

**From:** [Barb Ickes](#)  
**To:** [Malin, Craig](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Belvedere Etc.  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 2:18:30 PM

---

Not talking about leftover money. Not even a little bit.

After emailing most of the day, I have these two statements: "If the Dock is built, the city will not pay a penny for the belvedere." AND "To be specific, I said the property taxes paid by a Dock redevelopment will be more than sufficient to pay for the belvedere."

Not a penny, yet property taxes. And you see no conflict?

---

**From:** Malin, Craig [mailto:[ctm@ci.davenport.ia.us](mailto:ctm@ci.davenport.ia.us)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 1:54 PM  
**To:** Barb Ickes  
**Subject:** RE: Belvedere Etc.

That's not what I said.

To be specific, I said the property taxes paid by a Dock redevelopment will be more than sufficient to pay for the belevedere.

"More than sufficient" both implies and actually states there will be money left over.

There will only be money left over if the Dock is redeveloped and pays property taxes.

Page 49 of 2014 RiverVision update sums it up – "As is, is the worst option of all".

---

**From:** Barb Ickes [mailto:[BIckes@gctimes.com](mailto:BIckes@gctimes.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 1:46 PM  
**To:** Malin, Craig  
**Subject:** RE: Belvedere Etc.

I see. Property taxes are not city money.

---

**From:** Malin, Craig [mailto:[ctm@ci.davenport.ia.us](mailto:ctm@ci.davenport.ia.us)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 1:20 PM  
**To:** Barb Ickes  
**Subject:** RE: Belvedere Etc.

If it wasn't true, I wouldn't have written it.

---

**From:** Barb Ickes [mailto:[BIckes@gctimes.com](mailto:BIckes@gctimes.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 1:14 PM  
**To:** Malin, Craig  
**Subject:** RE: Belvedere Etc.

Once again (though I am certain you are aware of it), I am not asking you about the merits of a TIF. I am not asking you about math. And I am not speculating on whether the Levee commissioners

were correct in asserting the belvedere is actually a floodwall. I'm not even asking you why you said the 7-foot estimate is incorrect when your PW director confirmed that is it.

To be absolutely clear: You wrote, "If the Dock is built, the city will not pay a penny for the belvedere." Is this a true statement or isn't it?

As much as your reporter found your arguments "entertaining" and later, "interesting," I am more interested in their accuracy.

If you could, please, just answer the question. I've underlined it to be perfectly clear.

---

**From:** Malin, Craig [<mailto:ctm@ci.davenport.ia.us>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 12:39 PM

**To:** Barb Ickes

**Subject:** RE: Belvedere Etc.

Barb:

If the redevelopment of the Dock pays \$1.2 million or more in City property taxes and a public park feature costs less than that, we are money ahead. That's math. Math is true. You could add the \$100,000 a year in Dock lease revenue to the equation and the math gets even better, but I'd prefer to under-promise and over-deliver.

The larger issue, lost in the mischaracterization of the belvedere as a floodwall, is how private-public partnerships in public spaces can help cities. Check out pages 6 – 14 of [http://www.cityofdavenportiowa.com/egov/documents/1406305648\\_52206.pdf](http://www.cityofdavenportiowa.com/egov/documents/1406305648_52206.pdf)

Craig

---

**From:** Barb Ickes [<mailto:BIckes@gctimes.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 12:24 PM

**To:** Malin, Craig

**Subject:** RE: Belvedere Etc.

"If the Dock is built, the city will not pay a penny for the belvedere." Your words. "...the city will not pay a penny."

To help you track: If the money for the belvedere is not the city's, whose is it?

This is not a discussion about the usefulness of TIFs. It's about clarifying your representation of city money as somehow not coming from the city.

You said no city money was spent on the Ferris wheel. You said "...the city will not pay a penny for the belvedere." It would seem that neither statement is true.

Barb:

I may not be tracking your line of questioning. You asked how public money is no longer public when spent on two things ... both of which are public. Public money, spent on public facilities or services, is public.

When asked how the belvedere would be paid for, I noted the redevelopment of the Dock would provide City property taxes more than sufficient to provide this public park feature. That is basic math, with the "more than sufficient" statement highlighting other property taxpayers in Davenport won't be picking up the tab for the belvedere. The Ferris Wheel is slightly more complicated in that its funding

is tied to a lease rather than property taxes, but the same principle of a business paying for a public amenity applies.

Where public resources are created and directed is a topic of fair debate which elected bodies resolve. As I recall, both the Quad City Times building and Mississippi Plaza which houses Lee Enterprises benefited from TIF funding. I'd suggest the same principle of those businesses paying "more than sufficient" property taxes such that other taxpayers in Davenport are not harmed by their existence applies.

The difference between expanding and improving LeClaire Park or our ballpark as public places versus creating private buildings is obvious, but the principle of not putting residential taxpayers on the hook for a redevelopment is the same.

Craig

---

**From:** Barb Ickes [<mailto:BIckes@qctimes.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 11:18 AM  
**To:** Malin, Craig  
**Subject:** Belvedere Etc.

Hi, Craig.

I read your response to our edit on Doing It In Davenport.

I noticed you insist the belvedere uses no taxes. You said, "If the Dock is built, the city will not pay a penny for the belvedere." You then explain the redevelopment pays \$1.2 million, which is "more than sufficient."

Craig, isn't that \$1.2 million city money? Isn't it a property tax? You seem to be selling the idea that tax money that is earmarked is somehow no longer tax money.

You did the same thing, regarding the Ferris wheel. You portrayed the lease money from MWP as somehow not being public money. Given the park is publicly owned, the lease money is, in fact, public money.

Would you please explain how the use of this public tax and lease money is no longer public when you spend it on belvederes and Ferris wheels?

Thank you.

Barb

**Barb Ickes**  
Newsroom  
Quad-City Times  
563-383-2316  
[qctimes.com](http://qctimes.com)

