

**WAYZATA CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
November 1, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

Mayor Willcox called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. Council Members present: McCarthy, Mullin, Anderson, and Tyacke. Also present: City Manager Dahl, City Attorney Schelzel, City Engineer Kelly, Director of Public Service Dudinsky, and Director of Planning and Building Thomson.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Approve Agenda.

Mrs. McCarthy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to approve the agenda. The motion carried 5/0.

Mr. Willcox advised the Council met in Workshop prior to the meeting and discussed the potential designs for the Wayzata Boulevard and Superior Boulevard intersection.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Public Forum – 15 Minutes (3 minutes per person).

None.

AGENDA ITEM 4. New Agenda Items.

None.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Consent Agenda.

Mr. Tyacke inquired if the City Attorney had reviewed the two contracts that are part of the Consent Agenda. City Attorney Schelzel responded they have both been reviewed.

Mrs. McCarthy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to approve the consent agenda:

- a. Approval of City Council Workshop Meeting Minutes of October 18, 2016 and City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of October 18, 2016
- b. Approval of Check Register
- c. Approval of Resolution No. 45-2016 and Contact for The Open for Business Program with Hennepin County
- d. Approval of Contract with Urban Works for Creation of Special Services District

The motion carried 5/0.

AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing.

- a. **Public Hearing on Senior Multifamily Housing Developments and Issuance of Revenue Bonds and Consider Approval of Resolution 46-2016 Giving Approval to a Proposed Housing Program and the Issuance by the City of Apple Valley, MN of its Senior Living Bonds, Series 2016**

City Manager Dahl reported the City Council authorized a public hearing for the purpose of considering “host approval” to the issuance of revenue bonds by the City of Apple Valley in order to finance the purchase of several assisted living facilities, including Meridian Manor in Wayzata.

Jennifer Hanson, Dorsey and Whitney, Minneapolis, advised Presbyterian Communities Northwest is the member of the LLC that is purchasing Meridian Manor and not related to Presbyterian Homes.

City Attorney Schelzel stated this has been reviewed by the Bond counsel and it has no impact on the City’s legal liability or ability to raise future financing.

Mayor Willcox opened the public hearing at 7:07 p.m. There being no comment, Mayor Willcox closed the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to adopt Resolution No. 46-2016 Giving Approval to a Proposed Housing Program and the Issuance by the City of Apple Valley,

1 Minnesota of Its Senior Living Revenue Bonds (Minnesota Senior Living LLC Project), Series
2 2016.

3 Mr. Tyacke inquired how this will impact the residents. Mark Mullin, Presbyterian Homes
4 Northwest, stated there will be no impact to the residents. Their main office is in Seattle and they
5 are expanding to this area.

6 The motion carried 5/0.

7
8 **AGENDA ITEM 7. New Business.**

9 **a. Consider Resolution No. 48-2016 Accepting Bids and Authorizing the Execution of**
10 **Contract for Construction of Mill Street Parking Ramp**

11 City Manager Dahl provided a background on the Mill Street Parking Ramp project. He reported
12 the City received two bids for the construction of the Mill Street Parking Ramp. The total project
13 costs, soft costs, and contingency with the lowest bidder, Adolfson and Peterson Construction, are:
14 1) Base Ramp (no roof) plus enhanced landscaping, entrance portal, and retaining wall treatment:
15 \$10,050,400; and, 2) Base Ramp with roof: \$11,230,000.

16 Nate Pearson, TEGRA group, stated the reason the project came in over budget is because
17 of the retaining wall that is needed to build the parking ramp and the schedule implications related
18 to it. It will take longer to build the retaining wall than originally proposed. The top deck of the
19 ramp would be open on July 1, 2017 with the entire project completed on August 11, 2017.

20 Mr. Mullin inquired what was missed that caused the delay in completion. Mr. Pearson
21 stated the contractors are not pricing any risk into the bid. The bids were very similar and
22 competitive.

23 Mr. Willcox inquired how disruptive the construction will be in the summer. Mr. Pearson
24 stated it will look less chaotic than in the earlier stages of construction, but the site will be under
25 construction and not available to the public for safety reasons.

