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CITY OF CHICAGO

## RAM EMANUEL

 mayorSeptember 10, 2014

## TO THE HONORABLE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

Ladies and Gentlemen:
At the request of the Commissioner of Planning and Development, I transmit herewith ordinances establishing the Washington Park TIF District.

Your favorable consideration of these ordinances will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,


Mayor

# AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS APPROVING A REDEVELOPMENT PLAN <br> FOR THE <br> WASHINGTON PARK REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA 

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the best interest of the citizens of the City of Chicago, Illinois (the "City") for the City to implement tax increment allocation financing ("Tax Increment Allocation Financing") pursuant to the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et. seq., as amended (the "Act"), for a proposed redevelopment project area to be known as the Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area (the "Area") described in Section 2 of this ordinance, to be redeveloped pursuant to a proposed redevelopment plan and project attached hereto as Exhibit A (the "Plan"); and

WHEREAS, by authority of the Mayor and the City Council of the City (the "City Council," referred to herein collectively with the Mayor as the "Corporate Authorities") and pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-5(a) of the Act, the City's Department of Planning and Development established an interested parties registry and, on February 27, 2009, published in a newspaper of general circulation within the City a notice that interested persons may register in order to receive information on the proposed designation of the Area or the approval of the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Plan (including the related eligibility report attached thereto as an exhibit and, if applicable, the feasibility study and the housing impact study) was made available for public inspection and review pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-5(a) of the Act since May 30, 2014, being a date not less than 10 days before the meeting of the Community Development Commission of the City ("Commission"), at which the Commission adopted Resolution $14-C D C-20$ on June 10, 2014, fixing the time and place for a public hearing ("Hearing"), at the offices of the City Clerk and the City's Department of Planning and Development; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-5(a) of the Act, notice of the availability of the Plan (including the related eligibility report attached thereto as an exhibit and, if applicable, the feasibility study and the housing impact study) was sent by mail on July 17, 2014, which is within a reasonable time after the adoption by the Commission of Resolution 14-CDC-20 to: (a) all residential addresses that, after a good faith effort, were determined to be (i) located within the Area and (ii) located within 750 feet of the boundaries of the Area (or, if applicable, were determined to be the 750 residential addresses that were closest to the boundaries of the Area); and (b) organizations and residents that were registered interested parties for such Area; and

WHEREAS, due notice of the Hearing was given pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-6 of the Act, said notice being given to all taxing districts having property within the Area and to the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity of the State of Illinois by certified mail on June 17, 2014, by publication in the Chicago Sun-Times or Chicago Tribune on July 15, 2014, and July 22, 2014, and by certified mail to taxpayers within the Area on July 18, 2014; and

WHEREAS, a meeting of the joint review board established pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-5(b) of the Act (the "Board") was held on July 11, 2014, upon the provision of due notice on June 17, 2014, to review the matters properly coming before the Board and to allow it to
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provide its advisory recommendation regarding the approval of the Plan, designation of the Area as a redevelopment project area pursuant to the Act and adoption of Tax Increment Allocation Financing within the Area, and other matters, if any, properly before it; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 5/11-74.4-4 and 5/11-74.4-5 of the Act, the Commission held the Hearing concerning approval of the Plan, designation of the Area as a redevelopment project area pursuant to the Act and adoption of Tax Increment Allocation Financing within the Area pursuant to the Act on August 12, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has forwarded to the City Council a copy of its Resolution $14-C D C-32$, attached hereto as Exhibit B, adopted on August 12, 2014, recommending to the City Council approval of the Plan, among other related matters; and

WHEREAS, the Corporate Authorities have reviewed the Plan (including the related eligibility report attached thereto as an exhibit and, if applicable, the feasibility study and the housing impact study), testimony from the Public Meeting and the Hearing, if any, the recommendation of the Board, if any, the recommendation of the Commission and such other matters or studies as the Corporate Authorities have deemed necessary or appropriate to make the findings set forth herein, and are generally informed of the conditions existing in the Area; 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. The Area. The Area is legally described in Exhibit C attached hereto and incorporated herein. The street location (as near as practicable) for the Area is described in Exhibit D attached hereto and incorporated herein. The map of the Area is depicted on Exhibit E attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 3. Findings. The Corporate Authorities hereby make the following findings as required pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-3(n) of the Act:
a. The Area on the whole has not been subject to growth and development through investment by private enterprise and would not reasonably be expected to be developed without the adoption of the Plan;
b. The Plan:
(i) conforms to the comprehensive plan for the development of the City as a whole; or
(ii) either (A) conforms to the strategic economic development or redevelopment plan issued by the Chicago Plan Commission, or (B) includes land uses that have been approved by the Chicago Plan Commission;
c. The Plan meets all of the requirements of a redevelopment plan as defined in the Act and, as set forth in the Plan, the estimated date of completion of the projects described
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therein and retirement of all obligations issued to finance redevelopment project costs is not later than December 31 of the year in which the payment to the municipal treasurer as provided in subsection (b) of Section 11-74.4-8 of the Act is to be made with respect to ad valorem taxes levied in the twenty-third calendar year after the year in which the ordinance approving the redevelopment project area is adopted, and, as required pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-7 of the Act, no such obligation shall have a maturity date greater than 20 years;
d. The Plan will not result in displacement of residents from inhabited units; and
e. Within the Plan:
(i) as provided in Section 5/11-74.4-3(n)(5) of the Act, the housing impact study:
(a) includes data on residential unit type, room type, unit occupancy, and racial and ethnic composition of the residents; and (b) identifies the number and location of inhabited residential units in the Area that are to be or may be removed, if any, the City's plans for relocation assistance for those residents in the Area whose residences are to be removed, the availability of replacement housing for such residents and the type, location, and cost of the replacement housing, and the type and extent of relocation assistance to be provided;
(ii) as provided in Section 5/11-74.4-3(n)(7) of the Act, there is a statement that households of low-income and very low-income persons living in residential units that are to be removed from the Area shall be provided affordable housing and relocation assistance not less than that which would be provided under the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and the regulations under that Act, including the eligibility criteria.

Section 4. Approval of the Plan. The City hereby approves the Plan pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-4 of the Act.

Section 5. Powers of Eminent Domain. In compliance with Section 5/11-74.4-4(c) of the Act and with the Plan, the Corporation Counsel is authorized to negotiate for the acquisition by the City of parcels contained within the Area. In the event the Corporation Counsel is unable to acquire any of said parcels through negotiation, the Corporation Counsel is authorized to institute eminent domain proceedings to acquire such parcels. Nothing herein shall be in derogation of any proper authority.

Section 6. Invalidity 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 7. Superseder. All ordinances, resolutions, motions or orders in conflict with this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Section 8. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage
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## SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

This document presents a Tax Increment Financing ("TIF") Redevelopment Plan and Project (hereinafter referred to as the "Plan") pursuant to the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq.) as amended, (the "Act") for the Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area (the "Project Area") located in the City of Chicago, lllinois (the "City"). The Project Area can be separated into three sections: 1. Washington Park (the "Park") is bounded by $51^{\text {st }}$ and $60^{\text {th }}$ Streets on the north and south, and Cottage Grove Avenue and Martin Luther King Drive on the east and west; 2. the neighborhood section which is generally bounded by Martin Luther King Drive and Washington Park on the east, the Dan Ryan Expressway on the west, Garfield Boulevard on the north and $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street on the south; and 3. the industrial area south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street to the Chicago Skyway, west of Prairie Avenue. The neighborhood section is roughly one (1) mile north to south and 0.8 miles east to west, centered on $59^{\text {th }}$ Street and Michigan Avenue. The Park is roughly 1.2 miles north to south and 0.5 miles east to west, centered just north of the intersection of Morgan Drive and Rainey Drive. The industrial section is roughly two-thirds of a mile north to south and a third of a mile east to west, with a significant section of this area used as railway siding.

The Project Area consists of 988.4 acres in 2,272 parcels. There are 2,785 unique parcel identification numbers (PINS) represented in the 2,272 total parcels. The Project Area includes 241.8 acres for public rights-of-way for streets, alleyways, rail lines, and highways, leaving approximately 746.6 acres of usable land (either presently developed or vacant). The boundaries of the Project Area are described in the Plan Appendix, Attachment One - Legal Description and are geographically shown in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit A - Boundary Map of TIF Area.

The Plan summarizes the analyses and findings of Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises, Inc. and subconsultants, PGAV PLANNERS and the Goodman Williams Group (jointly hereinafter referred to as the "Consultant") and, unless otherwise noted, is the responsibility of the Consultant. The City is entitled to rely on the findings and conclusions of this Plan in designating the Project Area as a redevelopment project area under the Act. The Consultant has prepared this Plan and the related eligibility study with the understanding that the City would rely: 1 ) on the findings and conclusions of the Plan and the related eligibility study in proceeding with the designation of the Project Area and the adoption and implementation of the Plan, and 2) on the fact that the Consultant has obtained the necessary information so that the Plan and the related eligibility study will comply with the Act.

The Plan presents certain factors, research and analysis undertaken to document the eligibility of the Project Area for designation as a "conservation area" for the improved portion of the Project Area and a "blighted area" for the vacant portion of the Project Area. The need for public intervention, along with goals and objectives, land use policies, and other policy materials are presented in the Plan. The results of a study documenting the eligibility of the Project Area as a conservation area for the improved portion of the Project Area and a blighted area for the vacant portion of the Project Area are presented in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Three Eligibility Study.

## Tax Increment Financing

The Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (the "Act") permits municipalities to induce redevelopment of eligible "blighted," "conservation" or "industrial park conservation areas" in accordance with an adopted redevelopment plan. The Act stipulates specific procedures that must be adhered to in designating a redevelopment project area. One of those procedures is the determination that the area meets the statutory eligibility requirements. Under 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(p), the Act defines a "redevelopment project area" as:
"... an area designated by the municipality, which is not less in the aggregate than $1-1 / 2$ acres and in respect to which the municipality has made a finding that there exist conditions which cause the area to be classified as an industrial park conservation area or a blighted area or a conservation area or combination of both blighted areas and conservation areas."

In adopting the Act, the Illinois State Legislature found that:

1. ...there exists in many municipalities within this State blighted, conservation and industrial park conservation areas...(at 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-2(a)); and
2. ...the eradication of blighted areas and treatment and improvement of conservation areas by redevelopment projects is hereby declared to be essential to the public interest (at 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-2(b)).

The legislative findings were made on the basis that the presence of blight, or conditions that lead to blight, is detrimental to the safety, health, welfare and morals of the public. The Act specifies certain requirements that must be met before a municipality may proceed with implementing a redevelopment project in order to ensure that the exercise of these powers is proper and in the public interest.
The municipality must first determine that the proposed redevelopment area qualifies for designation as a "blighted area," "conservation area," "industrial park conservation area" or a combination "blighted and conservation areas." Based on the conditions present, the Eligibility Study concludes that the improved portion of the Project Area qualifies for designation as a conservation area and the vacant portion of the Project Area qualifies for designation as a blighted area under the Act.

Redevelopment projects are defined as any public or private development projects undertaken in furtherance of the objectives of the redevelopment plan and in accordance with the Act. The Act provides a means for municipalities, after the approval of a redevelopment plan and project, to redevelop blighted, conservation or industrial park conservation areas and to finance eligible "redevelopment project costs" with incremental property tax revenues. "Incremental Property Tax" or "Incremental Property Taxes" are derived from the increase in the current equalized assessed value (EAV) of real property within the redevelopment project area over and above the "Certified Initial EAV" of such real property. Any increase in EAV is then multiplied by the current tax rate to arrive at the Incremental Property Taxes. A decline in current EAV does not result in a negative Incremental Property Tax.

To finance redevelopment project costs, a municipality may issue obligations secured by Incremental Property Taxes to be generated within the redevelopment project area. In addition,
a municipality may pledge towards payment of such obligations any part or any combination of the following:
(a) net revenues of all or part of any redevelopment project;
(b) taxes levied and collected on any or all property in the municipality;
(c) the full faith and credit of the municipality;
(d) a mortgage on part or all of the redevelopment project; or
(e) any other taxes or anticipated receipts that the municipality may lawfully pledge.

Tax Increment Financing does not generate tax revenues. This financing mechanism allows the municipality to capture, for a certain number of years, the new tax revenues produced by the enhanced valuation of properties resulting from the municipality's redevelopment program, improvements and activities, various redevelopment projects, and the reassessment of properties. This revenue is then reinvested in the area through rehabilitation, developer subsidies, public improvements and other eligible redevelopment activities. All taxing districts continue to receive property taxes levied on the initial valuation of properties within the redevelopment project area. Additionally, taxing districts can receive distributions of excess Incremental Property Taxes when annual Incremental Property Taxes received exceed principal and interest obligations for that year and redevelopment project costs necessary to implement the redevelopment plan have been paid and such excess Incremental Property Taxes are not otherwise required, pledged or otherwise designated for other redevelopment projects. Taxing districts also benefit from the increased property tax base after redevelopment project costs and obligations are paid.

The City authorized an evaluation to determine whether a portion of the City, to be known as the Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area, qualifies for designation as a combination conservation area/blighted area pursuant to the provisions contained in the Act. If the Project Area is so qualified, the City requested the preparation of a redevelopment plan for the Project Area in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

## Overview of the Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area

The Project Area is approximately 988.4 acres, including 241.8 acres for public rights-of-way for streets and alleyways and a portion of the Dan Ryan Expressway. Excluding public rights-ofway the Project Area consists of 746.6 acres situated in 2,272 parcels. There are 2,785 unique parcel identification numbers (PINS) represented in the 2,272 total parcels. The Project Area is the shape of a square, and includes a 351 -acre recreational park, residential uses to the east, north and portions west of the expressway in addition to small commercial nodes and industrial uses in the south, north and west borders. The Project Area is located approximately seven (7) miles south of Chicago's downtown in the Washington Park community area. The Project Area includes eight (8) 2010 U.S. Census Tracts: 4003, 4004, 4005, 4008, 8345, 8346, 8361, and 8425; of which, only tract 4004 has shown population growth from 2000 to 2010.

The vast majority ( $92 \%$ ) of the buildings within the Project Area are well over 35 years of age. Many of the commercial properties are in need of minor repairs in order to improve their appearance, property values, and to remain viable. The majority of the Project Area was developed prior to the existence of a comprehensive plan and prior to present day development standards. This is most apparent in the excessive land coverage and lack of provisions for offstreet parking found throughout the Project Area. The Plan seeks to respond to problem conditions within the Project Area and reflects a commitment by the City to improve and revitalize the area.

In addition to over $50 \%$ of the buildings within the Project Area being 35 years or older, the improved tax blocks within the Project Area are characterized by the following statutory qualifying factors for a "conservation area" under Section 5/11-74.4-3(b) of the Act:

1. Deterioration
2. Inadequate utilities
3. Deleterious land use or layout
4. Lack of community planning
5. Declining or sub-par EAV growth

The vacant parcels within the Project Area are characterized by the following statutory qualifying factors for a "blighted area" under Section 5/11-74.4-3(b) of the Act:

1. Diversity of ownership
2. Deterioration of structures or site improvements in neighboring areas
3. Declining or sub-par EAV growth

In terms of net land area (total land area less public right-of-way and parcels used as street or rail right-of-way), approximately $16 \%$ of the Project Area is vacant land. If Washington Park and Dyett High School are excluded from the tabulation, vacant land accounts for about $31 \%$ of the net land area, or 952 individual parcels; $42 \%$ of the total parcels. Almost a third of the land in the Project Area, not including Washington Park/Dyett High School, is vacant land and is evidence of the extent of disinvestment. A case could also be made for excluding the industrial area south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street from these vacant land calculations, which would only increase the percentage of vacant land in the Project Area. As a result of these conditions, the Project Area
is in need of redevelopment. In recognition of the unrealized potential of the Project Area, the City is taking action to facilitate its revitalization.

The Project Area, as a whole, has not been subject to growth and development by private enterprise and would not reasonably be anticipated to be developed without the adoption of the Plan. The Eligibility Study, in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Three - Eligibility Study, concludes that the property in this area is experiencing deterioration and a lack of sufficient investment. The analysis of conditions within the Project Area indicates the improved portion of the Project Area qualifies as a conservation area, and the vacant portion of the Project Area qualifies as a blighted area.

The purpose of the Plan is to create a mechanism to allow for the development of new commercial, mixed-use and community facilities on existing parcels and/or the improvement of existing commercial, mixed use, and residential properties; and the general improvement of the area's physical environment and infrastructure. The development of the Project Area is expected to encourage economic revitalization within the community and the surrounding area.

The Plan has been formulated in accordance with the provisions of the Act. This document is a guide to all proposed public and private actions in the Project Area that are assisted with tax increment financing.

## SECTION 2. PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

## Brief History of the Community

The Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area sits within the greater Washington Park Community Area. Washington Park is located approximately seven (7) miles south of the Chicago Loop. The Project Area includes eight (8) 2010 U.S. Census Tracts: 4003, 4004, 4005, 4008, 8345, 8346, 8361, and 8425; of which, only tract 4004 has shown population growth from 2000 to 2010. The 351-acre recreational Washington Park along with the Walter H. Dyett High School site separates the Project Area from the more affluent eastern neighborhood of Hyde Park.

Settled by the Irish and German railroad and meat packing workers in the 1860s and 1870s, Washington Park was a growing community for much of the late $19^{\text {th }}$ and early $20^{\text {th }}$ centuries. By the 1890s German Jews began moving into east Washington Park and a small number of African Americans settled into the working class districts south of Garfield ( $55^{\text {th }}$ ) and west of State Street. Wealthy American born whites settled on the wide avenues that ran north towards the Loop. In 1893, confirmation that the Columbian Exposition would be held in Jackson Park also brought another influx to the community's population.

The development of the recreational park began in 1869 and was known as South Park until 1881. The park was later renamed Washington Park. After years of lobbying by prominent south side residents, the Illinois State Legislature authorized the creation of a five-member, governor appointed South Park Commission. Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux centered the park on a 100-acre greensward with surrounding walking trails, trees and shrubs. Olmsted and Vaux planned for a bandstand and refectory, a promenade, carriage roads and gathering places in the park. The park would be part of the boulevard system that linked the park north to the central business district. In addition, the architects' plans called for dredging and filling in wetlands in the park and the opening up of a canal between the park and Lake Michigan.

Transportation was the catalyst for much of the growth experienced by the south side neighborhoods; particularly in the Washington Park community during the late $19^{\text {th }}$ and early $20^{\text {th }}$ centuries. By 1887 cable cars reached as far south as $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street on State Street and $67^{\text {th }}$ Street on Cottage Grove Avenue. The "L" train system reached farther south than the Washington Park community by 1907. Cable cars, trains, and the wide boulevards provided easy access to Chicago's Loop for south side residents. Today, public transportation and highway access are still widely available to residents and visitors of Washington Park.

The site for the Race Riots of 1919, the Washington Park community was the home of many clashes between blacks and whites. The cultural institutions and churches have closely reflected the community's racial transition from one of the most racially diverse Chicago communities to a predominantly African American population. Greek Orthodox residents built SS. Constantine and Helen in 1909 and in 1948 the building was inhabited by an entirely African American Episcopal congregation. Many other churches in the Washington Park community such as St. Anselm Church in the 1930s, B'nai Shalom Temple Israel in 1925, were built in the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century and sold to entirely African American congregations by the mid-1900s.St.

Mary's African Methodist Episcopal Church is the oldest black congregation in the Project Area and was established in 1897.

The early 1960s saw the construction of two of the Chicago Housing Authority's ("CHA") larger projects; Washington Park Homes and the Robert Taylor Homes. With the construction of these two projects, Washington Park had one of the highest concentrations of public housing in the United States. The Robert Taylor Homes consisted of 28 16-story high rises. When built, the homes planned for 11,000 residents, but at its peak housed up to 27,000 residents at once. The Robert Taylor Homes marked a failure for the CHA as socioeconomic problems perpetuated throughout the 1980s and 1990s and the City neglected property and building maintenance or building code updates. In 1996, HOPE VI federal funds were granted for offsite replacement housing for Robert Taylor Home residents. All apartments were planned to be vacated by 2005 and the last of the Robert Taylor buildings was demolished on March 8, 2007.

## Current Land Use and Community Facilities

The eastern side of the Project Area is made up of Washington Park in addition to higher density residential uses. On the eastern boundary of the Project Area is Hyde Park, an affluent south side neighborhood that is home to the University of Chicago. Students and faculty have resided in Hyde Park for decades. As the demand for housing grows due to the growing number of university students, visitors and university faculty, they may choose to move to surrounding neighborhoods such as Washington Park. At the west end of the Project Area is the Englewood Community Area, which, until recently, was best known for the Englewood Mall. The Mall has recently been replaced by the Kennedy King College and the neighborhood has experienced a surge in housing demand and property values.

At intersections within and surrounding the Project Area, there are small commercial nodes. There are also some isolated industrial uses interspersed within the residential/commercial areas. Industrial corridors are located on the western border near Interstate Highway 90/94 (Dan Ryan Expressway) and also near the southwest boundary. Residential neighborhoods are also located on the western side of the Dan Ryan and to the north of the Project Area.

The Project Area includes a Chicago Fire Department station, located at the intersection of $59^{\text {th }}$ Street and South Lafayette Avenue. While the Project Area offers some community facilities, there are no Chicago Police Department stations, public libraries or hospitals located within the boundaries of the Project Area.

Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit C - Existing Land Use Map shows a lack of community parks within the boundaries of the Project Area. In 1959 the Chicago Park District took one (1) parcel of property and created the Loraine Hansberry Park which provides limited open space to the residents within the Project Area. During the 1990's, the Chicago Park District replaced the existing basketball court (at Loraine Hansberry Park) with a children's playground. The children in the neighborhoods have little access to local neighborhood parks. While there are three (3) pre-kindergarten thru eighth grade schools within the Project Area, only one provides a school playground for children. Two (2) of the schools are community schools, while the third is a charter school. There is a prominent need for more neighborhood park space within the Project Area.

Additionally, over the course of the last few decades, residential buildings have been demolished as the buildings deteriorated and were vacated. These parcels were "blighted before vacant". The City has developed the Red X Program to identify properties with structural or interior hazards with a red " X " sign. These hazards can include, but are not limited to, building deterioration or damage from previous fires, structural hazards when components of the building have been removed, and collapse hazards due to the integrity of chimney tops, parapet walls, roof systems and or stair systems being compromised. The red " X " serves as an indicator to first responders to the existence of the hazards. Further, the presence of the red " X " makes it unlawful for any person to enter the building without first notifying the fire commissioner. The vacant land that remains speaks to the poor building conditions before the demolition, the challenges of the Area, and also presents a resource and opportunity for in-fill development and revitalization.

## Landmark and Historic Buildings

The Washington Park Community Area is home to several architecturally or historically significant buildings. Washington Park, itself, was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 2004 as United States Registered Historic District and includes all contributing buildings and structures located within the park. The City's Park Boulevard System, including Garfield Boulevard, is in the process of being nominated for the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1995, the Commission on Chicago Landmarks completed an inventory of architecturally and historically significant structures. This inventory, called the Chicago Historic Resources Survey ("CHRS"), was a decade-long research effort to analyze the historic and architectural importance of all buildings constructed in the City prior to 1940. The CHRS database identifies each property's date of construction, architect, building style and type, Chicago Landmark status, inclusion in the lllinois Historic Structures Survey, and property identification numbers (PIN). A color-coded ranking system was used to identify historic and architectural significance relative to age, degree of external physical integrity, and level of possible significance.

According to the City of Chicago Landmarks Division, the following buildings in the Project Area are listed as category "Orange" on the CHRS. Orange properties possess some architectural feature or historical association that made them potentially significant in the context of the surrounding community. While there are other historic properties nearby the Project Area, the following list of 36 properties is representative of the "Orange"-coded CHRS properties in, or immediately adjacent to, the proposed TIF boundary.

| 1. | $40 \mathrm{E} .55^{\text {th }}$ St./Garfield Blvd. (Schulze Baking Co.) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | $301 \mathrm{E} .55^{\text {th }}$ St./Garfield Blvd. (office) |
| 3. | $119-125 \mathrm{~W} .55^{\text {th }}$ St./Garfield Blvd. (religious building/church) |
| 4. | $320 \mathrm{E} .55^{\text {th }}$ St./Garfield Blvd. (Garfield elevated train station) |
| 5. | $341-343 \mathrm{E} .55^{\text {th }}$ St./Garfield Blvd. (Rum-Boogie Club) |
| 6. | $5206-5310 \mathrm{~S}$. Cottage Grove (General Richard L. Jones Armory) |
| 7. | 5644 S. Cottage Grove (DuSable Museum of African American History) |
| 8. | $5700-5740 \mathrm{~S}$. Cottage Grove (railroad stable and roundhouse) |
| 9. | $5114-5128$ S. King Dr. (Chicago Orphan Asylum) |
| 10. | 5228 S. King Dr. (residence) |
| 11. | 5644 S. King Dr. (multi-unit residential building) |
| 12. | 5922 S. King Dr. (Jesse Binga House) |

```
13. 6116-6134 S. King Dr. (South Park Terrace Apartment Building)
14. 6160-6212 S. King Dr. (Washington Park Terrace Apartment Building)
15. 5613-5659 S. La Salle St. (industrial building)
16. 5621-5623 S. Lafayette Ave. (multi-unit residential building)
17. 5740 S. Lafayette Ave. (single family residence)
18. 5760 S. Lafayette Ave. (John Raber House)
19. 5510-5514 S. Michigan Ave. (Mulvey Apartment Building)
20. 5516 S. Michigan Ave. (multi-unit residential building)
21. 5600-5602 S. Michigan Ave. (multi-unit residential building)
22. 6055-6059 S. Michigan Ave. (St. Anselm Church)
23. 6101-6115 S. Michigan Ave. (religious building/church)
24. 6144 S. Michigan Ave. (single family residence)
25. 5611 S. Perry Ave. (single family residence)
26. 6002 S. Prairie Ave. (Ring Lardner Residence)
27. 6137-6201 S. Prairie Ave. (utility building)
28. 5520 S. State St. (commercial/Residential)
29. 5955-5961 S. State St. (multi-unit residential and commercial building)
30. 5502-5512 S. Wabash Ave. (multi-unit residential building)
31. 5646 S. Wabash Ave. (multi-unit residential building)
32. 5648 S. Wabash Ave. (multi-unit residential building)
33. 5656-5658 S. Wabash Ave. (multi-unit residential building)
34. 5916 S. Wabash Ave. (single family residence)
35. 5527 S. Wentworth Ave. (commercial/residential building)
36. 6067-6077 S. Wentworth Ave. (warehouse)
```

While there are many "Orange" buildings listed on the CHRS, with the exception of Washington Park, there are no buildings in the Project Area registered on the National Register of Historic Buildings. The historic Raber House, located at 5760 S. Lafayette Avenue, was designated as an official Chicago Landmark in 1996.

## Transportation Characteristics

## Street System

Regional - The Project Area offers exceptional access to transportation routes both within the boundaries and entrance/exit routes to and from the Project Area as well as to and from other parts of the City of Chicago and the region. The western edge of the Project Area is bordered by Interstate Highway 90/94 (Dan Ryan Expressway) with entrance/exit ramps at $55^{\text {th }}$ Street, $57^{\text {th }}$ Street, $59^{\text {th }}$ Street, and $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street. Access to the expressway is also available traveling northbound on Wentworth Avenue and southbound on Wells Street. State Street provides entrance/exit ramps to the Chicago Skyway.

Local - For residents and visitors who choose to drive into, out of, and around the Project Area, there are many major thoroughfares linking the Project Area to other parts of the City. Within the Project Area, the major thoroughfares include north-south routes: Martin Luther King Drive ("King Drive"), Michigan Avenue, Indiana Avenue, Cottage Grove Avenue and State Street; and east-west routes: Garfield Boulevard and $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street. Due to the location of the Dan Ryan Expressway at the western boundary of the Project Area, east and west access across the expressway is limited to Garfield Boulevard, $57^{\text {th }}, 59^{\text {th }}$, and $63^{\text {rd }}$ Streets.

## Public Transportation

The Chicago Transit Authority ("CTA") has many terminals located within the Project Area. CTA's Red and Green lines travel north/south to connect the Project Area to Chicago's Loop located seven (7) miles north, and farther south to Chicago's southern neighborhoods. Within the boundaries, the CTA Red Line stops at Garfield Boulevard and $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street, along the Dan Ryan Expressway. The CTA Green Line provides two stops along King Drive; at Garfield Boulevard and at $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street. Within a few blocks of the Project Area boundaries, the CTA Red Line stops at $47^{\text {th }}$ Street, $51^{\text {st }}$ Street, and at the intersection of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street and Cottage Grove Avenue.

CTA buses also service the interior with many stops in close proximity to the Project Area. There are eight (8) bus lines with stops within the Project Area with three (3) additional express buses and three (3) bus lines with stops adjacent to the Project Area that service residents and visitors within the Project Area's boundaries. CTA bus routes within the boundaries of the Project Area are listed below:

Bus \# Route<br>3/X3 North-south route along King Drive<br>4/X4 North-south route along Cottage Grove Avenue<br>15 East-west along $51^{\text {st }}$ Street<br>24 Northbound route on Wentworth Avenue and south on Yale Avenue<br>29 North-south route on State Street<br>55/X55 East-west route along Garfield Boulevard<br>59 East-west route along $60^{\text {th }}$ and $61^{\text {st }}$ Streets<br>63 East-west route along $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street

The following CTA buses stop in close proximity to the Project Area: \#2, \#15, \#51, and \#170. The CTA buses, in conjunction with CTA's Red and Green Lines, provide excellent public transportation options for residents and visitors within the Project Area.

## Pedestrian Transportation

Pedestrian traffic in and throughout the Project Area is concentrated along the major arterial streets, with Garfield Boulevard, $51^{\text {st }}$ Street, King Drive and Cottage Grove Avenue having the largest concentrations. The higher concentration of pedestrian traffic in these areas is associated with commuters utilizing the CTA bus and rail lines along this route and access to the recreational opportunities found in Washington Park. Concentration of pedestrian traffic is also associated with schools located within the Project Area. Most pedestrian traffic around schools is present during the peak periods before and after school hours.

There are sidewalks on most of the streets within the Project Area that connect pedestrians from north to south and east to west. The major thoroughfares provide crosswalks at intersections for pedestrian safety. Many of the sidewalks in the Project Area are cracked and uneven; neglect of sidewalk maintenance may make it difficult for children, elderly and/or handicapped individuals to use sidewalks as a form of transportation.

## SECTION 3. ELIGIBILITY OF THE PROJECT AREA FORDESIGNATION AS A CONSERVATION/BLIGHTED AREA

The Project Area, on the whole, has not been subject to significant growth and development through investment by private enterprise. Based on the conditions present, the Project Area is not likely to be comprehensively or effectively developed without the adoption of the Plan. A series of studies were undertaken to establish whether the land in the Project Area is eligible for designation in accordance with the requirements of the Act. This analysis, documented in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Three - Eligibility Study concluded that the Project Area so qualifies.

The improved parcels within the Project Area are characterized by the following statutory qualifying factors for a "conservation area" under Section 5/11-74.4-3(b) of the Act:

- the predominance of buildings that are 35 years of age or older ( $92 \%$ of buildings) ${ }^{1}$;
- deteriorated buildings ( $63 \%$ of buildings);
- deteriorated site improvements ( $29 \%$ of parcels);
- deteriorated street and/or sidewalk pavement ( $86 \%$ of sub-areas);
- dilapidated buildings ( $4 \%$ of buildings);
- obsolete buildings ( $10 \%$ of buildings);
- primary buildings with excessive vacancies (20\%);
- excessive land coverage ( $30 \%$ of improved parcels);
- inadequate utilities ( $76 \%$ of sub-areas);
- deleterious land use or layout ( $48 \%$ of sub-areas);
- lack of community planning ( $62 \%$ of sub-areas); and,
- demonstrates declining and sub-par EAV growth.


## See Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit B - Sub Area Key.

The vacant parcels within the Project Area, which constitutes approximately 120.6 acres ( $31 \%$ of net land area, not including The Park), represented on 952 parcels and by 21 sub-areas for this Plan. The vacant portion of the Project Area is characterized by the following statutory qualifying factors for a "blighted area" under Section 5/11-74.4-3(b) of the Act:

- obsolete platting ( $37 \%$ of parcels);
- diversity of ownership (43\% of sub-areas);
- tax delinquencies ( $21 \%$ of vacant parcels; $50 \%$ of taxable vacant parcels);
- deterioration of structures or site improvements in neighboring areas (94\% of vacant parcels); and,
- demonstrates declining or sub-par EAV growth.

For more detail on the basis for eligibility and definitions of these terms, refer to the Eligibility Study in Plan Appendix, Attachment Three - Eligibility Study.

Historic Equalized Assessed Values (EAV's) for the Project Area, the rate of EAV growth for the City and the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the Chicago-GaryKenosha MSA for the period between 2008 and 2013 are considered to identify development

[^0]activity and determine assessed value trends. As discussed in Section II-B of Attachment Three - Eligibility Study, analysis of historic EAV for the Project Area indicated that the Project Area's EAV has declined in 2010, 2011, and 2012 and has also experienced growth at a rate less than that of the balance of the City and less than the annual Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers in the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha MSA in those same years. Between 2008 and 2013, the EAV of the Project Area decreased from $\$ 119.5$ million to $\$ 76.5$ million (see Table 2-3 in Plan Appendix, Attachment Three - Eligibility Study). The table demonstrates that:

1. In at least 3 of the past 5 years, the EAV growth of the proposed Project Area has declined;
2. In at least 3 of the past 5 years, the EAV growth of the proposed Project Area has been less than the EAV growth of the remainder of the City; and,
3. In at least 3 of the past 5 years, the EAV growth of the proposed Project Area has been less than the CPI-U of the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha MSA.

