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1. Introduction

The Village of Plainfield (the "Village") seeks to establish a Tax Increment Financing ("TIF") district to serve as an economic development tool and promote the development and revitalization of the commercial district along Illinois Route 30 / Lincoln Highway. The Village engaged SB Friedman Development Advisors ("SB Friedman") to conduct a TIF District Eligibility Study (the "Eligibility Study") and prepare a Redevelopment Plan and Project (the "Redevelopment Plan").

This document serves as the Eligibility Study and Redevelopment Plan (the "Report") for the proposed Route 30 Redevelopment Project Area ("Route 30 RPA" or the "RPA"). Section 2 of the Report, the Eligibility Study, details the eligibility factors found within the proposed RPA in support of its designation as a "blighted area" for vacant land and a "conservation area" for improved land, within the definitions set forth in the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-1 et seq., as amended (the "Act"). Section 3 of this Report, the Redevelopment Plan, outlines the comprehensive program to revitalize the RPA, as required by the Act.

Redevelopment Project Area

The proposed Route 30 RPA is located within the Village of Plainfield in Will County (the "County"), as shown on Map 1. The proposed Route 30 RPA consists of 36 tax parcels (26 improved parcels and 10 vacant parcels) and 24 primary buildings. The RPA comprises approximately 209 acres of land, of which approximately 153 acres are vacant, 43 acres are improved, and approximately 13 acres are right-of-way. A majority of the parcels included in the RPA are located along Route 30, also known as Lincoln Highway, from just south of Renwick Road in the northwest to the Village's boundary with the City of Joliet in the southeast. The RPA also includes certain vacant parcels extending from near Route 30 to the former Joliet & Southern Co. railroad tracks and Interstate 55 to the north and east, as illustrated in Map 2. SB Friedman's analysis was completed for both vacant parcels and improved parcels, as shown in Map 3. Based upon SB Friedman's research, the RPA currently consists of a mix of commercial and vacant land uses, as shown in Map 4.

Determination of Eligibility

This report concludes that the proposed Route 30 RPA is eligible for designation as a "blighted area" for vacant land and as a "conservation area" for improved land, per the Act. Vacant land is any real property without industrial, commercial or residential structures, and has not been used for commercial agricultural purposes in the past five years unless it was subsequently subdivided. SB Friedman understands that the parcel with property index number (PIN) 0603231110040000 has been commercially farmed in recent years, but was subdivided into three separate parcels per document number R2018026438 recorded April 20, 2018, by the Will County Recorder. The area is therefore eligible for designation as a blighted area under the Act. The subdivision is not yet reflected in the County's parcel shapefile, but is indicated in the maps below and included in our analysis. The PIN list in Appendix 4 includes this original PIN, but the RPA will include three new PINs for the original parcel. For the purpose of our analysis, in a previously developed area, parcels that include side yards or parking lots related to an adjacent building are considered improved.
VACANT PARCELS: BLIGHTED AREA FINDINGS

Per SB Friedman’s analysis, the vacant portion of the RPA is eligible as a “blighted area” under the one-factor test for flooding as outlined in the Act. This factor is defined under the Act at 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3 (a) and (b) and more fully described in Appendix 2.

ONE-FACTOR ELIGIBILITY

The Village engaged Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers (“Baxter & Woodman”) to evaluate flooding or contribution to flooding within the watershed of the vacant parcels in the RPA. Baxter & Woodman determined that 98% of the vacant parcels, by land acreage, are within the 100-year floodplain, and 100% of the vacant parcels contribute to flooding within the Lily Cache Creek and the DuPage River watershed. Thus, the vacant land is eligible as a “blighted area” using the one-factor test.

IMPROVED PARCELS: CONSERVATION AREA FINDINGS

For the improved land within the RPA, SB Friedman’s analysis indicated that 54% of primary structures are aged 35 years or older and the following five (5) eligibility factors have been found to be present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA:

1. Lack of Growth in Equalized Assessed Value (“EAV”);
2. Deterioration;
3. Presence of Structures below Minimum Code Standards;
4. Inadequate Utilities; and
5. Lack of Community Planning.

These factors are defined under the Act at 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3 (a) and (b) and are more fully described in Appendix 2.

Based on the age of primary structures in the RPA and the presence of five eligibility factors, the improved parcels in the RPA qualify under a conservation area finding (age plus at least three eligibility factors).

SUMMARY OF ELIGIBILITY FINDINGS

SB Friedman has found that the vacant portion of the RPA qualifies to be designated as a “blighted area,” and the improved portion of the RPA qualifies as a “conservation area,” with 54% of the structures within the RPA at least 35 years of age or older, and five (5) of the thirteen (13) eligibility factors present to a meaningful extent within the RPA.

These conditions hinder the potential to redevelop the area and capitalize on its unique attributes. The RPA will benefit from a strategy that addresses the conditions of aged buildings, flood-prone parcels, and associated infrastructure while improving its overall physical condition.
Redevelopment Plan Goal, Objectives and Strategies

GOAL. The overall goal of the Redevelopment Plan and Project is to reduce or eliminate conditions that qualify the RPA as a vacant blighted area and an improved conservation area, and to provide the direction and mechanisms necessary to establish the RPA as a vibrant mixed-use district. Redevelopment of the RPA is intended to revitalize the area, strengthen the economic base, and enhance the Village’s overall quality of life.

OBJECTIVES. The following six (6) objectives support the overall goal of revitalization of the RPA:

1. Facilitate the physical improvement and/or rehabilitation of existing structures and façades within the RPA, and encourage the construction of new commercial, residential, civic/cultural and recreational development, where appropriate;

2. Foster the replacement, repair, construction and/or improvement of public infrastructure, where needed, to create an environment conducive to private investment;

3. Facilitate the renovation or construction of stormwater management systems and flood control within the RPA;

4. Provide resources for streetscaping, landscaping and signage to improve the image, attractiveness and accessibility of the RPA, create a cohesive identity for the RPA and surrounding area, and provide, where appropriate, for buffering between different land uses and screening of unattractive service facilities such as parking lots and loading areas;

5. Facilitate the assembly and preparation, including demolition and environmental clean-up, where necessary, and marketing of available sites in the RPA for redevelopment and new development by providing resources as allowed by the Act; and

6. Support the goals and objectives of other overlapping plans, including the Village of Plainfield Comprehensive Plan Update published in 2013 (the “2013 Comprehensive Plan” or “2013 Plan”), and other TIF redevelopment plans, and coordinate available federal, state and local resources to further the goals of this Redevelopment Plan and Project.

STRATEGIES. Rehabilitation and redevelopment of the RPA is to be achieved through an integrated and comprehensive strategy that leverages public resources to stimulate additional private investment. The underlying strategy is to use TIF, as well as other funding sources, to reinforce and encourage further private investment.

