

On motion of Alderman Burke, the said proposed order transmitted with the foregoing committee report was *Passed* by yeas and nays as follows:

Yeas -- Aldermen Flores, Fioretti, Dowell, Preckwinkle, Lyle, Jackson, Harris, Beale, Pope, Balcer, Cárdenas, Olivo, Burke, Foulkes, Thompson, Thomas, Lane, Rugai, Cochran, Brookins, Muñoz, Zalewski, Dixon, Solis, Ocasio, Burnett, E. Smith, Carothers, Reboyras, Suarez, Waguespack, Mell, Austin, Colón, Banks, Mitts, Allen, Laurino, O'Connor, Doherty, Reilly, Daley, Tunney, Levar, Shiller, Schuler, M. Smith, Moore, Stone -- 49.

Nays -- None.

Alderman Carothers moved to reconsider the foregoing vote. The motion was lost.

The following is said order as passed:

Ordered, That the Corporation Counsel is hereby authorized and directed to enter into and execute a settlement agreement in the following matter: *Helen Majerczyk v. Michael Pryzynski and the City of Chicago*, cited as 06 C 10934 in the amount of \$400,000.

AUTHORIZATION FOR AMENDMENT NUMBER 2 TO
95TH/WESTERN TAX INCREMENT FINANCING
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROJECT.

The Committee on Finance submitted the following report:

CHICAGO, February 6, 2008.

To the President and Members of the City Council:

Your Committee on Finance, having had under consideration an ordinance authorizing Amendment Number 2 to the 95th/Western Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Plan and Project, having had the same under advisement, begs leave to report and recommend that Your Honorable Body *Pass* the proposed ordinance transmitted herewith.

This recommendation was concurred in by a viva voce vote of the members of the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) EDWARD M. BURKE,
Chairman.

On motion of Alderman Burke, the said proposed ordinance transmitted with the foregoing committee report was *Passed by yeas and nays* as follows:

Yeas -- Aldermen Flores, Fioretti, Dowell, Preckwinkle, Lyle, Jackson, Harris, Beale, Pope, Balcer, Cárdenas, Olivo, Burke, Foulkes, Thompson, Thomas, Lane, Rugai, Cochran, Brookins, Muñoz, Zalewski, Dixon, Solis, Ocasio, Burnett, E. Smith, Carothers, Reboyras, Suarez, Waguespack, Mell, Austin, Colón, Banks, Mitts, Allen, Laurino, O'Connor, Doherty, Reilly, Daley, Tunney, Levar, Shiller, Schulter, M. Smith, Moore, Stone -- 49.

Nays -- None.

Alderman Carothers moved to reconsider the foregoing vote. The motion was lost.

The following is said ordinance as passed:

WHEREAS, Under ordinances adopted on July 13, 1995, and published in the *Journal of the Proceedings of the City Council of the City of Chicago* (the "*Journal*") for such date at pages 3914 to 3971, and under the provisions of the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4.1, et seq., as amended (the "Act"), the City Council (the "Corporate Authorities") of the City of Chicago (the "City"): (i) approved a redevelopment plan and project (the "Redevelopment Plan") for a portion of the City known as the "95th/Western Redevelopment Project Area" (the "Redevelopment Project Area") (such ordinance being defined herein as the "Approval Ordinance"); (ii) designated the Redevelopment Project Area as a "redevelopment project area" within the requirements of the Act (the "Designation Ordinance"); and, (iii) adopted tax increment financing for the Redevelopment Project Area (the "Adoption Ordinance"); and

WHEREAS, Under an ordinance adopted on March 19, 1997 and published in the *Journal* for such date at pages 42053 to 42107 (the "Plan Amendment Number 1 Ordinance") (the Approval Ordinance, the Designation Ordinance, the Adoption Ordinance, and the Amendment Number 1 Ordinance are collectively referred to in this ordinance as the "T.I.F.

Ordinances”), the Corporate Authorities approved an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan (“Plan Amendment Number 1”); and

WHEREAS, The Approval Ordinance, the Designation Ordinance, the Adoption Ordinance, and the Plan Amendment Number 1 Ordinance are collectively referred to in this ordinance as the “T.I.F. Ordinances”; and

WHEREAS, The Redevelopment Plan, as amended by Plan Amendment Number 1, is referred to in this ordinance as the “Amended Redevelopment Plan” (a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B); and

WHEREAS, Public Act 92-263, which became effective on August 7, 2001, amended the Act to provide that, under Section 11-74.4-5(c) of the Act, amendments to a redevelopment plan which do not (1) add additional parcels of property to the proposed redevelopment project area, (2) substantially affect the general land uses proposed in the redevelopment plan, (3) substantially change the nature of the redevelopment project, (4) increase the total estimated redevelopment project cost set out in the redevelopment plan by more than five percent (5%) after adjustment for inflation from the date the plan was adopted, (5) add additional redevelopment project costs to the itemized list of redevelopment project costs set out in the redevelopment plan, or (6) increase the number of inhabited residential units to be displaced from the redevelopment project area, as measured from the time of creation of the redevelopment project area, to a total of more than ten (10), may be made without further hearing, provided that notice is given as set forth in the Act as amended; and

WHEREAS, The Corporate Authorities now desire to amend the Amended Redevelopment Plan further to expand the land uses for which the City may use its power of eminent domain to acquire property, which such amendment shall not (1) add additional parcels of property to the proposed redevelopment project area, (2) substantially affect the general land uses proposed in the redevelopment plan, (3) substantially change the nature of the redevelopment project, (4) increase the total estimated redevelopment project cost set out in the redevelopment plan by more than five percent (5%) after adjustment for inflation from the date the plan was adopted, (5) add additional redevelopment project costs to the itemized list of redevelopment project costs set out in the redevelopment plan, or (6) increase the number of inhabited residential units to be displaced from the redevelopment project area, as measured from the time of creation of the redevelopment project area, to a total of more than ten (10); now, therefore,

Be It Ordained by the City Council of the City of Chicago:

SECTION 1. Recitals. The above recitals are incorporated herein and made a part hereof.

SECTION 2. Approval Of Plan Amendment Number 2 To Amended Redevelopment Plan. The “Plan Amendment Number 2 January, 2008 95th/Western Redevelopment Plan

and Project," a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A (the "Plan Amendment Number 2"), is hereby approved. Except as amended hereby, the Amended Redevelopment Plan shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 3. Invalidation Of Any Section. If any provision of this ordinance shall be held to be invalid or unenforceable for any reason, the invalidity or unenforceability of such provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this ordinance.

SECTION 4. Superseder. All ordinances (including, without limitation, the T.I.F. Ordinances), resolutions, motions or orders in conflict with this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflicts.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage.

Exhibit "A" and "B" referred to in this ordinance read as follows:

Exhibit "A".
(To Ordinance)

Plan Amendment Number 2.

January, 2008.

95th/Western Redevelopment Plan And Project.

The 95th/Western Redevelopment Plan and Project (the "Plan") of the City of Chicago approved by ordinance of the City Council of Chicago (the "City Council") on July 13, 1995, as amended by that certain Plan Amendment Number 1 approved by ordinance of the City Council on March 19, 1997, is amended as follows:

In Section V, Conservation Conditions Existing In The Redevelopment Project Area, under the heading "Redevelopment Activities", subheading "1. Use Of Incentives for Property Assembly", the second (2nd) sentence is amended by inserting the following underlined text to read as follows:

These activities may include: a) the use of the City's power of eminent domain to acquire property needed for development of new business or commercial uses,

including parking facilities, and mixed-use or residential uses; b) the negotiated purchase, exchange or long-term lease of property within the Redevelopment Area for redevelopment or for parking improvements; c) the clearance of all improvements on acquired property.

Exhibit "B".
(To Ordinance)

Plan Amendment Number 1.

*95th/Western Redevelopment Area
Redevelopment Plan And Project.*

November 12, 1996.

The 95th/Western Redevelopment Plan and Project (the "Plan") of the City of Chicago approved by ordinance of the City Council of Chicago on July 13, 1995, is amended by the following deletions and insertions:

Page 12 -- Redevelopment Objectives:

The fourth bullet point is deleted and replaced by the following text:

- Assemble land into functionally suitable and marketable parcels, using the City's power of eminent domain if necessary, in accordance with the needs of the area to attract new business uses through redevelopment.

Page 13 -- Redevelopment Activities:

Section 1. Use of Incentives for Property Assembly, beginning "Use tax increment incentives" through ". . . construction of public improvements" is deleted and replaced by the following text:

The City may engage in activities to encourage and assist qualified developers to acquire property for the purpose of redevelopment consistent with the Plan. These activities may include: a) the use of the City's power of eminent domain to acquire

property needed for development of new business or commercial uses, including parking facilities; b) the negotiated purchase, exchange or long-term lease of property within the Redevelopment Area for redevelopment or for parking improvements; c) the clearance of all improvements on acquired property.

Page 15 -- General Land-Use Plan:

The first paragraph under the heading, beginning "Existing land-uses . . ." and ending ". . . for the R.P.A." is deleted and replaced by the following text:

Appendix 4, General Land-Use Plan, illustrates proposed land-use within the Redevelopment Area, continuing the overall function of the area as a local commercial and business district. Key changes to the existing land-use pattern include the addition of new off-street parking facilities and higher intensity business uses at the Ashland Avenue -- 95th Street intersection and the 95th Street -- Western Avenue intersection. Appendix 4 represents a broad scheme for land-use and may be modified to fulfill general project objectives for economic revitalization.

The paragraph headed "Commercial and Mixed Uses" is deleted in its entirety.

Appendix 4: Boundary and Proposed Land-Use Map.

This appendix is deleted and replaced by: Appendix 4, Proposed Land Map, revised November 12, 1996 (attached).

Appendix 5: Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs.

This appendix is deleted and replaced by: Appendix 5, Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs, revised November 12, 1996 (attached).

[Appendix 4 referred to in this Plan Amendment Number 1
printed on pages 20025 and 20026 of this *Journal*.]

Appendix 5 referred to in this Plan Amendment Number 1 reads as follows:

Appendix 5.
(To Plan Amendment Number 1)


Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs
Revised November 12, 1996.

Program Action/Improvements	Project Cost
Property Assembly	\$ 5,000,000.00
Demolition, Environmental Remediation, Site Preparation	1,000,000.00
Rehabilitation	5,000,000.00
Public Improvements/Parking Facilities	500,000.00
Public Infrastructure Improvements/Streetscaping	5,250,000.00
Public Infrastructure Improvements/Transit	500,000.00
Interest Costs Incurred By Developers	750,000.00
Relocation	750,000.00
Job Training	500,000.00
Planning, Legal, Studies	750,000.00
TOTAL T.I.F. PROJECT COSTS	\$ 20,000,000.00

* Note: The total redevelopment project costs provide an upper limit on T.I.F.- eligible expenditures (exclusive of capitalized interest costs, bond issuance costs and other financing costs). These costs are estimates and do not represent City of Chicago commitments or expenditures. Within this limit, adjustments may be made in line items without further amendment to the 95th and Western Redevelopment Plan and Project.


