

**FINANCE COMMITTEE
AUGUST 13, 2018 AT 7:25 P.M.
POLICE DEPARTMENT – 933 MICHIGAN AVENUE**

PRESENT: Ald. Phillips, Slowinski, Johnson, Shorr, and Morrow

ALSO

PRESENT: C/T Ladick; Mayor Wiza; City Attorney Beveridge; City Clerk Moe; Director Schrader, Ostrowski, Lemke, Beduhn; Police Chief Skibba; Fire Chief Finn; Ald. Kneebone, McComb, Oberstadt, Dugan, Jennings, Nebel; Deputy C/T Freeberg; Brandi Makuski; Dave Ladick

ITEM #1 – PRESENTATION ON REVENUE DEBT.

C/T Ladick gave a presentation on revenue debt.

ITEM #2 – CLEAN WATER FUND LOAN BORROWING.

Director Lemke stated that the Utility Commission acted on the water and sewer rates. The amount of the loan is \$19,827,115, with \$650,000 in principal forgiveness, which is essentially a grant, so that then makes the loan \$19,177,115, with a 1.892% interest rate. That being said, this will require a 15% increase in wastewater rates, across the board.

Ald. Slowinski questioned what sort of average increase that would be on a quarterly bill. Director Lemke replied that they estimate, with the increases that were approved for wastewater and water, it would be approximately \$30 more per quarter, or \$10 a month. The last time sewer rates were adjusted was in 2010, 2012 for water rates, so that is under 2% per year increase.

Ald. Johnson questioned how long into the future this will take us. Director Lemke replied the last project of this scale was done approximately 23-26 years ago. The project consists of upgrades to the solids treatment end of the operation so when we get into things that are regulated on that side, such as finding fields to do applications, we will have more expensive hauling costs because we have to go further. Nutrient Management Plans, although a great thing, are making it harder because you need to have more fields to put the same product on.

Ald. Morrow questioned how long before the project would be done. Director Lemke replied Spring of 2020.

Motion made by Ald. Johnson, seconded by Ald. Morrow, to approve the Clean Water Fund loan borrowing as described in the document that was presented.

C/T Ladick stated the formal borrowing resolution will be at the Council meeting next week.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion carried.

ITEM #3 – PRESENTATION ON OPTIONS FOR CEMETERY PERPETUAL CARE FUNDS.

C/T Ladick stated that one of the updates to the City investment policy that was done earlier this year, was to allow additional options for investment of cemetery care funds. He then gave a presentation on the options.

ITEM #4 – CONSIDERATION OF BID REPAIRS TO EDGEWATER MANOR.

Director Ostrowski stated they received one bid for the repairs to Edgewater Manor, which was just over \$4.1 million. At that point, he stated he was instructed to go back to see what the condition of the wall is and how much time we have left on the temporary fix that was put on that wall. AECOM went out and assessed the wall and stated they figure we have 4-5 years left on the temporary fix assuming that we do several repairs that they identified within that study. We are looking for action

on whether or not you want to proceed with the permanent repairs or if we want to hold at this point in time and look at other alternatives for this building. If we opt to hold off on the façade at this time, he would like to get authorization to do the necessary repairs that are needed to prolong the life of the façade and also getting some ash trees treated that are on the site. The trees were slated to come down with the new façade, so if we are holding on that, they would need to be treated in the meantime.

Ald. Johnson questioned what the cost is to treat the trees. Director Ostrowski replied it is a few hundred dollars per tree, per year, and there are about 8-10 trees, so about \$2,500.

Ald. Morrow questioned how much the necessary repairs were. Director Ostrowski replied they do not have a cost yet, but there is some tuckpointing, seals for the windows, etc. These repairs are needed to prolong the life of the façade.

Ald. Slowinski questioned if these items that are necessary repairs will help lower the cost of the permanent façade fix. Director Ostrowski replied that these are just general maintenance items that will help the life of the temporary façade fix, but will not have anything to do with the permanent fix. These fixes would buy us some time over the next year so we can research the best option.

Ald. Slowinski questioned what the alternative would be, whether it will be a different use, different direction, etc. Director Ostrowski replied maybe even rebid it next year or the year after or use different materials to try to bring down the costs somewhat.

Ald. Phillips stated that since the bid we received was 100% over budget, it should be rejected.

Motion made by Ald. Phillips, seconded Ald. Johnson, to reject the bid.

Director Ostrowski questioned if that included the repairs. Ald. Phillips stated he would like to handle that separately.

Ald. Morrow stated that Edgewater does have its own fund from the rents paid to help with the repairs.

Ald. Phillips questioned if the necessary repairs would be paid for using Edgewater funds. Director Ostrowski stated they would and he recommends proceeding with those minor repairs because if he had to go out for bids and get them back to the Committee, it would be Spring of next year before that process was completed. He said these would be minor fixes, not costing much, and he would direct our property management company, Candlewood, to go out and perform the necessary work or hire contractors to get it done before winter to avoid any more water infiltration into the walls.

Ayes: All Nays: None Motion carried.

Motion made by Ald. Johnson, seconded by Ald. Morrow, to direct staff to move forward with making the incidental repairs to secure the building and treat the trees.

Ald. McComb stated she supports rejecting the bid, but thinks it is important to do what is necessary now to prolong the time frame. She did state that people are concerned over the trees so she would like to see a few of them saved. She stated we made a commitment when we purchased Edgewater to have a good place for low-income seniors to live and that is the standard we are seeking, we support the low-income seniors.

Ayes: All Nays: None Motion carried.

ITEM #5 – UTILITY EASEMENT IN BUKOLT PARK.

Director Schrader stated the person living at 100 Bukolt Avenue would like to upgrade the electric service into the building and would like to switch from LP gas to natural gas, so Public Service needs to run the electric and gas lines to the house. They would be running the gas down the right-of-way until it gets to the front of the house and then the electric would go across the lagoon, then across the road to the pole, put in a new guide wire, and then underground to the driveway and then into the house. The only thing he has to go by was from 1996 when Norlight Telecommunications ran an easement on the end of Franklin Street, 10-15'x150', but this was a fiber optics line. It was a major line that served the west side plus outside the community. At that point, the City decided, through the Finance Committee, that it would be \$1,000 per year to run that permanent easement through the park. This easement request is different because it is a single-family home. He did not think it would be fair, due to current policy, which is for corporations, to run an easement through the park at \$1,000 per year, so he thinks what needs to be determined is what we need to do when we have a private individual or private company, such as Wisconsin Public Service, to a single family home. We need to set some type of policy. The policy and fee should maybe be a scale that would float on how big the easement is. When these easements go through a park, it limits what can be done in the park. Originally WPS proposed the easement to be north and west of the existing road in the park, which we said no to because any future development of the park, we would have to deal with that easement. When they ran the easement down the right-of-way, there is just a small piece that connects between Bukolt Avenue and the house, which would probably never have any development.

Ald. Johnson asked Director Schrader if he had ever talked to colleagues about easements that have gone through other parks and how they handled them. Since we are looking at some sort of policy and fee structure, we are looking for some guidance. Director Schrader replied that it varied, some do not charge, some charge upwards of \$100,000.

Mayor Wiza stated the easement that was run by the Franklin Street boat landing that serviced the entire west side, was a utility company. Director Schrader replied yes. Mayor Wiza commented that the City was essentially providing a service for everyone on the west side and beyond. This particular request from WPS for an easement, would just serve one household.

Ald. Johnson clarified that Norlight Telecommunications pays the \$1,000 per year, Director Schrader replied yes.

Doug Lynch, 100 Bukolt Avenue, gave some history on the property and stated he does not believe that a single-family residence should be charged a yearly easement fee and if there is a charge for this, he feels WPS should pay for it.

Ald. Phillips questioned Director Lemke if City water and sewer are currently run to this property through a right-of-way. Director Lemke replied that they do access the property straight to the south, through the park. Ald. Phillips questioned why they would not run electrical and gas in the right-of-way. Director Lemke replied he really does not know, but that he thinks that is the shortest point between what is right-of-way and his land, the two do not connect. Mayor Wiza commented that the majority of that is the public right-of-way, which is where all the other utilities are. This particular request is in the right-of-way as much as possible but the park has that short piece of land that looks like 66 ½ feet that is not public right-of-way, nor is it Mr. Lynch's property, it is the park property. Ald. Phillips questioned how the sewer and water get to his property right now. Director Lemke stated through the park property, but it is a City utility.