Financial Plan

ELIGIBLE COSTS. The Act outlines several categories of expenditures that can be funded using incremental property taxes. These expenditures, referred to as eligible redevelopment project costs, include all reasonable or necessary costs incurred or estimated to be incurred, and any such costs incidental to this Redevelopment Plan pursuant to the Act.

ESTIMATED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS. The estimated eligible costs of this Redevelopment Plan are $45 million. The total of eligible redevelopment costs provides an upper limit on expenditures that are to be
funded using tax increment revenues, exclusive of capitalized interest, issuance costs, interest and other financing costs.

**EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUE OF PROPERTIES IN THE RPA.** The 2017 EAV (the most recent year in which assessed values and the equalization factor were available) of all taxable parcels in the RPA is $4,930,688. By tax year 2041 (collection year 2042), the total taxable EAV for the RPA is anticipated to be approximately $32 million.

**Required Findings and Tests**

The required conditions for the adoption of this Redevelopment Plan and Project are found to be present within the Route 30 RPA:

1. The RPA is 210 acres in size and thus satisfies the requirement that it be at least 1.5 acres;

2. Limited private investment has occurred in the Route 30 RPA over the last five years;

3. Without the support of public resources, the redevelopment objectives for the RPA would most likely not be realized. Accordingly, “but for” the designation of a TIF district, these projects would be unlikely to occur on their own;

4. The Route 30 RPA includes only those contiguous parcels of real property that are expected to benefit substantially from the proposed Redevelopment Plan and Project;

5. The Redevelopment Plan conforms to and proposes land uses that are consistent with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan;

6. The Village certifies that no displacement will occur as a result of activities pursuant to this Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, a Housing Impact Study is not required under the Act; and

7. The Redevelopment Plan is estimated be completed, and all obligations issued to finance redevelopment costs shall be retired no later than December 31, 2041, if the ordinances establishing the RPA are adopted during 2018.
Parcel 0603231100040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Red subdivision lines shown here are approximate.
Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 060323110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.
Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 0603231110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.

Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 060323110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.

Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
2. Eligibility Analysis

This report concludes that the proposed Route 30 RPA is eligible for designation as a “blighted area” for vacant land and as a “conservation area” for improved land, per the Act.

Provisions of the Illinois Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act

Under the Act, two (2) primary avenues exist to establish eligibility for an area to permit the use of TIF for redevelopment: declaring an area as a “blighted area” and/or a “conservation area.” “Blighted areas” are those improved or vacant areas with blighting influences that are impacting the public safety, health, morals, or welfare of the community, and are substantially impairing the growth of the tax base in the area. “Conservation areas” are those improved areas that are deteriorating and declining and soon may become blighted if the deterioration is not abated. A description of the statutory provisions of the Act is provided below.

Factors for Vacant Land

According to the Act, there are two ways by which vacant land can be designated as “blighted.” One way is to find that at least two (2) of six (6) factors from the “Two-Factor Test” are present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA. The second way is to find at least one (1) of the six (6) factors under the “One-Factor Test” is present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA.

ONE-FACTOR TEST

Under the provisions of the “blighted area” section of the Act, if the land is vacant, an area qualifies as “blighted” if one (1) or more of the following factors is found to be present to a meaningful extent.

- The area contains unused quarries, strip mines or strip mine ponds;
- The area contains unused rail yards, rail track, or railroad rights-of-way;
- The area, prior to its designation, is subject to or contributes to chronic flooding;
- The area contains unused or illegal dumping sites;
- The area was designated as a town center prior to January 1, 1982, is between 50 and 100 acres, and is 75% vacant land; or
- The area qualified as blighted prior to becoming vacant.

Factors for Improved Areas

According to the Act, “blighted areas” for improved land must demonstrate at least five (5) of the following eligibility factors, which threaten the health, safety, morals or welfare of the proposed district. “Conservation areas” must have a minimum of 50% of the total structures within the area aged 35 years or older, plus a combination of three (3) or more additional eligibility factors that are detrimental to the public safety, health, morals or welfare, and that could result in such an area becoming a “blighted area.” The following are eligibility factors for improved areas:
Methodology Overview

SB Friedman conducted the following analysis to determine whether the proposed RPA qualifies for TIF designation:

- Parcel-by-parcel field observations and photography documenting external property conditions completed on June 7, 2018;
- Analysis of historical EAV trends for the last six years (five year-to-year periods) for which data are available and final (2012-2017) from the Will County Assessor’s Office;
- Review of building age data from the Plainfield Township Assessor’s Office and the CMAP Aerial Photo Archive;
- Review of parcel-level GIS shapefile data provided by the County;
- Review of municipal and county codes, building permit records (2013-May 2018), and code violation records as of July 2018;
- Review of utility data and a memorandum provided by Baxter & Woodman regarding presence, age, condition and adequacy of water, stormwater and sanitary sewer infrastructure;
- A memorandum from Baxter & Woodman detailing flooding conditions for vacant land within the RPA; and
- A review of current and first comprehensive plans provided by the Village (the first plan being from 1988, and the current plan from 2013).

SB Friedman examined all properties for qualification factors consistent with requirements of the Act. SB Friedman calculated the number of eligibility factors present on a building-by-building and/or parcel-by-parcel basis, and analyzed the spatial distribution of the eligibility factors. The information was then plotted on a parcel map of the RPA to establish the distribution of eligibility factors, and to determine which factors were present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA.

Blighted Area Findings: Vacant Parcels

Per SB Friedman’s analysis, the vacant portion of the RPA is eligible as a “blighted area” per the one-factor finding for flooding. This designation is detailed below and shown in Map 5 at the end of this eligibility section.
ONE-FACTOR BLIGHTED FINDING

SB Friedman reviewed a flooding memo prepared for the vacant portion of the RPA by Baxter & Woodman. The memo is provided in Appendix 5. Per the memo, 100% of the vacant land within the RPA contributes to flooding within the watershed. The memo notes that while the land is relatively flat, it drains, almost entirely uncontrolled, into Lily Cache Creek. As a result, the land contributes to flooding within the downstream DuPage River watershed. In addition, 98% of the vacant parcels are subject to chronic flooding, by acreage. To mitigate these impacts, development of any vacant property in the RPA will require stormwater and floodplain detention. Map 5 below shows the vacant parcels that contribute to flooding within the watershed. This factor is considered present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA.

Conservation Area Findings: Improved Parcels

Based upon the conditions found within the RPA at the completion of SB Friedman’s research, it has been determined that the improved land within the RPA meets the eligibility requirements of the Act as a "conservation area." Of the 24 primary buildings in RPA, at least 13 buildings (54%) are 35 years of age or older, as they were constructed before 1982. Map 6 shows the location of buildings that are 35 years or older. SB Friedman’s research indicates that the following five (5) factors are present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA:

1. Lack of Growth in EAV;
2. Deterioration;
3. Presence of Structures below Minimum Code Standards;
4. Inadequate Utilities; and
5. Lack of Community Planning,

Maps 7A through 7E illustrate the distribution of eligibility factors found within the RPA by highlighting each parcel or building where the respective factors were found to be present to a meaningful degree. Each eligibility factor that is present to a meaningful extent is summarized below:

1. LACK OF GROWTH IN EAV

The Act defines lack of growth in EAV as having the portion of the RPA under evaluation (improved or vacant parcels) meet one of following criteria for three (3) of the last five (5) years: decline; increase at an annual rate that was less than the balance of the Village; or increase at an annual rate that was less than the Consumer Price Index. A full definition is provided in Appendix 2.