Appendix 4.
(To Plan Amendment Number 1)

Boundary And Land-Use Map.
(Page 1 of 2)



Appendix 4.
(To Plan Amendment Number 1)

Boundary And Land-Use Map.
(Page 2 of 2)



*95th/Western Avenue**Redevelopment Plan And Project.**June 26, 1995.**I.**Introduction And Background.*

The 95th Street component of the 95th and Western redevelopment area roughly bisects the Beverly community area while the Western Avenue portion runs along the western boundary of this community and the City. It is situated on the far southwest side of Chicago, adjacent to the suburban community of Evergreen Park. Located about fifteen (15) miles from the Loop, Beverly enjoys excellent accessibility to downtown Chicago via Rock Island commuter rail service and the Dan Ryan Expressway. This is most important to the economy of the community area since most of the residents work outside the area.

The area served by the proposed redevelopment area was first settled in the 1850s when the Rock Island Railroad and the predecessor of the Pennsylvania Railroad first laid tracks through the area. After the Great Chicago Fire, many wealthy central city residents built homes in the area, then called Washington Heights. The area was annexed to the City of Chicago in 1900. Between 1920 and 1960 the population of the Beverly community area expanded from about seven thousand five hundred (7,500) to about twenty-five thousand (25,000) with the most rapid growth occurring in the 1940s and 1950s. Between 1960 and 1990 the Beverly community area population declined from twenty-four thousand eight hundred fourteen (24,814) to twenty-two thousand three hundred eighty-five (22,385).

The area included in the redevelopment district consists entirely of strip commercial buildings also constructed primarily in the 1940s and 1950s. These stores originally served the diverse shopping needs of the relatively affluent residents of the Beverly community as well as the household goods needs, especially furniture, of many residents of the southwestern section of the City and suburbs. Most of the stores were housed in small, single- or two-story buildings with little or no provision for customer parking. These stores lined both sides of 95th Street on relatively shallow lots of about one hundred ten (110) feet depth.

Competition from suburban shopping malls started early for the 95th and Western retail establishments when the country's first enclosed shopping center was constructed on the southwest corner of 95th and Western in Evergreen Park in 1952. As a result, the City of Chicago annually loses large amounts of sales tax revenue to Evergreen Park and other suburban locations through purchases by Beverly and other City residents, while the

**95th & Western
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROJECT**

Prepared By:

**Public Finance Associates
and Micheal Elben, A.I.A. and Charles Shanabruch, Ph.D.
for**

**City of Chicago
Department of Planning and Development
Richard M. Daley, Mayor
June 26, 1995**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Background	4
II.	Redevelopment Project Area Boundary Description	7
III.	Redevelopment Plan and Project	7
IV.	Redevelopment Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies	8
V.	Conservation Area Conditions Existing in the Redevelopment Project Area	10
VI.	95th & Western Redevelopment Project	12
	Redevelopment Objectives	12
	Redevelopment Activities	13
	General Land Use Plan	15
	Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs	15
	Sources of Funds to Pay Eligible Redevelopment Project Costs	17
	Nature and Term of Obligations to be Issued	18
	Most Recent Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV) of Properties in the RPA	18
	Anticipated Equalized Assessed Valuation	19
VII.	Conformity to the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Chicago	19
VIII.	Scheduling of the Redevelopment Project	19
IX.	Commitment to Fair Employment Practices and Affirmative Action	19
X.	Evidence On Lack of Growth & Private Investment	19
XI.	Financial Impact and Demand on Taxing District Services	21
XII.	Program to Address Financial and Service Impacts	22
XIII.	Provisions for Amending the Tax Increment Redevelopment Plan and Project	22

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX

- 1 Boundary Map And Existing Structures By Use
- 2 Legal Description Of The 95th Street TIF District
- 3 Distribution Of Qualification Factors And Existing land Use
- 4 Boundary And Proposed Land Use Map
- 5 Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs
- 6 Summary Of Initial EAV By Block
- 7 Building Permit Summary, 1970--1995
- 8 Area Property Valuation Trends, 1983--1993
- 9 Area Sales Tax Trends, 1985--1990
- 10 Developer's Letters of Interest If TIF is Adopted

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The 95th Street component of the 95th and Western redevelopment area roughly bisects the Beverly community area while the Western Avenue portion runs along the western boundary of this community and the City. It is situated on the far southwest side of Chicago, adjacent to the suburban community of Evergreen Park. Located about 15 miles from the Loop, Beverly enjoys excellent accessibility to Downtown Chicago via Rock Island commuter rail service and the Dan Ryan Expressway. This is most important to the economy of the community area since most of the residents work outside the area.

The area served by the proposed redevelopment area was first settled in the 1850's when the Rock Island Railroad and the predecessor of the Pennsylvania Railroad first laid tracks through the area. After the Great Chicago Fire many wealthy central city residents built homes in the area, then called Washington Heights. The area was annexed to the City of Chicago in 1900. Between 1920 and 1960 the population of the Beverly community area expanded from about 7,500 to about 25,000 with the most rapid growth occurring in the 1940's and 1950's. Between 1960 and 1990 the Beverly community area population declined from 24,814 to 22,385.

The area included in the redevelopment district consists entirely of strip commercial buildings also constructed primarily in the 1940's and 1950's. These stores originally served the diverse shopping needs of the relatively affluent residents of the Beverly community as well as the household goods needs, especially furniture, of many residents of the southwestern section of the City and suburbs. Most of the stores were housed in small, single or two story buildings with little or no provision for customer parking. These stores lined both sides of 95th Street on relatively shallow lots of about 110 feet depth.

Competition from suburban shopping malls started early for the 95th & Western retail establishments when the country's first enclosed shopping center was constructed on the southwest corner of 95th and Western in Evergreen Park in 1952. As a result the City of Chicago annually loses large amounts of sales tax revenue to Evergreen Park and other suburban locations through purchases by Beverly and other City residents, while the redevelopment area loses customers due to small, obsolete shopping facilities with inadequate parking. A recent study (1993) of the characteristics and competitiveness of Chicago South Side retailing prepared for the Department of Planning and Development by Applied Real Estate Analysis, Inc. entitled "Final Report: Retailing in Chicago's South Side Neighborhoods" stated in this regard: "The common characteristic of households throughout the area is that they do a substantial portion of their shopping in the suburbs....The age and outmoded design of the stores, lack of parking, and growing number of new stores in the area are beginning to have a negative impact on 95th Street, especially the eastern half of the strip. New strip centers on Western Avenue south of 95th Street serve both to reinforce the 95th Street shops and to provide additional competition."

That report recommended that the 95th Street portion of the redevelopment area consolidate its retail activities and improve the existing retail while stabilizing the Western Avenue sub-area. This study also pointed out that even convenience goods purchases in the vicinity were being lost to the suburbs. The problem this area experiences due to the proximity of modern suburban alternatives is emphasized by the following statement from the Report: "This (loss of convenience goods sales) is somewhat understandable in the Mount Greenwood, Beverly and Morgan Park areas, where a suburban store may actually be 'in the neighborhood'."

The "Chicago Comprehensive Neighborhood Needs Analysis" prepared for the City in 1982 by Melipheny and Associates cited the need for Business district improvements as one of the Beverly community area's "Key Community Needs". The Report noted this need in spite of the author's recognition that the community had been very active in attempting to maintain and improve the viability of this shopping area. The Report also noted the negative impact that the City's home rule sales tax has upon the ability of areas such as this to compete with lower tax stores in adjacent suburban areas.

This Report concluded with the following: "Currently, the 95th Street Business District is suffering from the ailment of many older business districts. Due to the changing habits and patterns of shoppers, the age structure, racial composition, and the mobility of the consumer, the market, once served by the merchants along 95th Street have changed drastically. The 95th Street Business District currently contains 632,660 square feet of commercial space of which 470,225 square feet is currently used for retailing. Through the analysis of various market forces, it was found that the 95th Street Business District could support 306,225 square feet of retail space. Therefore, the 95th Street Business District contains 164,000 square feet of retail space which cannot be economically supported by the present trading area of the business district."

Finally this Report recommended with respect to the Beverly area that "The Department of Economic Development should assist community efforts to encourage suburban businesses to relocate in Chicago."

In order to redevelop this area numerous and costly improvements will be necessary including the following: property acquisition and assembly costs; demolition; environmental clean-up and site preparation; rehabilitation of existing structures; and infrastructure improvements.

The purpose of the Redevelopment Plan is to create a mechanism facilitating the redevelopment of existing buildings and for the development of new commercial facilities on existing vacant and/or underutilized land. The redevelopment of 95th Street is expected to encourage economic revitalization within the community and in the surrounding area.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

In January, 1977 the Illinois General Assembly enacted the "Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act" (hereinafter referred to as the "Act.") The Act provides authority for municipalities to finance specific public redevelopment costs with incremental tax property tax revenues after approval of a "redevelopment plan and project" incorporating plans to redevelop a "blighted", "conservation" or "industrial park conservation area" of at least 1.5 acres located within the boundaries of the municipality. Incremental property tax revenue ("tax increment revenue") is derived from the increase in the equalized assessed valuation ("EAV") of real property within the tax increment finance ("TIF") redevelopment project area over and above the certified initial EAV of the real property at the time of designation. Any subsequent increase in this EAV is then multiplied by the current tax rate of all the overlapping taxing bodies in order to determine the tax increment revenue.

Municipalities may finance eligible redevelopment project costs by paying them directly, by reimbursing private parties who have initially financed them or by issuing bonds to pay these expenses and retiring the bonds with tax increment revenues. Tax Increment Financing does not generate revenues by increasing tax rates, but rather generates revenues by allowing the municipality to capture, for a period of up to 23 years, all the new tax revenue generated by development within the TIF boundaries. Further, under TIF, all the taxing bodies continue to receive the property tax revenue they had been receiving from properties within the area prior to the establishment of the TIF. In addition, at the discretion of the municipality taxing bodies may receive distributions of excess tax increment if more revenue is received than is necessary to pay all the outstanding obligations of the district. The overlapping taxing bodies will also benefit from the TIF when the TIF is terminated and these governments then gain access to the increase in the property tax base produced by the new investment in the area.

The 95th and Western Redevelopment Plan and Project (hereinafter referred to as the Redevelopment Plan) has been formulated in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It is a guide to all proposed public and private action in the Redevelopment Project Area. In addition to describing the objectives of the redevelopment, the Redevelopment Plan sets forth the overall program to be undertaken to accomplish these objectives.

The Redevelopment Plan also specifically describes the 95th and Western Redevelopment Project Area (hereafter referred to as the "Redevelopment Project Area"). This area meets the eligibility requirements of the Act.

The purpose of this Redevelopment Plan is to ensure that new development occurs:

- 1) on a coordinated rather than a piecemeal basis to ensure that the land use, vehicular access, parking, service and urban design systems will meet with modern day principles and standards, and
- 2) on a reasonable, comprehensive and integrated basis to ensure that blighting and/or potentially blighting factors are eliminated, and
- 3) within a reasonable and defined time period.