26 In response to Mr. Mullin, Mr. Pearson outlined what they learned during the bidding
27 process. They did not know the full implication of the tiebacks for the retaining wall before it went
28 out to bid. After the design was looked at and finalized in the last couple weeks, they learned the
29 tieback system needs to be shorter and requires more labor and time, which then affects the cost.

30 Mr. Tyacke commented he thought the design of the retaining wall for the parking ramp
31 was based on the design of the retaining wall behind the Muni. Mr. Pearson stated this retaining
32 wall is different because it is 500 feet long and retaining 28 feet above grade which makes it a much
33 different retaining wall.

34 Mrs. Anderson summarized this contractor is covering the risks, they have the warranties,
35 and this is what the City must choose from.

36 Mr. Mullin inquired what risk mitigation measures are in the contract and who assumes the
37 liability that the wall is going to hold up and for how long. Mr. Pearson stated they have a
38 professional engineer who has submitted the design and TEGRA has hired Braun Engineering to
39 do a peer review. Contractually, the ultimate responsibility goes to A & P, Veit, and Lowell
40 Engineers.

41 Mr. Dahl advised there is still an 8% contingency in the bid until the wall is completed.

42 Mr. Willcox inquired if there was any point in rebidding the project. Mr. Pearson stated he
43 believes they would receive the same results with some material escalation.

44 Mrs. McCarthy stated to gain more spaces on Mill Street, the ramp had been pushed back
45 and now requires an expensive retaining wall. She inquired if there was a better design that would
46 not have this expensive trade off. City Engineer Kelly stated if the ramp is redesigned and moved
47 back towards the street, there would be more utility impacts and the price could potentially be about
48 the same.

49 Mrs. Anderson stated the retaining wall is still needed and if it is redesigned, it will
50 potentially be about the same price. The contractors know the City wants this ramp and the
51 engineers have to guarantee the retaining wall and the ramp.

1 Mr. Willcox inquired if the current design is better from a cost perspective than the grade
2 plus two ramp at this point.

3 Mr. Kelly commented the retaining wall is needed with either ramp design. The contractor
4 has provided a conservative bid and the City wanted minimal impact. If the project was done in
5 two phases, it could potentially cost more. Mr. Dahl advised the grade plus two design was
6 \$9,700,000 including the contingency, but not soft costs. Mrs. McCarthy reminded the Council
7 there was a height issue with the properties to the north with the grade plus two design.

8 Mr. Willcox inquired of the Council their thoughts on the proposed schedule.

9 Mrs. McCarthy inquired if poor weather days has been worked into the schedule. Mr.
10 Pearson stated there is allowance for some poor weather days.

11 Mr. Mullin asked Mr. Pearson how confident he was in the completion dates given by the
12 contractor. Mr. Pearson stated he has had multiple meetings with the contractors and while the
13 schedule is tight, he believes it can be done if it gets started this week.

14 Mr. Tyacke asked if there have been discussions with the surrounding building owners and
15 the impact to their parking. Mr. Dahl stated they have been talking with them and will work with
16 them to retain as many spaces as possible. There is some initial communication that needs to take
17 place right away and some longer-term issues that will be addressed as they come up.

18 At the request of Mr. Willcox, Becky Pierson, Chamber of Commerce President, stated the
19 completion date is not ideal, but the alternative of not having a ramp is a bigger issue.

20 Mrs. McCarthy requested more information about the phased approach for the ramp. Mr.
21 Kelly stated it would have to be rebid. Phase 1 could start this winter, and impact the north
22 parking area to give the contractor space to build a retaining wall. When the wall is complete, the
23 parking lot could then be available for use for the summer. Phase 2 could begin in September 2017,
24 which would include construction of the parking ramp and would be completed by spring 2018.

25 Mr. Pearson pointed out a major part of the cost is being put at risk because it is being
26 delayed for a season, and it could potentially cost \$250,000 more to do the project in phases.

27 Mrs. Anderson commented the business owners have been through some tough years of
28 construction in the City, this will be another season of construction, and the phase option should be
29 considered.

30 Mr. Dahl asked if the project could still be rebid this winter. Mr. Pearson stated he would
31 have to consider whether they use a change order or if they would have to reject all current bids.
32 City Attorney Schelzel stated it would be a huge change and it could not be done with a change
33 order.

