ 8,000$. We increased the annual administrative service fee from 25 basis points to 250 basis points.

We inserted language to ensure that all applicants are aware that stormwater fees must be paid. We increased coordination with county government, as well as the IDB Chair, to schedule public hearings.

We inserted stronger language pertaining to
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the but-for requirement. We inserted language for the ability of the City and the IDB to hire consultants to analyze the request.

And then we added language requiring applicants to disclose any felony or criminal convictions, civil proceedings, and past bankruptcies.

This is sort of a comparison,
compare-and-contrast. So, the 2015 policy, the maximum term of a TIF was 15 years, but there was language that allows you to do 20 years under certain circumstances. We took that out and just put 20 years because that's in line with the state statute.

The application fee increased from \$1,500 to \$8,000, as I mentioned before. Also, as I previously mentioned, the annual administration fee increased from 0.25 percent to 2.5 percent of the increment available to the IDB.

Legal disclosures and stormwater fee language were not present in the 2015 policy, so we added them into the new policy. And then we took the but-for language that's in the application that was adopted in 2015 and actually inserted that language into the actual policy that City Council adopted on November 29. So that's kind of the running summary.

The redlines that we presented were redlines
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that captured a majority of the changes that we were seeking. As Mark and I got into really trying to develop and edit and craft policies that were beneficial, we realized that this was going to require a much deeper dive, I think, than we had originally anticipated, which is good.

And so the redlines that we provided don't capture every single edit or redline that the City Council adopted, but it does capture the bulk of them and captures the spirit of what we're trying to do.

And so, with that, Mark, do you have anything that you want to add?

MR. MAMANTOV: The only thing I would add is really minor. The original policies, I don't think we could locate a work version, and so they were scanned in PDF. So the original version was almost impossible to redline against. I could try to recreate that, if you want, but I'm glad to highlight this and then go through any of the -- I'm familiar enough and I know that -- I was just talking with Helen, and she also picked up on some of the key issues. And I had discussed it. And, Chairman Rodgers, you raised some issues the last time I was here, and I discussed some of those points as well.

I've worked on these types of policies across the state. And so I made a lot of different ram --
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ramification isn't the right word, but just different approaches to this. But I agree with your initial statement. As you saw the TIF Uniformity Act Mr. Chairman referred to, generally -- I encourage that that be included in that statute, that it makes clear that both the City and the IDB work together and adopt policies to do this because, without this policy, we were getting a lot of questions that are not addressed by the statute.

So these types of policies were intended to fill up the gaps that the state law does not provide. So it's really helpful when you have this process.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mark, if I may, I want to ask you: One thing that still troubles me, and I know this was discussed at our last meeting, but I want you to follow up on it again, if only as a reminder to me, and that is, from your experience dealing with other municipalities and governmental entities, is it common for TIF policies like this to have separate procedures or requirements when the applicant is a private developer versus when it is the governmental entity itself, as this proposal does?

MR. MAMANTOV: There is not a ton of these policies across the state, maybe I've seen 20 of them. I would say most of them do carve out public projects
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initiated by the governing body where they come to you and say, "This is an important public project that we are asking your support on," and, therefore, often some of the requirements relative to the "but-for" tests and sort of the 15-percent limit, which I discussed a comment that Helen had, may not be relevant for that type of thing.

So I would say the majority of the ones that I have seen do carve that out. Is it required by state law? No. It's just that most civically-driven projects have a somewhat unique story behind them or purpose, and so they often don't fit well within some of the polices that they needed to.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay.
MR. FREEMAN: I would also just add as a follow-up, if I may, that the carveout for the City was already in the 2015 policy; we just kept it the same. So we chose not to change it. But that was already something that was already in the 2015 policy that was adopted by the City Council.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Freeman or Mr. Mamantov?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Seeing none, is there anyone else that wants to address the board on these proposed policies?
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MS. SHARP: (Indicating.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Ms. Sharp?
MS. SHARP: Do I need to touch anything, or am I already on?

MR. NOBLETT: You're on.
MS. SHARP: My name is Helen Burns Sharp. I'm speaking on behalf of Accountability for Taxpayer Money. ATM is a public-interest advocacy group that focuses on tax incentives and government transparency.

The TIF policies and procedures on your agenda today is the version passed by City Council on November 29. City Council did not hold a public hearing, nor did it have the benefit of your deliberation and recommendation.

ATM recommends that the IDB today not adopt the resolution on your agenda with the Council November policies, but instead take public testimony, deliberate, and then forward a recommendation to Council that they consider any changes recommended below that you like plus any other changes you identify.

Council could consider your recommendation and likely adopt a new resolution that reflects some or all of your suggestions. That version will then come back to you at a future meeting as a resolution for adoption.
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I think, as Jermaine says, I think this is an improvement. I think there's a lot to like about this new version relative to 2015. But there are some comments I would suggest that you take a look at and consider perhaps forwarding to Council.

Number one, make it clear that an applicant must pay school taxes in full. This has been an unwritten policy forever that's never been written down. There is an opportunity to do that.

Secondly, yes, there is now wording on the stormwater fee, which is great, but we need to add a sentence, I believe, to make clear that the required stormwater fees may not be deducted from the school taxes. This happened on Volkswagen. They paid the school taxes, but they said, "We really don't want to pay a stormwater fee, so if you want a stormwater fee, deduct it from our education taxes." We don't need for that to happen in the future, in my opinion.

Modify wording in the Application Review Committee process to increase the size of the committee from five to seven and designate the IDB to make the two new appointments. Currently, the Mayor appoints two, the Council appoints two, and the Chamber has an automatic seat.

Number five, delete references to maximum
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percentage of project costs in the heading and text in Policy 4.6. Including in a 15 percent maximum in the policies may lead to a perception among future applicants that they will automatically get a 15 percent taxpayer subsidy. Better to address the maximum issue with the new third-party review policy. It might be less than 15 percent. And in rare cases, it might even be more than 15 percent.

Number six, interesting about this, the City initiated it. Yes, it was in the 2015 policies. It was very interesting that whoever did the City's policies, we basically copied Knox County's policies. And Knox County did not have this carveout, but someone with the City added that in and said the City didn't have to follow the process if they didn't want to. So, yes, it was part of the 2015, but it sort of has an interesting history.

The reason that I believe that we -- clearly, it could be worded in such a way. Certainly, the City does not need to pay fees. That could be an exemption or whatever. But when you think about the stadium project, because, you know, we talk about -- Mark mentioned civic projects, like if the City's going to do a downtown area with a number of property owners and this, that and the other, that's one thing, but this was an instance where there could have been a private applicant. It could have
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been the property owners. It could have been the team owners. But the City decided to be the applicant.

Okay. That's all right. But, in doing that, what we didn't get that I think really hurt the process and the public perception is you never saw an application, you never saw a breakdown, you never saw a site plan or where the stadium's going to be.

You didn't see anything about, you know, what's the breakdown for infrastructure, how much is gonna projected to be -- you know, is the environmental remediation expected to cost. So the things you ask the private developers, you didn't get on this project. Nor was there on that project a third-party review on this.

I think, on the next TIF that you see, I think the City is doing a third-party review, which is I think great. But I think that this City-initiated thing, particularly in an instance where there's a logical private applicant, you know, it just creates some transparency issues.

I mean, like, when you have agreements with the private developers, that's one thing. But if the City is the applicant, how does the City have an agreement with the City, or whatever? So it just seems like that we would really want -- and, interestingly, even though the City exempted itself on the stadium
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project, they did go to the Application Review Committee, they just didn't do an application, and they didn't do a third-party review. So I'm not really as clear about the downside of following the process that we require for other people, so, anyway...

There's also an attached document I think that I sent to the board. It goes into a little bit more detail about the reasoning behind my recommendations here.

I'11 be happy to answer any questions. I thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yes.
MR. FLOYD: I want to hear you again on your limits and what you thought that change should be. I think it was your number five.

MS. SHARP: Yes. It's an interesting -- and I wish -- I have it back here, but there's a new heading. There's something about project costs that I think belongs. But then there was a maximum percentage of private costs that basically reads that an applicant can't get more than 15 percent of the total project costs.

So my thinking is -- and I think this is already kind of beginning to happen, that developers will say -- I mean, everybody would like a little upfront
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money; right? So when you see something like that in the City policy, you kind of think, "We11, you know, I could use 15 percent of my total project costs, that would help me, if the taxpayers would throw in a little bit."

It just seems to me like it sort of sets an expectation that most people are going to get a TIF and that you're going to -- I imagine everybody, with the policy, would ask for 15 percent, because that's the maximum; right? And I think if we do this and get a third-party review -- and the interesting thing -- and I think Mark deserves a lot of credit for this, he recommended Knoxville do it. Knoxville's got a big, robust and good TIF program. They've done a lot more TIFs than we have. They have a good review process. But they decided what, six/seven years ago, that they would require a third-party review and that they would send it to a company that has expertise in government finance.

So, in other words, this company looks at it from the local government perspective and makes a recommendation on how much should the TIF be and what the maximum term should be. Maybe they ask for 20 years, but maybe this firm comes back and says this could be 15 years, or whatever.

So it just seems to me like we are just sort of asking for trouble if we put this maximum -- I just
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don't see how we determine if they need it if we're going to do this third-party review and ask them to make a recommendation on the maximum amount and the maximum term.

Have I confused you even more? Probably.
MR. FLOYD: We11, I need to clarify. So I'm just trying to make sure. What you're recommending is that we remove the 15 percent altogether and where they could apply for 100 percent of the funding?

MS. SHARP: Well, right now, we don't have any wording --

MR. FLOYD: I'm not saying I disagree with you.

MS. SHARP: Okay.
MR. FLOYD: I'm just trying to figure out what --

MS. SHARP: What I'm saying is we can add it to the policies that we have, this new concept. This is new wording about maximum percentage of project costs.

MR. FLOYD: Right.
MS. SHARP: I'm saying I don't think we need that. Just leave that out. Let people apply for whatever they want to apply for. Now, maybe when they're talking informally with staff, staff is going to say, you know, "You might get approved for" -- you know, there'11
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be that discussion, that's fine. But don't try to arbitrarily set it at 15 percent. Let that review -- you know, that third-party review, let them decide what they're going to ask for. They should ask for what they think they need, right, recognizing, you know, the but-for test and things like that.

I just don't quite know what this buys us. And I'm just thinking that, on developer street, this might create an expectation of "I want my 15 percent," so, you know, obviously on TIFs. And I'm much more of a fan of TIFs than $I$ am of PILOTS.

And I think TIFs can be a wonderful tool, but we need to be careful with them, we need to reserve them, I think, for slum and blight and, you know, major public-benefit, game-changing projects and projects where clearly the but-for test has been met. And I'm just afraid anything we put in there, like a 15 -percent maximum, that that could encourage people that are doing a project.

And I think I gave you some -- a quote from some of the Saint Louis term limits that talk about that TIF can be a great economic development tool, but it's sort of become, you know, sort of an expectation on, you know, an entitlement for developers, that sometimes in some places, not Chattanooga, but in Saint Louis,
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Chicago, places like that, it's just kind of become an automatic "We want our TIF" type thing. I just think we needed to be careful there.

Let them ask for what they think they need, and maybe it's just 15 percent, or maybe it's 20 percent, or maybe it's 5 percent, but let that get negotiated with the staff and in this third-party review would be my thought.

Jermaine and Mark probably have comments on that.

MR. FLOYD: We11, I saw the 15 percent, and I wondered can anyone give me any history on why that's the cap?

MR. FREEMAN: Sure, we can to speak to that.
MS. SHARP: Did anybody else have anything for me?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: We may come back to you.
MR. FREEMAN: So, we included the 15 percent cap to put more, interestingly enough, to put more guardrails into the process so that we could ensure that we were not being hit with asks that were astronomical. And so that was the motivation for us to put the 15 percent cap in the process.

Now, I completely understand where Helen is coming from, in that if you -- you could read that
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excerpt and think "Okay, is this an automatic entitlement?"

But I think if you look at the totality of the policies that we have of these, meaning the amendments that we have done to the 2015 policy, everything that we have tried to do is to send the signal that this is not an entitlement and that there are going to be more guardrails and more expectations of the applicants.

