



CGF Meeting Feedback Form

Submitted On: May 4, 2026, 05:15PM CDT

City of Grand Forks

Meeting Type:	City Council Meeting
Full Name	First Name: Jodi Last Name: Carlson
Full Address	Street Address: 5124 Belmont Rd City: Grand Forks State: ND Zip: 58201
Agenda Item Number / Topic:	Citizen comments
Comments:	<p>Belmont Road is NOT a truck route. The taxpayers of Ward 5 have recently spent millions of dollars on this beautiful "raceway." There are cement trucks ("upwards of 70,000lbs" according to a truck driver, I questioned today) coming from Demers and South Washington to areas off of 62nd. There were two semi's, one with a side dump, that went by today as well.</p> <p>As development continues in this area of South Grand Forks, please enforce the city road ordinances and save the taxpayers from further costs.</p> <p>Also- on PILOT's - just say NO! Why do we continue to subsidize developers who claim there is such a great housing need, but out of the other side of their mouth claim that the apartment buildings are filled before the grass is growing! When will you do the right thing and let the market decide?</p>

Lundmark, Sherie

From: Bob Cowger <cowgerconst@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2026 4:15 PM
To: Lunski, Tricia; Berg, Tricia; Weigel, Daniel; Fridolfs, Mike; Lundmark, Sherie; Bochenski, Brandon; Vein, Ken; Sande, Dana; Osowski, Rebecca
Cc: Andrew Krauseneck
Subject: Domain & CK Development: tax incentives to developers

Dear Grand Forks Council members,

I am asking you NOT to approve the requested tax incentives for any more private development in Grand Forks today or in the future. There are so many that are wrong with giving away taxpayer funds to private developers.

1. School District : Currently in a 4.5million dollar budget deficit
2. GF County: Currently in a 2.5million dollar budget deficit
3. You are providing incentives to developers that compete directly with existing businesses that pay taxes.
4. You are giving away the future of Grand Forks.
5. You were elected to be stewards of the taxpayer's interest. In NO way does giving property tax incentives to private developers in the interest of the taxpayer.
6. City of Grand Forks will have been the catalyst behind over 1,000 apartment units to be built that will NOT pay any taxes for term of their agreement!!!
7. City of Grand Forks will have given away almost 100 million Taxpayer dollars in tax incentives to private developers.
8. You altered or did not "quite" share the WHOLE truth when you started reporting vacancy rates Your information in this area is not correct but NO ONE from City staff has ever contacted GF Apartment Assoc. until the 4th quarter 2025 vacancy report was submitted!!! 4th quarter 2025 showed 3.5% vacancy rate BUT you forgot to mention that the reason for low vacancy was due to Temp. duty Airmen at GFAFB
9. In the contract for Memorial Village 1 & 2 is there anything in writing that states "at the end of the 20yr PILOT this property will pay property taxes?
10. Do you have anything in writing making all of the properties liable to pay property taxes into perpetuity after their TIF or PILOT ends?
11. Have you prevented the possibility of a nonprofit owner taking over any of these essentially rendering them "non tax paying properties"?

Can you truthfully say that this is a "good" financial plan to spend 100 million taxpayer dollars???

Bob Cowger
Cowger Construction

218-779-2299 c
701-795-4014

From: [Kelsey Dodd](#)
To: [Weigel, Daniel](#); [Osowski, Rebecca](#); [Berg, Tricia](#); [Sande, Dana](#); [Lunski, Tricia](#); [Fridolfs, Mike](#); [Vein, Ken](#)
Cc: [Lundmark, Sherie](#)
Subject: City Council Meeting 5/4
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 4:39:25 PM

Hello, City Council Members -

I am writing to you to urge you to vote against the two PILOTs that come before you today. In the spirit of National Small Business Week, I encourage you to embrace that focus and see if we can finally hear some valuable discussion and perhaps some dialogue. One question that has previously been asked about what can be considered "substantial detriment" was answered with a very basic answer from our city attorney saying that it is basically up to council to determine that. After that, zero discussion among council members. The public does not know what council deems to be substantial detriment. While I appreciate the question being asked, it was very disappointing that there wasn't further discussion despite community members standing up and saying that these ARE to their substantial detriment. How many small business owners would it take showing up for Council to take their concerns seriously? Do you need employees or customers speaking on their behalf as well? What would make you reconsider your vote?

