

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2013**

1. Opening of Meeting

The meeting was convened by Chair. Turner at 7:18 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members Present: Chair. Turner, Ald. Stellato, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, and Lewis

Absent: Silkaitis

Others Present: Mark Koenen, Peggy Forster, Deputy Chief Kintz, Rita Tungare, Chris Minick, Chief Schelstreet, Peter Suhr

3. Omnibus Vote

None.

- 4. Presentation:** "In St. Charles" for consideration as the official City Song presented by Ald. Maureen Lewis and Jeff Hunt.

Ald. Lewis: Tonight there will be a public performance of the song "In St. Charles" that has been written by Jim Masters. He wrote it in 1984 and is not able to be with us tonight, but both his sister Barbara Masters and brother Rick Masters are here. This was brought to my attention about four months ago by Bill Russell, resident of St. Charles. Jim Masters, who lives in Ohio, came home to St. Charles for an event and sang this song "In St. Charles" and many of us thought it would be great to have this as an official St. Charles city song. We checked with the Heritage Center to see if there was a city song on file and there is none. So we brought the idea before Mayor Rogina and Mark Koenen, City Administrator and it was decided to bring it to you, the committee, tonight for your consideration to bring it before City Council for approval. Jeff and David Hunt will be singing this song for you tonight accompanied by Barbara Masters.

Chrmn. Turner: Welcome and we appreciate you being here this evening. (sing song)

Bill Russell: When Jim Masters came to the recent 50th Reunion and sang this song there was such applause among the people in the audience because this song embodied everything good in St. Charles and brought back so many memories about growing up in this city. A number of people asked why couldn't this be our City song? So we are here tonight because we feel this song says so much about this city, sense of community, friendship and unity, neighbors on every street, in St. Charles I found my dream. What better advertising for what St. Charles was, is, and can be could you possibly have? Perhaps we could have it on the website, telephone hold music, and on the chimes of this very building. We could use this in various different ways to present the image of St. Charles that we have as well as include it in the media, and to sing it at the upcoming Holiday Homecoming in November.

Chrmn. Turner: Maureen would you like a motion on this to make this our City song?

Motion by Ald. Lewis, second by Lemke to make this song “In St. Charles”, written by James Masters, the official city song for the City of St. Charles.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None; Absent: Silkaitis. Chrmn. Turner did not vote as chair.

Motion carried.

5. Finance Department

a. Recommendation to approve an Incentive Agreement with the Clarke Group under the City’s Knowledge Based Employment Incentive Pilot Program.

Chris Minick: Back in July of this year, Mr. Chris Aiston made a presentation of a program that was called the Knowledge Base Employment Incentive Pilot Program. He identified a specific proposed agreement with the Clarke Environmental Group to assist that corporation in moving their corporate headquarters and research and development facility here into the City of St. Charles. Immediately upon occupancy that particular project is anticipated to bring 70 new jobs to the City of St. Charles with the potential of adding 15 additional jobs within the first five years. There was an economic incentive agreement that was proposed that went along with that particular program. Payment of that incentive to Clarke Environmental will be based on the total number of employees that are ultimately employed at that particular facility with supplemental payments being made in the event that those employees become residents of St. Charles or residents of the approximate area of St. Charles as proposed in the agreement.

There was an additional stipend of \$100 specified per intern that would be hired at that facility. The payments were subject to maximums on both an annual basis and a maximum payout of \$275K was identified over the 5-year term of the economic incentive. The terms of the agreement that are proposed are consistent with the presentation that was made back in July. There have been no substance of changes to those terms and tonight we are seeking approval of the formal economic incentive. This will put the document into a contract form and it will then be in effect with Clarke Environmental. Based on the prior direction that was given by City Council, staff does recommend approval of the agreement as is enclosed in the packet tonight.

