STATE OF MAINE
COUNTY OF YORK
CITY OF SACO

I. CALL TO ORDER – On Monday, October 20, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. a Council Meeting was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS – Mayor Donald Pilon conducted a roll call of the members and determined that the Councilors present constituted a quorum. Councilors present: David Precourt, Leslie Smith Jr., Bette Brunswick, Kevin Roche, Arthur Tardif, Eric Cote and Nathan Johnston. City Administrator Rick Michaud was also present.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. GENERAL: EXTRA MILE DAY – 2014

WHEREAS: Saco, Maine is a community which acknowledges that a special vibrancy exists within the entire community when its individual citizens collectively “go the extra mile” in personal effort, volunteerism, and service; and

WHEREAS: Saco, Maine is a community which encourages its citizens to maximize their personal contribution to the community by giving of themselves wholeheartedly and with total effort, commitment, and conviction to their individual ambitions, family, friends, and community; and

WHEREAS: Saco, Maine is a community which chooses to shine a light on and celebrate individuals and organizations within its community who “go the extra mile” in order to make a difference and lift up fellow members of their community; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, Saco, Maine acknowledges the mission of Extra Mile America to create 500 Extra Mile cities in America and is proud to support “Extra Mile Day” on November 1, 2014.

Councilor Tardif moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to approve the Extra Mile Day 2014 Proclamation. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

V. AGENDA:
   A. TAX INCREMENT FINANCING 120 MAIN STREET – SACO ISLAND – (PUBLIC HEARING)

Chinburg Properties of Newmarket New Hampshire would like to renovate Mill 4 on Saco Island and build 150 market rate apartments. In addition to the private funding the $18 million project will seek federal historic preservation tax credits. The property is on National Register of Historic Places as part of the two city mill district.

The company is also seeking a tax increment financing district, which requires City Council and State approval. The agreement as proposed would return 80% of the property tax revenue to the developer to help mitigate the extraordinary costs of the ambitious redevelopment. The City would receive 20%, and the new value would be sheltered in a way favorable to the City’s financial interests.

Mill 4 at Saco Island has been unused for nearly 30 years and is deteriorating. Developer Gavin Ruotolo assembled most of the Saco Island mill properties in 1986 and 1987 and was able to clean up much of the mill yard and renovate one large mill for 90 condominiums and some office space. His project benefited from a 100 percent TIF for several years while it was active. The City Council approved it in 1986 as the first TIF in the state.

In the early 1990s a group of local investors purchased the property but accomplished little. They sold to another group in 2006 and that group obtained approvals for a major redevelopment of the remainder of the island properties in 2007. There are many owners of what is now called Mattson Development, but Kevin Mattson and
Severin Beliveau have been the face of the project. They were able to renovate one small building for the Run of Mill restaurant. Their project would have benefitted from a 100% TIF approved by the City Council had development continued. But the Saco Island Renaissance TIF has been discontinued and the development received nothing.

Mattson’s group continues to own other properties on the island, but would like to sell Mill 4. Chinburg has a purchase and sale agreement for this one large mill. Eric Chinburg will show a preliminary development plan for the mill and will describe the project and TIF request.

Chinburg is an experienced developer and homebuilder. In New Hampshire he has done five other mill projects, including projects in Dover and Newmarket. Redeveloping old mills is extremely complicated, and the company has done a very good job on these nearby projects.

Chinburg is seeking Council approval of a tax increment financing district for 30 years. The TIF would benefit the developer for 80% of the new value and the City for 20% of the new value, although the funds the firm could receive would be capped. The company will pay over $700,000 in sewer impact fees and recreation and open space impact fees to the City. The developer’s portion of the TIF, the distribution of which is governed by the credit enhancement agreement, could be used for any project related cost.

The City’s portion of the TIF could be used for economic development projects related to the site and for more general economic development work, to be expressed in Exhibit E (to be provided by email). The schedule exceeds what the TIF will pay for, but will allow future Councils some choice.

CITY OF SACO, MAINE
SACO ISLAND BUILDING NO. 4
MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT AND
TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

EXHIBIT H

TIF Vote

WHEREAS, the City of Saco (the “City”) is authorized pursuant to Chapter 206 of Title 30-A of the Maine Revised Statutes, as amended, to designate specified areas within the City as the City of Saco Saco Island Building No. 4 Municipal Development and Tax Increment Financing District (the “District”); and to adopt a development program for the District (the “Development Program”); and

WHEREAS, there is a need for development in the City of Saco and for redevelopment and restoration of the mill complex at Saco Island; and

WHEREAS, there is a need to improve and broaden the tax base of the City of Saco; and to improve the general economy of the City of Saco, the surrounding region and the State of Maine; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the Development Program will help to improve and broaden the tax base in the City of Saco and improve the economy of the City of Saco and the State of Maine; and

WHEREAS, there is a need to encourage the expansion, improvement and continuation of commercial development in the City through the establishment of the District in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 206 of Title 30-A; and

WHEREAS, the City has held a public hearing on the question of establishing the District in accordance with the requirements of 30-A M.R.S.A. §5226, upon at least ten (10) days prior notice published in a newspaper of general circulation within the City; and
WHEREAS, the City desires to designate the Municipal Development and Tax Increment Financing District, and to adopt a Development Program for the District; and

WHEREAS, it is expected that approval will be sought and obtained from the Maine Department of Economic and Community Development (the "Department"), approving the designation of the District and the adoption of the Development Program for the District.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY VOTED BY THE SACO CITY COUNCIL:

Section 1. The City hereby finds and determines that:

(a) At least twenty-five percent (25%), by area, of the real property within the District, as hereinafter designated, is a blighted area; and

(b) The total area of the District does not exceed two percent (2%) of the total acreage of the City, and the total area of all development districts within the City (including the District) does not exceed five percent (5%) of the total acreage of the City; and

(c) The aggregate original assessed value of the District as of April 1, 2014 plus the original assessed value of all other existing tax increment financing districts in the City does not exceed five percent (5%) of the total value of taxable property within the City as of April 1, 2014; and

(d) The District is designated and the Development Program is adopted by the City in order to induce the Company to complete the project described in the Development Program in the City (the "Project") by enabling the City to contribute toward the capital cost of project described in the Development Program; and

(e) The designation of the District and pursuit of the Development Program will generate substantial economic benefits for the City and its residents, including employment opportunities, broadened and improved tax base and economic stimulus, renovation and improvement of historic buildings on Saco Island and their preservation for future generations and therefore the Project constitutes a good and valid public purpose and will contribute to the economic growth or well-being of the inhabitants of the City or to the betterment of the health, welfare or safety of the inhabitants of the City.

Section 2. Pursuant to Chapter 206 of Title 30-A of the Maine Revised Statutes, as amended, the City hereby designates a Municipal Development and Tax Increment Financing District for the benefit of Chinburg Builders, Inc. or its affiliated assignee and to promote completion of the Project, designated and described as more particularly set forth in the Development Program presented to the City Council and such Development Program is hereby incorporated by reference into this vote as the Development Program for the District.

Section 3. Pursuant to the provisions of 30-A M.R.S.A. §5227, the percentage of the increased assessed value to be retained as captured assessed value in the District is 100% as set forth in the Development Program.

Section 4. The City Administrator be, and hereby is, authorized, empowered and directed to submit the proposed designation of the District and the proposed Development Program for the District to DECD for review and approval pursuant to the requirements of 30-A M.R.S.A. §5226(2).

Section 5. The foregoing designation of the District and the adoption of the Development Program for the District shall become final and shall take full force and effect upon receipt by the City of approval of the designation of the District and adoption of the Development Program by DECD.
Councilor Cote moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to open the Public Hearing on Saco Island Mill 4 – 120 Main Street Tax Increment Financing proposal. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

Jacob Johnston, 62 Pleasant St. – Mr. Johnston stated that everyone has to carry their fair share, but when somebody doesn’t the rest of us have to. This project has impacts on this community. They say there is not going to be allot of kids in the ages going to school. I say that they can’t say that because it is against the law to discriminate against children. So you have 150 units and you are at least going to have 100-300 students. The average in the City of Saco today for each student is $8,000 a year. You are going to be increasing taxes on all the other property tax owners by $800,000 to $3 million. There is no impact study telling us otherwise, so it is just my word versus nothing. But that is the impact for 30 years of this TIF. Anywhere from $100 million to $300 million, someone has got to pay. We all have to carry our fair share, but when somebody doesn’t the rest of us have to step up. There is no reason for them to need a TIF. This project is economical and if it isn’t, the mill is not going anywhere. I wish it was, but there it is. It is going to be allot less expensive to tear down that to educate children of renters. Not of property owners, but renters.

Bernie Gaines, 90 Bayview Road – Mr. Gaines is a neighbor of this project. He owns 144 – 158 Main Street. For you that do not know where that is, the building with the Army Recruiter shop is the building that I own. Mr. Gaines is in favor of the project. He has been a resident nearly all his life and has seen the vacant mill building there for a long, long time. Anything that we can do to put someone in there to get it operational and bring some life to that end of town is worth doing. I’m not worried about the taxes, I certainly pay enough taxes and we do need to get that building occupied by something. This is as good as anything, as long as they are market rents. It is my understanding that as part of this TIF that we may be getting natural gas up Main Street and if that is the case, I’m definitely in favor of it. The energy costs that we have been suffering because of lack of natural gas supplies is unconscionable. My energy costs are through the roof and anything that we could do to bring those down is an economical boom to the City of Saco.

Scott Thibeau 3 Chases Lane – Mr. Thibeau has mixed views about this and here is why. I think a TIF needs to be granted absolutely and without some type of TIF or help, that building is probably going to stay vacant for a very long time. The developer is a bona fide developer with a great reputation and I don’t think Saco could ask for a much better opportunity than it has today. That being said, I think 30 years is too long for the fact it is based on a 80-20 and all these stipulations 1) - If it was me, I would start at 15 and have a sliding scale from maybe the 80-20 to 60-40 and then to 50-50. 2) It is very difficult to predict what the rate will be I market housing and how fast this is going to happen. But whatever they state is going to happen, I would hold them to that. I speak from a little bit of experience because I also run the Pepperell Mill Campus. Not that this matters, but we really want to see
development up here because I think it will help the entire mill district. That being said, I think that the Council has a tough decision. Not all developers walk when they don’t get their way, it needs to be negotiated. This is my recommendation.