Director Schrader stated originally when Kulas owned it, the property was not in the City, it was in the Town of Hull. Her septic failed and the deal the City ran with her was that if she annexed into the City, the City would provide sewer. The sewer system comes from the Bukolt Lodge to the bathhouse to that house with a grinder pump system. There was no easement done. There was no other way of getting sewer to that house unless we dug up the road, etc.

Ald. Johnson stated the easement is with WPS so it is not with the owner. She stated it would be a good idea to have a policy as it relates to future easements in parks that will help us avoid this type of situation. We do not want easements to impede the use or future use of parks, so a written policy will help with that.

Mayor Wiza stated the applicant is WPS, a for profit company. They intend to make a profit off this connection and every other connection they have. The comment that Mr. Lynch made stating that the City chose to surround this particular property with a park, would also be true that Mr. Lynch chose to buy this property that was surrounded by park. There is no hardship created by not approving this easement at all because there is means to heat and provide electricity to the parcel as is. He stated the argument that there is no charge for the other utility, sewer and water, is not true as going from the Town of Hull to the City and paying those property taxes in the City, effectively is an annual charge to provide those services, in addition to the quarterly bill that property receives from the Stevens Point Water Department. He stated he would be very cautious with any park and providing a permanent easement because you are limiting the property. The recommendation is to allow the easement to WPS to provide utilities to their customer so they are allowed to make money off from that customer, but it should not be at the expense of the taxpayer. We are compromising the property that is owned by the taxpayers of the City of Stevens Point so there should be compensation for that, just like what has been done with other "for-profit" companies in easements in parks. That particular easement provided services to the citizen of the City of Stevens Point all over the west side and further, that is why there is only a fee of \$1000 per year. This request is for one customer, so no benefit to the citizens of the City. He recommends that we allow the easement for WPS to run the utilities, but compensate the citizens of the City of Stevens Point for the use of that property for whatever fee is determined.

Ald. Morrow agrees with Mayor Wiza.

Ald. Slowinski also agrees there should be some sort of fee charged, but feels it should be a one-time fee, although he would like to find comparables from other municipalities to know what that fee should be because they really would have no idea what it should be.

Motion made by Ald. Slowinski, seconded by Ald. Morrow, to postpone for one week so that Director Schrader can find some comparables.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion carried.

ITEM #6 – METHOD FOR HANDLING REQUESTS FOR THE 2019 OPERATING BUDGET, AND ESTABLISHMENT FOR PRIORITIES.

C/T Ladick stated this is a follow-up from the presentation last month about the operating budget, how things look and weighing priorities. Staff has discussed this and agrees there is a need for both more staff to provide services and increased compensation, and we are trying to figure out how to prioritize that and make everything work. There was a poll taken of the Department Heads and 6 indicated compensation needed to be the biggest priority and 4 indicated both compensation and additional staff needed to be a priority. Overall, what makes the most sense is to have 2019 be the year that we focus on compensation and 2020 be the year that we focus on enhancing services. We should have more money in 2020 than in 2019. We would like to get both Finance Committee and Council member's thoughts as to how they would like to see this work. The internal team has a consensus that they do not want to get into a fight amongst themselves so they are working on a solution to move forward.

Ald. Johnson commented the thought process on focusing on compensation first and additional staff to follow, is a good strategy, mostly because recruiting, hiring and training new people is very costly. She would like to retain the dedicated, high quality staff that we have so making sure they are compensated is one of our best investments and then focus on adding to the team.

Mayor Wiza stated we are looking for feedback. When the priorities were discussed with the internal team, a boost all the way across the board, to help us with attraction and retention of those employees, was key. Every single department has said they have problems hiring people and many of them have had problems keeping people. We do not want Stevens Point to be the learning center for every other municipality, they come here to get their skills here and move on. His opinion, along with the majority of the internal group, is that we provide the compensation lift as best we can as a priority, but there is also going to be staffing requests, so we need feedback as to what the thoughts are regarding that.