SB Friedman tabulated the EAV history of all improved RPA tax parcels for the previous six years (five year-to-year periods) using EAV data provided by the Will County Assessor. The most recent year for which final information was available was 2017. SB Friedman’s analysis identified a lack of EAV growth within the RPA in accordance to the following criteria, as defined in the Act:

1. The total EAV of RPA parcels has declined for three (3) of the last five (5) year-to-year periods;
2. The EAV growth rate of the RPA parcels has been less than the growth rate of the balance of the Village for four (4) of the last five (5) year-to-year periods; and
3. The EAV growth rate has been less than the growth rate of the Consumer Price Index for four (4) of the last five (5) year-to-year periods.
This eligibility factor is present to a meaningful extent and assessed area-wide throughout the Route 30 RPA. A summary of SB Friedman’s findings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Percentage Change in Annual EAV, 2012-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in RPA Improved Parcels</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA Improved Parcels Decline</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Village EAV Less RPA Improved Parcels</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA Improved Parcels Growth Less Than Village</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in CPI [1]</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA Improved Parcels Growth Less Than CPI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. DETERIORATION

The Act defines deterioration as 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.

Deterioration was found to be present to meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA. Physical deterioration was observed on 25 of 26 improved parcels (96% of improved parcels). The most common form of deterioration was on surface improvements, including streets and parking lots. Catalogued surface improvement deterioration included cracks in infrastructure, alligatoring of pavement, and potholes. Building deterioration included stairstepping in cinderblock and cracks in façades. Deterioration of buildings and surface improvements can make it appear as though the RPA lacks investment and can make it more difficult to attract new businesses or consumers. This factor was found to be meaningfully present and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA.

3. INADEQUATE UTILITIES

The Act defines inadequate utilities as underground and overhead utilities, such as storm sewers and storm drainage, sanitary sewers, water lines, and gas, telephone and electrical services, which are:

1. Of insufficient capacity to serve the uses in the RPA;
2. Deteriorated, antiquated, obsolete, or in disrepair; or
3. Lacking within the redevelopment project area.
Based on information provided by Baxter & Woodman, a significant number of parcels lack any type of stormwater conveyance or management facilities. Per the memo, “much of the existing development was constructed prior to the [Village’s] Stormwater Drainage and Detention Ordinance was created and thus there is no onsite detention for many of the existing uses.” Runoff from the parcels flow directly into roadside ditches and/or to Lily Cache Creek. Although Route 30 was reconstructed from 2015-2017, stormwater management capacity was installed for the roadway only, not stormwater runoff related to adjacent private parcels.

Per Baxter & Woodman, the large impervious areas from buildings and paved parking lots within the RPA have overburdened the limited stormwater detention facilities that do exist. Future improvements will need to include conveyance systems, drainage swales, overland routes, storm sewers, catch basins, and culverts on parcels. Overall, 20 of the RPA’s 26 improved parcels (77%) are characterized by inadequate utilities. Based on these conditions, the inadequate utilities factor was found to be present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed throughout the improved parcels in the RPA.

4. PRESENCE OF STRUCTURES BELOW MINIMUM CODE STANDARDS

Per the Act, structures below minimum code standards are those that do not meet applicable standards of zoning, subdivision, building, fire and other governmental codes. The principal purpose of such codes is to protect the health and safety of the public and to uphold the health and safety of building occupants, pedestrians, or occupants of neighboring structures.

According to a review of building age data from the Village’s Buildings Department, all of the structures in the RPA were constructed prior to the adoption of the Village’s current Building Code in 2015. Although the development of these properties predates current codes and standards of the Village, the buildings may not be in direct violation of all ordinances, as they may have been “grandfathered in” or received a sufficient level of upgrades and improvements since being constructed.

Data and conversations with Village staff indicate that 15 of the 24 buildings in the RPA (63%) do not meet at least one current code. The presence of structures below minimum code standards, and the cost to upgrade “grandfathered” structures to meet modern codes may also reduce the overallcompetitiveness and economic viability of the area. Based on information provided by the Village, this factor is present to a meaningful extent and is reasonably distributed throughout the RPA.

5. LACK OF COMMUNITY PLANNING

Lack of community planning within the RPA is an area-wide factor not necessarily attributable to any one parcel. The Act provides that “Lack of Community Planning” can be found in areas that have been developed without the benefit of a comprehensive plan, and as a result, have experienced negative consequences such as incompatible land use relationships, inadequate street layout, improper subdivision, parcels of inadequate shape and size to meet contemporary development standards, or other related conditions.

The Village was incorporated in 1877, but did not produce a comprehensive plan until 1988, by which time all but three of the existing buildings (88%) in the RPA had been constructed. Per the 1988 and 2013 Comprehensive Plans, the Village has experienced traffic congestion along Route 30 for years, but the area was nearly fully developed before a plan was in place to ensure development met contemporary standards for ingress and egress. Issues today include an abundance of curb cuts along a major arterial and front-loading parking adjacent to the right of way.
Due to the RPA’s history of development prior to a comprehensive plan, a substantial portion of the improved parcels (12 of 26 parcels, or 46%) are characterized by improper subdivision or obsolete platting along Route 30. Narrow and irregularly shaped parcels do not allow for sufficient access to and frontage along right-of-way, and do not meet parking/loading requirements. These parcels do not meet the needs of contemporary commercial users, making the area difficult to redevelop on a planned basis. Thus, issues of unplanned development have created a legacy of traffic and platting issues that continue to impede the ability of the RPA to attract new development. This factor is evaluated area-wide and is found to be present to a meaningful extent throughout the RPA.

**Summary of Findings**

SB Friedman has found that the RPA qualifies to be designated as a “blighted area” for vacant land and as a “conservation area” for improved land. The vacant land is eligible under a one-factor test due to flooding and contribution to flooding in the RPA. The improved land is eligible as a “conservation area”, with 54% of the structures within the RPA at least 35 years of age or older, and five (5) of the thirteen (13) eligibility factors present to a meaningful extent and reasonably distributed within the RPA.
Parcel 060323110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.
Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 0603231110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.

Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 0603231110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.

Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 0603231110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate. Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County.
Parcel 0603231110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.

Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 060323110040000 was subdivided on April 20, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.

Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Parcel 0603231110400000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.
Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
3. Redevelopment Plan and Project

This document describes the comprehensive redevelopment program proposed to be undertaken by the Village to create an environment in which private investment can reasonably occur. The redevelopment program will be implemented over the 23-year life of the RPA. If a redevelopment project is successful, various new projects will be undertaken that will assist in alleviating blighting conditions and promoting rehabilitation and development in the RPA.