Mark Johnston, Owner of several pieces of property in the Downtown area – Mr. Johnston stated that frankly, this is a déjà vu. I have been involved in Saco’s politics for over 40 years: Planning Board and Zoning Board. But what is really interesting is that we always have developers that come in and tell us how wonderful they are going to do a project for us. When in fact, let me review a few. Many of you were not on the Planning Board ad Zoning Board Gavin Routolo first came to our community. It wasn’t on Saco Island but it was a project off Stockman Avenue, with high end housing. When in fact today it is one of the #2 calls for our Police Department and other Departments. That high end project is now what we call the “projects”. What one says to you today is not what they deliver 10 or 15 years later. Another high end project was a Dictar Associate project at Garland Manufacturing that was going to clean up an area that was industrial. When in fact now it is probably the #3 or #4 on Police calls and is a low income housing project. Originally the developer promised us and we actually have the documentation. Ninety percent moderate housing that we call market housing and 10 % low income. Just a few years ago we discovered it was just the opposite. What I’m afraid of is this project on Saco Island. I’m not going to say I’m against it but I do believe that it is too many housing units and as a matter of fact 150 housing units that are being proposed are more than we have included or expanded in the housing rental industry in Saco in 15 years. What this developer is proposing is a 5% increase on our 2,800 rental housing units. Is there a market in Saco for it? As an owner of a number of properties in the downtown, I own ten housing units for rent. It takes 3-4 months to rent. As a matter of fact, mine are on the upper end, not on the extreme end that is being proposed $1,300 - $1,700. Mine are for $950 - $1,100. It takes a long time and if you walk through your downtown area you’ll see that there is approximately 10-12% of rentals that are not occupied. What are we going to do with the other 150 additional? Are we going to see our Middle Street, High Street, Beach Street and Vernon Street area suddenly become more vacant and deterioration? Big cities have this problem all the time and frankly Saco is not a new market. Our community has a low tax rate in comparison to other communities that have allot of housing units being rental. Communities that have a good basis are usually 70% housing, 20% industrial and commercial and 10% rental. Those are not, Mr. Mayor, even in your industry. Saco cannot have another 150 units. What I propose is that the project be reduced. Not 150, but maybe 75. As a matter of fact, when the Planning Board approved this project with Mr. Matteson the project was around 40 rental units high end. More condominiums as I remember correctly the Planning Board wanted. This should not be 150 units. If you look at Mr. Roaches numbers that I saw this evening. What it really showed was that this project even though you have an agreement with the developer is that it is not going to be a 30 year build-out, but a 30 year TIF. That is actually paid off somewhere between 10-15 years. What that means is that the agreement that you have, that he has agreed currently that he would not sell it to a non-profit organization or some other entity so that they could convert it into low income housing. But once that TIF is paid for you have no agreement. Does Saco really want more low income housing? I can tell you as a person that has grown up in the downtown and also look at what has happened when I was the Mayor. We have too many police calls in these particular neighborhoods. About 1 ½ years ago there was an organization called “Saco Citizens for Sensible Taxes”. One of the things I think we found out was that Saco’s government is well operated. Where we have is problem is revenues coming in. When one of these properties being what’s happening on Water Street and Stockman Avenue, when they become housing projects, they don’t pay their fair share of taxes. You can ask that of your Tax Assessor and see if that is the case. They pay less taxes than an apartment owner that has 4 or 5 units, because many of these housing projects become non-profit. They are taxes almost half of what a normal housing project. Is that what we want in Saco? Mr. Mayor I use to represent Ward 7 and I was also the Mayor and I can tell you that my close relationship with people on Saco Terrace Island which those folks have condo’s have not even been contacted by the developer. Don’t you believe that they should of at least had a opportunity to say how they feel about this project before you give the city Treasury away? These folks also deserve the same protection someone living down the Ferry Road or out in the country. These are their homes, they are not apartments, these people own condo’s. The value of a condo next to a high dense neighborhood being “apartments” drops. Is that what we want? I would ask that the Council consider to have this project reduced and on the TIF, I will let the experts make that decision. But frankly, I won’t be here 30 years from now and many of us won’t expect for Mr. Johnston probably. Because I’ll be 93 and I don’t know if I will have that opportunity to
come here and tell someone how I feel then. Not a good project with such a high density. No parking, no green space and the only thing recreation is to play on the tracks and you won’t be able to play in the parking lot because that will be full. This is not a good project! Mayor Pilon noted the Mr. Johnston introduced himself, but he didn’t get the address. Mr. Johnston replied that he lived in Cumberland and that was a known fact, but that he still owned properties in town.

George Austin, 29 Glenhaven Circle – Mr. Austin noted that everyone that he had spoken to so far has been in favor of this from what I have been told of the details. I sat in the presentations originally given by Chinburg a couple of weeks ago and everyone is excited about the prospects and I think the reason why is because that building has been abandoned for 30 years. The last time there was anyone in that building, I was 1 year old. I believe that there are things that need to be ironed out and I’m sure there are valid claims on both sides but I think that action needs to be taken on this property. At this point I don’t know if we are going to get or when. We would get better proposals than this. I don’t want to be here 5-10 years from now waiting on the next proposal or saying we should have bought than proposal property when it was offered 20 years ago. Eventually the cost of not dealing with this is going to prevent the city from moving forward. We all know it is a critical area of the city that needs to be taken care of. From what I have seen, it seems like a good option. The developer has experience. It is going to take a property that is close to be blighted in our city and to do something with it. If anyone else has another better idea I would certainly be in favor of hearing it. But, given the lack of a better option I think we should seriously consider this offer.

Ron Zehner, Vice-Chair of the Saco Citizens for Sensible Taxes, 124 Buxton Road – Mr. Zehner noted that a couple of people go way back to the 1980’s when we first started on that Island. I was on the Planning Board, Chairman for several years before we started with Mr. Routolo. I even worked up there. This building is hurting. But I also admire the gentleman who wants to put his money into it. I have been lobbying for both sides and both sides have good sound principals on what they are going to try to base this on. I guess it comes because I’m the active member and the Vice-Chair. The Saco Citizens group would be blessed with either way that you folks decide tonight. But just don’t do it tonight. Give it a little time. Our group is a membership of 18 people now. We picked up some very influential people. Some of you have had privilege because you are members of our group to see another total different approach from the business community side and from the tax payer side. The point is the current apartments down there are condo’s and they are in some dire straits. They have some problems, because the developer did not take care of them properly. That condo group is going to have to do something because the principal that owns it now has not been doing too much with it. Saco should work with this gentleman and be a partner for Saco and think of our people. Yes, he is from out of town and has deep pockets and that may make a complete difference compared to the other people and you have seen how many other different people thought they had enough pockets to do something up there. All I’m asking and some of you have been given additional information that the group before had not, and I’m sorry, but we will address those issues later. But the point is, really talk to this gentleman. Sit down and within 6 weeks I think. When was the first meeting that you had a public meeting? All of a sudden it is do or die tonight or he may walk. Appoint somebody from the Council to sit with him and see what we can work with, 80-20 I have to agree with Scott here that 30 years is allot of time and I don’t think there have been too many TIF’s except what you gave General Dynamics and such that have been to successful in this community. We also have what they call a worker rate something going right past the Train Station and that is not market rate. Now, people from across the river say there is a demand and those 150 can be filled, but can they be done in 2-3 years? Is the gentleman going to start and go right on through? I hope you hold his feet to the iron and do this, but remember as Mr. Johnston before me said, we are not going to be here. But 30 years ago when we started we were young and thought that we solved a problem. Look at what you are going to be leaving your children and come up with the best deal that you can work. Saco Citizens for Sensible Taxes will support just about anything you do because there are good plus’s on both sides. I commend the people that have spoken to me and all I’m asking is that you make sure you have something this time. I may only have 1-15 years and some of you a little longer, but remember it is our children. We have a group that is looking for a vision in Saco and does it include us to be a bedroom community then we have to look differently at how we pay, collect taxes and spend. This could be the answer to your prayers, but it could be something else. But 3 of you on there have been through this many times and I rely on you folks to use your wisdom to the best tonight. That is Mr. Cote,
Mr. Tardif and Mr. Smith. You folks know everything that most of us know and probably more, because you have been involved in it. Just get a good deal for Saco.