And so by putting in, by inserting the 15 percent language, I think we felt like it would be, one, something that the comptroller of the state would be able to embrace and appreciate because everything that we do here is oftentimes viewed and reviewed by the comptroller.

But then also, I think we wanted to send the signal that it's not going to be an open season for TIFs in terms of people just asking for the world, to Helen's point, and so we wanted to sort of send that message to them.

Having said that, I understand that you can see it from a different perspective and look at it and say, "Well, this is sort of setting the expectation that everyone who applies for a TIF will be approved and they will receive an automatic 15 percent of whatever the
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project cost is." That was not our intent.
And I want to support or remind this body that all TIF approvals are still discretionary, meaning that it is up to you all and the City Council, as well as the mayor, to have some input as to what is going to be approved. And that's just the reality of TIFs.

And so I certainly don't want to send the signal that we are trying to back in anything or guarantee any sort of step level of subsidy for any project.

Now, if I could, let me just sort of address some of the things Ms. Sharp spoke about. With regards to the --

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Jermaine, if I could, one second.

MR. FREEMAN: Sure.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Clarify -- you should know, if not, I wanted to ask Ms. Sharp. Was she or the public given any opportunity to make these type comments before the City Council?

MR. FREEMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay.
MR. FREEMAN: Well, I take that back. The amendments to the TIF policies went through several changes. And so this was on the City Council's agenda
for most of the month of October and almost the entire month of November. So a person could have come to the open comment section of City Council and they could have spoken on the TIF policies during the public comment phase.

There was not a set public hearing in the way that the IDB has scheduled now and the way that we did last month. But I guess the issue certainly could have come to public comment and made their points heard about the TIF policies because they were on the agenda for almost two months.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. And I think where you were headed -- and I'm sorry to interrupt you -- I was curious to know what your position is on Ms. Sharp's bullet points one through six there. I think some of them seem to be fairly straightforward.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes. So, I certainly agree with Ms. Sharp on then stormwater fee language. I think that's entirely reasonable. And we -- I think when Mark and I were working on the stormwater fee language, the addition of the stormwater fee language was actually came to -- was prompted to us by City Counci1, and I think Ms. Sharp had some hand in that, and we appreciated that and felt like that was a good thing to add to the TIF policy. So we certainly don't have any objection to that.
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On the school fees, the school fees really we believe need to be left up to the county. The county pays for school taxes, not the city. So it is not, in our opinion, the place, either the City or IDB or the City Council to determine or to dictate what the county should do when it comes to school taxes.

Yes, it has always been the position that the school taxes would be paid for, but that ultimately is a county decision that needs to be made about the county. That's how we feel about that.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Well, couldn't we include some language, though, that says the understanding is the school taxes will be paid in full unless waived by the County or modified by the County; therefore, we're making it clear from a standpoint of public policy, that we are setting the expectations they will be paid?

MR. FREEMAN: You absolutely could. As long as you understand that the ultimate decision would be made by the County, not the City or the City IDB.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: But we could put that into the language?

MR. FREEMAN: You could, you could have that language, yes.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Which would address
Ms. Sharp and I think a good concern there and make it
clear the expectations of the IDB and the City, "Hey, we want these things paid but it's not our baby, and if the County wants to do something else"...

MR. FREEMAN: Hundred percent.
CHAIRMAN RODGER: Okay.
MR. FREEMAN: Yeah. Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay.
MR. FREEMAN: Absolutely. I'm sorry. I don't have a copy of Ms. Sharp's comment. What was the text?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Here you go. Come get this one if you would.

MS. SHARP: (Complies.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Or she's getting it.
MR. FREEMAN: Thank you. Thank you,
Ms. Sharp. I think the portion about the Application Review Committee, I think that's up to this board and up to the City Council. I think what -- you know, I think that that's something, one of the things that we -- it can be difficult to schedule application review committee meetings just because of the number of people involved. And so if you increase the size of the committee, that obviously adds more time to the process. But I think that's something for the IDB to work with the City Council on.

The third, the language of the TIF policy that was adopted by City Council on November 29th already makes a reference to the third-party review, so I don't -- let's see here. So, I mean, we have already added -I'm not sure that I quite understand number four because we have already added that language into the TIF policy that allow the City to bring on a third-party reviewer, if we so need.

And then I have already addressed point number give, which was again on the --

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Jermaine, if we can go back to that third-party review.

MR. FREEMAN: Sure.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: As I understood what she's say is that it should not be a "we may do it," it's that "it will be done" by a third-party review committee. And I may be wrong there. Ms. Sharp can clarify for me. In other words, it's going to have this outside entity step in and take a look and advise us as an IDB does this pass muster? Does this look right?

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah. We don't have any issue with that.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay.
MR. FLOYD: Who's responsible to find that
person?

MR. FREEMAN: Well, so, typically, what we would do is we would handle that and staff as part of the application process. And so we would just build that into all of the other administrative work that is required from us to sort of take the application from start to finish.

MR. FLOYED: Okay.
MR. FREEMAN: And then for point number five, so, again, the 15 percent was something that we put in to increase sort of the guardrails on the project. But I think that if the board or the City Council felt like that that in some way sort of led developers to believe there was an entitlement, I think that that's -- I can certainly understand that perspective. But from our perspective, we put it in to put in more guardrails, actually, in terms of just the total amount of TIF that can be asked for.

And then the last point, the last point that I will say about number six, a City-initiated TIF is often very different from when a private developer is initiating a TIF. And I said this last month, but I will be sure to reiterate this: When a private developer is initiating a TIF request, they're typically doing so sort of with the narrow perspective of a single project that has -- that is typically for one or two, maybe three
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parcels. The project is very well defined. The developer knows exactly what they need in terms of the gap of and for the funding of the public infrastructure to help the project come to fruition.

When a city is initiating a TIF, a city is not necessarily looking at the TIF from the perspective of a single project or a single building. What a city is using the TIF for is to use a project to catalyze further redevelopment in an area.

So, for example, if you go back to the East Chattanooga Rising TIF that was approved under the Berke administration in 2019, that TIF was to build public infrastructure that could provide better connectivity to Nippon Automotive Paint Manufacturing Plant in East Chattanooga.

However, there's also a component in that TIF whereby redevelopment efforts could be considered on the remainder of city-owned property that surrounds Nippon Paint because that property is currently vacant but it was included as part of the TIF district.

The City at the time didn't know what would happen on the rest of that property because the City was using the TIF as a tool to spark and to catalyze a vision, not knowing where all the sidewalks would be, where the parks would be, how much sewage would be
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needed, what the sewer pipes would do.
And so in terms of doing an application, be it that application is never -- when initiated by a city, it's not necessarily going to include all the fine details that you get from a TIF that's initiated by a private developer because the city is typically looking with a much more larger lens and a much more visionary framework for what the TIF can do.

It's not looking at a single building that's got a set amount for sidewalk that needs to be done. And so it becomes much more difficult for cities to do the application in the same way that a private developer would.

That's why, under state law, the economic impact plan is required, not the application. The application is a local product. It's not required under state law because the economic impact plan is designed to be a visionary document that a public entity could use to outline why they want to create a TIF.

A city could very well -- and I think Mark can speak to this better than I -- cities can very well create TIF districts to use a TIF district to fund redevelopment or economic development or to catalyze the creation of more affordable housing. But, at the time, they may not know what the exact site plan will be for
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the district or every corner or every park or every linear square footage of sewage is going to be.

And that's just the nature of the city as it works to develop and to redevelop and to bring economic prosperity to all parts of the community.

Mark, do you have anything to add to that?
MR. MAMANTOV: I have a couple of things I'd like to add to that.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Let me hold off, Mark, one second if you would.

MR. MAMANTOV: Yes. Sure.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mr. Parker, did you have a question for Jermaine?

MR. PARKER: No, sir. He's answered what I'm looking for.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. All right, Mark. Thank you. Okay.

MR. MAMANTOV: I thought Ms. Sharp's comments were really good and helpful. Some of them are political. I mean, not really political, but it's being thrown back to City Council. But I didn't have a problem from a legal standpoint with any of them, other than possibly the 15 -percent limit. It's not so much legal.

I've just seen that -- that limit actually started in Memphis. It's in their -- they use that on
their downtown TIFs and it is spread to a number of jurisdictions. And, ironically, it's often -- she's very good about the wise use of incentives, but I've found, actually, the opposite of what she is saying, that the 15 percent limit -- what developers typically do is they look at the increment that they project they are going to get, they back into a present value number of that and they say, "I want the whole enchilada," which often is 25 or 30 percent of our budget costs.

We have found that, through some PILOTs and stuff that we have done elsewhere, that we're paying -say, for the structured parking, which they allocate -structured parking is the most common thing you pay for these kind of TIFs because that is clearly a public infrastructure cost under state law that can be on private property. So you're paying for private structure parking. And you can design that in a way that you can get way over. You are going to pay for 25 percent of their budget cost through that limit.

So we have found that the 15 percent limit, actually, they go, "Oh, I'm limited to 15 percent," and they may design it in a way to try to -- to not ask for as much.

$$
\text { So I have not found that it's a default } 15
$$ percent request. What I found as a default is they see
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up to 20 years -- that's a separate topic I'd like to address very briefly -- up to 20 years, "What's the increment? I want the whole thing." And we have found that this is a break, as Jermaine described, on them asking for quite as much.

And I saw it in Memphis when they're
improving -- Montgomery County has been using TIFs for lots in downtown Clarksville in trying to incentivize some downtown development there. We found it to be a good break on incentives there and what people are asking for. I just found it to be, going to a lot of seminars and stuff, sort of a good rule of thumb. In fact, I've seen some people using 10 percent, some people using 20. 15 seemed to be a good number. It seems to allow them to get a reasonable public incentive without getting -- you know, I don't think her point is a bad one. I can see that someone will say, "Whoa, I'm going to go up to the 15 percent," but you can still deal with that with the third-party review process.

Of course, if I were you, I would say, "Then why do we need 20 years?" We talked about this a little bit at a prior meeting. Given that you all reserve more percentage through the county through school taxes and through 40 percent than almost any other jurisdiction in the state, and so by reserving such a high percentage,
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you often need a longer increment period to make the project financially successful. So I do totally agree.

I mean, the default that everybody's asking now is for 20 years. I do think the third-party review can take care of that in terms of like, "Okay, now you don't" -- we have generally found we're fighting over years when we have these third-party reviews. We'11 come back and our third-party guy will say, "They only need three years."

We had, again, one of those huge student housing developments that's on the strip in Knoxville. They asked for a 20 year TIF on an $\$ 82$ miliion development that would result in $\$ 20$ million in public subsidy.

By the time we were through, we'd asked for the six-year TIF, and all because we had a third-party review that we pushed back hard on. And, amazingly, they had broken ground and they were able to make it work on six instead of 20.

And so I think that's really where the battle is fought, particularly, here again, where you keep such a large percentage over the term and not so much the percentage.

I do agree there's arguments that could be made both ways on the 15 percent. And that's just what I
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found working in other jurisdictions, that what Jermaine said, it's been a helpful back on want developers -- they may design their whole project differently if they're told they can't stick it to you on the whole parking garage cost, for example.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Any other questions for Mark?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mark, I had one, if you don't mind. I forwarded recently some thoughts from Charles Wood with the Chamber of Commerce, and one of the things that he commented on was allowing TIFs to address housing, as permitted by state law.

Now, what we've got in front of us, it does not address housing, does it?

MR. MAMANTOV: An earlier draft did. But I think the thought was that -- Jermaine really can address this better than I can and can provide more background.

But I think the thought was that more thought had to go into that because housing is such a unique thing. I spent quite a bit of time last week in with Jermaine and the new housing officer from the City talking about incentives and TIFs. And I do think that there will be -- I mean, affordable housing is part of Mayor Kelly's emphasis. I mean, everyone feels very
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supportive that affordable housing is an important thing. Generally, affordable housing is more likely to be a PILOT than a TIF, so it's not likely somebody will lose a whole lot of sleep over it.

