

MINUTES OF THE STARK COUNTY LAND REUTILIZATION CORPORATION
April 19, 2021

The Stark County Land Reutilization Corporation met for their regular meeting on Monday, April 19, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. in the Stark County Regional Planning Commission Conference Room.

Board Members

Alex Zumbar
Bill Smith
Lem Green
John Arnold
Janet Creighton

1. CALL TO ORDER – Alex Zumbar, SCLRC Chairman
2. ROLL CALL – Board Members Present

Roll call found the following Board members in attendance: Alex Zumbar, Lem Green, Bill Smith, John Arnold and Janet Creighton.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 18, 2021 MEETING

Zumbar moved and Green seconded to approve the minutes of March 18, 2021 meeting. Roll call vote: Zumbar -yes, Green – yes, Smith - yes, Arnold – abstained, Creighton – abstained. Motion carried.

4. PUBLIC SPEAKS – No public speaks
5. TREASURER/FISCAL REPORT - Heather Cunningham

Cunningham reviewed the Treasurer’s Report for the month of March. Arnold moved, Creighton seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Treasurer’s Report as submitted.

6. SIDE LOT/VACANT LOT PROGRAM REPORT
Alexandra Cramer presented the Side Lot/Vacant Lot Program Update:

Total Applications Submitted: 2,128
(34 applications were received since March ‘21 update)

Cities – 1,764
Canton: 1,397, Massillon: 137, Alliance: 230

Other Communities – 364

Bethlehem Twp – 40, Brewster – 9, Canal Fulton – 1, Canton Twp – 73, East Canton – 7, East Sparta – 2, Hartville – 3, Jackson Twp – 6, Lake Twp – 6, Lawrence Twp – 11, Lexington Twp – 40, Limaville – 2, Louisville – 2, Marlboro – 1, Meyer’s Lake – 1, Minerva – 3, Nimishillen – 6, North Canton – 2; Osnaburg Twp – 15, Paris Twp – 3, Perry Twp – 14, Pike Twp – 21, Plain Twp – 37, Sandy Twp – 41,

Sugarcreek Twp – 6, Tuscarawas Twp – 2, Washington Twp – 5, Waynesburg – 4, Wilmot-1

-
- Total Number of Applications under Preliminary Review: 15
 - Total Number of Applications Denied: 862
 - Number of Canceled Applications/Fee Refunded: 71
 - Total Number Pending Approval by Community: 38
 - **Total Number of Approved Applications: 1,142**
-
- Total Number of Approved Applications Pending Deposit Receipt / NIP Early Lien Release Approval / Request for Foreclosure / Completed Foreclosure Proceeding: 135
 - Total Number Being Prepared for Transfer: 27
 - **Total Number Transferred to Date: 980**

Vacant Lot Program Update:

Total Applications Submitted: 236

(6 Application received since March. '21 update)

Cities – 193; Canton: 170, Alliance: 14, Massillon: 9

Other Communities – 43

Bethlehem Twp – 15, Canton Twp – 7, Hartville – 1, Jackson Twp – 2, Lake – 1, Lexington Twp – 6, Perry – 1, Sandy Twp – 5; Sugarcreek Twp – 1, Washington Twp – 4,

-
- Total Number of Applications under Preliminary Review: 6
 - Total Number of Applications Denied: 166
 - Number of Canceled Applications/Fee Refunded: 7
 - Total Number Pending Approval by Community: 7
 - **Total Number of Approved Applications: 50**
-
- Total Number of Approved Applications Pending Executed MOU/ Completion of Foreclosure Proceeding: 10
 - Total Number Being Prepared for Transfer: 1
 - Total Number Transferred to Date: 39

Smith moved, Arnold seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Side Lot/Vacant Lot report as presented.

7. NEW BUSINESS

Sarah Peters presented the following TAAP and DAP Requests:

- a. Targeted Acquisition Assistance Program Requests
 - Habitat for Humanity – 46 parcels (Hartford and Belden Areas)
 - City of Alliance – Parcels #107925 (549 E. College St.) & 100316 (790 W. Main St.)

- City of Massillon – Parcel #600047 (1333 14th St. SE)
- Village of Minerva – Parcel #4200835 (104 Short St.)

Creighton asked Aaron Brown, Habitat for Humanity, if all the homes Habitat was building were single homes or were they condo style. Brown stated in order to give the board some background, 2018 Habitat looked to the City of Canton to help them address where they should be going. They identified a couple of areas around the Aultman area and the southeast. The southeast area had a higher homeowner-occupancy rate, which would allow them to make more of an impact with greater development opportunities. So they developed their plan, and in 2019 they were going to begin to enact that plan until the COVID hit. Now Habitat is backtracking to get everything submitted, so they can start their building. This plan is a combination of new construction builds and green space development. Habitat is looking at different models of row houses, which could mean more multi-family, but it would still be under their homeownership program. Homeowners would be receiving 0% loans, but it would be together, multi-unit, more middle housing. There are models across the country they are considering, so it brings in a little single-family mixed with row housing. Creighton asked if there was any opportunity for Habitat to go to the Aultman area. Brown stated there is always opportunity to go to different areas, but Habitat could not build a single house in that area. There are about 73-75% rentals in that area, and Habitat does not work with rentals. From an organizational standpoint, they couldn't do too much in that area right now, but that could change in the future.