Beth Johnston, 62 Pleasant St. – Ms. Johnston noted that Mr. Zehner said something really important which is that a project in Mill Building #4 could be the answer to our prayers or it could be our worst nightmare. I think that the distinction about how it is done could make a huge difference for Saco. My vision would be allot more commercial space with small/light industry, shops, things that would draw people either to make a living here or to be able to find some sort of retail items or even places to eat that they might some to Saco for. When I think of 150, or even 100 or even 90 new residential units on Saco Island in a pretty cramped space, especially supposedly high end units that are, I can’t imagine how most of the people in Saco would be drawn to go there simply because they don’t have the money to go there and if they did might want to live in a single family home some place with a bit of land. So what I see is lots more traffic in Saco going to Portland, going to Portsmouth or going to other places rather than here and I think there is probably nobody in this room that would actually acknowledge that there isn’t too much traffic going into Main Streets and the side streets and downtown right now. I walk them every day and I have said this to you before. I don’t even feel safe as a pedestrian because the speed is not contained. People drive in and out of the side streets with no regard to pedestrians what so ever. So I have this vision of 150 new units and let’s say you can fill them, are there 150 new jobs in Saco, high end ones? So the people are going to be going elsewhere to work and they are probably going to get out of work at the end of the day and they are going to go to Portland to buy their groceries if they work there. I think this is what does happen. Right now there are let’s say 90 units on Water Street at the complex there and the Riverview Complex where I use to live a long time ago. There are some more units at the Lord Pepperell and there are 90 condo’s on the Island. Well I’m a retailer on Main Street in Saco and have been for 42 years. I sell food and wine and I would hazard a guess that the number of people from any of those units that patronize me is a fraction of a percent. Some do and I love them and they are great and I appreciate them but there is a mentality in this country that we go to the big box stores or supermarket and the only way I can see that we are going to change that mentality is to actually put something downtown besides Vic & Whit’s and the shops that we do have down on Main Street and I do love the clothing stores that we have etc. We are going to need to put something else maybe in Mill #4 that will draw people to our downtown. Because to change that mentality of we have to go away to get what we need, we are fighting that. We need something concrete to fight it with in terms of retailers etc in our downtown. We are going to have more Police protection right, because we have those 150 new units? We also need more Fire protection right? I know this development is not supposed to affect our schools but there is the possibility that it will. So we have these projects come on historically and again, I would like to see something positive done with this mill. But we have a project that comes along, that yeah it has some potential for good but people who are making the decisions are given the minimal amount of information and a short time in which to make the decision and you top that off with a few scare tactics, like the developer is going to walk and there might never be another one. But you have people making decisions that you should take allot more time to make and get allot more information to make them with. There isn’t time as other people have suggested here tonight to actually teak this a bit and make it a good project for Saco instead of one that has allot of potential long term, long range to be detrimental for Saco. This thing about well the building has been there and what are we going to do with it, I don’t know, it has been there and there is potential to do other things with it. I mean the City could take it, but if they don’t, there is other potential that could come along to do that and I don’t think we have to say it is all or nothing is the only possibility. So a little story about my dad that used to drive me drive all the way from South Bristol to Hallowell to go shopping. Why did he do that? Because my father was a antique nut and he went to Hallowell because the one Main Street they have is lined with antique shops. We need something in Saco to draw whatever it is that people say “I can go to Saco to explore this or that and see if I can find what I want there”, and that is what I would like to see for this area with or without Mill #4 I would love to see more of that. So, I talked to a woman today who moved to Saco just recently from Portland and she moved here because the rents were cheaper. I believe she still works there but she is paying $850 for a house and her reason for moving to Saco was that she could live less expensively. There is something to think about that. So I would encourage the Council to think about that saying that we have all heard which I think is very wise which is to sleep on it. There is something to be gained by mulling things over, thinking about them and looking at it a different way and making sure that there is not something hidden. I think there are 2 or 3 things hidden in this situation that could potentially kick us down even though we don’t realize it or at least some of us don’t. So I would like to encourage
the Council to please sleep on this and ear on the side of caution because this is a huge project for Saco and if we do it wrong, we are going to have hell to pay.