Revitalization of the Redevelopment Project Area is a large and complex undertaking and presents challenges and opportunities equal to its scale. The success of this effort will depend to a large measure on cooperation between the private sector and agencies of local government. Adoption of this Redevelopment Plan by the City will make possible implementation of a balanced, comprehensive plan for stimulating redevelopment of the RPA, an area which can not reasonably be anticipated to be developed without adoption of this Redevelopment Plan. Public investments will create the environment necessary to attract the needed private investment required for the revitalization of the area. "But for" the public investments made possible by the adoption of TIF, the necessary private investments would not be forthcoming and the area would not be revitalized.

II. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

The boundaries of the 95th and Western Redevelopment Project Area (hereinafter referred to as the "Redevelopment Project Area" or "RPA") have been carefully drawn to include only those contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon substantially benefited by the proposed redevelopment project improvements to be undertaken as part of this Redevelopment Plan. The proposed 95th Street and Western Avenue redevelopment project area consists of approximately 33 acres of privately owned property plus the intervening roads including the commercial portions of 28 city blocks along 95th Street extending from Ashland Avenue to Western Avenue, the commercial property on the west side of the westernmost two of these blocks and the commercial property on the east side of the next four blocks north of this area along Western Avenue. The area is generally bordered on the east by Ashland, on the south by the alley behind the stores along the south side of 95th Street, on the west by Western Avenue, which in this vicinity is the City limits, and on the north (between Western and the alley one half a block to the east) by the Dan Ryan Woods Forest Preserve and by the alley behind the stores along the north side of 95th Street until Ashland Avenue. The boundaries are more specifically shown in Chart 1, the Redevelopment Project Area Boundaries, and more precisely described by the following legal description of the area:

III. THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROJECT

The Redevelopment Plan and Project has been formulated in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It is a guide to all proposed public and private development actions within the Redevelopment Project Area. This plan also specifically describes the RPA and sets forth a summary of the "conservation" factors which qualify the RPA for designation as a "conservation" area as defined by the Act.

In addition to describing the redevelopment objectives for the area, the Redevelopment Plan sets forth the overall program to be undertaken to achieve these objectives. The "Redevelopment Project" as used herein means any redevelopment project which may, from time to time, be undertaken to accomplish the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan. By adopting this Plan the City creates an environment for private investment within the RPA, which will in turn contribute to strengthening the tax base of the City, create and retain jobs within the City and retain firms that might otherwise migrate to the suburbs or out of state.

The goal of the City is to ensure that the entire RPA is developed on a comprehensive and planned development basis in order to provide that new development occur:

1. On a coordinated rather than a piecemeal basis so that land-use, pedestrian access, vehicular circulation, parking, service and urban design systems function together in a way that meets modern market demands and planning principles.
2. In a manner that eliminates the threat of blight and conserves the community consistent with the goals of the plan.
3. In a timely manner so that the area may soon make a meaningful contribution to the economic vitality of the City.
4. In keeping with the existing architecturally significant and historic/landmark designations of the redevelopment project area.

The RPA has not been subject to redevelopment through investment by private enterprise and is not reasonably expected to be redeveloped without the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan. During the last 10 years (1985-1994) only \$3,027,030 has been invested in real estate in the area according to a review of the City's building permits. Of that total only \$1,612,597 was expended for new construction and additions, most of it on a small number of projects (see Appendix 7). Total investment in the area declined by over 25% during the last 5 years, 1990-1994, as compared to the prior 5 years, 1985-1989 unadjusted for inflation. The total area investment during this 10 year period, including the cost of repairs, represents only about 7% of the estimated market value of the property within the area, or an annual investment of well under 1% of the value of each property. Thus there was very little investment in the area during the decade when compared to the overall value of the property.

The adoption of this Redevelopment Plan will make possible the implementation of a comprehensive program for the redevelopment of the RPA. The availability of limited amounts of public investment funds will be used throughout the area to leverage private investment that has so long been absent from the area. This public and private investment will be forthcoming only if tax increment financing is adopted for the RPA, in accordance with the provisions of the Act. The conservation conditions that have prevented private investment in the area will be eliminated through implementation of the Plan. The Plan will help the City to marshal the resources of the private sector in a true public-private redevelopment partnership.

IV. REDEVELOPMENT PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES.

This section of the Redevelopment Plan identifies the goals and policies of the City for the RPA. A later section of the Redevelopment Plan identifies the more specific program which the City plans to undertake in achieving the redevelopment goals and policies which have been identified.

General Goals

- 1) Reduce or eliminate those conditions which qualify the RPA as a conservation area, including environmental remediation, through the implementation of this Plan.
- 2) Enhance the property tax and sales tax base of the City and other overlapping tax districts extending into the conservation area.
- 3) Strengthen the existing business community and enhance local business and employment development within the area while stimulating revitalization in the surrounding commercial and residential areas.
- 4) Retain and upgrade sound buildings that are compatible with the overall redevelopment plan.
- 5) Identify and attract new business and job growth to the area that will capitalize on the inherent strengths of the area, including the architectural significance and historic/landmark designations accorded the area.
- 6) Develop "anchor" projects that encourage retail, commercial, residential and mixed use development in the area.
- 7) Improve the marketability of vacant and other underutilized properties by encouraging private investments which strengthen the community's economic base and business environment.

- 8) Increase the quantity and quality of off-street parking and service delivery access points for commercial use so as to improve the viability of existing and new retail businesses as well as the traffic circulation of the area.
- 9) Create an environment within the RPA which will contribute to the health, safety, and general welfare of the City, and preserve and enhance the value of properties adjacent to the RPA.
- 10) Provide needed infrastructure and public improvements including utilities, lighting and other security facilities, parking, open space, landscaping and recreational facilities, sidewalks, alleys, signage and streetscapes etc. within the RPA.
- 11) Ensure the participation of the local merchants and the community in all phases of redevelopment within the area.
- 12) Provide incentives to encourage improvements that will help to create a positive perception about the security for shopping and other activities within the area.

Policies

- 1) Upgrade existing retailing and develop a program to attract quality developers of retail, commercial and mixed-use projects to the area.
- 2) Implement traffic and pedestrian circulation improvements and policies, including the provision of well located off-street parking and improved access for pick-up and delivery of goods.
- 3) Institute an exterior commercial rehabilitation program which upgrades properties and provides a unifying design theme for all or relevant parts of the area consistent with the historical nature of the community.
- 4) Acquire underutilized sites for redevelopment by the private sector, particularly those that will encourage other unassisted development.
- 5) Encourage concentration of retail into nodes around major intersections while assisting the transition of retail properties in other areas to more appropriate uses.
- 6) Assist existing retailers to relocate into the most viable retail areas with adequate parking within the RPA.
- 7) Finance the aforementioned improvements through the use of tax increment finance (TIF) and other applicable financing sources.

V. CONSERVATION CONDITIONS EXISTING IN THE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA

As set forth in the Act a "conservation area" means any improved area within the boundaries of a redevelopment project area located within the territorial limits of the municipality in which 50% or more of the structures in the area have an age of 35 years or more. Such an area is not yet a blighted area but because of a combination of 3 or more of the following factors: dilapidation; obsolescence; deterioration; illegal use of individual structures; presence of structures below minimum code standards; abandonment; excessive vacancies; overcrowding of structures and community facilities; lack of ventilation, light or sanitary facilities; inadequate utilities; excessive land coverage; deleterious land use or layout; depreciation of physical maintenance; lack of community planning, is detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare and such an area may become a blighted area.

The area that is the subject of this study consists almost exclusively of improved land. According to the Act, for such an area to be designated as a "Conservation Area", the municipality must demonstrate that because 50% or more of the structures in the area have an age of 35 years or more and because of the presence of a combination of three or more of the factors described in the Act, the area is detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare and such area may become a blighted area.

While it may be concluded that the mere presence of the minimum number of stated factors is sufficient to make a finding of eligibility as a "conservation area", the following evaluation was made on the basis that the eligibility factors must be present to an extent which would lead reasonable people to conclude that public intervention is appropriate or necessary. In addition, the distribution of conservation factors throughout the study area must be reasonable so that basically good areas are not arbitrarily found to satisfy the conservation requirements simply because they are adjacent to a blighted or conservation area.

Based upon a windshield survey supervised by the research team, development of other information and documents pertaining to the eligibility factors as they applied to each parcel of property in the area and analysis of the survey results, the Redevelopment Project Area qualifies as a "Conservation Area" as defined in the Act. A separate report, entitled "95th and Western Tax Increment Financing Eligibility Report", describes in detail the surveys and analysis undertaken by the research team and the basis for finding that the Redevelopment Project Area qualifies as a "conservation area" as defined by the Act.

Summarized below are the findings of the Eligibility Report:

- of the fourteen factors set forth in the Act for improved areas, five are present to a major extent in the Redevelopment Project Area.
- the eligibility factors which are present are reasonably distributed throughout the Area.
- all blocks within the Area show the presence of some eligibility factors.
- the Area includes only those contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon substantially benefited by the proposed redevelopment project improvements.

Age as a factor is a precondition for designation of a "conservation area" and is present to a major extent in the RPA. A total of 95 of the 121 buildings in the redevelopment area, or 79 percent, are 35 years of age or older. Fifty percent or more of the buildings are 35 years of age or older in 26 of the 33 blocks that comprise the redevelopment area.

The following five "conservation" factors are present to a **major extent** throughout the Area:

1. Obsolescence

Obsolescence is present to a major extent with the area. Of the 121 buildings in the area, 105, or 87 per cent, are obsolete. Obsolete buildings are present to a major extent on 30 of the 33 blocks in the redevelopment area. This factor was observed with respect to obsolete buildings, obsolete platting and obsolete parcels.

2. Excessive Land Coverage

Excessive land coverage is present to a major extent in the redevelopment area. A total of 97 of the 121 buildings in the area, or 80 per cent, exhibited this factor. This factor is present to a major extent on 28 of the 33 blocks in the redevelopment area.

3. Deleterious Land-Use or Layout

Deleterious land-use or layout is present to a major extent in the area. Of the 121 buildings in the area, 95, or nearly 79 per cent suffered from deleterious land-use or layout. This factor is present to a major extent on 28 of the 33 blocks. Conditions contributing to this finding include parcels of limited depth and width, parcels of irregular shape and incompatible uses.

4. Depreciation of Physical Maintenance

Depreciation of physical maintenance is present to a major extent throughout the area. Of the 121 buildings in the area, 95, or 79 per cent, satisfied this criteria. This factor is present to a major extent on 30 of the 33 blocks included in the area.

5. Lack of Community Planning

Lack of community planning is present to a major extent throughout the area. The area generally developed before the City implemented effective community planning guidelines and standards, and thus developed without their benefit. Other conditions contributing to this finding are parcels of inadequate size or depth for contemporary development and the lack of reasonable controls for building setbacks and off-street parking.

In addition the following three "conservation" factors are present to a **minor extent** within the Area:

1. Excessive Vacancies

Excessive vacancies exist to a limited extent within the area. A total of 15 of the 121 buildings in the area are currently vacant. Excessive vacancies are present to a major extent on 5 of the 33 blocks in the area and to a limited extent on 7 blocks.