Chrmn. Turner: I want to say one thing as we have these students here tonight. Your definition of an intern, it means a person employed by a company on a part-time basis who is a student or recent graduate undergoing supervised practical training and resides inside the St. Charles corporate boundaries. Is that correct?

Chris: Yes.

Motion by Ald. Stellato, second by Bancroft to recommend approval of an Incentive Agreement with the Clarke Group under the City’s Knowledge Based Employment Incentive Pilot Program.

Roll Call: Ayes: Lemke, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis, Stellato, Payleitner; Nays: None; Absent: Silkaitis. Chrmn. Turner did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

6. Inventory Control

a. Recommendation to approve the low Illinois State Contract bid for 2013/14 rock salt purchase at \$55.51/ton from Cargill Salt (North Olmsted, Ohio).

Mike Shortall: We are seeking approval to accept the State bid for this year's road salt. The cost is \$55.51 per ton for contracted price of a thousand ton and this will be once again through Cargill Salt. The criteria has stayed the same as in past.

Ald. Lemke: Are we saying this is a joint venture with the State of Illinois that we would get terms equivalent to what they would get with their power?

Mike: This is through our State bid which is through a cooperative; and if you notice also the cost has been reduced since the last couple of years, which we are pleased to announce, and we have lowered our contracted amount due to the fact that we have excess salt from last year. We should be good for the year.

Motion by Ald. Lemke, second by Stellato to recommend approval of the low Illinois State Contract bid for 2013/14 rock salt purchase at \$55.51/ton from Cargill Salt (North Olmsted, Ohio).

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None; Absent: Silkaitis. Chrmn. Turner did not vote as chair.

Motion carried.

b. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Authorizing the Sale of Items of Personal Property Owned by the City of St. Charles (miscellaneous items).

Mike Shortall: We are seeking approval of said vehicles and equipment via publics surplus.com, an on-line auction service, which would go to the highest bidder.

Motion by Ald. Stellato, second by Bessner to recommend approval of an Ordinance Authorizing the Sale of Items of Personal Property Owned by the City of St. Charles (miscellaneous items).

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None; Absent: Silkaitis. Chrmn. Turner did not vote as chair.

Motion carried.

c. Recommendation to accept bid of \$30,725 for one 2013 E-350 Cutaway Chassis and Knapheide Body; and approve an Ordinance Authorizing the Sale of Items of Personal Property Owned by the City of St. Charles.

Mike Shortall: We are seeking approval to purchase a 2013 E-350 Ford chassis and Knapheide body. We did obtain State bid on this and went to our local vendor, Zimmerman Ford, and asked if they would match that price and they did. I recommend we go ahead and purchase from our local vendor at the State contracted price and I'm also asking for approval to dispose the replacement vehicle #1776 which would go to auction and be sold to the highest bidder.

Motion by Ald. Lemke, second by Bancroft to recommend accepting a bid of \$30,725 for one 2013 E-350 Cutaway Chassis and Knapheide Body; and approve an Ordinance Authorizing the Sale of Items of Personal Property Owned by the City of St. Charles.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None; Absent: Silkaitis. Chrmn. Turner did not vote as chair.

Motion carried.

7. City Administrator's Office

- a. Update on the status for the 1st Street Redevelopment PUD Phase III project.

Mark Koenen: About 60 days ago there was a presentation which the Council entertained relative to Phase III of 1st Street. Phase III is the parcel along the river in St. Charles and extends between Main Street and Illinois with its western border being 1st Street. At that time Council gave direction, which I'll refer to as the 3-building alternative; the second alternative was a 4-building. Over the last 60 days staff has been working directly with the development community proposal and, at the same time 60 days ago, the developers granted a 90-day extension to formulate a final plan and demonstrate the capacity of the building improvement. We are 30 days from that cutoff date, which is four weeks from now. We decided as a staff and along with the development community to bring it back tonight to update you with our progress and status so that in 30 days when we have that conversation about an extension for this particular project you'll have background and something to work with.

In your packet is a memo that was put together by Community Development and Finance staff to begin to address where we are 60 days into this project review. I advise you that we are not completed with this exercise; the evaluation is still ongoing and the development community is still moving ahead as well. This is meant to be an interim presentation. There is no action for you to take tonight other than to listen, ask questions, and clarify issues. I will ask Rita to come forward to walk through the information in this packet.

Rita Tungare: Regarding the memo in the packet, we have prepared to provide you with some background and give you a status update of where things are subsequent to the August 12 meeting where 1st Street LLC had presented a revised concept plan for Phase III. I have some exhibits here to provide some background on the physical boundaries of the 1st Street Development Project.

The first exhibit speaks to the boundaries of the TIF district. As you are well aware there is a TIF district that was superimposed on the 1st Street Development Project. The boundaries of the TIF district do extend beyond the project area itself. It extends from Main Street south of Prairie and we have identified some landmarks to give you a general sense.

The next exhibit speaks to the boundaries of the actual 1st Street Redevelopment Plan/Unit Development area. This extends all the way down Main Street, passed the Blue Goose, but it doesn't extend past Prairie as it did for the 1st TIF district. The 1st Street TIF district also included properties all the way down Second.

The third exhibit speaks to the Phase III properties specifically which is the property in question that we've been in discussion on since August of this year with 1st Street LLC. The boundaries here depict the boundaries of the property of which 1st Street LLC has proposed a revised concept which is the 3 of the 4-building plan that was presented to you earlier in August. Just north of that is the land that had been identified for another plaza as we call the East Plaza and then there is piece here that is slated for the development of what we refer to as the 1 W Main Street Project. That is also part of the 1st Street PUD Redevelopment Project, but is not what is being considered for development along with the Phase III Project that has been presented with 1st Street LLC.

So with that as the background, I want to walk through on the progress that has been made with developer and staff since August of the discussions that have ensued since that point. In a nutshell we have met with the developer on a number of occasions and had specifically discussed three components. One being the proposed parking deck including the layout configuration, the need for public vs. private spaces, the developer's obligation to provide a certain number of public spaces as was defined in the original redevelopment agreement, and the number of parking spaces that would be needed to support any future development of this property. The second item that's been discussed with the developer has been the developer's obligation on the existing redevelopment agreement to provide a construction escrow for all the Phase III property at the time the City conveys property to the developer. Refers to slide – this piece here is owned by the City of St. Charles. There is a piece here called the Harris Bank piece that is in joint escrow between 1st Street LLC and the City, but the majority of this property is owned by the City as of this point. The third piece is the impact of the three vs. four buildings on the TIF projections. In August there were two plans that were presented to the Committee for consideration/comment. One was a 3-building plan and the other a 4-building plan. At that time the direction we received from committee, the consensus was there was a preference for a 3-building over the 4-building plan. However, after going back we recognized that discussion had occurred outside of any consideration to the TIF district.

So having said that based on the impact of a 3- vs. 4-building plan for the TIF projections, we asked the developer if there was any way the buildings could be enlarged in terms of the footprint and size. As a result of these discussions, the developer has resubmitted a revised plan that was submitted to our office on October 14. That is the plan that has been included in your packets and posted on the City website as well. This revised plan has not been totally evaluated by staff yet and is currently under staff review, and I'll allow Mr. Rassmussen to speak to these specific elements or changes of this revised plan. Some other progress that has been made is that the City decided to engage Tracy Cross & Associates to conduct a market study for the Phase III proposal. The preliminary findings of this market analysis will be available sometime early November. In addition to that, Finance Director Chris Minick has done some brief financial analysis on the TIF projections. At this point of where we are at, we are waiting for some information from the developer. As outlined in the staff memo there are three items specifically outstanding. One is the construction proposal for the parking deck, second is some proof of financing for the project, and third is some more detail information on the construction costs so we can refine our financial analysis further. I will now turn it over to Mr. Rassmussen who represents 1st Street LLC to walk you through the revised plan and to update you on their perspective from their end on any progress that has been made.