I've done a hundred TIFs for -- excuse me -a hundred PILOTs for affordable housing, and I think I've done one or two TIFs. It's very rare that it happens. And I can explain that, if you're interested, why that's the case. But it is very rare that you use a TIF for affordable housing, for a stand-alone affordable housing project.

If you are trying to do a bigger area and encourage affordable housing within the area, it does happen sometimes. Memphis has such an area, what they cal1 Uptown, that they use TIFs a little bit to try to incentivize more affordable housing in the area.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: And just for --
MR. MAMANTOV: I lost Jermaine.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah. Just for my fellow board members, I do point out to you guys that this does not have to be a once every five-, seven-, ten-year project here, as far as looking at these TIF Policies and Procedures, that we are free to modify and amend them, with the City Council's agreement, of course, or vice versa, as we deem fit.

So, certainly, to the extent we leave out housing now and the Chamber wants us to address it, Mr. Freeman, we can come back to it next month or next year if we want to.

MR. FREEMAN: I would look at it as a working document. That's what I tried to express to the City Council, is that you don't have to look at -- it's a policy that's adopted by a resolution, so it's something that the City Council and the IDB should feel amendable enough to change as conditions change and as the City's change. So it does not require us to wait seven years between the adoption of the 2015 policy and the adoption of the 2022 policy. It should be a working document that we should continue to have valuable exchanges and feedback on.

One other thing I would add about the affordable housing component is one of the things that the City Council wanted to do is it really wanted to wait until our chief housing officer starting working with the City. She did. And so they want to sort of wait to hear from her in terms of what were all the incentives that the City Council should be considering to spur the creation of affordable housing. And so she is working on that as we speak.

But to Mark's point, there was an earlier
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version of the redlines that did include the allowing affordable housing to be ineligible to a project, which it is allowed under state law. I believe the statute specifically says multi-family housing for persons of low to moderate income, the elderly, or the -- I think it uses handicap, the disabled.

And that is something that the Chamber is thinking about because, as we talk to the employers, as we work to attract employers to the city, what we have heard from certain employers and from some major employers is a difficulty in finding housing for their workers.

And so to the extent that we can create housing that is more affordable for people along the income scale and along the AMI scale, we want to have every tool in the toolbox to be able to do that, whether it's through a single project and whether that's going to be a PILOT that you guys don't ever see because those go through the Health, Education and Housing Facility Board, or through as part of a larger development that might come to the IDB.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Any other questions for Mr. Freeman?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Now, we somewhat cut off
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the public comment period after Ms. Sharp spoke, Mr. Freeman and Mr. Mamatov, and we got going on Ms. Sharp's comments. Ms. Sharp, were you even through?

MS. SHARP: I wasn't quite through. I wanted to say I'm glad we took this little break because I understand the point now about the maximum percentage. I still would feel more comfortable without the 15 percent max, but I understand what Jermaine and Mark are saying about it. So that I think you could go either way on.

But I do think it's important, on this third-party review, for that to be mandatory. I think the wording now basically says the City "may" require third-party review. I think that should be "wil1" or "shall" or whatever.

And also I think it's very critical that the wording about a firm that specializes in public finance as well as real estate development be in there because. In the past with the TIF projects we've had, the Chamber of Commerce will send the project to a firm, and I'm sure it's a good firm, in Jackson, and I don't want to say they rubber-stamped it, but, I mean, it -- like on the MLK project, it was like they said, Oh, yes, and it meets the but-for test," and what was interesting about that one is all the development in the area had already happened, and I don't think they realized that, or
whatever. So I'm not sure how thorough an analysis it was. I'm not sure they were looking at it necessarily from the City and the taxpayer standpoint.

And then when you have a company like MuniCap, or whatever it is, in Baltimore, they have some expertise in that area. So, like I said, the 15 percent I think you can go either way on, but I hope you will please consider making that third-party review a requirement and mention that it will be done by a company with expertise in public finance.

I think somebody else had a question for me. (No response.)

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Mr. Parker?
MR. PARKER: Mr. Freeman, I have a question for you. So, the stormwater fee --

MR. FREEMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. PARKER: -- I guess she indicated
Volkswagen was not paying it or deducted it other ways. And I think Volkswagen is probably the purple elephant -MR. FREEMAN: Yes.

MR. PARKER: -- of all IFs and projects that any city could ever expect to have.

MR. FREEMAN: And to be clear, Volkswagen did not receive a TIF. Volkswagen received a combination of real estate, cash, and then they received -- they also
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receive a PILOT.
MR. PARKER: So excuse me for remarking that. Is there any -- was there just no expectation, or was the stormwater fee sort of a new entity at that point, that they didn't calculate into it or -- you know, why -- has anyone else said "We are not doing this?"

MR. FREEMAN: So, I wasn't around at that time, but -- and I will let Jason chime in here. I think the big thing about Volkswagen is just because it was such a major project for the City, the City and County were willing to go above and beyond to make sure that they didn't lose the project.

And I think you would -- it is, obviously, an economic impact, that Volkswagen and all its suppliers that have come to Chattanooga since Volkswagen came that followed Volkswagen here, have obviously had a major economic impact on the city.

But I think, at the time, the City -- you will have to remember that, when Volkswagen came and when Volkswage announced, that was during 2008, I believe, which was the beginning of the great recession. And so throughout the country, there was economic carnage going on, and yet Chattanooga and Hamilton County kind of stood on a hill and said "Hey, we just landed Volkswagen, so, yay, for good economy times."

But in order to do that and in order for Chattanooga to be competitive, as it got down to the final negotiations -- I think Chattanooga was competing with Huntsville, Alabama, and some other comparably-sized cities at the time. And, of course, Huntsville, you know, lost out on Volkswagen, but then they turned out all right. They got a Toyota Mazda plant a few years ago. So these things all sort have a cyclical effect.

But I think that the City really wanted to go above and beyond to just make sure that they didn't lose the project, that they were willing to -- they're willing to do a little bit more.

MR. PARKER: I see. I understood that.
MR. FREEMAN: Yeah.
MR. PARKER: And, again, because Volkswagen was such, again, the giant elephant, right? That's landing the big one?

MR. FREEMAN: Yes.
MR. PARKER: Was there -- is there any opposition to including something that -- I'm not going to say "everybody e1se," but 99 percent of everybody else is going have to pay this, and is there room to still leave a carveout if there was someone -- I'm going to effectively say "waive" that at the very end under a vote of some type, but anyone else that's going to get this,
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whether it's a $\$ 5$ million or a $\$ 25$ or a $\$ 50$ miliion, you know, you don't expect to pay it?

MR. FREEMAN: Sure. So I think -- so, yes, I think we should do that. And as we contemplate also adopting PILOT policies because we currently don't have existing PILOT policies, the stormwater fee is something that we are certainly looking to put into those policies as well. But I think, yes, we want to ensure that everybody from here on out pay stormwater fees.

You know, when you create lots of impervious surface, that water has to go somewhere when we have heavy rain events, and it puts more strain on our combined sewer and water overflow system, which Jason could also speak to because the City has also -- because we are under a consent agreement with the EPA, we've also had to spend millions of dollars to build wastewater infrastructure and storage tanks to ensure that we don't have flooding on the west bank of the river. So, yes, I think everybody should have to pay stormwater fees.

I think Attorney Noblett could probably speak to this. It is required under the law anyway, that everybody pay stormwater fees. But I think we can certainly make sure that we include language in the TIF policies, and I think we started that with what we included in the current policies, but if there's
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something else that this board and that the City Council feel like we need to in addition, we are certainly welcome to do that.

MR. NOBLETT: Stormwater fees are required by the federal government to be paid. However, they are not considered to be tax under federal law. And that's a big difference here. Whenever you are trying to collect things, it's much easier, if somebody goes into an 11 or a 13 , to be able to collect the taxes that are owed.

The stormwater fees themselves are unsecured, in that regard, fees, so we have to depend on whether there are enough assets to be able to collect or not if you deal with a bankruptcy case. So I think that's a significant difference, to try to make sure you get those fees if you can.

MR. FREEMAN: But, Mr. Parker, we certainly want to collect stormwater fees.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Any other questions for Mr. Freeman?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mr. Parker, were you through?

MR. PARKER: I'm looking. Yes. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Is there anyone else from the public here, Mr. Gilliland or anybody else?

11:54:15

11:54:17

11:54:22

11:54:25

11:54:29

11:54:30

11:54:32

11:54:35
$11: 54: 35$

11:54:35

11:54:37

11:54:37

11:54:37

11:54:40

11:54:41

11:54:42
$11: 54: 42$

11:54:42

11:54:44

11:54:53

11:54:54

11:55:02
$11: 55: 05$
$11: 55: 11$

11:55:21

MS. GOODEN: (Indicating.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Ma'am, come forward. Yes.
MS. GOODEN: I'm Janice Gooden, and I'm representing CALEB Economic Mobility Task Force as one of the co-chairs.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: You said your name is Janice Gooden?

MS. GOODEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Tell us where you live, please, ma'am.

MS. GOODEN: I live on Elena Drive, East Chattanooga.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Thank you.
MR. ADKINS: Can you speak up just a little bit?

MS. GOODEN: Can you hear me?
THE COURT REPORTER: What is your address again, ma'am?

MS. GOODEN: 2125 Elena Drive.
MR. FREEMAN: I don't know if I'm supposed to do this, but... (adjusts microphone.)

MS. GOODEN: Okay. I'm speaking on behalf of
CALEB's Economic Mobility Task Force. I connected with
CALEB in January 2021 around the Develop With Us
Campaign. Shortly after this time, mayoral and City
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Council candidate forums took place, and one of the candidates, being our current Mayor Kelly, one of the questions asked was, "Would you support community benefits agreements as part of the policy?" And he affirmatively agreed, as well as some of the other candidates.

So I want to focus on community benefits agreements. I didn't see anything mentioned in the TIF policy about community benefit agreements. My definition of "community benefit agreement" is a negotiated contract between community groups and developers that set the rules for a project to receive public subsidies. CBAs are legally binding and enforceable by the signatories.

CALEB would like to see a requirement of a community benefit agreement included as part of the TIF policy.

As you are aware, or I believe you are aware, that CALEB was brought into the process to help to facilitate a community benefits agreement with the South Broad Redevelopment Project. We were not brought in at the beginning.

So it would be more effective to have this process included to start at the beginning and not two or three months after the process. So, we are in this
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process and we feet that we are making progress, but it would be more effective to start at the beginning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Thank you. Ms. Gooden, I know one I had, does CALEB have any language or any proposals kind of in writing that we could see, that, okay, based on what's been proposed, you're thinking we should insert into the TIF Policies and Procedures that would cover the community benefits agreement idea?

MS. GOODEN: I think Michae1 can address that. We've had discussions. I'm not sure if we have anything drafted.

MR. GILLILAND: I'm Mike Gilliland. I'm the organizing director of CALEB. I live at 1816 Ivy Street. No, we don't currently have a recommendation on exact language, but at your request, we'd be happy to work on a proposal for that.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: We11, I'm not saying whether any of the board here is for or against including that language or that type of requirement. I think the problem we would have is right now we have something concrete to go on that we may modify or not.

But what you are talking about theoretically may or may not be approved by this board, but we kind of -- it's more generic, and I think -- I'11 defer to my
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fellow members. It would be helpful if we had more something concrete to go on.

MR. GILLILAND: Thank you, Chairman. I think, as Mr. Freeman said, this being a working document and the ability to provide to you, we just want to be able to bring this up to keep this on your mind. In the case of bringing it up, we certainly can work on proposed language that we communicate to this body.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: What I would encourage you to do is maybe seeing where we are with this TIF Policies and Procedures. We're hopefully getting close to an end where we can adopt something. And maybe then your proposal would be, "Okay, here's a first amendment" afterward. It's just an idea. It doesn't have to wait. But that's just an idea that I throw out there because then you would have something concrete to modify.

MR. GILLILAND: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Just a thought.
MS. JONES: I agree.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Anybody else from the public want to make a comment?

MR. PADEN: (Indicating.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: All right. Welcome again.
MR. PADEN: My name is Joseph Paden. And I got you good last time, so I'11 try to get you just as
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well again this time. But I also am a member of CALEB's Economic Task Force.

