

MINUTES
CITY OF WOODSTOCK
OLD COURTHOUSE AND SHERIFF'S HOUSE ADVISORY COMMISSION
March 21, 2016
City Council Chambers

A Regular Meeting of the City of Woodstock Old Courthouse and Sheriff's House Advisory Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Dennis Sandquist on Monday, March 21, 2016 in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

A roll call was taken.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Lynde Anderson, Jim Campion, Trisha Doornbosch, Jodie Kurtz-Osborne, Jim Prindiville, David Stumpf, and Chairman Dennis Sandquist.

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: Tammy Townsend-Kise and Joseph White

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Roscoe Stelford, Economic Development Director Garrett Anderson, City Planner/Staff Liaison Nancy Baker, and Grant Writer Terry Willcockson.

OTHERS PRESENT: Susan Stelford of the Friends of the Old Courthouse & Sheriff's House, Plan Commissioner Darrell Moore, and City Clerk Cindy Smiley

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by J. Prindiville, second by J. Kurtz-Osborne, to approve the minutes of the February 15, 2016, meeting of the Old Courthouse and Sheriff's House Advisory Commission with the following corrections:

Page 5, Paragraph 4, in all instances "stairs" should be replaced with "exterior stairs."

Page 8, Paragraph 2, in all instances "stairs" should be replaced with "exterior stairs."

Ayes: L. Anderson, J. Campion, T. Doornbosch, J. Kurtz-Osborne, J. Prindiville, D. Stumpf, and Chairman D. Sandquist. Nays: none. Abstentions: none. Absentees: T. Townsend-Kise and J. White. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kathleen Spaltro, 143 Lawrence Avenue, advised the Commission that the Illinois Humanities Council recently revealed a Multiplier Grant which offers grant opportunities to groups which unite on projects of historic significance. She noted that perhaps this would be an opportunity for groups interested in the preservation of the Old Courthouse to unite and apply for this grant.

Ms. Spaltro also stated she has been encouraged by the Illinois State Historical Society to apply for placement of a historical marker at the Sheriff's House and Old Courthouse commemorating the incarceration of Eugene V. Debs in 1895. Ms. Spaltro stated she was not aware of the significance of this event until she began research for an article she is writing. She noted there were several charges filed against Mr. Debs as a result of the Pullman Strike, with all criminal charges being dropped. She stated the civil charges were not dropped with the appeal for those being taken to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled against Mr. Debs resulting in his incarceration in the Sheriff's House in 1895. Ms. Spaltro noted this ruling affected labor law for the next 40 years and has been called the most pivotal labor event in history. She stated this means Woodstock is the site

of a building that is very important to national history. She also noted the interest in this building in Woodstock coincides with the establishment of a national park in the Pullman Neighborhood in Chicago so this would gain national attention.

Ms. Spaltro stated the cost of a 100-word plaque would be \$2,000, with a 250-word plaque costing \$3,500. She further stated the wording would be approved by the City of Woodstock, the Advisory Commission, and the Historical Society and would be developed over time. She stated she is now trying to raise funds and support for this project, including from the Commission, and noted she would be happy to work with the Commission in any capacity to forward this project.

In response to a question from D. Stumpf, Ms. Spaltro stated placement of this plaque would not place any constraints upon the building. She further stated there is probably no other building in McHenry Council marking a Supreme Court event.

Chairman Sandquist stated he would like to discuss whether the plaque, if placed, would be devoted just to Debs and the Pullman case or to all historic aspects of the building.

It was the consensus of the Commission that this item be placed on the April meeting agenda for discussion. J. Prindiville requested that a copy of the letter of support provided by the State Bar Association as referenced by Ms. Spaltro be provided as part of that discussion.

ULI TAP

Chairman Sandquist stated that TAP Panel Chairman Ray Hartshorne is present this evening to discuss the TAP process and its recommendations. He noted that this is appropriate as it was the Panel's recommendation that this commission be formed.

Mr. Hartshorne thanked the Commission for this opportunity, noting it is gratifying to see that the Commission is focusing on the Old Courthouse. He stated that, from reading the minutes of previous meetings, he feels the Commission is asking the right questions and understands how difficult it can be to undertake a project such as this.

Mr. Hartshorne briefly discussed his background and experience noting he does the largest preservation projects in the Midwest, including the restoration/renovation of 500 vintage buildings. He stated the oldest was a 1880s building, noting he has never before been involved with a pre-Civil War building such as the Old Courthouse. He further stated this building is a treasure with few, if any, pre-Civil War buildings existing in Illinois.