While any one of the above conditions regarding property valuation is sufficient under the TIF Act to demonstrate evidence of a declining EAV, all 3 conditions are present in the proposed Project Area. A continuation of this minimal level of private investment may exacerbate deterioration and other conservation conditions within the Project Area. There is little incentive for commercial and residential developers to initiate new projects or make major investments in the Project Area, without public financial assistance that may include the use of tax increment financing.

Despite small incremental improvements scattered throughout the Project Area, there exist conditions that continue to threaten the public safety, health and welfare of the Project Area. While not an eligibility factor under the Act, crime statistics also provide evidence that these threatening conditions are present in the Project Area. Recent crime statistics (Chicago Tribune -2014, May 19. Retrieved from http://crime.chicagotribune.com/chicago/community/ for the month of April 2014, obtained from the City of Chicago Data Portal) indicate the Washington Park Community Area currently ranks $7^{\text {th }}$ among Chicago's 77 community areas in violent crime reports; $2^{\text {nd }}$ for property crime reports; and $10^{\text {th }}$ for quality of life crime reports. Other crime data sources may differ, but all indicated that the Washington Park Community Area has a high rate of crime. Furthermore, the presence of factors indicated by the Act include deteriorated, obsolete structures; building vacancies; inadequate utilities; land use incompatibilities; deteriorated streets and sidewalks; declining or sub-par EAV growth; and the predominance of underutilized, vacant and tax exempt or tax delinquent properties in the Project Area and may result in continued disinvestment that will not be overcome without action by the City. These conditions have been previously documented in this report. All properties within the Project Area will benefit from the TIF program.

## SECTION 4. REDEVELOPMENT PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following goals and objectives are provided to guide the decisions and activities that will facilitate the revitalization of the Project Area: They generally reflect existing City policies in all or portions of the Project Area. These goals and objectives can be achieved through effective use of local, state and federal tools. They are meant to guide the review and development of future projects in the Project Area.

## General Goals

- Reduce or eliminate the conditions that qualify the Project Area as a Conservation/Blighted area.
- Strengthen the economic well-being of the Project Area and the City by enhancing properties and the local tax base to their fullest potential.
- Create new jobs and retain existing jobs for residents in the Project Area.
- Improve the quality of life for the residents by creating viable commercial area.
- Create an environment within the Project Area that will contribute to the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents of the Project Area and the City.
- Preserve and enhance the historic or architecturally significant properties in the Project Area.
- Improve and enhance access to transportation flow and public transportation facilities.
- Improve the public infrastructure in the Project Area.
- Encourage the participation of minorities and women in the redevelopment process of the Project Area.


## Redevelopment Objectives

To achieve the general goals of this Plan, the following redevelopment objectives have been established:

- Encourage private investment in new development and rehabilitation of buildings in the Project Area.
- Revitalize and restore the physical and economic conditions in this once thriving neighborhood by removing structurally substandard buildings, obsolete building types, deleterious uses, and other blighting influences.
- Assemble City-owned vacant lots and other underutilized land into viable disposition parcels in order to provide sites for development.
- Use City programs, where appropriate, to create a unified identity that would enhance the marketability of the Project Area.
- Improve the transportation access, traffic flow and safety particularly along $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street, State Street and Michigan Avenue to accommodate an increase in both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to the businesses.
- Encourage private investment in new development and rehabilitation of buildings in the Project Area.
- Provide public infrastructure improvements throughout the Project Area. Replace and repair streets, alleys, sidewalks, and curbs, where necessary.
- Provide public and private infrastructure and streetscape improvements and other available assistance necessary to promote commercial (office and retail) uses in the Project Area.
- Establish job training and job readiness programs to provide residents within and near the Project Area with skills necessary to secure jobs.
- Attract new sales tax and real estate tax dollars to the City of Chicago.


## SECTION 5. REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

The City proposes to achieve its redevelopment goals and objectives for the Project Area through the use of public financing techniques, including tax increment financing, and by undertaking some or all of the following actions:

## Property Assembly, Site Preparation and Environmental Remediation

To meet the goals and objectives of the Plan, the City may acquire and assemble property throughout the Project Area. Land assemblage by the City may be by purchase, exchange, donation, lease, eminent domain or through the Tax Reactivation Program, and may be for the purpose of (a) sale, lease or conveyance to private developers, or (b) sale, lease, conveyance or dedication for the construction of public improvements or facilities. Furthermore, the City may require written redevelopment agreements with developers before acquiring any properties. As appropriate, the City may devote acquired property to temporary uses until such property is scheduled for disposition and development.

Plan Appendix, Attachment 2, Exhibit H-1, Land Acquisition Overview Map indicates the parcels that may be acquired for redevelopment in the Project Area. Plan Appendix, Attachment 2, Exhibit $\mathrm{H}-2$ contains Land Acquisition by Block and Parcel Identification Number which portrays the acquisition properties in more detail.

In connection with the City exercising its power to acquire real property not currently identified in Plan Appendix, Attachment 2, including the exercise of the power of eminent domain, under the Act in implementing the Plan, the City will follow its customary procedures of having each such acquisition recommended by the Community Development Commission (or any successor commission) and authorized by the City Council. Acquisition of such real property as may be authorized by the City Council does not constitute a change in the nature of this plan.

For properties described in Plan Appendix, Attachment 2: (1) the acquisition of occupied properties by the City shall commence within four years from the date of the publication of the ordinance approving the Plan; (2) the acquisition of vacant properties by the City shall commence within ten years from the date of publication of the ordinance authorizing the acquisition. In either case, acquisition shall be deemed to have commenced with the sending of an offer letter. After the expiration of the applicable period, the City may acquire such property pursuant to this Plan under the Act according to its customary procedures as described in the preceding paragraph.

## Affordable Housing

The City requires that developers who receive TIF assistance for market rate housing set aside $20 \%$ of the units to meet affordability criteria established by the City's Department of Planning and Development or any successor agency. Generally, this means the affordable for-sale units should be priced at a level that is affordable to persons earning no more than $100 \%$ of the area median income, and affordable rental units should be affordable to persons earning no more than $60 \%$ of the area median income.

## Intergovernmental and Redevelopment Agreements

The City may enter into redevelopment agreements or intergovernmental agreements with private entities or public entities to construct, rehabilitate, renovate or restore private or
public improvements on one (1) or several parcels (collectively referred to as "Redevelopment Projects"). Such redevelopment agreements may be needed to support the rehabilitation or construction of allowable private improvements, in accordance with the Plan; incur costs or reimburse developers for other eligible redevelopment project costs as provided in the Act in implementing the Plan; and provide public improvements and facilities which may include, but are not limited to utilities, street closures, transit improvements, streetscape enhancements, signalization, parking, surface right-of-way improvements, public schools and parks.

Terms of redevelopment as part of this redevelopment project may be incorporated in the appropriate redevelopment agreements. For example, the City may agree to reimburse a developer for incurring certain eligible redevelopment project costs under the Act. Such agreements may contain specific development controls as allowed by the Act.

## Financial Impact on Taxing Districts

The Act requires an assessment of any financial impact of the Project Area on, or any increased demand for services from any taxing district affected by the Plan and a description of any program to address such financial impacts or increased demand. The City intends to monitor development in the Project Area and with the cooperation of the other affected taxing districts will attempt to ensure that any increased needs are addressed in connection with any particular development.

## Costs Eligible for Payment with TIF Funds Include:

## Analysis, Professional Services and Administrative Activities

The City may undertake or engage professional consultants, engineers, architects, attorneys, and others to conduct various analyses, studies, administrative or legal services to establish, implement, and manage the Plan.

## Financing Costs Pursuant to the Act

Interest on any obligations issued under the Act accruing during the estimated period of construction of the redevelopment project and other financing costs may be paid from the incremental tax revenues pursuant to the provisions of the Act.

## Interest Costs Pursuant to the Act

Pursuant to the Act, the City may allocate a portion of the incremental tax revenues to pay or reimburse developers for interest costs incurred in connection with redevelopment activities in order to enhance the redevelopment potential of the Project Area.

## Construction of New Low-Income Housing Pursuant to the Act

Pursuant to the Act, the City may pay from incremental tax revenues up to $50 \%$ of the cost of construction of new housing units to be occupied by low-income and very low-income households as defined in Section 3 of the Illinois Affordable Housing Act. The cost of construction of those units may be derived from the proceeds of bonds issued by the City under this act or other constitutional or statutory or from other sources of municipal revenue that may be reimbursed from incremental tax revenues or the proceeds of bonds issued to finance the construction of that housing.

## SECTION 6. REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Plan seeks to maintain and enhance most of the existing land uses with a focus on residential and mixed use (defined as commercial, residential, and/or institutional uses) redevelopment. A mix of commercial and light industrial uses is planned for the frontage of Wentworth Avenue and portions of State Street. The construction of new infrastructure is seen as an essential part of needed redevelopment due to the documentation of inadequate utilities in much of the Project Area.

The plan recognizes that new investment in residential, institutional, commercial and mixed-use property is needed to improve the appearance, vibrancy, and overall economic health of the Project Area. Such investment will create the high quality environment that is required to sustain a revitalization of the Project Area. The major physical improvements anticipated as a result of implementing the proposed Plan are outlined below.

## Residential Development

Residential uses may take the form of various single-family and multi-family developments, with density and height restrictions consistent with existing zoning. Open space and neighborhoodoriented community facilities are also acceptable in these residential areas along most frontages on Wabash, Michigan and Indiana Avenues. Since a majority of the existing Project Area is residential, the Plan seeks to promote residential infill on vacant properties and also encourages site assembly to allow for larger multi-family residential development where permitted. In areas where there are multiple adjacent vacant parcels and/or vacant residential buildings that are so deteriorated that demolition may become necessary in the near future, the Plan encourages site assembly for redevelopment of larger, multi-family residential development and infill housing.

As set forth in the Act, if the redevelopment plan for a redevelopment project area would result in the displacement of residents from 10 or more inhabited residential units, or if the redevelopment project area contains 75 or more inhabited residential units and a municipality is unable to certify that no displacement will occur, the municipality must prepare a housing impact study and incorporated the study in the redevelopment project plan.

The Project Area contains 3,590 inhabited residential units. The Plan provides for the development or redevelopment of several portions of the Project Area that may contain occupied residential units. As a result, it is possible that by implementation of this Plan, the displacement of residents from 10 or more inhabited residential units could occur.

The results of the housing impact study section are described in a separate report which presents certain factual information required by the Act. The report, prepared by the Consultant, is entitled Washington Park Project Area Tax Increment Financing Housing Impact Study, and is located in Plan Appendix, Attachment Six.

## Mixed Use (Commercial/Residential/Institutional)

The Plan recognizes that attractive new commercial development, coupled with stabilization and expansion of existing businesses, will encourage investment in residential property as well as provide a diverse mix of job opportunities for the residents of the Project Area. Additionally, the Plan seeks widespread residential development which will ultimately create an increased demand for commercial and retail uses. Currently, there are opportunities for several retail and
commercial corridors along the frontages of State Street, Michigan Avenue, Calumet Avenue and King Drive to compliment and promote expansion of existing smaller commercial nodes.

On State Street and Michigan Avenue there exists a diverse mix of commercial, retail and residential uses on the same block and many times on adjacent properties. Mixed use redevelopment is therefore encouraged along the frontages of State Street and Michigan Avenue, with the exception of the slated construction of a new park space south of $57^{\text {th }}$ Place at State Street, to revitalize and strengthen these commercial corridors that serve residents and businesses in and around the Project Area.

Community organizations have expressed a particular desire for more restaurants, cultural venues, and retail merchandisers. In addition to providing an opportunity for retail development along State Street and Michigan Avenue, the Plan seeks to promote mixed use redevelopment along the west side of King Drive and along Calumet Avenue. Many of the existing multi-family housing units are currently vacant. Additionally, there are numerous vacant tax parcels. The Plan seeks to promote new commercial redevelopment along these streets to create productive and vibrant commercial corridors that would provide a variety of job opportunities for existing and future residents of the Project Area.

## Commercial and Light Industrial

The Plan seeks to promote the growth of existing commercial and light industrial uses within the Project Area and to encourage and attract new enterprises along Wentworth Avenue and along State Street south of $59^{\text {th }}$ Street as well as those areas south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street where needed.

## Parks and Open Space

There are plans to develop park space within the Project Area at the intersection of $57^{\text {th }}$ Place and State Street. This new park space will be constructed around the Chicago Landmark Raber House which is located at 5760 S. Lafayette Avenue.

## Public Improvements

The creation of public infrastructure is needed to complement and attract private sector investment. Infrastructure improvements planned for the Project Area may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Repair existing sidewalks, street furniture, street lighting, highlighting of pedestrian crosswalks, and other pedestrian-friendly amenities;
- Repair curbs, gutters and pedestrian walkways within Washington Park.
- Creation of additional neighborhood park space at the intersection of $57^{\text {th }}$ Place and State Street.
- Implementation of streetscape and building design guidelines that meet modern development needs and standards.
- New street lighting and streetscape improvements along State Street, Michigan Avenue, Indiana Avenue, and King Drive in the Project Area, as well as installation of similar lighting where deemed necessary for health and safety.
- Physical buffers or barriers between light industrial, intensive commercial uses and residential areas (such as fences, trees, bushes or other vegetation), to the extent possible;
- Installation of additional traffic signals, signage, and traffic calming mechanisms where necessary;
- Improvements that promote the use of public transportation and for transit-related facilities, including CTA bus and rail transit improvements.


## SECTION 7. GENERAL LAND USE PLAN

Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit I - Generalized Land Use Plan, identifies land use policies to be pursued in the implementation of the Plan. The Generalized Land Use Plan is intended to serve as a guide for land use improvements and developments within the Project Area.

The land uses proposed for the Project Area are consistent with the redevelopment goals of this Plan and are consistent with existing zoning. The Generalized Land Use Plan is intended to serve as a broad guide for land use and redevelopment policy. The Plan is general in nature to allow adequate flexibility to respond to shifts in the market and private investment.

The principal land use categories planned for the Project Area are residential and Mixed Use (Commercial, Residential, and/or Institutional). Residential uses may take the form of various single-family and multi-family developments, with density and height restrictions consistent with existing zoning. Open space and neighborhood-oriented community facilities and institutional uses are also acceptable in these residential areas.

Mixed use designation is intended in the eastern corridors of the Project Area - along State Street, Michigan Avenue, Calumet Avenue, and King Drive. The mixed use category allows for commercial, residential and/or institutional uses. The Plan seeks to enhance and promote existing and new commercial/residential development in the eastern section of the Project Area in addition to major north/south arterial streets. These corridors offer the best environment for creating a pedestrian-friendly zone with a broad mix of retail merchants such as restaurants, coffee shops, bakeries, specialty food stores and book stores.

New commercial and light industrial uses are particularly encouraged for properties fronting on Wentworth Avenue and LaSalle Street, as these streets offer the best environment for creating new commercial uses in this area as well as maintaining and providing expansion opportunities for existing light industrial uses already located near the "L" tracks and in those areas south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street.

Additional park space is planned within the Project Area at the intersection of $57^{\text {th }}$ Place and State Street.

These land use strategies are intended to direct development toward the most appropriate land use pattern for the various portions of the Project Area and enhance the overall development of the Project Area in accordance with the goals and objectives of the Plan. Locations of specific uses, or public infrastructure improvements, may vary from the Generalized Land Use Plan as a result of more detailed planning and site design activities. Such variations are permitted without amendment to the Plan as long as they are consistent with the Plan's goals and objectives and the land uses and zoning approved by the Chicago Plan Commission.

## SECTION 8. REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FINANCING

Tax increment financing is an economic development tool designed to facilitate the development of blighted areas and to arrest decline in areas that may become blighted without public intervention. It is expected that tax increment financing will be an important tool, but not the only one, of financing improvements and providing development incentives in the Project Area throughout its 23-year life.

Tax increment financing can only be used when private investment would not reasonably be expected to occur without public assistance. The Act sets forth the range of public assistance that may be provided.

It is anticipated that expenditures for redevelopment project costs will be carefully staged in a reasonable and proportional basis to coincide with expenditures for redevelopment by private developers and the projected availability of tax increment revenues.

The various redevelopment expenditures that are eligible for payment or reimbursement under the Act are reviewed below. Following this review is a list of estimated redevelopment project costs that are deemed to be necessary to implement this Plan (the "Redevelopment Project Costs").

In the event the Act is amended after the date of the approval of this Plan by the City Council of the City of Chicago to (a) include new eligible redevelopment project costs, or (b) expand the scope or increase the amount of existing eligible redevelopment project costs (such as, for example, by increasing the amount of incurred interest costs that may be paid under 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(11)), this Plan shall be deemed to incorporate such additional, expanded or increased eligible costs as Redevelopment Project Costs under the Plan, to the extent permitted by the Act. In the event of such amendment(s) to the Act, the City may add any new eligible redevelopment project costs as a line item in Table 8.1 - Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs or otherwise adjust the line items in Table 8.1 without amendment to this Plan, to the extent permitted by the Act. In no instance, however, shall such additions or adjustments result in any increase in the total Redevelopment Project Costs without a further amendment to this Plan.

## Eligible Redevelopment Project Costs

Redevelopment project costs include the sum total of all reasonable or necessary costs incurred, estimated to be incurred, or incidental to this Plan pursuant the Act. Such costs may include, without limitation, the following:

1. Costs of studies and surveys, development of plans and specifications, implementation and administration of the Plan including, but not limited to, staff and professional service costs for architectural, engineering, legal, financial, planning or other services (excluding lobbying expenses), provided that no charges for professional services are based on a percentage of the tax increment collected;
2. The cost of marketing sites within the Project Area to prospective businesses, developers and investors;
3. Property assembly costs, including, but not limited to, acquisition of land and other property, real or personal, or rights or interests therein, demolition of buildings, site preparation, site improvements that serve as an engineered barrier addressing ground level or below ground environmental contamination, including, but not limited to parking lots and other concrete or asphalt barriers, and the clearing and grading of land;
4. Costs of rehabilitation, reconstruction, repair or remodeling of existing public or private buildings, fixtures and leasehold improvements; and the cost of replacing an existing public building, if pursuant to the implementation of a redevelopment project, the existing public building is to be demolished to use the site for private investment or devoted to a different use requiring private investment; including any direct cost or indirect costs relating to Green Globes or LEED certified construction elements or construction elements with an equivalent certification;
5. Costs of the construction of public works or improvements, including any direct or indirect costs relating to Green Globes or LEED certified construction elements or construction elements with an equivalent certification subject to the limitations in Section 11-74.4-3(q)(4) of the Act;
6. Costs of job training and retraining projects including the cost of "welfare-to-work" programs implemented by businesses located within the Project Area.
7. 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 thereunder, including interest accruing during the estimated period of construction of any redevelopment project for which such obligations are issued and for a period not exceeding 36 months following completion and including reasonable reserves related thereto;
8. To the extent the City by written agreement accepts and approves the same, all or a portion of a taxing district's capital costs resulting from the redevelopment project necessarily incurred or to be incurred within a taxing district in furtherance of the objectives of the Plan.
9. Relocation costs to the extent that the City determines that relocation costs shall be paid or is required to make payment of relocation costs by federal or state law or by Section 74.4-3(n)(7) of the Act (see "Relocation" section, Plan Appendix, Attachment Six, Housing Impact Study, Addenda);
10. Payment in lieu of taxes, as defined in the Act;
11. Costs of job training, retraining, advanced vocational education or career education, including but not limited to, courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment, incurred by one (1) 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 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, 110 ILCS 805/3-37, 805/3-38, 805/3-40 and 805/3-40.1, and by school districts of costs pursuant to Sections 10-22.20a and 10-23.3a of the School Code, 105 ILCS 5/10-22.20a and 5/10-23.3a.
12. Interest costs incurred by a redeveloper related to the construction, renovation or rehabilitation of a redevelopment project provided that:

- such costs are to be paid directly from the special tax allocation fund established pursuant to the Act;
- such payments in any one (1) year may not exceed $30 \%$ of the annual interest costs incurred by the redeveloper with regard to the redevelopment project during that year;
- if there are not sufficient funds available in the special tax allocation fund to make the payment pursuant to this provision, then the amounts so due shall accrue and be payable when sufficient funds are available in the special tax allocation fund;
- the total of such interest payments paid pursuant to the Act may not exceed $30 \%$ of the total: (i) cost paid or incurred by the redeveloper for such redevelopment project; (ii) redevelopment project costs excluding any property assembly costs and any relocation costs incurred by the City pursuant to the Act; and
- up to $75 \%$ of the interest cost incurred by a redeveloper for the financing of rehabilitated or new housing for low-income households and very low-income households, as defined in Section 3 of the Illinois Affordable Housing Act.

13. Unless specifically authorized by the Act, the cost of construction of new privately-owned buildings shall not be an eligible redevelopment project cost,
14. An elementary, secondary or unit school district's increased costs attributable to assisted housing units will be reimbursed as provided in the Act;
15. Instead of the eligible costs provided for in (12) above, the City may pay up to $50 \%$ of the cost of construction, renovation and/or rehabilitation of all low-income and very lowincome housing units (for ownership or rental) as defined in Section 3 of the Illinois Affordable Housing Act. If the units are part of a residential redevelopment project that includes units not affordable to low-income and very low-income households, only the low- and very low-income households shall be eligible for benefits under the Act; and
16. The cost of day care services for children of employees from low-income families working for businesses located within the Project Area and all or a portion of the cost of operation of day care centers established by Project Area businesses to serve employees from low-income families working in businesses located in the Project Area. For the purposes of this paragraph, "low-income families" means families whose annual income does not exceed $80 \%$ of the City, county or regional median income as
determined from time to time by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.
17. A public library district's increased costs attributable to assisted housing units will be reimbursed as set forth in the Act.
18. If a special service area has been established pursuant to the Special Service Area Tax Act, 35 ILCS 235/0.01 et seq., then any tax increment revenues derived from the tax imposed pursuant to the Special Service Area Tax Act may be used within the Project Area for the purposes permitted by the Special Service Area Tax Act as well as the purposes permitted by the Act.

## Estimated Project Costs

A range of activities and improvements may be required to implement the Plan. The proposed eligible activities and their estimated costs over the life of the Project Area are briefly described below and shown in Table 8.1 -- Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs.

1. Professional services including planning studies, legal, surveys, real estate marketing costs, fees and other costs related to the implementation and administration of the Plan. This budget element provides for studies and survey costs for planning and implementation of the project, including planning and legal fees, architectural and engineering, development site marketing, and financial and special service costs. (Estimated cost: $\$ 750,000$ )
2. Property assembly costs, including, but not limited to, acquisition of land and other property, real or personal, or rights or interests therein, and other appropriate and eligible costs needed to prepare the property for redevelopment. These costs may include the reimbursement of acquisition costs incurred by the City and private developers. Land acquisition may include acquisition of both improved and vacant property in order to create development sites, accommodate public rights-of-way or to provide other public facilities needed to achieve the goals and objectives of the Plan. Property assembly costs also include: demolition of existing improvements, including clearance of blighted properties or clearance required to prepare sites for new development, site preparation, including grading, and other appropriate and eligible site activities needed to facilitate new construction, and environmental remediation costs associated with property assembly which are required to render the property suitable for redevelopment. (Estimated cost: \$3,000,000)
3. Costs of Rehabilitation, reconstruction, repair or remodeling of existing public or private buildings and fixtures; and up to $50 \%$ of the cost of construction of low-income and very low-income housing units. (Estimated cost: $\$ 12,750,000$ )
4. Costs of Construction of public improvements, infrastructure and facilities. These improvements are intended to improve access within the Project Area, stimulate private investment and address other identified public improvement needs, and may include all or a portion of a taxing district's eligible costs, including increased costs of the Board of Education attributable to assisted housing units within the Project Area in accordance with the requirements of the Act. (Estimated cost: $\$ 4,500,000$ )
5. Relocation costs. (Estimated cost: $\$ 1,000,000$ )
6. Job Training, Re-training, and Welfare-to-Work Programs. (Estimated cost: $\$ 2,000,000$ )
7. Interest costs related to redevelopment projects, pursuant to the provisions of the Act. (Estimated cost: $\$ 500,000$ )
8. Provision of day care services as provided in the Act. (Estimated cost: $\$ 500,000$ )

The estimated total of all eligible project costs over the life of the Redevelopment Project Area is approximately $\$ 25,000,000$. All project cost estimates are in 2014 dollars. Any bonds or other tax increment allocation revenue obligations issued to finance portions of the Redevelopment Project may include an amount of proceeds sufficient to pay customary and reasonable charges associated with issuance of such obligations, as well as to provide for capitalized interest and reasonably required reserves. The total project cost figure excludes any costs for the issuance of bonds. Adjustments to estimated line items, which are upper estimates for these costs, are expected and may be made without amendment to the Plan.

Additional funding from other sources such as federal, state, county, or local grant funds may be utilized to supplement the City's ability to finance Redevelopment Project Costs identified above. While development in within the Project Area will greatly influence the budget available, the Consultants are unaware of any pending projects at this time.

# TABLE 8.1 <br> ESTIMATED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS 

| Eligible Expense | Estimated Cost |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1. Analysis, Administration, Studies, Surveys, Legal, Marketing, etc. | $\$ 750,000$ |
| 2. Property Assembly including Acquisition, Site Prep and Demolition, <br> Environmental Remediation | $\$ 3,000,000$ |
| 3. Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings, Fixtures and Leasehold <br> Improvements, Affordable Housing Construction and Rehabilitation <br> Cost | $\$ 12,750,000$ |
| 4. Public Works \& Improvements, including streets and utilities, parks <br> and open space, public facilities (schools \& other public facilities) |  |
| 5. Relocation Costs | $\$ 4,500,000$ |
| 6. Job Training, Retraining, Welfare-to-Work | $\$ 1,000,000$ |
| 7. Interest Subsidy | $\$ 2,000,000$ |
| 8. Day Care Services | $\$ 500,000$ |
| TOTAL REDEVELOPMENT COSTS ${ }^{\mathbf{3}}$ 4 | $\$ 500,000$ |

[^1]
## Sources of Funds

The funds necessary to pay for Redevelopment Project Costs and secure municipal obligations issued for such costs are to be derived primarily from Incremental Property Taxes. Other sources of funds which may be used to pay for Redevelopment Project Costs or secure municipal obligations are land disposition proceeds, state and federal grants, investment income, private financing, and other legally permissible funds as the City may deem appropriate. The City may incur redevelopment project costs which are paid for from funds of the City other than incremental taxes, and the City may then be reimbursed for such costs from incremental taxes. Also, the City may permit the utilization of guarantees, deposits and other forms of security made available by private sector developers.

Additionally, the City may utilize revenues, other than State sales tax increment revenues, received under the Act from one redevelopment project area for eligible costs in another redevelopment project area that is either contiguous to, or is separated only by a public right-ofway from, the redevelopment project area from which the revenues are received.

The Project Area may be contiguous to or separated by only a public right-of-way from other redevelopment project areas created under the Act. The City may utilize net Incremental Property Taxes received from the Project Area to pay eligible redevelopment project costs, or obligations issued to pay such costs, in other contiguous redevelopment project areas, or project areas separated only by a public right-of-way, and vice versa. The amount of revenue from the Project Area made available to support such contiguous redevelopment project areas, or those separated only by a public right-of-way, when added to all amounts used to pay eligible redevelopment project costs within the Project Area, shall not at any time exceed the total redevelopment project costs described in this Plan.

The Project Area may become contiguous to, or be separated only by a public right-of-way from, redevelopment project areas created under the Industrial Jobs Recovery Law (65 ILCS 5/11-74.6-1 et seq.). If the City finds that the goals, objectives and financial success of such contiguous redevelopment project areas, or those separated only by a public right-of-way, are interdependent with those of the Project Area, the City may determine that it is in the best interests of the City and the furtherance of the purposes of the Plan that net revenues from the Project Area be made available to support any such redevelopment project areas and vice versa. The City therefore proposes to utilize net incremental revenues received from the Project Area to pay eligible redevelopment project costs (which are eligible under the Industrial Jobs Recovery Law referred to above) in any such areas, and vice versa. Such revenues may be transferred or loaned between the Project Area and such areas. The amount of revenue from the Project Area so made available, when added to all amounts used to pay eligible redevelopment project costs within the Project Area, or other areas described in the preceding paragraph, shall not at any time exceed the total redevelopment project costs described in Table 8.1 - Estimated Redevelopment Project Costs.

Development of the Project Area would not be reasonably expected to occur without the use of the incremental revenues provided by the Act. Redevelopment project costs include those eligible project costs set forth in the Act. Tax increment financing or other public sources will be used only to the extent needed to secure commitments for private redevelopment activity.

## Nature and Term of Obligations to be Issued

The City may issue obligations secured by Incremental Property Taxes pursuant to Section 11-74.4-7 of the Act. To enhance the security of a municipal obligation, the City may pledge its full faith and credit through the issuance of general obligation bonds. Additionally, the City may provide other legally permissible credit enhancements to any obligations issued pursuant to the Act.

The redevelopment project shall be completed, and all obligations issued to finance redevelopment costs shall be retired, no later than December 31 of the year in which the payment to the City Treasurer as provided in the Act is to be made with respect to ad valorem taxes levied in the twenty-third calendar year following the year in which the ordinance approving the Project Area is adopted (i.e., assuming City Council approval of the Project Area and Plan in 2014, by December 31, 2038). Also, the final maturity date of any such obligations which are issued may not be later than 20 years from their respective dates of issue. One (1) or more series of obligations may be sold at one (1) or more times in order to implement this Plan. Obligations may be issued on a parity or subordinated basis.

In addition to paying Redevelopment Project Costs, Incremental Property Taxes may be used for the scheduled retirement of obligations, mandatory or optional redemptions, establishment of debt service reserves and bond sinking funds. To the extent that Incremental Property Taxes are not needed for these purposes, and are not otherwise required, pledged, earmarked or otherwise designated for the payment of Redevelopment Project Costs, any excess Incremental Property Taxes shall then become available for distribution annually to taxing districts having jurisdiction over the Project Area in the manner provided by the Act.

## Most Recent Equalized Assessed Valuation

The purpose of identifying the most recent equalized assessed valuation ("EAV") of the Project Area is to provide an estimate of the initial EAV, which the Cook County Clerk will certify for the purpose of annually calculating the incremental EAV and Incremental Property Taxes of the Project Area. The 2012 EAV of all taxable parcels within the Project Area is approximately $\$ 76,534,773$. This total EAV amount, by Property Index Number ("PIN"), is summarized in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Four - Estimated EAV by Tax Parcel. The EAV is subject to verification by the Cook County Clerk. After verification, the final figure shall be certified by the Cook County Clerk, and shall become the Certified Initial EAV from which all Incremental Property Taxes in the Project Area will be calculated by Cook County. The Plan has utilized the EAVs for the 2012 tax year. If the 2013 EAV shall become available prior to the date of the adoption of the Plan by the City Council, the City may update the Plan by replacing the 2012 EAV with the 2013 EAV.

## Anticipated Equalized Assessed Valuation

By tax year 2037 (collection year 2038) and following substantial completion of the Washington Park Redevelopment Plan, the EAV of the Project Area is estimated to be approximately $\$ 105$ million. This estimated value is based on several key assumptions, including: 1) redevelopment in the project area will occur over the next five (5) to ten years; 2 ) several existing low value uses will be redeveloped with new development and underutilized buildings will experience renovation and/or increased occupancy; 3) an estimated inflation rate in EAV of 0.71 percent through 2037 (somewhat less than the historic CPI-U), realized in triennial assessment years
only; and 4) for all future years, EAV is calculated using the 2013 state equalization factor for Cook County of 2.6621 .

## Financial Impact on Taxing Districts

The Act requires an assessment of any financial impact of the Project Area on, or any increased demand for services from, any taxing district affected by the Plan and a description of any program to address such financial impacts or increased demand. The City intends to monitor development in the Project Area and with the cooperation of the other affected taxing districts will attempt to ensure that any increased needs are addressed in connection with any particular development.

The following taxing districts will be eligible to levy taxes on properties located within the Project Area:

City of Chicago: The City is responsible for the provision of a wide range of municipal services, including police and fire protection; capital improvements and maintenance; water supply and distribution; sanitation service; building, housing and zoning codes, etc.

Chicago Park District: The Park District is responsible for the provision, maintenance and operation of park and recreational facilities throughout the City and for the provision of recreation programs.

School Districts for the City of Chicago: General responsibilities of the School Districts include the provision, maintenance and operations of educational facilities and the provision of educational services for kindergarten through twelfth grade.

Cook County: The County has principal responsibility for the protection of persons and property, the provision of public health services and the maintenance of County highways.

Cook County Forest Preserve District: The Forest Preserve District is responsible for acquisition, restoration and management of lands for the purpose of protecting and preserving open space in the City and County for the education, pleasure and recreation of the public.

Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago: The Water Reclamation District provides the main trunk lines for the collection of wastewater from the City and for the treatment and disposal thereof.

The proposed revitalization of the Project Area would be expected to create moderate demands on public services. The renovation or development of new residential property on underutilized parcels, deteriorated commercial parcels, or currently vacant residential units could increase the demand for school services as well as parks and other population-based services.

Within the land use designations on the General Land Use Plan (Plan Appendix, Attachment Two - Exhibit I) that allow for mixed use which includes residential uses, approximately 500 new dwelling units could be constructed over the next 5 to 10 years. The total population of the Project Area could increase from the current number of residents. The number of school age children in the Project Area is also likely to increase as a result of residential redevelopment. At
this time, as there are schools within the surrounding areas which may or may not be currently running at capacity, TIF sources may possibly be used to accommodate increased enrollment in existing schools or to build new schools should the need arise.

The proposed residential and commercial redevelopment may increase the demand for improved water and sewer services and similar types of infrastructure, including the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. As discussed below, the Project Budget's $\$ 11$ million for "Public Works and Improvements" is intended, in part, to address such improved service and infrastructure needs.

Redevelopment of the Project Area may result in changes to the level of required public services. The required level of these public services will depend upon the uses that are ultimately included within the Project Area. Although the specific nature and timing of the private investment expected to be attracted to the Project Area cannot be precisely quantified at this time, a general assessment of financial impact can be made based upon the level of development and timing anticipated by the proposed Plan.

When completed, developments in the Project Area will generate property tax revenues for all taxing districts. Other revenues may also accrue to the City in the form of sales tax, business fees and licenses, and utility user fees. The costs of some services such as water and sewer service, building inspections, etc. are typically covered by user charges. However, others are not and should be subtracted from the estimate of property tax revenues to assess the net financial impact of the Plan on the affected taxing districts.

For the taxing districts levying taxes on property within the Project Area, increased service demands are expected to occur. Prior to the completion of the Plan, certain taxing districts may experience an increased demand for services. However, upon completion of the Plan, all taxing districts are expected to share the benefits of a substantially improved tax base.

In anticipation of the increased demand, $\$ 11$ million has been allocated to public improvements, including "taxing district capital costs" to address potential demands associated with implementing the Plan.

Real estate tax revenues resulting from increases in the EAV, over and above the Certified Initial EAV established with the adoption of the Plan, will be used to pay eligible redevelopment costs in the Project Area. Following termination of the Project Area, the real estate tax revenues attributable to the increase in the EAV over the Certified Initial EAV, will be distributed to all taxing districts levying taxes against property located in the Project Area. Successful implementation of the Plan is expected to result in new development and private investment on a scale sufficient to overcome blighted conditions and substantially improve the long-term economic value of the Project Area.

## Completion of the Redevelopment Project and Retirement of Obligations to Finance Redevelopment Project Costs

The Plan will be completed, and all obligations issued to finance redevelopment costs shall be retired, no later than December 31st of the year in which the payment to the City Treasurer as provided in the Act is to be made with respect to ad valorem taxes levied in the twenty-third
calendar year following the year in which the ordinance approving the Plan is adopted (assuming adoption in 2014, by December 31, 2038).

## SECTION 9. HOUSING IMPACT STUDY

As set forth in the Act, if the redevelopment plan for a redevelopment project area would result in the displacement of residents from 10 or more inhabited residential units, or if the redevelopment project area contains 75 or more inhabited residential units and a municipality is unable to certify that no displacement will occur, the municipality must prepare a housing impact study and incorporate the study in the Redevelopment Project Plan.

The Project Area contains 4,375 inhabited residential units. The Plan provides for the development or redevelopment of several portions of the Project Area that may contain occupied residential units. As a result, it is possible that by implementation of this Plan, the displacement of residents from 10 or more inhabited residential units could occur.

The results of the housing impact study are described in a separate report which presents certain factual information required by the Act. The Report, prepared by the Consultant, is entitled Redevelopment Project Area Tax Increment Financing Program Housing Impact Study and is attached as Plan Appendix, Attachment Five to this Plan.

## SECTION 10. PROVISIONS FOR AMENDING THE PLAN

The Plan may be amended pursuant to the provisions of the Act.

## SECTION 11. CITY OF CHICAGO COMMITMENT TO FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

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

1. The assurance of equal opportunity in all personnel and employment actions with respect to the Redevelopment 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, disability, national origin, ancestry, sexual orientation, marital status, parental status, military discharge status, source of income, or housing status.
2. Redevelopers must meet the City of Chicago's standards for participation of 24 percent Minority Business Enterprises and 4 percent Woman Business Enterprises and the City Resident Construction Worker Employment Requirement as required in redevelopment agreements.
3. This commitment to affirmative action and nondiscrimination will ensure that all members of the protected groups are sought out to compete for all job openings and promotional opportunities.
4. Redevelopers will meet City standards for any applicable prevailing wage rate as ascertained by the llinois Department of Labor to all project employees.

The City shall have the right in its sole discretion to exempt certain small business, residential property owners and developers from the above.

## APPENDIX

## PLAN APPENDIX, ATTACHMENT ONE LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THAT PART OF SECTIONS $10,11,14,15,16,21$ AND 22 IN TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 14 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTH LINE OF THE SOUTH 16 FEET OF LOT 6 OF SOUERBRY \& GRUS' SUBDIVISION IN THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 16 AFORESAID RECORDED SEPTEMBER 24, 1868 AS DOCUMENT 183534; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF GARFIELD BLVD. TO THE WEST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD TO THE NORTH LINE OF SECTION 16; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SECTION 16 TO THE EAST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF GARFIELD BLVD.; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY OF GARFIELD BLVD. TO A POINT AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN BLOCK 2 IN YERBY'S SUBDIVISION RECORDED OCTOBER 17, 1857 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 93105 SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF INDIANA AVE; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF INDIANA AVENUE TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55Th PLACE SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN SUBDIVISION OF LOT 25, 26, 27 OF BLOCK 2 OF YERBY'S SUBDIVISION RECORDED SEPTEMBER 25, 1889 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 1160736; THENCE EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55th PLACE TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 16 FEET OF LOT 2 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID EAST 16 FEET OF LOT 2 AND ITS SOUTHERLY EXTENSION TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING SOUTH OF 55тh PLACE; THENCE EAST TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 11 FEET OF LOT 11 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID EAST 11 FEET OF LOT 11 TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 56Th STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 56 Th STREET TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 18 FEET OF LOT 12 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST 18 FEET OF LOT 12 TO THE NORTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 56 th STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG SAID ALLEY TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 23 FEET OF LOT 1 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST 23 FEET OF LOT 1 TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55 th PLACE; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55rh PLACE TO THE WEST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVE); THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVE) TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 51st STREET; THENCE WEST TO THE SOUTHERLY EXTENSION OF THE WEST LINE OF SOUTH PARK AVENUE AS LOCATED IN THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 10 AFORESAID; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE SOUTHERLY EXTENSION OF

THE WEST LINE OF SOUTH PARK AVENUE TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 51st STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $51^{\text {ST }}$ STREET AND ITS EASTERLY EXTENSION TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF COTTAGE GROVE AVENUE; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF COTTAGE GROVE AVENUE TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th STREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th STREET TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVENUE); THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVENUE) TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $63^{* 2}$ STREET ALSO BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 10 IN BLOCK 2 IN SONNENSCHEIN \& SOLOMON'S SUBDIVISION RECORDED APRIL 20, 1891 AS DOCUMENT 1453254; THENCE WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 63rd STREET TO THE CENTER LINE OF PRAIRIE AVENUE; THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID CENTER LINE OF PRAIRIE AVENUE TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 12 IN SUBDIVISION OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 12 IN SUBDIVISION OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 TO THE EAST LINE OF INDIANA AVENUE; THENCE WESTERLY TO THE POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID AND THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 3 IN $64^{\text {TH }}$ AND STATE STREETS SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF LOT 3 A DISTANCE OF 327.80 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 3 IN $64^{\text {TH }}$ AND STATE STREETS SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN CITY PRODUCTS CORPORATION SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 A DISTANCE OF 25.67 FEET TO AN ANGLE POINT; THENCE CONTINUING SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 A DISTANCE OF 187.50 FEET TO AN ANGLE POINT; THENCE CONTINUING SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 A DISTANCE OF 88.99 FEET TO THE MOST EASTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 1 SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF THE RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH SECTION 22; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 27 IN BRACKETT'S RESUBDIVISION OF LOTS 1 TO 30 IN JUNCTION GROVE, ARTEMUS WHITE AND FRANCIS B. DODSWORTH'S SUBDIVISION OF

PART OF THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 27 AND LOT 28 TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 28 IN BRACKETT'S RESUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF LOT 28 AFORESAID TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 28 BEING ALSO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66^{\text {TH. }}$ STREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66^{\text {TH }}$ STREET TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET TO A POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66^{\text {TII }}$ STREET AS LOCATED IN THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66^{\mathrm{TH}}$ STREET TO THE EAST LINE OF THE RIGHT OF WAY OF PERRY AVENUE; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE RIGHT OF WAY OF PERRY AVENUE TO THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 3 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF LOTS 3 AND 4 OF BLOCK 13 OF SKINNER \& JUDD'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE OF LOT 3 TO THE CENTER LINE OF VACATED PERRY AVENUE AS VACATED BY DOC. 89170528; THENCE NORTH TO THE POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHERLY LINE OF VACATED PERRY AVENUE; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF VACATED PERRY AVENUE TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF LOT 1 BEING 49.50 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 1 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF LOTS 3 AND 4 OF BLOCK 13 OF SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID; THENCE WEST ALONG A LINE BEING 49.50 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 1 TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1 AND ITS NORTHERLY EXTENSION TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 8 IN BLOCK 13 IN SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 8 A DISTANCE OF 86 FEET; THENCE NORTH TO THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 8 AT A POINT BEING 86 FEET WEST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 8; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 8 AND ITS WESTERLY EXTENSION TO THE INTERSECTION WITH A LINE BEING 40 FEET EAST OF AND PARALLEL TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID, SAID LINE BEING ALSO THE EAST LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE AS EXTENDED; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EXTENSION OF THE EAST LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH LINE OF $65^{\text {TH }}$ STREET AS LOCATED IN THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID; THENCE WEST ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $65^{711}$ STREET TO THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE DAN RYAN EXPRESSWAY ALSO BEING A POINT 182.80 FEET EAST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 5 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF LOTS 4, 5 AND 6 OF BLOCK 8 OF SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE

NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF THE DAN RYAN EXPRESSWAY TO THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 8 IN BLOCK 3 IN SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE EAST TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 8; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 40 FEET OF LOT 8 LYING 50.76 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 8; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 40 FEET OF LOT 8 AFORESAID EXTENDED NORTH TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $64{ }^{\text {TH }}$ SREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $64^{\text {TH }}$ STREET TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF Yale avenue; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF YALE AVENUE TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $63{ }^{\text {RD }}$ STREET; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 34 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY OF 63rd STREET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 30 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 30 IN BLOCK 3 A DISTANCE OF 38 FEET; THENCE NORTHEAST TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 31 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION SAID POINT BEING 12 FEET EAST OF THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 31; THENCE NORTH TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 63rd STREET SAID POINT ALSO BEING A POINT ON LOT 22 IN BLOCK 3 IN l.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE WEST ALONG SAID NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE PUBLIC ALLEY, TO THE CENTER LINE OF THE VACATED ALLEY IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE CENTER LINE OF THE VACATED PUBLIC ALLEY TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF ENGLEWOOD AVENUE; THENCE EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF ENGLEWOOD AVENUE TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 22 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 35 IN BLOCK 2 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF A 20 FOOT ALLEY; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID ALLEY TO THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 17 IN BLOCK 1 OF IRA J. NICHOLS SUBDIVISION; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 17 AND THE SOUTH LINE OF LOTS 15 AND 16 IN BLOCK 1 TO THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH SAID BLOCK 1; THENCE NORTHWEST ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY TO THE EAST LINE OF THE 20 FOOT VACATED ALLEY IN BLOCK I OF IRA J. NICHOLS SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID VACATED ALLEY TO THE SOUTH LINE OF AN ALLEY SOUTH OF $61{ }^{5 T}$ PLACE; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN BLOCK 7 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION OF OUTLOTS 17 TO 21 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY LYING EAST OF PRINCETON AVENUE TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 61st PLACE; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF $61{ }^{\text {ST }}$ PLACE TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 20 FEET OF LOT 8 IN THE SUBDIVISION OF THE WEST 300 FEET OF PART OF BLOCK 5 OF

ASSESSOR'S DIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF THE WEST 20 FEET OF LOT 8 TO THE NORTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 61st PLACE; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID ALLEY TO THE EAST LINE OF LOT 4 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 61st STREET; THENCE NORTH TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 17 OF THE SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH 148.56 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 18 AND THE SOUTH 116.80 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 19 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 61st STREET; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 17 TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF A 16 FOOT ALLEY IN SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH 148.56 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 18 AND THE SOUTH 116.80 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 19 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID 16 FOOT ALLEY; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID ALLEY TO A POINT 11.12 FEET WEST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 24 IN THE SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH 148.56 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 18 AND THE SOUTH 116.80 FEET OF THE EAST ½ OF OUT LOT 19 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY TO A POINT 7.32 FEET WEST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 24 SAID NORTHEAST CORNER ALSO BEING THE INTERSECTION WITH THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th PLACE; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th PLACE TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 25 FEET OF LOT 26 IN D.C. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION EXTENDED TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th PLACE; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE AND ITS SOUTHERLY EXTENSION AND ITS NORTHERLY EXTENSION TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY OF A 16 FOOT PUBLIC ALLEY IN D.C. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE EAST TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 11 FEET OF LOT 16 IN D.C. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $60^{\text {T }}$ STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $60^{\text {™ }}$ STREET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 7 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF PART OF BLOCK 5 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 7 TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 60 Th STREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF A 16 FOOT PUBLIC ALLEY TO A POINT WITH THE EXTENSION OF THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 50 FEET OF LOT 11 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59тн PLACE; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59th PLACE TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 19 IN BLOCK 1 IN MICHAEL REICH'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF LOTS $19 \& 29$ IN BLOCK 1 TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59th STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59th STREET TO THE WEST RIGHT OF WAY

LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
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## PLAN APPENDIX, ATTACHMENT THREE ELIGIBILITY STUDY

## I. Introduction

Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises ("ERSE") in conjunction with PGAV PLANNERS (the "Consultant") has been retained by the City of Chicago (the "City") to prepare a Tax Increment Redevelopment Plan (the "Redevelopment Plan") for the proposed redevelopment project area known as the Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area (the "Project Area"). Prior to preparation of the Redevelopment Plan, the Consultant undertook various surveys and investigations of the Project Area to determine whether the Project Area qualifies for designation as a tax increment financing district, pursuant to the llinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq., as amended ("the Act").

This report includes the analyses and findings of the Consultant's work, which is the responsibility of the Consultant. This assignment is the responsibility of the Consultant which has prepared this Eligibility Study with the understanding that the City would rely: 1) on the findings and conclusions of this Eligibility Study in proceeding with the designation of the Project Area as a redevelopment project area under the Act, and 2) on the fact that ERSE has obtained the necessary information to conclude that the Project Area can be designated as a redevelopment project area in compliance with the Act.

Following this introduction, Section II presents background information of the Project Area including the geographic location, description of current conditions and area data; Section III documents the building condition assessment and qualifications of the Project Area as a combination conservation area and vacant blighted area under the Act; and Section IV, Summary and Conclusions, documents the findings of the Eligibility Study.

This Eligibility Study is a part of the overall tax increment redevelopment plan (the "Plan") for the Project Area. Other portions of the Plan contain information and documentation as required by the Act for a redevelopment plan.

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

## A. Location and Size of Project Area

The Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area is located about seven (7) miles south of Downtown Chicago. The Project Area can be separated into three sections: 1. Washington Park (the "Park") is bounded by $51^{\text {st }}$ and $60^{\text {th }}$ Streets on the north and south, and Cottage Grove Avenue and Martin Luther King Drive on the east and west; 2. the neighborhood section which is generally bounded by Martin Luther King Drive and Washington Park on the east, the Dan Ryan Expressway on the west, Garfield Boulevard on the north and 63 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Street on the south; and 3. the industrial area south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street to the Chicago Skyway, west of Prairie Avenue. The neighborhood section is roughly one (1) mile north to south and 0.8 miles east to west, centered on $59^{\text {th }}$ Street and Michigan Avenue. The Park is roughly 1.2 miles north to south and 0.5 miles east to west, centered just north of the intersection of Morgan Drive and Rainey Drive. The industrial section is roughly two-thirds of a mile north to south and a third of a mile east to west, with a significant section of this area used as railway siding.

The Project Area contains approximately 988.4 acres in 2,272 parcels. The Project Area includes 241.8 acres for public rights-of-way for streets, alleyways, rail lines, and highways, leaving approximately 746.6 acres of usable land (either presently developed or vacant).

The boundaries of the Project Area are described in the Plan Appendix, Attachment One Legal Description and are geographically shown on Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit A - Boundary Map of TIF Area. The existing land uses are identified on Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit C - Existing Land Use Map.

## B. Description of Current Conditions

## Surrounding Area Characteristics

The Project Area sits within the greater Washington Park community, located approximately seven (7) miles south of the Chicago Loop. The Project Area includes eight (8) 2010 U.S. Census Tracts: $4003,4004,4005,4008,8345,8346,8361$, and 8425 ; of which, only tract 4004 has shown population growth from 2000 to 2010. The 352 -acre Washington Park and Walter H. Dyett High School site separates the Project Area from the more affluent eastern neighborhood of Hyde Park.

Transportation was the catalyst for much of the growth experienced by the south side neighborhoods; particularly in the Washington Park community during the late $19^{\text {th }}$ and early $20^{\text {th }}$ centuries. By 1887 cable cars reached as far south as $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street on State Street and $67^{\text {th }}$ on Cottage Grove Avenue. The " $L$ " train system reached farther south than the Washington Park community by 1907. Cable cars, trains, and the wide boulevards provided easy access to Chicago's Loop for south side residents. Today, public transportation and highway access are still widely available to residents and visitors of Washington Park.

The Project Area is bordered by higher density residential uses. On the eastern boundary of the Washington Park Community Area is Hyde Park, an affluent south side neighborhood that is home to the University of Chicago. Students and faculty have resided in Hyde Park for decades. As the demand for housing grows around the growing university students, visitors and
university faculty may choose to move to surrounding neighborhoods such as Washington Park. To the west of the Project Area is the Englewood Community Area, which, until recently, was best known for the Englewood Mall. The Mall has recently been replaced by the Kennedy King College and the neighborhood has experienced a much needed surge in housing demand and property values.

At intersections within and surrounding the Project Area, there are small commercial nodes. There are also some isolated industrial uses interspersed within the residential/commercial areas. Industrial corridors within the Project Area are located near Interstate Highway 90/94 (Dan Ryan Expressway) and south of 63rd Street. Residential neighborhoods are also located on the western side of the Dan Ryan Expressway and to the north of the Project Area.

## Existing Land Use

A tabulation of land area by land use category is provided below in Table 2-1 - Tabulation of Existing Land Use. Since almost $50 \%$ of the land area being encompassed by Washington Park and Walter H. Dyett High School, an additional table on the following page, Table 2-2 Tabulation of Existing Land Use Excluding Washington Park, provides a tabulation of land use excluding Washington Park/Dyett High School. Table 2-2 illustrates a more accurate breakdown of existing developed land uses in the Project Area because the percent to total land uses is not skewed by the open land in Washington Park; although the industrial area to the south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ street is included. The existing land uses are shown graphically on Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit C - Existing Land Use. Land use data for the Project Area was compiled as part of the TIF eligibility and redevelopment planning fieldwork conducted in spring and fall of 2013 and early 2014.

Table 2-1
Tabulation of Existing Land Use

|  | Eand Ärea (acres) | $\%$ of Net Land Aréa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vacant Land | 120.6 | 16.1\% |
| Multi-Family Residential | 83.8 | 11.2\% |
| Public/Semi-Public (Including Walter H. Dyett High School in Washington Park - 3.8 acres) | 33.1 | 4.4\% |
| Industrial | 102.8 | 13.8\% |
| Two-Family Residential | 14.9 | 2.0\% |
| Single-Family Residential | 10.6 | 1.4\% |
| Commercial (Retail/Service/Office) | 14.1 | 1.9\% |
| Mixed Use | 4.0 | 0.5\% |
| Utility | 13.4 | 1.8\% |
| Park (including parcels comprising Washington Park - 348.2 acres) | 349.3 | 46.8\% |
| TOTAL | 746.6 | 100.0\% |

1. Land Area excludes 241.8 acres of street, alley, rail, or other public rights-of-way Note. Percentage and acreage figures are approximated due to rounding

In classifying land use for this TIF eligibility report, it is important to clarify the use of the term "vacant land". The Act establishes one (1) set of eligibility criteria for designation of improved land and a separate set of criteria for designation of vacant land. The full definition of "vacant land" and the full set of criteria are provided in Section III of this study. In short, under the Act all parcels without buildings are considered "vacant".

Classification of vacant land is especially relevant given the high proportion of the Project Area that is currently vacant. In terms of net land area (total land area less public right-of-way and parcels used as street or rail right-of-way), approximately $16 \%$ of the Project Area is vacant land as shown in Table 2-1 - Tabulation of Existing Land Use. If Washington Park/Dyett High School is omitted from tabulations, as shown below in Table 2-2 - Tabulation of Existing Land Use Excluding Washington Park, vacant land accounts for about 31\% of the net land area, or 952 individual parcels; $42 \%$ of the total parcels. The next largest land use categories (still excluding Washington Park) are industrial uses (about $26 \%$ of net land area), followed by multi-family residential (about $21 \%$ of net land area).

Table 2-2
Tabulation of Existing Land Use Excluding Washington Park

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vacant Land | 120.6 | 30.6\% |
| Multi-Family Residential | 83.8 | 21.2\% |
| Public/Semi-Public (excludes Walter H. Dyett High School in Washington Park - 3.8 acres) | 29.3 | 7.4\% |
| Industrial | 102.8 | 26.1\% |
| Two-Family Residential | 14.9 | 3.8\% |
| Single-Family Residential | 10.6 | 2.7\% |
| Commercial (Retail/Service/Office) | 14.1 | 3.6\% |
| Mixed Use | 4.0 | 1.0\% |
| Utility | 13.4 | 3.4\% |
| Park (excludes parcels comprising Washington Park - 348.2 acres) | 1.1 | 0.3\% |
|  | 394.6 | 100:0\% |

1. Land Area excluding Washington Park, street, alley, rall, or other public rights-of-way Note: Percentage and acreage figures are approximated due to rounding

Almost a third of the land in the Project Area, not including Washington Park/Dyett High School, is vacant land and is evidence of the extent of disinvestment. A case could also be made for excluding the industrial area south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street from these vacant land calculations, which would only increase the percentage of vacant land in the Project Area. Additionally, over the course of the last few decades, residential buildings have been demolished as the buildings deteriorated and were vacated. These parcels were "blighted before vacant". The City has developed the Red $X$ program to identify properties with structural or interior hazards with a red " X " sign. These hazards can include, but are not limited to, building deterioration or damage
from previous fires, structural hazards when components of the building have been removed, and collapse hazards due to the integrity of chimney tops, parapet walls, roof systems and or stair systems being compromised. The red " $X$ " serves as an indicator to first responders to the existence of the hazards. Further, the presence of the red " $X$ " makes it unlawful for any person to enter the building without first notifying the fire commissioner. The vacant land that remains speaks to the poor building conditions before the demolition, the challenges of the Area, and also presents a resource and opportunity for in-fill development and revitalization. Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit E - Vacant Land Map highlights the location of the vacant parcels in the Project Area and distinguishes between public and privately owned land. Of the 952 vacant parcels, 498 ( $52 \%$ ) are owned by the City, 53 ( $6 \%$ ) are owned by another taxexempt entity, and the remaining $401(42 \%)$ are privately owned. There are 2,785 unique parcel identification numbers (PINS) represented in the 2,272 total parcels. Of these PINS, 22 are railroad property and 907 are owned by other entities exempted from property tax. These 929 PINS indicate that a full third (33\%) of the PINS in the Project Area are not in use by a property tax revenue generating entity.

As shown on Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit C - Existing Land Use Map, the majority of the Project Area is residential in nature, with commercial uses situated near intersections and a number of smaller industrial uses scattered in the southern and western portions of the Project Area; and then industrial uses south of $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street. Some of these industrial uses are directly adjacent to land used for, or zoned as, residential, which may present an obstacle to in-fill development. The residential density is generally greater in the central and eastern portions of the Project Area. Moving east toward the Park, there are fewer single-family homes and more multi-family buildings.

A total of 1,090 structures are located on the approximately 277 acres of improved land in the Project Area. Of these structures, 174 are accessory buildings, such as garages, outbuildings or other secondary structures. The improved portions of the Project Area comprise about $70 \%$ of land area, not including Washington Park and other parkland. According to field observation, $92 \%$ of buildings were judged to be more than 35 years old, which means the improved portions of the Project Area may qualify as a "conservation area" if a combination of three (3) or more conservation factors are found to be present such that the presence of those factors is detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare and the area may become "blighted". These factors are defined in detail in Section III. Qualification of the Project Area.

A high proportion of buildings in the Project Area have deteriorated primary or secondary building components. Further, deteriorated conditions in the public right-of-way, including streets, sidewalk, curb and gutter, have been documented. The extent of deterioration on improved parcels is documented in detail in Section III of this report.

Within the Project Area, there are varying types of residential uses. The types of residential uses were identified during the building condition and land use survey conducted as part of this eligibility analysis for the Project Area. This survey, completed in 2013 and 2014, revealed that the Project Area contains about 4,375 housing units. Of those housing units, $3.7 \%$ are single unit dwellings, $7.0 \%$ are two-unit buildings, $32.8 \%$ are in 3 -unit or 4 -unit buildings, and $37.1 \%$ are multi-family dwellings in buildings of 5 units or more. Approximately $86 \%$ of all occupied units are rental units. Because there are likely to be residents displaced from more than 10 inhabited residential units within the boundaries of the Project Area, the municipality is required to perform a Housing Impact Study as part of the feasibility report (see Subsection 11.74.4$3(n)(5)$ of the Act).

The Project Area has a relative lack of quality retail/commercial uses. While commercial buildings account for $3.6 \%$ of the total land (excluding rights-of-way and the Park), the majority of commercial and retail uses that used to thrive on neighborhood street corners are now boarded-up and vacant or underutilized. Many storefronts have deteriorated over time because of long-term disinvestment in the Project Area. The deterioration that has occurred as a result has led to total vacancy of many parcels in the Project Area.

## Development Activity and Assessed Value Trends

Historic Equalized Assessed Values (EAV's) for the Project Area, the rate of EAV growth for the City, and the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the Chicago-GaryKenosha MSA for the period between 2008 and 2013 are considered to identify development activity and determine assessed value trends. Table 2-3 - Equalized Assessed Value Trends, shown below, illustrates the comparison of the Project Area's EAV growth to both the City EAV and the CPI-U.

Table 2-3 Equalized Assessed Value Trends 2008-2013
Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area
City of Chicago, Illinois
Comparison of EAV Growth Rates

|  | Project Area EAV ${ }^{1}$ | \% Change from Previous Year | Balance of City EAV ${ }^{2}$ | \% Change from Previous Year | Is Area's EAV grow th rate low er than the balance of the City's EAV grow th rate? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | \$119,521,985 |  | \$80,858,021,035 |  |  |
| 2009 | \$128,241,562 | 7.3\% | \$84,458,566,127 | 4.5\% | NO |
| 2010 | \$115,965,285 | -9.6\% | \$81,971,204,778 | -2.9\% | YES |
| 2011 | \$96,747,622 | -16.6\% | \$75,026,166,288 | -8.5\% | YES |
| 2012 | \$76,534,773 | -20.9\% | \$65,173,852,494 | -13.1\% | YES |
| 2013 | \$76,534,773 | 0.0\% | \$65,173,852,494 | 0.0\% | NO |

${ }^{1}$ Cook County Assessor data compiled by ERSE, April 2013.
${ }^{2}$ Cityw ide EAV less the Project Area EAV. Source is Cook County Clerk's Agency Tax Rate Reports for City of Chicago.

Comparison to Consumer Price Index

|  | Project Area EAV ${ }^{1}$ | \% Change from Previous Year | CP-U for Chicago-GaryKenosha MSA | s proposed Area's EAV grow th rate less than the CPFU for Chicago-Gary-Kenosha MSA²? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | \$119,521,985 |  | -0.5\% |  |
| 2009 | \$128,241,562 | 7.3\% | 2.2\% | NO |
| 2010 | \$115,965,285 | -9.6\% | 1.4\% | YES |
| 2011 | \$96,747,622 | -16.6\% | 2.1\% | YES |
| 2012 | \$76,534,773 | -20.9\% | 1.2\% | YES |
| 2013 | \$76,534,773 | 0.0\% | 1.2\% | YES |

${ }^{1}$ Cook County Assessor data compled by ERSE, April 2013.
${ }^{2}$ CPH-U source is U.S. Department of Labor.
The upper half of Table 2-3 also shows that between 2008 and 2013, the EAV of the Project Area decreased from $\$ 119.5$ million to $\$ 76.5$ million. The table demonstrates that; 1 ) In at least 3 of the past 5 years, the EAV growth of the Project Area has declined; 2) In at least 3 of the
past 5 years, the EAV growth of the Project Area has been less than the EAV growth of the remainder of the City; and, 3) In at least 3 of the past 5 years, the EAV growth of the Project Area has been less than the CPI-U of the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha MSA.

There are 2,785 PINS represented in the 2,272 total parcels. As noted, 929 (33\%) of these PINS are owned by an entity exempted from property tax. In 2012 a total of 424 PINS (15\%), represented by 211 parcels were delinquent in the payment of property taxes; 200 of these parcels were also vacant.

## Prior Redevelopment Efforts

Four (4) existing TIF redevelopment project areas are adjacent to the Project Area. The Englewood Neighborhood TIF (T-106) borders the Project Area to the south-west, the $67^{\text {th }}$ Wentworth TIF (T-174) extends into the Project Area to the south, the West Woodlawn TIF (T-171) was established on the south-eastern boundary, and the $47^{\text {th }} /$ State TIF (T-136) borders along the north and western boundary of Washington Park. The boundaries of the adjacent TIF redevelopment project areas are identified in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit G - Adjacent TIF/Redevelopment Areas Map.

The South Side Empowerment Zone covers a portion of the Project Area from the northern boundary to the southern boundary and from the eastern boundary west to State Street. The Englewood Enterprise Zone (\#6) covers most of the Project Area. The Enterprise Zone omits only a section of the Project Area between $60^{\text {th }}$ and $62^{\text {nd }}$ Streets, east of State Street.

## III. QUALIFICATION OF THE PROJECT AREA

## A. Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act

The Act authorizes Illinois municipalities to redevelop locally designated deteriorated areas through tax increment financing. In order for an area to qualify as a tax increment financing district, it must first be designated as a blighted area, a conservation area (or a combination of the two), or an industrial park conservation area as defined at 5/11-74.4-3(a) of the Act. Based on the criteria set forth in the Act, the improved portion of the Area was determined to qualify as a conservation area, and the vacant portion of the Area was determined to qualify as a blighted area.

As set forth in the Act a conservation area is:
"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 three (3) or more of the following factors is detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare and such an area may become a blighted area:
(1) Dilapidation. An advanced state of disrepair or neglect of necessary repairs to the primary structural components of buildings or improvements in such a combination that a documented building condition analysis determines that major repair is required or the defects are so serious and so extensive that the buildings must be removed.
(2) Obsolescence. The condition or process of falling into disuse. Structures have become ill-suited for the original use.
(3) Deterioration. With respect to buildings, defects including, but not limited to, major defects in the secondary building components such as doors, windows, porches, gutters and downspouts, and fascia. With respect to surface improvements, that the condition of roadways, alleys, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, off-street parking, and surface storage areas evidence deterioration, including, but not limited to, surface cracking, crumbling, potholes, depressions, loose paving material, and weeds protruding through paved surfaces.
(4) Presence of structures below minimum code standards. All structures that do not meet the standards of zoning, subdivision, building, fire, and other governmental codes applicable to property, but not including housing and property maintenance codes.
(5) Illegal use of individual structures. The use of structures in violation of applicable federal, State, or local laws, exclusive of those applicable to the presence of structures below minimum code standards.
(6) Excessive vacancies. The presence of buildings that are unoccupied or underutilized and that represent an adverse influence on the area because of the frequency, extent, or duration of the vacancies.
(7) Lack of ventilation, light, or sanitary facilities. The absence of adequate ventilation for light or air circulation in spaces or rooms without windows, or that require the removal of dust, odor, gas, smoke, or other noxious airborne materials. Inadequate natural light and ventilation means the absence or inadequacy of skylights or windows for interior spaces or rooms and improper window sizes and amounts by room area to window area ratios. Inadequate sanitary facilities refers to the absence or inadequacy of garbage storage and enclosure, bathroom facilities, hot water and kitchens, and structural inadequacies preventing ingress and egress to and from all rooms and units within a building.
(8) Inadequate utilities. Underground and overhead utilities such as storm sewers and storm drainage, sanitary sewers, water lines, and gas, telephone, and electrical services that are shown to be inadequate. Inadequate utilities are those that are:
(i) of insufficient capacity to serve the uses in the redevelopment project area,
(ii) deteriorated, antiquated, obsolete, or in disrepair, or
(iii) lacking within the redevelopment project area.
(9) Excessive land coverage and overcrowding of structures and community facilities. The over-intensive use of property and the crowding of buildings and accessory facilities onto a site. Examples of problem conditions warranting the designation of an area as one exhibiting excessive land coverage are: the presence of buildings either improperly situated on parcels or located on parcels of inadequate size and shape in relation to present-day standards of development for health and safety and the presence of multiple buildings on a single parcel. For there to be a finding of excessive land coverage, these parcels must exhibit one (1) or more of the following conditions: insufficient provision for light and air within or around buildings, increased threat of spread of fire due to the close proximity of buildings, lack of adequate or proper access to a public right-of-way, lack of reasonably required off-street parking, or inadequate provision for loading and service.
(10) Deleterious land use or layout. The existence of incompatible land-use relationships, buildings occupied by inappropriate mixed-uses, or uses considered to be noxious, offensive, or unsuitable for the surrounding area.
(11) Lack of community planning. The proposed redevelopment project area was developed prior to or without the benefit or guidance of a community plan. This means that the development occurred prior to the adoption by the municipality of a comprehensive or other community plan or that the plan was not followed at the time of the area's development. This factor must be documented by evidence of adverse or incompatible land-use relationships, inadequate street layout, improper subdivision, parcels of inadequate shape and size to meet contemporary development standards, or other evidence demonstrating an absence of effective community planning.
(12) The area has incurred Illinois Environmental Protection Agency or United States Environmental Protection Agency remediation costs for, or a study conducted by an independent consultant recognized as having expertise in environmental remediation has determined a need for, the clean-up of hazardous waste, hazardous substances, or underground storage tanks required by State or federal law, provided that the remediation costs constitute a material impediment to the development or redevelopment of the redevelopment project area.
(13) The total equalized assessed value of the proposed redevelopment project area has declined for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years for which information is available or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the balance of the municipality for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years for which information is available or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the United States Department of Labor or successor agency for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years for which information is available."

As set forth in the Act, a blighted area is:
"any improved or vacant area within the boundaries of a redevelopment project area located within the territorial limits of the municipality where:
(2) If vacant, the sound growth of the redevelopment project area is impaired by a combination of two (2) or more of the following factors, each of which is (i) present, with that presence documented, to a meaningful extent so that a municipality may reasonably find that the factor is clearly present within the intent of the Act and (ii) reasonably distributed throughout the vacant part of the redevelopment project area to which it pertains:
(A) Obsolete platting of vacant land that results in parcels of limited or narrow size or configurations of parcels of irregular size or shape that would be difficult to develop on a planned basis and in a manner compatible with contemporary standards and requirements, or platting that failed to create rights-of-way for streets or alleys or that crated inadequate right-of-way widths for streets, alleys,, or other public rights-of-way or that omitted easement for public utilities.
(B) Diversity of ownership of parcels of vacant land sufficient in number to retard or impede the ability to assemble the land for development.
(C) Tax and special assessment delinquencies exist or the property has been the subject of tax sales under the Property Tax Code within the last five (5) years.
(D) Deterioration of structures or site improvements in neighboring areas adjacent to the vacant land.
(E) The area has incurred Illinois Environmental Protection Agency or United State Environmental Protection Agency remediation costs for, or a study conducted by an independent consultant recognized as having expertise in environmental remediation has determined a need for, the clean-up of
hazardous waste, hazardous substances, or underground storage tanks required by State or federal law, provided that the remediation costs constitute a material impediment to the development or redevelopment of the redevelopment project area.
(F) The total equalized assessed value of the proposed redevelopment project area has declined for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the redevelopment project area is designated or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the balance of the municipality for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years for which information is available or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the United States Department of Labor or successor agency for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the redevelopment project area is designated.
(3) If vacant, the sound growth of the redevelopment project area is impaired by one of the following factors that (i) is present, with that presence documented, to a meaningful extent so that a municipality may reasonably find that the factor is clearly present within the intent of the Act and (ii) is reasonably distributed throughout the vacant part of the redevelopment project area to which it pertains:
(A) The area consists of one or more unused quarries, mines, or strip mine ponds.
(B) The area consists of unused rail yards, rail tracks, or railroad rights-of-way.
(C) The area, prior to its designation, is subject to chronic flooding that adversely impacts on real property in the area as certified by a registered professional engineer or appropriate regulatory agency.
(D) The area consist of an unused or illegal disposal site containing earth, stone, building debris, or similar materials that were removed from construction, demolition, excavation, or dredge sites.
(E) Prior to the effective date of this amendatory Act of the $91^{\text {st }}$ General Assembly, the area is not less than 50 nor more than 100 acres and $75 \%$ of which is vacant (notwithstanding that the area has been used for commercial agricultural purposes within five (5) years prior to the designation of the redevelopment project area), and the area meets at least one (1) of the factors itemized in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the area has been designated as a town or village center by ordinance or comprehensive plan adopted prior to January 1, 1982,, and the area has not been developed for that designated purpose.
(F) The area qualified as a blighted improved area immediately prior to becoming vacant, unless there has been substantial private investment in the immediately surrounding area."

## B. Survey, Analysis and Distribution of Eligibility Factors

A parcel-by-parcel analysis of the Project Area was conducted to identify the presence of TIF eligibility factors. The condition of each parcel and structure in the Project Area was documented using a tablet computer with GIS software. Field survey data was compiled and analyzed to investigate the presence and distribution of each of the TIF eligibility factors.

Eligibility factor data was collected for individual parcels and is aggregated into 21 sub-areas (each approximately four blocks) for analysis and presentation in two tables: Table 3-1 Conservation Factors Matrix for Improved Land, and Table 3-2 - Blighting Factors Matrix for Vacant Land. The conditions recorded in Table 3-1 and Table 3-2 are depicted graphically in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit D - Existing Conditions Map (due to map scaling, the Existing Conditions Map displays the Project Area divided into six sections and labeled as Exhibit D1 through D6).

The improved portion of the Project Area contains 1,090 structures and constitutes approximately $70 \%$ of the land area not including Washington Park. The Project Area is characterized by the following conditions:

- the predominance of buildings that are 35 years of age or older ( $92 \%$ of buildings) ${ }^{1}$;
- deteriorated buildings ( $63 \%$ of buildings);
- deteriorated site improvements (29\% of parcels);
- deteriorated street and/or sidewalk pavement ( $86 \%$ of sub-areas);
- dilapidated buildings (4\% of buildings);
- obsolete buildings ( $10 \%$ of buildings);
- primary buildings with excessive vacancies (20\%);
- excessive land coverage ( $30 \%$ of improved parcels);
- inadequate utilities ( $76 \%$ of sub-areas);
- deleterious land use or layout (48\% of sub-areas);
- lack of community planning ( $62 \%$ of sub-areas); and,
- demonstrates declining and subpar EAV growth.

The vacant portion of the Project Area constitutes approximately 120.6 acres (30\% of net land area, not including Washington Park), represented on 952 parcels and by 21 sub-areas for this Eligibility Study. The vacant portion of the Project Area is characterized by the following statutory qualifying factors for a "blighted area" under Section 5/11-74.4-3(b) of the Act:

- obsolete platting (37\% of parcels);
- diversity of ownership (43\% of sub-areas);
- tax delinquencies ( $21 \%$ of vacant parcels; $50 \%$ of taxable vacant parcels);
- deterioration of structures or site improvements in neighboring areas ( $94 \%$ of vacant parcels); and,
- demonstrates declining or subpar EAV growth.


## C. Evaluation Procedure

The Consultant conducted exterior surveys of observable conditions on all properties, buildings, and public and private improvements located in the Project Area. These inspectors have been trained in TIF survey techniques and have extensive experience in similar undertakings.

The surveys examined not only the condition and use of buildings, but also included surveys of streets, sidewalks, curbs, gutters, lighting, vacant land, underutilized land, parking facilities, landscaping, fences and walls, and general maintenance. In addition, an analysis was

[^2]conducted on existing site coverage, parking and land uses, and their relationship to the surrounding area. Investigators also researched historic photos and were assisted by information obtained from the City. The boundary and qualification of the Project Area was determined by the field investigations, eligibility requirements described in the Act, and the needs and deficiencies of the Project Area.

## D. Investigation and Analysis of Factors

In determining whether or not the Project Area meets the eligibility requirements of the Act, various methods of research were used in addition to the field surveys. The data includes information assembled from the sources below:

1. Contacts with local individuals knowledgeable as to the Project Area conditions and history, age of buildings and site improvements, methods of construction, real estate records and related items, and other information related to the Project Area was used. In addition, aerial photographs, Sidwell block sheets, City utility atlases, electronic permitting data, etc. were also utilized.
2. Inspection and research as to the condition of local buildings, streets, utilities, etc.
3. On-site field inspection of the Project Area conditions by experienced property inspectors of the Consultant and others as previously noted. Personnel of the Consultant are trained in techniques and procedures of determining conditions of properties, utilities, streets, etc. and determination of eligibility of areas for tax increment financing.
4. Use of accepted definitions as provided for in the Act.
5. Adherence to basic findings of need as established by the llinois General Assembly in establishing tax increment financing which became effective on January 10, 1977. These are:
i. There exists in many Illinois municipalities, areas that are conservation or blighted areas, within the meaning of the TIF statute.
ii. The eradication of blighted areas and the treatment of conservation areas by redevelopment projects are essential to the public interest.
iii. These findings are made on the basis that the presence of blight or conditions which lead to blight, is detrimental to the safety, health, welfare and morals of the public.

Table 3-1 - Conservation Factors Matrix for Improved Land, provided on the following page documents the conditions in the Project Area.
Table 3-1
Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area


## E. Eligibility Factors - Improved Area

In making the determination of eligibility, each and every property or building in the Project Area is not required to be blighted or otherwise qualify. It is the Project Area as a whole that must be determined to be eligible.

The report stated below details conditions that cause the Project Area to qualify under the Act as a conservation area, per surveys and research undertaken by the Consultant in 2013 and 2014:

## Age of Structures

Age, although not one of the 13 factors used to establish a conservation area under the Act, is used as a threshold that an area must meet in order to qualify.

Age presumes the existence of problems or limiting conditions resulting from normal and continuous use of structures and exposure to the elements over a period of many years. As a rule, older buildings typically exhibit more problems than buildings constructed in later years because of longer periods of active usage ("wear and tear") and the impact of time, temperature and moisture. Additionally, older buildings tend not to be ideally suited for meeting modern-day space and development standards. These typical problematic conditions in older buildings can be the initial indicators that the factors used to qualify may be present.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Age:

There are 1,090 buildings in the Project Area (including accessory structures such as garages and secondary buildings). Of these buildings, 1006 (92\%) are 35 years of age or older as determined by field surveys and local research. In many instances buildings are significantly older than 35 year of age; the vast majority of buildings were constructed prior to World War II. The Project Area meets the threshold requirement for a conservation area in that more than $50 \%$ of the structures exceed 35 years of age.

## 1. Dilapidation

Dilapidation as a factor is based upon the documented presence and reasonable distribution of buildings in an advanced state of disrepair. In order for a building to be classified as dilapidated, as the term is defined in the Act, major defects to the primary structural components of the building must be evident, or evident structural defects must be so extensive that the buildings must be removed. A small number of structures in the Project Area have critical defects in primary structural components, such as leaning or bowing load-bearing walls, severely sagging roofs, damaged floor structures, or foundations exhibiting major cracks or displacement.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Dilapidation:

Of the 1,090 buildings in the Project Area, 43 buildings, (4\%), were found to exhibit primary structural components in an advanced state of disrepair.

## 2. Obsolescence

An obsolete building or improvement is one which no longer serves its intended use. The Act defines obsolescence as "the condition or process of falling into disuse. Structures have become ill-suited for the original use." Obsolescence, as a factor, is based upon the documented presence and reasonable distribution of buildings and other site improvements evidencing such obsolescence. Examples include:
a. Functional Obsolescence: Structures are typically built for specific uses or purposes, and their design, location, height and space arrangement are each intended for a specific occupancy at a given time. Buildings are obsolete when they contain characteristics or deficiencies that limit the use and marketability of such buildings. The characteristics may include loss in value to a property resulting from an inherent deficiency existing from poor design or layout, improper orientation of the building on site, etc., which detracts from the overall usefulness or desirability of a property. Obsolescence in such buildings is typically difficult and expensive to correct.
b. Economic Obsolescence: Economic obsolescence is normally a result of adverse conditions that cause some degree of market rejection, and hence, depreciation in market values. Typically, buildings classified as dilapidated and buildings that contain vacant space are characterized by problem conditions, which may not be economically curable, resulting in net rental losses and/or depreciation in market value.
c. Obsolete site improvements: Site improvements, including sewer and water lines, public utility lines (gas, electric and telephone), roadways, parking areas, parking structures, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, lighting, etc., may also evidence obsolescence in terms of their relationship to contemporary development standards for such improvements. Factors of this obsolescence may include inadequate utility capacities, outdated designs, etc.

Throughout the Project Area, there are buildings that have a size, layout, or construction type that are indicative of obsolescence. Vacant storefronts, vacant upper-stories, underutilized properties, undersized commercial buildings, lack of parking or loading space, deteriorated buildings, and inadequate site improvements are all found in the Project Area and are indicators of obsolescence. Some structures are clearly now used for purposes other than the building's designed and original use.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Obsolescence:

The field survey of buildings in the Project Area found that certain buildings exhibit characteristics of obsolescence. Obsolete buildings comprised approximately 10\% or 106 of the 1,090 buildings in the Project Area. These obsolete buildings include:

- Long-term vacant commercial and industrial structures (e.g. 6115 S. Prairie Avenue, 5822 State Street, 6238 Wabash Avenue) that have been rejected by the local realestate market could be indicative of functional or economic obsolescence.
- Industrial buildings that have become ill-suited for their original use (e.g. 6155 S. Prairie Avenue). Industrial structures of this age are ill-suited for modern industrial
techniques due to factors such as inadequate floor area, excessive roof supports, inadequate utilities, poor energy efficiency, and constrictive vehicular access. These conditions could be indicative of functional or economic obsolescence as well as obsolete site improvements.
- Residential buildings that house more dwelling units than originally intended (multiple examples on LaSalle Street, Perry Avenue, and Michigan Avenue). Single-family housing that has been converted to multi-family units or another use demonstrates functional obsolescence and the buildings are not being used as originally intended. Obsolete site improvements also exist in the Project Area and are generally associated with the commercial and industrial buildings.


## 3. Deterioration

Deterioration refers to physical deficiencies or disrepair in buildings or site improvements requiring treatment or repair. Conditions that are not easily correctable in the course of normal maintenance were classified as deteriorated. Such buildings may be classified as deteriorating or in an advanced stage of deterioration, depending upon the degree or extent of the defects. Buildings with major defects in the secondary building components (e.g., damaged doors and door frames, broken windows, window frames and muntins, dented or damaged metal siding, gutters and downspouts damaged or missing, weathered fascia materials, cracks in masonry walls, spalling masonry surfaces, etc.) were observed in the Project Area. Many of the structures located in the Project Area exhibited these conditions. In addition, roadways, off-street parking and surface storage areas also evidenced deterioration such as cracking on paved surfaces, potholes, depressions, loose paving materials, weeds protruding through the surface, etc.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Deterioration:

Throughout the Project Area, deteriorating conditions were recorded on 687 (63\%) of the 1,090 buildings. The exterior field survey of primary buildings in the Project Area found major defects in secondary building components, including windows, doors, gutters, downspouts, siding, fascia materials, parapet walls, etc. 332 (29\%) of the improved parcels in the Project Area demonstrated deteriorated site improvements. Deteriorated public improvements (street pavement, curb and gutter, and sidewalk) were observed on 18 (86\%) of the 21 sub-areas in the Project Area.

## 4. Presence of Structures Below Minimum Code Standards

Structures below minimum code standards include all structures that do not meet the standards of zoning, subdivision, State building laws and regulations. The principal purposes of such codes are to require buildings to be constructed in such a way as to sustain safety of loads expected from various types of occupancy, to be safe for occupancy against fire and similar hazards, and/or establish minimum standards essential for safe and sanitary habitation. Structures below minimum code are characterized by defects or deficiencies that presume to threaten health and safety.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Presence of Structures Below Minimum Code Standards:

Considering the age of buildings in the Project Area, it is certain that many of the buildings are below the minimum code standards currently in force by the City of Chicago. However, in order to substantiate these conditions both interior and exterior inspections of the properties by qualified professionals would be required. Rather than attempt such an evaluation, the Consultant relied on City data on documented code violations.

The Department of Planning and Development provided electronic data on code violation records for the Project Area. These records included thousands of building or property maintenance code compliance issues documented through the Department of Buildings tracking system between 2004 and 2013. Code violations were recorded for 216 separate addresses for buildings in the Project Area ( $20 \%$ of all primary buildings).

Because the data are based on property address rather than PIN, code violation data is not presented at the sub-area level in Table 3-1 - Conservation Factors Matrix for Improved Land. It should also be recognized that the code violations documented through the City's record system are only a fraction of the code deficiencies in the Project Area. The predominance of structures in excess of 60 years of age indicates that most of the buildings in the Project Area likely have some characteristics that do not meet the City's current building or zoning requirements. However, due to this unsubstantiated data, this factor cannot be verified as present for this Eligibility Study.

## 5. Illegal Use of Individual Structures

This factor applies to the use of structures in violation of applicable national, State or local laws. Examples of illegal uses may include, but not be limited to, the following:
a. illegal home occupations;
b. conduct of any illegal vice activities such as gambling or drug manufacture;
c. uses not in conformance with local zoning codes and not previously grand fathered in as legal nonconforming uses;
d. uses involving manufacture, sale, storage or use of dangerous explosives and firearms.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Illegal Use of Individual Structures:

This factor was not documented in the Project Area.
6. Excessive Vacancies

Establishing the presence of this factor requires documenting unoccupied or underutilized buildings that represent an adverse influence on the Project Area because of the frequency, extent, or duration of such vacancies. It includes properties which evidence no apparent effort directed toward occupancy or utiiization and partial vacancies.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Excessive Vacancies:

During the field investigation, and subsequent updates, of the Project Area a total of 185 primary buildings were observed to contain vacant floor space. Based on the condition of some of the vacant buildings (boarded-up windows, deteriorated interior finishes, lack of lighting, outdated signage, etc.) it is evident that a number of these buildings have been vacant for an extended period of time. The appearance of vacant buildings within the Project Area indicates underutilization of existing structures and may lead to a tendency of vacancies to spread quickly throughout the Project Area.

Residential vacancies are especially abundant on Lafayette Avenue between Garfield Boulevard and $57^{\text {th }}$ Street. Where there are improved parcels in this stretch, many multiunit and single family residential structures stand boarded-up and vacant. Vacant residential buildings represent an adverse influence on the Project Area by causing a decrease in the value of surrounding property.

In addition to the number of vacant residential units in the Project Area, many commercial buildings are boarded-up and vacant, as well. The extent and duration of vacancies at these locations and other vacant commercial parcels within the Project Area, combined with the lack of investment in commercial development indicate that the frequency of vacancies will likely persist and spread.

Vacancies are generally distributed equally among commercial and residential structures within the Project Area, and many are owned by the City of Chicago as shown in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit E - Vacant Land Map. From the field investigation, it appears that a high concentration of privately owned vacancies occurs in the north/west-central sub-areas of $A, B, E, F, I, J$, and $K$, as identified in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit B - Sub Area Key Map. This distribution of vacancies results in a significant blighting effect on surrounding properties. Without intervention, vacancies are likely to persist and begin to negatively impact surrounding properties. The field investigation indicates that 185 primary buildings, $20 \%$ of the 916 total primary buildings, have vacancy of floor space, and It appears that many primary structures have been abandoned without use for an extended period of time.

## 7. Lack of Ventilation, Light or Sanitary Facilities

Many older structures fail to provide adequate ventilation, light or sanitary facilities. This is also a characteristic often found in illegal or improper building conversions and in commercial buildings converted to residential usage. Lack of ventilation, light or sanitary facilities are presumed to adversely affect the health of building occupants (i.e., residents, employees or visitors).

## Summary of Findings Regarding Lack of Ventilation, Light or Sanitary Facilities:

The exterior field survey of main buildings in the Project Area did not result in documentation of structures without adequate mechanical ventilation, natural light and proper window area ratios.

## 8. Inadequate Utilities

Inadequate utilities refers to deficiencies in the capacity or condition of utilities which service a property or area, including, but not limited to, storm water drainage, water supply, electrical power, sanitary sewers, gas and electricity.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Inadequate Utilities:

The Bureau of Engineering Services in the City's Department of Water Management provided the consultant with data on the condition of sanitary sewer mains and water lines in the Project Area. Many of the water mains serving the Project Area are deficient in terms of either age or size. According to the City's Bureau of Engineering Services, all 6 -inch cast iron water mains are obsolete and in need of replacement with ductile iron mains of at least eight (8) inches in diameter. Undersized water mains are found in the majority of the Project Area's sub-areas. The projected service life of water mains is 100 years. Some sections of water line in the Project Area are more than 120 years old, and the Project Area's sub-areas are served by water mains that exceed their expected service life.

Sanitary sewer data was also reviewed by the Consultant. Many sections of sewer line exceed 100 years of age. Based on the age and condition of lines, 12 sections of sanitary sewer main in the Project Area have been identified as candidates for relining (a less costly alternative to replacement). These relining projects, along with three (3) sewer improvement projects identified through hydraulic studies, are distributed throughout the Project Area.

Obsolete, undersized and deficient water lines are indicated on Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit D - Existing Condition Maps with a dashed line pattern. These deficient utilities are distributed throughout the Project Area and present in 16 (76\%) of the 21 sub-areas.

## 9. Excessive Land Coverage and Overcrowding of Structures and Community Facilities

This factor may be documented by showing instances where building coverage is excessive. Excessive coverage refers to the over-intensive use of property and the crowding of buildings and accessory facilities onto a site. Problem conditions include buildings either improperly situated on the parcel or located on parcels of inadequate size and/or shape in relation to present-day standards of development for health and safety; and multiple buildings on a single parcel. The resulting inadequate conditions include such factors as insufficient provision for light and air, increased threat of fire due to close proximity to nearby buildings, lack of adequate or proper access to a public right-of-way, lack of required off-street parking, and inadequate provision for loading or service. Excessive land coverage has an adverse or blighting effect on nearby development because problems associated with lack of parking or loading areas can negatively impact adjoining properties.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Excessive Land Coverage and Overcrowding of Structures and Community Facilities:

Structures exhibiting 100\% lot coverage with party or fire walls separating one structure from the next is a historical fact of high-density urban development. This situation is common throughout the industrial and commercial corridors in the western portion of the Project Area, and in the southern residential sub-areas. The incidence of excessive land coverage in the Project Area is high both as a result of inadequate spacing between buildings and inadequate parking.

Numerous commercial and industrial businesses are located in structures that cover $100 \%$ of their respective lots. Other businesses are utilizing $100 \%$ of their lots for business operations. These conditions typically do not allow for off-street loading facilities for shipping operations or do not provide parking for patrons and employees. This has prompted overflow parking and truck traffic associated with normal business operations to utilize surrounding residential areas for parking and access. This is common along Wentworth Avenue and La Salle Street. Furthermore, delivery trucks were observed to be blocking alleys and streets while performing normal delivery operations or accessing shipping facilities.

In addition, numerous residential structures exhibited excessive land coverage and overcrowding of structures. Along Wabash Avenue, LaSalle Street and State Street between $58^{\text {th }}$ Street and $60^{\text {th }}$ Street are numerous buildings where the buildings are spaced too closely or buildings are improperly situated on their sites. Residences that were originally built as single family homes have been converted into multi-unit residences. The result of overcrowding of structures in the residential corridors throughout the Project Area is increased demand for parking on residential streets. $30 \%$, or 335 of the 1,128 improved parcels in the Project Area, revealed some evidence of excessive land coverage or overcrowding of structures and community facilities. This Eligibility Study considers no finding regarding Excessive Land Coverage.

## 10. Deleterious Land Use or Layout

Deleterious land uses include all instances of incompatible land-use relationships, buildings occupied by inappropriate mixed uses, or uses which may be considered noxious, offensive or environmentally unsuitable.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Deleterious Land Use or Layout:

In locations such as the Project Area where its character has evolved over the years, industrial, commercial and residential uses are often in close proximity to one another. It is not unusual to find small pockets or isolated residential buildings within a predominantly industrial area or an industrial use in a residential area. Although these buildings may be considered, because of age and continuous occupancy, as legal nonconforming uses (whose existence and use is thereby "grandfathered"), they are, nonetheless, incompatible land uses inasmuch as the predominant character of the Project Area is influenced by these differing uses.

As illustrated in Exhibit C - Existing Land Use, the Project Area is primarily residential with interspersed pockets of industrial corridors in the western sub-areas, as well as an industrial area to the south. The combination of limited on-site parking and high density industrial and commercial development in close proximity to primarily residential uses causes conflict in traffic, parking, safety, and environmental conditions that has promoted deleterious use of land in some portions of the Project Area. For example, a food manufacturing company, located on South Perry Avenue is located in a predominantly residential part of the Project Area. Parallel streets adjacent to Perry Avenue, Lafayette and LaSalle Streets, contain mostly residential parcels or vacant parcels zoned residential. The food manufacturer's location in a predominantly residential neighborhood is an example of deleterious land uses and land use relationships within the Project Area.

Additionally, the presence of other commercial or industrial uses within residential land uses or abandoned equipment and vehicles are present. As an example, there is a vehicle storage on Wentworth Avenue, or the automotive repair business located on South State Street qualify as deleterious or incompatible land uses. Commercial uses are typically not encouraged within primarily residential neighborhoods. The garage on the residential parcel located on South LaSalle Street is being used for tire storage and is a noxious and offensive land use to neighboring residential property owners. The storage of abandoned vehicles on Wentworth Avenue is another example of deleterious land use. The location of the automotive repair business on South State Street adjacent to residential land uses further exhibit's the presence of deleterious land uses distributed throughout the Project Area.

Deleterious land uses and land use relationships were located within $48 \%$, or ten (10) of the 21 sub-areas identified in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit B - Sub Area Key Map.

## 11. Lack of Community Planning

This may be counted as a factor if the proposed area was developed prior to, or without the benefit or guidance of, a community plan. This means that no community plan existed, was considered inadequate, and/or was virtually ignored during the time of the area's development. Indications of a lack of community planning include:

1. Streets, alleys, and intersections that are too narrow or awkwardly configured to accommodate traffic movements.
2. Inadequate street and utility layout.
3. Tracts of land that are too small or have awkward configurations that would not meet contemporary development standards.
4. Properties lack adequate access to public streets.
5. Industrial land use and zoning adjacent to or within heavily developed residential areas without ample buffer areas.
6. Commercial and industrial properties that are too small to adequately accommodate appropriate off-street parking and loading requirements.
7. The presence of deteriorated structures, code violations and other physical conditions that are further evidence of an absence of effective community planning.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Lack of Community Planning:

Much of the Project Area was developed originally from the late 1800's to the mid1900's. As evidenced by limited lot sizes for commercial uses, placement and orientation of buildings with total or near-total lot coverage, and lack of provisions for offstreet parking, loading and service, the development of the area occurred without consideration of a comprehensive community plan with adequate guidelines for the overall community area development.

It should be noted that the Study Area has benefited from community planning in recent times. However, many of the conditions that now plague the area are the result of original development, which occurred without the benefit of sound community planning. Therefore, while significant planning investment has been made in the Study Area over recent decades, original development done without the benefit of sound community planning has contributed significantly to the Study Area's current problems.

As previously noted in this analysis, many properties in the Project Area are affected by narrow streets, lack of parking that has led to excessive land coverage, incompatible land-uses, and inadequate utilities. Additionally, there is evidence of deteriorating building conditions and numerous code violations. Large commercial or industrial properties are in potential conflict with residential areas and may not meet contemporary development standards. Deteriorated infrastructure is present as indicated by areas with standing water that also indicate inadequate storm water utilities. Many parcels have been left vacant where previously there had been structural improvements. Increased disinvestment and lack of demand has resulted in the vacancy of structures and many buildings have subsequently been demolished. The lack of new construction after demolition can also be attributed to a lack of community planning in the Project Area.
As indicated previously, there is a general lack of commercial uses throughout the Project Area. While Garfield Boulevard, State Street and Prairie Avenue had once served as commercial corridors for the Project Area, many of the previously existing businesses have been replaced by vacant or boarded-up storefronts. For example, on South State Street a previously open commercial structure is now boarded and vacant. This example shows the presence of deteriorated structures and other conditions that indicate the absence of community planning. The lack of effective community planning has led to continued disinvestment in the Project Area as well as increased commercial and residential vacancies.

Lack of community planning was observed in $62 \%$ or 13 of the 21 sub-areas identified in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit B - Sub Area Key Map.

## 12. Environmental Remediation Costs

If an area has incurred Illinois or United States Environmental Protection Agency remediation costs for, or a study conducted by an independent consultant recognized as having expertise in environmental remediation has determined a need for, the clean-up of hazardous waste, hazardous substances, or underground storage tanks required by State or federal law, provided that the remediation costs constitute a material impediment to the development of the redevelopment project area then this factor may be counted.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Environmental Remediation Costs:

This factor was not identified in the Project Area. However, field observation reveals that several properties may be affected by environmental contamination.

## 13. Declining or Lagging Rate of Growth of Total Equalized Assessed Valuation

If the total equalized assessed value of the proposed redevelopment project area has declined for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years for which information is available, or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the balance of the municipality for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years for which information is available, or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the United States Department of Labor or successor agency for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years for which information is available then this factor may be counted.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Declining or Lagging Rate of Growth of Total Equalized Assessed Valuation:

As discussed in Section II-B, Development Activity and Assessed Value Trends, of this Eligibility Study, analysis of historic EAV for the Project Area indicates that the EAV of the Project Area has declined in 2010, 2011, and 2012 and has also experienced growth at a rate less than that of the balance of the City and less than the annual Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers in the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha MSA in those same years.

## F. Conclusion of Investigation of Eligibility Factors for the Improved Portion of the Redevelopment Project Area

The presence of deteriorated buildings; deteriorated site improvements and public rights-of-way; inadequate utilities; deleterious land use relationships; lack of community planning; and declining or sub-par EAV growth are all indications of detrimental conditions in the Project Area. Furthermore, these conditions are present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the improved portions of the Project Area. The presence of these TIF eligibility factors underscores the lack of private investment in the Project Area.

The tax increment program and redevelopment plan include measures designed to reduce or eliminate the deficiencies, which cause the improved portion of the Project Area to qualify as a conservation area consistent with the strategy of the City of Chicago for revitalizing other designated redevelopment areas and industrial corridors. As documented in this investigation and analysis, it is clear that a number of eligibility factors affect the Project Area. The presence of these factors qualifies the improved portion of the Project Area as a conservation area.

## G. Analysis of Undeveloped or Vacant Property

For the purpose of qualification for TIF, the term "vacant land" is defined in the TIF Act as follows:

Any parcel or combination of parcels of real property without industrial, commercial, and residential buildings which has not been used for commercial agricultural purposes within five (5) years prior to the designation of the redevelopment project area.

Approximately 120.6 acres of the 394.6 -acre Area ( $30.6 \%$ of the net land area excluding Washington Park/Dyett High School) is considered vacant by this definition. Vacant land is identified in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit C - Existing Land Use Map and highlighted in the Plan Appendix, Attachment Two, Exhibit E - Vacant Land Map. The blighting factors present on vacant parcels are summarized on Table 3-2 - Blighting Factors Matrix for Vacant Land on the following page.

Table 3-2
Blighting Factors Matrix for Vacant Land Washington Park Redevelopment Project Area City of Chicago, Illinois


Using GIS software the Consultant evaluated the Project Area's vacant land in terms of the conditions listed in Table 3-2 during field surveys and subsequent analyses. The data was consolidated by sub-area for each of the factors relevant to making a finding of eligibility.

## Vacant Blighted Area Category 1 Factors:

Obsolete Platting, Diversity of Ownership, Tax Delinquencies, Deterioration of Structures in Neighboring Areas, Environmental Remediation, Declining or SubPar E.A.V. (2 or More)

Vacant land may qualify as a blighted area if any two (2) of the six (6) Vacant Blighted Area Category 1 Factors are present or if any one (1) of the Vacant Blighted Area Category 2 Factors is present.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Obsolete Platting:

The result of obsolete platting of vacant land is parcels of limited or narrow size or configurations of parcels of irregular size or shape that would be difficult to develop on a planned basis and in a manner compatible with contemporary standards and requirements, or platting that failed to create rights-of-way for streets or alleys or that created inadequate right-of-way widths for streets, alleys, or other public rights-ofway or that omitted easement for public utilities.

This Eligibility Study considers no finding regarding Obsolete Platting in the Project Area.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Diversity of Ownership:

Diversity of ownership refers to parcels of vacant land owned by so large a number of individuals or entities that the ability to assemble the land for development is retarded or impeded. As indicated above, some assembly of parcels has taken place over time. However, an analysis of common ownership grouping reveals that there remain diverse ownership conditions in 9 of the Area's 21 sub-areas (43\%). This diversity of ownership in the Project Area will present an obstacle to redevelopment of the Project Area.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Tax Delinquencies:

There are 952 vacant parcels in the Project Area. 498 (52\%) of these vacant parcels are owned by the City and another 53 (6\%) are owned by other entities exempt from property tax, leaving a total of 401 (42\%) vacant, privately owned, tax revenue generating parcels. The ability of these parcels to generate property tax revenue is critical and represents increased revenue potential for the Project Area. For the 2012 tax year, there were 200 (21\%) vacant parcels found to be delinquent. Although not an impact on the qualifying factor, it is also important to note that of the 401 vacant, privately owned, tax generating parcels, $50 \%$ were delinquent for the 2012 tax year.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Deterioration of Structures or Site Improvements in Neighboring Areas Adjacent to the Vacant Land:

As indicated in the prior analysis of blighting factors on improved portions of the Project Area, approximately $63 \%$ of buildings exhibited deteriorated conditions and $86 \%$ of subareas exhibited deteriorated right-of-way conditions. It was found that 896 (94\%) of the 952 vacant parcels are located adjacent to deteriorated buildings or site improvements.

Much of the vacant land in the Project Area is adjacent to or near deteriorated buildings and site improvements. These deteriorated buildings detract from the desirability and marketability of nearby vacant sites. This impediment to redevelopment can be addressed in part through the use of public-private financing mechanisms such as tax increment financing to encourage investment.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Environmental Remediation:

As is noted in the discussion of environmental remediation, this factor was not identified. It is not known whether past land uses on parcels that are now vacant created soil or groundwater contamination. No documentation of past contamination of vacant land is presently available.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Declining or Sub-Par Equalized Assessment Valuation (EAV) Growth:

As indicated in the prior analysis of blighting factors on improved portions of the Project Area, analysis of historic EAV for the Project Area indicated that the EAV has declined in 2010, 2011, and 2012 and has also experienced growth at a rate less than that of the balance of the City and less than the annual Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers in the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha MSA in those same years.

With regard to the second set of vacant land factors, if the category 1 factors are not found to exist, only one (1) category 2 factor is required for eligibility. No category 2 factors were found to be present in the Project Area.