Redevelopment Needs of the RPA

Currently, the RPA is comprised of flood-prone vacant land and aging buildings that are characterized by a failure to meet current code standards, a lack of growth in property values, deterioration, inadequate utilities, and a lack of community planning. These conditions reduce the value of the properties in the area and make the RPA less competitive, overall, with property in other communities, thus limiting local area employment and development opportunities, and contributing to the lack of new investment in the RPA.

The existing conditions for the RPA suggest six (6) major redevelopment needs:

1. Capital improvements that further the objectives set forth in this Redevelopment Plan;
2. Site preparation, environmental remediation and stormwater management;
3. Redevelopment of underutilized parcels;
4. Streetscape and infrastructure improvements, including utilities;
5. Rehabilitation of existing buildings; and
6. Resources for commercial, residential, public/private institutional, community facility, park/open space, and utility development.

The goals, objectives and strategies discussed below have been developed to address these needs and facilitate the sustainable redevelopment of the RPA.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Goals, objectives and strategies, designed to address the needs of the community, form the overall framework of this Redevelopment Plan.

GOAL. The overall goal of the Redevelopment Plan is to reduce or eliminate conditions that qualify the proposed RPA as a blighted area for vacant land and a conservation area for improved land, and to provide the direction and mechanisms necessary to establish the RPA as a vibrant mixed-use district. Redevelopment of the RPA is intended to revitalize the area, strengthen the economic base, and enhance the Village’s overall quality of life.

OBJECTIVES. Six (6) objectives support the overall goal of area-wide revitalization of the RPA:

1. Facilitate the physical improvement and/or rehabilitation of existing structures and façades within the RPA, and encourage the construction of new commercial, residential, civic/cultural and recreational development, where appropriate;
2. Foster the replacement, repair, construction and/or improvement of public infrastructure where needed, including public utilities, public park and recreational facilities, sidewalks, streets, curbs, gutters, underground water and sanitary systems, and stormwater detention of adequate capacity to create an environment conducive to private investment;

3. Facilitate the renovation or construction of stormwater management systems and flood control within the RPA;

4. Provide resources for streetscaping, landscaping and signage to improve the image, attractiveness and accessibility of the RPA, create a cohesive identity for the RPA and surrounding area, and provide, where appropriate, for buffering between different land uses and screening of unattractive service facilities such as parking lots and loading areas;

5. Facilitate the assembly and preparation, including demolition and environmental clean-up, where necessary, and marketing of available sites in the RPA for redevelopment and new development by providing resources as allowed by the Act; and

6. Support the goals and objectives of other overlapping plans, including the Village's 2013 Comprehensive Plan and other TIF redevelopment plans, and coordinate available federal, state and local resources to further the goals of this Redevelopment Plan and Project.

**STRATEGIES.** Rehabilitation and redevelopment of the RPA is to be achieved through an integrated and comprehensive strategy that leverages public resources to stimulate additional private investment. The underlying strategy is to use TIF, as well as other funding sources, to reinforce and encourage further private investment.

**Proposed Future Land Use**

The proposed future land use of the RPA, as shown in Map 8, reflects the objectives of this Redevelopment Plan. For the purposes of this plan, two mixed-use designations are used to allow for a variety of uses appropriate to the RPA in conformance with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. Both mixed-use designations allow commercial, institutional, park/open space, community facilities, utilities, and right-of-way. Only the Mixed-Use B designation allows residential land uses.
Parcel 0603231110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438. Subdivision lines shown here are approximate.
Source: Esri, SB Friedman, Village of Plainfield, Will County
Financial Plan

ELIGIBLE COSTS

The Act outlines several categories of expenditures that can be funded using tax increment revenues. These expenditures, referred to as eligible redevelopment project costs, include all reasonable or necessary costs incurred or estimated to be incurred, and any such costs incidental to this Redevelopment Plan pursuant to the Act. The Village may also reimburse private entities for certain costs incurred in the development and/or redevelopment process. Such costs may include, without limitation, the following:

1. Costs of studies, surveys, development of plans and specifications, and implementation and administration of the Redevelopment 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, as more fully set forth in 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(1).

2. The costs of marketing sites within the RPA 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 as more fully set forth in 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(2).

4. Costs of rehabilitation, reconstruction, or repair or remodeling of existing public or private buildings, fixtures and leasehold improvements, as more fully set forth in 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(3); and the costs 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.

5. Costs of the construction of public works or improvements, 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 costs of “welfare to work” programs implemented by businesses located within the RPA, as more fully set forth in 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(5).

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 hereunder including interest accruing during the estimated period of construction of any redevelopment project for which such obligations are issued and for not exceeding 36 months thereafter and including reasonable reserves related thereto.

8. To the extent the municipality 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 this Redevelopment Plan.
9. An elementary, secondary or unit school district's increased per pupil tuition costs attributable to net new pupils added to the district living in assisted housing units will be reimbursed, as further defined in the Act.

10. A library district's increased per patron costs attributable to net new persons eligible to obtain a library card living in assisted housing units, as further defined in the Act.

11. Relocation costs to the extent that the municipality determines that relocation costs shall be paid or is required to make payment of relocation costs by federal or state law, or by Section 11-74.4-3(n)(7) of the Act.

12. Payment in lieu of taxes, as defined in the Act.

13. 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 or more taxing districts, as more fully set forth in 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(10).

14. Interest costs incurred by a developer, as more fully set forth in 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(11), related to the construction, renovation or rehabilitation of a redevelopment project provided that:

   a. Such costs are to be paid directly from the special tax allocation fund established, pursuant to the Act;

   b. Such payments in any one year may not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the annual interest costs incurred by the developer with regard to the development project during that year;

   c. If there are not sufficient funds available in the special tax allocation fund to make the payment pursuant to this provision, then the amounts so due shall accrue and be payable when sufficient funds are available in the special tax allocation fund;

   d. The total of such interest payments paid, pursuant to the Act, may not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the total of: (i) cost paid or incurred by the developer for the redevelopment project; and (ii) redevelopment project costs excluding any property assembly costs and any relocation costs incurred by the municipality, pursuant to the Act;

   e. 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, the percentage of seventy-five percent (75%) shall be substituted for thirty percent (30%) in subparagraphs 12b and 12d above; and

   f. Instead of the interest costs described above in paragraphs 12b and 12d, a municipality may pay from tax incremental revenues up to fifty percent (50%) of the cost of construction, renovation and rehabilitation of new housing units (for ownership or rental) to be occupied by low-income households and very low-income households, as defined in Section 3 of the Illinois Affordable Housing Act, as more fully described in the Act. If the units are part of a residential redevelopment project that includes units not affordable to low- and very low-
income households, only the low- and very low-income units shall be eligible for this benefit under the Act.