Mr. Hartshorne stated this pre-Civil War building on a pristine city square makes this the "Mona Lisa of urban rehab." He noted this is 150 years of history which could have been wiped out if the building were torn down. He stated this provides a unique, authentic experience which many communities are seeking or even attempting to build, but Woodstock already has and that preservation of this asset is a good investment which will be paid back over time. He noted many people come to Woodstock because of the Old Courthouse and the Opera House and that these people are coming not only for the event, but for the atmosphere as well. He stated that these people are seeking an experience that cannot be duplicated, but are attracted to the exclusive experience Woodstock provides. He further stated Woodstock is one of the most exclusive experiences because it is authentic and that millennials, in particular, are looking for this authentic craftsmanship experience, making this a great time to be doing this project. He urged the

Commission to communicate this significance to the public, some of whom may be frustrated with the project.

Mr. Hartshorne noted staff did an amazing job during the panel process. He stated that to have a Mayor who is committed to preservation of one of the City's greatest assets and a Commission whose only job is to concentrate on the Old Courthouse and Sheriff's House is wonderful for Woodstock. He stated he could tell from the minutes that the Commission has the ability to represent the people of Woodstock and make recommendations concerning the Old Courthouse. He existed that from two years ago when nothing was happening, there is now a great focus on this project.

Mr. Hartshorne then discussed financing, stating this will be the project's greatest challenge, noting gaps in the Pro Forma. He stated this type of project will require layered financing with the first step to make sure the building is stabilized, which is being done. This will then allow time to make decisions and raise funds. He recommended the Commission have attitude, patience, tenacity, and creativity as they work through the jigsaw puzzle of this project. He urged them to get a plan and build into it.

Mr. Hartshorne stated the cost for the project has been estimated at \$5 million, noting this figure will surely be refined. He stated that the current tenants do not fund this, noting anything less than \$40 per square foot will not underwrite \$5 million and that it will be challenging to find tenants at \$40 per square foot given the layout of the building. He stated perhaps \$2.5 million could be financed through creative government financing with the remainder coming from donations, grants, or a capital campaign with a smaller amount raised through rent.

Mr. Hartshorne suggested that two Pro Formas be developed so the Commission is never asking if this can be done. He noted the Commission should know what the costs are and what the rents are based upon \$0-\$40 per square foot as the tenant(s) could be not-for-profit or commercial. He again noted the current tenants are not paying for the renovations. Mr. Hartshorne also noted that while it is certain that donations will be needed, the amount needed in donations is not known at the present time. He stated having this information would also help the Commission answer questions from the public.

Again discussing donations, Mr. Hartshorne stated that to raise and receive donations, a not-for-profit vehicle is needed so it is good that this vehicle has been created in the Friends of the Old Courthouse, noting this is also a mechanism for grant application.

Mr. Hartshorne stated the panel's recommendation for an institutional educational usage came straight from the City's Vision 2020 statement that Woodstock be "a place for life-long learning." He noted the panel wished to make a recommendation that reflected the community of Woodstock and that there were major educational institutions in the area, namely McHenry County College, Aurora University, and Loyola. Again noting the design of the building, Mr. Hartshorne stated the cellular design with small spaces is conducive to an educational use but may not be so for other uses. He stated the panel would like to see a stable user with a track record that is in sync with the values of the community. He noted this was just a recommendation and another institutional use that would work in the space and pay rent would certainly be acceptable. Some such business or corporate classifications were discussed.

Mr. Hartshorne stated there is limited time left on the TIF and the City's budget is not just for the Old Courthouse project, but also for parks and streets and all other municipal expenditures. He noted this is one reason the Commission was recommended and formed; while the City must focus on everything, the Commission's single focus is this project.

Mr. Hartshorne then discussed the importance of nearby housing, such as that which could be provided at Woodstock Station, to Woodstock and the Old Courthouse project in particular, noting such housing helps to keep an area vital. He stated that many communities are trying to create or emulate this while Woodstock already is preserving this wonderful historic building. He again discussed the return on investment of this project and also of the residences that may be built on Woodstock Station, noting not only will this be in the form of taxes but also in support of the merchants.

Mr. Hartshorne also discussed marketing Woodstock stating he was pleased to see a marketing campaign. He urged the City to do a better job of physically marking the city at the various entry points, drawing people to the Square. He also stated this would lead people to Woodstock's many events and suggested a \$1.00 per event goer donation to the Old Courthouse project. He also suggested asking a corporation to match these donations to be used as seed money for the project.

Mr. Hartshorne then discussed various fundraising mechanisms including "adopt a landmark," development of an Old Courthouse Fund, locating an "angel" donor who believes in historic projects, developing a program with levels of funding which could be used to encourage donations, and a tax levy. Mr. Hartshorne stated there is a possibility of finding grants for small green building projects and urged the City's Grant Writer to investigate these.

Chairman Sandquist thanked Mr. Hartshorne for his work on the Panel and also for his presentation this evening.

In response to a question from D. Stumpf, Mr. Hartshorne stated reports could be located which identify dollar for dollar numbers to show that this preservation effort would pay for itself over time. He stated his feeling that it is very important to have this information and to advocate for the project using these facts. He urged these advocates to note that the City is not being extravagant on this project, but is rather being prudent in protecting this asset and serving the City because while there is certainly an unquantifiable element, there are also many studies that show a dollar for dollar return on investment. Mr. Hartshorne again noted this historic building provides an authentic, exclusive experience which is certainly attractive to millennials who may be drawn to Woodstock because of it, making this an excellent time to undertake this project. He opined that the City is being very progressive in undertaking a project that will attract people to come back and live in and around the Square.

Ms. Spaltro opined that people do not realize the historic significance of this building and stated this, including its association with the Supreme Court case, could be used in the fundraising campaign. She also stated perhaps the tenants could include a law school campus or law firms.

Mr. Hartshorne urged the Commission to think of flexible uses such as a Welcome Center which could also provide information on the history of Woodstock, perhaps partnering with another user or users in the remainder of the building. He noted it would be desirable to have a use that is open for public access.

In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist, Mr. Hartshorne stated the Panel did not hear much negativity regarding preserving the building. The questions seemed to be how and for what purpose.

Chairman Sandquist summarized the steps as: 1) Development of Pro Formas; 2) Fundraising; 3) Identification of users. He asked Mr. Hartshorne if the fundraising and grant applications will be dependent upon the end use and if there is a limiting factor if there is no vision.

Mr. Hartshorne stated he feels there should be a vision and that it would include users who pay rent and who are in sync with the values of the community and will provide experiences on the Square for future generations. This would start the conversation and get a dialog going with potential donors and the public and could possibly identify ideas and partnerships.

Mr. Hartshorne stated it would be good to come up with a generalized idea of who and what could go into the space which could be a donor/user and then have an aspirational rendering to present showing the donor's name on the space. He noted conversations should be had with everyone possible, identifying that the City has spent significant funds to stabilize this wonderful pre-Civil War building that will be the future of the Community and that now the City wishes to raise ½ of the capital and the donor is one of the people who has been identified to fit this vision. These people should be asked, "What can we do to interest you in this building and this project?"

Noting that he explained the institutional use focus identified by the panel, Chairman Sandquist asked if there is no scenario seen for private occupancy such as a corporate headquarters. Mr. Hartshorne stated that while one should "never say never," there would be a very rare chance that this would occur. He stated the availability of the Old Courthouse has not been a secret and has not drawn the interest of such a user who is willing to invest this amount of money.

In response to questions and comments from D. Stumpf concerning companies that may come to Woodstock due to development, about the possibility of attracting a large hotel to Woodstock, and how these companies could contribute to this project, Mr. Hartshorne stated he has talked to the top real estate broker who markets such projects who stated Woodstock does not have a large enough market to attract such businesses.

Mr. Hartshorne stated the City could think about bringing in an outside operator who is successful in other communities and underwrite them. He stated this could involve high-quality events that people would want to come to. He suggested perhaps focusing on businesses within 100 miles that are involved in hospitality but emphasized that in order to bring such an entity to such a small market as Woodstock, the City would have to underwrite it. Mr. Hartshorne stated he also discussed with staff the possibility of a hybrid hospitality product because Woodstock does not have lodging. He stated he does not think this should be focused on as a lot of Woodstock's events are day events. He again emphasized that large operators will not consider Woodstock because it is a small market.

Chairman Sandquist again thanked Mr. Hartshorne for his time and for the information he provided. Mr. Hartshorne stated he is excited to see what the Commission is doing and noted the Urban Land Institute is always available to help.

COURTHOUSE AND SHERIFF'S HOUSE TENANTS

Nancy Baker provided the Commission members with a summary of the leases currently in place at the Old Courthouse, noting she will provide copies of the leases if desired.