Eric Chinburg, Lives in Exeter, N.H. and the President of Chinburg Properties – Mr. Chinburg noted that his company has been building homes and renovating mills for close to 30 years now. As you know, we are here tonight as we have a purchase agreement on Mill Building # 4 on the Saco Island and our plans to create 150 market rate high end apartments on the top 3 floors and have the lower floor of over 150,000 sq. feet be dedicated to commercial or civic uses. Tonight I would just briefly talk about our firm and our abilities and provide some examples of our work and let you know what our thoughts are for Mill Building #4. We started renovating mills back in 1996. We have never done affordable housing, only market rate housing. We have worked on now about 15 mills and still own, manage and maintain several of them which include about 600 apartments which are all market rate. The type of apartments that we do and the unique character of mill architecture creates the type of home that is very attractive to young professionals and youngster empty nesters. Which are people on the early side of their work career and the later side of their work career. Typically they are near rivers and downtowns and people like to walk, frequent shops and eat at restaurants. They don’t like to mow the lawn or paint the house. So we have been very successful in creating this type of product home that is really popular to a demographic that is generally very good for downtowns. These mills are unique in that there are a unique type of architecture that is located in the downtown and on a river and you can’t recreate that and people really like living in these situations. Mr. Chinburg did a power-point presentation of projects they have completed. The unique characteristics are that the mills have really tall ceilings that you can’t economically build anymore, heavy timber which you can’t do anymore, really big windows and this urban kind of contemporary feel that is like I said very attractive of this type of demographic. We have a project recently completed that is analogist to this Saco proposal can be. It was a vacant mill for over 20 years in New Market, N.H., and we created 112 living units which were 96 traditional apartments, 16 were work/live units and we have 50,000 sq. ft. of commercial space of which 5,400 of that we gave to a local arts non-profit and they are creating a performing arts space there. All 112 apartments are occupied. It is interesting that there was a comment stating a reasonable concern about what this could do to vacancy rates to other properties rates in town. There is a large landlord in New Market who met with me when this project was being approved and he owned several hundred apartments and was quite concerned. At the time he had about a 10% vacancy rate. I said that I have this hunch and it is proved I all of our projects that the rising tide will float all boats and this will create something in the downtown that produces energy and that produces a desire for people to want to come and be there. I ran into this gentleman a couple of months ago and he is just like us 100% occupied. In the interim, 3 new restaurants have opened in New Market since we opened our doors and the varied type of people that live in these units are the very ones that want to go walk down the street to a restaurant, go buy their wine and beer, get some groceries and but whatever and they can all walk from there. Another thing that I can’t prove is that there won’t be any school children here, but I can just say that we created 600 of these apartments and there are no school children in them. So it is not attractive to the type of family that has school children and this is empirically true. We do not discriminate we just produce a type of home that the people that live in them generally don’t have school children. The outside architecture of the buildings doesn’t change, but there is nice landscaping, new windows and the power lines are down. The New Market project directly joins condo units and across the river are more condo units for a total of about 108. We also created a River Walk and people are thrilled to have all this new vitality and the condo dwellers now have restaurants to go to, where before there was 1 or 2. These are great spaces for living as well as offices. We have already been approached by someone who is interested in putting a restaurant. We put WiFi throughout the building so that people can work wherever they are. We are estimating this project to be about $18 million of which $700,000 would be impact fees paid to the town and those are not exempt by virtue of getting this TIF approved, those would be paid. We have several people that live in the New Market Mill and they work in the bicycle shop that is in the mill and the restaurants in town, so they don’t even have to have a car. This plan shows 300 spaces which is 2 cars per unit which is generally a requirement. We have never had any of our projects require more than 1.5. This type of unit just doesn’t, we always have 1.4 cars per unit. We would also propose increasing the green space and lowering the parking count to actually meet the demand and not to exceed the demand. We are also interested in some desire to connect the walk to the bridge to go over to the Biddeford side and we are very open to those type of conversations. There had been some concerns made by some Councilors as a result of the Workshop a few weeks ago. 1) Could we demolish part of the building
and do fewer units? It is really not possible to do that because this project can only work in our view with this TIF and with the historic and federal and state tax credits. You cannot destroy part of the building and still be eligible to receive those tax credits, it just wouldn’t work. 2) We also know there is a concern about traffic and we share that concern and we would work with the town and Maine DOT. But I would point out that our proposed use would in predominate residential use apartments is the least impact in traffic use that we can think of. Commercial uses generate much more traffic and require more parking per 1,000 sq.ft. than apartments do. So obviously we work with the Planning Board and the State DOT to make the impacts minimized. But, we do feel that the use we are proposing is already doing that. We believe that the demand is there and I understand that people are not thinking that is true. I don’t think it is a finite some game. I think that when you create something really interesting, people com. Our projects have created energy that has created momentum and that’s what I think. Biddeford is obviously doing very well and I spoke to Mr. Sanford and looked at his market rate apartments and they are full and we believe that the demand is there. So now on the TIF we have proposed the 80-20 and we work with city staff and this seemed to be a reasonable approach to the request. The payments to the company will be capped and the TIF limit is $5 million. This mill is in pretty tuff shape and I think it can last a couple or 3 more years of nothing happening but I think that at some point demolition by neglect would occur and it would be a great treasure lost. The costs to bring it back are substantial but doable. We have done it before and we can do it again. The impact fees, permits, off-site mitigation regarding sewer, traffic and pedestrian sidewalks are significant and close to around $1 million that we would have to handle. So this summarizes our history and goals for this project.

City Administrator Rick Michaud addressed Mr. Chinburg and noted that a couple of the speakers made comments encouraging delay. What is your reaction to that? We are in a decent part of the market where financing is generally available for these sorts of projects. I don’t know when that will change. I’m not a Chicken Little, if we didn’t do this project, it wouldn’t fall down for a couple of years and maybe somebody else could do something with it. That wouldn’t last forever, at some point it is going to get beyond the point of no return. There is urgency from our perspective because we are in a deal with the seller that requires heed and we need to honor that commitment. We also have a window where we could be building this in 2015, so things are aligned well for getting it done.

Councilor Brunswick noted that it was mentioned by a citizen earlier about possibly revisiting the TIF and maybe tiering it somehow. How open are you to possibly looking at that again? Mr. Chinburg stated that they were open to things that make sense and that initially they proposed one that was a little more complicated and was heavier in the beginning and phased in, and there was some suggestion that it just be made simple. You can net present value it and kind of all wash it out the same way. So we are open to any reasonable conversation that gets us across the finish line.

Councilor Smith noted that he would love to see something done with that building and the only thing that concerns him is that down the road 5-10 years from now, the building changes ownership and instead of 150 high end apartments we end up with 150 low end apartments. A conversion to subsidized housing would be a bigger tragedy to me than that building falling in on itself. We were promised all kinds of stuff on Water Street and several projects and the moment they changed hands subsidized housing. There is no way we can say “you have to stay for 30 years or 50 years” you’re a business man and down the road 5-10 years from now somebody offers you the right amount of money you turn this thing over and the moment you walk away from it the TIF is over and so is any guarantee that it won’t become subsidized housing. Mr. Chinburg stated that he was not familiar with the concept that if he sold the project the TIF would be over. He thought that the TIF would stay with the property provided property continued to do what the TIF requires. My understanding is that if the TIF lasts 30 years the TIF is a quick quvo pro and the units remain market rate housing and if it doesn’t remain market rate housing than the TIF goes away. Councilor Smith noted that if the TIF goes away, so does the guarantee that it would be Section 8 housing. My other concern is traffic. I don’t think we have come nearly far enough in addressing it. Anybody who drives downtown in the middle of summer will tell you that the traffic in downtown Saco is pretty horrific in peak hours. Would these people be commuters traveling somewhere else? There certainly aren’t 150 jobs right now kicking around Saco that will generate $65,000-$70,000 which is what I hear you are going to need to be able to afford to live in this environment. So will these people be picking up and going somewhere else? An issue that I
have is addressing the traffic up and down the York Hill. Mr. Chinburg noted that he understood that the Planning Board and DOT and again just for recognition, there is not another use that we can imagine that would produce less traffic than this proposed use.