2. Overcrowding of Structures and Community Facilities

Overcrowding of Structures and Community Facilities exists to a limited extent within the area. Only 7 of the 121 buildings included in the area are currently overcrowded.

3. Deterioration

Deterioration is present to a minor extent with the area. Of the 121 buildings in the area, 6, buildings are deteriorated to a major extent. In addition many parking areas and alleys, streets, curbs and gutters and sidewalks in the area are deteriorated.

The above analysis is based upon information provided by the research team based upon the following surveys and analyses:

- 1) Exterior surveys of the condition and use of each building.
- 2) Field survey of the condition of the streets, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, lighting, traffic, parking facilities, landscaping, fences and walls and general property maintenance within the area.
- 3) Analysis of existing uses and their relationship to one another.
- 4) Comparison of current land use to current zoning and the current zoning map.
- 5) Comparison of surveyed buildings to property maintenance and other codes of the City.
- 6) Analysis of original and current platting and building size and layout.
- 7) Analysis of building floor area and site coverage.
- 8) Review of previously prepared plans, studies and data on the area.

95TH AND WESTERN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

This section presents the overall program to be undertaken by the City of Chicago or by private developers acting under redevelopment agreements with the City. It includes a description of the redevelopment plan and project objectives; the redevelopment activities necessary to implement the plan; a general land use plan, estimated redevelopment project costs, any obligations that may be issued in order to achieve the objectives of the plan, identification of the most recent equalized assessed valuation of properties within the RPA and an estimate of the anticipated equalized assessed value of the area after implementation of the plan.

In the event the City determines that implementation of some or all of the activities or improvements is not feasible, the City may reduce the scope of the overall program and Redevelopment Project.

Redevelopment Objectives

- Reduce or eliminate those conditions which qualify the RPA as a conservation area described in the preceding section of this Plan.
- Strengthen the economic well-being of the City and the RPA by increasing business activity, taxable values and job opportunities in the area.
- Create an environment which stimulates private investment in new construction, expansion and rehabilitation projects throughout the area.
- Assemble land into parcels functionally adaptable with respect to shape and size for disposition and redevelopment in accordance with the needs of the area, the limitations on the size of sites in the area and the uses demanded by the market for property in the area.
- Achieve development which is integrated both functionally and aesthetically with nearby existing development, which contains a complementary mix of uses and meets shopping needs not currently served by existing businesses.
- Encourage a high quality appearance of buildings, thoroughfares, public facilities and open spaces, and promote high standards of design in keeping with the architecturally significant and historic/landmark designations of the RPA.
- Provide incentives needed to encourage private investment in rehabilitation, reconversion and redevelopment projects within the area.

- Organize the necessary beautification and facade improvement programs that will give the area an identity and once again become an area where people will desire to shop.
- Make the infrastructure and public improvement investments that are needed in order to stimulate private investment in the area, including those that will improve the public's perception about the security of the area.
- Encourage the participation of minorities and women in professional and investment opportunities involved in the redevelopment of the RPA.
- Implement the RPA goals and policies set forth in Section IV of this Redevelopment Plan.

Redevelopment Activities

The City proposes to achieve its redevelopment goals, policies and objectives for the RPA through public financing techniques including , but not limited to, tax increment financing and by undertaking redevelopment activities including, but not limited to the following:

1. Use of Incentives for Property Assembly

Use tax increment incentives to solicit and encourage qualified private redevelopment entities to undertake property acquisition and assembly of obsolete properties and the redevelopment of those consolidated parcels into projects that satisfy current market needs. Other properties in the RPA may be acquired by purchase, exchange or long-term lease by the City of Chicago and cleared of all improvements and either (a) sold or leased for private redevelopment, or (b) sold, leased or dedicated for construction of public improvements. The City may determine that to meet the goals, policies or objectives of this Redevelopment Plan property may be acquired where: a) the current use of the property is not permitted under this Redevelopment Plan; b) the exclusion of the property from acquisition would have a detrimental effect on the disposition and development of adjacent and nearby properties; or c) the owner or owners are unwilling or unable to conform the property to the land-use and development objectives of this Redevelopment Plan. Further, the City may require written redevelopment agreements with developers before acquiring any properties. The City may devote property which it has acquired to alternative temporary uses until such property is scheduled for disposition and redevelopment.

2. Demolition, Site Preparation and Redevelopment

Clearance and demolition activities will include demolition of buildings, breaking-up and removal of old foundations, excavation and removal of soil and other materials, including sources of environmental contamination to create suitable sites for new development. Clearance and demolition activities will, to the greatest extent possible, be timed to coincide with redevelopment activities so that tracts of land do not remain vacant for extended periods of time and so that the adverse effects of clearance activities may be minimized.

3. Incentives for Rehabilitation, Renovation and Adaptive Reuse of Existing Buildings

The City will encourage the rehabilitation, renovation and adaptive reuse of buildings in need of such expenditures by paying the redevelopers of these properties for some of the TIF eligible costs incurred by the developer in the rehabilitation, etc. In most instances the City will reimburse the redeveloper for some of the TIF eligible costs incurred on the project from property tax increment produced by the project upon receipt of those tax revenues under terms of a redevelopment agreement between these two parties. In a few instances the City may decide to pay these expenses from the proceeds of bonds to be secured, at least partially, and serviced by the tax increment of the RPA, all in accordance with the terms of a redevelopment agreement.

4. Infrastructure, Parking, Utilities and Other Public Improvements

Adequate public improvements are necessary for the conservation of the RPA. In order to improve the present condition of the area's infrastructure some of the tax increment produced by properties and projects within the area will be used to leverage other public funds available from other City sources, the State and the Federal government. These funds will be used to improve the perception of personal security in the area through improved lighting and other security-related facilities. Other types of public improvements activities include: acquisition of parcels for creation of off-street parking to facilitate development by qualified redevelopment entities and provide convenient access for delivery service; increase the amount of open space; improved landscaping and recreational facilities; improve streets, curbs, alleys, medians, sidewalks and streetscape improvements to foster pedestrian and public safety; water, sanitary and storm sewer improvements.

5. Beautification and Facade Improvement Programs

In addition to rehabilitation of individual buildings, some tax increment revenues will also be used for facade and landscaping rebate programs designed to encourage the improved appearance of adjacent groups of properties with a consistent and/or coordinated design. This may include the promotion of facade renovation programs such as shared public /private funding of facade improvements or low/no interest loans for this purpose and or incentives for sign/structure removal and incentives for uniform signage; certain landscaping and beautification projects, to the extent that their costs are TIF eligible costs, may also be funded in order to enhance the appearance of the area, the medians or to provide more green/open space between private land uses. These efforts may require the City to retain some architectural and design services in order to encourage participation by existing and new retailers within the area.

6. Relocation Assistance

Relocation costs will be incurred to the extent that the City determines that relocation costs shall be paid or the City is required to make payment of relocation costs by federal or state law.

7. Job Training

In order to increase the effectiveness of the redevelopment program some tax increment resources will be allocated to create opportunities for job training at local colleges, through workshops and seminars needed by employees or businessmen of existing and new businesses within the area. Training designed to increase the skills of the labor force within the community to take advantage of the employment opportunities created within the area will be implemented.

8. Planning, Administration, Architectural, Studies & Surveys, Legal and Other Professional Services

These activities include the management of the TIF program throughout its duration, research needed to assure that the program is effective in reaching the goals and objectives of this Redevelopment Plan, architectural and engineering support for facade improvement and land disposition programs and legal and other kinds of services necessary to acquire and dispose of property obtained for redevelopment.

General Land Use Plan

Existing land uses consist almost entirely of small retail and commercial facilities, except for a railroad station, its related parking and several other public buildings. Exhibit 5, attached hereto and made a part of this plan, designates intended general land uses in the RPA. It is anticipated that the existing zoning classification will be amended from time to time to reflect the conversion of existing commercial areas to mixed or possibly residential use. The following area characteristics of the future land use plan for the RPA:

Retail Uses

Retail uses should be developed in order to better serve the convenience shopping needs of the surrounding neighborhood, to provide appropriate goods and services to commuters using the train station and to complement the regional mall at the western end of the RPA. Some of the shopping needs not currently served by existing merchants include full service book stores, bakeries, family restaurants, family clothing and shoe stores, home improvement centers, sporting goods stores etc. The City retains the discretion to provide TIF assistance or not to provide assistance to specific businesses of these types desiring to locate in the area and shall not be barred from providing assistance to other types of businesses as well throughout the life of the district.

Parking Uses

Full realization of economic development potential of the RPA is directly related to the availability of sufficient automobile parking that is conveniently located together with appropriate pedestrian linkages and amenities to allow and encourage patrons to combine their errands into a one-stop, multi-purpose trip.

Commercial and Mixed Uses

As the economy becomes more and more service oriented, it is expected that some of the existing retail space in the area will be converted to office and other commercial uses, particularly in the area of the train station.

As more and more of the retail activity within the area is concentrated into more effective clusters, the replacement redevelopments are likely to consist of all or some of the following mixed uses: commercial, service, retail and residential.

Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs

According to the Act redevelopment project costs mean the sum total of all reasonable or necessary costs incurred or estimated to be incurred, and include any such costs incidental to this Redevelopment Plan. Private investments which supplement "Redevelopment Project Costs" are expected to substantially exceed such redevelopment project costs. Eligible costs permitted under the Act may include, without limitation, the following:

1. Costs of studies and surveys, development of plans and specifications, implementation and administration of the redevelopment plan including, but not limited to, staff and professional service costs for architectural, engineering, legal, marketing, financial planning or other special services, provided, however, that no charges for professional services may be based on a percentage of the tax increment collected.
2. Property assembly costs, including but not limited to acquisition of land and other property, real or personal or rights or interests therein, demolition of buildings, and the clearing and grading of land;
3. Costs of rehabilitation, reconstruction or repair or remodeling of existing buildings and fixtures;
4. Costs of the construction of public works or improvements;
5. Costs of job training and retraining projects;
6. Financing costs, including but not limited to all necessary and incidental expenses related to the issuance of obligations and which may include payment of interest on any obligations issued pursuant to the Act accruing during the estimated period of construction of any redevelopment project for which such obligations are issued and for not exceeding 36 months thereafter and including reasonable reserves related thereto;
7. All or a portion of a taxing district's capital costs resulting from the redevelopment project necessarily incurred or to be in furtherance of the objectives of the redevelopment plan and project, to the extent the City by written agreement accepts and approves such costs;
8. Relocation costs to the extent that the City determines that relocation costs shall be paid or are required to make payment of relocation costs by federal or state law;
9. Payment in lieu of taxes as defined in the Act.
10. Costs of job training, advanced vocational education or career education, including but not limited to courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment, incurred by one or more taxing districts, provided that such costs (i) are related to the establishment and maintenance of additional job training, advanced vocational education or career education programs for persons employed or to be employed by employers located in the Redevelopment Project Area; and (ii) when incurred by a taxing district or taxing districts other than the City, are set forth in a written agreement by or among the City and the taxing district or taxing districts, which agreement describes the program to be undertaken, including but not limited to the number of employees to be trained, a description of the training and services to be provided, the number and type of positions available or to be available, itemized costs of the program and sources of funds to pay for the same, and the term of the agreement. Such costs include, specifically, the payment by community college districts of costs pursuant to Sections 3-37, 3-38, 3-40 and 3-40.1 of the Public Community College Act and by school districts of costs pursuant to Sections 10-22.20a and 10-23.3a of The School Code.

