# NOTICE OF STUDY SESSION <br> OF THE <br> UNIVERSITY CITY CITY COUNCIL 

Public Notice is hereby given that a Study Session of the City Council of University City will be held on Monday, May 9, 2016, at 5:30 p.m., at City Hall, fifth floor, 6801 Delmar, University City, MO.

## AGENDA

1. Meeting called to order
2. Any changes to upcoming meeting agenda
3. Finance options for new police facility
4. Adjournment

This meeting is OPEN to the public.

Dated this $5^{\text {th }}$ day of May, 2016

## City Council Study Session Agenda Item Cover

## MEETING DATE:

May 9, 2016
AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Finance Options for New Police Facility
(Informational, for discussion)

## BACKGROUND REVIEW:

On March 28, 2016 City Council approved the construction of a new police facility. The next step in the process is for City Council to identify a funding mechanism for the estimated $\$ 12.5$ million project. Missouri State Statutes provides authority for municipalities to use specific financing tools to fund capital improvement projects. A summary of these programs was presented to City Council in a March 28, 2016 informational memorandum.

Since that time, staff performed additional analyses of the options. The status of the General Fund Reserve and potential impact of each option on the City's rating was critical to the analyses. For background, in March 2014, Standard \& Poor Rating Services raised the City's long term rating on General Obligation from AA to AA+. This favorable rating was based on the FY13 financial status, when the City had reserves of $\$ 17.9$ million or $66 \%$ of operating expenditures. In FY14, the City used a portion of reserves for one-time capital projects, but still maintained $60 \%$ of expenditures. The City projected that reserves would remain above $30 \%$ of expenditures through 2016. This ratio is indicative of a strong management condition with good financial practices, in accordance with Financial Management Assessment methodologies.

Below is summary of the General Fund Reserve without revenues and expenditures during FY 2016:

| Date | General Fund Reserve |  | Purpose |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| June 30, 2015 | \$ | 15,800,000 | Unassigned fund reserve |
| July 2015 |  | (7,000,000) | Renovation or construction Police facility |
| October 2015 |  | $(500,000)$ | Remediation existing Police department |
| March 2016 |  | (2,000,000) | Additional cost for remediation |
| Next budget amendment |  | $(300,000)$ | Legal fees - Social House |
| Projected GF fund reserve | \$ | 6,000,000 | 25\% of operating expenditures |
| Operating expenditures FY 2016 | \$ | 23,510,000 | Adopted budget |

To maintain the City's AA+ bond rating, the recommended General Fund Reserve should not be less than $25 \%$ of budgeted operating expenditures. As of March 31, 2016, the General Fund expenditures exceeded revenues by nearly $\$ 607,000$ due to a slow growth of sales tax revenue. If sales tax does not increase by the end of this fiscal year, the General Fund may result in a deficit balance, and would mean a decrease in fund reserve. The use of reserves must be carefully evaluated with respect to financing the police building.

The City must finance the project through borrowing. The two options are General Obligation Bonds and Certifications of Participation. Both are described in detail.

## 1. General Obligation Bonds (GO Bonds)

The City may issue general obligation bonds for this purpose authorized by Charter of Missouri law. Many municipalities have financed capital improvement projects through GO bonds, which are secured by the full faith and credit and taxing power of a municipality (see table below for example). The debt service on bonds is paid through an additional property tax levy. The City may only issue GO bonds after obtaining approval of four-sevenths of the qualified voters of the city.

| General Obligation Bonds Other Municipalities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Government | Year | Issued Amount | Purpose of Issuance |
| City of Belleville, IL | 2015 | \$ 8,500,000 | City Hall and Police Station |
| City of Lake St. Louis | 2010 | 7,230,000 | Street Improvements |
|  | 2014 | 8,655,000 | Street and Park Improvements |
| City of Maplewood | 2015 | 6,000,000 | Fire Station Project |
| City of Olivette | 2014 | 13,500,000 | City Hall Project |
| City of St. Charles | 2013 | 12,400,000 | Various Capital Project |
| City of St. Peters | 2014 | 9,675,000 | Storm Water Project |
|  | 2015 | 7,500,000 | Water Works and Sewerage Project |
| City of Webster Groves | 2011 | 13,000,000 | Street Project |
| City of Woodson Terrace | 2015 | 1,500,000 | Community Center |

Benefits of a GO bond option include a low interest rate for financing the project and low cost of issuance. Disadvantages of issuing GO bonds include the requirement for a supermajority approval of the voters. Bonds will also impose an additional financial burden on city taxpayers.

The remaining 2016 election dates for a GO bond with deadlines for submission to the St. Louis County Election Board are:

| Election | Type |
| :--- | :--- |
| August 2, 2016 | Primary Election |
| November 8, 2016 | General Election |

Submission Deadline
May 24, 2016
August 30, 2016

These elections require $4 / 7$ bond majority approval.
City Council may consider three bond amounts for three scenarios. The debt service schedules are presented on the following pages. Each scenario includes a $1.5 \%$ of issuance cost:

1. Bond request of $\$ 7.7$ million. In this scenario, the remainder of the estimated $\$ 12.5$ million construction costs would come from the $\$ 7$ million General Fund reserve set aside for this purpose. It is important to note, that the estimated $\$ 2.2$ million costs to temporarily relocate the Police Department is coming from this set aside and will reduce the amount of reserves available for new construction.
2. Bond request of $\$ 12.5$ million. Request the estimated construction costs of the new building only.
3. Bond request of $\$ 15$ million. Request the estimated construction costs of the new building plus additional maintenance and improvement costs for the Annex building. This request would include funding for additional work identified for the Annex that exceeds available general revenues. It is based on a professional assessment of all City facilities that occurred in March 2016 by EMG Corporation. The EMG report for the Annex identified repair work that is currently in progress (exterior repair work, interior environmental) and the following:

- Steam pipe tunnel repair or fill in
- Replace interior finishes
- Replace HVAC systems
- Replace/upgrade electrical systems
- Upgrade elevator
- White-box interior

The three bond amounts are based on the following assumptions:

- All of the bonds would be sold as a single issue at one time. If the City authorizes more than $\$ 10$ million and subdivides the issue so that not more than $\$ 10$ million are sold in a single calendar year, the bonds could be "bank qualified" which would reduce the interest cost.
- All issues are based on non-bank qualified interest rates.
- The maximum maturity for Missouri GO Bonds is 20 years. These schedules are 19 years to conform with the tax levy cycle.
- Interest rates reflect current rate plus $1 / 4 \%$ for double A rated issues. If the City does not retain this rate, interest rates would be substantially higher.
- If the bond issue is not approved at an August election, the City would not be able to levy a tax for debt service until 2017. The schedules assume no debt service payments would be made until March 1, 2018.
- There will not be growth in assessed valuation of $\$ 591,656,000$.

CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY GENERAL OBLIGATION- \$7,700,000