Creighton moved, Arnold seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Targeted Acquisition Program requests.

b. Demolition Assistance Program Requests

- City of Alliance – Parcels #101636 & 101632 (172 & 176 E. Main St.)
- City of Alliance – Parcels #113621 & 113622 (530 & 536 E. Main St.)

Peters stated based upon the city's applications, they estimate a total cost of \$235,251 for demolition of the two projects. The overall estimate for the project at 172/176 E. Main Street has come in at \$124,875.60, so Alliance is requesting funding assistance from the Land Bank for \$62,437.80. The overall estimate for the second project at 530/536 E. Main Street is \$110,375.60, and Alliance is requesting \$55,187.80 from the Land Bank for that project. The city is requesting a total of \$117,625.60 from the Land Bank for these two projects. Based upon the review of the applications, they need additional information and paper work is needed from the city regarding their legal authority to enter on the property to complete and demolish each structure. If these applications are approved, they would enter into two separate agreements, one for each project. Peters stated that since initial discussions with Alliance last year and at the August meeting, they indicated they would potentially be asking the Land Bank for about \$200,000. The actual bids Alliance received for the work came in lower than anticipated. Smith asked if these were the same properties that were discussed with Alliance last fall. Zubar stated yes, and the 2021 budget was adjusted in anticipation for these potential projects.

Green moved, Smith seconded, and the motion carried to approve the Demolition Assistance Program requests as submitted.

8. OLD BUSINESS

Nau referenced the memo included in the packet summarizing RPC's administrative activities. In the 2021 budget, the allocation for the RPC contract was increased, so now he felt it was necessary to

provide a document that outlines the history of RPC's agreements and the additional fiscal activities that RPC has taken over. In addition, Alex Cramer has been assigned the Side Lot/Vacant Lot responsibilities, and RPC has hired an additional person that will assist with the fiscal responsibilities. The three items that will be addressed in this agreement are 1) an increase in the dollar amount of the contract, 2) the removal of the 5% management fee, which some board members have expressed concern about, and 3) the addition of a clause that states if RPC's expenses go over their contracted amount, then the Board would mutually agree to pay the overages. This agreement is set up as a time and materials agreement, which works out well if RPC's costs come under the contract amount, but last year RPC's cost went over almost \$14,000, and RPC had to absorb those expenses. This proposed contract will be sent out to the Board ahead of time and addressed at next month's meeting.

RPC met with representatives from the Stark Economic Development Board, and they are working on a project in the City of Alliance related to the Carnation Mall. There is a large retail chain that is looking at demolishing the mall and building a new retail business. Nau stated they have had preliminary discussions with them, and they wanted to know what type of assistance they could get from the Land Bank with demolition. The Land Bank's Demolition Assistance Program, absent the Hall of Fame agreement, is with local governments. An exception was made with the Hall of Fame when the Land Bank partnered with them on their project. They signed the checks last week on that project, and the costs have come in well under the allocated amount. This type of project is not really covered under the existing Demolition Assistance Program, because that is only with political subdivisions. This project in Alliance would be with another private entity. The Board needs to consider that and be aware of the implications. They were told to submit a specific request detailing how much they need, and some of the Land Bank's budgetary constraints were explained to them.

Smith stated the Hall of Fame project did come in under cost, but they have yet to take the school down, so he asked if the Land Bank will participate in that also. Nau stated this project was closed out, but if the HOF asks, he thought the Land Bank could because that was part of the original agreement. Smith stated that each request should be looked at individually. A request may come along that doesn't fit and the Board would turn it down. Creighton asked if there was any chance this property could be transferred to a CIC and then the dollars could be requested by the CIC to demo it. Zumbar stated the Land Bank is actually a special CIC, and we could weigh in on an agreement with perhaps the city. Nau believed the city was putting a financial package together for this project. Zumbar stated in this instance, we know there is going to be an end result; we know there's going to be development. That is what is positive about assisting with those types of projects. He did understand too there are properties the Land Bank may want to acquire for future development, and an end user is not known at that point in time, but certainly those types of projects must be looked at case by case and then weigh the pros and cons when making a decision.

Creighton asked if the Starfire property transfer was completed. Nau stated we do have a signed agreement but have not closed on it yet.

9. NEXT MEETING – Monday, May 17, 2021, 9:00 a.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned.