

1. Needed Update: CMR Report to address the impact of [SB 2 senate bill](#). The article summarizes SB 2: “*...the measure includes one controversial provision that requires many cities, counties and other taxing units to hold an election if they wish to raise 3.5% more property tax revenue than the previous year. The growth rate excludes taxes levied on new construction and can be averaged over three years, allowing taxing units to exceed the 3.5% threshold in some of them.*”

- Provide addendum to Report that addresses SB Impact, and update Table 38 accordingly.

2. Recommended Addition:

- Add column in Table 38 which extrapolates the net annual City Tax Revenue Increment. This new column would reflect the potential tax revenue which *could* be available for a TIF Finance Plan.

3. Recommended Addition: CMR’s analysis used the "proportional" and "competitive" shares of downtown growth that might occur in the SCW. These shares were based on the McCann Adams Studio evaluation of downtown opportunity sites in 2016, both the designation of sites and the anticipated capacity of those sites. If those opportunity site evaluations were revised to include the new Statesman proposal, would a different "proportional" and "competitive" share of downtown growth be allocated to the SCW TIRZ district? The CMR work sets the City's perceived ceiling on the TIF capacity and it would be helpful to know if the maximum potential buildout of the TIRZ area could be greater than what is estimated if the Plan allowed for more growth in the district.

4. Needed Clarification: Several times the CMR Report references the SCW Plan as forecasting “more than 8 million square feet of new development.” However, the SCW Plan’s forecast assumed 6.2 M SF of new development within the “bonus properties” (replacing approximately 900 K SF of demolition), with 2.3 M SF of remaining properties. The newly developed 6.2 M SF plus the remaining 2.3 M SF of undeveloped properties is where the 8.5 M SF comes from in the SCW Plan projections.

- Modify references throughout Report to clarify the SCW Plan’s projection was that 6.2 M SF of new development. Here are the locations in the Report which need the clarifications:
 - page 25, paragraph 2
 - page 44, paragraph 2
 - page 44, paragraph 3
 - page 65, paragraph 2
 - page 65, paragraph 3
 - page 69, Table 35