SERIES 2016

|  | Date | Principal | Interest Rate | Interest | Debt Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3/1/2018 | 215,000 | 0.950 | 233,497 | 448,497 |
|  | 9/1/2018 |  |  | 92,378 |  |
| $2 *$ | 3/1/2019 | 355,000 | 1.150 | 92,378 | 539,756 |
|  | 9/1/2019 |  |  | 90,336 |  |
| $3 *$ | 3/1/2020 | 360,000 | 1.300 | 90,336 | 540,672 |
|  | 9/1/2020 |  |  | 87,996 |  |
| $4^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2021 | 365,000 | 1.350 | 87,996 | 540,992 |
|  | 9/1/2021 |  |  | 85,532 |  |
| 5' | 3/1/2022 | 370,000 | 1.450 | 85,532 | 541,064 |
|  | 9/1/2022 |  |  | 82,850 |  |
| $6 "$ | 3/1/2023 | 375,000 | 1.600 | 82,850 | 540,700 |
|  | 9/1/2023 |  |  | 79,850 |  |
| $7{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2024 | 380,000 | 1.750 | 79,850 | 539,700 |
|  | 9/1/2024 |  |  | 76,525 |  |
| $8^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2025 | 390,000 | 1.900 | 76,525 | 543,050 |
|  | 9/1/2025 |  |  | 72,820 |  |
| $9{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2026 | 395,000 | 2.100 | 72,820 | 540,640 |
|  | 9/1/2026 |  |  | 68,673 |  |
| $10^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2027 | 405,000 | 2.300 | 68,673 | 542,346 |
|  | 9/1/2027 |  |  | 64,015 |  |
| $11^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2028 | 415,000 | 2.350 | 64,015 | 543,030 |
|  | 9/1/2028 |  |  | 59,139 |  |
| $12^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2029 | 425,000 | 2.700 | 59,139 | 543,278 |
|  | 9/1/2029 |  |  | 53,401 |  |
| $13^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2030 | 435,000 | 2.850 | 53,401 | 541,802 |
|  | 9/1/2030 |  |  | 47,203 |  |
| $14^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2031 | 450,000 | 3.050 | 47,203 | 544,406 |
|  | 9/1/2031 |  |  | 40,340 |  |
| $15^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2032 | 465,000 | 3.150 | 40,340 | 545,680 |
|  | 9/1/2032 |  |  | 33,016 |  |
| $16^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2033 | 480,000 | 3.200 | 33,016 | 546,032 |
|  | 9/1/2033 |  |  | 25,336 |  |
| $17^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2034 | 495,000 | 3.250 | 25,336 | 545,672 |
|  | 9/1/2034 |  |  | 17,293 |  |
| $18^{*}$ | 3/1/2035 | 510,000 | 3.300 | 17,293 | 544,586 |
|  | 9/1/2035 |  |  | 8,877 |  |
| 19 | 3/1/2036 | 530,000 | 3.350 | 8,877 | 547,754 |
|  |  | 7,815,000 |  | \$ 2,404,657 | \$ 10,219,657 |

Based on the current assessed value of \$591,656,000, the tax rate required would be approximately 9.2 cents per $\$ 100$. The estimated impact would be:

ESTIMATED TAX IMPACT

| If Your House Is Worth |  | Your Assessed Valuation Is |  | At \$. 092EstimatedMonthly Cost |  | At \$. 092 <br> Estimated <br> Annually Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 80,000 | \$ | 15,200 | \$ | 1.17 | \$ | 13.98 |
|  | 90,000 |  | 17,100 |  | 1.31 |  | 15.73 |
|  | 100,000 |  | 19,000 |  | 1.46 |  | 17.48 |
|  | 110,000 |  | 20,900 |  | 1.60 |  | 19.23 |
|  | 120,000 |  | 22,800 |  | 1.75 |  | 20.98 |
|  | 130,000 |  | 24,700 |  | 1.89 |  | 22.72 |
|  | 150,000 |  | 28,500 |  | 2.19 |  | 26.22 |
|  | 175,000 |  | 33,250 |  | 2.55 |  | 30.59 |
|  | 200,000 |  | 38,000 |  | 2.91 |  | 34.96 |
|  | 400,000 |  | 76,000 |  | 5.83 |  | 69.92 |
|  | 500,000 |  | 95,000 |  | 7.28 |  | 87.40 |
|  | 600,000 |  | 114,000 |  | 8.74 |  | 104.88 |
|  | 700,000 |  | 133,000 |  | 10.20 |  | 122.36 |