Bob Rassmussen, 37W425 Mission Hills, St. Charles: As Rita just mentioned we've had multiple meetings with different areas of staff, engineering, building, fire, and finance over the last 6 to 7 weeks. After all those discussions it came to fruition to look at this 3-building plan and enlarging building 3. We've eliminated the fourth building to keep more open space, but in turn extended the parking garage, both the ground level floor and raised floor, and added a fifth story to building 3. That gets us closer to the square footage units that were in the 4-building plan but with three buildings keeping the open space. The consensus between staff, engineering, and us as developers was that this would be the best opportunity for all of us to present to this City. So

what you see in this plan is a parking deck that is dead ended which we've had some comments on a couple of floors of the Plaza parking deck that it is frustrating sometimes for people coming and going. So we looked at the angle parking and showed this as an option. In talking with the city planners and developers this might work well, but you see it's a significant decrease in parking. We literally lose from 120 down to 80 – it's a big difference. I think staff agrees we should stay with the 90-degree parking, leave open spaces at the ends for turnarounds, and make sure we have that ability at both ends. On the ground level parking we've added parking going down into buildings 1 and 2; and anywhere you have these driveway options it is going leave another turnaround option in those multiple places on that garage floor. I think its pretty conducive to people having the ability to turnaround and move in that deck more than the second and third floor of the Plaza parking garage. We believe this would meet the City's obligations in wanting somewhere close to 100 parking stalls and in this case its 121. We have enough parking in the garages of each building to take care of the tenants within from a residential standpoint. This package here works pretty well.

Previously in the redevelopment agreement we had 269 overall stalls and now we are talking about 228. The square footages we are talking about today are 159,930 compared to 212,000 before, so its about 75% of the original square footage. The parking is actually on a percentage basis slightly more than it used to be. Our retail space is 1,000 sq. ft. than it used to be on the ground floor. Our residential space is larger because we omitted the second floor office and made it residential in each of the buildings. That's the look of the site plan and the statistics with it. The second floor of the parking garage is very similar to last time but the parking deck is longer now. There are two outdoor dining areas which gives us a significant opportunity on the river for a restaurant in half of building two and another restaurant in a third of building 3 utilizing the triangular areas for their outdoor dining. Showed a slide of the actual real exterior which Dan Marshall has redesigned to make it accurate to the floor plan that was presented last time; and put together a couple or renderings so we can get a feel of how the building will look and the attractiveness of it. That's where we are at today.

Ald. Stellato: The footprint of the parking field is exactly the same; all we are talking about is striping? So if the structure was built that way and for some reason the City said that parking isn't an issue and we wanted to make the alternate down there, all you would have to do is restripe – correct?

Bob: That's correct.

Ald. Stellato: I prefer obviously more parking.

Bob: You can switch gears pretty easy here.

Ald. Lemke: What's the number of spots below and above in that alternative?

Bob: It's 60 to 40 give or take one on each floor. That's where I had the 120 on both floors and 80 between the diagonal.

Ald. Bessner: Is this parking deck completely closed?

Bob: It's open air. This is a ground level parking garage. Now we say ground level but in order to get into these parking garages under these three buildings it's actually going to be a little bit lower than the sidewalks and streets; about 2 to 3 feet lower so it will have a little bit of a garden wall around it. The parking garage itself will be 10 feet higher which is only 7 feet above the actual ground. All that will be open air around it, you'll see through it, nothing will be enclosed, no big structures; it's pretty user friendly that way.

Ald. Krieger: What's the total number of apartments and/or condos?