34 Mr. Dahl stated the City can finance the basic ramp and outlined the financing as follows:

- 35 • Financing for Ramp: \$9,440,000 allocated
- 36 • Gap of: \$610,000 for base ramp with add-ons and \$1,790,000 for ramp with roof
- 37 • Other Revenue Sources to fill gap: \$191,000 in ramp contingency and \$400,000 to
38 \$500,000 in year-end transfers

39 Mrs. Anderson stated the payment-in-lieu-of parking, Broadway Place policy and their
40 landscape contribution are included in the fund that would cover some of the capital costs. Mr.
41 Dahl stated these fees would primarily fund future parking related improvements.

42 Mr. Willcox commented the timing is unfortunate, but not a reason to stop the project. The
43 prospect of not having a ramp at all would be worse. He suggested a roof be added to the CIP so
44 that it can be funded in the future.

45 Mr. Tyacke stated this has been in the Comprehensive Plan for many years and the decision
46 to build it now will accommodate development and growth in the future. He agrees the roof should
47 be included in a CIP and is still interested in exploring a solar roof in the future.

48 Mrs. McCarthy commented she is sensitive to the financial situation and sees the need for
49 increase parking. They have worked very hard to come up with a ramp that meets their parking
50 needs, is aesthetically pleasing, and is sensitive to budgets. She has faith that TEGRA will push to
51 have the ramp done on schedule, but is less optimistic it will be done in July. She supports moving

1 forward with the base ramp, and supports additional discussion for a roof in the future. She
2 expressed concern that if the roof will get lost in all the other projects the City and suggested putting
3 aside money immediately, add to it continuously, and possibly set a timeline as to when it would
4 get done.

5 Mr. Mullin commented he remains supportive of moving ahead with the base ramp and is
6 open to further specific discussion regarding the roof. Regarding the financing of the project, most
7 of it will be paid for through TIF. The burden of maintenance has been placed on
8 the commercial property owners. Regarding the intent of the roof, if appropriate funding became
9 available, he would encourage future policy makers to do the following to close the funding gap:
10 1) look at the annual budget process for additional money; 2) explore assessing direct property
11 owners that would benefit from the roof; 3) explore solar options and a full roof; and, 4) explore
12 public/private partnerships.

13 Mr. Willcox stated he agrees with Mr. Mullin, but added money should be shifted from
14 CIP's into this account so that it is more than just a thought process.

15 Mrs. Anderson thanked the design team and TEGRA for their work. She stated covering
16 the additional costs are a lot for the community and there is already a lot to do in the community.
17 This ramp is about future development and big development for Lake Effect, but she has a lot of
18 reservations because the City cannot afford it. She does not support taking money from various
19 funds to come up with the original shortfall amount, and now the City must come up with more
20 money to cover the difference. The community already has a lot going on and there are other
21 alternatives to see what would work best. The ramp is using taxpayer dollars through TIF. She is
22 concerned with the burden this will put on commercial property owners and does not support
23 awarding bids and any future financing.

24 Mrs. McCarthy inquired if they should proceed with the retaining wall treatment if they
25 are committed to putting on a roof in a couple of years. Mr. Dahl commented he would
26 recommend moving forward with the recommended alternatives because there is no guarantee
27 when the City can come up with the financing for the roof. Even for a few years, the alternatives
28 will have some value.

29 Victor Pechaty, HGA, commented the retaining wall extends significantly above the upper
30 deck and is slated to receive the decorative pattern under the alternatives. It will be very visible
31 until the roof is installed.

32 Mr. Schelzel suggested the intent of the roof be addressed separately.

33 Mr. Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mullin, to adopt Resolution No. 48-2016
34 Accepting Low Bid and Awarding and Approving a Contract with Lowest Responsible Bidder for
35 the Mill Street Parking Structure Project, including Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. The motion carried 4/1
36 (Anderson).

37 Mrs. McCarthy requested the roof discussion be part of the next Council meeting agenda.
38 If the ramp comes in under budget, she suggested the excess funds could be used for the roof.

39 Mr. Dahl outlined the next steps with the ramp project and hoped to present a concrete plan
40 at the November 15 Council meeting.