And so greetings in the new year. We are very encouraged and glad that you are actually beginning the new year with a public hearing. I think that really is something we're very encouraged by and certainly appreciate.

So I guess to kind of follow up on what my colleague just kind of discussed: I think, you know, we are encouraged that this body is doing a lot to make sure that the policies that are now being drafted are both well-constructed and conscientious, considering the kind of economic impacts that we see them causing with these projects, I guess.

As I understand what Ms. Sharp is saying, I think one of the benefits of this public hearing is that you get really great outside expertise. And I would just draw attention to just a couple of thoughts that she had which were mentioned. The third-party review, I just would like to join that and say that is particularly an effective thing, which I think the City Attorney also recommended. And with that third-party review, it's also helpful.

I think Ms. Sharp mentioned the fact that one of the consultants that we use for like economic impact
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analysis that was kind of presented during PILOT work, but I wonder if there is also ways where whichever third party is selected will be sure that in their analysis to do kind of not just the aggregate benefit of something, right, the aggregating magnitude of the economic impact, but also help quantify the actual costs, the opportunity costs, and the things that are put forward on the City's side so that you get kind of a more proportionate comparison between both the magnitude of the benefit of something but also the costs that you have to outlay in order to receive that, so then you have got more of a real, you know, apportion of what the total net requirements are of a project. So it's something to keep in mind.

And, you know, also with these projects, like with South Broad, for instance, if you are going to do a project, there's a lot of good things to come of it, but these are also kind of indirect issues that can be harmful or challenges to that area as it undergoes kind of a revitalization, things which you've heard, I'm sure, like gentrification or kind of additional kinds of demands that are put on that specific area's transportation network and things like that.

And perhaps these independent reviews can help break out some of those additional pieces that kind
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of come along with all the good things, so that the City can better attend to those and make sure that those are mitigated as it goes along. So maybe those are some things which maybe I see the City could, you know, bear in mind as we're going about that process.

So I really think that's of great value. And I really appreciate Ms. Sharp going through so many of the fine points for the board.

So I guess the only other thing I would mention is it's also interesting that this hearing comes right after Martin Luther King celebration holiday on Monday. And on Monday, I had a chance to join in the march and go down and listen to the assembly there. And it was a good time to remember Martin Luther King's mission for liberty and justice, and I remember that it was a helpful reminder that a big part of that was economic justice.

And so I think, with these new policies, those are things that really get to the very heart of what he was working towards during his life, and as a part of that Martin Luther King program, Mayor Kelly actually spoke and again reiterated his real commitment and drive to see equity really placed at the center of all of his policies, and he went about forming a new division I believe in the City, right, and seeks to kind
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of align equity within all of its different departments and programs and policies.

So I think, going to kind of CALEB's interest, that is something we would like to see again with CBA being more explicit kind of in this policy, and we certainly would like to work with you all and come up with some language which would, you know, both address some of those equity issues and make sure that that's more prominent, have a prominent place in some of the pieces of the policy.

So, I think those are some of the things, and I feel like that's also appropriate -- just briefly -because I think, if I understand this policy update a bit -- I guess as far as I understand the policy update, I think it's really, basically, expanding the power of this TIF instrument for the City. It's really putting it in a place to really be more of an active part of what the City intends to do, and I think there's a lot of wonderful things that can be done there, and I think there are some very positive things that the City's proposed with its amendments and updates.

By making it a more powerful and active tool, I think it's important that it balance that with some of our longstanding needs which go to those, I think, really those equity issues. So I think it's very appropriate
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that that be included. So thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Thank you for sharing your comments and thoughts there. Anyone else from the public want to speak?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Is there anyone here from the Chamber of Commerce? I did mention about forwarding or reminding board members of the emailed letter we got from Charles Wood a few weeks ago, so we do have the benefit of that and appreciate that.

Anybody else here want to speak to this issue?

MR. FREEMAN: (Indicating.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mr. Freeman?
MR. FREEMAN: So, just a couple of points that I would like to make, and I appreciate all the comments that we have heard today. I certainly think there is an opportunity for community benefits to be part of things that we do, but I also want the board to understand that traditionally, community benefits agreement is a legal document of which the City typically has no part and which the Industrial Development Board typically has no part.

And so it's typically a document negotiated
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between developers and a specific community group, which, for example, could be tabled. And so there are some legal separations between the two, which, Mark could probably speak to better than I.

But there are certain things, for example, that the City with the IDB may be asked to commit to that legally under state law you cannot commit to because you are a public entity, and so it's important for us to understand that.

Secondly, you know, the Kelly administration actively supports the pursuit and wants to see a community benefits agreement negotiated with regards to the South Broad project. However, every TIF project is different. And so, for example, you know, I think as we talk about community benefits, I do want to make sure that the board understands that the perceived community benefit for one project may look very different for a different project.

And so the one example that I would use is the North Access Road TIF where the developer said, "Hey, as part of the community benefit, we want to dedicate a certain amount of our property along the river to be used to create a future river walk in the future on the north side of the Tennessee River." That is a community benefit.
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Now, that community benefit that those developers were willing to commit to may not necessarily have -- may not necessarily have been what CALEB or another community group was looking for, but it's still a community benefit nonetheless.

And so we need to understand that as we seek further expansion and growing the city, community benefits are going to look different from one place to another. So I will just sort of remind everyone of that.

But we certainly with the Kelly
administration certainly want to make sure that when we are engaged in the TIFs or PILOTs, that we are creating more opportunities for more equity and more shared prosperity across the board.

Mark, did you want to add anything?
MR. MAMANTOV: I would like to make two points. One, y'all asked a number of questions about the third-party review, and Ms. Sharp has encouraged that to be mandatory. That, again, that's an important decision.
(Whereupon, Ms. Jones exits the council
room.)
MR. MAMANTOV: I just thought maybe a little background would be helpful. I was the person that arranged for this to get started in Knoxville, in Knox County, about seven years ago. At the time, I found
really only one national firm that could really do what I call the "but-for analysis," to really dig into the developer's pro forma and represent local government and not be on the other side.

As Ms. Sharp referred to, traditionally, in Chattanooga and Hamilton County, you've gotten what is really an economic impact analysis, not a but-for analysis. The younger, sort of good, reputable folks, they, typically, for the chamber say, "Oh, it'11 create this many jobs and do this." That's wonderful, but it does not answer the key question: Do they even need the incentive in the first place?

This analysis is intended to figure it out. And, typically, we basically get him to accept \$10,000 retainers to do that, and he does a really, really, thorough job. And sometimes I wish he would not do quite such a thorough job and just sort of give us an answer.

But the bottom line is they always end up spending the $\$ 10,000$. Sometimes they go over because I can't get him to agree to a fixed fee. And so as recent -- he's my friend, he's sort of become of my friend over the years. I sort of surveyed recently like are there other alternatives just so if people ask that question. There's probably bout four or five people in this business.
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You could RFV it to try to get sort of an idea. We have found that there are a few projects from time to time that are so small, like it's a whole site that their TIF is worth $\$ 200,000$. If you make them spend $\$ 10,000$ on a but-for analysis whether they really need it, you've eaten up five percent of their entire costs just doing the but-for analysis. That's why we did it optiona1.

I see the point. I would make it a default in my mind that you're going to do it, unless there's a really good reason for not. That's why Jermaine and I used the word "may" instead of "shall" on that and give you all, the IDB and the City, the alternative whether you want to make it an incurred cost. But I just want to give you an idea of what we were talking about.
(Whereupon, Ms. Jones re-enters the council room.)

MR. MAMANTOV: And it often takes 60 to 90 days to actually do it, because the developer will almost always say, "Oh, you missed this, you missed that," and you argue for about two months after the first draft and the report comes out. And so it's a slow, slow process.

On the community benefit agreement, you're very fortunate to have CALEB in your community. We don't have someone like that in Knoxville. And I, obviously,
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from what I've seen them in meetings and read about them, they're excellent folks to work with. So this is not any reflexion on their point. It's just community benefit agreements raise extraordinarily difficult constitutional questions.

The model that is generally cited in Tennessee is the community benefit agreement that was done for the soccer stadium. It was really the first of its kind. Metro government is not a party to it in any way, and neither is the sports authority.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: You're talking about in Nashville; right?

MR. MAMANTOV: Nashville.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay.
MR. MAMANTOV: They assiduously avoid seeing it because it covers things like labor union participation, DPE type participation, certain affordable housing requirements that would not be constitutional to impose directly by a governmental entity.

And so if you require it as a governmental entity, it raises very challenging constitutional issues. Generally, often what happens is a group, a community benefit group, a group like CALEB, will say, "Look, this developer wants to do this project. We tried to approach them to agree to do some reasonable things to acknowledge
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the community, to work with me, they were totally unresponsive, and we would encourage you not to approve this incentive." That's usually how this goes down.

I'm sure Jermaine would be as well -- the CALEB guys are both great -- we need to sit down and see if we can work out some language. I just thought it might be helpful for y'all to understand why this is so challenging, because, again, a lot of the times that the types of things that you are trying to achieve is -- as many of you -- I know this will be shocking to you, but we have a fairly conservative legislature and they have adopted a number of state laws that prohibit governmental bodies from making things contingent upon labor union participation and DBE type stuff, things like that, that it is -- you've got to very careful that you are not only not violating federal laws that raise constitutional issues, but also state laws that they have made it very difficult to try to make things contingent upon certain things.

And so it's a -- we do not have a community benefit agreement of the type that people think of from the Nashville experience and Knoxville because we really didn't have a CALEB-type group to negotiate with. And so -- but the one in Nashville, it took me quite a while to even get a copy of it, and I've read it a number of
times, because metro said, "We don't want that," you know, because we can't make the financing of the stadium contingent upon it.

Although, politically, they can do that by saying, "Look, you've got to work out something with the community before we'11 support this." And that's generally how these things work.

So, but -- and again, I'm delighted, and I'm sure Jermaine would be as well, to meet and see what we could work out. But it is a difficult challenge sometimes.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Thank you, Mr. Mamantov.
All right. This will conclude the public hearing aspect of our agenda. Moving on to the resolution that is before the board, we have the proposal as it is from the City Council before us. I guess the issue for the board here is what do we want to do? We have heard some proposed or suggested changes by Ms. Sharp, some of which have been -- the City through Mr. Freeman, and hasn't objected to even. A couple of them with some modifications I think were deemed acceptable. And then a couple of them, we might want to have some further discussion on or whatever.

What do you guys want to do here? You may like the proposal from the City Council and want to go
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with it. If so, I will entertain a motion? Otherwise, let me know ---

MR. ADKINS: Mr. Chairman, why don't we postpone any action today until our March meeting, if that's acceptable, and look at what Ms. Sharp has said and see if we want to entertain any changes? Is that -any other board members got any views on that?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: If I may make a suggestion along that line, Mr. Adkins, what I would suggest we do is look at asking Mr. Mamantov and Mr. Freeman, and with Ms. Sharp even some involvement maybe, to come back to us with maybe a redline version of the City Council's resolution from November, end of November there, based on the comments and what's gone on here today, because, as we heard about the stormwater fee and school taxes, those are things that seem like there was an agreement in principle as far as what could be tweaked from what we were represented with the City Council. But we need to have that, and like I mentioned to Mr. Gilliland, we need to have that in front of us.

MR. ADKINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: So that would allow time for that to happen. Mr. Adkins, is that kind of what you're getting at?

MR. ADKINS: Yes.

MS. JONES: And I guess what -- how much time do you all need to get together and review that?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mr. Mamantov, let me ask this: Based on -- you've heard some comments here today. Is this something you could get to and address and maybe make some changes based on the comments here today so that we can consider them at our next IDB meeting? Is that quick -- or is that too quick for you?

MR. FREEMAN: The next meeting's in March.
MR. ADKINS: That's two weeks.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Wait a minute. That is in two weeks, isn't it?

MR. ADKINS: Yeah. We may want to postpone March because --

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: I thought our March meeting --

MR. NOBLETT: I thought you canceled the board meeting.