Ald. Shorr stated he believes in retention, keeping faith by rewarding faithful service, and also understands what is going on in the economy with the wage issues. He has also heard from the department heads that need the extra staff, so he feels the pressures and is for the compensation as a start. Ald. Phillips stated he also feels compensation should be first. Ald. Morrow stated compensation also. Ald. Johnson stated she thinks the new positions should be looked at in a hierarchy or matrix to see if they support essential functions, is it a part of protecting human health and public safety, etc. It needs to be prioritized, does it have a funding source, does it help the City achieve its mission, etc. She stated she would like to see the new positions not be excluded, but rather a system of evaluating those after we know how much the lift in compensation will cost. Ald. Slowinski stated he would like to see that everyone would get a raise.

Mayor Wiza stated the idea was tossed around for a raise for just hourly employees, but then you get wage compression. His thought was to provide an increase across the board, putting an increase into the matrix, so people would still get their steps in addition. He stated with the position requests, he would expect to have those before the Personnel Committee next month. He expects there will be several requests and would like to present them all at the same time. His goal is to do both, compensation and create new positions to allow services to be back to where they should be, but we cannot do both at the same time. Ald. Johnson commented that we cannot do 100% of both. Mayor Wiza agreed and said we have been doing well at creating additional sources of revenue and we had nearly \$120,000,000 in growth last year with the net new construction so that will help us for several years down the road. We are hoping to be able to raise it up a little bit at a time so that we can get it where we need to be and then hopefully be able to sustain that as in the past that has been an issue. Ald. Slowinski stated he supports the compensation, but he wants it to be across the board as he wants to uphold the integrity of the pay plan and avoid the wage compression with management. Ald. Morrow agrees with Ald. Slowinski. C/T Ladick stated that giving a significant increase across the board would be incredibly positive and out of the ordinary. There have been a lot of times when we have had to make adjustments that have been painful for the employees, such as health insurance adjustments or ACT 10, etc., so we want everyone to feel positive about this.

ITEM #7 – FUNDING FOR A GARBAGE CORRAL AND SHELTER DOWNTOWN.

Mayor Wiza gave some history on how this came to be, stating that when the square was redone, there was a need to provide a location for businesses to put their garbage. Prior to that, there were bags of garbage and cans sitting outside the shops. At the time, it was decided that they would build a garbage corral downtown on the square. Since that time, it has been a stinky, disgusting, mess on the square and has had multiple problems. The City provides the location of the dumpsters, but do not do anything else, we do not own the dumpsters, we do not pick it up, we do not shovel, etc. There are 6 businesses that have keys to the dumpster and they are responsible for the maintenance of it, the contract for the dumpsters, etc. The goal for this project is to get that dumpster corral out of the public market and put it somewhere that is less intrusive. We have talked about moving it across Clark Street, where the City owns a lot, but that was a hardship to get the garbage there. The location that is being looked at, Lot #22, is currently being used for private dumpsters, also not owned and operated by the City, nor do we have any contractual obligation with any haulers. Since they are using two City parking spots and are not paying any rent for those spots, the proposal is to move the current area on the square and move them to a location in Lot #22. The City would still not have anything to do with it, we just provide the site and build a decorative fence around it. Then, rather than tearing down the current area on the square where

the dumpsters sit, make that into something usable because so many people hang out on the square, and making that a covered, sheltered area. He also noted that there is now free City wifi on the square, primarily to be used by the market people, that is password protected. The proposals estimated cost is \$25,000 to put up the fence at the new location, and about \$25,000 to take the existing dumpster corral and turn it into a gazebo. We would reuse as much of the material as we can from the existing fences for the new one. This expense is currently not in the budget, so he proposes consideration for allowing this to come out of contingency. The alternative would be to wait another year to get it in the capital budget for 2019, but he would like it to get done this year.

Ald. Slowinski questioned C/T Ladick where the contingency account is at. C/T Ladick responded it is ok so the money would be available.

Ald. Morrow questioned if there was any plan for the City to be compensated for those two stalls that are currently being used by the dumpsters in Lot #22. Mayor Wiza stated there is not, but that we are providing a service for the citizens so that they do not have to look at the garbage as well as providing a safe and secure area in Lot #22.

Ald. Johnson stated she has not heard anything about recycling and that it is a Wisconsin law so it is mandatory, so she strongly encouraged that be looked in to. Mayor Wiza clarified there are also recycling dumpsters. If we, in the future, would need more space for the dumpsters in the future, we would just not renew the parking permit next to the dumpster area and add to it.