Unless explicitly provided in the Act, the cost of construction of new privately-owned buildings shall not be an eligible redevelopment project cost.

If a Special Service Area is 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 RPA for the purposes permitted by the Special Service Area Tax Act as well as the purposes permitted by the Act.

**ESTIMATED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS**

The total eligible redevelopment project costs define an upper expenditure limit that may be funded using tax increment revenues, exclusive of capitalized interest, issuance costs, interest, and other financing costs. The totals of line items are not intended to place a limit on the described expenditures. Adjustments to the estimated line item costs are expected and may be made by the Village without amendment to this Redevelopment Plan, either increasing or decreasing line item costs because of changed redevelopment costs and needs. Each individual project cost will be re-evaluated in light of projected private development and resulting incremental tax revenues as it is considered for public financing under the provisions of the Act. The estimated eligible costs of this Redevelopment Plan are shown in Table 2.

Additional funding in the form of state and federal grants, private developer contributions, and other outside sources may be pursued by the Village as a means of financing improvements and facilities within the RPA.
Table 2: Estimated TIF-Eligible Redevelopment Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Expense [1]</th>
<th>Estimated Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Professional Service Costs</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Marketing Costs</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Assembly and Site Preparation Costs</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of Building Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of Construction of Public Works or Improvements</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of Job Training or Retraining (Businesses)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxing District Capital Costs</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Costs</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments in Lieu of Taxes</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of Job Training (Community College)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Costs (Developer or Property Owner)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT COSTS [2] [3] [4]</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Described in more detail in Eligible Costs Section.
[2] Total Redevelopment Project Costs exclude any additional financing costs, including any interest expense, capitalized interest, costs of issuance, and costs associated with optional redemptions. These costs are subject to prevailing market conditions and are in addition to Total Redevelopment Project Costs.
[3] The amount of the Total Redevelopment Project Costs that can be incurred in the RPA may be reduced by the amount of redevelopment project costs incurred in contiguous RPAs, or those separated from the RPA only by a public right-of-way, that are permitted under the Act to be paid, and are paid, from incremental property taxes generated in the RPA, but may not be reduced by the amount of redevelopment project costs incurred in the RPA that are paid from incremental property taxes generated in contiguous RPAs or those separated from the RPA only by a public right-of-way.
[4] All costs are in 2018 dollars and may be increased by 5% after adjusting for annual inflation reflected in the Consumer Price Index (CPI), published by the U.S. Department of Labor. In addition to the above stated costs, each issue of obligations issued to finance a phase of the Redevelopment Plan and Project may include an amount of proceeds sufficient to pay customary and reasonable charges associated with the issuance of such obligations, including interest costs.

PHASING, SCHEDULING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT, AND ESTIMATED DATES OF COMPLETION

Each private project within the RPA receiving TIF benefits shall be governed by the terms of a written redevelopment agreement entered into by a designated developer and the Village. This Redevelopment Plan is estimated to be completed, and all obligations issued to finance redevelopment costs are estimated to be retired, no later than December 31 of the year in which the payment to the Village Finance Director 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 this RPA is adopted. This Redevelopment Plan is estimated to be completed, and all obligations issued to finance redevelopment costs shall be retired no later than December 31, 2042, if the ordinances establishing the RPA are adopted during 2018.

SOURCES OF FUNDS TO PAY COSTS

Funds necessary to pay for redevelopment project costs and/or municipal obligations, which may be issued or incurred to pay for such costs, are to be derived principally from tax increment revenues and/or proceeds from municipal obligations, which have as a repayment source tax increment revenue. To secure the issuance of these obligations and the developer’s performance of redevelopment agreement obligations, the Village may require the utilization of guarantees, deposits, reserves, and/or other forms of security made available by private sector developers. The Village may incur redevelopment project costs that are paid from the funds of
the Village other than incremental taxes, and the Village then may be reimbursed for such costs from incremental taxes.

The tax increment revenue, which will be used to fund tax increment obligations and eligible redevelopment project costs, shall be the incremental real property tax revenues. Incremental real property tax revenue is attributable to the increase of the current EAV of each taxable lot, block, tract, or parcel of real property in the RPA over and above the certified initial EAV of each such property.

Other sources of funds, which may be used to pay for development costs and associated obligations issued or incurred, include land disposition proceeds, state and federal grants, investment income, private investor and financial institution funds, and other sources of funds and revenues as the municipality and developer from time to time may deem appropriate.

The RPA may be or become contiguous to, or be separated only by a public right-of-way from other redevelopment areas created under the Act (65 ILCS 5/1174.4 4 et. seq.). The Village may utilize net incremental property tax revenues received from the RPA to pay eligible redevelopment project costs, or obligations issued to pay such costs, in other contiguous redevelopment project areas, or those separated only by a public right-of-way, and vice versa. The amount of revenue from the RPA 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 RPA, shall not at any time exceed the Total Redevelopment Project Costs described in Table 2 of this Redevelopment Plan.

### ISSUANCE OF OBLIGATIONS

To finance project costs, the Village may issue bonds or obligations secured by the anticipated tax increment revenue generated within the RPA, or such other bonds or obligations as the Village may deem as appropriate. The Village may require the utilization of guarantees, deposits or other forms of security made available by private sector developers to secure such obligations. In addition, the Village may provide other legally permissible credit enhancements to any obligations issued pursuant to the Act.

All obligations issued by the Village pursuant to this Redevelopment Plan and the Act shall be retired within the timeframe described under “Phasing and Scheduling of the Redevelopment” above. Also, the final maturity date of any such obligations that are issued may not be later than 20 years from their respective dates of issue. One or more of a series of obligations may be sold at one or more times in order to implement this Redevelopment Plan. The amounts payable in any year as principal and interest on all obligations issued by the Village shall not exceed the amounts available from tax increment revenues, or other sources of funds, if any, as may be provided by ordinance. Obligations may be of parity or senior/junior lien nature. Obligations issued may be serial or term maturities, and may or may not be subject to mandatory, sinking fund or optional redemptions.

In addition to paying redevelopment project costs, tax increment revenues may be used for the scheduled and/or early retirement of obligations, and for reserves and bond sinking funds.

### MOST RECENT EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUE OF PROPERTIES IN THE RPA

The purpose of identifying the most recent EAV of the RPA is to provide an estimate of the initial EAV for the purpose of annually calculating the incremental EAV and incremental property taxes of the RPA. The 2017 EAV
(the most recent year in which final assessed values and the equalizer were available) of all taxable parcels in the RPA is $4,930,688. This total EAV amount by PIN is summarized in Appendix 4. The EAV is subject to verification by the Will County Assessor’s Office. After verification, the final figure shall be certified by the Will County Clerk, and shall become the “Certified Initial EAV” from which all incremental property taxes in the RPA will be calculated by the County.

**ANTICIPATED EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUE**

By tax year 2041 (collection year 2042), the total taxable EAV for the RPA is anticipated to be approximately $32 million.

