

**Tax Increment Finance Authority****Review Committee – Discussion Framework**

**Subject:** Structural Options for Updating the TIFA Development (Master) Plan

**From:** Andrew D. Gelzer, Chairperson

**For:** Review Committee discussion only

**Date:** February 24, 2026

Purpose of This Context Document

The purpose of this memorandum is to outline, at a high level, the structural options available to the Tax Increment Finance Authority for updating its Development Plan (commonly referred to as the “Master Plan”), and to frame those options for discussion by the Review Committee.

This document is intended solely as a discussion framework. It is not a recommendation, draft resolution, or proposed course of action. It is being shared in this manner to allow the Committee to openly evaluate options together before any materials are prepared for formal packets, publication, or broader circulation.

Context

As discussed previously, the current Development Plan originated in 1986 and has been amended multiple times over the past four decades. While the Plan remains legally valid and compliant with statutory requirements, its current form reflects an accumulation of amendments responding to specific needs at specific moments in time, rather than a single, cohesive planning document.

The Review Committee’s task is not to criticize prior Boards or prior decisions, but to determine whether the existing structure of the Plan continues to serve the Authority well, and whether changes to that structure would improve clarity, effectiveness, and long-term usefulness.

Any action taken by the Authority—regardless of form—will ultimately require review by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council, as required by statute.

Structural Options for Consideration

The following options represent the principal ways in which the Development Plan could be updated. They are presented in increasing order of scope, not preference.

#### Option 1: Targeted Amendment to the Existing Plan

Under this approach, the Authority would amend the existing Development Plan to address specific deficiencies or omissions, while leaving the overall structure of the document intact.

This could include:

- Clarifying objectives and goals
- Updating or consolidating project categories
- Adding new policy guidance while retaining historical sections
- Removing or deemphasizing obsolete timelines or dollar figures

This option represents the least disruptive approach procedurally but would preserve much of the existing document's structure and complexity.

#### Option 2: Comprehensive Restatement via Amendment

Under this approach, the Authority would adopt a single, comprehensive amendment that effectively restates the Development Plan in full, while explicitly acknowledging and incorporating the original plan and prior amendments.

Practically speaking, this would function as a "cleaned-up" plan:

- Organized as a single, internally consistent document
- Written in contemporary terms
- Focused on current objectives and forward-looking strategy
- Retaining legal continuity with the original plan

Although technically an amendment, this approach would allow the Authority to present a coherent, modern Development Plan without severing ties to the existing statutory framework.

#### Option 3: Adoption of a New Development Plan

Under this approach, the Authority would prepare and adopt an entirely new Development Plan, which would formally supersede the prior plan while recognizing it for historical and legal purposes.

This option would provide the greatest opportunity for:

- Reframing the Authority's purpose and objectives
- Aligning the Plan more directly with current economic conditions
- Establishing a clear planning horizon and methodology

It would also be the most visible and resource-intensive option and would likely invite the most feedback, useful or not, during Planning Commission and City Council review.

#### Procedural Considerations (Common to All Options)

Regardless of which option is ultimately selected:

- Planning Commission review and recommendation will be required
- City Council approval will be required
- Public notice and hearing requirements will apply
- The Authority retains control over drafting and internal deliberation prior to submission

The primary differences among the options are not legal authority, but rather:

- Degree of structural change
- Clarity of the resulting document
- Administrative effort
- External perception and process complexity

**Discussion Focus for the Committee**

At this stage, the Review Committee is asked to consider:

- Whether the current structure of the Development Plan meaningfully supports the Authority's work
- Which option best balances clarity, continuity, and practicality
- What level of change is appropriate given the Authority's objectives and operating environment

No decision is expected at this meeting. The goal is to establish a shared understanding and narrow the range of viable paths forward before any drafting begins.