Ald. Phillips questioned why we cannot build a structure similar to the one by the Elks and Bill's Pizza, rather than a big structure. Mayor Wiza clarified that is what they are doing. The new area will not be covered as the dumpsters are already covered.

Ald. Phillips stated he does not agree with building a gazebo area, he stated he would like it just tore down and be done with it. He also stated that he feels contingency should be used for emergencies and he does not feel this is an emergency or a high priority.

Ald. Johnson stated that she feels that the public health issue as it relates to garbage being in close proximity to a high volume of people on the square, it does fall in the category of emergency or immediate attention. She supports the idea.

Ald. Slowinski stated he agrees with Ald. Phillips with regards to converting the old area and questioned what material is there now. Mayor Wiza replied the brick pillars and the black steel fencing that goes all the way around. We would just be adding a roof, taking down some of the fencing and adding some benches.

Ald. Jennings stated she is in favor of moving the dumpsters but against retaining the structure and trying to modify it. She would like to see it tore down and repurpose the materials to build the new dumpster enclosure.

Ald. Nebel stated she agrees with Ald. Jennings and Ald. Phillips with regards to contingency money should be used for something that is about safety and agrees the dumpsters should be moved.

Director Beduhn commented that the controls for the fountain are in that area so the whole thing cannot be torn down as that would then be exposed and not protected.

Mayor Wiza stated with regards to reusing material, we will not be able to reuse the brick columns because that is not going to be the design for the other one. The intent is to use the same kind of fence that is currently there. He stated that if it is decided to tear down the structure, it is not going to be free either as it will need to be repaired to make it look like the rest of the square does. He stated that leaving the two sides of the fencing up was to protect the grassy area, so we may want to leave those.

Ald. Jennings stated her vision has been to have outside seating and talked about having a beer garden area. If this structure is left there, it will be limiting the area for outdoor café type settings, which is a good place for it because it is a protected corner.

Ald. Shorr stated he would like to see different possibilities for the area.

Ald. Shorr made a motion that was seconded by Ald. Johnson, to approve setting up the new location for garbage and recycling, which would include moving the material from where it is.

Mayor Wiza stated what we are looking for is authorization to fund this in whatever shape it takes, so maybe we take up what can be done with this square location after the move. We are looking for authorization to pull funding from contingency on the cost of creating the new dumpster corral in Lot #22 and then we can come back to review what to do with the area on the square. He stated he will get some numbers together on what it will cost to tear it down and make it usable into whatever we decide.

Motion made by Ald. Shorr, seconded by Ald. Johnson, to approve funding the new dumpster corral in Lot #22 from contingency and revisit the area on the square once we have costs and ideas put together.

Ayes: All Nays: None Motion carried.

ITEM #8 – CONSIDERATION OF CLAIM-VERSENAS MCCRARY-INJURY-TRIP AND FALL DUE TO ROCK DOWNTOWN.

Motion made by Ald. Johnson, seconded by Ald. Slowinski, to deny the claim.

Ayes: All Nays: None Motion carried.

ITEM #9 – REQUEST BY PORTAGE COUNTY TO AMEND LIBRARY LEASE AGREEMENT.

C/T Ladick stated this goes back to 2012 when the City and the County evaluated the library building and put together a list of needs and one of those needs was windows, for \$55,000. When the City and County renewed the library lease, the County agreed to make all the improvements that were listed on that report, in lieu of rent, and they understood that whatever those costs were going to be, they were committing to. They have now proposed a replacement for those windows but it did not get approved by the Historic Preservation Committee so now they decided that maybe they do not need to do the windows at all. They are asking for us to release them from that obligation to do the windows. He suggested that if this truly is not needed anymore, there are other things that came up since that original 2012 report that under the lease the City is responsible for and one of them is windows in a different section of the building. We agreed to pay for those because it is part of our contract that was approved in June, so if they want to swap windows around and agree to pay for some other items that may come up, he stated that would be acceptable.

Ald. Phillips questioned if part of a lease agreement can be opened up or if the whole lease then needs to be looked at. City Attorney Beveridge replied there is no rule that says if you consider one aspect of a lease you have to consider them all. Typically lease modifications are governed by the terms for amendment that are contained within that lease and we did not write anything like that in it.

