

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor
6801 Delmar Blvd.
University City, Missouri 63130
Monday, January 28, 2019
6:30 p.m.

A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

At the Regular Session of the City Council of University City held on the fifth floor of City Hall, on Monday, January 28, 2019, Mayor Terry Crow called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

In addition to the Mayor, the following members of Council were present:

Councilmember Stacy Clay
Councilmember Paulette Carr
Councilmember Steven McMahon
Councilmember Jeffrey Hales
Councilmember Tim Cusick
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also in attendance were City Manager, Gregory Rose, and City Attorney, John F. Mulligan, Jr.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Crow stated with the exception of the typographical error of John rather than Jerrold Tiers; for which he would like to apologize, the agenda was approved as presented during the Study Session.

D. PROCLAMATIONS

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 14, 2019, Regular Session minutes were moved by Councilmember Carr, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay and the motion carried unanimously.
2. January 14, 2019, Joint Study Session minutes were moved by Councilmember Carr, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.

F. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

1. Jerrold Tiers is nominated to the Traffic Commission replacing Curtis Tunstall's expired term (1/21/19) by Councilmember Stacy Clay, it was seconded by Councilmember Hales and the motion carried unanimously.

G. SWEARING IN TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

1. Joe Edwards was sworn into the Loop Special Business District Board in the City Clerk's office on January 22, 2019.

H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)

Jerrold Tiers, 7345 Chamberlain, University City, MO

Mr. Tiers stated after examining documents for the I-170 project, it appears as though Council and City staff might have received some bad advice based on a number of serious oversights made by one or more of the consultants. The predicted tax income from the project appears to be considerably overstated, which means the City will be unable to pay off the proposed \$70 million dollars in TIF bonds with the projected available resources. He stated by his calculations the project will need to generate about \$300 million dollars; plus or minus, to pay off the \$70 million dollars within the 25-year timeframe. But, on the other hand, the City needs this project. So at a minimum, Costco should be constructed since it is the big money maker with annual sales of approximately 165 million dollars per store. However, that alone will not support the \$70 million dollar bond. In contrast, this project could work and generate income, as opposed to requiring the City to chip in out-of-pocket, if the TIF was reduced to \$25 million dollars. Again, according to his rough calculations, the City would still receive over \$1 million dollars in general revenue after its TIF payment. And if yearly payments of \$750,000 of that revenue were made available to Ward 3, the previous agreement of \$15 million dollars would be achieved over a 20-year period of time.

Another alternative under this scenario would be a 20-year, \$10 million dollar municipal bond issue backed by part of the sales tax receipts from this development, which would cost about \$900,000 a year. That would still leave the City with a net income and an immediate lump sum of \$10 million dollars; which is much better than a pay-as-you-go strategy. And while he is uncertain of whether the bond rate, in this case, would be 6.5% or 6.8%, the City does have decent credit so it should be able to get a pretty good rate.

Mr. Tiers stated although his limited knowledge of details cause the exact amounts to be somewhat variable, and his alternatives are not consistent with the original deal, this reduced scale development would be better than the City having to pay out taxes that it now receives out-of-pocket without the benefit of any direct income. He stated in his opinion, the City really needs an independent outside evaluation of the project costs and predicted revenues before moving forward with any further commitments.

Sonya Pointer, 8039 Canton Avenue, University City, MO

Ms. Pointer stated as a 3rd Ward resident she is not in support of the proposed development and would ask that Council place this project on the ballot and allow residents to decide what they want for their City. Council lied when they said that eminent domain would absolutely not be used on owner-occupied homes because the Redevelopment Agreement says it can be used whenever necessary. Council also lied when they said this project was for the benefit of the 3rd Ward because these so-called benefits are being offset by their agreement to allow 100% of the sales tax to go towards paying off the bond. This takes dollars away from schools that are already seriously underperforming and ensures that 3rd Ward residents; who are largely Black, will no longer be able to afford to live here due to the influx of increased taxes and costs associated with this development.

The question then becomes who is really benefitting from this project?