Bob: In building 1 there are three floors with 12 units on each floor for rent so there are 36 in that building and 36 in building 2 for a total of 76 rental units. In building 3 it's a little bit speculative because we are keeping that open ended until we sell some and build them, but right now we are figuring eight units per floor which is about 1400 sq. ft. per unit which is very similar to what we have in Milestone Road. There'll be four floors of that which will be 32 units. All combined we have 104 residential units planned.

Chrmn. Turner: If I'm hearing you right the only building that is going to be five stories is building 3 – the building on the river?

Bob: Correct. We are doing that for building reasons because you can only go so tall with a certain type of construction with "for rent" units in buildings 1 and 2, and we need to keep those construction costs affordable. If you're going to have a 5-story building, the one on the river would be the one to do. That keeps 1st Street a little less cavernous. I know that was a concern 6-7 years ago and I think this will open things up and bring a little more sunlight into there. It's beneficial from both sides.

Ald. Krieger: Also you have more units on the river and I think they would be more interesting.

Bob: I agree and building 2 is pretty much river front as well. It's going to have a garage there but that garage does not even get up to the first floor of residential. It just covers the back door of retail.

Ald. Lemke: There was a comment in the packet about some conflict with underground utilities, maybe a storm sewer, has that been resolved – I couldn't tell?

Bob: It's been resolved to the standpoint in knowing we need to move it. It's not a crazy thing that has to be moved. It just needs to be straightened out and turned back out to the river.

Ald. Bancroft: Can you walk me through the status of the three outstanding items that Rita mentioned: construction proposal, proof of financing, and more detailed information of construction cost?

Bob: First of all we are looking for a plan that we could go out for bid which was to get some parking garage numbers. We just solidified this plan and wanted to hear back from you folks to know that we are heading down the right path with this particular plan. Then I'm going to put the parking lot out to bid and probably within the next couple of weeks I'll have some pretty solid numbers on that. They can bid a parking lot once they know its footprint and elevations pretty quickly. That's the first number because that affects the original agreement on how much we had planned for the 99 stalls that we were originally going to sell to the City. In this case we are going to sell 120 potential stalls to the City and try to keep it within that same budget number we previously had. It's a little less expensive parking garage to build than we previously had planned.

Second step we've had ongoing meetings and discussions with the bank we've been talking to since June. We will not have a formal commitment from them until we are actually about ready to get permits and ready to go into the ground. We will get updated term sheets showing where we are at and here's what we anticipate we are doing.

Ald. Bancroft: Will you get those before the extension date 30 days from now?

Bob: We'll have updated term sheets by then, yes. The construction costs, we put together our budgets on buildings 1 and 2 so far and have nailed them down pretty good and had them out for preliminary bid. You can only do so much when you only have the drawings that we have here today. We presented that to our bank already and verbally discussed that with the City but have not put anything in writing yet. We can put that package together in short term. I don't think the actual cost of construction for buildings 1 and 2 has much of an impact on the City's portion because that's not how the tax assessments are derived. We've met with Chris and Mark on the potential assessments area and compared them to the other buildings we currently own in the area, and they are pretty much dead-on for how they are projecting from a city standpoint.

Ald. Bancroft: So it's realistic to at least have some of these things in process before that date comes up?

Bob: Yes we should have all those addressed.

Chrmn. Turner: We are looking at the second Council meeting at the end of November to do your extension if one is so required; so that would be the date. Mark, Chris, it's my understanding that you don't really have a solid number so far, but they're getting there?

Chris Minick: We are getting there. It's a work in progress and there are a lot of moving parts with this particular arrangement and some variables.

Chrmn. Turner: Is the Council going to be given those figures in November before this comes up so we have some time to digest those numbers?

Chris: Yes.

Ald. Lewis: I'm not a real big fan of five floors. I liked your project that you presented three months ago and I'm not exactly sure what changed? Why are your numbers different and your costs different? It seems like you got everyone on board with what you presented and now that's not going to work.