41
42 The Council recessed at 8:28 p.m. and reconvened at 8:34 p.m.

43
44 **b. Consider Approval of Payment-in-Lieu-of-Parking (PILOP) Policy**

45 City Manager Dahl reported PILOP is an effort to create a downtown parking district that
46 maximizes both public and private parking stalls in downtown and increase economic development
47 activity. He reported on the background and provided an update on PILOP.

48 Mr. Dahl provided more detail on the proposed fee of \$10,000 per stall. It should be based
49 on a combination of the construction cost of stalls, value to the property owner, what other cities
50 are doing, future capital improvement needs of the City, and what the City previously charged.

1 Mr. Dahl pointed out this is a policy to guide for future use and development. It will be
2 used in drafting future development agreements and there may be unique variables for every
3 development.

4 Mrs. McCarthy inquired if the per stall fee and interest rate would be part of the annual fee
5 schedule review, and how interest rate was decided. Mr. Dahl responded the fee would be reviewed
6 annually, but perhaps should be tied to prime instead of having it in the fee schedule. Regarding
7 the interest rate, he spoke with Steve McDonald and Stacey Kvilvang about an appropriate interest
8 rate.

9 Mr. Tyacke inquired if the \$10,000 fee per stall follows the recently adopted ordinance.
10 Director of Planning and Building Thomson stated staff believes it is consistent with the ordinance.
11 The policy only applies to properties within draft mobility district area. They want flexibility to
12 approve other projects outside of the mobility district area.

13 Mr. Tyacke inquired if the amount the City is subsidizing of the parking stalls falls under
14 the City's subsidy policy that requires statutory authorization. Mr. Dahl stated they do not see it as
15 a business subsidy. City Attorney Schelzel stated they looked at the definition of a business subsidy
16 under the statute, and they are confident this policy would not fit the definition and trigger
17 regulatory requirements.

18 Mr. Mullin commented the policy text is confusing as it refers to "future" downtown
19 parking and not the ramp, and the term of the fee is not specific enough. He suggested a 30-year
20 term that is tied with the land, not the owner, and a more specific rate since it is for future parking
21 improvements.

22 Mr. Dahl confirmed the intent of the policy is related to all things parking in the future, not
23 outstanding debts. He agreed there should be a more solid term and fee and a 30-year term would
24 be appropriate.

25 Mr. Schelzel stated tying the term to the life of the facility was recognizing those spaces as
26 available for the use and the money coming in will pay for future things. The drawback to setting
27 a specific schedule is in the future and there may be other facilities where the capital life is longer
28 or shorter. This policy will be implemented through a CUP process. A developer will make a
29 request and as a condition of approval of the CUP, all the details will be finalized and staff will
30 have a recommendation.

31 Mr. Willcox summarized cash is needed to operate, yet they do not want to penalize a
32 potential developer. A 30-year term seems generous, and does not require the developer to come
33 up with a lot of cash. However, it does not produce a lot of needed cash flow.

34 Mrs. McCarthy suggested they develop a sliding scale. If a developer requests up to 20
35 stalls, they have a 20-year term. If they request 20 to 50 stalls, it would trigger a 30-year term. She
36 requested clarification on how the policy works if a developer tears down their building after 20
37 years versus selling their land. Mr. Schelzel referred to page 77, Section C, and commented the
38 policy does say the obligation to pay the fee in lieu of parking runs with the property and the
39 development agreement shall be recorded against the property.

40 Mrs. McCarthy inquired if a new agreement would be triggered if the use changed, but the
41 property did not change owners. City Attorney Schelzel stated if the change in use could not be met
42 with the number of parking stalls on the property, then the property owner would have to apply for
43 a CUP under this policy. If there was a reduction in use, the obligation to pay would still be there.

44 Mr. Tyacke stated he is not comfortable going any higher than a 24-year term. Mr. Schelzel
45 stated the policy itself states the term can be agreed to, but cannot exceed the term of financing for
46 the capital costs.