Additionally, while you are allowed to approve these 5 year PILOTs without the approval of any other local board or commission, does that make it right? Perhaps the City should consider being a better community partner, lead by example and ask the School Board, the County & heck, even the Park District, what they think about the City handing out 5 year PILOTs to anyone that asks? We have a School District that is in a budgetary crisis at the moment, receives the largest cut of property taxes, but they are being told it's a them problem, and the City can simply give away their portion for 5 years without question.

Lastly, I (and I'm sure others) have concerns regarding the Franklin on 4th PILOT. I read the related documents on the agenda, but perhaps for the sake of transparency and ease for the everyday person, it could be translated into simpler terms. Who currently owns or is an investor of Franklin on 4th? Is that who received the PILOT? Who would the property be transferred to? This seems more than an "oversight" even though that is what it is being sold as. If an exception is made for this "oversight", how can the public be assured that this "oversight" doesn't happen going forward or that other exceptions won't happen going forward? The PILOT agreement seems clear in the regard that PILOTs cannot be transferred.

I look forward to watching the meeting tonight, and hopefully hearing some good engagement. Thank you for your time.

Kelsey Dodd

Lundmark, Sherie

From: Mary Koponen <mjkoponen@cs.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 2, 2026 4:05 PM
To: Bochenski, Brandon; Lunski, Tricia; Berg, Tricia; Weigel, Daniel; Osowski, Rebecca; Fridolfs, Mike; Vein, Ken; Sande, Dana; Lundmark, Sherie
Subject: The Domain and CK Commercial PILOTs May 4

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Please do not pass the two proposed 5 year apartment PILOTs on Monday the 4th. I am referring to the Domain and CK Commerical's PILOT. The City Council seems to be disregarding the severe budget shortfalls that the schools and Grand Forks County are experiencing. You keep passing these PILOTs which makes no sense because you are only compounding their pain as well as the pain of regular taxpayers who are going to see a larger tax increase down the road. When are you going to stop? You've already given up more than 50 million in current and future tax revenue, isn't that enough?

How can these 5 year 80-100% PILOTs be straightforward, when many of the developers initially were asking or telling you it was not financially feasible without a much longer PILOT, and now they are suddenly making do with 5 years? If they are bringing more investors onboard to make it work now, the Council needs to make them do that from the start. Grand Forks is not the only town where PILOTs seem to be misused for purposes other than primary sector. By misuse, I mean any use which "favors" an apartment or retail PILOT.

Also, I have heard that one of the Council members has a financial investment in one of the PILOT apartments coming up. If this is true, and it is the Domain or the CK Commercial one, of course, the ethical thing that Council member to do is to recuse from that vote, and all other past or forthcoming votes where any of you have a financial interest or would benefit from passage of PILOTs. I know you will do this because Dana Sande said there is no need for ethical oversight for the City Council. He said this City Council is above any ethical misconduct so there is no need for ethical oversight. If that is true, this Council member has recused him or her -self from other (past) votes pertaining to any other property which he/she is investing in, or maybe this upcoming one is the first for any Council member.

When these developers are getting massive tax breaks for which we tax payers are paying for their share of taxes for up to 20 years, those 'silent' investors should be individually listed on the public record. It is my understanding they are remaining anonymous behind a corporation or LLC. Since one or some are reportedly on the City Council, this would fit the the definition of needing ethical oversight.

Mary Koponen
1312 Noble Cove
Grand Forks



CGF Meeting Feedback Form

Submitted On: May 4, 2026, 02:48PM CDT

City of Grand Forks

Meeting Type:	City Council Meeting
Full Name	First Name: Tim Last Name: Schwanz
Full Address	Street Address: 1730 11th Ave N City: Grand Forks State: ND Zip: 58203
Agenda Item Number / Topic:	Several
Comments:	<p>Seems to be more and more issues coming forward now with these Pilots, first Epic asking for more money, then filing bankruptcy. Now something with the Franklin, changing ownership or something prior to asking or checking to see if affects the Pilot before doing so.</p> <p>Pilots were designed to bring NEW businesses to town, not housing. Especially where there is no PROVEN need for them, when there are so many vacancies in town, almost every one of those new developments and rental agency's are advertising vacancy's all over town, Most of those built with retail on lower level sit empty of retail.</p> <p>Why should the city be giving tax breaks to these high frills complexes with amenities that will be in direct competition with existing tax paying businesses.</p> <p>It's time for deeper investigation into the real purpose and need, instead of just relying on the data provided by those looking FOR the tax breaks.</p>