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah. My understanding was that the February meeting was canceled because this meeting was happening in the middle of the month.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah. That's right.
That's right. So six weeks, essentially.
MR. MAMANTOV: No. That's easy. These six items, some of them, like the size of the review
committee, that's ultimately a political question. But to draft the changes for you all to vote on each one, saying "I like that one," "I don't know that one," I can have it to you next week.

These are conceptually -- I mean, obviously, like the 15 percent, that's just a big X, you know, y'all have just got to decide whether you like it or not. That's an easy requirement to delete.

So, yes, we can get these to you really quickly. And if y'all have any other changes that you would like to at least see worded that you want to vote on, I'm sure that we could do that for you all.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Mr. Freeman, did you want to add?

MR. FREEMAN: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Let me ask the -okay. With that in mind, Mr. Adkins, it looks like we are all in agreement to postpone the consideration of the resolution of the issue until the March meeting.

To help out with Mr. Mamantov and giving him some clarification of what we are thinking, let's discuss briefly, if we could, the third-party review idea. Is it you all's idea here today that you would prefer a mandatory versus a "may" type language, or would we maybe say -- Mr. Mamantov is talking about an example of a
$\$ 200,000$ TIF and that's a problem when you've got mandatory language. Maybe we cap it and the project has to exceed a million dollars in order to require a third-party review committee. I think that's doable as a way to address the monetary issues. Is that right, Mr. Mamantov?

MR. MAMANTOV: Yes, that would be a good idea, to address the really small-sized ones that may not make --

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: So maybe we make it mandatory above a certain amount.

MR. PARKER: Mr. Mamantov, is $\$ 1$ million a reasonable number, that anything lower, you're going to weed out? Is $\$ 2.5$ a better number? $\$ 5$ million? I mean, what's so that were not -- I hate to use the word "wasting" time, but what's sort of that threshold of where it's --

MR. MAMANTOV: I would tie the request to the IDB incentive, and so I think anything really -certainly a million dollars would be very reasonable. Even, say, half a million or $\$ 750,000$ would probably be okay. But a million would certainly be safe. And you can require -- we could make it so you would require it for everything under a million or anything less.

I will tell you there are significant
stories, like we have a small university in Knoxville called Lincoln Memorial University and they came and said "We want this." We have a developer that wants to do student housing next to it. And they waived the third-party report because they felt like the public benefited in that case. And that project was well over a million dollars of incentive and we'd otherwise would have benefited. But it was a determent.

But I think you could do that on a one-off basis. We just recommend that we waited in that case. But yes.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: So it could be discretionary beneath a certain amount and mandatory above the amount.

MR. PARKER: I would agree to that.
MR. ADKINS: Say that again.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: In other words, I think the idea here were talking about is it be discretionary below, say, a million dollars but mandatory above a million dollars.

MR. FREEMAN: Mr. Chair, let me just add one thing. In the current TIF policy that was adopted in 2022 -- well, both in 2015 and adopted in 2022, the applicant must also reasonably anticipate a total projected project cost of at least $\$ 5 \mathrm{million}$ with
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respect to a proposed project in order to apply for that tax increment incentive.

So, in the TIF policy, a $\$ 200,000$ TIF would not be eligible for a TIF. Under the existing policy. $\$ 5$ million is the floor as it is.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: And that $\$ 5$ million threshold is in what the City Council approved at the end of November?

MR. FREEMAN: Yeah. But it was also in 2015, too.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: So if we made it mandatory, it would only apply if the project would be $\$ 5$ million or more anyway?

MR. MAMANTOV: That's actually true. I'd forgotten that y'all had the $\$ 5$ million in this one. That's sort of the weed-out for getting requests for really small projects. And so, probably, with that built in -- theoretically, you've got a $\$ 5$ million project and it's still a very small TIF request, but that would be highly unlikely.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: So from the board's standpoint, do you want to make it -- do you want to ask Mr. Mamantov to make it mandatory or discretionary period?

MR. ADKINS: I'd say mandatory.
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MS. JONES: Mandatory.
MR. PARKER: Mandatory.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mandatory?
(Board members move head up and down.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right. Mr. Mamantov, if you would draft it as mandatory and then we will evaluate in March.

Was there any other issue there that we really need to address now probably to give him a better idea?

MR. FREEMAN: We would go ahead and include to put in the language that sort of mentions the school taxes as long as it's understood that the school taxes will ultimately be the decision of the county?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: I think that was -- that was the idea, yes. And the stormwater fee, I think there was a general consensus here.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: The Application Review Committee, what is your pleasure here as far as the board goes? Right now, there's five: two appointed by the City Counci1, two appointed by the Mayor, and one appointed by the Chamber of Commerce. The IDB has no representation, nor does that development community such as associated general contractors, nor does labor.
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I mean, it's subject to what you guys want to do. We can leave it at five, we could expand it to seven with a specific proposal. An AGC representative, a building trades' representative, or maybe the chairman of the IDB could appoint two as well since we're partners with the City on this. But, in part of the process, you guys want to replace me, that's fine too. I'm not trying to grasp at anything there.

MR. ADKINS: You're here permanently.
(Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: No. I can assure you that's not the case. So what do you guys want to do there? Leave it at five? Go to seven? What do you want to do?

MS. JONES: I do think the IDB needs to have representation, so...

MR. SHARPLEY: I'm with you, I would like to expand it if we can find somebody to fill it.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: That would be the issue, but that would be subject -- if you make it to the discretion appointment by the IDB chair, then the IDB chair -- I mean, we have elections every year, so you can replace the IDB chair annually anyway, if you wanted to. And the only thing I point out is Mr. Freeman's concern about scheduling and everything of seven people instead
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of five. I mean, that's certainly a legitimate concern. MS. JONES: We11, does it have to be the chair, or can the chair --

MR. NOBLETT: Designee.
MS. JONES: Designee, yeah.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah. No. That's what I was getting at. The chair designates two people.

MS. JONES: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: But also keep in mind here we don't have to propose it go from five to seven. We could propose the Mayor appoints one, the Council appoints one, the Chamber appoints one, and -- I mean, we can make it -- leave it at five. We don't have to grow to seven. Mr. Freeman -- or -- wait a minute -- Mr. Parker?

MR. PARKER: So, Mr. Chairman, the way I'm sort of looking at it is it's an Application Review Committee, so in that the board is not currently overwhelmed with a vast number of applications, I feel that the five are currently doing a pretty good job weeding them out. Adding two more people is just two more people, time commitment, and, again, now you've got to schedule a quorum of seven.

If the board doesn't like an application that comes, we don't accept it. I mean, that's -- we're the
$12: 25: 45$

12:25:47

12:25:47

12: $25: 50$

12:25:51

12:25:55
$12: 25: 55$

12:25:55

12:25:58

12:25:59

12:25:59

12:25:59

12:26:07

12:26:09

12:26:09

12:26:09

12:26:12

12:26:14

12:26:17

12:26:17

12:26:21

12:26:24

12:26:27

12:26:33
next level of the board. Why add two more people?
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Good point.
MR. NOBLETT: It also potentially creates a conflict if you have to vote on a matter that you've already been promoting to come before this board. So that's another potential issue that you might have.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Mr. Freeman?
MR. FLOYD: I say leave it.
CHAIRMAN RODGER: You say what, Jim?
MR. FLOYD: I say leave it.
CHAIRMAN ADKINS: Leave it. We've got a "leave it." We've got "leave it." Okay. That seems to be the consensus. Mr. Mamantov, that one's easy for you: leave it.

MR. MAMANTOV: I'm going to leave it. Okay.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Leave it. Okay. That one's done. All right.

Lastly, project costs of 15 percent, what is your thoughts?

MR. FLOYD: Yeah. I was more curious about that. I think Jermaine -- they made a good argument for the 15 percent, to me, so I say leave that. If that seems to be the industry norm, let's not upset the apple cart right now. But that's just my opinion.

I could see, honestly, going up to 25
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percent. I kind of like that flexibility. But on that note, it sort of sounds like the developers who actually make applications to these -- how can I say this -- are flexible enough in their financing and in their request is where they generally get what they really need anyway, say for the infrastructure and what it's really used for. So I think 15 percent is a good starting point.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. We've got one
saying leave 15 percent.
MR. PARKER: I let go of his comments. And Ms. Sharp made a very good point. I can really see it from both sides. But I think if you remove that cap, what stops anybody from asking for 50 or 75 every single time? 15 is a good guardrail, I like that there.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. We have got two opinions there.

MR. ADKINS: I agree.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: We seem to have a consensus there, Mr. Mamantov, on leaving the 15 percent.

All right. So with that, anything else that you guys want to give instructions, thoughts, as far as Mr. Mamantov, going forward?

MR. FLOYD: I will say one thing, and that's actually not about that, it's going back to Ms. Sharp's concern on that 15 percent. I didn't share that concern,
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that everybody would expect that. To me, even in looking at development, my thought on it is 15 percent is pretty low, and is it even worth doing.

It's all a lot of work and problem to do it for 15 percent, you know? You've got to have your stuff together as a developer and really have it organized just to even make it worth your time; otherwise, I think it's a losing proposition.

So, I guess, just for your thought, I saw that completely different, that you thought they would expect it, and I thought they wouldn't even fool with it.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Ms. Jones?
MS. JONES: And then just back on the committee, not to say that it needs to be a whole lot more people, but is there anybody that's not represented on it? It doesn't necessarily have to be us. But is there anybody that we feel should have representation on that committee that currently isn't?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: That certain1y would be subject to something. I mean, it's going to come back in front of us, so we could certainly think about that issue, Ms. Jones. And to the extent you recognize somebody in further thought that needs to be on there, I mean, we can always modify that at the March meeting. It's not something he has to prepare in advance. That's
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modifiable.
Mr. Floyd?
MR. FLOYD: I was just going to -- I thought the same thing. And in thinking about that, I think that's all of us. We are the ones, we're the ones from, you know, our various districts and our various -- so I kind of see that as being us because, after all, we are still going to review and approve, you know? So that's why I thought, "Well, that additional representation is the board," is what I came up with.

MS. JONES: If we get more people on the board.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right. This is not a public comment period, but Ms. Sharp's been kind enough to share her expertise with us, and she's done a lot. Ms. Sharp, real quick, if you would.

MS. SHARP: Go any way you want to go on the size of the Application Review Committee, it's probably not a big deal, but I did want to point out this committee only meets once, and I'm sure, in setting up this meeting that Maria, or whomever, contact people, tries to find a good date or whatever, so it's not like a lot of committees, like a planning commission or whatever that has a monthly meeting. This is a one-time thing. So whether that has any bearing on your decision, like I
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say, this is not a huge, big deal.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: You're talking about the Application Review Committee is a one-time?

MS. SHARP: The
Application Review Committee, yes, it's a one time.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Gotcha.
MR. NOBLETT: It may be a long meeting, depending on the project, too.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. All right.
Anything else from the board on this issue?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right. We'11 put that on the agenda for the March meeting. And thank you to CALEB and to Ms. Sharp, and certainly to the Chamber, for sharing your thoughts. The Chamber through writing, and CALEB and Ms. Sharp for being here in person, we appreciate that very much.

On the agenda, Discussion Items-Other Business: Kerry Hayes is out of town, wasn't able to join us.

Mr. Floyd, I know you and I -- I think Mr. Hayes has kind of taken the lead on the website -- did you have anything you wanted to add? Because, from my understanding, there's been a lot of progress made; in fact - -
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MR. FREEMAN: We can show it to you.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah. We've got, actually, something up and running. It looks good.

MR. FREEMAN: (Indicating.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Oh, you can show it to us now. Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: I can show you now. So thank you, Harry, if you want to put on the screen.

MR. VELA: (Complies.)
MR. FREEMAN: So, this is the City's Economic Development website for the Department of Economic Development. You will notice at the top, we inserted a little tab that says IDB.

So, Harry, if you would be so kind as to click on IDB.

MR. VELA: (Complies.)
MR. FREEMAN: And then you just click on it and then it takes you to your very own page.

Now, of course, this is not meant to be the permanent site for you, but we have created this on our website, and so we are still updating it. The links work. We're trying to get head-shots for all of you. I think we may be missing one or two. But this is -- you can actually find us on the City's web page.

So, for example, if you go to -- Harry, if
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you would be so kind as to go to Chattanooga.gov, and then if go over to Departments, and then scroll down to Economic Development, and then click here to view our website.

MR. VELA: (Complies.)
MR. FREEMAN: It's in the middle of the page. And then here you are, and then you can go to IDB at the top, and then you can click on the links. So, Harry, if you'11 go down to Our Board Members.

MR. VELA: (Complies.)
MR. FREEMAN: So, we have got some lovely head-shots for many of you. So everybody is looking good.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: So who are the slackers here?
(Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right. Mr. Floyd, flying solo there. All right.
(Laughter.)
MR. FREEMAN: So just -- so we're currently updating it, but it is live and people can click on it.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: That's wonderful. It's much improved, so thank you. And we'11 certainly --

MR. FREEMAN: I will share that with Kim. Kim worked hard on this.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah. I'm impressed. And it looks much better. You guys agree?

MS. JONES: Yes.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Very good. Bylaws: We've spent a lot of time here on TIF policies. I don't think -- I haven't heard anything back from you guys as far as any major requirements or anything, modifications needed to the bylaws. With your permission, I'll put that on the March agenda, and we'11 -- there's nothing pressing from that standpoint.

MR. NOBLETT: We can go from seven to nine.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah, we have got to go from seven to nine. There's a few other little things that I think I'm going to suggest to guys, but they are little so we can address that in March, if you are willing. And it looks like you are good.

HomeServe, we had a resolution on our agenda, if you will recall, at the last meeting, that was postponed. It's not on this agenda, but Mr. Noblett and I got an email about it from HomeServe, a vice president or something. Mr. Noblett, can you kind of update us, if you would?

MR. NOBLETT: Yes, sir. We sent, after the last board meeting here on the 5th, the provisions to HomeServe telling them that we needed to have some more
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information from them under 17b of the PILOT Agreement because that provision of the HomeServe PILOT provides that they can do certain things if they are engaged in a -- I guess it's a change of control.

And the change of control under paragraph 17b of the PILOT Agreement says that if there is a change of control by a company other than a related party and the ownership is 50 percent or more of the voting power of HomeServe, then they can do certain things if they just give notice.

And, in this case, we sent them a letter back asking them to respond to our request for change of control within 20 days and if we did not object to the change of control within the 20-day time period, then they can complete the change of control.

To my knowledge, after December the 12th, I have not gotten another email. That's what I was concerned about, in that regard. I know I had some immediate contact from Mr. Keith Persick (phonetic approximation) right after that occurred. Did you get something more recently?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah. We got something yesterday.

MR. NOBLETT: Okay. I was asking him to send a letter to everybody here. And that's why I didn't find
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it, from Eileen Hewitt is where it came from.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: There's an attached
1etter.
MR. NOBLETT: Yes. And that letter in that regard is showing what the employment issues were with the PILOT program, what the wage for employees were in that regard, and how the, I guess, the initial costs were going in connection with their PILOT report.

They actually had to file a recent PILOT report on here. And we were concerned initially about the commitments that they made on the front end of it here. And this is their report to the Chamber at least showing that they are still here and are available in the city and that they have significantly exceeded the 154-job commitment, for the total growth of 377 new full-time positions and that these new positions have exceeded the original average wage by $\$ 10,000$, with an average wage of approximately $\$ 50,000$ each.

So that was something that was concerned on the front end, about the new jobs here and that the anticipated investment on the property is supposed to be $\$ 4$ million right now. And they said that the annual report that was made, apparently, some of those investments were excluded from what they've actually provided. So they provided us information in connection
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with this.
And I guess the question at this point in time is is there anything more that y'all need from HomeServe regarding their annual report they that provided?

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: And since, Mr. Noblett, that was not sent to anybody at least connected with the IDB, other than me and you, I think we need to put that on our next agenda.

MR. NOBLETT: We'11 get it on the agenda.
CHAIRMAN RODGER: And let me forward that email to you all.

MR. NOBLETT: And that, likewise, is something that the City and the County should have been forwarded as well, and I'll confirm that that has occurred as well.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay.
MR. NOBLETT: Okay.
CHAIRMAN RODGER: So I will -- thank you, Mr. Noblett -- I'11 get that to my fellow board members and then at the next meeting -- Maria, if you'11 help me remember to put that on the agenda, please, about HomeServe.

MR. NOBLETT: Yeah. I was doing a search for HomeServe and Ms. Eileen Hewett did not come up when I
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did that, so that's my problem.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Okay. Good dea1. A11 right. PILOT Policies and Procedures, I continue to want us to get that on the agenda and have that as a later-to-do, but I don't want us to forget about it, and I don't think we will, but I expressly want to mention that because I think we need to get the TIF Policies and Procedures first get that ironed out. I don't want too much on our plate at one time. So it looks like you guys are in agreement with that and aren't going to stage a coup on me because we are not addressing it today. So, okay, thank you very much.

MR. NOBLETT: Notice of Lien.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah, Notice of Lien from Gestamp dealing with B\&B Stee1 Erectors.

MR. NOBLETT: Yeah, because that is a project that is ongoing here for Gestamp, back and forth here, they have actually sent us, with the IDB, a copy of a notice of lien. Apparently, it's a dispute over supplies and materials that has been provided by B\&B to Gestamp. We forwarded that on to Gestamp as well for them to at least resolve that issue, the lien. But I wanted to make sure that y'all were aware. Y'all are getting notice since there is a PILOT project involved and y'all are the ownership of the property, and that's why it came to the
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Industrial Development Board.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right. Thank you.
Any questions for Mr. Noblett about that?
(No response.)
MR. NOBLETT: It didn't look like it was that big.

CHAIRMAN RODGERS: $\$ 24,000 / \$ 25,000$.
MR. NOBLETT: Yeah. \$24,436.
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Yeah. So that's all.
A11 right. Any other items of business from the board?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: Any board member have anything to bring up?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RODGERS: A11 right. Seeing none, thank you all for coming, we stand adjourned.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:14, 24:19, 25:3, } \\ & 32: 7,40: 10,40: 23, \\ & 54: 25,55: 6,79: 14 \\ & \text { county }[8]-7: 23, \\ & 24: 2,24: 5,24: 9, \\ & 32: 23,66: 14 \\ & \text { County's }[1]-14: 12 \\ & \text { coup }[1]-80: 11 \\ & \text { couple }[5]-30: 7, \\ & \text { 48:18, } 52: 16,59: 20, \\ & 59: 22 \\ & \text { course }[6]-6: 12,7: 5, \\ & 32: 20,35: 24,41: 5, \\ & 74: 19 \\ & \text { court }[1]-44: 17 \\ & \text { cover }[1]-46: 9 \\ & \text { covers }[1]-57: 16 \\ & \text { craft }[1]-9: 3 \\ & \text { create }[8]-5: 16,19: 9, \\ & 29: 19,29: 22,37: 13, \\ & 42: 10,53: 23,55: 9 \\ & \text { created }[2]-6: 20, \\ & 74: 20 \\ & \text { creates }[2]-15: 18, \\ & 69: 3 \\ & \text { creating }[1]-54: 12 \\ & \text { creation }[2]-29: 24, \\ & 36: 23 \\ & \text { credit }[1]-17: 11 \\ & \text { Creek }[1]-6: 14 \\ & \text { criminal }[1]-8: 5 \\ & \text { critical }[1]-38: 15 \\ & \text { curious }[2]-23: 14, \\ & 69: 20 \\ & \text { current }[3]-42: 25, \\ & 45: 2,64: 22 \\ & \text { cut }[1]-37: 25 \\ & \text { cyclical }[1]-41: 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | deemed ${ }_{[1]}-59: 21$ deeper $[1]-9: 4$ default $[4]-31: 24$, $31: 25,33: 3,56: 9$ defer $[1]-46: 25$ defined $[1]-28: 1$ definition $[1]-45: 9$ definitions $[1]-3: 22$ delete $[2]-13: 25,62: 8$ deliberate $[1]-12: 17$ deliberation $[1]-$ 12:13 delighted $[1]-59: 8$ demands $[1]-49: 22$ Department $[1]-$ $74: 11$ departments $[1]-51: 1$ Departments $[1]-$ $75: 2$ described $[1]-32: 4$ deserves $[1]-17: 11$ design $[3]-31: 17$, $31: 22,34: 3$ designate $[1]-13: 21$ designates $[1]-68: 7$ designed $[1]-29: 17$ designee $[2]-68: 4$, $68: 5$ detail $[1]-16: 8$ details $[1]-29: 5$ determent $[1]-64: 8$ determine $[2]-18: 1$, $24: 5$ develop $[2]-9: 2,30: 4$ Develop $[1]-44: 24$ developer $[12]-10: 20$, 19:8, 27:20, $27: 22$, $28: 2,29: 6,29: 12$, $53: 20,56: 19,57: 24$, $64: 3,71: 6$ developer's $[1]-55: 3$ developers $[11]-$ $15: 12,15: 21,16: 24$, 19:24, 27:12, 31:5, $34: 2,45: 11,53: 1$, $54: 2,70: 2$ Development $[7]-$ $2: 3,5: 11,52: 23$, $74: 11,74: 12,75: 3$, $81: 1$ development $[9]-$ 19:22, 29:23, $32: 9$, $33: 13,37: 20,38: 17$, $38: 24,66: 24,71: 2$ developments $[1]-$ $33: 11$ dictate $[1]-24: 5$ difference $[2]-43: 7$, $43: 14$ different $[11]-4: 17$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:25, 10:1, 21:22, } \\ & \text { 27:20, } 51: 1,53: 14, \\ & 53: 17,53: 18,54: 8, \\ & 71: 10 \\ & \text { differently }[1]-34: 3 \\ & \text { difficult }[6]-4: 16, \\ & 25: 20,29: 11,57: 4, \\ & 58: 18,59: 10 \\ & \text { difficulty }[1]-37: 11 \\ & \text { dig }[1]-55: 2 \\ & \text { directly }[1]-57: 19 \\ & \text { director }[1]-46: 14 \\ & \text { disabled }[1]-37: 6 \\ & \text { disagree }[2]-4: 13, \\ & 18: 12 \\ & \text { disclose }[1]-8: 5 \\ & \text { disclosures }[1]-8: 18 \\ & \text { discretion }[1]-67: 21 \\ & \text { discretionary }[4]- \\ & 22: 3,64: 13,64: 18, \\ & 65: 23 \\ & \text { discuss }[1]-62: 21 \\ & \text { discussed }[5]-9: 21, \\ & 9: 23,10: 15,11: 5, \\ & 48: 9 \\ & \text { discussion }[3]-2: 18, \\ & 19: 1,59: 23 \\ & \text { Discussion }[1]-73: 18 \\ & \text { discussions }[1]- \\ & 46: 11 \\ & \text { dispute }[1]-80: 19 \\ & \text { district }[3]-28: 20, \\ & 29: 22,30: 1 \\ & \text { District }[1]-7: 6 \\ & \text { districts }[2]-29: 22, \\ & 72: 6 \\ & \text { dive }[1]-9: 5 \\ & \text { division }[1]-50: 25 \\ & \text { doable }[1]-63: 4 \\ & \text { document }[7]-16: 6, \\ & 29: 18,36: 6,36: 13, \\ & 47: 4,52: 22,52: 25 \\ & \text { dollars }[6]-42: 16, \\ & 63: 3,63: 20,64: 7, \\ & 64: 19,64: 20 \\ & \text { done }[12]-17: 13, \\ & 21: 5,26: 16,29: 10, \\ & 31: 11,35: 5,35: 7, \\ & 39: 9,51: 19,57: 8, \\ & 69: 17,72: 15 \\ & \text { down }[8]-13: 8,41: 2, \\ & 50: 13,58: 3,58: 5, \\ & 66: 4,75: 2,75: 9 \\ & \text { downside }[1]-16: 4 \\ & \text { downtown }[4]-14: 22, \\ & 31: 1,32: 8,32: 9 \\ & \text { DPE }[1]-57: 17 \\ & \text { draft }[5]-5: 13,34: 16, \\ & 56: 21,62: 2,66: 6 \\ & \text { drafted }[2]-46: 12, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ```48:11 draw [1] - 48:18 drawing [1] - 3:20 drive [1] - 50:23 Drive [2]-44:11, 44:19 driven [1] - 11:9 duly [1]-2:5 duration [1] - 7:5 during [4]-23:4, 40:20, 49:1, 50:20```E <br> easier $[1]-43: 8$ <br> East $[4]-6: 20,28: 10$, <br> 28:14, 44:11 <br> easy $[3]-61: 24,62: 8$, <br> $69: 13$ <br> eaten $[1]-56: 6$ <br> Economic $[7]-5: 10$, <br> $44: 4,44: 23,48: 2$, <br> $74: 10,74: 11,75: 3$ <br> economic $[13]-19: 22$, <br> $29: 14,29: 17,29: 23$, <br> $30: 4,40: 14,40: 17$, <br> $40: 22,48: 13,48: 25$, <br> $49: 5,50: 17,55: 7$ <br> economy $[1]-40: 25$ <br> edit $[2]-9: 3,9: 8$ <br> edited $[1]-6: 11$ <br> education $[1]-13: 17$ <br> Education $[1]-37: 19$ <br> effect $[1]-41: 8$ <br> effective $[3]-45: 23$, <br> $46: 2,48: 21$ <br> effectively $[1]-41: 24$ <br> efforts $[1]-28: 17$ <br> Eileen $[2]-78: 1$, <br> $79: 25$ <br> either $[3]-24: 4,38: 9$, <br> $39: 7$ <br> elderly $[1]-37: 5$ <br> elections $[1]-67: 22$ <br> Elena $[2]-44: 11$, <br> $44: 19$ <br> elephant $[2]-39: 19$, <br> $41: 16$ <br> eligible $[1]-65: 4$ <br> else".. $[1]-25: 3$ <br> elsewhere $[1]-31: 11$ <br> email $[4]-3: 18,76: 20$, <br> $77: 17,79: 12$ <br> emailed $[1]-52: 9$ <br> embrace $[1]-21: 13$ <br> emphasis $[1]-34: 25$ <br> employees $[1]-78: 6$ <br> employers $[4]-37: 8$, <br> $37: 9,37: 10,37: 11$ <br> employment $[1]-78: 5$ <br> eme | ```enchilada [1] - 31:8 encourage [5] - 10:4, 19:18, 35:13, 47:9, 58:2 encouraged [4] - 48:4, 48:6, 48:10, 54:18 end \([7]-41: 24,47: 11\), 55:18, 60:13, 65:7, 78:11, 78:20 enforceable [1] - 45:13 engaged [2] - 54:12, 77:3 ensure \([4]-7: 21\), 20:20, 42:8, 42:17 enters [2]-4:10, 56:16 entertain [2]-60:1, 60:6 entire [2] - 23:1, 56:6 entirely [1] - 23:19 entities \({ }_{[1]}\) - 10:18 entitled [1] - 4:15 entitlement [4]- 19:24, 21:2, 21:7, 27:13 entity \([7]-10: 21\), 26:18, 29:18, 40:4, 53:8, 57:19, 57:21 environmental [1] - 15:10 EPA [1] - 42:15 equity [5] - 50:23, 51:1, 51:8, 51:25, 54:13 Erectors [1] - 80:15 essentially [1] - 61:23 estate [2]-38:17, 39:25 evaluate [1]-66:7 events [1]-42:12 exact [2] - 29:25, 46:15 exactly [1] - 28:2 example [8]-28:10, 34:5, 53:2, 53:5, 53:14, 53:19, 62:25, 74:25 exceed [1] - 63:3 exceeded [2] - 78:14, 78:17 excellent \({ }_{[1]}-57: 2\) excerpt [1]-21:1 exchanges [1] - 36:14 excluded [1] - 78:24 excuse [2] - 35:5, 40:2 exempted [1]-15:25 exemption [1] - 14:19 existing [2] - 42:6, 65:4``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

LORI A. ROBERSON. LCR. CCR
LAW REPORTING (423) 505-0909
1awreporting225@gmai1.com

| ```exits [1] - 54:20 expand [2]-67:2, 67:18 expanding [1] - 51:15 expansion [1] - 54:7 expect [4] - 39:22, 42:2, 71:1, 71:11 expectation [5] - 17:6, 19:9, 19:23, 21:23, 40:3``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fellow }[5]-3: 20,3: 23, \\ & 35: 19,47: 1,79: 20 \\ & \text { felony }[1]-8: 5 \\ & \text { felt }[4]-21: 11,23: 24, \\ & 27: 11,64: 5 \\ & \text { few }[4]-41: 7,52: 10, \\ & 56: 2,76: 13 \\ & \text { fighting }[1]-33: 6 \\ & \text { figure }[2]-18: 15, \\ & 55: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { footage }[1]-30: 2 \\ & \text { Force }[3]-44: 4, \\ & \text { 44:23, 48:2 } \\ & \text { forever }[1]-13: 8 \\ & \text { forget }[1]-80: 5 \\ & \text { forgotten }[1]-65: 15 \\ & \text { forma }[1]-55: 3 \\ & \text { forming }[1]-50: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $4: 19,18: 9,28: 3$future $[5]-12: 24$,$13: 18,14: 3,53: 23$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { guardrail }[1]-70: 14 \\ \text { guardrails }[4]-20: 20, \\ 21: 8,27: 10,27: 15 \\ \text { guess }[12]-23: 8, \\ 39: 17,48: 8,48: 14, \\ 50: 9,51: 14,59: 16, \\ 61: 1,71: 9,77: 4, \\ 78: 7,79: 2 \\ \text { guy }[1]-33: 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | game-changing [1] - |  |
|  |  |  | 19:15 |  |
|  |  |  | gap [1] - 28:3 | guys [13]-3:23 |
| expectations [3] - | file [1] - 78:9 | forums [1]-45: | gaps [1] - 10:1 | 35:20, 37:18, 58:5, |
| 21:8, 24:16, 25:1 | fill [2] - 10:11, 67 | fo | garage [1] - 34:5 | 24, 67:1, 67:7 |
| expected [1]-15:11 | final [1]-41:3 | 12:18, 44:2, 49:7 | general [2]-66:17, | :12, 70:21, 76:2, |
| experience [2] - | finance [3] - 17:17, | 70:22, 79:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:25 } \\ & \text { generally }[7]-10: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 76:6, 76:14, 80:9 |
| expertise [5] - 17:17, | financially $[1]-33: 2$ | $79: 15,80: 2$ | 33:6, 35:2, 57:6, $57 \cdot 22 \cdot 59 \cdot 7 \cdot 70: 5$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 39: 6,39: 10,48: 17 \\ & 72: 15 \end{aligned}$ | Financing [1] - 3:10 | forwarding [2]-13:5, | 57:22, 59:7, 70:5 |  |
| explain [1]-35:8 | 70:4 | fought [1]-33:2 | gentrification [1] 49.21 | Hamilton [2]-40:23, 55:6 |
| explicit $[1]-51: 5$ <br> express [1]-36:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fine }[4]-19: 1,29: 4, \\ & 50: 8,67: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { four }[3]-6: 9,26: 5 \text {, }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 49:21 } \\ \text { Gestam } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 6 \\ & \text { hand }[1]-23: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| expressly [1] - 80:6 | finish [1]-27 | frames | 80:17, 80:20, 80:21 | andicap [1] - 37: |
| Extension [2] - 6:16, | firm [5] - 17:22, 38:16 | framework [1] - 29: | giant [1] - 41:16 | handle [1]-27:2 |
| 7:4 | $38: 19,38: 20,55: 1$ first [7] - | free [1] -35:23 | GILLILAND [3] 46:13, 47:3, 47:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { happy [2] - 16:10, } \\ & 46: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| extension [1]-6:21 <br> extent [3]-36:1, | first $[7]-5: 4,6: 12$ | FREEMAN [49]-5:8, | 46:13, 47:3, 47:17 <br> Gilliland [3]-43:25, | 46:16 <br> hard [2] - 33:17, 75:25 |
| 37:13, 71:22 | 57:8, 80:8 | $2: 16$ | 46:13, 60:19 | Hardy [1] - 6:20 |
| external ${ }_{[1]}-5$ : | fit ${ }_{[2]}$ - 11:11, 35:25 | 2:23, 23:17, | given [2]-22:19, | harmful [1] - 49:19 |
| extraordinarily [1] - | five [16] -2:4, 7:3, | 24:17, 24:22, 25:4, | $32: 22$ | Harry [5] - 6:2, 74:8, 74:14, 74:25, 75:8 |
|  | 13:21, 13:25, 16:15, | $25: 6,25: 8,25: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{glad}[3]-9: 18,38: 5, \\ & 48: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 74:14, 74:25, 75:8 <br> hate [1] - 63:15 |
| F | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 6,66: 21,67: 2, \\ & 67: 13,68: 1,68: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : 8,36: 5,39: 16, \\ & : 20,39: 23,40: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gonna [1] - 15:10 } \\ & \text { GOODEN [8] - 44:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hayes }[2]-73: 19, \\ & 73: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| facilitate ${ }_{[1]}$ - 45:20 | 68:13, 68:20 | :14, 41:18, 42:3, | 44:3, 44:8, 44:11 | head [3] - 66:4, 74:22, |
| Facility [1]-37:19 | fixed [1] - 55:20 | :16, 44:20, 52:14, | 44:16, 44:19, 44:22, | 75:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { fact }[3]-32: 12,48: 24, \\ & 73: 25 \end{aligned}$ | flexibility ${ }_{[1]}-70$ : flexible | $: 16,61: 9,61: 19,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:10 } \\ & \text { Gooden [3] - 44:3, } \end{aligned}$ | head-shots [2] - $74: 22,75: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 73: 25 \\ & \text { fairly }[2]-23: 16,58: 11 \end{aligned}$ | flexible [1] - 70:4 <br> flooding ${ }_{[1]}$ - 42:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 15,64: 21,65: 9, \\ & 6: 11,66: 18,74: 1, \end{aligned}$ | Gooden [3] - 44:3, 44:7, 46:4 | 74:22, 75:12 <br> headed [1] - 23:13 |
| familiar [1] - 9:19 | floor ${ }_{[1]}$-65:5 | 4, 74:7, 74:10, | gotcha [1]-73:6 | heading [2]-14:1, |
| family [1] - 37:4 | FLOYD [11] - 16:13 | 4:17, 75:6, 75:11, | governing [1] - 11:1 | 16:17 |
| fan [1] - 19:11 | 18:6, 18:12, 18:15, | 75:20, 75:24 | government $[7]-7: 23$, | Health [1]-37:19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{far}[6]-35: 22,51: 14, \\ 60: 17,66: 20,70: 21, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:20, 20:11, 26:24, } \\ & 69: 10,69: 20,70: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { freeman }[3]-38: 2 \\ 59: 20,68: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:9, 17:17, 17:19, } \\ & 43: 5,55: 3,57: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { hear [3] - 16:13, } \\ 36: 21,44: 16 \end{gathered}$ |
| 76:7 | 72:3 | Freeman [11] - 5:10 | governmental [5] | heard [8]-23:9 |
| favor ${ }_{[1]}-2: 20$ | floyd $[3]-69: 8,72: 2$, | $11: 21,36: 3,37: 23$, $39: 14,43: 19,47: 4$ | 10:18, 10:21, 57:19 $57.20,58: 12$ | 37:10, 49:20, 52:18, |
| February ${ }_{[1]}$ - 61:20 federal [3] - 43:5, | 75:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 14,43: 19,47: 4, \\ & 2: 15,60: 10,62: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57: 20,58: 12 \\ \text { grasp }[1]-67: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 18,60: 15,61: 4, \\ & 76: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $43: 6,58: 16$ | FLOYED ${ }_{[1]}$ - $27: 7$ |  | great [7]-13:11, | hearing [6] - 12:12 |
| fee $[17]-7: 18,7: 20$, | flying $[1]$ - 75:18 | Freeman's [1] - 67:24 | $15: 16,19: 22,40: 21,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 6,48: 5,48: 16, \\ & 50: 10,59: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 13,8: 15,8: 18, \\ & \text { 13:11, 13:16, 23:18, } \end{aligned}$ | focus [1]-45:7 <br> focuses [1]-12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { friend }[2]-55: 2^{2} \\ & 55: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $48: 17,50: 6,58: 5$ greetings [1] $-48: 3$ | 50:10, 59:14 hearings [1]-7:24 |