Mayor Pilon noted that the market place in Saco is that there are 132 houses for sale right now and the average listing price for a single family house in Saco is $343,000. This is an average footage of 21,000 sq. feet. There are also 30 condo’s for sale right now in Saco and the average list price is $224,000 with 13,062 sq. feet. In reference to Councilor Smith’s comment about I anyone going to be able to afford it, frankly look at what it is going to cost you to buy a single family house or condo in town and be able to afford it plus taxes and insurance. So I believe that you have a product that is going to be very marketable because these prices to buy a home or condo in town are quite high.

Councilor Roche noted that he was a rookie Councilor and not originally from Saco, let me qualify that. I want to get first to what a delay acceptable on your side and we can still talk about big issues such as why you are here. But, I’ve been on this Council for 7 months and we went through 3 sessions spread over 6 weeks about a sign on Main Street. Just to put up a sign on Main Street. This is the public hearing and approval date all wrapped into one that could A) Add 2% to the Saco population and B) Decide on something that is the entry point of our city. We are not talking about some side industrial development or some downtown middle pit area. We are talking about “the place”. For this Council to decide on it, in all respect to the developer you want action by government, but this is allot to digest. This is nothing against you at all but this is potentially a marriage here for many years that so far I like what I see. So typically the next Council meeting will be November 3rd. Is that past the drop dead date? Mr. Chinburg stated that Nov. 3rd would work, because they have until Nov. 17th as the deadline date. Councilor Roche noted that this is the biggest worry you have had from a consensus of Councilors. If we had the next Council session as a typically progression in 2 weeks when our next Council meeting is, it is not necessarily a delay it is when it would happen especially with a big thing like this. This is certainly bigger than a sign on Main Street.

Councilor Brunswick stated that she would like to see those TIF variations that had been talked about prior to this one being presented to us.

Councilor Roche stated that he did not know who was going to work on the TIF variations but I came up with my own before we came to this meeting and these are the types of things we would like to submit in, in the next 2 weeks and decide whether 80-20 is the right mix. One thing that came out of the Workshop for example is that it looked to be $100,000 of services were possibly an expense that the City of Saco would have on an annual basis, and just mixing up the formula and keeping the $5 million cap and keeping the present value of that which is need for financing and the credit enhancement agreement. The city could have over $100,000 in year 6 on a 60-40 split through 15 years and the split could go to 50-50 after the 15 years is capped off. I think we can make this happen at 60-40 with a couple other assumptions here. One question that I have for you is this is an $18 million project, so would you assume 15 years from now that the project will be worth more than $18 million? I just changed the market value assumption of the property to make it $22 million in year 15 and that is not a huge appreciation and that changed the numbers at least favorable to Saco without affecting your side. I did increase the mil rate 2% a year just as it has been more than that the last 10 years, but it didn’t hurt the numbers at all. Mr. Chinburg stated that from his perspective the least tenable time is the first 5 years so when we first had presented something, we had a chart with 90-10 for 5 years and so on. So changing those numbers after 5 years to get it quicker to the city being in better balance, knowing that we are capped at the $5 million that is all something that is negotiable. Councilor Roche noted that he had kept to 80-20 for the first 5 years. Mr. Chinburg suggested having a liaison that we could do some quick back and forth spreadsheet stuff. We do have a drop dead date of closing by November 17th so if this happened in the next few weeks and there was a vote up or down on the November 3rd, and the closing Nov. 17th, that would work.

Councilor Cote inquired whether Mr. Chinburg was available next Monday night? He noted that this is a important issue and we should put it on for a Special Meeting next Monday night with nothing else on the agenda so that we can talk about some of the issues that we have and leave the Public Hearing open so that people can give their
opinions. Councilor Roche noted he wasn’t available that night. Councilor Cote asked if Tuesday would work for everyone. Councilor Roche inquired if the Council would be talking and voting that night or waiting to the next meeting to vote. Councilor Cote replied that the Council would decide the night of Oct. 28th whether to vote or not. Councilor Cote has some of the same concerns and this is a B4 Zone which is very new to the community and if you build a multiple family housing unit in a regular zone it would be 5,000 sq feet per housing unit which means that for 150 units you would be allowed 3 times the size that you got, so it bothers me that basically we have a big parking lot and the mill buildings which I think you will make look nice but you have a huge parking lot and this is what we have been going back and forth on today. Whether we can cut down 2 parking spaces per unit to the 1.5 I think is what we want to go and have some green space and maybe you can plan on showing a reconfiguration as one of my questions. I notice that looking at the Planning Board approval of the prior project it looks like there is going to be a traffic light there and I’m not sure how a traffic light would work with what we have in Pepperell Square and maybe a traffic engineer can explain what they have in mind to do, because right now there are issues with getting out of there. Are you still looking at natural gas and have you looked at geo thermal? Mr. Chinburg noted that they have looked at geo thermal and have talked to some engineers about sizing to see if it is possible and how it would work. Councilor Cote noted that geo thermal gives you heating and cooling. You wouldn’t need 150 air conditioners that you take out every Fall and it is cheaper in the long run. I know that there are some natural gas proponents around but geo thermal is cheaper than natural gas and you would have geo thermal, not a air source heat pump, but a air source heat pump is cheaper than natural gas too. That is the new technology, not explosive natural gas. So I think we should continue talking about these things.

Councilor Johnston inquired if there was any room for more than the 50,000 sq feet of commercial space? Mr. Chinburg noted that if he had a user that wanted to take 50,000 sq feet on the second floor than we would just do 200 apartments. But it is harder to find these guys generally, so we adapt for the market need.

Councilor Tardif wanted to know if with 150 units and those businesses downstairs, have you had any traffic study done for what that is going to create in that area with the amount of traffic that is there already? Mr. Chinburg said they did some empirical numbers but that would really be vetted in the site plan process and working with the Planning and Zoning Boards and DOT.

Councilor Roche stated that traffic plus one down there is terrible and we need to start talking as a city about what we are doing down there for traffic. Forget about the development for a second. Traffic is not good and there have been some very good proposals out there and the one that I like the best is the “one way”. Elm Street down Main Street in Biddeford take a left at the car wash and go past Mulligan’s with 2 lanes going all the way around and up the hill. This may not be the solution and maybe even can’t do it because of X,Y,Z but get that out there to discuss.

TABLED - Councilor Cote moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to continue the meeting next Tuesday Oct 28th and to continue the Public Hearing. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.