Bob: I don't disagree with you at all. One of our challenges in presenting you with a redefine redevelopment package is that we got to meet the City's needs for the financial end of the project as well. As a developer, I can honestly say we prefer to build four stories, but from a City's standpoint we need to build five stories in order to create the increment we need to create. We are onboard with that as a developer. We believe we will put together a great building and be able to market it and sell it and do the best we can under that scenario. So we are comfortable with that. It does generate an additional amount of revenue to the City going back to the original redevelopment agreement that we committed to and that's the purpose for that.

Ald. Lewis: Does it say in here that neither one meets...

Chris: Neither one closes the gap entirely. There is a significant impact on the gap regardless of whether the 3-building scenario was built or whether the 4-building scenario was built; however, there is a pretty big difference between the 3-building and 4-building based on preliminary estimates. The difference between the 3-building and 4-building is roughly \$5M over the life of the TIF district. So based on that it was staff's request that there was an analysis of whether we could build a 3-building scenario that had the same types of square footage, same types of values, and same potential for increment generation that the 4-building had initially. This modified 3-building approach that the developer presented this evening was the result of that and this modified 3-building approach is very close to where we were with the original 4-building approach.

Bob: Also the entire height of this building will still be 12-14 feet lower than we originally had planned. So we shortened up the first floor to help with that and we've changed the elevation to help with that; so all that helps as well. For everything combined, meeting the financial needs as well as what we believe we can sell and market, this is the plan that meets both those criteria.

Chrmn. Turner: I will say when everything was billed on 1st Street it was five stories and we were worried about the cavern affect. It was a lot higher.

Mayor Rogina: When you refer to the bank, are we dealing with the Sterling Bank?

Bob: Yes.

Ald. Bancroft: Have they started any due diligence? It doesn't state anything in the letter.

Bob: Yes, tons. That term sheet is a couple of months old. Our partners are on board with that and it's all headed down the path for future approval. We'll get you more updated on that in November.

Ald. Lemke: What would be the impact of not closing the gap or as much of a job as a 4-building if we went back to a 3-story or was it 4 instead of 5 – what impact would that have and where are we left?

Chris: In terms of exact dollars – I can't give you that number, but conceptionally what that means is that we would have to subsidize more of the debt service for the 1st Street TIF out of the general fund over the remaining life of the TIF district over the remaining life of the bonds. If you recall we did structure the bonds for the call feature and any additional increment that we can generate between now and that call date in 2022 has a multiplier effect on the debt service. So you are actually getting more dollar for dollar revenue return by simply retiring those bonds early. It's like making an extra principle payment on your mortgage.

Ald. Bancroft: What does this mean with where you are at right now with drawings and the bank? Give me a little bit of a forward look at your time table for having a shovel in the ground.

Bob: It's a pretty significant commitment for us to go ahead and complete the drawings on the building. Engineering will require a decent amount of work but not a ton, but the architectural is quite a bit of work and a significant contract. So we kind of piece-mealed our way up to this point waiting to get the final approval in November to say go ahead. If you see us spend that kind of money on architecture then you know we are going to put the spade in the ground as soon as we can. That is the intent after the second week in November.

Once we do that, I hate to commit for Dan, but it really becomes a time frame of how long it is going to take to get the buildings to a drawing standpoint; but I would expect that to happen sometime in the spring and then come in for permits. Our goal right now is to try and break ground sometime mid-summer. We previously talked about April but have lost some months here in doing the due diligence required to make sure we get it right for everybody and that's where we stand today.

Ald. Stellato: We talked about phasing at one point in building one building at a time, but I want to point out that in the initial phase you talked about building the entire parking structure and get all that done, then building the first building and waiting to see what happens. So let's choose the doomsday scenario and you build the one building and nothing happens after that. The City is left with two buildable pads with all the infrastructure and all the parking already done.

Bob: Correct.

Chrmn. Turner: Did you say you could build the parking structure before the other buildings and you would do that fairly soon?