Ms. Baker stated that NAAC is renting most of the first floor through a donation agreement with the City calling for payments of \$600 per month. She also stated that the Talia Pavia String Academy has a donation agreement with the City calling for payments of \$150 per month and that Woodstock Celebrates, Inc. occupies space on the first floor with no rental payments based upon an agreement with the City Council made a few years ago.

In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist as to whether there is an official policy in place concerning rental of the building and whether the City is actively trying to lease more of the space, Ms. Baker stated this was last discussed concerning space in the Sheriff's House at which time Council stated it was not interested in leasing out more of the space until the Commission had looked at the building.

Discussion followed concerning developing and recommending a rental plan to the City Council with D. Stumpf noting it is possible a five-year agreement will constrain what can be done with the building during that time. He opined the City should not get locked into something for very long.

In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist, R. Stelford stated there is a clause in the agreements which provides for termination under certain conditions such as sale of the building. He explained this clause in the Public House lease as an example. J. Prindiville stated this is a significant issue as the project has so many unknowns and variables which should be minimized. He opined that the project is more complicated when there are entities occupying the building and the City should make sure it can exit an agreement. He stated the Commission should ask questions and obtain more information about the buy-out clause in the restaurant lease, including when it expires. He noted this is important when considering uses and potential investors.

In response to a question from J. Campion, Mr. Stelford stated there is some type of exit clause with Woodstock Celebrates.

In response to a question from J. Kurtz-Osborne, Ms. Baker confirmed that space on the second floor cannot be leased for safety reasons.

In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist concerning the Commission's desire to develop and recommend a lease or rental policy for Council's consideration, it was the consensus of the Commission members that they would like to see the Public House lease and have more information concerning this. D. Stumpf stated a year-to-year timeline would be helpful, showing the exit parameters of the various tenants.

Chairman Sandquist stated there are now good, viable entities in the building which have been good for the City but that these tenants should not limit other uses.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Chairman Sandquist reminded the Commission of the Mayor's statement that perhaps the Commission's first step for the project is to engage the public concerning possible uses. He also reminded them of the upcoming Artspace Project as outlined by Terry Willcockson at the last

meeting, noting this will provide public involvement. He advised the Commission that in response to staff's request for a Commission member to serve as the Commission's representative on the Artspace Project, he appointed Commissioner Townsend-Kise. He stated the Commission is asked to save May 18 at 7:00PM at Stage Left Café for the public Artspace presentation. He further noted that art may be one of the appropriate uses for the building and this could be looked at as a focus group.

Nancy Baker drew attention to a document provided in the Commission packet, noting that the Commission should determine what they are looking for from the public. She noted the seven categories identified in the document as being: Future Use, What else is needed/wanted in the Downtown, Ownership, Goals for the Property, Collaboration, Funding Support, and Community concerns/community support. Stating she added a Welcome Center, Corporate Headquarters and Business Image Locate to Item One based upon the comments of Mr. Hartshorne, she asked if members of the Commission had any comments or additions. She also noted the Commission could delete items from the list. Following completion of the list, Ms. Baker stated the Commission could then plan how they will obtain the information from the public.

J. Prindiville stated he would add Business Jobs to Item Two, opining that what is driving people wanting to come to Woodstock is the availability of jobs. He stated businesses want to be around jobs and a user would want to come where there are jobs. In addition, he added Stores and Services. Based upon comments made by Mr. Hartshorne, Chairman Sandquist added Housing to Item Two.

D. Stumpf cautioned when asking for public comment and opinion, those giving the opinions expect to be listened to and to have their suggestions carried out. He noted this is especially true of donors and urged the Commission to be careful not to set expectations but rather note that it is trying to absorb the information but must consider all ideas.

J. Prindiville asked about the Opera House restoration project, stating that group must have a wealth of fundraising information. He asked how the Opera House feels about what is trying to be accomplished with the Old Courthouse. J. Kurtz-Osborne noted that the Opera House restoration project was on a much smaller scale than the Old Courthouse project. D. Stumpf suggested talking with the Opera House people as they may have people coming to them that they could refer to the Commission. Chairman Sandquist agreed this would be a good idea.

T. Doornbosch provided a document entitled PR Basic Strategy for the Advisory Commission. She recommended to start focusing on how the Commission could get public input and that it "needs to increase awareness of its existence and encourage public involvement."

T. Doornbosch noted three objectives including:

1) Build public awareness of the Commission by increasing publicity.

To accomplish this, she recommended a specific button on the City's home page dedicated to the Old Courthouse Advisory Commission, placing specific information in the City Scene concerning the Commission and inviting the public to attend, using social media, and developing a database of other involved/interested groups.