**Impact of the Redevelopment Project**

This Redevelopment Plan is expected to have short- and long-term financial impacts on the affected taxing districts. During the period when TIF is utilized, real estate tax increment revenues from the increases in EAV over and above the Certified Initial EAV (established at the time of adoption of this document) may be used to pay eligible redevelopment project costs for the RPA. To the extent that real property tax increment is not required for such purposes, revenues shall be declared surplus and become available for distribution annually to area taxing districts in the manner provided by the Act. At the time when the RPA is no longer in place under the Act, the real estate tax revenues resulting from the redevelopment of the RPA will be distributed to all taxing district levying taxes against property located in the RPA. These revenues will then be available for use by the affected taxing districts.

**DEMAND ON TAXING DISTRICT SERVICES AND PROGRAM TO ADDRESS FINANCIAL AND SERVICE IMPACT**

In 1994, the Act was amended to require an assessment of any financial impact of a redevelopment project area on, or any increased demand for service from, any taxing district affected by the redevelopment plan, and a description of any program to address such financial impacts or increased demand.

Replacement of vacant and underutilized buildings and sites with active and more intensive uses may result in additional demands on services and facilities provided by the districts. Given the preliminary nature of this Redevelopment Plan, specific fiscal impacts on the taxing districts and increases in demand for services provided by those districts cannot accurately be assessed within the scope of this Plan. At this time, no special programs are proposed for these taxing districts. The Village intends to monitor development in the area and should demand increase, the Village intends to work with the affected taxing districts to determine what, if any, program is necessary to provide adequate services.

The following major taxing districts presently levy taxes on properties within the RPA:

- Will County
- Will County Forest Preserve
- Will County Public Building Commission
- Plainfield Township
- Plainfield Township Road
- Village of Plainfield
- Village of Plainfield Road & Bridge
- Plainfield Park District
- Plainfield Fire District
- Plainfield Public Library District
- Plainfield Consolidated School District 202
- Joliet Junior College District 525
Required Tests and Findings

In order to establish the RPA as a TIF district, the municipality must comply with all of the following requirements:

FINDING 1: LACK OF GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The Village is required to evaluate whether or not the RPA has been subject to growth and development through private investment and must substantiate a finding of lack of such investment prior to establishing a TIF district. Limited private investment has occurred in the Route 30 RPA during the past five years (2013-2017), as demonstrated by the following:

- **EAV Trends.** Change in property value is one of the strongest indicators that an area is suffering from decline and a lack of private investment. EAV within the RPA (improved and vacant land) has declined for three of the last five year-to-year periods. Thus, the RPA has not been subject to growth and private investment.

- **Decline in EAV.** In order to assess whether the RPA has been subject to growth and private investment, SB Friedman analyzed growth in property taxable value in the rest of the Village and compared that growth to the trends within the RPA. Between 2013 and 2017, EAV decreased by 15.7% in aggregate within the RPA. Within the Village, excluding the RPA, values increased by 15.9% over the last five years. Thus, based on this data, the RPA has significantly lagged behind the rest of the Village and has not been subject to growth and private investment.

- **Limited construction-related permit activity.** Building permit data provided by the Village indicates that there have been no new construction permits pulled within the past five years from 2013 to 2017. Besides new construction, there has been about $1.6 million in investment of commercial improvements over the past five years. However, 80% of this investment came from a renovation to Bill Jacobs Chevy when it was purchased by Webb Chevy in 2013. Two additional relatively minor renovations occurred for Todd’s Body Shop and a building at 16300 S Lincoln Highway. However, these commercial investments have not been sufficient to reverse the overall trend of declining EAV in the RPA. Thus, the RPA has not been subject to growth and private investment.

Finding: The RPA on the whole has not been subject to growth and development through investment by private enterprise and would not reasonably be anticipated to be developed without the adoption of this Redevelopment Plan.

FINDING 2: “BUT FOR...” REQUIREMENT

The Village is required to find that, but for the designation of the TIF district and the use of TIF, the Route 30 RPA is not reasonably anticipated to be developed.

Without the support of public resources, the redevelopment objectives for the RPA would most likely not be realized. The investments required to update stormwater systems, address flooding, and rehabilitate buildings exhibiting deterioration, a lack of planning, and that are below minimum code throughout the Route 30 RPA are extensive and costly, and the private market, on its own, has shown little ability to absorb all of these costs.
Public resources to assist with public improvements and project-specific development costs are essential to leverage private investment and facilitate area-wide redevelopment.

**Finding:** But for the adoption of this Redevelopment Plan, critical resources will be lacking to support the redevelopment of the RPA, and the RPA would not reasonably be anticipated to be developed.

**FINDING 3: CONTIGUITY**

No RPA can be designated unless a plan and project are approved prior to the designation of the area; and the area can only include those contiguous parcels that are to be substantially benefited by the proposed redevelopment project improvements.

**Finding:** The RPA includes only those contiguous parcels of real property that are expected to benefit substantially from the proposed Redevelopment Plan and Project.

**FINDING 4: CONFORMANCE TO THE PLANS OF THE VILLAGE**

The Redevelopment Plan and Project must conform to the comprehensive plan for the development of the municipality as a whole.

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan identifies challenges within the existing RPA including older buildings developed prior to site plan review and façade and appearance issues. Goals of the 2013 Plan include roadway upgrades, improvements in corridor appearance, and development of vacant property into additional commercial development. All aspects of this Redevelopment Plan, including the anticipated future land use, are in agreement with the Village’s 2013 Plan.

**Finding:** The Route 30 RPA Redevelopment Plan conforms to and proposes predominant land uses that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

**FINDING 5: HOUSING IMPACT AND RELATED MATTERS**

As set forth in the Act, if a 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 into the Redevelopment Plan and Project document.

**Finding:** SB Friedman found no housing units within the RPA. The Village hereby certifies that no displacement will occur as a result of activities pursuant to this Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, a Housing Impact Study is not required under the Act.

**FINDING 6: ESTIMATED DATES OF COMPLETION**

As set forth in the Act, the redevelopment plan must establish the estimated dates of completion of the redevelopment project and retirement of obligations issued to finance redevelopment project costs.
Finding: The estimated dates of completion of the project and retirement of obligations are described in "Phasing and Scheduling of the Redevelopment" above. This Redevelopment Plan is estimated be completed and all obligations issued to finance redevelopment costs shall be retired no later than December 31, 2042, if the ordinances establishing the RPA are adopted during 2018.

Provisions for Amending Action Plan

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

Commitment to Fair Employment Practices and Affirmative Action Plan

The Village of Plainfield hereby affirms its commitment to fair employment practices and an affirmative action plan.
Appendix 1: Limitations of the Eligibility Study and Consultant Responsibilities

The Eligibility Study covers events and conditions that were determined to support the designation of the RPA as a “conservation area” for improved land and a “blighted area” for vacant land under the Act at the completion of our field research in June 2018 and not thereafter. These events or conditions include, without limitation, governmental actions and additional developments.