City Administrator clarified that the Public Hearing remains open and that the Council reconvenes on Oct 28th at 7:00 p.m. with an open public hearing.

B. ORDER TO VACATE BURROW STREET (PAPER STREET) – (PUBLIC MEETING)

Burrow Street is a paper street shown on City tax map 34, running between Stockman Avenue and Ocean Park Road and bounded on either side by such businesses as R.P. Bell, VIP Auto Parts, and Cumberland Farms. At the request of Phil O’Connor of R.P. Bell, staff has initiated the process for vacating the paper street. It is intended that a public easement will be retained to ensure access for utility or drainage work. Burrow Street was originally shown on the 1923 plan of the Lexington subdivision, a recorded plan. Its sister streets – Louise, Paul, Norman, Olive, Lucille, Coolidge – provide multiple crossover options from Ocean Park Road to Stockman and vice versa. Burrow is the closest to Main Street/Route One of all these streets, probably too close to be built and utilized safely given today’s traffic volumes.
The Planning Board forwards a positive recommendation on the vacation of Burrow Street.

Councilor Brunswick moved, Councilor Johnston seconded “Be it ordered that the City Council of the City of Saco, Maine, hereby orders the discontinuance of the unimproved Burrow Street, said road being a public way, excepting and preserving the public easement as described on the document titled “Legal Description of Burrow Street””. Further move to approve the order. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

There were no comments from the public.

Councilor Roche moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to close public hearing. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.

Legal Description of Burrow Street
Said street being a paper street approximately fifty (50) feet wide including the right of way, from a point beginning at the northwesterly corner of its intersection with Ocean Park Road (also Route 9), said point being also the easterly corner of Lot 551 on the plan of Lexington made by C.H. & G.H. Barron, C.A., dated December, 1923 and recorded in the York County Registry of Deeds, Plan Book 9, Page 32; thence running south 51° 30’ west, bounding Lots 551, 550, 549, 548, 547, 546, 545, 544, 543, 542, 541, 540, 539, 538, 537, 536 and 535 for a distance of 581.78 feet +/-, to a point of intersection with Stockman Avenue, a city street, said point being also the southeasterly corner of Lot 535 on said plan of Lexington; thence southeasterly a distance of 50 feet along the right of way of Stockman Avenue to a point shown as the southeasterly corner of Lot 486 on said plan of Lexington; thence running north 51° 30’ east along the northwesterly sidelines of Lots 486, 531, 530, 529, 528, 527, 526, 525, 524, 523, 522, 521, 520, 519, 518, 517 and 516 of said plan of Lexington a distance of 581.15 feet +/- to a point of intersection with Ocean Park Road, said point also being the northwesterly corner of Lot 516 on said plan of Lexington; thence northwesterly approximately 50 feet along the right of way of Ocean Park Road to the point and place of beginning.”

C. RENEWAL APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT – BIDDEFORD SACO COUNTRY CLUB – (PUBLIC HEARING)
Biddeford Saco Country Club has applied for a renewal of their Special Entertainment Permit. The permit will be concurrent with the establishment’s liquor license.

The applicant has paid all applicable permit fees and the clerk has properly advertised the public hearing in accordance with the Saco City Code, Chapter 93 - Entertainment §93-2.

Councilor Johnston moved, Councilor Roche seconded to open the Public Hearing. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

Councilor Brunswick inquired whether the Special Entertainment Permits, in particular the bottom of the application where is has types of entertainment such as music, dancing and so forth. On these sometimes live bands are indicated but I’m wondering if we have in our Ordinances anything that pertains to when hours of permit is effective, that 12:00 a.m. in the morning if the bands are outdoors, what limits these live bands from being outdoors until that time. City Administrator Rick Michaud noted that it would require specific wording inserted by the City Council to create that limit. Without that limit this does not say inside or outside, so they have the option on their property. Councilor Brunswick asked if we should discuss this right now as a Council about limiting any outdoor live bands. Mayor Pilon noted that this is something that would need to be put on a Workshop. City Administrator Rick Michaud stated that if you were to address it right now he would suggest an amendment to types of music to say “indoor live bands” and you have done that. You don’t need a code amendment in that other whole process, just put conditions right in here and they have to follow this or they lose their permit.
Councilor Roche noted that as far as the golf course, they basically host weddings. So to Bette’s point, they could theoretically just have a big band way outside and have a couple thousand people there if they want versus someone who is maybe trying to have a small wedding in their backyard and they get shut down because the neighbor thinks they are too noisy or something.

Councilor Brunswick noted that it is not because she wants to limit this entertainment facility specifically. I guess I’m just indicating that maybe we might want to workshop the idea of what facilities might have some limitations to them especially those such as a big apartment complex with a restaurant downstairs and some outdoor seating and there being live bands.

City Administrator clarified that it would be on a per license basis.

Councilor Brunswick noted that said Biddeford and Saco Country Club, are there very close neighborhoods to this Country Club? Mayor Pilon noted that across the street there are a couple of houses but other than that there is just open fields. Councilor Brunswick noted that she would not want to put indoor live bands in this case because of wedding perhaps that might be outdoors.

City Administrator Rick Michaud stated that the Code virtually says that if this permit is granted as written the good neighbor standards for sound levels don’t apply and if you added a condition to say “the code relating to the good neighbor sound levels apply” and they had very loud music the code sets decibel levels at property lines, but you have to say that it applies. So otherwise it is a complete waiver.

City Clerk Michele Hughes noted that she does check with the Police Department to see if they have any issues on these types of licenses, and they had no issues on this one.

Councilor Johnston moved, Councilor Smith seconded to close the Public Hearing and “Be it Ordered that the City Council grant the renewal application submitted by the Biddeford Saco Country Club for a Special Entertainment permit to be concurrent with the establishment’s current liquor license”. Further move to approve the Order. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.

D. RENEWAL APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT – SACO EAGLES #3792 – (PUBLIC HEARING)

Saco Eagles #3792 has applied for a renewal of their Special Entertainment Permit. The permit will be concurrent with the establishment’s liquor license.

The applicant has paid all applicable permit fees and the clerk has properly advertised the public hearing in accordance with the Saco City Code, Chapter 93 - Entertainment §93-2.

Councilor Smith moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to open the Public Hearing. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

There were no comments from the public.