- A wealthy developer?
- Bwayne Smotherson, who is reportedly shopping ideas to everyone except the 3rd Ward residents he represents?

- Paulette Carr's sister-in-law's new business located in the same area where MSD wanted to place the raw sewage tanks she fought so hard against?
- Steve McMahon, who purchased property in the 3rd Ward and sold it to investors?
- Or this rouge City Council actively working on their own behalf to make this community homogeneous across household incomes that correlate with race.

Council has said that their goal is to diversify the community; a keyword for low and moderate income earners to be kicked out because they cannot afford what they envision for this City. Developments that displace communities of color where household incomes are low to moderate is the new version of deed or covenant restrictions that once kept Black residents out of certain communities. And as she has said before, this development is merely the inception point of gentrification, and the City's displacement efforts will not end at Woodson or McKnight.

Ms. Pointer stated Obsessive Compulsive Disorder is a real mental health issue and while she has empathy for anyone who has to deal with this illness on a daily basis, she has never had someone become so obsessed over her as Patty McQueen has. In fact, it's a little creepy the way she and the rest of her elementary school click harass, intimidate and bully residents, as well as former members of Council, who disagree with them. But the real reason she is addressing this toxicity is that these same mob members are the ones who sit down with members of this Council over tea and dinner to discuss her and this proposed development. And when that type of toxic behavior is present on your City Council, it's easy to understand why it would be allowed to persist within certain members of this audience. This type of behavior is disgusting, extremely troubling, and should not be tolerated.

She stated her sole purpose for attending these meetings is to exercise her right as a private citizen of this community to talk to Council. And believes that is the right thing to do since 3rd Ward residents really don't have any representation on this Council. Ms. Pointer stated her desire is to be left alone and for individual comments to be limited to the business at hand. Let's do better to try to improve this City by addressing issues that reflect the best interest of this community.

Tom Sullivan, 751 Syracuse, University City, MO

Mr. Sullivan stated no one should be surprised that there are now questions being raised about the revenue projections for the Olive/170 development since it has been a fiasco from the very beginning. The project summary illustrates that taxpayers will be giving \$10 million more to the project than NOVUS; and that was before the agreement was changed to provide for a 50% tax abatement, and before the 50% sales tax going to the TIF was changed to 100%. There have also been no explanations as to how this 50% tax abatement will impact the school district.

Mr. Crow noted that there have been eleven public hearings on this development, yet in the course of those meetings, citizens have been deceived or lied to; relevant information has been withheld, and they continue to be prohibited from providing any input before decisions are made.

Generally speaking, public officials are immune from lawsuits for the actions they take, assuming they have been done in good faith. But that can hardly be said about this proposed development where they seem to be giving away the City in order to save a badly flawed proposal. And they certainly can't say they weren't warned. The people who dealt with NOVUS in Sunset Hills said "*Beware, you're dealing with sharks,*" and that these latest changes are right out of the NOVUS playbook.

Consequently, members of this Council could rack up millions of dollars in personal liability. Mr. Sullivan stated he thinks the time has come to put an end to this proposed development.

David Harris, 8039 Gannon, University City, MO

Mr. Harris stated he has identified three additional concerns about this project since he last spoke at the January 14th Council meeting regarding the contents of the Redevelopment Agreement.