GO Bonds Scenario 2

## CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY GENERAL OBLIGATION- \$12,500,000 SERIES 2016 (20 Years)

|  | Date | Principal | Interest Rate | Interest | Annual Debt Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3/1/2018 | 345,000 | 0.950 | 379,309 | 724,309 |
|  | 9/1/2018 |  |  | 150,085 |  |
| $2^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2019 | 575,000 | 1.150 | 150,085 | 875,170 |
|  | 9/1/2019 |  |  | 146,779 |  |
| $3{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2020 | 858,000 | 1.300 | 146,779 | 1,151,558 |
|  | 9/1/2020 |  |  | 142,976 |  |
| $4 *$ | 3/1/2021 | 590,000 | 1.350 | 142,976 | 875,952 |
|  | 9/1/2021 |  |  | 138,994 |  |
| $5^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2022 | 600,000 | 1.450 | 138,994 | 877,988 |
|  | 9/1/2022 |  |  | 134,644 |  |
| $6^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2023 | 610,000 | 1.600 | 134,644 | 879,288 |
|  | 9/1/2023 |  |  | 129,764 |  |
| $7^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2024 | 620,000 | 1.750 | 129,764 | 879,528 |
|  | 9/1/2024 |  |  | 124,339 |  |
| $8{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2025 | 630,000 | 1.900 | 124,339 | 878,678 |
|  | 9/1/2025 |  |  | 118,354 |  |
| $9^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2026 | 645,000 | 2.100 | 118,354 | 881,708 |
|  | 9/1/2026 |  |  | 111,581 |  |
| $10^{*}$ | 3/1/2027 | 655,000 | 2.300 | 111,581 | 878,162 |
|  | 9/1/2027 |  |  | 104,049 |  |
| $11^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2028 | 675,000 | 2.350 | 104,049 | 883,098 |
|  | 9/1/2028 |  |  | 96,117 |  |
| $12^{\prime}$ | 3/1/2029 | 690,000 | 2.700 | 96,117 | 882,234 |
|  | 9/1/2029 |  |  | 86,803 |  |
| $13^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2030 | 710,000 | 2.850 | 86,803 | 883,606 |
|  | 9/1/2030 |  |  | 76,685 |  |
| $14^{*}$ | 3/1/2031 | 730,000 | 3.050 | 76,685 | 883,370 |
|  | 9/1/2031 |  |  | 65,552 |  |
| $15^{\prime}$ | 3/1/2032 | 755,000 | 3.150 | 65,552 | 886,104 |
|  | 9/1/2032 |  |  | 53,661 |  |
| $16^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2033 | 780,000 | 3.200 | 53,661 | 887,322 |
|  | 9/1/2033 |  |  | 41,181 |  |
| $17^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2034 | 805,000 | 3.250 | 41,181 | 887,362 |
|  | 9/1/2034 |  |  | 28,100 |  |
| $18^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2035 | 830,000 | 3.300 | 28,100 | 886,200 |
|  | 9/1/2035 |  |  | 14,405 |  |
| 19 | 3/1/2036 | 860,000 | 3.350 | 14,405 | 888,810 |
|  |  | 12,963,000 |  | \$ 3,907,447 | \$ 16,870,447 |

Based on the current assessed value of \$591,656,000, the tax rate required would bel approximately 15.0 cents per $\$ 100$. The estimated tax impact would be:

## ESTIMATED TAX IMPACT

| If Your House Is Worth |  | Your Assessed Valuation Is |  | At $\$ .15$EstimatedMonthly Cost |  | At $\$ .15$ <br> Estimated Annually Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 80,000 | \$ | 15,200 | \$ | 1.90 | \$ | 22.80 |
|  | 90,000 |  | 17,100 |  | 2.14 |  | 25.65 |
|  | 100,000 |  | 19,000 |  | 2.38 |  | 28.50 |
|  | 110,000 |  | 20,900 |  | 2.61 |  | 31.35 |
|  | 120,000 |  | 22,800 |  | 2.85 |  | 34.20 |
|  | 130,000 |  | 24,700 |  | 3.09 |  | 37.05 |
|  | 150,000 |  | 28,500 |  | 3.56 |  | 42.75 |
|  | 175,000 |  | 33,250 |  | 4.16 |  | 49.88 |
|  | 200,000 |  | 38,000 |  | 4.75 |  | 57.00 |
|  | 400,000 |  | 76,000 |  | 9.50 |  | 114.00 |
|  | 500,000 |  | 95,000 |  | 11.88 |  | 142.50 |
|  | 600,000 |  | 114,000 |  | 14.25 |  | 171.00 |
|  | 700,000 |  | 133,000 |  | 16.63 |  | 199.50 |

CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY GENERAL OBLIGATION- \$15,000,000 SERIES 2016

|  | Date | Principal | Interest Rate | Interest | Annual Debt Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3/1/2018 | 415,000 | 0.950 | 455,056 | 870,056 |
|  | 9/1/2018 |  |  | 180,051 |  |
| $2^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2019 | 690,000 | 1.150 | 180,051 | 1,050,102 |
|  | 9/1/2019 |  |  | 176,084 |  |
| $3{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2020 | 700,000 | 1.300 | 176,084 | 1,052,168 |
|  | 9/1/2020 |  |  | 171,534 |  |
| 4" | 3/1/2021 | 710,000 | 1.350 | 171,534 | 1,053,068 |
|  | 9/1/2021 |  |  | 166,741 |  |
| 5 " | 3/1/2022 | 720,000 | 1.450 | 166,741 | 1,053,482 |
|  | 9/1/2022 |  |  | 161,521 |  |
| 6 | 3/1/2023 | 730,000 | 1.600 | 161,521 | 1,053,042 |
|  | 9/1/2023 |  |  | 155,681 |  |
| $7{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2024 | 745,000 | 1.750 | 155,681 | 1,056,362 |
|  | 9/1/2024 |  |  | 149,163 |  |
| 8 | 3/1/2025 | 755,000 | 1.900 | 149,163 | 1,053,326 |
|  | 9/1/2025 |  |  | 141,990 |  |
| 97 | 3/1/2026 | 770,000 | 2.100 | 141,990 | 1,053,980 |
|  | 9/1/2026 |  |  | 133,905 |  |
| $10^{*}$ | 3/1/2027 | 790,000 | 2.300 | 133,905 | 1,057,810 |
|  | 9/1/2027 |  |  | 124,820 |  |
| $11^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2028 | 810,000 | 2.350 | 124,820 | 1,059,640 |
|  | 9/1/2028 |  |  | 115,303 |  |
| $12^{*}$ | 3/1/2029 | 830,000 | 2.700 | 115,303 | 1,060,606 |
|  | 9/1/2029 |  |  | 104,098 |  |
| $13^{*}$ | 3/1/2030 | 850,000 | 2.850 | 104,098 | 1,058,196 |
|  | 9/1/2030 |  |  | 91,985 |  |
| $14^{*}$ | 3/1/2031 | 880,000 | 3.050 | 91,985 | 1,063,970 |
|  | 9/1/2031 |  |  | 78,565 |  |
| $15^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2032 | 905,000 | 3.150 | 78,565 | 1,062,130 |
|  | 9/1/2032 |  |  | 64,311 |  |
| $16^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2033 | 935,000 | 3.200 | 64,311 | 1,063,622 |
|  | 9/1/2033 |  |  | 49,351 |  |
| $17^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/1/2034 | 965,000 | 3.250 | 49,351 | 1,063,702 |
|  | 9/1/2034 |  |  | 33,670 |  |
| 18 | 3/1/2035 | 995,000 | 3.300 | 33,670 | 1,062,340 |
|  | 9/1/2035 |  |  | 17,252 |  |
| 19 | 3/1/2036 | 1,030,000 | 3.350 | 17,252 | 1,064,504 |
|  |  | 15,225,000 |  | \$ 4,687,106 | \$ 19,912,106 |

Based on the current assessed value of \$591,656,000, the tax rate required would bel approximately .178 cents per $\$ 100$. The estimated tax impact would be:

## ESTIMATED TAX IMPACT

| If Your House Is Worth |  | Your Assessed Valuation Is |  | At \$. 178 <br> Estimated <br> Monthly Cost |  | At $\$ .178$ <br> Estimated <br> Annually Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 80,000 | \$ | 15,200 | \$ | 2.25 | \$ | 27.06 |
|  | 90,000 |  | 17,100 |  | 2.54 |  | 30.44 |
|  | 100,000 |  | 19,000 |  | 2.82 |  | 33.82 |
|  | 110,000 |  | 20,900 |  | 3.10 |  | 37.20 |
|  | 120,000 |  | 22,800 |  | 3.38 |  | 40.58 |
|  | 130,000 |  | 24,700 |  | 3.66 |  | 43.97 |
|  | 150,000 |  | 28,500 |  | 4.23 |  | 50.73 |
|  | 175,000 |  | 33,250 |  | 4.93 |  | 59.19 |
|  | 200,000 |  | 38,000 |  | 5.64 |  | 67.64 |
|  | 400,000 |  | 76,000 |  | 11.27 |  | 135.28 |
|  | 500,000 |  | 95,000 |  | 14.09 |  | 169.10 |
|  | 600,000 |  | 114,000 |  | 16.91 |  | 202.92 |
|  | 700,000 |  | 133,000 |  | 19.73 |  | 236.74 |

## 2. Certificates of Participation (COPs)

Legal authority for lease-purchase financing is authorized by Missouri statutes. Under a leasepurchase financing option, the City can lease the real property to be acquired and constructed from a lessor, which may be and investor or a trustee bank. The City makes rental payments annually and can purchase the property at the end of term. A lease-purchase agreement outlining the terms must be approved by the governing body, but is not a voter approved obligation. Therefore, the City will not have the ability to place a debt service levy to repay the bonds. There is no legal limit with respect to the maturity of lease obligations; however, a term longer than twenty-five years is not recommended.

The most common structure used to accomplish this objective is certificates of participation (COPs). COPs are certificates that represent a proportionate interest of the owner of each Certificate of the lessor to receive rental payments in accordance with the agreement. COPs generally have a higher interest rate that for bonds due to lease-obligations being renewed annually through the budget process, rather than secured by an enforceable pledge of revenues (such as property tax). Section 97.890 RSMo. provides the City with revenue generated from $1 / 2$ cent sales tax that is legally available for capital improvement purposes. The City currently uses this revenue to retire a portion of COPs series 2012 which would end in FY 2020. The City may continue to make rental payments from the General Fund on this series until FY 2020 so that the routine capital projects would not be interrupted or ceased. The new COPs could be retired through an annual budget appropriation from either the General Fund or Capital Improvement Sales Tax Fund. The table illustrates the amortized schedules for borrowing $\$ 7.7$ million with the term of 20 years. This schedule is estimated based on approximated current interest rate and assume the City retains its AA+ bond rating.

This financing tool has been used by many St. Louis County municipalities for the construction of public facilities. Below is the listing of those cities, the year and amount of certificates.

|  |  |  | icates of Participation cal Municipalities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Government | Year | Issued Amount | Purpose of Issuance |
| City of Chesterfield | 2000 | \$ 17,565,000 | Acquisition of Land and construction of City Hall and Police Station |
|  | 2005 | 25,700,000 | Acquisition of Park Land and construction |
| City of Brentwood | 2014 | 5,760,000 | Improved Recreational Complex |
| City of Bridgeton | 2009 | 5,785,000 | Construction of Municipal Govemment Center |
|  | 2013 | 9,465,000 | Community Center |
| City of Eureka | 2012 | 8,170,000 | Recreation Center |
| City of Frontenac | 2009 | 4,010,000 | Construction of City Government Center |
| City of Ferguson | 2013 | 9,055,000 | Community Center and Police Station |
| City of Kirkwood | 2014 | 3,605,000 | Automated Water Meter Reading System |
| City of Maryland Heights | 2015 | 15,000,000 | Community Center |
| City of Wentzville | 2011 | 18,900,000 | Park Project |
| City of Wildwood | 2010 | 3,000,000 | Construction of City Hall |

CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY
CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION - \$7,700,000
SERIES 2016 (20 Years)