Councilor Smith moved, Councilor Precourt seconded to close the Public Hearing and “Be it Ordered that the City Council grant the renewal application submitted by Saco Eagles #3792 for a Special Entertainment permit to be concurrent with the establishment’s current liquor license”. Further move to approve the Order. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.

E. CITY SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

On January 6, 2014, the City Council drafted a list of potential goals for the City. Among these Goals was the Council’s desire to review City-owned properties to determine if there is value to the City in owning each property
and consider whether selling the property or maintaining the current status of the property is appropriate.

On October 6, 2014, in Workshop, Council reviewed a list of staff recommendations of properties that were already available for sale as Surplus property or should be referred to the Planning Board for review and recommendation. Council added four additional City properties for consideration, listed below as Amendments 1 – 4.

EXHIBITS: City Properties Recommended by Staff – II
Amendment 1 – North Saco Fire Station
Amendment 2 – Prentiss Park Property
Amendment 3 – Tarbox Property
Amendment 4 – Willey Property Industrial Park
Chapter 81, Article I, City Code: Sale of City-Owned real Property
City Owned Properties - All properties owned by the City of Saco.

Councilor Cote moved, Councilor Precourt seconded “Be it Ordered that the City Council authorize the City Administrator to refer the document titled ‘City Properties Recommended by Staff – II’ to the Planning Board for review and recommendation pursuant to code ‘Sale of City-Owned Property Chapter 81, Article I, Section 81-2’.” Further move to approve the Order.

AMENDMENT #1 – Councilor Roche moved, Councilor Precourt seconded “Be it Ordered that the City Council add the property known as the North Saco Fire Station to the document ‘City Properties Recommended by Staff – II’.” The motion failed with zero (0) yeas and seven (7) nays – All Councilors.

Mayor Pilon called for a vote on the Main Motion. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.
F.  BIDDING CITY SNOW REMOVAL

The Public Works Department provides in-house plowing services for City streets, parking lots, and sidewalks at this time. Members of the City Council would like to explore bidding this work to contractors in an attempt to save money on overall winter maintenance costs. Public Works staff was asked to explore this possible savings on winter maintenance and to prepare bid packages for these services accordingly.

City staff recommends continuing the current practice of in-house street plowing to maintain the high level of service and lowest cost option for winter maintenance available to the City. It is also recommended that supplementing parking lot plowing to increase level of service and defer the expansion of the existing City fleet be explored further; however this would be an increase to the existing winter maintenance budget.

Councilor Precourt moved, Councilor Brunswick seconded “Be it ordered that the City Council authorize City staff to increase service levels in parking lot winter maintenance through contracted services for the FY 2016 proposed budget.” Further move to approve the Order. The motion passed with four (4) yeas and (3) nays – Councilors Johnston, Tardif and Smith.

G.  AUTHORIZE BOND QUESTION REGARDING FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE – (FIRST READING)

There are pressing capital improvement needs that cannot always be addressed within the annual operating budget to be replaced in the most timely, cost effective manner. Four such capital needs that will be addressed with the Facility and Infrastructure Bond include:

- **Public Works Facility**: A 20+ year solution to improving vehicle maintenance and extending fleet life. Includes relocation of the school transportation department operation.

- **Foss Road Recreation / Transfer Station**: Relocation of the existing transfer station to improve safety and parking for the existing and expanding recreation uses.

- **School/City Building Energy Improvements**: Replacements and upgrades to heating systems, lighting, air quality, and other energy efficiency components to establish long term savings as fuel and electricity costs escalate.

- **Lincoln Street Road Reconstruction**: Replacement of failing sewer, drain, sidewalk, curb and roadway along Lincoln St from Market St to Elm St.

The timing of this bond is such that payments will not be incurred by the City until 2018. Between fiscal year 2015 and 2018 the City will retire $540,000 in annual principal debt payments. In 2018 the annual payment of this Infrastructure Bond will be approximately $245,000. This still provides for an annual decrease in debt service payments of $295,000. Interest payments for this bond are estimated to total $150,000 annually.

Projecting out future needs and debt payments over the next twenty year period the City’s debt payments continue to drop significantly. A replacement of Young School is anticipated to be the only major facility bond over the coming years. This project, likely to be approximately $12 Million, if completed in 2019, would still allow for the City's annual debt payments to decrease steadily over a 20 year period. A reserve account could be established with the retiring debt payments moving forward to address future capital needs in a sustainable manner, contributing to a long term stable tax rate. The Facility and Infrastructure Bond question will require a public hearing in March 2015 and be put on the ballot for the scheduled June 2015 election.
Councilor Cote moved, Councilor Roche seconded “The City of Saco hereby approves the First Reading of the ‘Order Authorizing City of Saco to Borrow an Amount not to Exceed $5,500,000 for Facility and Infrastructure Improvements, and moves to schedule a Public Hearing for March 2015.”

TABLED - Councilor Cote moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to table this item until the Nov. 3rd Council meeting. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Pilon set aside consent agenda items #B and #C because he wasn’t ready to make the appointments yet.

Councilor Smith moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to approve consent agenda items # A, and D as follows:

A. “Be it Ordered that the City Council approve the minutes for September 2, 2014”. Further move to approve the order:

D. “Be it Ordered that the City Council grant the applications for a License to Operate Games of Chance as follows: daily pool and playing cards socially during business hours from January 1, 2015 to January 1, 2016 as submitted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles #3792.” Further move to approve the Order.

The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.

A. APPLICATION FOR A LICENSE TO OPERATE GAMES OF CHANCE

Fraternal Order of Eagles #3792 has applied for Licenses to Operate Games of Chance as follows: daily pool and playing cards socially during business hours from January 1, 2015 to January 1, 2016.

The applicant has submitted their application in accordance with the provisions of Title 17 M.R.S.A. Chapter 13-A, and in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated by the Chief of the State Police governing the operation of Beano/Bingo or Games of Chance.

VII. RECESS THE MEETING AND CONVENE THE WORKSHOP

Councilor Roche, Councilor Johnston seconded to recess the meeting and convene to Workshop. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas. TIME: 9:53 p.m.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Councilor Johnston moved, Councilor Brunswick seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed with unanimous consent. TIME: 9:58 p.m.

Attest: __________________________
Michele L. Hughes, City Clerk