1. The cost-benefit analysis for the project contains a serious mistake pertaining to the sales tax revenue available to the City as a result of this project. It appears as though this mistake was made because PGAV's analysis depicts U City as being a point of sales city rather than a pool city. *(A point of sales city keeps most of the sales taxes it collects; a pool city only receives a percentage of the 1% County-wide sales tax and 1/2% capital improvement sales tax based on its population.)* And based on that analysis PGAV estimated that those two taxes would generate roughly \$30 million dollars in revenue for U City when in reality it will only generate \$2.5 million; a difference of more than \$27 million dollars. Mr. Harris stated he prepared a table comparing PGAV's annual sales tax estimates to the corrected estimates. The corrected estimates accept PGAV's sales projections but use the actual sales tax factors for a pool city rather than a point of sale city.
2. The City's administration is planning to pay TIF obligations with expected tax revenue from the project, even though there is no requirement to do so, and the expectation was that this revenue would be used to benefit the residents of U City. Perhaps, there is a good reason behind such a plan, but that rationale has not been explained or even mentioned in the cost-benefit analysis, the TIF Commission hearings or any other public forum.
3. The increased cost for public safety that will not be paid for by the project. One of the biggest concerns cited with these types of subsidized projects is that other taxpayers are burdened with extra costs. That is why since the very first TIF meeting he has asked the Commission and Council on numerous occasions what increased costs might U City or any other taxing districts incur from this project that will not be funded by the project? Ultimately, during a meeting with the City Manager on July 3, 2018, he was informed that this project would generate an increase of six to seven officers at a cost of \$450,000 per year and that there would be no increase in fire protection costs. Mr. Rose further explained that Prop P; which is estimated to produce \$750,000 a year, would provide the money needed to cover these increased costs and still have a substantial amount leftover. Mr. Harris stated his initial thoughts were that Mr. Rose had been referring to the Prop P revenue generated by the project, but now understands that the development's Prop P revenue will be less than \$10,000 a year. Therefore, the City will be supporting this project with a \$450,000 subsidy paid for by the residents rather than the project. Mr. Harris stated these concerns call into serious question the economic benefit of the project. And while he acknowledges that some of the concerns he has expressed could be incorrect, there is no doubt that the City needs a more specific reply and analysis from the consultants than what has been received thus far. So he would implore Council to initiate an open dialogue in Study Sessions or a series of public meetings to discuss every aspect of this project. If we are going to pursue this development, and this Council has been unquestionably unanimous in support of it, then residents deserve to have a good deal. *(Mr. Harris asked that his written comments and the sales tax table be included in the minutes for this meeting.)*

Kathy Straatmann, 6855 Plymouth Avenue, University City, MO

Ms. Straatmann stated as a resident of the 3rd Ward she would like to emphasize that Sonya Pointer does not speak for everyone in that Ward. Obviously, a few kinks have arisen, but she hopes they can be worked out and the City can proceed as planned. So she would like to thank Council and this administration for all of their hard work on this project.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J. CONSENT AGENDA – Vote Required

1. Street Sweeper Purchase
2. Capital Improvement Program Amendment – Parking Study

Councilmember Hales moved that both items be approved, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.

K. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

BILLS

1. **BILL 9377 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 400 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, RELATING TO ZONING, BY AMENDING SECTION 400.3080 – NON-CONFORMING LOTS OF RECORD AND SECTION 400.1020 – LOT AREA AND WIDTH EXCEPTIONS, RELATING TO DISTRICT REGULATIONS; CONTAINING A SAVINGS CLAUSE AND PROVIDING A PENALTY.** Bill Number 9377 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Carr moved to approve, seconded by Councilmember McMahon.

Roll Call Vote Was:

Ayes: Councilmember Carr, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Clay, and Mayor Crow.

Nays: None.

2. **BILL 9378 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 400 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, RELATING TO ZONING, BY AMENDING SECTION 400. 3090 – NON-CONFORMING STRUCTURES, RELATING TO DISTRICT REGULATIONS; CONTAINING A SAVINGS CLAUSE AND PROVIDING A PENALTY.** Bill Number 9378 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Carr moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick.

Roll Call Vote Was:

Ayes: Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Clay, Councilmember Carr, and Mayor Crow.

Nays: None.

M. NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTIONS

Introduced by Councilmember Carr

1. **Resolution 2019-1:** Budget Amendment # 2 - Fiscal Year 2018-2019. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and carried unanimously.

Introduced by Councilmember Smotherson

2. **Resolution 2019-2:** Defer Payment of Refuse Service Collection Fees by Federal Employees working without pay or on furlough during the partial shutdown of the United States Government. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Carr and carried unanimously.

BILLS

Introduced by Councilmember Hales

3. **BILL 9380** – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SCHEDULE III OF THE TRAFFIC CODE, TO REVISE TRAFFIC REGULATION AS PROVIDED HEREIN; (*Trinity Parking*). Bill Number 9380 was read for the first time.

N. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions

Councilmember Smotherson stated as the liaison for the Commission on Human Relations he would like to bring staffs attention to the fact that there was an incident that took place last summer which led to their decision to no longer have meetings. Obviously, this is an issue that needs to be addressed, so he would like to know when this Commission is scheduled to be reviewed by Council and staff. Mr. Rose stated a review of the Human Relations Commission has tentatively been scheduled for the first part of March because there are a number of Study Sessions that must occur first, in order to identify Council's priorities related to the budget process.

Councilmember Clay stated he would like to acknowledge the newly elected officers of the Senior Commission who were elected at last week's meeting; Wayne Flesh, Chairperson and Gloria Nickerson, Vice Chair. Councilmember Clay thanked both of them for stepping up to lead this group.

AARP is offering tax preparation services for seniors, and perhaps, non-seniors if they have the capacity to assist them. Additional information can be obtained from the Senior Services Coordinator, Marcia Mermelstein.

Councilmember McMahon stated December was Steve Goldstein's last meeting as a member of the Parks Commission, so he would like to thank him for all of the hard work he has put in over the last two years. Of course, that also means there is an opening on the Parks Commission if anyone is interested in stepping up to serve.

3. Boards, Commissions, and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business

O. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)

P. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember McMahon stated his wife's business did purchase some property in the 3rd Ward and those properties were renovated and purchased by some very nice families. Her purpose for buying this property was to help the 3rd Ward grow and sustain their neighborhoods because that's how invested his family is in this community. So it's not a conflict of interest to make such an investment, in fact, it's something that anybody in this community can do; including Ms. Pointer. And it's certainly not toxic when you're willing to admit the things you do; that are also a matter of record. He stated his wife no longer owns this property, but if Ms. Pointer still wants to suggest there's a conflict of interest, then he would challenge her to find it. Councilmember McMahon stated he is proud of his wife and her commitment to this community and for someone to suggest the opposite is insulting.

**Q. Roll-Call vote to go into a Closed Council Session according to RSMo 610.021 (1):
Legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys.**

Councilmember Hales made a motion to go into a Closed Session; it was seconded by Councilmember Carr.

Roll Call Vote Was:

Ayes: Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Clay, Councilmember Carr, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, and Mayor Crow.

Nays: None.

R. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Crow thanked everyone for coming out on such a cold evening and closed the regular City Council meeting at 7:00 p.m. to go into a Closed Session on the second floor. The Closed Session reconvened in an open session at 7:41 p.m.

LaRette Reese
City Clerk

Please include in minutes

Jerrold Tiers 7345 Chamberlain

It seems that the Council, and the City, may have received bad advice from consultants with respect to the proposed Olive and I-170 project. At least one consultant appears to have made very serious mistakes. That is not what one expects from a competent paid consultant.

As a result, the predicted tax income from the project appears to be considerably overstated. It seems clear that the proposed \$70 million of TIF bonds cannot be paid off with the resources actually available. By my calculations, the project would need to generate around \$300 million in taxable sales to pay off \$70 million in bonds over the TIF lifetime.

This project needs to happen, with at the minimum, the Costco portion. The average annual sales per-store for Costco is about \$165 million (information from Statista). But that will not support a \$70 million TIF bond issue, and the balance is just not available elsewhere.

However, if the scale of the project can be reduced to work with a TIF of around \$25 million, it looks like it can work and still generate an income to the city, as opposed to requiring out of pocket payments. It would also allow the \$15 million for Ward 3.

According to my rough calculations, after TIF payments, the city could still get over a million dollars more in general fund money. Then, \$750,000 per year could be made available for Ward 3 and still leave a net income for general purposes. Over 20 years, that would equal the \$15 million that this project was supposed to provide.

Alternately, a \$10 million municipal bond issue, backed by part of the 170 development sales tax income, could cost about \$900,000 per year over 20 years, and still leave net income to the city. That would provide \$10 million immediately in a lump sum, similar to the original plan, but costs more. The City has decent credit, and should get a good bond interest rate.