Bob: Yes, the parking structure has to be the first thing to go in right when we are building that first building or nothing works. There is already such a challenge for our retail parking. People use the garage when they have to but they much rather park on the ground. So this parking garage has a significant amount of ground parking that will help a lot.

Chrmn. Turner: And that has to be done before you construct a building?

Bob: It will be done in conjunction with that first building.

Ald. Lewis: The plaza shrunk, has it gotten smaller than it was last time we saw it?

Bob: Refer to slide – this black line is the exact black line of the previous River Terrace River Loft project. This is the original from 2006. The actual plazas are not shown here but they will not have changed at all. They will not change along the river and sidewalks won't change. The only thing we are changing is this little bit of entrance and the reason that's changing is that we have this 1,200 sq. ft. maximum we can build under type 5 construction. So to make these buildings 1,200 footprints the driveway now has to move to the middle. It would be real easy to make one building 1,300 and this one 1,100 and we wouldn't have to move anything but then we can't meet code.

Ald. Lewis: So when you are on the east side of the river and you look across will you see some of that parking?

Bob: Yes, a little bit.

Ald. Bancroft: So in the next two weeks whatever happens – happens and we come up to the extension date and you say you are looking for the go ahead. What does that mean? What are you asking us to do? How do we make sure that you/they start spending money November 20?

Mark: The key with regards to our future extension relates to where we are 30 days from now. I think we are trying to develop a comfort level that we are moving ahead collectively; and if in 30 days we see us moving ahead, we can do another extension to the level that it's another 60 or 90 days. It doesn't have to be for another 3 years, for example. It's another step in the process. One of the things that are going to be key in terms of where we are to give that extension in 30 days from now is where Sterling Bank is with Mr. Rassmussen and says this is where we are with the financing for this package and this is how we're going to do it and how it's going to work. That would be for that conversation between now and middle of November.

Ald. Bancroft: I agree, it sounds terrific, but in terms of presenting the conceptual plans what are you looking for from us?

Bob: From our standpoint of what we're looking for from you is an extension to get us through that permitting time so that we can know that we have no issues with losing the opportunity of building this project prior to June when we want to break ground.

Ald. Bancroft: Is the extension enough or a ratification of the existing plan that you have from us to give you that comfort?

Bob: In order to go ahead and draw a building that is this significant, we're going to need preliminary approval for the concept and because it is already in an approved PUD we got to go

back to P&D to exactly cross our t's and dot our i's for what we need for preliminary approvals so we can head towards final approvals for this concept. We can't get final until the engineering is 100% complete. Our intent is to improve the architecture in buildings 1 and 2; and we're not going to draw building 3 yet because it's going to be a different building so we are going to leave that for an approval for a later date. That will have to come back in front of you when we design that building, but we can still get preliminary approval of the concept so we know this is what we are going to build, this is the garage, these are the sizes, these are the buildings, etc. Final approval comes sometime over the winter when we can move forward on the architecture.

Mark: It's also fair to say that there is a redevelopment agreement (RDA) that will need to be extended along with this extension because there are some new terms that we have talked about collectively. Those need to be documented to update the already existing RDA and you'll need to weigh in on those concepts as well.

Mayor Rogina: Would it be fair to say that in that interim period of time, whether it's the meeting we have prior to the extension, that a representative would be here from Sterling bank to field any questions that the committee would have?

Bob: Yes we can have them here at that approval time.

Chrmn. Turner: This is for information only and we have asked enough questions. We look forward to seeing you at the second Council meeting in November.

8. Executive Session

- Personnel
- Pending Litigation
- Probable or Imminent Litigation
- Property Acquisition
- Collective Bargaining
- Review of Minutes of Executive Sessions

9. Additional Items

None.

10. Adjournment

Motion by Ald, Stellato, second by Bessner to adjourn meeting at 8:17p.m.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None; Absent: Silkaitis. Chrmn. Turner did not vote as Chairman. **Motion Carried.**