2) Commission members should consider themselves ambassadors for the Old Courthouse complex.

To accomplish this she suggested enlisting family and friends, modifying social media profiles, speaking at events or to groups, networking with other groups and solicit feedback. It was noted that approval from the City should be obtained before speaking at events or to groups.

3) Solicit public input to help formulate a vision plan for the Old Courthouse complex.

To accomplish this, she suggested encouraging public participation at the meetings, placing a dedicated e-mail address for the Commission on the City's website, developing an online survey form for placement on the City's website, and review of social media options. Ms. Doornbosch noted suggested survey questions appear on the back page of her proposal.

D. Stumpf expressed concern about using social media, opining that negative information or comments can be left on a Facebook page. T. Doornbosch stated this could be used strictly for public relations and not discussion.

In response to questioning from the Commission, Garrett Anderson described the City's two Facebook pages, noting when photos of the Old Courthouse appear on the pages, they are very popular. In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist, Mr. Anderson stated it would be better to use an existing page rather than to create a new one because it takes some time for a new page to get going and develop a following. Ms. Stelford also offered to place information concerning the Commission meetings and business on the Friends of the Old Courthouse Facebook page.

In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist as to whether this would be the primary data collection method, T. Doornbosch stated she views this as something that can be done fairly soon. Chairman Sandquist stated there will only be one opportunity to do a survey so the questions should be asked correctly the first time. T. Doornbosch noted the TAP report also had some good questions which could be used.

Chairman Sandquist stated he would like to see the questions phrased positively and would like people to be asked what their dream is for the Old Courthouse rather than what is their biggest concern. D. Stumpf also expressed concern about the questions, asking what if people express the opinion that this is not feasible. T. Doornbosch responded that this would be input from the public. Dr. Stumpf recommended the questions asked should concern what the best uses for the building are rather than concern ownership as this is premature. He opined that the Commission does not have enough information concerning this issue to be asking for input from the public.

D. Stumpf stated that a survey may not be the best way to obtain public input, opining that focus groups are better. He noted with small groups of citizens more in-depth discussions can be held rather than using fixed questions. He stated there is usually a marketing person who is trained in this who conducts the groups so the Commission would not bias the discussion. He also asked how the information would be used.

T. Doornbosch stated there have already been a lot of focus groups and the Commission should try to obtain information from people who have not or would not normally participate. She stated she wished to make it easy for taxpayers to provide information and to keep the process and questions simple. She also stated the survey could be an option for people who are not invited to participate in a focus group.

Chairman Sandquist stated he would like to see a survey but that it needs work to obtain a proper survey design. He stated people should be asked what brings them to the Square and what is needed in Woodstock. He also indicated that many people who come to the Square do not live in Woodstock. Dr. Stumpf stated unless information is known about the respondents, the survey could be skewed.

Following a brief discussion, it was agreed that the Commission should undertake this task rather than the Friends group.

J. Champion stated his feeling that the survey would provide valuable information and that people would not necessarily expect to get what they indicate they want. He suggested speaking before groups such as Rotary and the Chamber of Commerce to talk about the Old Courthouse, noting this would give immediate feedback. Other members expressed support of this idea.

In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist, R. Stelford stated the City does have basic Survey Monkey. He noted this has been used in the past for a smoking survey, stating 470 responses were received. He stated the downside of the basic Survey Monkey is that one person could fill out multiple surveys and where the respondent is from cannot be identified.

Chairman Sandquist recommended moving forward with staff to develop a survey. He asked that questions be included concerning where the respondent lives and how often he or she comes to the Square. He also stated he did not feel the question of ownership should be addressed at this time.

L. Anderson stated he did not feel the Commission was ready to do a survey at this time because it would take very special wording. He noted people can read a lot into the wording of the questions so they must be worded correctly.

In response to a question from L. Anderson concerning publication of information in the newspapers, R. Stelford stated information is supplied to the papers and it is up to them whether it is published. He stated more press releases could be issued concerning the actions of the Commission. He also stated that the meetings are properly noticed as required by the Open Meetings Act.

Chairman Sandquist stated his opinion that the Commission is ready to start working on a survey but is not ready to put it out to the public as yet. He suggested staff and Commission members work on the survey to be reviewed at the next meeting. In response to a request for volunteers, Nancy Baker noted that no more than two members can meet per the Open Meetings Act. It was the consensus of the Commission that Nancy Baker will receive suggestions from T. Doornbosch, T. Townsend-Kise, and J. White and develop a survey outline for presentation at the next meeting.