The exact amounts are somewhat variable, depending on details that are not known to me. But either way, it looks as if that scale of TIF contribution is credibly possible.

These alternatives are, unfortunately, not the originally promised deal. But if the reduced scale of development can work, it would be better than the city having to pay out tax money that we now receive, on top of not getting any direct income from the development. And it would be much better than the project failing.

The city really needs an independent outside evaluation of the project costs and predicted revenues before moving forward with any further commitments on this project.

Statement to University City Council about Olive-170 Redevelopment Project
January 28, 2019

Good evening. My name is David Harris. My address is 8039 Gannon. I am here to speak about the proposed Olive-170 Redevelopment Project.

Since January 14, when I spoke at the Council meeting regarding my concerns about the contents of the Redevelopment Agreement, I have learned three major new concerns about the project.

Here is the first major new concern. The Cost Benefit Analysis for the project contains a serious mistake about the sales tax revenue available to us from the project. Sales tax revenue from the project will be less than half of the amount estimated. The difference is more than \$27 million. This amount is significant revenue we thought we would be getting from the project and now we will not.

It appears the sales tax mistake was made because PGAV Planners considered University City a point-of-sale city instead of a pool city. A point-of-sale city keeps most of the sales taxes that it collects. A pool city puts the 1% Countywide Sales Tax and the 0.5% (1/2 percent) Capital Improvement Sales Tax into a pool and receives back a percentage of those taxes based on population.

PGAV estimated these two taxes would bring us about \$30 million. Actually, they will bring us about \$2.5 million, a decrease of over \$27 million.

I prepared a table that compares PGAV's annual sales tax estimates to corrected estimates. The corrected estimates accept PGAV's sales projections but use the actual sales tax factors for U. City being a pool city instead of a point-of-sale city. I will leave a copy of this table.

The second major concern is that the City administration is planning to pay TIF Obligations with expected tax revenue from the project that are not required to be used to pay TIF Obligations. This plan makes no sense. Maybe there is a good reason for it. However, that reason has not been explained and this plan was never mentioned in the Cost Benefit Analysis or during the TIF Commission meetings or other public forums. This expected revenue was supposed to benefit us, not pay TIF Obligations.

The third major concern is the increased cost for public safety at the project that will not be paid for by the project. Since the first TIF Commission meeting on April 18, 2018, I asked the Commission, and this Council, several times what increased costs might U. City or other taxing districts incur from the project (for instance, for public safety) that will not be funded from the project? I asked that question because one of the biggest concerns cited with these types of subsidized projects is that other taxpayers are burdened with extra costs. In a meeting with City Manager Rose on July 3, 2018, he said the increase in police would be 6 to 7 officers, at a cost of \$450,000 per year, and no increase in fire protection costs. He explained, however, that Prop P would produce \$750,000 per year so we will have the money to cover the increased costs with a substantial amount leftover. I thought he meant our Prop P revenue from the project would be \$750,000 per year. Now I understand our Prop P revenue from the project will be less than \$10,000 per year. Therefore, we will be supporting the project with another \$450,000 subsidy that is paid for by us and not by the project.

These concerns call into serious question the economic benefit of the project for us.

I recognize we could be wrong about these concerns. But we will need a more specific reply and analysis from the City Administration and consultants than what we have received so far. I implore the Council to have an open dialogue in study sessions or a series of public meetings about all aspects of the project, including its economics and the contents of the Redevelopment Agreement. If we are going to have this project, and this Council has been unquestioningly unanimous in support of it, then we deserve a good deal not a bad deal.

I would appreciate my comments and the sales tax table I prepared being included with the minutes of this meeting. Thank you.

**Table 8 from Redevelopment Project Area One Cost/Benefit Analysis dated 6/4/2018 prepared by PGAV Planners
 Contribution to Sales Tax Pool From City EATs (Economic Activity Taxes) Not Captured by TIF
 Corrected by David J. Harris based on information received from Greg Pace and others. 1/28/2019**

Footnotes from PGAV Table 8

These projections are based on a series of assumptions and should be used only to provide an indication of how the project may perform. These projections represent revenues estimated to be allocated to each affected taxing jurisdiction. Revenue estimates associated with the University City Countywide Sales Tax and the University City Capital Improvements Sales Tax are net of the contribution to the County sales tax pool associated with each of these sales taxes.