Ald. Phillips questioned why the Historic Preservation Committee said no to the windows. Director Ostrowski stated it would have been dealing with the type of materials they would be using and what would be historically accurate for that building and that age. He also mentioned that the City cannot deny an applicant solely based off the material if the party presents an alternative material that essentially looks the same. That is a new change in State law that the Historic Preservation Commission cannot do anymore but being this is the City's building, you could require that.

Ald. Johnson asked if we know the price differential. Mayor Wiza stated it was less, the original proposal was roughly within what the County had budgeted, but the recommendation by the Historic Preservation/Design Review Committee was significantly higher. Ald. Johnson stated she goes back to the Journal building and Council said it is a lovely building and it would be nice to have it historically accurate, however, in an age of trying to have energy efficient buildings, that design is no longer relevant and Council overturned that and she stated she believes that applies here. It makes sense to have something that looks like it, but has the ability to provide all the integrity you want in a building but be energy efficient and aesthetically pleasing.

City Attorney Beveridge stated that would be granting an appeal of a decision of the Historic Preservation Committee, which is initiated by a request from the person whose application is denied. Although, we do not have that before us right now.

Director Ostrowski stated the larger question is whether or not those windows need to be replaced or maybe taking this back through Historic Preservation, with the recent State law change, and if they present material that is substantially similar what would go in there, the Commission may have a different outlet.

City Attorney Beveridge stated at first, back in 2012 when he was an Alderman, it was a request from the County that the City foot the bill for all these capital improvements and he thought wanting the windows replaced because there is a little condensation in them, was being fussy. When things were renegotiated and the County agreed to pick up the capital tab, it was inserted in the contract as specific items and based upon what they told the City needed to be done. The City's willingness to extend the lease with the terms was bought by the County's willingness to do the capital improvements. It is more to determine whether there is loss of value of them not doing that or putting it off for a while and in Historic context, there is a little value you may be giving up but it is theoretical value.

Mayor Wiza suggested this request is to amend the library agreement. If you choose to amend the agreement to not force them to replace the windows, that would be an affirmative action. If the decision is to not change the agreement, we could afford the County to go back to the Historic Preservation with the original plan or if it is decided to hold them to the agreement and make them put in what is approved, you would deny the request and could direct staff to contact the County with whatever the wishes are.

C/T Ladick stated the County is asking to not have to replace the windows at all but he would suggest, as a counter to that, is to say if this is truly the case, then they don't need to be done, but these other things do.

Motion made by Ald. Slowinski, seconded by Ald. Morrow, to deny the request from Portage County to amend the library lease agreement and direct staff to work with the County to come up with an agreement.

Ayes: All Nays: None Motion carried.

ITEM #10 – APPROVAL OF CLAIMS PAID.

Motion made by Ald. Shorr, seconded by Ald. Slowinski, to approve the claims paid in the amount of \$3,081,981.56.

Ayes: All Nays: None Motion carried.

ITEM #11 – ADJOURN INTO CLOSED SESSION (APPROXIMATELY 8:00 P.M.) PURSUANT TO WISCONSIN STATUTES 19.85(1)(E) (DELIBERATING OR NEGOTIATING THE PURCHASING OF PUBLIC PROPERTIES, THE INVESTING OF PUBLIC FUNDS, OR CONDUCTING OTHER SPECIFIED PUBLIC BUSINESS, WHENEVER COMPETITIVE OR BARGAINING REASONS REQUIRE A CLOSED SESSION) ON THE FOLLOWING: A. NEGOTIATING THE TERMS OF A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR A PROJECT IN TIF DISTRICT 5.

Motion made by Ald. Morrow, seconded by Ald. Johnson, to adjourn into closed session at 9:40 p.m.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ald. Phillips, Slowinski, Shorr, Johnson, and Morrow Nays: None Motion carried.

ITEM #12 – RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION (APPROXIMATELY 8:30 P.M.) FOR POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE ABOVE REFERENCED CLOSED SESSION ITEM.

Motion made by Ald. Johnson, seconded by Ald. Slowinski, to reconvene into open session at 9:57 p.m.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ald. Phillips, Slowinski, Shorr, Johnson, and Morrow Nays: None Motion carried.

Motion made by Ald. Johnson, seconded by Ald. Morrow, to have staff move forward with the development agreement working with the developer as outlined in closed session.

Ayes: All Nays: None Motion carried.

Adjournment at 9:58 p.m.