11. Interest costs incurred by the redeveloper related to the construction, renovation or rehabilitation of the redevelopment project provided that:
 - (a) such costs are to be paid directly from the special tax allocation fund established pursuant to the Act; and
 - (b) such payments in any one year may not exceed 30% of the annual interest costs incurred by the redeveloper with regard to the redevelopment project during that year;
 - (c) if there are not sufficient funds available in the special tax allocation fund to make the payment pursuant to this paragraph (11) then the amounts so due shall accrue and be payable when sufficient funds are available in the special tax allocation fund; and
 - (d) the total of such interest payments incurred pursuant to the Act may not exceed 30% of the total (i) cost paid or incurred by the redeveloper for the redevelopment project plus (ii) redevelopment project costs excluding any property assembly costs and any relocation costs incurred by the municipality pursuant to this Act.

A wide variety of activities and improvements will be required to implement the Redevelopment Project. The necessary improvements and their costs are shown in Appendix 5, Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs. The total Redevelopment Project Costs are intended to provide an upper limit on tax increment expenditures in the area. Within this limit, adjustments may be made in line items, including provision for capitalized interest and other costs of financing associated with the issuance of obligations, without amendment of this Redevelopment Plan. The costs represent estimated amounts and do not represent actual City commitments or expenditures. Additional funding in the form of State and Federal grants, and private developer contributions may be pursued by the City as means of financing improvements and facilities which are of a general community benefit.

Estimated project costs eligible under Illinois TIF statute are listed in Appendix 5. These are potential costs to be expended over the maximum 23 year life of the RPA and their expenditure is subject to the availability of redevelopment projects and the willingness of the City to fund them at a level of need to be determined by the City. (Note: This summary does not include private expenditures upon redevelopment projects within the area that are ultimately paid with non-tax increment resources).

Sources of Funds to Pay Eligible Redevelopment Project Costs

Funds necessary to pay redevelopment project costs are to be derived principally from tax increment revenues and proceeds from municipal obligations which are to be retired using tax increment revenue. If such costs are to be paid directly from municipal bond proceeds, the debt service on such bonds shall ultimately be paid from tax increment revenues. To secure the issuance of these obligations, the City may permit the utilization of guarantees, deposits and other forms of security made available by private sector developers.

The tax increment revenue which will be used to fund tax increment obligations and redevelopment project costs shall be the incremental real property tax revenue. Incremental real property tax revenue is attributable to the increase in the current EAV of each taxable lot, block, tract, or parcel of real property in the RPA over and above the initial EAV of each parcel of real property in the RPA. Other sources of funds which may be used to pay for redevelopment costs and obligations issued, the proceeds of which are used to pay for such costs, are land disposition proceeds, state and federal grants, investment income, and such other sources of funds and revenues as the City may from time to time deem appropriate.

Nature and Term of Obligations to be Issued

The City may issue obligations secured by the Tax Increment Special Tax Allocation Fund established for the Redevelopment Project Area pursuant to the Act. Any and/or all obligations issued by the City pursuant to this Redevelopment Plan and Project and the Act shall be retired not more than twenty-three (23) years from the date of adoption of the ordinance approving Amended Redevelopment Plan and Project, such ultimate retirement date occurring in the year 2018. Also the final maturity date of any such obligations may not be later than 20 years from their respective date of issuance.

One or more series of obligations may be issued from time to time in order to implement this Redevelopment Plan and Project. The total principal and interest payable in any year on all obligations shall not exceed the amounts available in that year, or projected to be available in that year, from tax increment revenues and from bond sinking funds, capitalized interest, debt service reserve funds and all other sources of funds as may be provided by ordinance. Obligations may be of a parity or senior/junior lien natures. Obligations issued may be serial or term maturities, and may or may not be subject to mandatory sinking fund redemptions.

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

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

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

The purpose of identifying the most recent EAV of properties in the RPA is to provide an estimate of the initial EAV which the County Clerk will certify for the purpose of calculating incremental EAV and incremental property taxes. The equalized assessed valuation (EAV) of the property within the RPA is approximately \$15,437,154, which is the 1993 equalized assessed valuation, the most recent EAV available. These values will be used so long as the RPA is established by the City before the 1994 state equalization factor is issued, which is expected to be sometime in July or August, 1995. Additionally, this estimated amount is subject to any Certificates of Error which may be adjudicated before a final Certified Initial EAV is issued by the Cook County Clerk's office. Appendix 6, Summary of Initial EAV by Block, summarizes the initial equalized assessed values of blocks within the RPA.

Anticipated Equalized Assessed Valuation

Upon completion of the anticipated private development of the Redevelopment Project Area by the year 2018, it is estimated that the equalized assessed valuation of the property within the Redevelopment Project Area will be increased to approximately \$36,000,000. This estimate is based upon several key assumptions: 1) a constant Cook County equalization factor (multiplier) of 2.1407 in 1994 dollars; 2) a total tax rate of \$9.25 per \$100 of valuation throughout the life of the TIF, 3) redevelopment for the uses specified in this Redevelopment Plan will occur in a timely manner; and 4) the market value of the recommended residential and commercial developments will increase following completion of the redevelopment activities described in the Redevelopment Plan.

VII. Conformity to the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Chicago

The Redevelopment Plan and Project conform to the comprehensive plan for development of the City of Chicago as a whole, The Comprehensive Plan of Chicago of 1966.

VIII. Scheduling of the Redevelopment Project

This Redevelopment Project and all obligations issued to finance redevelopment project costs will be completed on or before a date 23 years from the adoption of the Ordinance designating the RPA. The City expects that the Redevelopment Project will be completed sooner than the maximum time limit set by the Act, depending on the incremental tax yield. It is anticipated that City expenditures for redevelopment project costs will be carefully staged on a reasonable and proportional basis to coincide with expenditures on redevelopment projects by participating private developers.

IX. Commitment to Fair Employment Practices and Affirmative Action

The City is committed to and will affirmatively implement the following principles with respect to the Plan and Project:

A. The assurance of equal opportunity in all personnel and employment actions with respect to the Plan and Project, including, but not limited to: hiring, training, transfer, promotion, discipline, fringe benefits, salary, employment working conditions, termination, etc. without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, handicapped status, national origin, creed or ancestry.

B. This commitment to affirmative action will ensure that all members of the protected groups, are sought out to compete for all job openings and promotional opportunities.

In order to implement these principles for this Project and Plan, the City shall require and promote equal employment practices and affirmative action on the part of itself and its contractors and vendors and the developer's contractors and vendors. In particular, parties contracting for work on the Project shall be required to agree to the principles set forth in this section.

X. Lack of Growth and Development Through Investment by Private Enterprise

As described earlier in this report, the RPA as a whole is adversely impacted by the presence of numerous "conservation" factors and these factors are reasonably distributed throughout the area. The RPA on the whole has not been subject to redevelopment through investment by private enterprise and is not reasonably expected to be redeveloped in a comprehensive manner without the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan.

The enabling statute requires that "The municipality finds that the redevelopment project area on the whole has not been subject to growth and development through investment by private enterprise and would not reasonably be anticipated to be developed without the adoption of the redevelopment plan." Elsewhere the statute requires that the Redevelopment Plan include evidence in support of this finding.

The extent of past private investment in the area was determined based upon an analysis of the value of all (71) of the building permits issued by the City for the 121 properties in the area during the last 10 years. This study revealed that only 10 permits were issued during this decade for new construction and additions for a total of \$1,612,597. In addition, 61 building permits in the amount of \$1,414,433 were issued for building alterations and repairs during this ten year period. Thus a total of \$3,027,030 was expended on all the properties in the area throughout this decade. As Appendix 9 shows almost 3/4th of these expenditures were spent upon only a few projects--a total of \$2,237,800, or 73.9% of the value of all permits issued, was allocated to only 9 projects. Five of these projects, absorbing 26% of the total investment during the decade, were fast food restaurants, one of which has since burned down and been vacant for four years. Three properties situated just across Western Avenue from the Evergreen Shopping Center were the recipient of \$1,074,800 of investment during the decade, or over 35% of the total for the district. Thus very little capital investment, an average of about \$750 per year, was expended on each of the other 104 properties located in the area during the decade.

The amount of investment in the area during the last five years declined by more than 25% from that which occurred during the first half of the decade studied unadjusted for inflation. The total area investment during this 10 year period, including the cost of repairs, represents only about 7% of the estimated market value of the property within the area, or an annual investment of well less than 1% of the value of each property. This small investment was spent on these properties in spite of the fact that the area, like most commercial areas throughout the country, was greatly affected by the rapid changes that were occurring in retailing throughout this period often requiring substantial expenditures to adapt existing retail property for other uses. Appendix 9 also summarizes the results of this research.

The lack of prior growth and investment by the private sector is also supported by the trend in the equalized assessed value (EAV) of the all of the property in the redevelopment project area over the last decade (see Appendix 8). During the period between 1983 and 1993 the EAV of the RPA expanded by only 67% (unadjusted for inflation) as compared to 135% for all commercial property in the City of Chicago. After eliminating the compound growth effect, the annual rate of increase in the taxable value of property within the RPA was only 5.26% during this period, equal to or less than the rate of inflation in property values throughout the region during this period, while the rate of increase Citywide was 8.92%, a rate that was 70% greater than that of the area.

Further evidence of the area's economic decline is indicated by a comparison of municipal sales tax receipts for the area (approximated by the two zip codes which comprise the RPA) and that of the City of Chicago for the period from 1985 through 1990 (see Appendix 9). Later data is not available inasmuch as the City no longer administers and collect this tax. Whereas during this period the City's municipal sales tax receipts increased by 36%, comparable receipts for the two Zip code areas which include the RPA declined by 6%.

Appendix 10 provides evidence indicating that private investment in the area would be stimulated by the adoption of a tax increment district.

Thus, it is clear that private investment in redevelopment of the area has not occurred on a comprehensive basis or in a timely manner in order to overcome the conservation conditions that currently exist within the area. The redevelopment area is not reasonably expected to be redeveloped without the efforts of the City, including the adoption of this Redevelopment Project and Plan, and the adoption of tax increment financing.

XI. Financial Impact and Demand on Taxing District Services

Without the adoption of this Redevelopment Project and Plan, and tax increment financing, the RPA is not reasonably expected to be redeveloped by private enterprise. There is a real prospect that the conservation conditions will continue to exist and spread, and the area as a whole will tend to become blighted and less attractive for the maintenance and improvement of existing buildings and sites. The possibility of the erosion of the assessed value of property which would result from the lack of a concerted effort by the City to stimulate revitalization and redevelopment could lead to a reduction of real estate tax values to all the overlapping taxing districts.

This Redevelopment Plan and Project describes a comprehensive redevelopment program to be undertaken by the City to create an environment in which private investment can occur. The redevelopment program will be staged over a period of years consistent with local market conditions and available resources required to complete the various redevelopment projects and activities set forth in the Plan. If the Redevelopment Project is successful, it is anticipated that the rehabilitation and expansion of existing buildings and new development resulting therefrom will be instrumental in alleviating the existing conservation conditions and restoring the area to sound conditions over the long run.

The Redevelopment project is expected to have both short and long term financial impacts on the taxing bodies overlapping the RPA. During the period when tax increment financing is being used, real estate tax revenues resulting from increases in EAV over and above the certified initial EAV established at the time the district was adopted will be used to pay redevelopment project costs incurred by the City on projects in the area. At the end of this period, the real estate tax revenues attributable to the increase in the EAV over the certified initial amount will be distributed to all the taxing bodies overlapping the RPA.

The following taxing bodies presently levy property taxes against all the properties located within the RPA:

- Cook County
- Cook County Forest Preserve District
- Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
- Chicago Community College District 508
- Chicago Board of Education District 299
- Chicago Park District
- Chicago School Finance Authority
- City of Chicago
- South Cook Mosquito Abatement District

In addition the 95th Street portion of the redevelopment project area is also taxed by the City of Chicago Special Service Area # 4.

Non-residential development, such as retail, commercial service, office, public and institutional uses, should not cause increased demand for services or capital improvements on any of the above taxing bodies except for the Water Reclamation District. Replacement of vacant and underutilized buildings and sites with active and more intensive uses will result in additional demands on services and facilities provided by the Water Reclamation District. However it is expected that any increase in demand for treatment of sanitary and storm sewerage associated with the RPA will not have a significant impact upon the existing treatment facilities maintained and operated by the Water Reclamation District.

Residential development may cause increased demand for services or capital improvements to be provided by the Board of Education, Community College District 508, the Chicago Park District, the Forest Preserve District and the City of Chicago. New private investment in residential and non-residential development, and public investment in infrastructure improvements may increase the demand for public services or capital improvements provided by the City and the Chicago Park District within and adjacent to the RPA. However, it is not possible at this time to predict, with any degree of reliability, (i) the number or timing of new and rehabilitated residential buildings that may be added to the RPA, or (ii) the increased level of demand for services or capital improvements to be provided by any taxing district as a result therefrom.

Over time the implementation of the Redevelopment Plan may lead to an increase in the value of properties adjacent to the RPA.

XII. Program to Address Financial and Service Impacts

As a result of the level of uncertainty about the financial and service impacts of the Redevelopment Plan upon the overlapping taxing bodies, the City has not developed, at present, a specific plan to address any of these financial impacts or increases in demand. However, some or all of the public improvements described earlier in the Redevelopment Activities section on Infrastructure, Parking, Utilities and Public Improvements may mitigate some of the additional services and capital improvement demands placed on the overlapping taxing bodies as a result of the implementation of this Plan. In addition, there will be a willingness on the part of the City to work with the other taxing bodies to assess the financial and service impacts upon these agencies at the Joint Review Board meetings after the TIF is established.

XIII. Provisions for Amending This Redevelopment Plan and Project

This Redevelopment Plan and Project may be amended pursuant to the provisions of the Act.

Appendix 1




BOUNDARY MAP AND EXISTING STRUCTURES BY USE

95th - STREET TAX INCREMENT DISTRICT

REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

BOUNDARY MAP AND
EXISTING STRUCTURE BY USE


PROJECT BOUNDARY

- LEGEND**
-  Commercial
 -  Mix Use
 -  Institutional

OCTOBER, 1994



City of Chicago
Richard M. Daley, Mayor
Department of Planning and Development
Valerie B. Jarrett, Commissioner



Appendix 2

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE 95TH STREET TIF DISTRICT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE 95TH STREET

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICT

A parcel of land in Chicago, Cook County, Illinois being a part of the N 1/2 of Section 7, and the S 1/2 of Section 6 in Township 37 North, Range 14 East of the third Principal Meridian described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the center line of West 95th Street and the center line of South Western Avenue: thence northerly along said center line of South Western Avenue to the north lot line extended of Lot 1 of O. Rueber and Co's. Beverly Hills Sub. of the S. 3/8 of the W. 1/2 of the N.W. 1/4 of Sec. 6-37-14; thence easterly along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of the first north-south public alley parallel to and first east of South Western Avenue; thence southerly along said center line of the aforesaid alley to the intersection with the south lot line extended of Lot 15 of said O. Rueber and Co's. subdivision; thence westerly eight feet to the intersection with the east lot line extended of Lot 16 of said O. Rueber and Co's. subdivision; thence southerly along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of West 91st Street in said O. Rueber and Co's. subdivision; thence easterly 3 feet to the intersection with the east lot line extended of Lot 28 in Beverly Hills Blvd. Sub., being a resub. of the N. 22 acres of Geo. H. Chambers Sub. of the W. 1/2 of the S. W. 1/4 of Sec. 6-37-14; thence southerly along said lot line to the intersection with the north lot line of Lot 13 in Geo. H. Chambers Sub. of the W. 1/2 of the S. W. 1/4 of Sec. 6-37-14; thence westerly along said lot line 23 feet to the intersection with the east parcel division line of Lot 13 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly 159 feet along said parcel division line to the intersection with the center line of West 92nd Street in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly 45 feet along said center line of West 92nd Street to the intersection with the east parcel division line extended of Lot 12 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly along said parcel division line 159 feet to the intersection with the south lot line of Lot 12 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence westerly 13 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the east parcel division line of Lot 11 in Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly 252 feet along said parcel division line to the intersection with the north lot line of Lot 9 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly 13 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the east parcel division line of Lot 9 in Geo. H. Subdivision; thence southerly 126 feet to the intersection with the north lot line in Lot 8 of said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence westerly 15 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the east parcel division line in Lot 7 of said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly 252 feet along said parcel division line to the intersection with the center line extended of West 94th Street in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly 13 feet along said center line of West 94th Street to the intersection with the east parcel division line extended of Lot 5 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly 242 feet along said parcel division line to the intersection with the north lot line of Lot 3 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly 151.45 feet along said lot line extended to the intersection with the center line of South Clairmont Street in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly along said center line of South Clairmont Street to the intersection with the north lot line extended of Lot 39 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of South Oakley Avenue in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly along said center line of South Oakley Avenue to the intersection with the north lot line extended of Lot 41 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly 329 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of South Bell Avenue in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence northerly 125 feet along said center line of South Bell Avenue to the intersection with the south line of the north parcel division line extended of Lot 79 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly 121.9 feet along said parcel division line to the intersection with the west lot line of Lot 81 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence northerly 25 feet along said lot line to the intersection with north lot line of Lot 81 in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence easterly 208 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of South Leavitt Avenue in said Geo. H. Chambers Subdivision; thence southerly 33 feet along said center line of South Leavitt Avenue to the intersection with the center line

extended of the first east-west public alley parallel to and first north of West 95th Street in Sub. of Blk 36 in Hilliard & Dobbin's Sub. of Sec. 6-37-14; thence easterly along said center line to the intersection with the center line extended of South Hoyne Street in A Sub. of Blk. 37 of Hilliard & Dobbin's Sub. of Sec. 6-37-14; thence northerly 28 feet to the intersection with the center line extended of the first east-west public alley parallel to and first north of West 95th Street in Campbell's Sub. of Blk. 37 of Hilliard & Dobbin's Sub. of Sec. 6-37-14; thence easterly along said center line to the intersection with the center line of South Damen Avenue in said Hilliard & Dobbin's Subdivision; thence southerly 26.49 feet along said center line to the intersection with the north lot line extended of Lot 14 in Plotke & Crosby's Resub. of Blk. 39 in Hilliard & Dobbin's Sub. of Sec. 6-37-14; thence easterly to the intersection with the center line of South Winchester Street in said Hilliard & Dobbin's Subdivision; thence southerly 50 feet along said center line to the intersection with the north parcel division line of Lot 47 in Longwood Sub. of Sec. 6-37-14; thence easterly 160.46 feet along said parcel line to the intersection with the west lot line of Lot 46 in said Longwood Subdivision; thence northerly 50 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the north lot line extended of Lot 46 in said Longwood Subdivision; thence easterly along said lot line extended to the intersection with the center line of South Longwood Drive in said Longwood Subdivision; thence northerly 50.07 feet to the intersection with the north parcel division line of Lot 33 in said Longwood Subdivision; thence easterly along said parcel division line to the intersection with the center line of the CRI&P Railroad right of way in said Longwood Subdivision; thence southerly 10.06 feet to the intersection with the north lot line extended of Lot 22 in Longwood Sub., a sub. of all that part of Sec 6-37-14 lying E. of the center line of Spruce St., S. of the center line of 93rd St., W. of the W line of P.C.& St L. RR right of way and N. of the S. line of S.E. 1/4 of said Sec. 6-37-14; thence easterly along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of South Vanderpoel Street in aforesaid Longwood Subdivision; thence northerly 10 feet along said center line to the intersection with the north parcel division line extended of Lot 12 in said Longwood Subdivision; thence easterly 157.98 feet to the intersection with the east lot line of Lot 9 in said Longwood Subdivision; thence southerly 8 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of the first east-west public alley parallel to and first north of West 95th Street in Joseph B. Fleming's Sub. of the S. 1/2 of Lot 9 and all of Lot 10 in Longwood Sub; thence easterly along said center line to the intersection with the center line of South Charles Street in aforesaid Longwood Subdivision; thence northerly 66 feet along said center line of South Charles Street to the intersection with the north lot line extended of Lot 2 in said Longwood Subdivision; thence easterly 138.6 feet to the intersection with the West line of the Penna. Railroad right of way; thence southerly along said line to the intersection with the center line of West 95th Street in said Longwood Subdivision; thence easterly along said center line of West 95th Street to the intersection with the east lot line extended of Outlot B in Beverly Pointe, a sub. in N.E. 1/4 of Sec. 7, the N.W. 1/4 and the S.W. 1/4 of Sec. 8-37-14; thence southerly along said lot line to the intersection with the north lot line of Lot 90 in said Beverly Pointe subdivision; thence westerly 106.22 feet to the intersection with the west lot line of Outlot B in said Beverly Pointe Subdivision; thence southerly along said lot line to the intersection with the north lot line of Lot 1 in Howard Oviatt's sub. of Lots 1 to 17 incl. Lots 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Blk. 5 and lots 15,16,18,19, and 26 of Blk 3 in Hilliard and Dobbin's 1st Add. to Washington Heights of Sec. 8-37-14; thence westerly 140 feet along said lot line extended to the intersection with the center line of South Charles Street in said Howard Oviatt's subdivision; thence northerly 43 feet along said center line of South Charles Street to the intersection with the south lot line extended of Lot 45 in Hilliard and Dobbin's 1st Add. to Washington Heights being a sub. of the E. 1/2 of the N.E. 1/4 of Sec 7 and the N.W. 1/4 of Sec. 8-37-14; thence westerly 139 feet to the intersection with the east lot line of Lot 50 in said Hilliard and Dobbin's subdivision; thence northerly 100 feet to the intersection with the south lot line of Lot 49 in said Hilliard and Dobbin's subdivision; thence westerly 186 feet along said lot line extended to the intersection with the center line of South Prospect Avenue in said Hilliard and Dobbin's subdivision; thence northerly 10 feet along said center line of South Prospect Avenue to the intersection with the south lot line extended to Lot 6 in said Hilliard and Dobbin's subdivision; thence westerly 112.23 feet to the intersection with the east lot line of Lot 12 in O'Neill's Sub. of Lot 3 & Lot 2 (except that part for School lot) in Blk 6 of Hilliard and Dobbin's Sub of Sec 8-37-14; thence southerly 165.48 feet to the intersection with the south lot line of Lot 10 in said O'Neill's Subdivision; thence westerly 155.42 feet along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of South

Vanderpoel Street in said O'Niell's Subdivision; thence northerly along said center line of South Vanderpoel Street to the intersection with the center line extended of the first east-west public alley parallel to and first south of West 95th Street in Howe's Sub. at Longwood of Lots 110 to 113 incl. of Blk. 6 in Hilliard and Dobbin's 1st Add. to Washington Heights of Sec. 8-37-14; thence westerly along said center line to the intersection with the center line of the C.R.I. & P Railroad right of way in said Howe's Subdivision; thence southerly 15.75 feet to the intersection with the south lot line extended of Lot 3 in Dore's Sub. of the W. 1/2 of the N.E. 1/4 of Sec. 7-37-14; thence westerly along said lot line to the intersection with the east lot line of Lot 9 in Sub. of lots 21, 22, 23, & 24 in Blk. 1 in Dore's Sub. of Sec. 7-37-14; thence southerly 50 feet to the intersection with the south lot line of Lot 9 in said Dore's Subdivision; thence westerly 165 feet along said lot line extended to the intersection with the center line of South Longwood Drive in said Dore's Subdivision; thence northerly 50 feet to the intersection with the south lot line extended of Lot 3 in said Dore's Subdivision; thence westerly along said lot line to the intersection with the center line of South Damen Avenue in said Dore's Subdivision; thence northerly 8 feet to the intersection with the first east-west public alley first south and parallel to West 95th Street in said Dore's Subdivision; thence westerly along the center line extended of said alley to the center line of South Leavitt Street in John Bain's Resub. of part of Forest Ridge of Sec. 7-37-14; thence northerly 3 feet along said center line of South Leavitt Avenue to the intersection with the first east-west public alley parallel to and first south of West 95th Street in Highland Add. to Longwood, being a resub. of Calumet Highlands of Sec. 7-37-14; thence westerly along said center line extended of said alley to the intersection with the center line of the first north-south public alley parallel to and first east of South Western Avenue in said Highland Addition; thence southerly along said alley center line extended to the intersection with the center line of West 96th Street in said Highland Addition; thence westerly along said center line of West 96th Street to the intersection with the center line of South Western Avenue in said Highland Addition; thence northerly along said center line of South Western Avenue to the point of the beginning.

Appendix 3




DISTRIBUTION OF QUALIFICATION FACTORS AND EXISTING LAND USE

95th - STREET TAX INCREMENT DISTRICT

REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

DISTRIBUTION OF QUALIFICATION FACTORS AND EXISTING LAND USE

LEGEND


-  Commercial
-  Mix Use
-  Institutional

100 Block Number




City of Chicago
 Richard M. Daley, Mayor
 Department of Planning and Development
 Valerie B. Jarrett, Commissioner

OCTOBER, 1994



PRESENT TO MAJOR EXTENT PRESENT TO MINOR EXTENT

BLOCK	PRESENT TO MAJOR EXTENT	PRESENT TO MINOR EXTENT	CODE
100	1,3,11,14		
101	1,2,11,12,13,14		
102	1,3,12,14	8,11,12	
103	1,2,11,12,13,14	6,8,7	
104	1,3,11,12,13,14		
105	1,14	3,11,12	
106	1,3,11,12,13,14	8	
107	1,3,11,12,13,14		
108	1,3,11,12,13,14	4	
110	1,3,11,12,13,14	8,7	
117	7,12,14		
200	1,2,7,11,12,13,14	4	
201	1,2,7,12,13,14	11	
202	1,2,11,12,13,14		
203	1,2,11,12,13,14		
211	1,2,11,12,13,14		
212	12,14		
213	2,7,11,12,13,14	4	
300	1,3,11,12,13,14		
310	1,2,11,12,13,14		
317	3,11,14	1,7,12,13	
318	2,7,11,12,13,14		
319	12,14		
320	1,2,8,11,12,13,14	7	
321	1,2,11,12,13,14		
322	1,2,11,12,13,14	2,7	
323	1,2,11,12,13,14		
421	2,11,12,13,14	5	
422	12,14	12	
423	1,2,11,12,13,14		
424	1,2,11,12,13,14	7,8	
426	1,2,11,12,13,14	7,8	
428	1,2,11,12,13,14	4	




Appendix 4

BOUNDARY AND PROPOSED LAND USE MAP

Appendix 4

BOUNDARY AND PROPOSED LAND USE MAP



95th - STREET TAX INCREMENT DISTRICT

REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

BOUNDARY AND PROPOSED LAND USE

— PROJECT BOUNDARY


LEGEND


- 1. RETAIL/COMMERCIAL
- 2. RESIDENTIAL
- 3. GREEN SPACE
- 4. PARKING
- 5. MIXED USE
- 6. INSTITUTIONAL
- 7. OFFICE/SERVICE

BLOCK	PROPOSED USE
100, 101, 102, 103	1, 4
104	7
105, 106	4, 6
107	4
200, 201	4, 5
202, 203	1, 4
211	6
212, 213, 117	2
421, 423, 424, 425, 426	1, 4
422	3, 4
321, 322, 323	1, 4
317, 318, 319, 320	6, 7, 4
310, 300	7
115, 108	2



JANUARY, 1995
 City of Chicago
 Richard M. Daley, Mayor
 Department of Planning and Development
 Valerie B. Jarrett, Commissioner





**95th - STREET TAX
INCREMENT DISTRICT**

REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

**BOUNDARY AND PROPOSED
LAND USE**

— PROJECT BOUNDARY

BLOCK	PROPOSED USE
100, 101, 102, 103	1, 4
104	7
105, 106	4, 6
107	4
200, 201	4, 5
202, 203	1, 4
211	6
212, 213, 117	2
421, 423, 424, 425, 426	1, 4
422	3, 4
321, 322, 323	1, 4
317, 318, 319, 320	6, 7, 4
310, 300	7
115, 108	2

LEGEND

- 1. RETAIL/COMMERCIAL
- 2. RESIDENTIAL
- 3. GREEN SPACE
- 4. PARKING
- 5. MIXED USE
- 6. INSTITUTIONAL
- 7. OFFICE/SERVICE



JANUARY, 1995
 City of Chicago
 Richard M. Daley, Mayor
 Department of Planning and Development
 Valerie B. Jarrett, Commissioner

Appendix 5

ESTIMATED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS

<u>Program Action/ Improvements</u>	<u>Project Costs</u>
Property Acquisition and Assembly Costs	\$5,000,000
Demolition, Environmental Clean-up and Site Preparation	1,000,000
Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings	5,000,000
Construction of Public Parking Lots and Facilities	2,000,000
Beautification, Facade and Public Landscape Improvements	500,000
Infrastructure Improvements including roads, alleys, sidewalks and utilities, etc.	2,500,000
Public Facilities Construction and/or Rehabilitation of Public Facilities	1,000,000
Transit Improvements	500,000
Interest Costs Incurred by Developers	750,000
Relocation Assistance	500,000
Job Training	500,000
Planning, Administration, Architectural, Studies and Surveys, Legal and other Professional Services	750,000
GROSS PROJECT COST	\$20,000,000

Note: Gross Project Cost excludes financing costs, including interest expense, capitalized interest, and costs associated with issuing bonds and other obligations. All cost estimates in the table are based upon the purchasing power of the dollar in 1995.

Appendix 6

SUMMARY OF INITIAL EAV BY BLOCK

25-06-108	\$ 211,219.00
25-06-115	712,740.00
25-06-300	1,007,234.00
25-06-310	854,403.00
25-06-317	1,841,464.00
25-06-318	464,335.00
25-06-319	281,252.00
25-06-320	512,340.00
25-06-321	391,091.00
25-06-322	550,982.00
25-06-323	825,809.00
25-06-421	359,212.00
25-06-422	22,574.00
25-06-423	435,245.00
25-06-424	453,357.00
25-06-425	253,249.00
25-06-426	300,974.00
25-07-100	1,422,713.00
25-07-101	554,293.00
25-07-102	409,360.00
25-07-103	517,170.00
25-07-104	374,719.00
25-07-105	31,299.00
25-07-106	363,163.00
25-07-107	244,305.00
25-07-200	648,431.00
25-07-201	531,450.00
25-07-202	150,277.00
25-07-203	350,219.00
25-07-211	- ✓
25-07-212	339,776.00
25-07-213	- ✓
25-08-117	<u>22,499.00</u>
TOTAL	\$15,437,154.00

Appendix 7

BUILDING PERMIT SUMMARY, 1985-94

**Building Permit Summary
1985-94**

Value of Permits

<u>Year</u>	<u>New</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Constructions</u>	<u>Alterations</u>	<u>Repairs</u>	
1985	\$ 20,000	\$ 104,321	\$ 124,321	\$ 124,321
1986	\$ 105,247	\$ 29,800	\$ 135,047	\$ 135,047
1987	\$ 690,000	\$ 92,950	\$ 782,950	\$ 782,950
1988	\$ -	\$ 431,500	\$ 431,500	\$ 431,500
1989	\$ 212,000	\$ 51,600	\$ 263,600	\$ 263,600
1990	\$ 17,850	\$ -	\$ 17,850	\$ 17,850
1991	\$ 226,400	\$ -	\$ 226,400	\$ 226,400
1992	\$ 100,000	\$ 204,500	\$ 304,500	\$ 304,500
1993	\$ 233,900	\$ -	\$ 233,900	\$ 233,900
1994	\$ 7,200	\$ 489,762	\$ 506,962	\$ 506,962
Total	\$ 1,612,597	\$ 1,414,433	\$ 3,027,030	\$ 3,027,030

<u>Dollar Value of Permit</u>	<u>Number for New Construction Additions</u>	<u>Number for Alteration Repair</u>	<u>Total Number of Permits</u>	<u>Total Value of Permits</u>	<u>Percent of Total Permit Value</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent of Permit Value</u>
\$1,000-9999	2	21	23	\$ 85,397	2.83%	2.95%
\$10,000-24,999	2	9	11	\$ 157,800	5.23%	8.19%
\$25,000-49,999	-	15	15	\$ 527,500	17.50%	25.68%
\$50,000-99,999	1	9	10	\$ 599,500	19.89%	45.57%
\$100,000-199,999	1	0	1	\$ 100,000	3.32%	48.89%
\$200,000-349,999	2	2	4	\$ 1,191,012	39.51%	88.39%
\$350,000-499,999	1	0	1	\$ 350,000	11.61%	100.00%
Total	10	61	71	\$ 3,014,809		