City Retained Portion of Sales Tax		PGAV	Corrected		% Comparison	% Comparison	% Comparison
Sales Tax		Assumptions	Actual		Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV
Countywide	1.00%	84.70%	4.707%		5.56%	8.20%	48.60%
Capital Improvement	0.50%	85.00%	11.446%		13.47%		
Parks	0.50%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Fire Protection	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Econ. Development	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Base Sales		\$5,820,000	\$5,820,000				
Year		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Total Sales (from Table 7)		\$120,054,688	\$158,051,400	\$173,600,387	\$186,447,027	\$194,011,936	\$201,985,948
Total Taxable Sales	97.00%	\$116,453,047	\$153,309,858	\$168,392,375	\$180,853,616	\$188,191,578	\$195,926,370
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from PGAV Assumptions							
Countywide	1.00%	517,826	673,915	737,789	790,563	821,639	854,396
Capital Improvement	0.50%	259,830	338,151	370,201	396,681	412,275	428,711
Parks	0.50%	305,683	397,825	435,531	466,684	485,029	504,366
Fire Protection	0.25%	152,841	198,912	217,765	233,342	242,514	252,183
Econ. Development	0.25%	152,841	198,912	217,765	233,342	242,514	252,183
Total		\$1,389,022	\$1,807,715	\$1,979,053	\$2,120,612	\$2,203,972	\$2,291,839
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	28,777	37,451	41,001	43,934	45,661	47,481
Capital Improvement	0.50%	34,988	45,535	49,851	53,417	55,516	57,730
Parks	0.50%	305,683	397,825	435,531	466,684	485,029	504,366
Fire Protection	0.25%	152,841	198,912	217,765	233,342	242,514	252,183
Econ. Development	0.25%	152,841	198,912	217,765	233,342	242,514	252,183
Total		\$675,131	\$878,636	\$961,914	\$1,030,718	\$1,071,235	\$1,113,943
Difference between PGAV Assumptions and Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	489,049	636,464	696,789	746,629	775,978	806,915
Capital Improvement	0.50%	224,842	292,616	320,350	343,265	356,758	370,981
Parks	0.50%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire Protection	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ. Development	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		\$713,891	\$929,080	\$1,017,139	\$1,089,894	\$1,132,737	\$1,177,896

**Table 8 from Redevelopment Project Area One Cost/Benefit Analysis dated 6/4/2018 prepared by PGAV Planners
Contribution to Sales Tax Pool From City EATs (Economic Activity Taxes) Not Captured by TIF
Corrected by David J. Harris based on information received from Greg Pace and others. 1/28/2019**

Footnotes from PGAV Table 8

These projections are based on a series of assumptions and should be used only to provide an indication of how the project may perform. These projections represent revenues estimated to be allocated to each affected taxing jurisdiction. Revenue estimates associated with the University City Countywide Sales Tax and the University City Capital Improvements Sales Tax are net of the contribution to the County sales tax pool associated with each of these sales taxes.

City Retained Portion of Sales Tax		PGAV	Corrected		% Comparison	% Comparison	% Comparison
Sales Tax		Assumptions	Actual		Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV
Countywide	1.00%	84.70%	4.707%		5.56%	8.20%	48.60%
Capital Improvement	0.50%	85.00%	11.446%		13.47%		
Parks	0.50%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Fire Protection	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Econ. Development	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Base Sales		\$5,820,000	\$5,820,000				
Year		2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Total Sales (from Table 7)		\$205,005,807	\$206,045,865	\$208,106,324	\$210,187,387	\$212,289,261	\$214,412,154
Total Taxable Sales	97.00%	\$198,855,633	\$199,864,489	\$201,863,134	\$203,881,765	\$205,920,583	\$207,979,789
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from PGAV Assumptions							
Countywide	1.00%	866,801	871,074	879,538	888,087	896,721	905,442
Capital Improvement	0.50%	434,936	437,080	441,327	445,616	449,949	454,325
Parks	0.50%	511,689	514,211	519,208	524,254	529,351	534,499
Fire Protection	0.25%	255,845	257,106	259,604	262,127	264,676	267,250
Econ. Development	0.25%	255,845	257,106	259,604	262,127	264,676	267,250
Total		\$2,325,115	\$2,336,576	\$2,359,280	\$2,382,212	\$2,405,373	\$2,428,766
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	48,170	48,408	48,878	49,353	49,833	50,318
Capital Improvement	0.50%	58,568	58,857	59,429	60,006	60,590	61,179
Parks	0.50%	511,689	514,211	519,208	524,254	529,351	534,499
Fire Protection	0.25%	255,845	257,106	259,604	262,127	264,676	267,250
Econ. Development	0.25%	255,845	257,106	259,604	262,127	264,676	267,250
Total		\$1,130,117	\$1,135,687	\$1,146,722	\$1,157,868	\$1,169,126	\$1,180,496
Difference between PGAV Assumptions and Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	818,631	822,666	830,660	838,734	846,888	855,124
Capital Improvement	0.50%	376,368	378,223	381,898	385,610	389,359	393,146
Parks	0.50%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire Protection	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ. Development	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		\$1,194,999	\$1,200,889	\$1,212,558	\$1,224,344	\$1,236,247	\$1,248,270

**Table 8 from Redevelopment Project Area One Cost/Benefit Analysis dated 6/4/2018 prepared by PGAV Planners
 Contribution to Sales Tax Pool From City EATs (Economic Activity Taxes) Not Captured by TIF
 Corrected by David J. Harris based on information received from Greg Pace and others. 1/28/2019**

Footnotes from PGAV Table 8

These projections are based on a series of assumptions and should be used only to provide an indication of how the project may perform. These projections represent revenues estimated to be allocated to each affected taxing jurisdiction. Revenue estimates associated with the University City Countywide Sales Tax and the University City Capital Improvements Sales Tax are net of the contribution to the County sales tax pool associated with each of these sales taxes.

City Retained Portion of Sales Tax		PGAV	Corrected		% Comparison	% Comparison	% Comparison
Sales Tax		Assumptions	Actual		Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV
Countywide	1.00%	84.70%	4.707%		5.56%	8.20%	48.60%
Capital Improvement	0.50%	85.00%	11.446%		13.47%		
Parks	0.50%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Fire Protection	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Econ. Development	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same		
Base Sales		\$5,820,000	\$5,820,000				
Year		2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037
Total Sales (from Table 7)		\$216,556,275	\$218,721,838	\$220,909,056	\$223,118,147	\$225,349,328	\$227,602,822
Total Taxable Sales	97.00%	\$210,059,587	\$212,160,183	\$214,281,784	\$216,424,603	\$218,588,848	\$220,774,737
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from PGAV Assumptions							
Countywide	1.00%	914,250	923,146	932,131	941,206	950,371	959,629
Capital Improvement	0.50%	458,744	463,208	467,716	472,270	476,869	481,514
Parks	0.50%	539,699	544,950	550,254	555,612	561,022	566,487
Fire Protection	0.25%	269,849	272,475	275,127	277,806	280,511	283,243
Econ. Development	0.25%	269,849	272,475	275,127	277,806	280,511	283,243
Total		\$2,452,392	\$2,476,255	\$2,500,356	\$2,524,699	\$2,549,285	\$2,574,116
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	50,807	51,302	51,801	52,305	52,815	53,329
Capital Improvement	0.50%	61,774	62,375	62,982	63,595	64,215	64,840
Parks	0.50%	539,699	544,950	550,254	555,612	561,022	566,487
Fire Protection	0.25%	269,849	272,475	275,127	277,806	280,511	283,243
Econ. Development	0.25%	269,849	272,475	275,127	277,806	280,511	283,243
Total		\$1,191,979	\$1,203,578	\$1,215,292	\$1,227,124	\$1,239,073	\$1,251,143
Difference between PGAV Assumptions and Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	863,443	871,844	880,330	888,901	897,557	906,300
Capital Improvement	0.50%	396,970	400,833	404,734	408,674	412,654	416,674
Parks	0.50%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire Protection	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ. Development	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		\$1,260,413	\$1,272,677	\$1,285,064	\$1,297,575	\$1,310,211	\$1,322,973

**Table 8 from Redevelopment Project Area One Cost/Benefit Analysis dated 6/4/2018 prepared by PGAV Planners
 Contribution to Sales Tax Pool From City EATs (Economic Activity Taxes) Not Captured by TIF
 Corrected by David J. Harris based on information received from Greg Pace and others. 1/28/2019**

Footnotes from PGAV Table 8

These projections are based on a series of assumptions and should be used only to provide an indication of how the project may perform. These projections represent revenues estimated to be allocated to each affected taxing jurisdiction. Revenue estimates associated with the University City Countywide Sales Tax and the University City Capital Improvements Sales Tax are net of the contribution to the County sales tax pool associated with each of these sales taxes.

City Retained Portion of Sales Tax		PGAV	Corrected		% Comparison	% Comparison	% Comparison
Sales Tax		Assumptions	Actual		Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV	Actual/PGAV
Countywide	1.00%	84.70%	4.707%		5.56%	8.20%	48.60%
Capital Improvement	0.50%	85.00%	11.446%		13.47%		
Parks	0.50%	100.00%	100.00%		same	same	
Fire Protection	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same	same	
Econ. Development	0.25%	100.00%	100.00%		same	same	
Base Sales		\$5,820,000	\$5,820,000				
Year		2038	2039	2040	2041*		Totals
Total Sales (from Table 7)		\$229,878,850	\$232,177,638	\$234,499,415	\$236,844,409		\$4,555,855,962
Total Taxable Sales	97.00%	\$222,982,485	\$225,212,309	\$227,464,433	\$229,739,077		\$4,419,180,283
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from PGAV Assumptions							
Countywide	1.00%	968,979	978,422	987,960	1,720,533		\$19,980,418
Capital Improvement	0.50%	486,205	490,944	495,729	860,267		\$10,022,547
Parks	0.50%	572,006	577,581	583,211	860,267		\$11,639,420
Fire Protection	0.25%	286,003	288,790	291,606	430,133		\$5,819,710
Econ. Development	0.25%	286,003	288,790	291,606	430,133		\$5,819,710
Total		\$2,599,196	\$2,624,527	\$2,650,111	\$4,301,333		\$53,281,804
City Retained Portion of Sales Tax from Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	53,849	54,373	54,903	95,615	5.56%	\$1,110,364
Capital Improvement	0.50%	65,472	66,110	66,754	115,843	13.47%	\$1,349,624
Parks	0.50%	572,006	577,581	583,211	860,267	100.00%	\$11,639,420
Fire Protection	0.25%	286,003	288,790	291,606	430,133	100.00%	\$5,819,710
Econ. Development	0.25%	286,003	288,790	291,606	430,133	100.00%	\$5,819,710
Total		\$1,263,333	\$1,275,645	\$1,288,080	\$1,931,990	48.31%	\$25,738,827
Difference between PGAV Assumptions and Actual							
Countywide	1.00%	915,130	924,048	933,056	1,624,918	94.44%	\$18,870,054
Capital Improvement	0.50%	420,733	424,834	428,975	744,424	86.53%	\$8,672,923
Parks	0.50%	0	0	0	0	0.00%	\$0
Fire Protection	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0.00%	\$0
Econ. Development	0.25%	0	0	0	0	0.00%	\$0
Total		\$1,335,863	\$1,348,882	\$1,362,031	\$2,369,343	51.69%	\$27,542,977
*PGAV Table 8 for 2041 should be: Countywide 1,476,558; Capital Imp 740,892; Parks 871,639; Fire 435,810; Econ Dev 435,810; a total of \$3,960,709 based on the Table 7 data for 2041. The "actual" amounts were adjusted to match with the PGAV Table 8 amounts so that the difference for 2041 should be approximately correct even if the individual amounts are not quite correct.							