## Summary of Findings Regarding Blighted Improved Area Immediately Prior to Becoming Vacant:

It is evident from aerial photography that many buildings have been demolished in the Project Area. Those familiar with the Project Area indicate that many of these buildings were deteriorated and vacant. Additionally, over the course of the last few decades, residential buildings have been demolished as the buildings deteriorated and were vacated. These parcels were "blighted before vacant". The City has developed the Red $X$ program to identify properties with structural or interior hazards with a red " $X$ " sign. These hazards can include, but are not limited to, building deterioration or damage from previous fires, structural hazards when components of the building have been removed, and collapse hazards due to the integrity of chimney tops, parapet walls, roof systems and or stair systems being compromised. The red " $X$ " serves as an indicator to first responders to the existence of the hazards. Further, the presence of the red " $X$ " makes it unlawful for any person to enter the building without first notifying the fire commissioner. The vacant land that remains speaks to the poor building conditions
before the demolition, the challenges of the Area, and also presents a resource and opportunity for in-fill development and revitalization. Based on data from the City, 63 demolition permits have been issued in the Project Area from 2007 to 2013. However, documentation of actual building demolitions and the conditions of these parcels prior to their becoming vacant is not available, and for the purposes of this analysis this factor was not shown as present within the Project Area on Table 3-2 - Blighting Factors Matrix for Vacant Land.

Summary of Findings Regarding Unused or Illegal Disposal Site:
Garbage and littering consisting of various materials was found on scattered vacant lots around the Project Area. However, none of these sites had accumulations of materials at a sufficient quantity to classify them as "illegal disposal sites", and for the purposes of this analysis this factor was not shown on Table 3-2 - Blighting Factors Matrix for Vacant Land to be present. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the prevalence of vacant lots in the Project Area, most of which are not owned by residents of the Project Area, is such that ensuring proper maintenance of vacant lots will continue to be a challenge for the neighborhood. The presence of overgrown or litter-strewn vacant lots detracts from the appearance of the Project Area and inhibits investment.

## H. Conclusion of Investigation of Eligibility Factors for the Vacant Portion of the Redevelopment Project Area

The discussion above, and the evidence summarized in Table 3-2 - Blighting Factors Matrix for Vacant Land, indicate that the factors required to qualify the vacant portion of the Project Area as a blighted area exist, that the presence of those factors were documented to a meaningful extent so that the City may reasonably find that the factors are clearly present within the intent of the Act, and that the factors were reasonably distributed throughout the vacant portion of the Project Area.

The tax increment program and redevelopment plan include measures designed to reduce or eliminate the deficiencies which cause the Project Area to qualify consistent with the strategy of the City of Chicago for revitalizing other designated redevelopment areas and industrial corridors. As documented in this investigation and analysis, it is clear that the vacant portion of the Project Area is impacted by a number of eligibility factors. The presence of these factors qualifies the vacant portion of the Project Area as a blighted area.

## IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of PGAV PLANNERS are that the number, degree, and distribution of eligibility factors in the Project Area as documented in this Eligibility Study warrant: i) the designation of the improved portion of the Project Area as a conservation area, and ii) the designation of the vacant portion of the Project Area as a blighted area as set forth in the Act. Below is a table summarizing the qualifying factors that are found to exist in the Project Area.
A. Conservation Area Statutory Factors

|  | ACTOR | EXISTINGINIROUEGTAREA? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age ${ }^{3}$ | 92\% of bldgs. exceed 35 yrs . of age |
| 1 | Dilapidation | Minor extent (4\% of buildings) |
| 2 | Obsolescence | Minor extent ( $10 \%$ of buildings) |
| 3 | Deterioration | Major extent ( $63 \%$ of buildings; $86 \%$ of sub-areas) |
| 4 | Presence of structures below minimum code standards | Not Verified |
| 5 | Illegal use of individual structures | Not Documented |
| 6 | Excessive vacancies | Minor extent ( $20 \%$ of buildings) |
| 7 | Lack of ventilation, light or sanitary facilities | Not Documented |
| 8 | Inadequate utilities | Major extent (76\% of sub-areas) |
| 9 | Excessive land coverage or overcrowding of structures | No Finding |
| 10 | Deleterious land use or layout | Minor extent (48\% of sub-areas) |
| 11 | Environmental clean-up | Not Documented |
| 12 | Lack of Community Planning | Major extent (62\% of sub-areas) |
| 13 | Declining or subpar E.A.V. growth | YES |

Notes:
1 Not including Age as a factor, only three (3) factors are required by the Act to be present for eligibility as a Conservation Area. Eight (8) factors are verified present in the Project Area.
2 Except for EAV growth, qualifying factors can be identified as being found to a major extent by their existence on more than $50 \%$ of the structures or sub-areas in the Project Area. Three (3) factors were found to exist to a major extent and four (4) other factors were found to exist to a minor extent.
3 Age, although not a blighting factor for designation, is a threshold that must be present for an area to qualify as a Conservation Area.
B. Blighting Factors for Vacant Areas

|  |  | EXISTINGINVACANTI UNIMPROVED PORTION OF PROJECTAREA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Two (2) or more of the following factors: <br> i. Obsolete platting - no finding <br> ii. Diversity of ownership - minor <br> (Present on 43\% of sub-areas) <br> iii. Tax and assessment delinquencies - minor <br> (Present for 21\% of vacant parcels) <br> iv. Deterioration of Structures in Neighboring Areas - YES <br> (Present on 94\% of vacant parcels) <br> v. Environmental Remediation - not present <br> vi. Declining or Subpar E.A.V. Growth - YES <br> or | YES <br> Two (2) factors required, Two (2) are present |
| 2 | Area immediately prior to becoming vacant qualified as a blighted improved area; or | Not Applicable |
| 3 | Area consists of unused quarry or quarries; or | Not Applicable |
| 4 | Area consists of unused rail yards, rail tracks or railroad right-of-way; <br> or | Not Applicable |
| 5 | Area prior to designation is subject to chronic flooding or contributes to downstream flooding; or | Not Applicable |
| 6 | Area consists of unused or illegal disposal site containing earth, stone, building debris or similar materials; or | Not Documented |
| 7 | Area is not less than 50 nor more than 100 acres and $75 \%$ is vacant; | Not Applicable |

Note: The Project Area qualifies per statutory requirements. Only one (1) above the above seven (7) situations is required by the Act

Although it may be concluded that the mere presence of the stated eligibility factors noted above may be sufficient to make a finding of qualification as a conservation area or a vacant blighted area, this evaluation was made on the basis that the factors must be present to an extent that would lead reasonable persons to conclude that public intervention is appropriate or necessary. From the data presented in this report it is clear that the eligibility factors are reasonably distributed throughout the Project Area.

Despite small incremental improvements scattered throughout the Project Area, there exist conditions that continue to threaten the public safety, health and welfare of the Project Area. While not an eligibility factor under the Act, crime statistics also provide evidence that these threatening conditions are present in the Project Area. Recent crime statistics (Chicago Tribune -2014, May 19. Retrieved from http://crime.chicagotribune.com/chicago/community/ for the month of April 2014, obtained from the City of Chicago Data Portal.) indicate the Washington Park Community Area currently ranks $7^{\text {th }}$ among Chicago's 77 community areas in violent crime reports; $2^{\text {nd }}$ for property crime reports; and $10^{\text {th }}$ for quality of life crime reports. Other crime data sources may differ, but all indicated that the Washington Park Community Area has a high rate of crime. Furthermore, the presence of factors indicated by the Act include deteriorated, obsolete structures; building vacancies; inadequate utilities; land use incompatibilities; deteriorated streets and sidewalks; declining or subpar EAV growth; and the predominance of underutilized, vacant and tax exempt or tax delinquent properties in the Project Area and may result in continued disinvestment that will not be overcome without action by the City. These conditions have been previously documented in this report. All properties within the Project Area will benefit from the TIF program.

The conclusions presented in this Eligibility Study are those of the Consultant. The local governing body should review this Eligibility Study and, if satisfied with the summary of findings contained herein, adopt a resolution making a finding of a conservation area for the improved portion of the Project Area and a finding of a blighted area for the vacant portion of the Project Area and making this Eligibility Study a part of the public record.

The analysis contained herein was based upon data assembled by Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises and PGAV PLANNERS. The study and survey of the Project Area indicate the requirements necessary for designation as a combination conservation and blighted area, are present. Therefore, the Project Area qualifies as a combination conservation area and a vacant blighted area to be designated as a redevelopment project area and eligible for Tax Increment Financing under the Act.

## PLAN APPENDIX, ATTACHMENT FOUR 2012 ESTIMATED EAV BY TAX PARCEL

| 20104000020000 | EXEMPT | 20153100220000 | 46,646 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20104000030000 | EXEMPT | 20153100230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151000010000 | 364,722 | 20153100240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151000020000 | 8,467 | 20153100250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151000050000 | 8,470 | 20153100260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151000060000 | EXEMPT | 20153100270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151000070000 | 42,662 | 20153100280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151000080000 | 16,937 | 20153100290000 | 33,067 |
| 20151000090000 | EXEMPT | 20153100301001 | 36,633 |
| 20151000100000 | EXEMPT | 20153100301002 | 43,024 |
| 20151000110000 | 780,024 | 20153100301003 | 46,102 |
| 20151000120000 | 13,551 | 20153100301004 | 50,057 |
| 20151000130000 | 64,453 | 20153100311001 | 111,163 |
| 20151000140000 | EXEMPT | 20153100311002 | 83,685 |
| 20151000150000 | 48,015 | 20153100311003 | 57,456 |
| 20151000170000 | EXEMPT | 20153100311004 | 53,292 |
| 20151000180000 | EXEMPT | 20153100311005 | 57,456 |
| 20151000190000 | 26,339 | 20153100311006 | 53,292 |
| 20151000200000 | 16,937 | 20153110010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151000240000 | 59,695 | 20153110020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010010000 | EXEMPT | 20153110030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010020000 | EXEMPT | 20153110040000 | 20,983 |
| 20151010030000 | 41,989 | 20153110050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010040000 | 119,238 | 20153110060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010050000 | 84,839 | 20153110070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010060000 | EXEMPT | 20153110080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010070000 | EXEMPT | 20153110090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010080000 | EXEMPT | 20153110100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010090000 | EXEMPT | 20153110110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010100000 | 27,102 | 20153110120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010110000 | 27,102 | 20153110130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010120000 | 13,551 | 20153110140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010130000 | 57,913 | 20153110150000 | 68,218 |
| 20151010140000 | 13,551 | 20153110160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151010150000 | 13,551 | 20153110170000 | 32,938 |
| 20151010170000 | 39,890 | 20153110180000 | 114,679 |
| 20151010201001 | 23,096 | 20153120010000 | 6,186 |
| 20151010201002 | 16,096 | 20153120020000 | 3,765 |
| 20151010201003 | 23,096 | 20153120030000 | 2,441 |
| 20151010201004 | 23,096 | 20153120040000 | 9,514 |
| 20151020010000 | EXEMPT | 20153120050000 | 3,838 |
| 20151020020000 | EXEMPT | 20153120070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020030000 | 5,081 | 20153120080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020040000 | 5,081 | 20153120090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020060000 | 78,402 | 20153120100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020070000 | 25,991 | 20153120110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020080000 | 9,876 | 20153120120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020090000 | EXEMPT | 20153120130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020100000 | 16,117 | 20153120140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020120000 | 50,274 | 20153120150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020130000 | 458,101 | 20153120160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020140000 | 136,874 | 20153120170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020150000 | 92,285 | 20153120180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020160000 | EXEMPT | 20153120190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020170000 | 29,049 | 20153120200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020201001 | 32,222 | 20153120210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020201002 | 26,165 | 20153120220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020201003 | 26,165 | 20153120230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020211001 | 30,811 | 20153120240000 | 14,766 |
| 20151020211002 | 37,811 | 20153120250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020211003 | 30,811 | 20153120260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151020211004 | 30,811 | 20153120300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050010000 | EXEMPT | 20153120310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050020000 | EXEMPT | 20153120320000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050030000 | EXEMPT | 20153120330000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050040000 | 58,267 | 20153120340000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050050000 | 23,261 | 20153120350000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050060000 | EXEMPT | 20153120360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050070000 | EXEMPT | 20153120370000 | 71,790 |


| 20151050080000 | 52,305 | 20153120380000 | 92,837 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151050090000 | EXEMPT | 20153120390000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050100000 | EXEMPT | 20153120410000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050110000 | EXEMPT | 20153120420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151050120000 | EXEMPT | 20153120430000 | 160,149 |
| 20151050130000 | 14,603 | 20153120440000 | 23,682 |
| 20151050140000 | 271,694 | 20153120450000 | 889 |
| 20151050150000 | EXEMPT | 20153120460000 | 1,852 |
| 20151050160000 | EXEMPT | 20153120470000 | 143,492 |
| 20151050170000 | 19,883 | 20153120480000 | 5,227 |
| 20151050180000 | EXEMPT | 20153120490000 | 668 |
| 20151060010000 | 72,281 | 20153130010000 | 35,384 |
| 20151060280000 | 223,472 | 20153130020000 | 19,375 |
| 20151060050000 | 23,517 | 20153130030000 | 27,256 |
| 20151060060000 | 147,199 | 20153130040000 | 27,254 |
| 20151060070000 | 151,438 | 20153130050000 | 27,254 |
| 20151060080000 | 96,939 | 20153130060000 | 4,660 |
| 20151060090000 | 75,039 | 20153130070000 | 50,666 |
| 20151060290000 | 217,936 | 20153130080000 | 71,734 |
| 20151060150000 | EXEMPT | 20153130090000 | 32,806 |
| 20151060160000 | 12,726 | 20153130100000 | 30,373 |
| 20151060170000 | 63,084 | 20153130110000 | 35,780 |
| 20151060180000 | EXEMPT | 20153130140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060190000 | 14,847 | 20153130150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060200000 | EXEMPT | 20153130160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060210000 | EXEMPT | 20153130170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060220000 | 70,620 | 20153130180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060230000 | EXEMPT | 20153130190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060240000 | 8,560 | 20153130200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060250000 | EXEMPT | 20153130210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060260000 | 13,573 | 20153130220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151060270000 | EXEMPT | 20153130230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070010000 | EXEMPT | 20153130240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070020000 | 8,678 | 20153130250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070030000 | 8,678 | 20153130260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070040000 | 8,678 | 20153130270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070050000 | 29,700 | 20153130280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070060000 | 17,358 | 20153130290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070070000 | EXEMPT | 20153130300000 | 1,383 |
| 20151070170000 | EXEMPT | 20153130320000 | 39,040 |
| 20151070180000 | EXEMPT | 20153130330000 | 7,544 |
| 20151070190000 | 301,829 | 20153130340000 | 7,502 |
| 20151070200000 | 29,761 | 20153130350000 | 7,502 |
| 20151070210000 | 49,609 | 20153130360000 | 7,497 |
| 20151070310000 | 16,937 | 20153130370000 | 4,497 |
| 20151070320000 | 33,538 | 20153130380000 | 7,196 |
| 20151070330000 | 8,131 | 20153130390000 | 28,903 |
| 20151070340000 | 8,467 | 20153130400000 | 30,455 |
| 20151070350000 | 8,467 | 20153130410000 | 19,460 |
| 20151070360000 | 8,467 | 20153130420000 | 34,440 |
| 20151070370000 | 8,521 | 20153130430000 | 10,100 |
| 20151070380000 | 8,417 | 20153130440000 | 19,460 |
| 20151070390000 | 13,568 | 20153130450000 | 18,315 |
| 20151070400000 | 45,771 | 20153130460000 | 3,654 |
| 20151070410000 | EXEMPT | 20153130470000 | 178,215 |
| 20151070420000 | 24,032 | 20153130480000 | 17,706 |
| 20151070430000 | 57,686 | 20153130490000 | 48,004 |
| 20151070440000 | 34,214 | 20153130500000 | 59,184 |
| 20151070450000 | 45,768 | 20153130510000 | 55,559 |
| 20151070460000 | 39,831 | 20153130520000 | 68,316 |
| 20151070470000 | 13,551 | 20153130540000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070480000 | 0 | 20153130570000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151070490000 | EXEMPT | 20153130580000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080010000 | EXEMPT | 20153130590000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080020000 | 51,424 | 20153130600000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080030000 | 37,359 | 20153130610000 | 56,538 |
| 20151080040000 | 52,855 | 20153130620000 | 144,988 |
| 20151080050000 | 32,363 | 20153130630000 | 12,499 |
| 20151080060000 | 44,570 | 20153130660000 | 30,632 |


| 20151080070000 | 0 | 20153130670000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151080080000 | 45,330 | 20153130680000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080090000 | 17,213 | 20153130690000 | 31,827 |
| 20151080100000 | 55,486 | 20153130700000 | 5,886 |
| 20151080110000 | 49,794 | 20153130710000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080120000 | 44,023 | 20153140010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080130000 | 13,551 | 20153140020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080150000 | 54,415 | 20153140030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080160000 | 13,551 | 20153140040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080170000 | 26,270 | 20153140050000 | 52,815 |
| 20151080180000 | 45,406 | 20153140060000 | 41,702 |
| 20151080200000 | 2,663 | 20153140070000 | 335 |
| 20151080240000 | 78,966 | 20153140080000 | 80,714 |
| 20151080250000 | 211,767 | 20153140090000 | 17,035 |
| 20151080260000 | 83,579 | 20153140100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080270000 | 76,012 | 20153140110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080280000 | 79,763 | 20153140120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080290000 | EXEMPT | 20153140130000 | 79,752 |
| 20151080300000 | EXEMPT | 20153140140000 | 81,295 |
| 20151080310000 | 46,298 | 20153140150000 | 78,647 |
| 20151080320000 | 187,075 | 20153140160000 | 144,244 |
| 20151080340000 | 54,802 | 20153140170000 | 26,995 |
| 20151080350000 | 45,992 | 20153140180000 | 43,004 |
| 20151080360000 | 13,551 | 20153140280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080370000 | 27,102 | 20153140290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080380000 | 80,075 | 20153140300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080390000 | 89,386 | 20153140310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080401001 | 43,361 | 20153140320000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080401002 | 23,696 | 20153140330000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151080430000 | 18,927 | 20153140340000 | 78,933 |
| 20151080421001 | 20,792 | 20153140370000 | 34,318 |
| 20151080421002 | 20,141 | 20153140380000 | 56,106 |
| 20151080421003 | 20,529 | 20153140390000 | 26,034 |
| 20151090010000 | 121,342 | 20153140400000 | 18,663 |
| 20151090020000 | 121,342 | 20153140410000 | 22,215 |
| 20151090030000 | 84,454 | 20153140420000 | 51,598 |
| 20151090040000 | 73,972 | 20153140430000 | 72,668 |
| 20151090050000 | EXEMPT | 20153140440000 | 68,067 |
| 20151090060000 | EXEMPT | 20153140450000 | 41,946 |
| 20151090140000 | EXEMPT | 20153140460000 | 59,184 |
| 20151090150000 | EXEMPT | 20153140470000 | 27,075 |
| 20151090160000 | 68,642 | 20153140480000 | 17,117 |
| 20151090170000 | 53,612 | 20153140490000 | 47,154 |
| 20151090180000 | 40,193 | 20153140500000 | 47,151 |
| 20151090190000 | 4,814 | 20153140510000 | 41,621 |
| 20151090200000 | 0 | 20153140520000 | 36,953 |
| 20151090210000 | 45 | 20153140530000 | 47,939 |
| 20151090220000 | 11,382 | 20153140540000 | 47,047 |
| 20151090230000 | 45,605 | 20153140560000 | 34,447 |
| 20151090240000 | 38,571 | 20153140570000 | 41,548 |
| 20151090380000 | EXEMPT | 20153140580000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090390000 | 27,102 | 20153140610000 | 0 |
| 20151090400000 | 13,551 | 20153140620000 | 9,886 |
| 20151090410000 | 13,551 | 20153140630000 | 26,886 |
| 20151090420000 | 94,268 | 20153140640000 | 19,920 |
| 20151090430000 | 49,987 | 20153140660000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090440000 | 58,631 | 20153140670000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090450000 | 58,631 | 20153140680000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090460000 | 58,631 | 20153140690000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090470000 | 18,695 | 20153140720000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090480000 | 54,760 | 20153140730000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090490000 | EXEMPT | 20153140740000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090500000 | 23,306 | 20153140750000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090510000 | EXEMPT | 20153140760000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151090520000 | EXEMPT | 20153140770000 | 484,056 |
| 20151090530000 | EXEMPT | 20153140780000 | 483,057 |
| 20151090540000 | 68,314 | 20153140790000 | 483,057 |
| 20151090550000 | 31,128 | 20153140800000 | 484,095 |
| 20151100010000 | 26,886 | 20153140810000 | 504,284 |


| 20151100020000 | 25,632 | 20153140830000 | 56,539 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151100030000 | 21,032 | 20153150010000 | 187,209 |
| 20151100040000 | 52,507 | 20153150020000 | 172,707 |
| 20151100050000 | 2,257 | 20153150030000 | 80,756 |
| 20151100060000 | 17,708 | 20153150040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100080000 | EXEMPT | 20153150050000 | 206,955 |
| 20151100090000 | 9,924 | 20153150060000 | 3,232 |
| 20151100100000 | EXEMPT | 20153150070000 | 19,203 |
| 20151100110000 | EXEMPT | 20153150080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100120000 | EXEMPT | 20153150090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100130000 | 86,090 | 20153150160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100140000 | 168,950 | 20153150200000 | 47,802 |
| 20151100150000 | 26,937 | 20153150210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100160000 | 76,444 | 20153150350000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100190000 | 10,605 | 20153150360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100210000 | 64,116 | 20153150370000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100240000 | 344,017 | 20153150380000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100250000 | EXEMPT | 20153150390000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100260000 | EXEMPT | 20153150400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100271001 | 8,582 | 20153150420000 | 27,284 |
| 20151100271002 | 15,265 | 20153150590000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100271003 | 28,137 | 20153150700000 | 26,894 |
| 20151100271004 | 26,827 | 20153150750000 | 26,861 |
| 20151100271005 | 14,811 | 20153150760000 | 17,846 |
| 20151100271006 | 21,137 | 20153150770000 | 27,038 |
| 20151100281001 | 15,206 | 20153150790000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100281002 | 16,115 | 20153150800000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100281003 | 22,694 | 20153150810000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100281004 | 22,142 | 20153150830000 | 315,624 |
| 20151100281005 | 18,211 | 20153150840000 | 192,877 |
| 20151100281006 | 23,211 | 20153150860000 | 232,216 |
| 20151100281007 | 24,830 | 20153150880000 | 67,054 |
| 20151100281008 | 24,830 | 20153160010000 | 41,189 |
| 20151100281009 | 884 | 20153160020000 | 15,363 |
| 20151100281010 | 884 | 20153160030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100281011 | 884 | 20153160040000 | 154,546 |
| 20151100281012 | 884 | 20153160060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100281013 | 884 | 20153160070000 | 26,934 |
| 20151100281014 | 884 | 20153160080000 | 289,100 |
| 20151100281015 | 884 | 20153160120000 | 98,143 |
| 20151100281016 | 884 | 20153160130000 | 58,954 |
| 20151100281017 | 884 | 20153160140000 | 13,467 |
| 20151100281018 | 884 | 20153160150000 | 13,467 |
| 20151100281019 | 884 | 20153160160000 | 26,934 |
| 20151100281020 | 884 | 20153160170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291001 | 46,396 | 20153160180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291002 | 25,410 | 20153160190000 | 13,467 |
| 20151100291003 | 34,057 | 20153160200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291004 | 38,268 | 20153160210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291005 | 20,410 | 20153160220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291006 | 34,057 | 20153160230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291007 | 2,466 | 20153160240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291008 | 2,466 | 20153160250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291009 | 2,466 | 20153160270000 | 166,796 |
| 20151100291010 | 1,007 | 20153160280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100291011 | 1,007 | 20153160290000 | 38,106 |
| 20151100291012 | 1,007 | 20153160300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100301001 | 22,100 | 20153160320000 | 20,195 |
| 20151100301002 | 22,100 | 20153170010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100301003 | 17,697 | 20153170020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100301004 | 29,697 | 20153170200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100301005 | 24,215 | 20153170210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100301006 | 31,215 | 20153170300000 | 456,033 |
| 20151100301007 | 32,736 | 20153170310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100301008 | 32,736 | 20153170320000 | 21,757 |
| 20151100301009 | 3,793 | 20153170330000 | 492,301 |
| 20151100301010 | 3,793 | 20153170340000 | 464,324 |
| 20151100301011 | 3,793 | 20153170350000 | 45 |
| 20151100301012 | 3,793 | 20153170360000 | 62,108 |


| 20151100301013 | 3,793 | 20153170370000 | 69,890 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151100301014 | 3,793 | 20153170380000 | 85,568 |
| 20151100301015 | 3,793 | 20153170390000 | 135 |
| 20151100301016 | 3,793 | 20153170400000 | 455,427 |
| 20151100311001 | 28,940 | 20153170410000 | 68,443 |
| 20151100311002 | 35,381 | 20153170430000 | 63,348 |
| 20151100311003 | 35,381 | 20153170450000 | 616,567 |
| 20151100311004 | 35,381 | 20153170470000 | 193,146 |
| 20151100311005 | 39,612 | 20153170500000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100311006 | 37,777 | 20153170510000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100311007 | 37,777 | 20153170520000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100311008 | 28,940 | 20153170530000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100311009 | 34,753 | 20153170560000 | 113,276 |
| 20151100311010 | 34,753 | 20153170570000 | 395,960 |
| 20151100311011 | 36,989 | 20154000010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100321001 | 44,093 | 20155000020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100321002 | 29,366 | 20155000030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151100321003 | 31,386 | 20155000040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110010000 | EXEMPT | 20155000050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110020000 | EXEMPT | 20155000060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110030000 | 163,844 | 20155000070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110040000 | EXEMPT | 20155000080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110050000 | 85,175 | 20155000090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110060000 | EXEMPT | 20155000100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110070000 | EXEMPT | 20155000110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110080000 | EXEMPT | 20155000120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110090000 | 13,551 | 20155000130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110100000 | 27,102 | 20155000140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110110000 | 16,202 | 20155000160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110120000 | EXEMPT | 20155000170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110130000 | 68,650 | 20155000180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110140000 | 82,656 | 20155000190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110150000 | EXEMPT | 20155000200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110160000 | EXEMPT | 20155000210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110170000 | 22,557 | 20155000220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110180000 | 22,557 | 20155000240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110190000 | EXEMPT | 20155000250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110200000 | 83,340 | 20155000260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110220000 | EXEMPT | 20155000270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110230000 | 37,710 | 20155000300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151110240000 | 69,402 | 20155000310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120010000 | EXEMPT | 20155000330000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120020000 | 58,873 | 20162040010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120281001 | 19,931 | 20162040020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120281002 | 22,779 | 20162040030000 | 34,627 |
| 20151120281003 | 31,198 | 20162040040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120281004 | 25,646 | 20162040050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120281005 | 26,931 | 20162040060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120281006 | 29,779 | 20162040070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120281007 | 30,957 | 20162040080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120281008 | 25,646 | 20162040090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120050000 | 59,075 | 20162040100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120060000 | 13,551 | 20162040110000 | 3,527 |
| 20151120070000 | 27,102 | 20162040120000 | 9,797 |
| 20151120080000 | EXEMPT | 20162040130000 | 7,168 |
| 20151120090000 | 27,102 | 20162040140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120100000 | 83,910 | 20162040150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120110000 | 30,693 | 20162040160000 | 7,348 |
| 20151120120000 | 64,346 | 20162040170000 | 4,899 |
| 20151120130000 | EXEMPT | 20162040200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120140000 | EXEMPT | 20162040210000 | 67,292 |
| 20151120150000 | 237,920 | 20162040220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120160000 | 89,288 | 20162040230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120170000 | 159,857 | 20162040240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120180000 | 43,442 | 20162040250000 | 4,899 |
| 20151120190000 | 104,890 | 20162040260000 | 16,654 |
| 20151120200000 | 77,673 | 20162040270000 | 8,433 |
| 20151120210000 | 107,449 | 20162040280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120220000 | 131,695 | 20162040290000 | EXEMPT |


| 20151120240000 | 83,570 | 20162040300000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151120250000 | EXEMPT | 20162040310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120260000 | 105,044 | 20162040320000 | 7,696 |
| 20151120271001 | 13,705 | 20162040330000 | 8,484 |
| 20151120271002 | 25,882 | 20162040340000 | 31,176 |
| 20151120271003 | 20,458 | 20162040350000 | 29,501 |
| 20151120271004 | 25,576 | 20162040380000 | 4,899 |
| 20151120271005 | 20,458 | 20162040390000 | 17,437 |
| 20151120271006 | 25,576 | 20162040400000 | 4,899 |
| 20151120291001 | 22,989 | 20162040410000 | 23,968 |
| 20151120291002 | 24,134 | 20162040420000 | 0 |
| 20151120291003 | 23,943 | 20162040430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151120291004 | 24,325 | 20162040440000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130010000 | 165,884 | 20162040450000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130020000 | 5,903 | 20162040460000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130030000 | EXEMPT | 20162040470000 | 10,148 |
| 20151130040000 | EXEMPT | 20162040480000 | 30,371 |
| 20151130050000 | EXEMPT | 20162040490000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130060000 | 8,467 | 20162040500000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130070000 | 8,467 | 20162040510000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130080000 | 8,467 | 20162040520000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130090000 | EXEMPT | 20162040530000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130100000 | 33,552 | 20162040540000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130110000 | EXEMPT | 20162040550000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130120000 | EXEMPT | 20162040560000 | 6,986 |
| 20151130130000 | 966 | 20162040570000 | 4,750 |
| 20151130150000 | 8,386 | 20162040580000 | 4,652 |
| 20151130160000 | EXEMPT | 20162040590000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130170000 | 25,169 | 20162040600000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130180000 | EXEMPT | 20162040630000 | 10,369 |
| 20151130200000 | 47,575 | 20162040640000 | 11,847 |
| 20151130210000 | EXEMPT | 20162040650000 | 2,418 |
| 20151130220000 | 45,117 | 20162040660000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130230000 | 13,467 | 20162040670000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130240000 | EXEMPT | 20162040680000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130250000 | 55,972 | 20162040690000 | 29,880 |
| 20151130260000 | 72,735 | 20162040700000 | 38,658 |
| 20151130270000 | EXEMPT | 20162050010000 | 23,267 |
| 20151130280000 | EXEMPT | 20162050020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130290000 | EXEMPT | 20162050030000 | 34,759 |
| 20151130300000 | 32,124 | 20162050040000 | 29,509 |
| 20151130320000 | 40,903 | 20162050050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130330000 | 16,226 | 20162050060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130340000 | 0 | 20162050070000 | 41,335 |
| 20151130350000 | EXEMPT | 20162050080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130360000 | 45,841 | 20162050090000 | 21,738 |
| 20151130380000 | 187,599 | 20162050100000 | 31,280 |
| 20151130390000 | 13,467 | 20162050110000 | 4,899 |
| 20151130400000 | 35,766 | 20162050120000 | 8,248 |
| 20151130410000 | EXEMPT | 20162050130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130420000 | EXEMPT | 20162050140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130430000 | EXEMPT | 20162050150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130440000 | 3,919 | 20162050160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130450000 | 33,389 | 20162050170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130460000 | 36,243 | 20162050180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151130481001 | 30,138 | 20162050190000 | 26,836 |
| 20151130481002 | 31,024 | 20162050200000 | 24,740 |
| 20151130481003 | 27,478 | 20162050210000 | 27,840 |
| 20151140050000 | EXEMPT | 20162050220000 | 3,201 |
| 20151140060000 | EXEMPT | 20162050230000 | 3,201 |
| 20151140070000 | EXEMPT | 20162050240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151140080000 | 42,895 | 20162050250000 | 4,483 |
| 20151140120000 | EXEMPT | 20162050260000 | 20,052 |
| 20151140130000 | EXEMPT | 20162050270000 | 0 |
| 20151140140000 | 189,398 | 20162050280000 | 33,889 |
| 20151140150000 | 85,978 | 20162050290000 | 0 |
| 20151140160000 | 86,923 | 20162050300000 | 3,201 |
| 20151140180000 | 125,915 | 20162050310000 | 3,201 |
| 20151140190000 | 65,991 | 20162050320000 | 3,201 |


| 20151140200000 | EXEMPT | 20162050330000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151140210000 | EXEMPT | 20162050340000 | 13,750 |
| 20151140220000 | 54,022 | 20162050350000 | 8,234 |
| 20151140231001 | 7,440 | 20162050360000 | 15,551 |
| 20151140231002 | 8,044 | 20162050370000 | 3,201 |
| 20151140231003 | 8,010 | 20162050380000 | 53,559 |
| 20151140231004 | 8,131 | 20162050390000 | 3,201 |
| 20151140231005 | 8,010 | 20162050400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151140231006 | 8,131 | 20162050410000 | 3,201 |
| 20151150010000 | 149,962 | 20162050420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150020000 | EXEMPT | 20162050430000 | 3,072 |
| 20151150030000 | 27,270 | 20162050440000 | 54,546 |
| 20151150040000 | 69,520 | 20162050450000 | 3,818 |
| 20151150050000 | 45,150 | 20162050460000 | 3,684 |
| 20151150060000 | 48,122 | 20162050470000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150080000 | 64,007 | 20162050480000 | 3,818 |
| 20151150090000 | 53,217 | 20162050490000 | 3,818 |
| 20151150120000 | 122,549 | 20162050550000 | 7,306 |
| 20151150130000 | EXEMPT | 20162050560000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150140000 | 70,900 | 20162050570000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150150000 | 16,160 | 20162050580000 | 3,134 |
| 20151150170000 | 33,115 | 20162060010000 | 5,796 |
| 20151150180000 | 34,023 | 20162060020000 | 3,858 |
| 20151150190000 | 44,278 | 20162060030000 | 3,858 |
| 20151150200000 | 78,492 | 20162060040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150210000 | 48,301 | 20162060050000 | 22,187 |
| 20151150220000 | 31,846 | 20162060060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150230000 | 33,900 | 20162060070000 | 3,858 |
| 20151150240000 | 40,824 | 20162060080000 | 37,522 |
| 20151150250000 | 36,546 | 20162060090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150270000 | 78,021 | 20162060100000 | 22,411 |
| 20151150280000 | 72,258 | 20162060110000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150300000 | EXEMPT | 20162060120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150310000 | 14,309 | 20162060130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150320000 | 13,635 | 20162060140000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150330000 | 12,704 | 20162060150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150340000 | 73,170 | 20162060160000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150351001 | 53,792 | 20162060170000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150351002 | 37,328 | 20162060180000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150351003 | 43,251 | 20162060190000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150351004 | 51,500 | 20162060200000 | 5,917 |
| 20151150351005 | 42,328 | 20162060210000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150351006 | 50,251 | 20162060220000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150420000 | 69,615 | 20162060230000 | 6,222 |
| 20151150371001 | 15,150 | 20162060240000 | 10,560 |
| 20151150371002 | 25,769 | 20162060250000 | 17,566 |
| 20151150371003 | 26,706 | 20162060260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150381001 | 48,862 | 20162060270000 | 16,301 |
| 20151150381002 | 30,101 | 20162060280000 | 3,628 |
| 20151150381003 | 36,032 | 20162060290000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150381004 | 48,862 | 20162060300000 | 3.779 |
| 20151150381005 | 35,101 | 20162060310000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150381006 | 43,032 | 20162060320000 | 3,779 |
| 20151150391001 | 18,943 | 20162060330000 | 0 |
| 20151150391002 | 18,943 | 20162060340000 | 28,536 |
| 20151150391003 | 18,943 | 20162060350000 | 30,068 |
| 20151150391004 | 17,636 | 20162060360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150391005 | 17,633 | 20162060370000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151150391006 | 17,633 | 20162060380000 | 3,818 |
| 20151150410000 | 122,939 | 20162060390000 | 3,818 |
| 20151160010000 | EXEMPT | 20162060400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160020000 | EXEMP ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 20162060410000 | 3,664 |
| 20151160030000 | 155,363 | 20162060420000 | 3,818 |
| 20151160040000 | EXEMPT | 20162060430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160050000 | 88,851 | 20162060440000 | 3,818 |
| 20151160060000 | 122,139 | 20162060450000 | 2,963 |
| 20151160070000 | 34,102 | 20162060460000 | 3,818 |
| 20151160080000 | EXEMPT | 20162060470000 | 3,818 |
| 20151160090000 | 61,339 | 20162060480000 | 3,818 |


| 20151160100000 | 49,359 | 20162060490000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151160130000 | 47,990 | 20162060500000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160140000 | EXEMPT | 20162060510000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160160000 | 78,734 | 20162060520000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160170000 | EXEMPT | 20162060530000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160180000 | 30,811 | 20162060540000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160190000 | 446 | 20162060550000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160200000 | 30,912 | 20162060560000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160210000 | EXEMPT | 20162060570000 | 3,779 |
| 20151160220000 | EXEMPT | 20162060580000 | 3,779 |
| 20151160230000 | EXEMPT | 20162060590000 | 29,619 |
| 20151160240000 | 101,187 | 20162060600000 | 23,668 |
| 20151160250000 | 12,934 | 20162060610000 | 30,418 |
| 20151160261001 | 22,737 | 20162060620000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151160261002 | 27,068 | 20162060630000 | 29,184 |
| 20151160261003 | 29,237 | 20162060640000 | 17,409 |
| 20151160261004 | 29,237 | 20162060650000 | 17,543 |
| 20151170010000 | EXEMPT | 20162060660000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170020000 | 46,057 | 20162060670000 | 28,878 |
| 20151170030000 | 127,658 | 20162060680000 | 3,628 |
| 20151170060000 | EXEMPT | 20162060690000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170070000 | EXEMPT | 20162060700000 | 62,896 |
| 20151170090000 | EXEMPT | 20162060710000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170100000 | EXEMPT | 20162060720000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170110000 | EXEMPT | 20162060730000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170120000 | 61,967 | 20162060740000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170130000 | 12,098 | 20162060750000 | 62,896 |
| 20151170180000 | EXEMPT | 20162060760000 | 3,647 |
| 20151170190000 | EXEMPT | 20162060770000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170200000 | 22,725 | 20162060780000 | 33,370 |
| 20151170210000 | 131,656 | 20162060790000 | 0 |
| 20151170220000 | EXEMPT | 20162060800000 | 5,594 |
| 20151170250000 | 84,541 | 20162060810000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170260000 | 67,966 | 20162060820000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170270000 | EXEMPT | 20162060830000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170280000 | 35,222 | 20162060840000 | 44,578 |
| 20151170290000 | 33,339 | 20162060850000 | 3,818 |
| 20151170300000 | 32,764 | 20162060860000 | 3,818 |
| 20151170310000 | 34,641 | 20162060870000 | 3,818 |
| 20151170330000 | 5,785 | 20162070010000 | 7,174 |
| 20151170340000 | 8,038 | 20162070020000 | 10,762 |
| 20151170360000 | 11,907 | 20162070030000 | 12,561 |
| 20151170370000 | 4,371 | 20162070040000 | 6,141 |
| 20151170381001 | 37,371 | 20162070050000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170381002 | 6,963 | 20162070060000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170381003 | 6,963 | 20162070070000 | 29,731 |
| 20151170381004 | 6,863 | 20162070080000 | 4,495 |
| 20151170391001 | 64,591 | 20162070090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170391002 | 64,591 | 20162070100000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170391003 | 64,591 | 20162070110000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170391004 | 64,591 | 20162070120000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170391005 | 64,591 | 20162070130000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170391006 | 64,591 | 20162070140000 | 3,779 |
| 20151170391007 | 64,591 | 20162070150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170391008 | 64,591 | 20162070160000 | 17,541 |
| 20151170430000 | 109,230 | 20162070170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151170420000 | 248,470 | 20162070180000 | 10,815 |
| 20151180010000 | 184,308 | 20162070190000 | 1,832 |
| 20151180020000 | 18,079 | 20162070200000 | 6,891 |
| 20151180040000 | 39,772 | 20162070210000 | 19,213 |
| 20151180050000 | EXEMPT | 20162070220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180060000 | EXEMPT | 20162070230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180070000 | 77,757 | 20162070240000 | 22,049 |
| 20151180130000 | EXEMPT | 20162070250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180140000 | 24,746 | 20162070260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180160000 | 91,398 | 20162070270000 | 0 |
| 20151180190000 | 38,922 | 20162070280000 | 21,014 |
| 20151180221001 | 24,193 | 20162070290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221002 | 21,008 | 20162070300000 | EXEMPT |


| 20151180221003 | 21,224 | 20162070310000 | 3,684 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151180221004 | 21,553 | 20162070320000 | 29,226 |
| 20151180221005 | 27,136 | 20162070330000 | 27,029 |
| 20151180221006 | 31,602 | 20162070340000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221007 | 22,969 | 20162070350000 | 3,818 |
| 20151180221008 | 23,188 | 20162070360000 | 29,751 |
| 20151180221009 | 14,359 | 20162070370000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221010 | 27,136 | 20162070380000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221011 | 23,758 | 20162070390000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221012 | 19,701 | 20162070400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221013 | 18,500 | 20162070410000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221014 | 18,610 | 20162070420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221015 | 15,013 | 20162070430000 | 81,399 |
| 20151180221016 | 15,666 | 20162070440000 | 38,785 |
| 20151180221017 | 23,211 | 20162070450000 | 6,862 |
| 20151180221018 | 17,193 | 20162070460000 | 80,487 |
| 20151180221019 | 16,211 | 20162070470000 | 30,657 |
| 20151180221020 | 23,758 | 20162070480000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221021 | 17,083 | 20162070490000 | 25,054 |
| 20151180221022 | 22,751 | 20162070500000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221023 | 16,758 | 20162070510000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221024 | 10,013 | 20162070520000 | 3,628 |
| 20151180221025 | 22,557 | 20162070530000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221026 | 16,101 | 20162070540000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221027 | 25,393 | 20162070550000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221028 | 18,719 | 20162070560000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221029 | 25,938 | 20162070570000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221030 | 15,557 | 20162070580000 | 77,437 |
| 20151180221031 | 23,101 | 20162070590000 | 44,194 |
| 20151180221032 | 16,758 | 20162070600000 | 81,301 |
| 20151180221033 | 19,263 | 20162070610000 | 14,477 |
| 20151180221034 | 30,076 | 20162070620000 | 28,379 |
| 20151180221035 | 23,407 | 20162070630000 | 29,251 |
| 20151180221036 | 29,644 | 20162070640000 | 14,749 |
| 20151180221037 | 17,630 | 20162070650000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221038 | 26,157 | 20162070660000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221039 | 21,443 | 20162070670000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221040 | 21,987 | 20162070680000 | 2,778 |
| 20151180221041 | 1,523 | 20162070690000 | 24,440 |
| 20151180221042 | 1,523 | 20162070700000 | 2,778 |
| 20151180221043 | 1,523 | 20162070710000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221044 | 1,523 | 20162070720000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221045 | 1,523 | 20162070730000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221046 | 1,523 | 20162070740000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221047 | 1,523 | 20162070760000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221048 | 1,523 | 20162070770000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221049 | 1,523 | 20162070780000 | 19,566 |
| 20151180221050 | 1,523 | 20162120010000 | 12,572 |
| 20151180221051 | 1,523 | 20162120020000 | 45,277 |
| 20151180221052 | 1,523 | 20162120030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221053 | 1,523 | 20162120040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221054 | 1,523 | 20162120050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221055 | 1,523 | 20162120060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221056 | 1,523 | 20162120070000 | 35,811 |
| 20151180221057 | 1,523 | 20162120080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221058 | 1,523 | 20162120090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221059 | 1,523 | 20162120100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221060 | 1,523 | 20162120110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221061 | 1,523 | 20162120120000 | 31,117 |
| 20151180221062 | 1,523 | 20162120130000 | 5,210 |
| 20151180221063 | 1,523 | 20162120140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221064 | 1,523 | 20162120150000 | 28,151 |
| 20151180221065 | 1,523 | 20162120160000 | 19,381 |
| 20151180221066 | 1,523 | 20162120170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221067 | 1,523 | 20162120190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221068 | 1,523 | 20162120200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221069 | 1,523 | 20162120210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221070 | 1,523 | 20162120220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180221071 | 1,523 | 20162120231001 | 6,077 |


| 20151180221072 | 1,523 | 20162120231002 | 6,077 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151180221073 | 1.523 | 20162120231003 | 6,259 |
| 20151180221074 | 1,523 | 20162130010000 | 4,677 |
| 20151180221075 | 1,523 | 20162130020000 | 31,672 |
| 20151180221076 | 1,523 | 20162130030000 | 25,775 |
| 20151180221077 | 1,523 | 20162130040000 | 4,677 |
| 20151180230000 | 25,393 | 20162130050000 | 29,739 |
| 20151180241001 | 28,508 | 20162130060000 | 27,341 |
| 20151180241002 | 27,961 | 20162130070000 | 4,938 |
| 20151180241003 | 35,362 | 20162130080000 | 4,938 |
| 20151180241004 | 28,362 | 20162130090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180241005 | 36,187 | 20162130100000 | 14,626 |
| 20151180241006 | 36,187 | 20162130110000 | 21,078 |
| 20151180241007 | 30,284 | 20162130120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180241008 | 30,284 | 20162130130000 | RAILROAD |
| 20151180251001 | 14,937 | 20162130140000 | 13,520 |
| 20151180251002 | 20,015 | 20162130150000 | RAILROAD |
| 20151180251003 | 20,040 | 20162130160000 | 13,910 |
| 20151180251004 | 27,119 | 20162130170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251005 | 21,059 | 20162140270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251006 | 21,137 | 20162140288001 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251007 | 21,059 | 20162140288002 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251008 | 21,137 | 20162140298001 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251009 | 4,074 | 20162140298002 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251010 | 4,074 | 20162150010000 | 3,765 |
| 20151180251011 | 4,074 | 20162150020000 | 28,418 |
| 20151180251012 | 4,074 | 20162150030000 | 3,765 |
| 20151180251013 | 4,074 | 20162150040000 | 3,765 |
| 20151180251014 | 4,074 | 20162150050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251015 | 4,074 | 20162150060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251016 | 4,074 | 20162150070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251017 | 4,074 | 20162150080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180251018 | 4,074 | 20162150090000 | 7,546 |
| 20151180261001 | 24,600 | 20162150100000 | 3,818 |
| 20151180261002 | 13,677 | 20162150110000 | 21,628 |
| 20151180261003 | 7,598 | 20162150120000 | 4,124 |
| 20151180261004 | 13,677 | 20162150130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180261005 | 14,598 | 20162150140000 | 5,648 |
| 20151180261006 | 13,677 | 20162150150000 | 5,648 |
| 20151180261007 | 14,598 | 20162150160000 | 5,648 |
| 20151180261008 | 24,600 | 20162150170000 | 11,295 |
| 20151180261009 | 13,655 | 20162150180000 | 11,455 |
| 20151180261010 | 14,598 | 20162150190000 | 5,726 |
| 20151180261011 | 13,677 | 20162150200000 | 5,726 |
| 20151180261012 | 7,598 | 20162150210000 | 3,818 |
| 20151180261013 | 13,677 | 20162150220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180261014 | 14,598 | 20162150230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271001 | 50,380 | 20162180010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271002 | 50,380 | 20162180020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271003 | 18,189 | 20162180030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271004 | 25,189 | 20162180040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271005 | 25,189 | 20162180050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271006 | 25,189 | 20162180060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271007 | 2,340 | 20162180070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271008 | 2,340 | 20162180080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271009 | 2,340 | 20162180090000 | 54,451 |
| 20151180271010 | 2,340 | 20162180100000 | 14,814 |
| 20151180271011 | 2,340 | 20162180110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271012 | 2,340 | 20162180120000 | 44,314 |
| 20151180271013 | 2,340 | 20162180130000 | 11,184 |
| 20151180271014 | 2,340 | 20162180140000 | 15,237 |
| 20151180271015 | 2,340 | 20162180150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271016 | 2,340 | 20162180160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271017 | 2,340 | 20162180170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271018 | 2,340 | 20162180180000 | 7,407 |
| 20151180271019 | 2,340 | 20162180190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180271020 | 2,340 | 20162180200000 | 22,459 |
| 20151180281001 | 44,786 | 20162180210000 | 21,898 |
| 20151180281002 | 37,786 | 20162180220000 | 85,001 |


| 20151180281003 | 37,786 |  | 20162180270000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151180281004 | 37,786 |  | 20162180280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281005 | 30,093 |  | 20162180290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281006 | 44,786 |  | 20162180300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281007 | 44,786 |  | 20162180310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281008 | 44,786 |  | 20162180320000 | 21,092 |
| 20151180281009 | 37,786 |  | 20162180330000 | 5,207 |
| 20151180281010 | 37,786 |  | 20162180340000 | 20,761 |
| 20151180281011 | 37,786 |  | 20162180350000 | 10,880 |
| 20151180281012 | 37,786 |  | 20162180360000 | 23,127 |
| 20151180281013 | 20,052 |  | 20162180370000 | 23,042 |
| 20151180281014 | 37,786 |  | 20162180380000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281015 | 35,828 |  | 20162180390000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281016 | 44,786 |  | 20162180400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281017 | 44,786 |  | 20162180410000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281018 | 37,786 |  | 20162180420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281019 | 37,786 |  | 20162180430000 | 17,282 |
| 20151180281020 | 37,786 |  | 20162180440000 | 6,874 |
| 20151180281021 | 44,786 |  | 20162180450000 | 7,081 |
| 20151180281022 | 38,473 |  | 20162180460000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281023 | 44,786 |  | 20162180470000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281024 | 44,786 |  | 20162180480000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281025 | 44,786 |  | 20162180490000 | 5,207 |
| 20151180281026 | 3,863 |  | 20162180500000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180281027 | 3,863 |  | 20162180510000 | 28,623 |
| 20151180281028 | 3,863 |  | 20162180520000 | 25,845 |
| 20151180281029 | 3,863 |  | 20162180530000 | 25,845 |
| 20151180281030 | 3,863 |  | 20162180540000 | 31,956 |
| 20151180281031 | 3,863 |  | 20162180550000 | 33,833 |
| 20151180281032 | 3,863 |  | 20162180560000 | 4,820 |
| 20151180281033 | 3,863 |  | 20162180570000 | 6,574 |
| 20151180281034 | 3,863 |  | 20162180580000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180291001 | 76,969 |  | 20162180590000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180291002 | 49,928 |  | 20162180600000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151180291003 | 49,928 |  | 20162180610000 | 83,893 |
| 20151190010000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190010000 | 5,081 |
| 20151190020000 | 839 |  | 20162190020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190030000 | 2,368 |  | 20162190030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190040000 | 9,146 |  | 20162190040000 | 16,772 |
| 20151190050000 | 8,807 |  | 20162190050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190060000 | 8,807 |  | 20162190060000 | 13,562 |
| 20151190070000 | 8,467 |  | 20162190070000 | 0 |
| 20151190080000 | 337 |  | 20162190080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190090000 | 9,146 |  | 20162190090000 | 1,089 |
| 20151190100000 | 6,049 |  | 20162190100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190130000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190110000 | 34,402 |
| 20151190140000 | 59,184 |  | 20162190120000 | 32,029 |
| 20151190150000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190160000 | 9,850 |  | 20162190140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190170000 | 1,450 |  | 20162190150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190180000 | 185,652 |  | 20162190160000 | 27,197 |
| 20151190190000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190200000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190210000 | 53,994 |  | 20162190190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190220000 | 70,659 |  | 20162190200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190230000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190240000 | 14,180 |  | 20162190220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190250000 | 33,732 |  | 20162190230000 | 5,246 |
| 20151190260000 | 46,102 |  | 20162190240000 | 5,246 |
| 20151190270000 | 48,851 |  | 20162190250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190280000 | 5,284 |  | 20162190260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190290000 | 37,455 |  | 20162190270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190300000 | 19,611 |  | 20162190280000 | 5,592 |
| 20151190310000 | 56,199 |  | 20162190290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190320000 | 1,429 |  | 20162190300000 | 23,477 |
| 20151190330000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190310000 | 37,525 |
| 20151190340000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190320000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190350000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190330000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190360000 | EXEMPT |  | 20162190340000 | 34,481 |


| 20151190370000 | EXEMPT | 20162190350000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151190380000 | EXEMPT | 20162190360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190390000 | EXEMPT | 20162190370000 | 2,430 |
| 20151190400000 | EXEMPT | 20162190380000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190420000 | 58,505 | 20162190390000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151190430000 | 9,674 | 20162190400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200010000 | 133,244 | 20162190410000 | 2,424 |
| 20151200020000 | 20,549 | 20162190420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200030000 | EXEMPT | 20162190430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200040000 | 53,604 | 20162190440000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200050000 | 14,006 | 20162190450000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200060000 | 35,210 | 20162190460000 | 24,577 |
| 20151200070000 | 26,529 | 20162190470000 | 769 |
| 20151200080000 | 56,566 | 20162190480000 | 120,282 |
| 20151200090000 | 39,158 | 20162190500000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200100000 | 75,291 | 20162190510000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200110000 | 45,585 | 20162190520000 | 962 |
| 20151200120000 | 39,253 | 20162190530000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200130000 | 37,710 | 20162190540000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200140000 | EXEMPT | 20162190550000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200150000 | 15,083 | 20162200010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200160000 | 51,937 | 20162200020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200170000 | 17,238 | 20162200030000 | 4,871 |
| 20151200180000 | EXEMPT | 20162200040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200190000 | EXEMPT | 20162200050000 | 3,818 |
| 20151200200000 | EXEMPT | 20162200060000 | 63,227 |
| 20151200250000 | 53,399 | 20162200070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200260000 | 3,771 | 20162200080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200280000 | 77,087 | 20162200090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200290000 | 84,087 | 20162200100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200300000 | 121,499 | 20162200110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200310000 | 117,922 | 20162200120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200320000 | 291,597 | 20162200130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200330000 | 170,373 | 20162200140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200340000 | 204,716 | 20162200150000 | 6,049 |
| 20151200351001 | 24,257 | 20162200160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200351002 | 19,611 | 20162200170000 | 5,709 |
| 20151200351003 | 26,611 | 20162200180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200361001 | 33,109 | 20162200190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200361002 | 35,311 | 20162200200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151200361003 | 44,185 | 20162200210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210010000 | EXEMPT | 20162200220000 | 28,494 |
| 20151210020000 | EXEMPT | 20162200230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210040000 | 1,624 | 20162200240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210050000 | 52,476 | 20162200250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210060000 | 13,551 | 20162200260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210070000 | EXEMPT | 20162200270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210080000 | 56,224 | 20162200280000 | 3,818 |
| 20151210090000 | EXEMPT | 20162200290000 | 29,630 |
| 20151210100000 | 149,872 | 20162200300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210110000 | 87,024 | 20162200310000 | 7,926 |
| 20151210120000 | 44,379 | 20162200320000 | 63,227 |
| 20151210130000 | 83,023 | 20162200330000 | 3,818 |
| 20151210140000 | 77,729 | 20162200340000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210150000 | EXEMPT | 20162200350000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210160000 | EXEMPT | 20162200360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210170000 | EXEMPT | 20162200370000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210180000 | EXEMPT | 20162200380000 | 0 |
| 20151210200000 | 27,102 | 20162200390000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210210000 | 60,217 | 20162200400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210220000 | 50,369 | 20162200410000 | 4,582 |
| 20151210230000 | EXEMPT | 20162200420000 | 4,582 |
| 20151210240000 | 54,474 | 20162200430000 | 4,582 |
| 20151210250000 | 4,655 | 20162200440000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210260000 | 50,602 | 20162200450000 | 0 |
| 20151210270000 | 1,624 | 20162200460000 | 28,224 |
| 20151210280000 | 27,806 | 20162200470000 | 28,637 |
| 20151210290000 | 41,295 | 20162200480000 | 33,600 |
| 20151210300000 | 44,511 | 20162200490000 | 457 |


| 20151210310000 | 50,953 | 20162200500000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151210320000 | 44,409 | 20162200510000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210330000 | 0 | 20162200520000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210340000 | 16,160 | 20162200530000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210351001 | 19,746 | 20162200540000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210351002 | 32,750 | 20162200550000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210351003 | 27,461 | 20162200560000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210351004 | 35,241 | 20162200570000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210351005 | 19,746 | 20162210010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210351006 | 32,750 | 20162210020000 | 152 |
| 20151210351007 | 27,461 | 20162210030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210351008 | 28,241 | 20162210040000 | 3,818 |
| 20151210361001 | 4,382 | 20162210050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151210361002 | 6,228 | 20162210060000 | 3,818 |
| 20151210361003 | 6,228 | 20162210070000 | 1,908 |
| 20151210361004 | 6,228 | 20162210080000 | 1,908 |
| 20151220020000 | 13,551 | 20162210090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220030000 | 13,551 | 20162210100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220050000 | EXEMPT | 20162210110000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220060000 | 13,551 | 20162210120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220070000 | 50,871 | 20162210130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220080000 | 57,091 | 20162210140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220090000 | 13,551 | 20162210150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220100000 | EXEMPT | 20162210160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220110000 | EXEMPT | 20162210170000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220130000 | 56,249 | 20162210180000 | 3,818 |
| 20151220140000 | 43,573 | 20162210190000 | 21,407 |
| 20151220150000 | 45,984 | 20162210220000 | 3,818 |
| 20151220160000 | 57,122 | 20162210230000 | 3,818 |
| 20151220170000 | 4,115 | 20162210240000 | 0 |
| 20151220180000 | 1,332 | 20162210250000 | 38,108 |
| 20151220190000 | 44,284 | 20162210260000 | 4,060 |
| 20151220200000 | 9,665 | 20162210270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220210000 | 237,225 | 20162210280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220220000 | EXEMPT | 20162210290000 | 4,646 |
| 20151220230000 | EXEMPT | 20162210300000 | 37,093 |
| 20151220240000 | EXEMPT | 20162210320000 | 5,726 |
| 20151220250000 | 72,993 | 20162210330000 | 15,184 |
| 20151220260000 | EXEMPT | 20162210340000 | 6,071 |
| 20151220270000 | EXEMPT | 20162210350000 | 6,265 |
| 20151220280000 | 56,429 | 20162210360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220300000 | 47,446 | 20162210370000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220310000 | 1,875 | 20162210380000 | 225,486 |
| 20151220330000 | EXEMPT | 20162210390000 | 83,169 |
| 20151220340000 | 20,394 | 20162210400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220420000 | 82,016 | 20162210410000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220430000 | 82,016 | 20162210420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220440000 | 227,660 | 20162210430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220371001 | 28,345 | 20162210440000 | 19,892 |
| 20151220371002 | 36,882 | 20162210450000 | 131,383 |
| 20151220371003 | 32,957 | 20162210460000 | 145,706 |
| 20151220371004 | 34,492 | 20162210470000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220381001 | 38,908 | 20162210480000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220381002 | 41,122 | 20162210490000 | 5,726 |
| 20151220381003 | 43,838 | 20162210500000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220381004 | 39,048 | 20164010110000 | 10,151 |
| 20151220391001 | 65,399 | 20164010120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220391002 | 76,015 | 20164010200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220391003 | 82,072 | 20164010210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220391004 | 95,197 | 20164010220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220401001 | 41,997 | 20164010230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220401002 | 27,071 | 20164010240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220401003 | 35,620 | 20164010250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411001 | 34,559 | 20164010260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411002 | 37,912 | 20164010270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411003 | 39,031 | 20164010280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411004 | 40,148 | 20164010290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411005 | 37,912 | 20164010300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411006 | 40,148 | 20164010310000 | EXEMPT |


| 20151220411007 | 41,326 | 20164010320000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151220411008 | 42,443 | 20164010380000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411009 | 37,912 | 20164010390000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411010 | 40,148 | 20164010430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411011 | 41,326 | 20164010440000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151220411012 | 49,443 | 20164010450000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230010000 | EXEMPT | 20164030140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230030000 | EXEMPT | 20164030150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230040000 | EXEMPT | 20164030300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230050000 | 62,913 | 20164030350000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230060000 | 49,982 | 20164030360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230070000 | EXEMPT | 20164030370000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230080000 | 48,784 | 20164040040000 | 26,678 |
| 20151230090000 | EXEMPT | 20164040050000 | 7,166 |
| 20151230100000 | 17,653 | 20164040070000 | 37,808 |
| 20151230110000 | 12,373 | 20164040080000 | 7,166 |
| 20151230120000 | 12,541 | 20164040090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230130000 | EXEMPT | 20164040100000 | 7.166 |
| 20151230140000 | EXEMPT | 20164040110000 | 10,151 |
| 20151230150000 | EXEMPT | 20164040120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230160000 | EXEMPT | 20164040130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230180000 | 81,935 | 20164040140000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230190000 | 82,552 | 20164040150000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230200000 | EXEMPT | 20164040180000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230210000 | EXEMPT | 20164040190000 | 2,558 |
| 20151230220000 | EXEMPT | 20164040200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230231001 | 24,100 | 20164040210000 | 31,768 |
| 20151230231002 | 24,100 | 20164040220000 | 5,036 |
| 20151230231003 | 24,137 | 20164040230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230231004 | 24,100 | 20164040240000 | 5,036 |
| 20151230231005 | 24,100 | 20164040250000 | 5,036 |
| 20151230231006 | 24,137 | 20164040260000 | 5,036 |
| 20151230231007 | 24,137 | 20164040270000 | 5,036 |
| 20151230231008 | 24,100 | 20164040280000 | 34,094 |
| 20151230231009 | 24,137 | 20164040290000 | 47,872 |
| 20151230231010 | 24,100 | 20164040300000 | 24,064 |
| 20151230231011 | 24,100 | 20164040310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151230231012 | 31,137 | 20164040320000 | 30,157 |
| 20151240010000 | EXEMPT | 20164040330000 | 29,852 |
| 20151240020000 | 17,664 | 20164040340000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240030000 | EXEMPT | 20164040350000 | 8,503 |
| 20151240040000 | 67,870 | 20164040360000 | 15,113 |
| 20151240060000 | 14,965 | 20164040370000 | 14,345 |
| 20151240070000 | EXEMPT | 20164040380000 | 5,246 |
| 20151240080000 | EXEMPT | 20164040390000 | 5,246 |
| 20151240090000 | 29,964 | 20164040400000 | 0 |
| 20151240110000 | 61,314 | 20164040420000 | 15,526 |
| 20151240130000 | 238,476 | 20164040430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240140000 | 19,886 | 20164040440000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240150000 | EXEMPT | 20164040450000 | 16,598 |
| 20151240160000 | EXEMPT | 20164040470000 | 14,929 |
| 20151240170000 | 66,689 | 20164040498001 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240190000 | EXEMPT | 20164040498002 | 3 |
| 20151240200000 | EXEMPT | 20164050010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240210000 | EXEMPT | 20164050030000 | 5,073 |
| 20151240220000 | 55,281 | 20164050040000 | 50,599 |
| 20151240230000 | EXEMPT | 20164050050000 | 30,536 |
| 20151240240000 | EXEMPT | 20164050060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240260000 | 93,859 | 20164050070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240270000 | 340,712 | 20164050080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240280000 | 46,581 | 20164050090000 | 2,721 |
| 20151240290000 | EXEMPT | 20164050100000 | 35,505 |
| 20151240300000 | 14,982 | 20164050110000 | 5,073 |
| 20151240321001 | 37,817 | 20164050120000 | 26,288 |
| 20151240321002 | 44,817 | 20164050130000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240321003 | 37,822 | 20164050140000 | 5,073 |
| 20151240331001 | 41,004 | 20164050150000 | 20,969 |
| 20151240331002 | 48,004 | 20164050160000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240331003 | 48,004 | 20164050170000 | 28,513 |


| 20151240331004 | 48,004 | 20164050180000 | 5,283 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20151240351001 | 10,574 | 20164050190000 | 5,283 |
| 20151240351002 | 10,574 | 20164050200000 | 11,472 |
| 20151240351003 | 3,984 | 20164050210000 | 18,270 |
| 20151240351004 | 10,984 | 20164050220000 | 17,420 |
| 20151240351005 | 10,984 | 20164050230000 | 20,313 |
| 20151240351006 | 10,574 | 20164050240000 | 7,009 |
| 20151240351007 | 13,217 | 20164050250000 | 18,826 |
| 20151240351008 | 9,825 | 20164050260000 | RAILROAD |
| 20151240361001 | 50,720 | 20164050270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240361002 | 54,580 | 20164050280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240361003 | 14,440 | 20164050290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20151240361004 | 58,438 | 20164050300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20152000010000 | EXEMPT | 20164050310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000010000 | 116,085 | 20164050320000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000020000 | 39,169 | 20164050340000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000030000 | 76,197 | 20164050350000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000040000 | 8,518 | 20164050360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000050000 | 16,867 | 20164050370000 | RAILROAD |
| 20153000060000 | 112,165 | 20164050380000 | 11,023 |
| 20153000070000 | 8,349 | 20164050390000 | RAILROAD |
| 20153000080000 | 8,349 | 20164050400000 | 5,555 |
| 20153000090000 | EXEMPT | 20164050410000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000100000 | 33,746 | 20164050420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000110000 | 33,025 | 20164050430000 | 0 |
| 20153000120000 | 263,000 | 20164050440000 | 4,820 |
| 20153000130000 | 7,631 | 20164050450000 | 27,576 |
| 20153000140000 | EXEMPT | 20164050460000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153000150000 | EXEMPT | 20164050470000 | 22,633 |
| 20153000160000 | EXEMPT | 20164050480000 | 4,820 |
| 20153000170000 | 26,995 | 20164050490000 | 5,014 |
| 20153000180000 | 30,084 | 20164050500000 | 9,212 |
| 20153000190000 | EXEMPT | 20164050510000 | 63,140 |
| 20153000200000 | EXEMPT | 20164050520000 | 64,731 |
| 20153000230000 | EXEMPT | 20164050530000 | 39,795 |
| 20153000250000 | EXEMPT | 20164050540000 | 138,524 |
| 20153000260000 | EXEMPT | 20164050550000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010010000 | 442,903 | 20164050560000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010020000 | EXEMPT | 20164050570000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010030000 | EXEMPT | 20164060010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010040000 | EXEMPT | 20164060020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010050000 | 152,066 | 20164060030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010060000 | EXEMPT | 20164060040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010070000 | EXEMPT | 20164060050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010080000 | EXEMPT | 20164060060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010090000 | EXEMPT | 20164060070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010100000 | EXEMPT | 20164060080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010110000 | 18,500 | 20164060090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010120000 | EXEMPT | 20164060100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010130000 | 50,787 | 20164060110000 | 46,040 |
| 20153010150000 | 80,689 | 20164060120000 | 9,258 |
| 20153010160000 | 23,379 | 20164060130000 | 30,949 |
| 20153010170000 | 60,579 | 20164060140000 | 30,949 |
| 20153010180000 | 57,453 | 20164060150000 | 32,113 |
| 20153010190000 | 83,194 | 20164060160000 | 22,706 |
| 20153010200000 | 31,002 | 20164060170000 | 22,414 |
| 20153010210000 | EXEMPT | 20164060180000 | 614 |
| 20153010221001 | 5,305 | 20164060190000 | 2,964 |
| 20153010221002 | 5,305 | 20164060200000 | 23,009 |
| 20153010221003 | 5,305 | 20164060210000 | 69,876 |
| 20153010221004 | 2,076 | 20164060220000 | 70,429 |
| 20153010221005 | 5,230 | 20164060270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010221006 | 5,230 | 20164060280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153010221007 | 5,230 | 20164060290000 | 36,863 |
| 20153010221008 | 2,345 | 20164060300000 | 36,097 |
| 20153020010000 | 235,670 | 20164060310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153020020000 | 31,762 | 20164060320000 | 5,785 |
| 20153020030000 | EXEMPT | 20164060330000 | 0 |
| 20153020040000 | 82,187 | 20164060340000 | 8,678 |


| 20153020050000 | 49,940 | 20164060350000 | EXEMPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20153020060000 | 37,713 | 20164060360000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153020070000 | 174,811 | 20164060370000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153020080000 | 75,706 | 20164060380000 | 9,026 |
| 20153020090000 | 203,866 | 20164060390000 | 9,026 |
| 20153020100000 | 21,135 | 20164060400000 | 9,026 |
| 20153020110000 | 48,585 | 20164060410000 | 9,699 |
| 20153020120000 | 30,974 | 20164060420000 | 440,541 |
| 20153020130000 | 30,974 | 20164060430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153020140000 | 71,557 | 20164080470000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153020150000 | 68,305 | 20164080480000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153020160000 | 29,125 | 20164080490000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153020170000 | 29,131 | 20164100180000 | 41,349 |
| 20153020180000 | 135,979 | 20164100300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030010000 | 63,140 | 20164100310000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030020000 | EXEMPT | 20164100320000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030030000 | 57,007 | 20164110010000 | 4,164 |
| 20153030040000 | 57,086 | 20164110020000 | 6,770 |
| 20153030050000 | 10,403 | 20164110030000 | 2,643 |
| 20153030060000 | 1,282 | 20164110040000 | 16,817 |
| 20153030070000 | EXEMPT | 20164110050000 | 7,642 |
| 20153030080000 | 61,311 | 20164110060000 | 7,642 |
| 20153030090000 | 44,847 | 20164110070000 | 164,206 |
| 20153030100000 | 45,212 | 20164110080000 | 38,072 |
| 20153030110000 | 14,295 | 20164110170000 | 15,271 |
| 20153030120000 | 39,649 | 20164110180000 | 13,848 |
| 20153030130000 | 56,286 | 20164110190000 | 8,365 |
| 20153030140000 | 45,959 | 20164110200000 | 8,710 |
| 20153030150000 | 47,507 | 20164110210000 | 23,084 |
| 20153030160000 | 41,153 | 20164110220000 | 12,052 |
| 20153030170000 | 35,496 | 20164110230000 | 20,840 |
| 20153030180000 | 41,329 | 20164110240000 | 30,385 |
| 20153030190000 | 43,702 | 20164110250000 | 4,887 |
| 20153030210000 | 47,516 | 20164110260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030220000 | 271,742 | 20164110270000 | 4,887 |
| 20153030230000 | 56,752 | 20164110280000 | 28,519 |
| 20153030260000 | EXEMPT | 20164110290000 | 4,887 |
| 20153030270000 | EXEMPT | 20164110300000 | 4,887 |
| 20153030280000 | 7,910 | 20164110310000 | 3,431 |
| 20153030290000 | 60,702 | 20164110320000 | 0 |
| 20153030310000 | 62,178 | 20164110330000 | 36,739 |
| 20153030320000 | 51,418 | 20164110340000 | 5,906 |
| 20153030330000 | 78,975 | 20164110350000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030350000 | 15,355 | 20164110360000 | 31,190 |
| 20153030360000 | EXEMPT | 20164110370000 | 33,608 |
| 20153030370000 | 43,341 | 20164110380000 | 19,731 |
| 20153030390000 | 42,438 | 20164110390000 | 6,111 |
| 20153030401001 | 32,565 | 20164110400000 | 6,111 |
| 20153030401002 | 22,672 | 20164110410000 | 6,111 |
| 20153030401003 | 22,672 | 20164110420000 | 17,627 |
| 20153030411001 | 38,428 | 20164110450000 | 258,090 |
| 20153030411002 | 26,364 | 20164110460000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030411003 | 19,364 | 20164110470000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030411004 | 37,643 | 20164110480000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030411005 | 18,809 | 20164120020000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411006 | 18,809 | 20164120030000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411007 | 26,039 | 20164120040000 | 2,315 |
| 20153030411008 | 19,341 | 20164120050000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411009 | 39,177 | 20164120060000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411010 | 40,906 | 20164120070000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411011 | 49,754 | 20164120080000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411012 | 40.415 | 20164120090000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411013 | 22,759 | 20164120100000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153030411014 | 54,712 | 20164120110000 | 31,094 |
| 20153030411015 | 20,293 | 20164120120000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030411016 | 13,097 | 20164120130000 | 4,629 |
| 20153030421001 | 23,870 | 20164120140000 | 6,557 |
| 20153030421002 | 22,187 | 20164120150000 | 4,711 |
| 20153030421003 | 23,253 | 20164120160000 | 19,538 |





| 20153080171002 | 19,131 | 20212070050000 | 19,614 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20153080171003 | 19,460 | 20212070060000 | 9,836 |
| 20153080171004 | 19,378 | 20212070070000 | 7.443 |
| 20153080171005 | 19,788 | 20212070080000 | 13,756 |
| 20153080171006 | 25,840 | 20212070090000 | 216,643 |
| 20153080171007 | 21,177 | 20212070100000 | 81,116 |
| 20153080171008 | 23,059 | 20212070110000 | 79,073 |
| 20153080171009 | 22,734 | 20212070120000 | 54,852 |
| 20153080171010 | 22,815 | 20212070130000 | 47,692 |
| 20153080171011 | 22,487 | 20212070140000 | 36,546 |
| 20153080171012 | 22,978 | 20212070150000 | 107.589 |
| 20153080171013 | 21,996 | 20212110400000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171014 | 20,035 | 20212110410000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171015 | 20,442 | 20212110420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171016 | 20,442 | 20212120320000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171017 | 20,526 | 20212120330000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171018 | 26,819 | 20212130010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171019 | 21,996 | 20212130020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171020 | 23,385 | 20212130030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171021 | 22,243 | 20212130050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171022 | 22,815 | 20212130060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171023 | 15,406 | 20212130070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171024 | 22,894 | 20212130200000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171025 | 22,159 | 20212130210000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171026 | 20,113 | 20212130220000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171027 | 20,526 | 20212130230000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171028 | 20,360 | 20212130240000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171029 | 20,526 | 20212130250000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171030 | 19,903 | 20212130260000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171031 | 21,915 | 20212130270000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171032 | 23,141 | 20212130280000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171033 | 22,487 | 20212130290000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171034 | 22,650 | 20212130300000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171035 | 22,487 | 20212130410000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171036 | 22,978 | 20212130420000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153080171037 | 21,996 | 20212130430000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090020000 | 130,424 | 20215020030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090050000 | 42,519 | 20221000020000 | 236,015 |
| 20153090110000 | EXEMPT | 20221000070000 | 552,902 |
| 20153090150000 | 66,007 | 20221000100000 | 808 |
| 20153090170000 | 13,641 | 20221000120000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090180000 | EXEMPT | 20221000140000 | 137,415 |
| 20153090190000 | 85,055 | 20221000150000 | 43,074 |
| 20153090200000 | 69,815 | 20221000160000 | 223,183 |
| 20153090210000 | 1,240 | 20221000170000 | 3,179 |
| 20153090260000 | EXEMPT | 20221000180000 | 6,579 |
| 20153090270000 | 8,150 | 20221000190000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090280000 | 7,659 | 20221000210000 | RAILROAD |
| 20153090290000 | 97,256 | 20221000220000 | RAILROAD |
| 20153090300000 | 11,741 | 20221000230000 | RAILROAD |
| 20153090310000 | 261,196 | 20221000240000 | 187,122 |
| 20153090320000 | EXEMPT | 20221000250000 | 207,112 |
| 20153090330000 | 229,919 | 20221000260000 | 255,764 |
| 20153090360000 | 134,938 | 20221010010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090351001 | 36,518 | 20221010020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090351002 | 45,947 | 20221010030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090351003 | 47,760 | 20221010040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090351004 | 38,591 | 20221010050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090351005 | 38,414 | 20221010060000 | 10,072 |
| 20153090351006 | 38,207 | 20221010070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090351007 | 35,098 | 20221010080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153090351008 | 34,150 | 20221010090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100010000 | EXEMPT | 20221020010000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100020000 | EXEMPT | 20221020020000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100040000 | EXEMPT | 20221020030000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100050000 | EXEMPT | 20221020040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100060000 | EXEMPT | 20221020050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100070000 | 30,850 | 20221020060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100080000 | 58,934 | 20221030010000 | 3,067 |


| 20153100090000 | 52,804 |  | 20221030020000 | 3,067 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20153100110000 | 75,025 |  | 20221030030000 | 3,067 |
| 20153100120000 | 78,596 |  | 20221030040000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100130000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221030050000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100140000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221030060000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100150000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221030070000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100160000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221030080000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100170000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221030090000 | EXEMPT |
| 20153100180000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221080010000 | 443,332 |
| 20153100190000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221080020000 | RAILROAD |
| 20153100200000 | 74,031 |  | 20221080050000 | RAILROAD |
| 20153100210000 | EXEMPT |  | 20221080080000 | RAILROAD |

TOTAL:
\$76,534,773
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Goodman Williams Group was retained by Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises, Inc. to be part of a team working for the City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development to develop a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district for an area designated as the Washington Park Project Area. PGAV Urban Consulting is also part of the team for this assignment.

The Washington Park Project Area (referred to in this report as the "Project Area") is generally bounded by:

- Cottage Grove Avenue and Washington Park on the east
- $51^{\text {st }}$ Street on the north
- The Dan Ryan Expressway (I-90/94) on the west
- $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street on the south

A map of the Project Area is included in the Redevelopment Plan, which is contained in a separate document.

## Housing Impact Study

The Redevelopment Plan for the Project Area does not presently envision acquiring or demolishing occupied housing units. It is possible, however, that at some point during the 23 -year life of the TIF some relocation may occur as a consequence of the renovation and redevelopment activity that is envisioned.

It is for that reason that this report fulfills the legislative requirements for a Housing Impact Study, as set forth in the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq.). The specific requirements of the Housing Impact Study are as follows:

Part I of the Housing Impact Study shall include the following for all residential units within the Project Area:
(i) data as to whether the residential units are single family or multi-family units; and
(ii) the number and type of rooms within the units, if that information is available; and
(iii) whether the units are inhabited or uninhabited, as determined not less than 45 days before the date that the ordinance or resolution required by subsection (a) of Section 11-74.4-5 is passed; and
(iv) data as to the racial and ethnic composition of the residents in the inhabited residential units. The data requirement as to the racial and ethnic composition of the residents in the inhabited residential units shall be deemed to be fully satisfied by data from the most recent federal census.

Part II of the Housing Impact Study shall identify the inhabited residential units in the Project Area that are to be or may be removed. If inhabited residential units are to be removed, then the housing impact study shall identify:
(i) the number and location of those units that will or may be removed; and
(ii) the municipality's plans for relocation assistance for those residents in the Project Area whose residences are to be removed; and
(iii) the availability of replacement housing for those residents whose residences are to be removed, and the type, location, and cost of the housing; and
(iv) the type and extent of relocation assistance to be provided.

## II. HOUSING IMPACT STUDY - Part I

The information presented in this report is compiled from a variety of sources. In winter 2014, Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises and PGAV conducted field research that identified the parcels and buildings located in the Project Area, the number of units in each building, and whether the units were occupied or vacant.

The field work was supplemented with information from the U.S. Census American Community Survey Selected Housing Characteristics Profile. Ratios from the four Census tracts that align most closely with the Project Area were applied to the actual unit counts to provide estimates of the age of the housing stock, the number of rooms and bedrooms, and whether the occupied units were leased or owned.

Demographic information on current residents of the Project Area was provided by Esri Business Analyst, a respected vendor of demographic and economic data. Other information in Part II of the Housing Impact Study was provided by Goodman Williams Group and reliable secondary sources as noted in the tables.

## Number and Type of Residential Units

The recent field work identified a total of 4,375 housing units in 887 buildings located within the Project Area. Table 1 provides estimates of the age of the structures based on percentages derived from the Census. As the table indicates, nearly half of the housing units in the Project Area were built before 1939.

Table 1 Housing Units in Project Area by Year Structure Built

| Built |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| Total Housing Units | 4,375 | $100.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| 2000 to Present | 206 | $4.7 \%$ |
| 1990 to 1999 | 105 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 1980 to 1989 | 201 | $4.6 \%$ |
| 1970 to 1979 | 385 | $8.8 \%$ |
| 1960 to 1969 | 411 | $9.4 \%$ |
| 1950 to 1959 | 459 | $10.5 \%$ |
| 1940 to 1949 | 508 | $11.6 \%$ |
| 1939 or Earlier | 2,109 | $48.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |

Source: ERS Enterprises and PGAV Consulting, based on field work, 2014 and U.S. Census American Community Survey Housing Profile

This older housing stock consists mostly of multifamily buildings. As Table 2 below shows, $22.7 \%$ of units in the Project Area are located in buildings containing two to four units. Almost three quarters of the housing stock (74.5\%) is in buildings with 5 or more units, and only $2.8 \%$ of the housing stock is comprised of single-family homes.

Table 2
Washington Park TIF Redevelopment Project Area
Housing Unit Occupancy by Building Type

|  | Occupied Units |  | Vacant Units |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Type | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Single Unit Dwellings | 104 | 2.9\% | 19 | 2.4\% | 123 | 2.8\% |
| Units in Two-Unit Buildings | 230 | 6.4\% | 84 | 10.7\% | 314 | 7.2\% |
| Units in 3 and 4-Unit Buildings | 479 | 13.3\% | 199 | 25.4\% | 678 | 15.5\% |
| Units in Multi-Family ( $>5$ units) Buildings | 2,777 | 77.4\% | 483 | 61.5\% | 3,260 | 74.5\% |
| TOTAL | 3,590 | 100.0\% | 785 | 100.0\% | 4,375 | 100.00\% |

Source: ERS Enterprises and PGAV Consulting, based on field work, 2014

## Number and Type of Rooms Within Units

Estimates of the number and types of rooms in the units in the Project Area are shown in Table 3. Key findings include:

- Of the 4,375 total units counted in the Project Area, more than $27 \%$ contain five rooms. Another $21 \%$ of units contain four rooms, and $17 \%$ contain six rooms.
- Most of the units in the Project Area (60.9\%) contain two or three bedrooms. Smaller studio and one-bedroom units make up $30 \%$ of the units. Larger units with four or five bedrooms make up the remainder of the mix.

These findings suggest that the housing stock in the Project Area includes a high percentage of larger units with two or more bedrooms. These apartments meet the needs of larger families with children.

| April 2014 | A5-5 | Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises <br> Goodman Williams Group |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |

Table 3
Washington Park TIF Redevelopment Project Area Number and Type of Rooms

|  | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Number of Housing Units |  |  |
|  | 4,375 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Number of Rooms |  |  |
| 1 room | 186 | $4.3 \%$ |
| 2 rooms | 454 | $10.4 \%$ |
| 3 rooms | 492 | $11.2 \%$ |
| 4 rooms | 928 | $21.2 \%$ |
| 5 rooms | 1,193 | $27.3 \%$ |
| 6 rooms | 741 | $16.9 \%$ |
| 7 rooms | 250 | $5.7 \%$ |
| 8 rooms | 83 | $1.9 \%$ |
| 9 or more rooms | 48 | $1.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Number of Bedrooms |  |  |
| No bedroom | 401 | $9.2 \%$ |
| 1 bedroom | 927 | $21.2 \%$ |
| 2 bedrooms | 1,499 | $34.3 \%$ |
| 3 bedrooms | 1,165 | $26.6 \%$ |
| 4 bedrooms | 347 | $7.9 \%$ |
| 5 or more bedrooms | 35 | $0.8 \%$ |

[^3]
## Number of Inhabited Units

Of the 4,375 total residential units identified in the Project Area, 3,590, or $82.1 \%$ are occupied. As shown in Table 4, most of these occupied units are rental apartments. Owner-occupied units constitute only $14.0 \%$ of the total.

Table 4
Washington Park TIF Redevelopment Project Area Housing Units Occupancy and Tenure

|  | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Housing Units | 4,375 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Occupied | 3,590 | $82.1 \%$ |
| Vacant | 785 | $17.9 \%$ |
| Occupied Housing Units | 3,590 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Owner Occupied | 503 | $14.0 \%$ |
| Renter Occupied | 3,087 | $86.0 \%$ |

Sources: ERS Enterprises and PGAV Consulting with tenure estimates from Esri Business Analyst

## Race and Ethnicity of Residents

Table 5 provides demographic information on residents of the Project Area.

- The 2013 total population of the Project Area is estimated to be 8,730, a slight decrease from the 2010 Census count. Of the total, $97.1 \%$ of the residents identify as Black or African American, 0.5\% White, 0.1\% Asian, and less than 1\% Hispanic or Latino.
- The majority of the Project Area's 3,240 estimated households in 2013 were Family Households, defined as two or more related persons living together. The number of non-family households grew between 2010 and 2013.
- The number of family households living in the Project Area with incomes below the poverty level was slightly higher than the number of family households at or above the poverty level. The estimated median household income within the Project Area in 2013 was $\$ 16,880$, well below the estimated 2013 median for the City of Chicago of $\$ 43,854$.

Table 5
Washington Park TIF Redevelopment Project Area Select Population Characteristics

|  | 2010 |  | 2013 Estimate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Population | 8,787 | 100.0\% | 8,730 | 100.0\% |
| Race |  |  |  |  |
| White Alone | 44 | 0.5\% | 43 | 0.5\% |
| Black or African American Alone | 8,602 | 97.9\% | 8,536 | 97.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Alone | 12 | 0.1\% | 12 | 0.1\% |
| Asian Alone | 6 | 0.1\% | 6 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some Other Race Alone | 18 | 0.2\% | 20 | 0.2\% |
| Two or More Races | 104 | 1.2\% | 113 | 1.3\% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 68 | 0.8\% | 72 | 0.8\% |
| Households | 3,241 | 100.0\% | 3,240 | 100.0\% |
| Family Households | 2,035 | 62.8\% | 2,009 | 62.0\% |
| Nonfamily Households | 1,206 | 37.2\% | 1,231 | 38.0\% |
| Median Household Income (Esri Estimate) | \$17,414 |  | \$16,880 |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Esri Business Analyst and Goodman Williams Group

## III. HOUSING IMPACT STUDY - Part II

## Number and Location of Units that Could Potentially be Removed

One of the defining features of this proposed TIF district is the abundance of vacant land, which presents many opportunities for development without the need to disturb existing structures. The primary objectives of the Plan are to rehabilitate existing single and multi-family dwellings, redevelop vacant land, and correct obsolete land use patterns through redevelopment.

## Methodology

Presented below are the three steps used to fulfill the statutory requirements of defining the number and location of inhabited residential units that may be removed or impacted.

1) Properties identified for acquisition. An acquisition plan has been prepared as part of the Plan. There are no occupied housing units that are planned for acquisition.
2) Dilapidation. As stated above and presented in more detail in the Eligibility Study, there are no occupied residential buildings classified as "dilapidated" in the Project Area. As a result of this analysis, there are no occupied housing units that are likely to be displaced because they are located within a dilapidated structure.
3) Changes in land use. The Land Use Plan, presented in Section $V$ of the Plan identifies the future land uses to be in effect upon adoption of the Plan. If public or private redevelopment occurs in accordance with land use changes proposed by the Plan, displacement of inhabited units will not result. As a result of this analysis, no occupied housing units are likely to be displaced because of land use changes.

## Relocation Plan

With no residential displacement anticipated, a relocation plan for displaced residents within the proposed TIF District has not been established.

## Replacement Housing

In accordance with Section 11-74.4-3 ( $n$ )(7) of the Act, the City shall make a good faith effort to ensure that affordable replacement housing for any qualified displaced resident whose residence is removed is located in or near the Project Area.

At this juncture there are no plans to remove any occupied residences within the Project Area. However, if replacement housing were needed, available housing options within the boundaries of, or in close proximity to, the Project Area are discussed below.

## Housing Eligibility Assessment

Table 6 presents a breakdown of Project Area households by income. These 2013 estimates suggest that $44.5 \%$ of the households in the Project Area have annual incomes of less than $\$ 15,000$. Nearly a third (31.9\%) have incomes between \$15,000 and \$35,000 annually, and the remaining $23.7 \%$ have incomes in excess of $\$ 35,000$.

Table 6
Washington Park TIF Redevelopment Project Area
Number of Households by Income, 2013 Estimates

|  | $<\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 15,000-$ <br> $\$ 24,999$ | $\$ 25,000-$ <br> $\$ 34,999$ | $\$ 35,000-$ <br> $\$ 49,999$ | $\$ 50,000-$ <br> $\$ 74,999$ | $\$ 75,000-$ <br> $\$ 99,999$ | $\$ 100,000$ <br> or more |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> Households <br> Percent of <br> Households | 1,429 | $44.5 \%$ | 652 | 373 | 350 | 185 | 93 | 132 |

Source: Esri Business Analyst

Most of the subsidized and public housing options available to low-income residents in Chicago are determined by Maximum Annual Income Limits published by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Limits are based on household size and are calculated from the Area Median Income (AMI). The 2013 schedule, the most recent available, is shown in Table 7 below. The highlighting corresponds to the household size and income that applies to most of the residents in the Project Area.

| April 2014 | Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Goodman Williams Group |  |

Table 7
Schedule of Maximum Annual Income Limits for Greater Chicago* Effective December 18, 2013

| AMI | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person |  | 4 Person |  | 5Person |  | 6 Person |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

* Includes Cook, DuPage, Lake, Kane, McHenry, \& Will Counties

Source: Illinois Housing Development Authority
The Project Area has an estimated 2,454 households, or $74 \%$ of total households, who earn $60 \%$ or less of the Area Median Income (AMI). 1,429 households earn less than $\$ 15,000$ and are categorized as earning less than $30 \%$ AMI. 652 households earn between $\$ 15,000$ and $\$ 24,999$ earn less than $50 \%$ AMI but more than $30 \%$ AMI.

## Rental Housing

This section discusses rental housing options, including CHA, affordable, and market-rate.

Housing Choice Vouchers. Approximately $86 \%$ of the Project Area's residents are renters and $74 \%$ of all households have an income at or below $60 \%$ AMI, making them qualified for Housing Choice Vouchers, also known as Section 8. Under the Housing Choice Voucher Program, renters pay $30-40 \%$ of their income for rent and utilities. Landlords whose tenants have Housing Choice Vouchers are entitled to Fair Market Rents (FMR), established annually by HUD, and which are roughly equivalent to Maximum Monthly Gross Rents for households at 60\% AMI. Landlords collect the difference between tenants' rent and the FMR directly from the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA). According to the CHA's FY2012 Annual Report, the City of Chicago had 38,525 tenant-based vouchers at the end of 2012.
Project-Based Voucher Program. This program is designed for developments where landlords enter into a contract with HUD to provide subsidized housing such that the Section 8 status is tied to the development and cannot be transferred if a qualified low-income tenant moves away. A major concern in gentrifying neighborhoods is the loss of these project-based Section 8 units when rental properties convert to condominiums or when landlords choose not to renew their Section 8 contracts, thereby decreasing the availability of low-income housing.

Within the Project Area and surrounding community areas, Table 8 shows that there are a total of 6,607 Section 8 units in 70 developments.

Table 8
Project-Based Section 8 Housing

| Project-Based Section 8 Housing |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Assisted <br> Units | Projects |
| Community Area | 583 | 8 |
|  |  | 1,252 |
| Washington Park (the Project Area) | 642 | 19 |
| Grand Boulevard | 2,024 | 19 |
| Englewood | 908 | 9 |
| Woodlawn | 1,198 | 9 |
| Kenwood |  |  |
| Greater Grand Crossing |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Source: Chicago Rehab Network

| April 2014 | A5-12 | Ernest R. Sawyer Enterprises |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Goodman Williams Group |  |  |

CHA and the Plan for Transformation. Chicago's public housing stock is in the midst of an ongoing redevelopment program known as CHA Plan for Transformation. Now in its $13^{\text {th }}$ year, the plan calls for the redevelopment of 25,000 units of public housing into mixed-income communities. The CHA's FY2012 Annual Report projected a total of 21,376 units, or $85.5 \%$ of 25,000 units, to be completed by the end of FY2012.

Many of the properties in the CHA's portfolio are reserved specifically for families. The CHA Community Wide (Family Housing) Wait List remained closed to new applicants in Fiscal Year 2012; 32,647 applicants remain on the list prior to completion of its wait list survey update which began in December 2012. There are several CHA properties in and around the Project Area, discussed below.

- Washington Park Low-Rises. This family housing development consists of 60 two-story row houses in 27 scattered locations roughly bounded by $39^{\text {th }}$ Street (N), 63 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Street (S), Stewart Avenue (W), and Lake Michigan (E). Some of the units are in the Project Area. Renovation of the units, which were built in 1963, was began in and was completed in 2010.
- Washington Park Homes. This family housing development is being redeveloped and rehabilitated as a mixed-income community. The completed project as currently envisioned will include 192 public housing units ( $37 \%$ ), 183 affordable units ( $35 \%$ ), and 146 market-rate units ( $28 \%$ ) for a total of 521 units. At the end of 2008, two developments were completed: Keystone Place and St. Edmund's Meadows.

St. Edmund's Meadows, located near the intersection of $61^{\text {st }}$ and South Michigan Avenue, was completed in 2007. The new rental development consists of three- and four-bedroom row houses and three-flat buildings. 14 of the 56 units are rehabilitated public housing units. Keystone Place has a mix of 38 public, 24 affordable and 7 market-rate units in the Woodlawn community area bounded by $63^{\text {rd }}$ Street (N), Woodlawn Avenue (E), Marquette Road (S), and Drexel Avenue (W).

- Legends South. This major redevelopment replaces Robert Taylor Homes. Once the country's largest public housing development with 4,321 units, Robert Taylor was demolished between 2002 and 2007, clearing 92 acres bounded by $39^{\text {th }}$ Street on the north, State Street on the east, $54^{\text {th }}$ Street on the south, and Federal Street on the west. Redevelopment of the property calls for 2,400 mixed-income rental and for-sale units, with one-third of the units reserved each for public, affordable, and market-rate housing tenants. The redevelopment team is being led by Brinshore Development.

Table 9 shows the unit mix for the phases in Legends South that are completed, and Table 10 presents the unit mix, size, and rent are shown for Savoy Square, located at 4448 South State Street.

Brinshore continues their redevelopment efforts with Legends South C-3, a 71 -unit mixed-income rental development bounded by $43^{\text {rd }}$ Street ( N ), Calumet Ave (E), 48 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street (S) and Michigan Ave (W). Table 11 shows the unit mix for Legends South C-3, which is expected to open in December 2014.

Table 9
Legends South Unit Mix

| Unit Type | Public | Affordable | Market Rate | Total Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hansberry Square, completed 2007 |  |  |  |  |
| Family, 1BR | 12 | 3 | 1 | 16 |
| Family, 2BR | 35 | 33 | 18 | 86 |
| Family, 3BR | 29 | 33 | 14 | 76 |
| Family, 4BR | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Subtotal | 83 | 68 | 30 | 181 |
| Mahalia Place, completed 2005 |  |  |  |  |
| Family, 1BR | 8 | 4 | 0 | 12 |
| Family, 2BR | 23 | 28 | 11 | 62 |
| Family, 3BR | 19 | 12 | 1 | 32 |
| Family, 4BR | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Subtotal | 54 | 44 | 12 | 110 |
| Coleman Place, completed 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| Family, 1BR | 7 | 3 | 2 | 12 |
| Family, 2BR | 25 | 28 | 14 | 67 |
| Family, 3BR | 16 | 12 | 7 | 35 |
| Family, 4BR | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Subtotal | 52 | 43 | 23 | 118 |
| Savoy Square, completed 2011 |  |  |  |  |
| Family, 1BR | 11 | 9 | 6 | 26 |
| Family, 2BR | 20 | 19 | 12 | 51 |
| Family, 3BR | 24 | 22 | 10 | 56 |
| Family, 4BR | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Subtotal | 60 | 50 | 28 | 138 |
| Total Units | 249 | 205 | 93 | 547 |

Source: Chicago Housing Authority, February 2014

Table 10
Savoy Square - Legends South Rent Mix


Source: Savoy Square rental office, February 2014 and Goodman Williams Group
*Higher rent is for $3 B R / 2 B A$ unit

Table 11
Legends South C-3 Unit Mix

| Unit Type | Public | Affordable | Market Rate | Total Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family, 1BR | 8 | 7 | 6 | 21 |
| Family, 2BR | 10 | 9 | 8 | 27 |
| Family, 3BR | 9 | 7 | 4 | 20 |
| Family, 4BR | 3 | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 3 |
| Subtotal | 30 | 23 | 18 | 71 |

Source: Chicago Housing Authority, February 2014
April 2014

## Planned and Completed Rental Developments

Several new development projects that are completed, are under construction, or are planned could provide additional affordable rental opportunities to residents of the Project Area. These include:

- POAH's redevelopment of Grove Park Plaza on South Cottage Grove Avenue between $61^{\text {st }}$ and $63^{\text {rd }}$ Streets. The renamed Woodlawn Park will include 420 residential units and 65,000 square feet of commercial space.
- The Shops and Lofts at 47, a mixed-use development that is currently under construction at the southwest corner of $47^{\text {th }}$ and South Cottage Grove Avenue that will include 96 rental apartments.
- Parkway Gardens, located on South King Drive between $63^{\text {rd }}$ and $66^{\text {th }}$ Street reopened in 2013 after a two-year renovation of its 694 units.
- The Rosenwald, a long vacant landmarked building at 4600 South Michigan Avenue, is scheduled to undergo extensive redevelopment. The project as currently envisioned will include 239 apartments, 51,000 square feet of commercial space and 27,000 square feet of community space.

Market Rate Rentals. The Project Area has relatively few market-rate rental apartments. Listings in Midwest Real Estate Data (MRED) in January 2014 revealed apartment rates that roughly corresponded to IHDA's Maximum Monthly Gross Rents for $50 \%$ to $60 \%$ Area Median Income (AMI).

The outliers shown in Table 12 below are three-bedroom apartments in Washington Park that were recently rehabbed and finished with high-end features.

Table 12
Summary of Rental Listings

| Washington ParkNeighborhood <br> Bedrooms <br> Available Apts. | Avg Rent |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2 | $\$ 730$ |
| 2 | 5 | $\$ 910$ |
| 3 | 7 | $\$ 1,292$ |
|  |  |  |
| Englewood Neighborhood |  |  |
| Bedrooms | Available Apts. | Avg Rent |
| 1 | 1 | $\$ 650$ |
| 2 | 13 | $\$ 812$ |
| 3 | 17 | $\$ 1,026$ |
| 4 | 3 | $\$ 1,292$ |

Source: Midwest Real Estate Data, January 2014

Senior Housing. Two affordable senior housing projects are located in the Project Area, one with 35 units and one with 60 units. Rent is tied to residents' incomes, and all units are reserved for low-income residents.

The CHA owns 10 dedicated senior buildings in the vicinity of the Project Area, although none is located in Washington Park. Seniors must be 60 years old to apply and 62 years old to move in to CHA senior housing. Nearby community areas with CHA senior buildings include Grand Boulevard, Kenwood, Fuller Park, Greater Grand Crossing, Woodlawn, and Englewood. A list of senior properties can be found in the master table in the Appendix.

## Planned and Completed Rental Developments

St. Edmund's Redevelopment Corporation (SERC) is a prominent developer in the Washington Park community area. Since its inception in 1990, it has developed 598 housing units in 26 buildings. Its most recent development is St. Edmund's Court, a vacant apartment building rehabbed into 36 units of affordable housing in conjunction with the City of Chicago's Neighborhood Stabilization Program. Located near St. Edmund's Common, the project was completed in December 2011.

SERC has two additional projects in the development stages:

- St. Edmund's Oasis will be a 54 unit rental townhome development on scattered sites on $61^{\text {st }} \mathrm{St}$, Indiana and Prairie Avenues. SERC is partnering with Tria Adelfi, LLC in a joint venture through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.
- St. Edmund's Tower Annex (Tower Annex) will be a 34 unit affordable senior rental building at 6151 South Michigan Avenue.


## For-Sale Housing

As discussed previously, only $14.0 \%$ of Project Area residents were estimated to be homeowners and the remaining $86.0 \%$ were renters. The market of for-sale housing is therefore relatively smaller than other community areas. Table 13 below summarizes 28 listings from registered Realtors as reported by Midwest Real Estate Data. The real estate listings revealed a wide range in prices, from inexpensive to high-end units. The predominant unit type was three-bedroom condominiums.

Table 13
Summary of Washington Park For-Sale Listings

| Type | \# Bedrooms | Median Price | Price Range | \# Listings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condominium | 1 | \$54,500 | \$28,000-\$125,000 | 4 |
| Condominium | 2 | \$33,600 | \$20,000-\$89,000 | 5 |
| Condominium | 3 | \$40,000 | \$29,000-\$83,500 | 13 |
| Condominium | 4+ | \$98,450 | \$92,000-\$104,900 | 2 |
| House | NA | \$129,450 | \$4,900-\$299,900 | 4 |

Source: Midwest Real Estate Data January 2014

Tables 14 and 15 on the following pages show median sale prices of detached and attached housing units sold by Realtors in the Washington Park, Englewood, Woodlawn, and Grand Boulevard community areas over the previous 10 years. Prices are highest in Grand Boulevard, remaining stable from 2005 to 2007. Prices have dropped precipitously with the market downturn beginning at the end of 2007.

|  | Number of Detached Single-Family Units Sold |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| Grand Boulevard | 51 | 45 | 24 | 30 | 45 |
| Woodlawn | 32 | 26 | 18 | 20 | 6 |
| Washington Park | 9 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 27 |
| Englewood | 184 | 139 | 123 | 100 | 117 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: This representation is based in whole or in part on data supplied by Midwest Real E |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 through December 2013. Midwest Real Estate Data LLC does not guarantee nor is it in |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data maintained by Midwest Real Estate Data LLC may not reflect all real estate activity in then |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Table 15 <br> Median Sales Price of Attached Single-Family Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Community Name | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Grand Boulevard | \$229,000 | \$244,000 | \$239,250 | \$205,000 | \$57,000 | \$36,315 | \$40,850 | \$50,600 | \$60,300 |
| Washington Park | \$184,900 | \$194,950 | \$199,950 | \$148,300 | \$44,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$28,000 | \$32,150 |
| Woodlawn | \$199,000 | \$213,000 | \$205,000 | \$179,900 | \$46,000 | \$45,000 | \$40,000 | \$37,000 | \$45,550 |
| Englewood | \$61,500 | \$69,995 | \$60,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,500 | \$6,000 | \$11,500 | \$1 | \$18,850 |
| Source: This representation is based in whole or in part on data supplied by Midwest Real Estate Data LLC for the period January 2011 through December 2013. Midwest Real Estate Data LLC does not guarantee nor is it in any way responsible for its accuracy. Data maintained by Midwest Real Estate Data LLC may not reflect all real estate activity in the market. © 2014 MRED <br> Number of Attached Single-Family Units Sold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Grand Boulevard | 309 | 423 | 272 | 159 | 153 | 178 | 140 | 158 | 176 |
| Washington Park | 186 | 192 | 96 | 63 | 67 | 65 | 76 | 58 | 62 |
| Woodlawn | 187 | 171 | 199 | 105 | 147 | 115 | 83 | 87 | 78 |
| Englewood | 11 | 9 | 3 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Source: This representation is based in whole or in part on data supplied by Midwest Real Estate Data LLC for the period January 2011 through December 2013. Midwest Real Estate Data LLC does not guarantee nor is it in any way responsible for its accuracy. Data maintained by Midwest Real Estate Data LLC may not reflect all real estate activity in the market. © 2014 MRED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Foreclosures

Table 16 below summarizes the foreclosure filings in the Washington Park, Englewood, Woodlawn, Grand Boulevard, and Kenwood community areas over the last five years. Foreclosures are highest in Greater Grand Crossing and Grand Boulevard. Washington Park and Kenwood have recorded the fewest foreclosures since 2008; foreclosures in Washington Park have dropped steadily over the last five years.