47 Mr. Willcox stated it would be simpler to just pick a term length and go with it.

48 Mrs. Anderson inquired if it is more of a burden for the land owner if they were ever to sell
49 if the agreement was tied to the property versus the owner. Mr. Schelzel stated it is typical for the
50 City to record development agreements with any large projects. A lot of times there is one entity

1 that comes in, gets approval, and signs it over to another entity and that is why it should be tied to
2 the land. The details would be worked out in the sale of the property.

3 Mr. Willcox inquired what terms other cities used. Mr. Dahl commented the term was
4 usually lower and a lot of cities did not even accept a finance term.

5 Mr. Mullin, Mr. Willcox, and Mrs. McCarthy stated they supports a tiered structure. Mr.
6 Willcox supports a 20-year term. Mrs. McCarthy supports either a 20 or 30-year term. Mr. Tyacke
7 supports the agreement as is and supports one uniform term and price.

8 Mr. Mullin stated this will provide a tool to negotiate an outcome for smaller scale
9 development. It is not a subsidy to try and get larger developers in.

10 Mrs. Anderson commented the purpose of the policy states it is "to propose higher density
11 projects in the downtown area." She suggested the language and purpose be looked at and discussed
12 further.

13 Mr. Willcox stated the idea is to assist current development, not drive bigger, more dense
14 development.

15 Mr. Schelzel advised the tiered system refers to the term of financing. After discussion, the
16 Council recommended a 20-year terms for up to 49 stalls and a 30-year term for over 50 stalls.

17 Mr. Dahl recommended staff discuss the terms and come back to the Council with a
18 recommendation. Staff will discuss the rate, proposal language and a tiered system.

19 Mrs. McCarthy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to table Resolution No. 44-2016
20 Adopting Fee In Lieu Of Parking Policy until the next Council meeting. The motion carried 5/0.

21 Mr. Tyacke inquired if the rate should be reflected on a market based rate or a reflection of
22 City funds. Mr. Dahl advised they move to a market based rate that would fluctuate, depending on
23 the market.

24
25 **c. Consider Resolution No. 47-2016 Adopting Fee-in-Lieu-of-Parking Policy and**
26 **Setting Fee per Stall**

27 City Attorney Schelzel advised by tabling Agenda Item 7(b), this item is also tabled until the next
28 Council meeting.

29
30 **d. Consider Authorizing Final Plans/Specifications and Ad for Bid for Construction of**
31 **Telecommunication Tower**

32 Director of Public Service Dudinsky reported the feasibility report concluded the project was
33 feasible. The overall relocation cost estimate is \$826,867. The funding for the project will come
34 from new leases with the tenants and the Telecommunication CIP Fund. If the proposed resolution
35 is approved, the bids will come before the Council in February.

36 Mr. Tyacke inquired about the cables on the tower and why the City is paying for the
37 cleanup and decommissioning of the old site. Mr. Dudinsky stated the cables will be on the inside
38 of the monopole. The City is the landowner of the old site and it will be put back to its original
39 state.

40 Mrs. Anderson commented she thought the vendor contract stated the vendor must cover
41 the cost of removal of their materials. Mr. Dudinsky stated the vendors are removing their own
42 materials but the City is responsible for what it owns, like the fencing and land.

43 Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to authorize Final
44 Plans/Specifications and Ad for Bid for Construction of Telecommunication Tower. The motion
45 carried 5/0.

46 Director of Planning and Building Thomson advised the zoning approval process will begin
47 with this site. Mr. Dudinsky commented the land lease will go before the school board in
48 November.

49
50 **e. Gianni's Steakhouse Request to Extend Temporary Right-of-Way Permit**

1 City Manager Dahl reported Gianni's is requesting the previously approved pergola structure be
2 allowed to remain year-round. Staff is concerned with snow removal with the structure being at the
3 curb as well as the structure being a liability to parked cars. The owner, Terri Huml, has offered to
4 do the snow removal. Staff recommends denial of this request.

5 Terri Huml, 293 Grace Point Court, Gianni's owner, commented the pergola structure will
6 have to come down when the City tears up the sidewalks in 2018. The burden of taking it down
7 and storing it is intensive. She suggested the Council use the pergola structure as an example to
8 define how to work with semi-permanent structures in the City. The structure was originally going
9 to be removable, but after the design that the City felt comfortable with was approved, it is a very
10 sturdy structure. She requested a one-year extension and offered to take it down in the winter if it
11 becomes too burdensome. She plans to decorate it for the holidays and make it a beautiful structure
12 for the winter.