This Eligibility Study, Redevelopment Plan and Project (the “Report”) summarizes the analysis and findings of the consultant’s work, which, unless otherwise noted, is solely the responsibility of SB Friedman. The Village is entitled to rely on the findings and conclusions of the Report in designating the RPA as a redevelopment project area under the Act. SB Friedman has prepared the Report with the understanding that the Village would rely: (1) on the findings and conclusions of this Redevelopment Plan in proceeding with the designation of RPA and the adoption and implementation of this Redevelopment Plan; and (2) on the fact that SB Friedman has obtained the necessary information including, without limitation, information relating to the equalized assessed value of parcels comprising the RPA, so that the Report will comply with the Act and that the RPA can be designated as a redevelopment project area in compliance with the Act.

The Report is based on estimates, assumptions, and other information developed from research of the market, knowledge of the industry, and meetings during which we obtained certain information. The sources of information and bases of the estimates and assumptions are stated in the Report. Some assumptions inevitably will not materialize, and unanticipated events and circumstances may occur. Therefore, actual results achieved will necessarily vary from those described in our Report, and the variations may be material.

The terms of this engagement are such that we have no obligation to revise the Report to reflect events or conditions which occur subsequent to the date of the Report. These events or conditions include, without limitation, economic growth trends, governmental actions, additional competitive developments, interest rates, and other market factors. However, we will be available to discuss the necessity for revision in view of changes in economic or market factors.

Preliminary Tax Increment Financing (TIF) projections were prepared for the purpose of estimating the approximate level of increment that could be generated by proposed projects and other properties within the proposed TIF district boundary and from inflationary increases in value. These projections were intended to provide an estimate of the final equalized assessed value (EAV) of the TIF district.

As such, our report and the preliminary projections prepared under this engagement are intended solely for your information, for the purpose of establishing a TIF district. These projections should not be relied upon for purposes of evaluating potential debt obligations or by any other person, firm or corporation, or for any other purposes. Neither the Report nor its contents, nor any reference to our Firm, may be included or quoted in any offering circular or registration statement, appraisal, sales brochure, prospectus, loan, or other agreement or document intended for use in obtaining funds from individual investors, without prior written consent.
Appendix 2: Glossary

Factors for Vacant Land – One Factor Test

Under the provisions of the “blighted area” section of the Act, if the land is vacant, an area qualifies as “blighted” if one (1) or more of the following factors is found to be present to a meaningful extent.

- The area contains unused quarries, strip mines or strip mine ponds;
- The area contains unused rail yards, rail track, or railroad rights-of-way;
- The area, prior to its designation, is subject to or contributes to chronic flooding;
- The area contains unused or illegal dumping sites;
- The area was designated as a town center prior to January 1, 1982, is between 50 and 100 acres, and is 75% vacant land; or
- The area qualified as blighted prior to becoming vacant.

Factors for Improved Land

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.

Obsolescence. The condition or process of falling into disuse. Structures have become ill-suited for the original use.

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.

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.

Illegal Use of Individual Structures. The use of structures in violation of the applicable federal, state or local laws, exclusive of those applicable to the Presence of Structures below Minimum Code Standards.

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.

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 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.

**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.

**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: (i) 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 (ii) the presence of multiple buildings on a single parcel. For there to be a finding of excessive land coverage, these parcels must exhibit one 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.

**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.

**Environmental Clean-Up**: The proposed redevelopment project 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.

**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.

**Lack of Growth in Equalized Assessed Value**: 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.
Appendix 3: Route 30 RPA Boundary Legal Description

PART OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 22 AND PART OF SECTION 23, TOWNSHIP 36 NORTH RANGE 9 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

SUBDIVISION, TO THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 23, ALSO BEING THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 3 IN SAID THE BOULEVARD SUBDIVISION, ALSO BEING THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 2 IN CROSS ROAD SUBDIVISION, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED OCTOBER 16, 1997 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R97-090822; THENCE WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 23, ALSO BEING SAID SOUTH LINE OF THE BOULEVARD SUBDIVISION, ALSO BEING THE NORTH LINE OF SAID CROSS ROAD SUBDIVISION, TO A NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN SAID CROSS ROAD SUBDIVISION; THENCE SOUTH ALONG A WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 1 TO A CORNER; THENCE WEST ALONG A NORTH LINE OF LOT 1 TO THE WESTERLY MOST NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE SOUTH ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 TO SAID NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. ROUTE 30 (LINCOLN HIGHWAY); THENCE SOUTH TO THE INTERSECTION OF SAID SOUTHWESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. ROUTE 30 (LINCOLN HIGHWAY) AND THE EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SPANGLER ROAD, ALSO BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 232 IN FRANKLIN HEIGHTS UNIT TWO, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED MARCH 2, 1960 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 898915; THENCE SOUTHWEST ON SAID EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SPANGLER ROAD TO THE INTERSECTION OF SAID EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SPANGLER ROAD AND NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF CHARLOTTE ROAD, ALSO BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 224 IN SAID FRANKLIN HEIGHTS UNIT TWO; THENCE WEST TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF A PARCEL DESCRIBED IN A DEED RECORDED APRIL 25, 2017 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R2017031957, ALSO BEING THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN WINDING CREEK SUBDIVISION UNIT ONE, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JANUARY 29, 1992 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R92-6546, ALSO BEING ON THE WEST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SAID SPANGLER ROAD; THENCE NORTHWEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID WINDING CREEK SUBDIVISION UNIT ONE TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN SAID WINDING CREEK SUBDIVISION UNIT ONE, ALSO BEING ON THE EAST LINE OF A PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED IN A DEED RECORDED SEPTEMBER 20, 2015 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R2015089912; THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF PARCEL DESCRIBED IN SAID DEED, ALSO BEING THE WEST LINE OF SAID WINDING CREEK SUBDIVISION UNIT ONE, TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE PARCEL DESCRIBED IN SAID DEED; THENCE NORTHWEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF THE PARCEL DESCRIBED IN SAID DEED TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE PARCEL DESCRIBED IN SAID DEED, ALSO BEING ON THE EAST LINE OF MAUER’S SUBDIVISION, RECORDED IN BOOK 33, PAGE 103 IN THE WILL COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE PARCEL DESCRIBED IN SAID DEED, ALSO BEING SAID EAST LINE OF MAUER’S SUBDIVISION, TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 3 IN SAID MAUER’S SUBDIVISION, ALSO BEING THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 1 IN T ODD’S PROFESSIONAL PARK SUBDIVISION, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED MARCH 16, 2007 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R2007041398; THENCE NORTHWEST ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 3 IN MAUER’S SUBDIVISION, ALSO BEING THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 1 IN T ODD’S PROFESSIONAL PARK SUBDIVISION, TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 3 IN SAID MAUER’S SUBDIVISION, ALSO BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1 IN T ODD’S PROFESSIONAL PARK SUBDIVISION, ALSO BEING ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF LILY CACHE ROAD, THENCE NORTHWEST TO THE EASTERLY MOST NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 2 IN LILY CACHE ACRES SUBDIVISION, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED FEBRUARY 2, 1966, AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R66-1785, ALSO BEING THE INTERSECTION OF THE WEST RIGHT-OF-LINE OF SAID LILY CACHE ROAD; THENCE NORTHWEST ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LILY CACHE ACRES SUBDIVISION TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 9 IN SAID LILY CACHE ACRES SUBDIVISION, ALSO BEING THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 21 IN SAID LILY CACHE ACRES, UNIT NO. 2 REVISED; THENCE NORTHWEST ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LILY CACHE ACRES, UNIT NO. 2 REVISED, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL OF LAND HAVING A PIN OF 06-03-23-300-057:

# Appendix 4: List of PINs in Route 30 RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record #</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>2017 EAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0603222060030000</td>
<td>$92,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0603222060040000</td>
<td>$131,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0603222060050000</td>
<td>$33,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0603222060060000</td>
<td>$7,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0603222060120000</td>
<td>$85,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0603222060140000</td>
<td>$272,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0603222060160000</td>
<td>$537,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0603222060230000</td>
<td>$298,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0603222060250000</td>
<td>$35,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0603222070090000</td>
<td>$44,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0603222070100000</td>
<td>$209,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0603222070160000</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0603222070170000</td>
<td>$157,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0603222070180000</td>
<td>$156,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0603222080340000</td>
<td>$167,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0603222080370000</td>
<td>$255,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0603222080380000</td>
<td>$63,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0603222080390000</td>
<td>$111,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0603231000060000</td>
<td>$3,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record #</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>2017 EAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0603231100010000</td>
<td>$480,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>060323110040000*</td>
<td>$25,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0603231100070000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>060323110080000</td>
<td>$18,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0603231120050000</td>
<td>$5,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>060323130010000</td>
<td>$207,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0603232000210000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0603233000010000</td>
<td>$60,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0603233000300000</td>
<td>$542,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0603233000390000</td>
<td>$290,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0603233000540000</td>
<td>$63,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0603233000560000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0603233010050000</td>
<td>$105,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0603233010060000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0603233010070000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $4,930,688

*Parcel 0603231110040000 was subdivided on April 20th, 2018 per document #R2018026438, will become three parcels
Source: Will County Clerk
Appendix 5: Documentation of Flooding
July 20, 2018

Mr. Jake Melrose, AICP
Economic Development Manager
Village of Plainfield
24401 West Lockport Street
Plainfield, Illinois  60455

Subject: Route 30 TIF District – Flooding Impacts

Dear Mr. Melrose:

In accordance with instructions from the Village, we have reviewed available flooding data for all of the vacant parcels within the proposed Tax Increment Financing District along Route 30. Please refer to the attached exhibits for the location and extent of this Study Area.

Mink Creek enters Lily Cache Creek, within this District. As a result, much of the Study Area is within regulatory flood zones. The Regulatory Floodway for Lily Cache has been defined by prior studies, and is shown on the Floodplain Exhibit, which is based on the current Flood Insurance Rate Maps published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Map Panels 17197C0130E and 17197C0135F). The Regulatory Floodway is defined by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources as “The channel and that portion of the floodplain adjacent to a stream or watercourse... which is needed to store and convey the 100-year frequency [one-percent annual chance] flood discharge...” Within the Regulatory Floodway, only certain “appropriate uses” are permitted. These are limited to activities which needed for access to or across the stream, recreational facilities, parking lots (with limits) and repair of existing buildings (also with limits). In all cases, the activity cannot “pose a danger to the general health and welfare of the user or require the expenditure of public funds or the provisions of public resources or disaster relief services or result in increased flood stages...” Any work within the floodway requires a detailed engineering analysis and design, and review and permitting by the Village of Plainfield, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

Additional flood zones in the Study Area include the flood fringe, which are areas of the 100-year floodplain outside of the floodway, and the 0.02-percent (“500-year”) floodplain. These areas have ground surfaces below the 100-year (or 500-year) flood frequency elevation, and are regulated by local, State and Federal regulations. Building within the flood fringe requires elevating structures to above the application elevations, and compensatory excavation for any fill placed within these zones. Critical facilities such as hospitals are regulated within the 500-year floodplain.

It is clear from an examination of the regulatory mapping that much of the land within the Study Area (all parcels with regulatory floodplain on them) is subject to chronic flooding which adversely impacts these properties. While all of the land within the Study Area is relatively flat, most of it drains to Lily Cache Creek. As a result, the land within the Study Area contributes to flooding within the
DuPage River watershed. Generally, the land in this area (including land outside of the floodplain and land in and out of the Study Area) drains to Lily Cache Creek and then to the DuPage River. All of this runoff contributes to the flooding in these streams.

Development of any property in the Study Area which includes floodplain and/or floodway will likely require filling within the flood fringe and compensatory storage. Since the Village of Plainfield requires compensatory storage to be 150 percent of the fill, there will be a net increase in floodplain storage, which will contribute to an improvement in flooding conditions on the development property and elsewhere within the DuPage River watershed.

FEMA is updating the Flood Insurance Rate Maps for all of Will County, including the panels which include the Route 30 TIF District. The draft maps reflect minor changes in floodplain elevations along Mink Creek and Lily Cache Creek, but the flooding impacts and regulatory requirements remain the same. FEMA expects to publish these maps later this year, and they will become effective in early 2019.

As part of any development within the Study Area, stormwater detention will be required for all events up to and including the 100-year-frequency flood. The Village’s detention ordinance limits discharges to 0.04 cubic feet per second per acre for the 50-percent chance (“2-year”) event and 0.15 cfs per acre for the 100-year event. The resulting storage for the smaller, more frequent events increases water quality since contaminants will settle out in a storage basin before leaving the site. The release rates for the larger events are less than the existing peak rates of runoff for almost all sites. As a result, water quality and flood stages downstream of the development are usually improved because of the development.

Developments within Plainfield are strongly encouraged, and often incentivized, to employ Stormwater Best Management Practices. These measures improve water quality by infiltrating a portion of the initial runoff from the site, and filtering the remainder of the runoff. Additional water quality improvements typically result from these measures.

An additional encumbrance to development of these properties is the likely presence of wetlands. The attached Wetland Exhibit shows wetlands as identified on the National Wetlands Inventory. Wetlands provide an important environmental benefit by slowing, filtering and infiltrating stormwater runoff, improving water quality and reducing peak flow rates in streams. Wetlands are typically associated with areas which flood frequently. Most wetlands are regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and impacts to them will require mitigation. Mitigation can take the form of non-development buffers and purchases at off-site wetland banks to compensate for losses of wetlands to development.
Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,

BAXTER & WOODMAN, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Stephen R. Amann, P.E., CFM
Development Assistance Department Manager