FUNDING/FINANCING

Referencing the information provided in the packet concerning this item, D. Stumpf emphasized this is a discussion guide and urged members not to over interpret the information. He gave a summary of how he approached gathering this information. He stated he used the figure of \$5 million as the amount needed to restore the building which is a "best guess" based upon the City's prior experience. He noted he did an assessment of the possibility of commercial ownership of the building and found this to be untenable as the projected costs to bring the building up to saleable

level exceeds the expected sales price. He noted a prior assessment by a consultant came to a similar conclusion. He stated this option would create a new taxable entity.

Dr. Stumpf then discussed leasing options, noting this would be break-even at best in years one through ten, with net revenue increasing to approximately \$50,000 after ten years. He stated this scenario would require financing to complete the renovations necessary to bring the building to a rentable condition and that most of the new revenue would come from new sales tax revenues from successful tenants.

Discussion then turned to City Ownership with Dr. Stumpf stating the numbers concerning this scenario are not yet available. He stated this would involve the City selling the current City Hall and using the proceeds to finance a portion, perhaps one-third to one-half, of the cost of the Old Courthouse restoration. He noted the current City Hall is much more suitable for conversion to commercial uses than the Old Courthouse.

Dr. Stumpf then discussed funding the project, stating the more funds that can come from grants and fund raising the better as this would leave less for the City to finance. He stated if one-half of the needed dollars can be fund raised, this would leave one-half, or about \$2.5 million to finance. He then discussed bond financing noting the City is in a position to sell bonds at a favorable rate, 4% over 20 years. The payments for this could be offset by property taxes which would result in a rate increase of \$4.22 per year per \$10,000 of assessed value, which is about a 1.8% increase. He stated the annual cost of bond service would reduce by 30% should the City attain Home Rule status. Dr. Stumpf noted that growth and inflation also would reduce this amount.

Dr. Stumpf noted that other options would be to extend the life of the TIF another 12 years or to transition the building to a non-profit.

In response to a question from Chairman Sandquist, D. Stumpf stated he would like to obtain more accurate numbers for the City-ownership scenario.

J. Prindiville expressed his skepticism concerning the City's ability to sell the current City Hall for the amount required to make the City-ownership scenario work. Dr. Stumpf noted the information provided for this scenario is very rough and needs to be more accurate to be able to study it more in depth.

Discussion followed of the funds that have been invested in City Hall to date, of the operational issues should City Hall move to the Old Courthouse, and of the cost impact. Chairman Sandquist stated the City would have to make sure there are economically-viable uses for City Hall before it is put up for sale.

Dr. Stumpf then detailed his experience with philanthropy noting there are individuals in the County who could make substantial gifts. He stated targets and levels should be developed.

J. Prindiville asked if a strategy should be developed and set in motion in light of the future expiration of the TIF. R. Stelford stated that Council has already asked staff to look at this but noted the biggest obstacle is obtaining support from District 200 which has the most dollars at stake. In response to a question from T. Doornbosch, Mr. Stelford explained how a TIF works and why another taxing body might object. Mr. Stelford also noted that a developer has expressed

interest in Woodstock Station but would require TIF incentives. He stated more research must be done to see if this is viable.

Chairman Sandquist thanked Commissioner Stumpf for his work on this subject and asked that he continue developing the numbers. He noted the information was consistent with that provided by Mr. Hartshorne.

STAFF UPDATE

Nancy Baker noted that the City Council approved a Professional Services Agreement with Gary Anderson Architects for plans and specs for the Old Courthouse windows.

She stated the Friends of the Old Courthouse group is focusing on a window restoration fundraising project to offset part of the cost of the windows.

She then provided information on the costs of the Old Courthouse Roof Project.

FUTURE AGENDA

Chairman Sandquist noted the following items for next month's agenda:

- 1) Public House lease information
- 2) Draft of Survey
- 3) Continuation of funding analysis

There were no other suggestions for future agenda items.

ADJOURN

Motion by J. Kurtz-Osborne, second by J. Prindiville, to adjourn this meeting of The Old Courthouse and Sheriff's House Advisory Commission to the next meeting scheduled for Monday, April, 18, 2016, at 7:00PM in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Ayes: L. Anderson, J. Campion, T. Doornbosch, J. Kurtz-Osborne, J. Prindiville, D. Stumpf, and Chairman D. Sandquist. Nays: none. Abstentions: none. Absentees: T. Townsend-Kise and J. White. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:26PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Smiley
City Clerk