13 Mrs. McCarthy inquired about the hold/harmless agreement and if a new agreement is
14 needed with the extension of the dates. City Attorney Schelzel stated they would need to revisit
15 that agreement, the right-of-way permit, and the CUP for the use to make sure the request could be
16 granted. Ms. Huml commented she put decking around the trees and the hold/harmless agreement
17 was extended to cover year-round.

18 Mr. Tyacke inquired if there are other businesses that have sidewalk furniture that does not
19 need to be removed. Mr. Dahl commented he did not know of any on public right-of-way. Director
20 of Planning and Building Thomson advised the zoning ordinance states all the items must be
21 removed when the patio is not in use.

22 Mr. Willcox inquired if there are any other seasonal structures authorized on the City's
23 right-of-way. Mr. Thomson explained temporary encroachment in the zoning ordinance does not
24 have a specified duration associated with it.

25 Mr. Mullin pointed out Cōv has a wall that sits on the right-of-way, but they remove all
26 their furniture for the winter.

27 Mrs. Anderson commented she originally did not support this as a temporary structure and
28 now it has become a permanent structure. She is not comfortable with the use the public right-of-
29 way, there are safety concerns with parking, and staff liability with snow removal. She supports
30 staff recommendation for denial of this request.

31 Mr. Tyacke commented everyone should be treated uniformly and recommends denial of
32 this request.

33 Mr. Mullin commented the structure adds to the charm of the City, there is a demonstrated
34 hardship, and with Lake Effect, a wider streetscape will be provided and more merchants will
35 benefit from it. He supports extending the permit.

36 Mrs. McCarthy commented the pergola is a great structure, but there is not enough space
37 for it at this time. She expressed concern for the accessibility for cars and stated the rules need to
38 be enforced uniformly.

39 Mr. Willcox commented Gianni's has been a great benefit to the City, but the agreement
40 was clear that it needed to come down at the end of the season. He supports staff recommendation
41 for denial of the request.

42 Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. McCarthy, to deny the extension of the
43 temporary encroachment permit. The motion carried 4/1. (Mullin)

44 **AGENDA ITEM 8. City Manager's Report and Discussion Items.**

45 **a. Discussion of Parking Mitigation Plan for Mill Street**

46 City Manager Dahl reported he will present this item at the next Council meeting.

47 **b. Lake Effect Update**

48
49 City Manager Dahl reported the Conservancy is in the process of hiring an Executive Director and
50 is actively cultivating potential donors. Staff is moving forward with the EAW and has received a
51

1 maintenance and operations report that will be presented to Council. Discussions continue with the
2 railroad and there is a lot of work going on.

3
4 Mr. Dahl advised Bushaway has opened and there will be a celebration tomorrow on the northeast
5 corner at 9:00 a.m. He thanked the Council and staff for their work on the project, the businesses
6 and residents for their patience, and Becky Pierson at the Chamber for her work.

7
8 **c. City Boards and Commissions**

9 City Manager Dahl stated today was the last day for submission of applications and there are many
10 to choose from.

11
12 **d. Chamber of Commerce Update**

13 Becky Pierson, Chamber of Commerce President, commented Boo Blast was a great event. She
14 thanked everyone for their work on the event. She announced the following events:

- 15 • Tree Lighting on November 25
- 16 • Small Business Saturday on November 26
- 17 • Jingle Mingle on December 1
- 18 • Santa and Reindeer on some Saturdays in December
- 19 • Shop With a Purpose in December

20
21 **AGENDA ITEM 9. Public Forum Continued (as necessary).**

22 Cathy Carlson, 226 Minnetonka Avenue North, thanked the Council and staff for their work on the
23 telecom project.

24
25 **AGENDA ITEM 10. Adjournment.**

26 Mr. Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Mrs. McCarthy to adjourn. There being no further
27 business, Mayor Willcox adjourned the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

28
29 Respectfully submitted,

30
31 *Becky Malone 11-15-2016*

32
33 Becky Malone
34 Deputy City Clerk

35
36 Drafted by Shannon Schmidt
37 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*