

City of East Bethel
Housing and Redevelopment Authority
Regular Meeting – 6:30 p.m.
Date: October 3, 2012



	Item	
6:30 PM	1.0	Call to Order
6:32 PM	2.0	Adopt Agenda
6:33 PM	3.0	Approve Minutes July 5, 2012 August 15, 2012
6:35 PM	4.0	SAC & WAC Revolving Loan Program
7:15 PM	5.0	Adjourn

City of East Bethel
Housing and Redevelopment Authority
July 5, 2012

The Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) met on July 5, 2012 for a regular meeting at City Hall at 6:45 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob DeRoche Richard Lawrence Heidi Moegerle
 Steve Voss

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Bill Boyer

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator
 Mark Vierling, City Attorney

Call to Order Chair Voss called the meeting to order at 6:45 PM.

Adopt **Lawrence made a motion to adopt the July 5, 2012 Housing and Redevelopment Authority**
Agenda **(HRA) meeting agenda. Moegerle seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Approve DeRoche, "In the minutes there is mention that all these reports that are going to be completed.
Minutes But there is not much said on when they were going to be done?" Moegerle, "That was Mr.
 Sackey that was working on those." Davis, "He completed most of those, but to my knowledge
 he hasn't completed them all." Voss said but that doesn't change the minutes.

Lawrence made a motion to approve the July 5, 2012 HRA minutes. DeRoche seconded; all in favor, motion carries.

EDA Davis explained that City Council will be presented with estimates and specifications for
Interfund approval to bid a reader board sign at the July 18, 2012 council meeting. In order to fund
Loan this project in 2012, it would be necessary to approve an intra-fund loan from the City's
 HRA account to the EDA in an amount of up to \$37,110. This loan, if approved, would be
 repaid to the HRA from 2013 EDA budget. The 2013 EDA budget is subject to Council
 approval.

There is currently \$50,000 in the EDA budget for the reader board sign. The City has received a donation of \$5,000 for the sign from the East Bethel Seniors and \$2,890 in a damage claim reimbursement from our LMC insurance.

Funds loaned to the EDA from an intra-fund loan would be repaid to the HRA by June 30, 2013.

Staff is requesting consideration of request to approve a no interest intra-fund loan from the HRA to the EDA to cover the balance of a reader board cost over \$57,890, with the loan not to exceed \$37,110.

Moegerle, "Have we sent out an RFP for this yet?" Davis, "We are going to give the specifications and renderings to Council at their next meeting. From those, we would come up with an RFP (if approved) to send out after the Council meeting."

DeRoche made a motion to approve a no interest intra-fund loan from the HRA to the EDA to cover the balance of a reader board of the cost over \$57,890, with the loan not to exceed \$37,110. Moegerle seconded.

Moegerle, "Why make the loan now rather than when we have something to accept?" Davis, "If we do something now we won't have to call a special meeting." Moegerle, "Because this is the quarterly meeting?" Davis, "That is correct. But if you want to wait, we can do that and we can always call a special meeting." Moegerle, "And this is the account we have the \$800,000 in?" Davis, "That is correct." Moegerle, "Is there any reason to do this now, to reserve against any other expenses? We know this is a pending expense, right?" Davis, "This is a pending expense if it is approved. We do know the reader board sign that Ham Lake did in 2006 was \$65,000. We priced one a year later and it was probably just a little more aesthetically developed than theirs and we were looking at \$75,000. And as mentioned before, Ham Lake did quite a bit of fundraising for theirs. I think they raised 50-60% of that amount was raised through donations. But, times were better then and they had a bigger business base to draw from. If we do that, we have to have a policy in place immediately. Sure people that donate may have some expectations about accessing the board."

Voss said their fundraising took a long time. And from what I recall, the City decided they needed the sign and paid for the balance. Davis, "I am sure it did. I don't know if anyone has looked at our sign that is down there now. But it is not in any form that is useable. The top panels are caved in. I was hoping we could use the bottom two tracks but they are too loose." Voss asked so the expectation is the sign will be around \$95,000? Davis, "That is what we are anticipating. We are hoping it would be less than that though. We won't know until we bid it. All I am requesting now is that we approve the inter-fund loan in case we do get acceptable bids. Then we will have a source to finance this. We wouldn't have to call another HRA meeting." Voss asked but it would still have to go to Council first because it is expenditure? Davis, "That is correct."

Moegerle made a motion to table the inter-fund loan from HRA to EDA for the reader board until we have an exact amount. DeRoche withdrew his motion to approve the loan. DeRoche seconded the motion to table.

Moegerle, "My point is why not do this all at one time, when we have the bids and know how much it will be. It will make it cleaner." Voss said it is pretty easy to call an HRA meeting right before a Council meeting. It is not like we have to come in special or anything. Lawrence, "I think we have some support to get the reader board sign done. We just need to know how much it will cost." Voss said by approving this loan to EDA it is sort of making a statement that this is the way that Council wants to go in that price range. We already approved this to go out for bids, right? Davis, "We will have this on the next Council meeting agenda, to approve to go out for bids." DeRoche, "Was this more to make sure that the money is going to go out for the sign? To go out for an RFP that doesn't require any money, correct?" Davis, "This will be a bid and once the bids are received then they have to be approved by Council. Council has to approve the project cost and if the cost is over \$57,000 than this will also need to be approved." **All in favor, motion carries.**

Voss said as long as we are talking about the EDA Inter-fund loan, what is the potential for the EDA to loan to Aggressive Hydraulics? And that would have to come out of HRA anyways; we would have to meet anyways. Davis, "That is correct."

Moegerle, "When would we know about failed septic systems and what we are going to do as a whole and the reports Mr. Sackey was doing?" Davis, "As far as using those numbers for justification to the PCA for funds, has to be a publically owned system." Moegerle, "But there are other sources of funds other than PCA, right?" Davis, "There may be. But anything like that is probably going to have to be a public applicant and publically owned." DeRoche, "Didn't Ham Lake look into that a little?" Davis, "Yes they looked into it and that was one of the problems. And the other thing they looked into was to form some type of association to deal

with it. But that was on a smaller scale. The problem when you do that is the maintenance of the system.”

Moegerle, “But what about a revolving loan fund for homeowners to fix their own systems?” Davis, “We could do something like that. The county does have programs, but they are need based. You have to fall under certain income guidelines.” Voss asked are we able to assess for a septic system upgrade? Vierling, “Probably not because it is not a public improvement.” Voss said the problem with the loan is they sell, go into forecloser or whatever. If it was an assessment, at least it would be collectable on the taxes. Moegerle, “We still have a problem with no solutions.” Davis, “We have options.” Moegerle, “I am very interested in getting this resolved.”

Adjourn **DeRoche made a motion to adjourn the HRA meeting at 7:00 PM. Lawrence seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Attest:

Wendy Warren
Deputy City Clerk

DRAFT

City of East Bethel
Housing and Redevelopment Authority
August 15, 2012

The Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) met on August 15, 2012 for a regular meeting at City Hall at 7:15 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob DeRoche Richard Lawrence Heidi Moegerle
 Steve Voss

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Boyer

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator

Call to Order Voss called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM.

Adopt Agenda **Moegerle made a motion to adopt the August 15, 2012 Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) meeting. Lawrence seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Resolution 2012-05 Davis explained that at the April 4, 2012 the HRA reviewed the proposed 2013 budget. As of December 31, 2011 the HRA Fund had a cash balance of \$801,562.73.

Setting 2013 HRA Levy Limits The reason for the proposed resolution is because HRA has sufficient funds to accomplish the goals of the authority for fiscal year 2013.

Staff requests City Council considers adoption of Resolution 2012-05, A Resolution Adopting No Tax Levy in 2012 Collectible in 2013.

DeRoche made a motion to adopt 2012-05, A Resolution Adopting No Tax Levy in 2012 Collectible in 2013. Moegerle seconded; all in favor, motion carries.

Adjourn **Moegerle made a motion to adjourn the HRA meeting at 7:17 PM. DeRoche seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Attest:

Wendy Warren
Deputy City Clerk



City of East Bethel Housing & Redevelopment Authority Agenda Information

Date:

October 3, 2012

Agenda Item Number:

Item 4.0

Agenda Item:

SAC and WAC Revolving Loan Program

Requested Action:

Discussion Item

Background Information:

Staff and City Council have had previous discussions on alternative proposals to consider how the ERU's (Equivalent Residential Units) or City SAC (Sewer Access Charge) and WAC (Water Access Charge) can be most equitably administered both for the City and the assignee.

The previous discussions centered on methods for potentially reducing the MET Council's ERU (SAC) assignment for City purposes. MET Council's assignment is essentially non-negotiable but the City has the flexibility to alter their SAC and WAC charges. As these discussions progressed it became evident that it would be extremely difficult to reduce the City charges, even for the existing businesses, and not create a precedent for those businesses that are outside the sewer area but may be future connections. It was also essential that these assigned charges remain unchanged in order to generate as much revenue as possible for bond repayment costs.

I have attached two of the previous proposals (Alternative 1 and 2) for dealing with this issue. Both of these dealt with reducing the City connection charges At this time I would offer for discussion the following as proposed policies for mitigating the initial cost of the City fees for connections that have more than one (1) MET Council SAC assignments.

- 1.) Alternative 3, permitting the payment of City SAC and WAC fees over a two year period with either one-half or three quarters of the assignment being due in the first year with the balance due in the second year at dates to be determined (City bond payments for the project are due in February and August of each year);
- 2.) Alternative 4, utilize City or County HRA or other available funds as a revolving loan source for SAC and WAC payments. If this is a consideration, development of policies regarding the eligibility for the loan, loan terms and interest, amount of HRA funds to be committed, setting a loan amount limit, limiting the policy to existing businesses only and identifying acceptable positions for securities will be required;
- 3.) A combination of Alternative's 3 and 4 could be considered.

In addition, any project assessments (generally costs for road improvements or renovations that relate to the project that are not SAC or WAC fees) could be payable in up to 10 year installments at the City's interest rate policy with payments due on January 2nd of the year following the assessment hearing and determination or at a date to be determined.

Any or combination of these methods would lessen the immediate economic impact on those required to connect to the system and would in varying degrees provide the revenue stream necessary for the project.

The East Bethel Theater will have the highest City SAC and WAC charges of all the businesses within the utilities project area. They are currently assigned 27 units and their charge for connection to the system for City charges will be \$151,200 under the current calculations, not including any assessments. There was discussion with the Theater in 2010 between the Project Engineer and the City Administrator regarding the possibility of reducing the City SAC and WAC assignments from 27 to 13 but this was never presented to City Council for approval.

Attachment:

- 1. Previous ERU Reduction Policy Discussion Materials

Fiscal Impact:

Alternatives as presented in the attachments are provided for information purposes only and would detrimentally impact the cash flow of the project.

Alternative 3 would increase the projected bond payment deficit for 2013 from \$91,000 to \$275,800 if the 1/2 option were adopted and from \$91,000 to \$186,200 if the 3/4 option were selected.

Alternative 4 would create no additional deficits for 2013 or beyond .

Alternative 5 could be structured to create no deficits for 2013 or beyond .

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that Alternative 4 and/or 5 be explored in greater detail to determine if these would be viable options to mitigate the expense of the City SAC and WAC fees and determine if East Bethel HRA monies could be a part or the whole of a funding source for this proposal.

HRA Action

Motion by:_____

Second by:_____

Vote Yes:_____

Vote No:_____



Proposed City ERU Reduction Policy

- 1.) Every existing business in the Project Assessment Area and the Hwy. 65 east side businesses will receive a reduction of 1 ERU. In no case can an ERU assignment be less than 1.
- 2.) The value of an ERU is \$17,000. This is calculated based on the following breakdown:
 - A.) MCES SAC Fee.....\$3,400 (2012)
 - B.) City SAC & WAC Fee.....\$5,600
 - C.) Lateral Benefit Assessment.....\$8,000

In addition to the ERU reduction that is proposed in 1.) I would also recommend that we offer additional ERU reductions based on the amount of property taxes paid on the parcel owned and operated by existing businesses. For the purpose of the initial discussion, additional ERU reductions would be granted in increments of each \$17,000 paid in property taxes. For example, if a business paid \$8,000 in property taxes they would receive an additional ERU reduction of 0.47 ERU's. Again in no case would the total ERU assignment be less than 1 for any existing business.

- 3.) This offer for ERU reductions would only be available to existing business and could only be offered if connections and payments for MCES and City SAC & WAC fees are completed by October 2012;
- 4.) The \$8,000 Lateral Benefit Assessment would be financed over 20 years at 4.5%. The City should consider a 10 year payback period. The 20 year/4.5% proposal was the term and rate that was used for calculations in the feasibility study.
- 5.) This policy would be a one time offer and again would be only for existing businesses.
- 6.) Undeveloped lots within the Project Area could be treated as Future Lateral Benefit Assessments. The total ERU's associated with the undeveloped lots are 61. If this were implemented in conjunction with the proposals described above the available ERU's would be reduced to 36.18 for the west side portion of the project. This would cash flow as indicated in attachments 6 and 7.

A specific example of how this proposal would work is as follows:

The East Bethel Theatre has a MCES ERU assignment of 27. This proposal would grant an automatic ERU reduction of 1 bringing their new City assignment to 26. The theatre will pay

\$46,346.03 in property taxes in 2011 so they would be eligible for an additional reduction of 2.73 ERU's ($\$46,346.03 / \$17,000$) making their final City assignment 23.27. Under this arrangement the Theatre would pay the City \$130,333.07 for SAC & WAC fees in October 2012 and would be assessed ($23.27 \times \$8,000$) \$186,160 over 20 years at 4.5% or an annual payment of approximately \$14,370 per year. In addition the Theatre would owe MCES SAC fees of \$91,800 ($27 \times \$3,400$) payable October 2012. The theatre would not be obligated to pay fees on the their vacant lots (10 ERU's) until these parcels were developed.

An additional example is Northbound Woodworks LLC. They have an assigned MCES ERU value of 2. This proposal would grant an automatic ERU reduction of 1 bringing their new City ERU assignment to 1. Even though they paid \$19,699.17 in taxes they would not qualify for any additional ERU reductions due to their new adjusted City assignment of 1. Under this arrangement they would pay \$5,600 for City SAC and WAC fees in October of 2012 and would be assessed \$8,000 over 20 years at 4.5% or an annual payment of \$615 per year. They would also owe MCES SAC fees of \$3,400 payable October 2012.

There is no magic in using \$17,000 as the increment for determining the ERU reduction for the property tax portion of this proposal. Whatever number is utilized must be defensible and must be one that will cash flow the project.

**HOUSING & REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
IN AND FOR THE CITY OF EAST BETHEL
EAST BETHEL, MINNESOTA**

RESOLUTION NO. 2012-06

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AN INTERFUND LOAN FOR ADVANCE OF
CERTAIN COSTS IN CONNECTION WITH TAX INCREMENT FINANCING
DISTRICT NO. 1-1, PROPOSED TO BE ESTABLISHED
BY THE CITY OF EAST BETHEL**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners (the “Board”) of the City of East Bethel Housing and Redevelopment Authority (the “Authority”), as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The City of East Bethel, Minnesota (the “City”) proposes to (i) approve the establishment of Tax Increment Financing District No. 1-1 (the “TIF District”) within Development District No. 1 (the “Project”), and (ii) adopt a Tax Increment Financing Plan (the “TIF Plan”) for the purpose of financing certain improvements within the Project.

1.02. If approved, the City will pay or cause to be paid certain costs identified in the TIF Plan consisting of land/building acquisition, site improvements/preparation, public utilities, interest and administrative costs (collectively, the “Qualified Costs”), which costs may be financed on a temporary basis from City funds available for such purposes.

1.03. Under Minnesota Statutes, Section 469.178, Subdivision 7, the Authority is authorized to advance or loan money from the Authority’s general fund or any other fund from which such advances may be legally authorized, in order to temporarily finance the Qualified Costs.

1.04. The Authority intends to be reimbursed by the City for the Qualified Costs, from tax increment revenues derived from the TIF District in accordance with the terms of this Resolution (which terms are referred to collectively as the “Interfund Loan”). Said tax increment revenues will originally be paid to the City under the TIF Plan.

Section 2. Terms of Interfund Loan.

2.01. The Authority hereby authorizes the advance of up to \$50,000 from any of its funds or so much thereof as may be paid as Qualified Costs, whichever is less. The City shall reimburse the Authority for such advances together with interest at the rate stated below. Interest accrues on the principal amount from the date of each advance. The maximum rate of interest permitted to be charged is limited to the greater of the rates specified under Minnesota Statutes, Section 270C.40 or Section 549.09 as of the date the loan or advance is authorized, unless the written agreement states that the maximum interest rate will fluctuate as the interest rates specified under Minnesota Statutes, Section 270C.40 or Section 549.09 are from time to time adjusted. The Interfund Loan interest rate shall be 4% and will not fluctuate.

2.02. Principal and interest (the “Payments”) on the Interfund Loan shall be paid semi-annually on each August 1 and February 1 (each a “Payment Date”), commencing on the first Payment Date on which the City has Available Tax Increment (defined below), or on any other dates determined by the

City Administrator, and continuing until unpaid principal and accrued interest on the Interfund Loan is fully retired, through the date of last receipt of tax increment from the TIF District.

2.03. Payments on this Interfund Loan are payable solely from "Available Tax Increment," which shall mean, on each Payment Date, tax increment available after other obligations have been paid, or as determined by the City Administrator, generated in the preceding six (6) months with respect to the property within the TIF District and remitted to the City by Anoka County, all in accordance with Minnesota Statutes, Sections 469.174 to 469.1799, all inclusive, as amended. Payments on this Interfund Loan may be subordinated to any outstanding or future bonds, notes or contracts secured in whole or in part with Available Tax Increment, and are on parity with any other outstanding or future interfund loans secured in whole or in part with Available Tax Increment.

2.04. The principal sum and all accrued interest payable under this Interfund Loan are pre-payable in whole or in part at any time by the City without premium or penalty. No partial prepayment shall affect the amount or timing of any other regular payment otherwise required to be made under this Interfund Loan.

2.05. This Interfund Loan is evidence of an internal borrowing by the City from the Authority in accordance with Minnesota Statutes, Section 469.178, Subdivision 7, and is a limited obligation payable solely from Available Tax Increment pledged to the payment hereof under this Resolution. This Interfund Loan and the interest hereon shall not be deemed to constitute a general obligation of the State of Minnesota or any political subdivision thereof, including, without limitation, the City or the Authority. Neither the State of Minnesota nor any political subdivision thereof shall be obligated to pay the principal of or interest on this Interfund Loan or other costs incident hereto except out of Available Tax Increment, and neither the full faith and credit nor the taxing power of the State of Minnesota or any political subdivision thereof is pledged to the payment of the principal of or interest on this Interfund Loan or other costs incident hereto. The City shall have no obligation to pay any principal amount of the Interfund Loan or accrued interest thereon which may remain unpaid after the final Payment Date.

2.06. The Authority may amend the terms of this Interfund Loan at any time by resolution of this Board, including a determination to forgive the outstanding principal amount and accrued interest to the extent permissible under law.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Resolution is effective upon the date of its approval.

Adopted this 3rd day of October, 2012 by the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of East Bethel.

HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Steven Voss, Chair

ATTEST:

Jack Davis, City Administrator



City of East Bethel City Council Agenda Information

Date:

October 27, 2011

Agenda Item Number:

Item

Agenda Item:

ERU Reduction Policy Work Meeting

Requested Action:

Commence discussions to develop an ERU reduction policy for existing businesses that will be served by the City water and sewer project

Background Information:

In order to properly charge the users of the water and sewer services for the Project 1 Municipal Utilities Project, assessments are based on Equivalent Residential Units (ERU's). The basis for determining an ERU is an equivalent to one single family residential unit's use of water. The amount of water used for this calculation is 274 gallons/day. ERU units are assigned for different types of property use based on the MCES Service Availability Charge Procedure Manual. The proposed charge for an ERU is \$17,000 (based on Bolton & Menk's recommendation) with \$8,000 of this cost being lateral charges assessed over 20 years, \$5,600 a charge for City SAC/WAC costs and \$3,400 for the MCES connection fee.

In order to fairly evaluate the overall connection cost for municipal services for existing businesses it is proposed that some latitude be considered in determining the number of ERU's per connection for City charges for this project. The City's Special Assessment Policy permits ERU calculations to be modified at the City's discretion. However, to avoid arbitrary decisions on a case by case basis it is recommended that the City consider a policy that would consistently apply a standard methodology for a reduction of ERU apportionment.

A variety of options can be used to establish a policy for City ERU reduction alternatives. A method that was previously discussed was to develop a policy based on actual water use of the businesses. While this would address a use approach for a policy it is not consistent with the peak flow aspects of MCES SAC manual assignments of ERU's. In our case actual water use and project costs have little relation. Basing an ERU reduction policy on water use would skew the total ERU requirements to a level that would create serious cash flow problems for the project in 2013 and 2014. In addition a policy based on water use would be extremely difficult to administer, monitor and implement due to the inherent problems associated with data collection and adjustments for ERU's.

Another method of consideration would be to postpone payment of City SAC and WAC fees on assigned but undeveloped ERU lots. This would enable the property owner to pay only \$3,400(MCES SAC fee) at the time of final ERU designation. The balance, \$8,000 for the

Attachment #2

assessment fee, would be paid over the term of the assessment and the City SAC and WAC fees would be rolled into the assessment and any balance paid in full when the property was developed. Staff is currently assessing the impact this type of option would have on the project's cash flow.

A third option would be to grant an ERU credit for businesses that employ more than 20 employees and grant an ERU credit to those businesses that pay more than \$12,000 per year in property taxes. This tax credit would be in increments of \$12,000 with each increment over \$12,000 being an additional credit. For example if a business paid \$20,000 in property taxes they would receive a 1.67 reduction in their ERU assessment. In no case would the reductions offered under this proposal be less than 50% of the original ERU assignment and always be a minimum of 1 ERU. This offer would only be available for only the initial ERU assignment for this project. Staff is currently assessing the impact this type of option would have on the project's cash flow.

Utilizing the third type of option would also address the City's commitment to existing business retention. This approach would also make an effort to equalize any future incentives that may be offered for new business recruitment in relation to ERU reductions offered to existing businesses.

Staff contacted the Cities of Andover, Ramsey, Blaine, Forest Lake and Lino Lakes to discuss their ERU reduction policies. None of these Cities have a policy for ERU reduction. The City of East Bethel is in a unique position with the MCES sewer project and in the financial design of the project. Our situation does not reflect the development of sewer systems for other Metro cities.

The adoption of an ERU reduction policy will have consequences and impacts that must be thoroughly understood in order to decide what type of policy will have the least financial impact on the City while at the same time considering the issues of those being affected by the project. This is a matter that would be best addressed in a meeting that is entirely devoted to this issue.

Attachments

Attachments 1-8

Cash Flow Alternatives 1-5

Fiscal Impact:

As presented in the Bolton & Menk Feasibility Study, there are 12 existing businesses with current assessments of 50 ERU's within the assessed project area. Three of these uses have only a single ERU designation so they would not be eligible for reduction under any policy, leaving 147 ERU's for consideration. However, one of the properties is the proposed East Bethel Water Treatment Plant which had an initial assigned ERU of 40. The redesign of the water treatment plant reduced this number to 1 ERU. Therefore, there are a total of 107 ERU's that would be eligible for review under this policy.

If all the eligible ERU's were reduced as described in the third alternative the reduction would be in the range of 67 to 77 ERU's from Bolton & Menks original estimate of 150 ERU's. While every ERU is critical for the financial feasibility of this project, this may be a useful tool in encouraging other existing businesses to connect to the system, reduce the burden of connection costs and provide a policy for consistent application of requests for ERU reductions.

The loss of one ERU is \$13,600 to the City side of this project. A reduction of 77 ERU's would result in a revenue loss of \$1,047,200. The project cash flow analysis is in the process of being

re-evaluated to determine if this loss could be absorbed within the bond payout schedule. Staff will be e-mailing various cash flow projections to Council as they become available. The challenge is to determine the amount of reductions that could be granted, develop a policy that will retain a certain amount of flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances and insure that the financial obligations of the project can be achieved .

Recommendation(s):

Discussion matter only at this time

City Council Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes: _____

Vote No: _____

No Action Required: _____