



## **TCAAP Redevelopment Relationship Timeline with Ramsey County**

The following timeline details the negotiations and actions between the City of Arden Hills and Ramsey County since 2012 when Ramsey County began its efforts to acquire the former Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant (TCAAP) land.

### **2012**

- The city and Ramsey County spend over a year drafting the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) that outlines the process for working together and explains that the county is in charge of land sales and the city is in charge of land use processes.
- The city and county agree to the JPA establishing the Joint Development Authority (JDA), which was formed to govern the process. According to the JPA, the city was to complete the AUAR (environmental assessment) and Master Development Plan by a certain date.
- Ramsey County approves an offer to purchase 427 acres from the GSA.

### **2013**

- Ramsey County purchases the TCAAP property from the U.S. Army.
- The city hires Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to complete a Master Plan, Alternative Urban Areawide Review (AUAR), and Regulation & Policies.

### **2014**

- The city approves the AUAR and Master Land Use Plan for TCAAP. The city meets the completion deadlines per the JDA.

### **2015**

- The city approves the TCAAP Redevelopment Code and an amendment to the 2030 Comprehensive Plan based on the city's vision and goals for the redevelopment.

### **2016**

- Based on the approved Master Plan, the city and the county, via the JDA, select Alatus, LLC as the master developer on the site.
- The city approves amendments to the TCAAP Redevelopment Code and the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, with county and developer input, to help facilitate the redevelopment plan proposed by Alatus.
- The city and county both vote to accept the Master Plan.

### **2016-2017**

- For 16 months, the county negotiates the land sale with the developer. Despite requests by the city to be present (but not participate) at these negotiations, the developer and the county turn down these requests.

### **2017-2018**

- During the course of these years, a number of JDA meetings were cancelled by the county, which did not allow the city and county to meet face to face for discussion of the issues.

## 2018

- On March 14, the county and developer announce a framework for the Master Developer Agreement (MDA). With little notice to the city, the county and developer reach a master development agreement framework, which is based on the master plan, and schedule a press conference to announce it. The city has not seen the framework agreement.
- On April 4, the city begins attending negotiations with the county and developer. The county presents the city with increased city fiscal responsibilities under the framework deal with no input by the city. Therefore, the city now starts negotiating with the county on the increased city fiscal responsibilities proposed by the county. During negotiations, the county states the city should be responsible for an additional \$1.8 million more than the previously agreed to \$8.2 million. The county also requests that the city not charge the Met Council sewer access charge (SAC) credits and questions the amount of the expense reimbursement to the city based upon the terms of the JPA.
- On September 4, at the JDA meeting, the county moves for a vote on an executive summary for a master development agreement that the city had received with little time for review. The county has drafted an executive summary based on the previous approved plan, but also directs the negotiations to include that the city not charge \$5.8 million in Met Council SAC credits. The JDA approves the executive summary of the master plan.
- On October 24, the city sends its response proposal to the county, agreeing to several of the terms requested by the county, including a waiver on certain Met Council SAC credits. To date, the city has received no response to this proposal from the county.
- On November 6, one week before the city holds a public forum to layout the draft proposal for residents, the county abruptly ends negotiations and contact with the city, saying it wants a break and citing concerns with the city's and county's previously agreed to density, affordable housing unit amounts, the city's financial contribution, as well as other issues. The county indicates that it is not wise to spend money to continue. The county pulls resources from the project stalling negotiations.

## 2019

- On January 7, the city calls and holds a JDA meeting, but the county does not attend. The city continues to push for a response from the county to resume negotiations.
- On February 4, the city calls and holds a JDA meeting, and the county attends and agrees to a schedule for JDA meetings. When asked if they will fund the JDA, which is the responsibility of the county, the county declines, and states it will make a decision at a later date. The county requests mediation, and the JDA chair asks each party to bring their lists of differences to a February 20 JDA meeting first, prior to mediation.
- On February 8, the county board chair delivers a letter to the city requesting mediation, indicating the county will not participate in any further discussion and will only enter into mediation. The county does not attend the February 20 JDA meeting and asks the city to respond to a request for mediation by February 26.
- On February 12, the county approves \$1.5 million funding to complete engineering work and technical design for the TCAAP spine road (the major road through the development).
- On February 19, the county adds the spine road to its Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for 2019 and the county appropriates \$11.5 million towards road construction.
- On February 25, the city declines the county's request for mediation, saying it is premature and asks the county to return to negotiations. The city requests information from the county concerning the specific items and amounts to be mediated.
- On March 6, the county manager requests the city terminate the JPA.
- On March 20, the city attorney responds by requesting that the full county board discuss termination and for both sides to continue negotiations.