| 23:20, 23:21, 39:15, | $\text { folks }[3]-5: 5,55: 8 \text {, }$ | front [6] - 4:4, 34:14, | ground [1] - $33: 18$ | heart $[1]-50: 19$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 4,42: 6,55: 20, \\ & 60: 15,66: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 57:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:20, 71:21, 78:11, } \\ & 78: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { group }[7]-12: 8,53: 1, \\ 54: 4,57: 22,57: 23 \end{gathered}$ | heavy [1] - 42:12 <br> Helen [4]-9:20, 11:6, |
| feedback [1] - 36:15 | $11: 15,14: 14,48: 8$ | fruition [1] - 28:4 | 58:23 | 12:6, 20:24 |
| fees [13]-7:22, 13:13, | follow-up [1] - 11:15 | full $[3]-13: 7,24: 13$, | groups [1] - 45:11 | Helen's [1] - $21: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:19, 24:1, 42:9, } \\ & 42: 19,42: 22,43: 4 \end{aligned}$ | followed [2]-6:19, | 78:16 <br> full-time ${ }_{[1]}-78: 16$ | 38:' | $\text { elp [7] - 17:3, } 28:$ |
| $43: 10,43: 11,43: 15$ | following ${ }_{[1]}-16: 4$ | fund [1] - 29:22 | growth [1] - 78:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 19,49: 0,2 \\ & 62: 20,79: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
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| ```\(\boldsymbol{s i x}[7]-14: 9,23: 15\), 27:19, 33:16, 33:19, 61:23, 61:24 six-year [1] - 33:16 six/seven [1] - 17:15 size [4] - 13:20, 25:22, 61:25, 72:18 sized [2] - 41:4, 63:8 slackers [1] - 75:14 sleep [1] - 35:4 slide [1] - 6:11 slides [3]-5:19, 5:22, 7:2 slow [2] - 56:22 slum [1] - 19:14 small [5] - 56:3, 63:8, 64:1, 65:17, 65:19 small-sized [1] - 63:8 so.. [1]-67:16 soccer [1] - 57:8 solo [1] - 75:18 someone [5] - 5:4, 14:13, 32:17, 41:23, 56:25 sometimes [5] - 19:24, 35:14, 55:16, 55:19, 59:11 somewhat [2]-11:10, 37:25 somewhere [1] - 42:11 sorry [3] - 6:2, 23:13, 25:8 sort [34]-5:19, 5:21, 7:9, 7:15, 8:7, 11:4, 14:16, 17:5, 17:24, 19:23, 21:19, 21:23, 22:9, 22:11, 27:5, 27:10, 27:12, 27:23, 32:12, 36:20, 40:4, 41:8, 54:9, 55:8, 55:17, 55:21, 55:22, 56:1, 63:16, 65:16, 66:12, 68:17, 70:2 sounds [1] - 70:2 South [5] - 6:25, 7:5, 45:20, 49:16, 53:13 spark [1] - 28:23 speaking [2]-12:7, 44:22 special \({ }_{[1]}-7: 7\) specializes [1] - 38:16 specific [3]-49:22, 53:1, \(67: 3\) specifically [2]-3:20, 37:4 spend [2]-42:16, 56:4 spending \([1]\) - \(55: 19\) spent [2] - 34:21, 76:5``` | ```spirit \({ }_{[1]}-9: 10\) spoken [1]-23:4 sports [1] - 57:10 spread [1] - 31:1 spur [1] - 36:22 square [1] - 30:2 stadium [6]-7:1, 7:6, 14:20, 15:25, 57:8, 59:2 stadium's [1] - 15:7 staff [4]-18:24, 20:7, 27:2 stage \([1]-80: 10\) stamped \({ }_{[1]}\) - 38:21 stand [2]-35:10, 81:16 stand-alone [1] - 35:10 standpoint [5] - 24:15, 30:22, 39:3, 65:22, 76:10 start [3]-27:6, 45:24, 46:2 started [4]-2:2, 30:25, 42:24, 54:24 starting [2] - 36:19, 70:7 state [19]- \(3: 3,3: 18\), 4:15, 7:8, 8:12, 9:25, 10:11, 10:24, 11:8, 21:12, 29:14, 29:17, 31:15, 32:25, 34:13, 37:3, 53:7, 58:12, 58:17 state's [2]-7:11, 7:17 statement [1]-10:3 statute \([7]-3: 18\), 7:11, 7:18, 8:12, 10:5, 10:9, \(37: 3\) Steel [1] - 80:15 step [2]-22:9, 26:18 stick [1] - 34:4 still [10]-10:14, 22:3, 32:18, 38:7, 41:22, 54:4, 65:19, 72:8, 74:21, 78:13 stood [1] - 40:23 stops [1] - 70:13 storage \({ }_{[1]}\) - 42:17 stories [1] - 64:1 stormwater [20] - 7:22, 8:18, 13:11, 13:13, 13:16, 23:18, 23:20, 23:21, 39:15, 40:4, 42:6, 42:9, 42:19, 42:22, 43:4, 43:10, 43:17, 60:15, 66:16 story [1] - 11:10 straightforward [1] -``` | ```23:16 strain [1] - 42:12 street [1]-19:8 Street [2]-6:20, 46:14 strip [1] - 33:11 stronger \([2]-5: 17\), 7:25 structure \({ }^{[1]}-31: 16\) structured [2]-31:12, 31:13 student [2]-33:10, 64:4 stuff [4] - 31:11, 32:12, 58:14, 71:5 subject \([3]-67: 1\), 67:20, 71:20 subsidiary \({ }_{[1]}-4: 2\) subsidies [1] - 45:12 subsidy [3] - 14:5, 22:9, 33:14 successful \([1]-33: 2\) suggest [3] - 13:4, 60:9, 76:14 suggested [1] - 59:18 suggestion [1] - 60:8 suggestions [1] - 12:23 summary \({ }_{[2]}-7: 16\), 8:24 suppliers [1] - 40:14 supplies [1]-80:19 support [4]-11:3, 22:2, 45:3, 59:6 supportive [1]-35:1 supports [1]-53:11 supposed [2]-44:20, 78:21 surface [1] - 42:11 surrounds [1] - 28:18 surveyed \({ }^{11]}\) - 55:22 system [1] - 42:13```T <br> T.C.A ${ }_{[1]}-3: 19$ <br> tab $[1]-74: 13$ <br> tabled $[1]-53: 2$ <br> tanks $[1]-42: 17$ <br> Task $[3]-44: 4,44: 23$, <br> $48: 2$ <br> $\operatorname{tax}[3]-12: 9,43: 6$, <br> $65: 2$ <br> Tax $_{[1]}-3: 10$ <br> taxes $[13]-13: 7$, <br> $13: 14,13: 15,13: 17$, <br> $24: 3,24: 6,24: 8$, <br> $24: 13,32: 23,43: 9$, <br> $60: 15,66: 13$ <br> taxpayer $[2]-14: 4$, <br> $39: 3$ | ```Taxpayer \({ }_{[1]}-12: 7\) taxpayers [1]-17:4 team [1]-15:1 ten [1]-35:21 ten-year [1]-35:21 Tennessee [2]-53:24, 57:7 term [5]-8:9, 17:21, 18:4, 19:21, 33:22 terms [6] - 21:18, 27:16, 28:2, 29:2, 33:5, 36:21 test \([3]-19: 6,19: 16\), 38:23 testimony \({ }_{[1]}\) - 12:17 tests [1]-11:4 text [2]-14:1, 25:10 THE [1] - 44:17 themselves [1]-43:10 theoretically \({ }_{[2]}\) - 46:23, 65:18 there'Il \({ }_{[1]}-18: 25\) therefore [2]-11:3, 24:14 they've [2]-17:13, 78:24 thinking [6] - 16:23, 19:8, 37:8, 46:7, 62:21, 72:4 third [29]-14:6, 15:13, 15:15, 16:3, 17:10, 17:16, 18:2, 19:3, 20:7, 26:1, 26:3, 26:7, 26:12, 26:16, 32:19, 33:4, 33:7, 33:8, 33:16, 38:11, 38:13, 39:8, 48:19, 48:22, 49:2, 54:18, 62:22, 63:4, 64:5 third-party [27]-14:6, 15:13, 15:15, 16:3, 17:10, 17:16, 18:2, 19:3, 20:7, 26:3, 26:7, 26:12, 26:16, 32:19, 33:4, 33:7, 33:8, 33:16, 38:11, 38:13, 39:8, 48:19, 48:22, 54:18, 62:22, 63:4, 64:5 thorough [3]-39:1, 55:16, 55:17 thoughts [6]-34:10, 48:18, 52:4, 69:19, 70:21, 73:15 three [4] - 7:3, 27:25, 33:9, 45:25 threshold [2]-63:16, 65:7 throughout [1]-40:22 throw [2]-17:4, 47:15``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { thrown }[1]-30: 21 \\ & \text { thumb }[1]-32: 12 \\ & \text { tie }[1]-63: 18 \\ & \text { TIF }[74]-3: 1,3: 4, \\ & 3: 1,5: 12,5: 13, \\ & 5: 17,5: 22,6: 7,6: 12, \\ & 6: 14,6: 16,6: 20,7: 4, \\ & 7: 6,7: 10,8: 9,10: 3, \\ & 10: 19,12: 10,15: 14, \\ & 17: 6,17: 13,17: 20, \\ & 19: 22,20: 2,21: 24, \\ & 22: 3,22: 24,23: 4, \\ & 23: 10,23: 24,26: 1, \\ & 26: 6,27: 16,27: 19, \\ & 27: 21,27: 23,28: 5, \\ & 28: 6,28: 8,28: 11, \\ & 28: 12,28: 16,28: 20, \\ & 28: 23,29: 5,29: 8, \\ & 29: 19,29: 22,33: 12, \\ & 33: 16,35: 3,35: 9, \\ & 35: 22,38: 18,39: 24, \\ & 42: 23,45: 8,45: 16, \\ & 46: 8,47: 10,51: 16, \\ & 53: 13,53: 20,56: 4, \\ & 63: 1,64: 22,65: 3, \\ & 65: 4,65: 19,76: 5, \\ & 80: 7 \\ & \text { TIFs }[23]-5: 24,6: 10, \\ & 6: 11,6: 23,7: 3, \\ & 17: 14,19: 10,19: 11, \\ & 19: 12,21: 17,22: 6, \\ & 31: 1,31: 14,32: 7, \\ & 34: 12,34: 23,35: 5, \\ & 35: 7,35: 15,39: 21, \\ & 54: 12 \\ & \text { today }[10]-5: 12, \\ & 12: 11,12: 15,52: 18, \\ & 60: 4,60: 14,61: 4, \\ & 61: 6,62: 23,80: 11 \\ & \text { together }[3]-10: 6, \\ & 61: 2,71: 6 \\ & \text { ton }[1]-10: 23 \\ & \text { took }[5]-8: 11,8: 20, \\ & 38: 5,45: 1,58: 24 \\ & \text { tool }[5]-19: 12,19: 22, \\ & 28: 23,37: 16,51: 22 \\ & \text { toolbox }[1]-37: 16 \\ & \text { tools }[1]-7: 13 \\ & \text { top }[2]-74: 12,75: 8 \\ & \text { topic }[1]-32: 1 \\ & \text { total }[6]-16: 21,17: 3, \\ & 27: 16,49: 12,64: 24, \\ & 78: 15 \\ & \text { totality }[1]-21: 3 \\ & \text { totally }[2]-33: 2,58: 1 \\ & \text { touch }[1]-12: 3 \\ & \text { towards }[1]-50: 20 \\ & \text { town }[1]-73: 19 \\ & \text { Toyota }[1]-41: 7 \\ & \text { trades' }[1]-67: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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