Building Permit Summary
Distribution of Permitted Expenditures
For the Period of 1985-1994

<u>Major Capital Projects</u>	<u>Number of Parcels</u>	<u>Permitted Cost</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>	<u>Average Cost Per Parcel</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Bonanza	1	\$ 350,000			Burned out, vacant 4 years
Other Fast Food	4	\$ 442,000			
Total Fast Food	5	\$ 792,000			
Citibank	1	\$ 475,000			abuts suburban Center
Rubloff	9	\$ 299,800			abuts suburban Center
O'Connor Hundai	1	\$ 300,000			abuts suburban Center
Evangelical Health	1	\$ 371,000			
Sub-total	17	\$ 2,237,800	73.9%	\$ 131,635	
All Other Properties	104	\$ 789,230	26.1%	\$ 7,589	
Total Investment	121	\$ 3,027,030			

Appendix 8

**EVIDENCE REGARDING LACK OF PRIOR GROWTH AND INVESTMENT IN THE AREA
AREA PROPERTY VALUATION TRENDS, 1983-1993**

**95th and Westam Avenue
 Redevelopment Project Area
 Property Valuation Trends, 1983-1993**

	<u>1983 Tax Year</u>	<u>1993 Tax Year</u>	<u>Decade Increase</u>	<u>Percentage Increase</u>	<u>Annual Compound % Increase</u>
Redevelopment Project Area	\$ 9,250,334	\$ 15,437,154	\$ 6,186,820	67%	5.26%
All Commercial Property-City of Chicago	\$ 5,522,000,000	\$ 12,987,000,000	\$ 7,465,000,000	135%	8.92%

Appendix 9

**EVIDENCE REGARDING LACK OF PRIOR GROWTH AND INVESTMENT IN THE AREA
AREA SALES TAX TRENDS, 1985-1990**

Analysis of Sales Tax Trends for
Ninety-Fifth Street Business Association

The Ninety-Fifth Street Business Association requested an analysis of retail business activity covering their portions of Western Avenue and 95th Street. Using the most recent sales tax data the following observations can be drawn:

Relative to state and city sales tax collections, the postal zip codes which cover the Association's membership experienced declining taxable retail sales activity.

While the city's overall sales tax and home rule tax revenues increased from \$107.9 million in 1985 to \$147.0 million in 1990, the Association's zip code area sales tax receipts declined from \$1.4 million in 1985 to \$1.3 million in 1990.

Indexing the trends in sales tax collections indicate:

	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>
Illinois	100	128
Chicago	100	136
60620/60643	100	94

The Chicago businesses that make up the Ninety-Fifth Street Business Association compete directly against the suburban business located in the Evergreen Plaza Shopping Center and the strong retail corridor just west on 95th street.

The retail businesses in the Association are at a significant competitive disadvantage due to differential sales tax rates.

Appendix 10

**EVIDENCE REGARDING "BUT FOR"
DEVELOPER'S LETTERS OF INTEREST IF TIF IS ADOPTED**



PROPERTY DIVISION

April 17, 1995

Ms. Valerie Jarrett
Commissioner of Economic Development
Chicago City Hall
121 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Dear Commissioner:

As an owner of a substantial amount of property in the Beverly community, I am seeking your support of the proposed TIF area ordinance presented by Alderman Ginger Rugai. Our property in the City of Chicago stretches from 94th Place to 99th Street and Western Avenue, in addition to being on both sides of 95th Street from Western to Oakley. We own over 5 million square feet of land in the immediate area.

The property on the southeast corner of 95th and Western was built in the early 1950's, and over the years has become aesthetically unattractive and non-functional. It is one of the premier corners of the area, and for several years we have entertained the idea of redeveloping the block along 95th Street (from Claremont to Western, and up Western to 96th). Several plans have been drawn to plan the improvement of that corner, but with the cost of construction in the limited space (because of the depths of the lots) it becomes a very tough deal. Convenient parking is essential, as well as costly, on a small site.

When the 95th Street Business Association and Alderman Ginger Rugai broached the idea of a TIF, I was thoroughly supportive of this type of City initiative. In reviewing our pro forma and with municipal assistance through the aid of a TIF, the deal would become feasible. Without the TIF, it cannot be accomplished; even with the TIF, it is not a profitable venture but, at least, it reduces some of our losses and enhances the area. Basically, an increase of \$5.00 over current rents will not offset demolition and construction costs.

9730 South Western Avenue
Suite 418
Evergreen Park, IL 60642
(312) 445-8000
FAX (708) 422-4700

PAGE TWO
April 17, 1995
Ms. Valerie Jarrett

Our commitment to the Beverly Neighborhood over many years is well known, and we have continued to build new projects to enhance the quality of life in this community. Your support of the proposed TIF ordinance would be of great benefit in strengthening our community, as well as encouraging economical development in the great City of Chicago.

Sincerely,

KOLL

Vincent J. Gavin
General Manager

VJG:jm

cc: Virginia A. Rugai, Alderman
Lola D. Weber, 95th Street Business Association

9730 South Western Avenue
Suite 418
Evergreen Park, IL 60642
(312) 441-8900
FAX (708) 422-9780

WIENKE COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES

April 14, 1995

Ms. Lois D. Weber
Executive Director
95th Street Business Association
2100 West 95th Street
Chicago, IL 60643


Dear Lois:

Thank you for your continued communications regarding development possibilities in your area. I am always interested in any information you may have regarding available buildings, land, and/or tenants seeking space for build to suits.

To date I have not found a project with economic justification. If you are able to provide some incentives such as facade improvement dollars, property assemblage assistance, or demolition cost assistance, I believe it would spur new development along 95th Street.

Please keep me informed as to any opportunities that may arise in the 19th Ward. With the right planning, economic development can blossom.

Yours truly,



Raymond M. Wienke
RMW/wmr

EXHIBIT A

PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1

November 12, 1996

**95th-Western Redevelopment Area
Redevelopment Plan and Project**

The 95th-Western Redevelopment Plan and Project (the "Plan") of the City of Chicago approved by Ordinance of the City Council of Chicago on July 13, 1995, is amended by the following deletions and insertions:

Page 12 - Redevelopment Objectives:

The fourth bullet point is deleted and replaced by the following text:

- *Assemble land into functionally suitable and marketable parcels, using the City's power of eminent domain if necessary, in accordance with the needs of the area to attract new business uses through redevelopment.*

Page 13 - Redevelopment Activities:

Section 1., Use of Incentives for Property Assembly, beginning "Use tax increment incentives" through "...construction of public improvements." is deleted and replaced by the following text:

The City may engage in activities to encourage and assist qualified developers to acquire property for the purpose of redevelopment consistent with the Plan. These activities may include: a) the use of the City's power of eminent domain to acquire property needed for development of new business or commercial uses, including parking facilities; b) the negotiated purchase, exchange or long-term lease of property within the Redevelopment Area for redevelopment or for parking improvements; c) the clearance of all improvements on acquired property.

Page 15 - General Land Use Plan:

The first paragraph under the heading, beginning "Existing land uses..." and ending "...for the RPA." is deleted and replaced by the following text:

Appendix 4, General Land Use Plan, illustrates proposed land use within the Redevelopment Area, continuing the overall function of the area as a local commercial and business district. Key changes to the existing land use pattern include the addition of new off-street parking facilities and higher intensity business uses at the Ashland Avenue-95th Street intersection and the 95th Street-Western Avenue intersection. Appendix 4 represents a broad scheme for land use and may be modified to fulfill general project objectives for economic revitalization.

The paragraph headed "Commercial and Mixed Uses" is deleted in its entirety.


Appendix 4: Boundary and Proposed Land Use Map

This appendix is deleted and replaced by: *Appendix 4, Proposed Land Map, revised November 12, 1996 (attached).*

Appendix 5: Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs


This appendix is deleted and replaced by: *Appendix 5, Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs, revised November 12, 1996 (attached).*

APPENDIX 4
 Revised November 12, 1996



Appendix 4
BOUNDARY and PROPOSED LAND USE MAP REVISED
25TH STREET/WESTERN AVENUE
 BUSINESS DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PREPARED FOR THE A. HERRING & COMPANY ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS
 1000 WESTERN AVENUE
 CAMBIOS



Appendix 4
BOUNDARY and PROPOSED LAND USE MAP REVISED (Continued)
95TH STREET/WESTERN AVENUE
BUSINESS DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Appendix 5

ESTIMATED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS
Revised November 12, 1996

<u>Program Action/Improvements</u>	<u>Project Cost</u>
Property Assembly	\$5,000,000.00
Demolition, Environmental Remediation, Site Preparation	\$1,000,000.00
Rehabilitation	\$5,000,000.00
Public Improvements / Parking facilities	\$500,000.00
Public Infrastructure Improvements / Streetscaping	\$5,250,000.00
Public Infrastructure Improvements / Transit	\$500,000.00
Interest Costs incurred by developers	\$750,000.00
Relocation	\$750,000.00
Job Training	\$500,000.00
Planning, Legal, studies	\$750,000.00
Total TIF project costs	\$20,000,000.00

* Note: The total redevelopment project costs provide an upper limit on TIF-eligible expenditures (exclusive of capitalized interest costs, bond issuance costs and other financing costs). These costs are estimates and do not represent City of Chicago commitments or expenditures. Within this limit, adjustments may be made in line items without further amendment to the 95th-Western Redevelopment Plan and Project.

CITY OF CHICAGO
95th/WESTERN TAX INCREMENT REDEVELOPMENT AREA
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROJECT

“Notice of Correction of the Redevelopment Plan and Project”

NOTICE is hereby given by the City of Chicago of the publication and inclusion of changes to the City of Chicago 95th/Western Tax Increment Redevelopment Plan and Project (the “Plan”), which includes the 95th/Western Tax Increment Redevelopment Plan and Project Eligibility Study. The Plan, pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-4 of the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS Section 5/11-74.4-1 et seq. (the “Act”) was adopted July 13, 1995, and previously amended March 19, 1997;

The amended Plan adopted February 6, 2008 (the “Revised Plan”), in which the City further expands the land uses for which the City may use its power of eminent domain, was approved pursuant to an ordinance enacted by the City Council on February 6, 2008, pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-4 of the Act. The Plan is hereby changed as follows:

Section V: Conservation Conditions Existing in the Redevelopment Project Area

under the heading "Redevelopment Activities", subheading "1. Use of Incentives for Property Assembly," the second sentence is amended by inserting the following underlined text to read as follows:

These activities may include: a) the use of the City’s power of eminent domain to acquire property needed for development of new business or commercial uses, including parking facilities, and mixed-use or residential uses; b) the negotiated purchase, exchange or long-term lease of property within the Redevelopment Area for redevelopment or for parking improvements; c) the clearance of all improvements on acquired property.

The complete Revised Plan is available at the Department of Planning and Development, Room 703, 121 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois. If you wish to review this Plan, as amended or obtain further information concerning the Plan, please contact Beth McGuire at the Department of Planning and Development, Room 703, 121 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, (312) 744-4772 during the hours of 9:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Arnold L. Randall, Commissioner
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
City of Chicago