Table 16
Foreclosure Filings by Property Type by Community Area

|  | $\frac{2008}{163}$ | $\frac{\mathbf{2 0 0 9}}{150}$ | $\frac{2010}{121}$ | $\frac{\mathbf{2 0 1 1}}{123}$ | $\frac{\mathbf{2 0 1 2}}{110}$ | $\frac{\text { 2008-2012}}{\text { Total }}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Washington Park | 351 | 347 | 315 | 252 | 259 | 1,524 |
| Grand Boulevard | 415 | 349 | 334 | 291 | 334 | 1,723 |
| Greater Grand Crossing | 111 | 90 | 125 | 103 | 118 | 547 |
| Kenwood | 397 | 294 | 277 | 201 | 195 | 1,364 |
| Woodlawn |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Woodstock Institute

## Proposed For-Sale Developments in Project Area

A number of new residential developments are planned or have been announced in the Project Area, taking advantage of the vacant lots or existing buildings in need of rehabilitation. Most of these developments, described below, are located in the eastern half of the Project Area. The status of a number of these developments is uncertain, and will depend on the ongoing recovery of the housing market.

- 10 single-family homes were proposed by Appiah Development on South Wabash Avenue between $56^{\text {th }}$ and $57^{\text {th }}$ Streets.
- A 12-unit condominium development was planned at $57^{\text {th }}$ Street and South Prairie Avenue.
- Ascendance Partners proposed rehabbing an existing building at $59^{\text {th }}$ Street and South Wabash Avenue to create approximately 32 units.
- Good Shepherd Community Service Organization proposed developing 19 units between $56^{\text {th }}$ and $57^{\text {th }}$ Streets on South Prairie Avenue.


## Relocation Assistance

In the event that the implementation of the Plan results in the removal of residential housing units in the Project Area occupied by low-income households or very low-income households, or the displacement of low-income households or very low-income households from such residential housing units, such households shall be provided affordable housing and relocation assistance not less than that which would be provided under the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and the regulations thereunder, including the eligibility criteria. Affordable housing may be either existing or newly constructed housing. The City shall make a good faith effort to ensure that this affordable housing is located in or near the Project Area.

As used in the above paragraph "low-income households", "very low-income households" and "affordable housing" shall have the meanings set forth in Section 3 of the Illinois Affordable Housing Act, 310 ILCS 65/3. As of the date of this Plan, these statutory terms are defined as follows: (i) "low-income household" means a single person, family or unrelated persons living together whose adjusted income is more than 50 percent but less than 80 percent of the median income of the area of residence, adjusted for family size, as such adjusted income and median income are determined from time to time by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") for purposes of Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; (ii) "very low-income household" means a single person, family or unrelated persons living together whose adjusted income is not more than 50 percent of the median income of the area of residence, adjusted for family size, as so determined by HUD; and (iii) "affordable housing" means residential housing that, so long as the same is occupied by low-income households or very low-income households, requires payment of monthly housing costs, including utilities other than telephone, of no more than 30 percent of the maximum allowable income for such households, as applicable.
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| Address | Bedrooms | Tenant Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6217 S Calumet Ave | 2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 5801 S Michigan Ave | 2，3 | Supportive |
| 5947－59 S Indiana Ave | 1，2，3 | Multifamily |
| 6253 S Michigan Ave | 1，2，3 | Multifamily |
| S Michigan Ave between 57th and 61st St | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 5751－59 S Michigan Ave | － | Multifamily |
| 325－43 E 55th Place | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily，Supportive |
| 60th \＆S Michigan，Wabash，and Indiana | 3，4 | Multifamily |
| 5556 S Michigan Ave | 2，3 | Senior |
| 331 E 56th St | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 5630 S．Michigan Ave | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 6027 S Michigan Ave | 1，2，3 | Multifamily |
| 6141 S Michigan Ave | － | Senior |
| 61st St between Michigan and Wabash | 3，4 | Multifamily |
| 6109－19 S Indiana Ave | 1，2，3 | Multifamily |
| 6121 S Michigan Ave \＆5926－32 S Indiana Ave | 1，2，3 | Multifamily |
| 6000 S Indiana Ave | － | Multifamily |
| 55 E Garfield Blvd | 0，1 | Multifamily，Senior |
| 4835 S King Dr | － | Multifamily |
| 5800 S Michigan Ave | － | Multifamily |
| 5110 S King Dr | － | Multifamily |
| 5907－09 S Wabash Ave | － | Multifamily |
| 331 E 56th St | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 220 E Garfield Blvd | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 6201 S King Dr | 1，2，3 | Multifamily |
| 5441 S Michigan Ave | － | Supportive |
| 3900 S Lake Park Ave | － | Multifamily |
| 661 E 69th St | 1 | Senior |
| 4162 S Drexel Blvd | 2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 1061 E 41st Place | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
| 4016 S State St | － | Multifamily |
| 3867 S Ellis Ave | 1，2，3， 4 | Multifamily |
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！ Within Study Area
Washington Park Low－Rises Washington Park Low－Rises
Brand New Beginnings，Inc St．Edmund＇s Manor St．Edmund＇s Village St．Edmund＇s Plaza Harriett Tubman Apartments Coppin House St．Edmund＇s Commons St．Edmund＇s Corners Prairie Park Apartments Woodlawn／Michigan Apts． 6027－29 S．Michigan St．Edmund＇s Tower St．Edmund＇s Meadows St．Edmund＇s Place St．Edmund＇s Square 6000 S Indiana Apartments Good Shepherd Tower Liberty Commons 5800 S Michigan LLC Park View Apartments South Wabash Apartments South Park Apartments Park Apartments Westwood Phase II Outside of Study Area Urbanite Apartments Lake Parc Place Ada S．Dennison－McKinley Apartments Jazz on the Boulevard Lake Park Crescent Legends South

Oakwood Shores

#  

 ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' $\mathfrak{N}$ N| - | Multifamily |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Senior |
| 1 | Senior |
| 1 | Senior |
| 1 | Senior |
| 1 | Senior |
| - | Senior |
| - | Senior |
| - | Senior |
| - | Senior |
| - | Senior |
| 2,3 | Multifamily |
| - | Supportive |
| - | Multifamily |
| $0,1,2$ | Supportive |
| - | Supportive |
| - | Supportive |
| $0,1,2,3$ | Supportive |
| $0,1,2,3,4$ | Multifamily |
| 1,2 | Senior |
| 1 | Senior |
| $2,3,4,5$ | Multifamily, Senior |
| $1,2,3$ | Multifamily |
| $1,2,3$ | Multifamily |
| $1,2,3$ | Multifamily |
| 1 | Multifamily |
| - | Multifamily |
| $1,2,3$ | Multifamily |
| $1,2,3,4,5$ | Multifamily |
| 0 | Supportive |
| $1,2,3,4$ | Multifamily |
| $1,2,3,4$ | Multifamily |
| $0,1,2,3,4$ | Multifamily |
| 2,3 | Multifamily |
| 1 | Multifamily |
| $0,1,2,3,4$ | Multifamily |
| $1,2,3$ | Multifamily, Supportive |
| 0,1 | Senior |
| $1,2,3,4$ | Multifamily |
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Senior
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Senior
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Multifamily
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$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Oakwood Shores Senior Apartments } & 3750 \text { S. Cottage Grove Ave. } \\
\text { Park Boulevard IA } & 3845 \text { S. State St. } \\
\text { Park Boulevard IIA } & 17 \text { W. 36th St. } \\
\text { Park Boulevard IIA } & 3604 \text { S. State St. } \\
\text { Park Boulevard IIA } & 3612 \text { S. State St. } \\
\text { Park Boulevard IIA } & 3640 \text { S. State St. } \\
\text { Park Boulevard IB } & 3506 \text { S. State St. } \\
\text { South Park Plaza } & 2600 \text { S. King Dr. } \\
\text { Pioneer Gardens Supportive Living } & 3800 \text { S. King Dr. } \\
\text { Pioneer Village Apartments } & 340 \text { E. 38th St. } \\
\text { Eden Development } & 3145 \text { S. Michigan Ave. } \\
\text { Indiana Manor Town Homes } & 44 \text { th/lndiana } \\
\text { Hearts United Phase I - The Langston } & 41 \text { st St. - 44th St. } \\
\text { Hearts United Phase II - The Quincy } & \text { E. Evans - W. Vincennes } \\
\text { Progressive Square } & 4752 \text { S. Wabash Ave. } \\
\text { Park Boulevard Tower/Grand Renaissance Apts } 4257 \text { S. King Dr. } \\
\text { Geneva Gables } & 4420-24 \text { S. Michigan Ave. } \\
\text { Margaret Ford Manor Independent Living } & 4500 \text { S. Wabash Ave. } \\
\text { Cornerstone/Evans Langley } & 4907 \text { S. St. Lawrence Ave. } \\
\text { Legends South - Hansberry Square } & 4034 \text { S. State St. } \\
\text { Legends South - Mahalia Place } & 116 \text { E. 43rd St. } \\
\text { Legends South - Coleman Place } & 223 \text { E. 41st St. } \\
\text { Legends South - Savoy Square } & 4448 \text { S. State St. } \\
\text { Hearts United Apartments } & 654 \text { E. 43rd St. }
\end{array}
$$
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## STATE OF ILLINOIS)

)SS

## COUNTY OF COOK )

## CERTIFICATE

## I, Robert Wolf, the duly authorized and qualified Assistant Secretary of the

 Community Development Commission of the City of Chicago, and the custodian of the records thereof, do hereby certify that I have compared the attached copy of a Resolution adopted by the Community Development Commission of the City of Chicago at a Regular Meeting held on the $12^{\text {th }}$ Day of August 2014 with the original resolution adopted at said meeting and noted in the minutes of the Commission, and do hereby certify that said copy is a true, correct and complete transcript of said Resolution.
## Dated this $\mathbf{1 2}^{\text {th }}$ Day of August 2014



# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO 

resolution 14 -CDC- 32<br>RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO<br>FOR THE PROPOSED WASHINGTON PARK<br>REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA:

## APPROVAL OF THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN, DESIGNATION AS A REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA AND ADOPTION OF TAX INCREMENT ALLOCATION FINANCING

WHEREAS, the Community Development Commission (the "Commission") of the City of Chicago (the "City") has heretofore been appointed by the Mayor of the City with the approval of its City Council ("City Council," referred to herein collectively with the Mayor as the "Corporate Authorities") (as codified in Section 2-124 of the City's Municipal Code) pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-4(k) of the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, as amended (65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq.) (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, the Commission is empowered by the Corporate Authorities to exercise certain powers set forth in Section 5/11-74.4-4(k) of the Act, including the holding of certain public hearings required by the Act; and

WHEREAS, staff of the City's Department of Planning and Development has conducted or caused to be conducted certain investigations, studies and surveys of the Washington Park area, the street boundaries of which are described on Exhibit A hereto (the "Area"), to determine the eligibility of the Area as a redevelopment project area as defined in the Act (a "Redevelopment Project Area") and for tax increment allocation financing pursuant to the Act ("Tax Increment Allocation Financing"), and previously has presented the following documents to the Commission for its review:

[^4][WHEREAS, the Commission has heretofore passed Resolution 13-CDC-37 on October 8, 2013 that contains the information required by Section 5/11-74.4-4.16(a) of the Act to be included therein and that provides for the preparation of a feasibility study on designation of the Area as a Redevelopment Project Area and requires that such feasibility study include the preparation of the housing impact study set forth in Section 5/11-74.4-3(n)(5) of the Act, all as required by Section 5/11-74.4-4.1(b) of the Act, which has resulted in the preparation of the Report and the Plan being presented to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, a public meeting (the "Public Meeting") was held in accordance and in compliance with the requirements of Section 5/11-74.4-6(e) of the Act on April 8, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at KLEO Center, 119 E. Garfield Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60637, Chicago, Illinois, being a date not less than 14 business days before the mailing of the notice of the Hearing (hereinafter defined), pursuant to notice from the City's Commissioner of the Department of Planning and Development given on March 21, 2014 being a date not less than 15 days before the date of the Public Meeting, by certified mail to all taxing districts having real property in the proposed Area and to all entities requesting that information that have taken the steps necessary to register to be included on the interested parties registry for the proposed Area in accordance with Section 5/1174.4.2 of the Act and, with a good faith effort, by regular mail to all residents and the last known persons who paid property taxes on real estate in the proposed Area (which good faith effort was satisfied by such notice being mailed to each residential address and the person or persons in whose name property taxes were paid on real property for the last preceding year located in the proposed Area), which to the extent necessary to effectively communicate such notice, was given in English and in other languages; and

WHEREAS, prior to the adoption by the Corporate Authorities of ordinances approving a redevelopment plan, designating an area as a Redevelopment Project Area or adopting Tax Increment Allocation Financing for an area, it is necessary that the Commission hold a public hearing (the "Hearing") pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-5(a) of the Act, convene a meeting of a joint review board (the "Board") pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-5(b) of the Act, set the dates of such Hearing and Board meeting and give notice thereof pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-6 of the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Report and Plan were made available for public inspection and review since May 30, 2014, being a date not less than 10 days before the Commission meeting at which the Commission adopted Resolution 14-CDC-20 on June 6, 2014 fixing the time and place for the Hearing, at City Hall, 121 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, in the following offices: City Clerk, Room 107 and Department of Housing and Economic Development, Room 1000; and

WHEREAS, notice of the availability of the Report and Plan, including how to obtain this information, were sent by mail on April 30, 2014, which is within a reasonable time after the adoption by the Commission of Resolution 14-CDC-20 to: (a) all residential addresses that, after a good faith effort, were determined to be (i) located within the Area and (ii) located outside the proposed Area and within 750 feet of the boundaries of the Area (or, if applicable, were
determined to be the 750 residential addresses that were outside the proposed Area and closest to the boundaries of the Area); and (b) organizations and residents that were registered interested parties for such Area; and

WHEREAS, notice of the Hearing by publication was given at least twice, the first publication being on July 15, 2014 a date which is not more than 30 nor less than 10 days prior to the Hearing, and the second publication being on July 22, 2014, in the Chicago Sun-Times, being newspapers of general circulation within the taxing districts having property in the Area; and

WHEREAS, notice of the Hearing was given by mail to taxpayers by depositing such notice in the United States mail by certified mail addressed to the persons in whose names the general taxes for the last preceding year were paid on each lot, block, tract or parcel of land lying within the Area, on July 18, 2014, being a date not less than 10 days prior to the date set for the Hearing; and where taxes for the last preceding year were not paid, notice was also mailed to the persons last listed on the tax rolls as the owners of such property within the preceding three years; and

WHEREAS, a good faith effort was made to give notice of the Hearing by mail to all residents of the Area by, at a minimum, giving notice by mail to each residential address located in the Area, which to the extent necessary to effectively communicate such notice was given in English and in the predominant language of residents of the Area other than English on July 18, 2014, being a date not less than 10 days prior to the date set for the Hearing; and

WHEREAS, notice of the Hearing was given by mail to the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity ("DCEO") and members of the Board (including notice of the convening of the Board), by depositing such notice in the United States mail by certified mail addressed to DCEO and all Board members, on June 17, 2014, being a date not less than 45 days prior to the date set for the Hearing; and

WHEREAS, notice of the Hearing and copies of the Report and Plan were sent by mail to taxing districts having taxable property in the Area, by depositing such notice and documents in the United States mail by certified mail addressed to all taxing districts having taxable property within the Area, on June 17, 2014, being a date not less than 45 days prior to the date set for the Hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Hearing was held on August 12, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. at City Hall, Room 1003A, 121 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, as the official public hearing, and testimony was heard from all interested persons or representatives of any affected taxing district present at the Hearing and wishing to testify, concerning the Commission's recommendation to City Council regarding approval of the Plan, designation of the Area as a Redevelopment Project Area and adoption of Tax Increment Allocation Financing within the Area; and

WHEREAS, the Board meeting was convened on July 11, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. (being a date at least 14 days but not more than 28 days after the date of the mailing of the notice to the taxing districts on June 17, 2014) in Room 1003A, City Hall, 121 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, to review the matters properly coming before the Board to allow it to provide its advisory recommendation regarding the approval of the Plan, designation of the Area as a Redevelopment Project Area, adoption of Tax Increment Allocation Financing within the Area and other matters, if any, properly before it, all in accordance with Section 5/11-74.4-5(b) of the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed the Report and Plan, considered testimony from the Hearing, if any, the recommendation of the Board, if any, and such other matters or studies as the Commission deemed necessary or appropriate in making the findings set forth herein and formulating its decision whether to recommend to City Council approval of the Plan, designation of the Area as a Redevelopment Project Area and adoption of Tax Increment Allocation Financing within the Area; now, therefore,

## BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO:

Section 1. The above recitals are incorporated herein and made a part hereof.
Section 2. The Commission hereby makes the following findings pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4$3(\mathrm{n})$ of the Act or such other section as is referenced herein:
a. The Area on the whole has not been subject to growth and development through investment by private enterprise and would not reasonably be expected to be developed without the adoption of the Plan;
b. The Plan:
(i) conforms to the comprehensive plan for the development of the City as a whole; or
(ii) the Plan either (A) conforms to the strategic economic development or redevelopment plan issued by the Chicago Plan Commission or (B) includes land uses that have been approved by the Chicago Plan Commission;
c. The Plan meets all of the requirements of a redevelopment plan as defined in the Act and, as set forth in the Plan, the estimated date of completion of the projects described therein and retirement of all obligations issued to finance redevelopment project costs is not later than December 31 of the year in which the payment to the municipal treasurer as provided in subsection (b) of Section 5/11-74.4-8 of the Act is to be made with respect to ad valorem taxes levied in the twenty-third calendar year following the year of the
adoption of the ordinance approving the designation of the Area as a redevelopment project area and, as required pursuant to Section $5 / 11-74.4-7$ of the Act, no such obligation shall have a maturity date greater than 20 years;
d. To the extent required by Section $5 / 11 \mathrm{~B} 74.4-3(\mathrm{n})(6)$ of the Act, the Plan incorporates the housing impact study, if such study is required by Section $5 / 11-74.4-3(\mathrm{n})(5)$ of the Act;
e. The Plan will not result in displacement of residents from inhabited units.
f. The Area includes only those contiguous parcels of real property and improvements thereon that are to be substantially benefitted by proposed Plan improvements, as required pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-4(a) of the Act;
g. As required pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-3(p) of the Act:
(i) The Area is not less, in the aggregate, than one and one-half acres in size; and
(ii) Conditions exist in the Area that cause the Area to qualify for designation as a redevelopment project area and a blighted area/conservation area as defined in the Act;
h. If the Area is qualified as a "blighted area", whether improved or vacant, each of the factors necessary to qualify the Area as a Redevelopment Project Area on that basis is (i) present, with that presence documented to a meaningful extent so that it may be reasonably found that the factor is clearly present within the intent of the Act and (ii) reasonably distributed throughout the improved part or vacant part, as applicable, of the Area as required pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-3(a) of the Act;
i. If the Area is qualified as a "conservation area", the combination of the factors necessary to qualify the Area as a redevelopment project area on that basis is detrimental to the public health, safety, morals or welfare, and the Area may become a blighted area; [and]

Section 3. The Commission recommends that the City Council approve the Plan pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-4 of the Act.

Section 4. The Commission recommends that the City Council designate the Area as a Redevelopment Project Area pursuant to Section 5/11-74.4-4 of the Act.

Section 5. The Commission recommends that the City Council adopt Tax Increment Allocation Financing within the Area.

Section 6. If any provision of this resolution 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 resolution.

Section 7. All resolutions, motions or orders in conflict with this resolution are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Section 8. This resolution shall be effective as of the date of its adoption.
Section 9. A certified copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the City Council.

ADOPTED:


List of Attachments:
Exhibit A: Street Boundary Description of the Area

## EXHIBIT A

Street Boundary Description of the Washington Park Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Project Area

The Area is generally bounded by 51st Street and 55th Street on the north, 67th Street on the south, Cottage Grove Avenue and Washington Park on the east, and the Dan Ryan Expressway on the west.

THAT PART OF SECTIONS $10,11,14,15,16,21$ AND 22 IN TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 14 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTH LINE OF THE SOUTH 16 FEET OF LOT 6 OF SOUERBRY \& GRUS' SUBDIVISION IN THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 16 AFORESAID RECORDED SEPTEMBER 24,1868 AS DOCUMENT 183534; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF GARFIELD BLVD. TO THE WEST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD TO THE NORTH LINE OF SECTION 16; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SECTION 16 TO THE EAST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILROAD TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF GARFIELD BLVD.; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY OF GARFIELD BLVD. TO A POINT AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN BLOCK 2 IN YERBY'S SUBDIVISION RECORDED OCTOBER 17, 1857 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 93105 SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF INDIANA AVE; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF INDIANA AVENUE TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55th PLACE SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN SUBDIVISION OF LOT $25,26,27$ OF BLOCK 2 OF YERBY'S SUBDIVISION RECORDED SEPTEMBER 25, 1889 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 1160736; THENCE EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55тн PLACE TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 16 FEET OF LOT 2 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID EAST 16 FEET OF LOT 2 AND ITS SOUTHERLY EXTENSION TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING SOUTH OF 55 th PLACE; THENCE EAST TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 11 FEET OF LOT 11 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID EAST 11 FEET OF LOT 11 TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 56th STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 56th STREET TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 18 FEET OF LOT 12 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST 18 FEET OF LOT 12 TO THE NORTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 56th STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG SAID ALLEY TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 23 FEET OF LOT 1 IN BLOCK 2 OF HANCE'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID WEST 23 FEET OF LOT 1 TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55th PLACE; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 55th PLACE TO THE WEST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVE); THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVE) TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 51st STREET; THENCE WEST TO THE SOUTHERLY EXTENSION OF THE WEST LINE OF SOUTH PARK AVENUE AS LOCATED IN THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 10 AFORESAID; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE SOUTHERLY EXTENSION OF

THE WEST LINE OF SOUTH PARK AVENUE TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 51 lst STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGIIT OF WAY LINE OF $51^{\text {ST }}$ STREET AND ITS EASTERLY EXTENSION TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF COTTAGE GROVE AVENUE; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF COTTAGE GROVE AVENUE TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th STREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 Th STREET TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVENUE); THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE (SOUTH PARK AVENUE) TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 63 ${ }^{\text {ru }}$ STREET ALSO BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 10 IN BLOCK 2 IN SONNENSCHEIN \& SOLOMON'S SUBDIVISION RECORDED APRIL 20, 1891 AS DOCUMENT 1453254; THENCE WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 63rd STREET TO THE CENTER LINE OF PRAIRIE AVENUE; THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID CENTER LINE OF PRAIRIE AVENUE TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 12 IN SUBDIVISION OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 12 IN SUBDIVISION OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 TO THE EAST LINE OF INDIANA AVENUE; THENCE WESTERLY TO THE POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID AND THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 3 IN $64^{\text {TH }}$ AND STATE STREETS SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF LOT 3 A DISTANCE OF 327.80 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 3 IN $64{ }^{\text {TH }}$ AND STATE STREETS SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN CITY PRODUCTS CORPORATION SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 A DISTANCE OF 25.67 FEET TO AN ANGLE POINT; THENCE CONTINUING SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 A DISTANCE OF 187.50 FEET TO AN ANGLE POINT; THENCE CONTINUING
SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 A DISTANCE OF 88.99 FEET TO THE MOST EASTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 1 SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF THE RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH SECTION 22; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 27 IN BRACKETT'S RESUBDIVISION OF LOTS 1 TO 30 IN JUNCTION GROVE, ARTEMUS WHITE AND FRANCIS B. DODSWORTH'S SUBDIVISION OF

PART OF THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 22 AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY' LINE OF SAID LOT 27 AND LOT 28 TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 28 IN BRACKETT'S RESUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF LOT 28 AFORESAID TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 28 BEING ALSO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66{ }^{\text {TH }}$ STREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66^{\text {TH }}$ STREET TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE STREET TO A POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66^{\text {TH }}$ STREET AS LOCATED IN THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $66^{\text {TH }}$ STREET TO THE EAST LINE OF THE RIGHT OF WAY OF PERRY AVENUE; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF THE RIGHT OF WAY OF PERRY AVENUE TO THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 3 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF LOTS 3 AND 4 OF BLOCK 13 OF SKINNER \& JUDD'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE OF LOT 3 TO THE CENTER LINE OF VACATED PERRY AVENUE AS VACATED BY DOC. 89170528; THENCE NORTH TO THE POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHERLY LINE OF VACATED PERRY AVENUE; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF VACATED PERRY AVENUE TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF LOT 1 BEING 49.50 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 1 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF LOTS 3 AND 4 OF BLOCK 13 OF SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID; THENCE WEST ALONG A LINE BEING 49.50 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 1 TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1 AND ITS NORTHERLY EXTENSION TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 8 IN BLOCK 13 IN SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 8 A DISTANCE OF 86 FEET; THENCE NORTH TO THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 8 AT A POINT BEING 86 FEET WEST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 8; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 8 AND ITS WESTERLY EXTENSION TO THE INTERSECTION WITH A LINE BEING 40 FEET EAST OF AND PARALLEL TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID, SAID LINE BEING ALSO THE EAST LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE AS EXTENDED; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EXTENSION OF THE EAST LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH LINE OF $65^{\mathrm{TH}}$ STREET AS LOCATED IN THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE NORTHEAST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 21 AFORESAID; THENCE WEST ALONG THE EASTERLY EXTENSION OF THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $65^{\text {TH }}$ STREET TO THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE DAN RYAN EXPRESSWAY ALSO BEING A POINT 182.80 FEET EAST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 5 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF LOTS 4, 5 AND 6 OF BLOCK 8 OF SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE

NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF THE DAN RYAN EXPRESSWAY TO THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 8 IN BLOCK 3 IN SKINNER AND JUDD'S SUBDIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE EAST TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 8; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 40 FEET OF LOT 8 LYING 50.76 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 8; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 40 FEET OF LOT 8 AFORESAID EXTENDED NORTH TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $64^{\text {TH }}$ SREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $64^{\text {TH }}$ STREET TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF YaLE AVENUE; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF YALE AVENUE TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $63^{\text {RD }}$ STREET; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 34 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY OF 63rd STREET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 30 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 30 IN BLOCK 3 A DISTANCE OF 38 FEET; THENCE NORTHEAST TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 31 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION SAID POINT BEING 12 FEET EAST OF THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 31; THENCE NORTH TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 63rd STREET SAID POINT ALSO BEING A POINT ON LOT 22 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE WEST ALONG SAID NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE PUBLIC ALLEY, TO THE CENTER LINE OF THE VACATED ALLEY IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE CENTER LINE OF THE VACATED PUBLIC ALLEY TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF ENGLEWOOD AVENUE; THENCE EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF ENGLEWOOD AVENUE TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 22 IN BLOCK 3 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 35 IN BLOCK 2 IN I.J. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF A 20 FOOT ALLEY; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID ALLEY TO THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 17 IN BLOCK l OF IRA J. NICHOLS SUBDIVISION; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 17 AND THE SOUTH LINE OF LOTS 15 AND 16 IN BLOCK 1 TO THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH SAID BLOCK 1; THENCE NORTHWEST ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY TO THE EAST LINE OF THE 20 FOOT VACATED ALLEY IN BLOCK 1 OF IRA J. NICHOLS SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID VACATED ALLEY TO THE SOUTH LINE OF AN ALLEY SOUTH OF $61{ }^{\text {ST }}$ PLACE; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN BLOCK 7 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION OF OUTLOTS 17 TO 21 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY LYING EAST OF PRINCETON AVENUE TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 61st PLACE; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF $61{ }^{\text {ST }}$ PLACE TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 20 FEET OF LOT 8 IN THE SUBDIVISION OF THE WEST 300 FEET OF PART OF BLOCK 5 OF

ASSESSOR'S DIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF THE WEST 20 FEET OF LOT 8 TO THE NORTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 61 st PLACE; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID ALLEY TO THE EAST LINE OF LOT 4 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 61st STREET; THENCE NORTH TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 17 OF THE SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH 148.56 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 18 AND THE SOUTH 116.80 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 19 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 61st STREET; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 17 TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF A 16 FOOT ALLEY IN SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH 148.56 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 18 AND THE SOUTH 116.80 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 19 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID 16 FOOT ALLEY; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID ALLEY TO A POINT 11.12 FEET WEST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 24 IN THE SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH 148.56 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUTLOT 18 AND THE SOUTH 116.80 FEET OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF OUT LOT 19 OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY TO A POINT 7.32 FEET WEST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 24 SAID NORTHEAST CORNER ALSO BEING THE INTERSECTION WITH THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th PLACE; THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 TH PLACE TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 25 FEET OF LOT 26 IN D.C. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION EXTENDED TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60th PLACE; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE AND ITS SOUTHERLY EXTENSION AND ITS NORTHERLY EXTENSION TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY OF A 16 FOOT PUBLIC ALLEY IN D.C. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE EAST TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 11 FEET OF LOT 16 IN D.C. NICHOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $60^{\text {TH }}$ STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF $60^{\text {th }}$ STREET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 7 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION OF PART OF BLOCK 5 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 7 TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE ALLEY LYING NORTH OF 60th STREET; THENCE WEST ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF A 16 FOOT PUBLIC ALLEY TO A POINT WITH THE EXTENSION OF THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 50 FEET OF LOT 11 IN COUNTY CLERK'S DIVISION AFORESAID; THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59 тн PLACE; THENCE WEST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59тн PLACE TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 19 IN BLOCK 1 IN MICHAEL REICH'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF LOTS $19 \& 29$ IN BLOCK 1 TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59th STREET; THENCE EAST ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 59th STREET TO THE WEST RIGHT OF WAY

LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF WENTWORTH AVENUE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

## Exhibit

## Street Location

The Project Area can be separated into three sections:

1. Washington Park is bounded by 51 st and 60 th Streets on the north and south, and Cottage Grove Avenue and Martin Luther King Drive on the east and west;
2. the neighborhood section is generally bounded by Martin Luther King Drive and Washington Park on the east, the Dan Ryan Expressway on the west, Garfield Boulevard on the north and 63rd Street on the south; and
3. the industrial area south of 63rd Street to the Chicago Skyway, west of Prairie Avenue.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This is $42 \%$ greater than the statutory requirement. Under the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, for designation of an area as a Conservation Area, $50 \%$ or more of the buildings must be 35 years of age or older.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ This category may also include paying for or reimbursing (i) an elementary, secondary or unit school district's increased costs attributed to assisted housing units, and (ii) capital costs of taxing districts impacted by the redevelopment Project Area. As permitted by the Act, to the extent the City by written agreement accepts and approves the same, the City may pay or reimburse all or a portion of a taxing district's capital costs resulting from a redevelopment project necessarily incurred or to be incurred within a taxing district in furtherance or the objectives of the Plan.
    ${ }^{3}$ Total Redevelopment Project Costs represent an upper limit on expenditures that are to be funded using tax increment revenues and exclude any additional financing costs, including any interest expense, capitalized interest and costs associated with optional redemptions. These costs are subject to prevailing market conditions and are in addition to Total Redevelopment Project Costs. Within this limit, adjustments are may be made in line items without amendment to this Plan, to the extent permitted by the Act.
    ${ }^{4}$ The amount of the Total Redevelopment Project Costs that can be incurred in the Project Area will be reduced by the amount of redevelopment project costs incurred in contiguous redevelopment project areas, or those separated from the Project Area only by a public right-of-way, that are permitted under the Act to be paid, and are paid, from the incremental property taxes generated in the Project Area, but will not be reduced by the amount of redevelopment project costs incurred in the Project Area which are paid from incremental property taxes generated in contiguous redevelopment project areas or those separated from the Project Area only by a Public right-of-way.
    ${ }^{5}$ All costs are in 2014 dollars and may be increased by five percent (5\%) after adjusting for inflation reflected in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for All Items for the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI, CMSA, published by the U.S. Department of Labor.

    Additional funding from other sources such as federal, state, county, or local grant funds may be utilized to supplement the City's ability to finance Redevelopment Project Cost identified above.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ This is $42 \%$ greater than the statutory requirement. Under the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, for designation of an area as a Conservation Area, $50 \%$ or more of the buildings must be 35 ycars of age or older.

[^3]:    Sources: ERS Enterprises with percentages derived from U.S. Census

[^4]:    Washington Park Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Area Project and Plan (the "Plan");

