



Department of Planning and Development

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8500, Fax: (314) 862-3168

MINUTES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING

Heman Park Community Center

975 Pennsylvania Avenue, University City, MO 63130

6:30 pm; Thursday January 16, 2020

Ms. Marin called the meeting to order at 6:32 PM.

Roll Call

Present:

Donna Leach

Donna Marin, Chair

Bill Chilton

Robert Klahr

Sandy Jacobson

Christine Mackey-Ross

Absent:

Esley Hamilton

Adam Brown, Planner

Clifford Cross, Director of Planning and Development

Council Liaison, Tim Cusick

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. The minutes from the HPC work session meeting on 11/21/2019 were approved unanimously.

2. Old Business

- a. **File Number:** 19-00711

Address: 711 Kingsland Avenue, University City, MO

Applicant: Tristar Companies LLC

Property Owner: Tristar Companies LLC

Request: Demolition Permit Review

The Commission met with Tri-Star at a work session on December 19, 2019. At that meeting Tri-Star presented their plan to renovate the Harvard School Building for office use and demolish the Delmar School building to be replaced with a hotel.

Mr. Chilton moved to amend the agenda to include discussion of the proper sequence for the HPC approval of design review for conformance. Ms. Jacobson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Chilton explained that the initial discussion of demolition begun at the last meeting (work session on 12/19/19) followed by design review. He stated that if there was a sound proposal as to why the Delmar building needed to be demolished, but the design of the new building was not approved, the City could end up with a vacant lot. Ms. Marin summarized that the HPC should consider the design of the new building before approving the demolition.

Ms. Mackey-Ross moved to discuss the design first, then approve demolition. Ms. Jacobson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Chilton expressed concern that the HPC was not properly prepared for this presentation because the commission members had not received additional information that was requested from the developers at the December work session. He stated that the agenda was the only information provided, and that the commission would have to rely on information from the work session. Ms. Leach said she had requested an engineer's report for why the building should be demolished, and that she would not be convinced without this report.

Michael Towerman of TriStar Properties said they were happy to participate in the work session in December as there was no quorum. He said that their team had incorporated the comments from Mr. Chilton and Ms. Leach into the current designs which they would be presenting at this meeting. He stated that they had not committed to providing an engineer's report.

Toby Heddinghaus from the Gray Design Group explained that the feedback from the study session in December had been incorporated into the design. He demonstrated a series of new renderings and drawings, including requested renderings from various directions showing the proposed new building in the context of the Civic Plaza as well as sections showing the relative elevations of the existing and proposed buildings.

He noted that the Tru Hotel brand is generally not brick, but mostly EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finish System). In this case, the building proposed is mostly brick with bricks selected to match to colors of nearby buildings. He also noted that, per the commission's request from the study session, the pattern of lighter and darker bricks had been reversed, making the building more closely match those around it. He also noted the brick details such as soldier courses over the windows. He noted that the Tru brand colors had been minimized in the design. He contended that the renderings and sections demonstrated the low visual impact the hotel would have on the area.

Mr. Heddinghaus showed new landscape drawings including a landscaping buffer between the parking lot of the new development and Kingsland Avenue. He said the stone wall that runs along the sidewalk would be maintained except for the section to be removed for vehicle access from Kingsland. The stone that is removed will be used to recreate pilasters to match the existing design.

Mr. Chilton asked to confirm there is a fourteen-foot height difference between the Lewis Center and proposed hotel. He asked about the brand and design, and whether the architects could pursue any further changes to be more in keeping with the context of the historic Civic Plaza. He gave the example of the angled wall treatment and the modern, plain windows with little articulation as design elements that could be improved upon.

Ms. Marin stated that the proposed hotel in the renderings dominates the site and competes with City Hall and may not be consistent with the rest of the plaza.

Ms. Leach stated that parents of Wash U students would not stay in a hotel of this quality. Mr. Heddinghaus said that all of the potential partners they had spoken with were in favor of the Tru brand. Mr. Klahr noted that the choice of hotel brand is not the purview of this commission.

Mr. Towerman described the process by which the brand and design were chosen, including a review of about 40 other Tru brand hotel designs throughout the U.S. In his estimation, this design represents the most conservative of all the Tru hotels they had viewed.

Mr. Heddinghaus said the three Tru brand features are the angled wall, which, in other hotels, further off the main structure, the “racing stripes” which were removed in this design, and the blue and yellow branding colors which have been significantly reduced to the circular brand sign and the canopy over the entrance. He said there is a high likelihood that Tru would give up the blue and yellow canopy elements to match the brick colors. He shared some brick samples they had used in the design. Mr. Towerman said these samples demonstrated the care taken to match brick in the design to the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Towerman said that the viewpoint from the parking lot across Kingsland would not be a common view of the building. He noted that the developers had taken care to anticipate the impact of the hotel from the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ms. Leach asked if any of the trees in the landscaping plan would be taller trees that would approach the height of street trees. Thomas Douglas of TriStar said they would be preserving as many of the existing trees as possible, particularly the maples on Kingsland.

Ms. Jacobson said she felt the three elements of the design that do not fit for the Civic Plaza were the contemporary, streamlined look, the dynamic aspect of the brown colors, and the height. She felt that this building challenges City Hall and other buildings around it. She also disagreed that people the vantage point from the City’s parking lot across Kingsland was not an important view – she felt many people would view the building from that location.

Mr. Heddinghaus noted that the height was close to the surrounding buildings and not substantially taller than the existing Delmar Building.

Mr. Klahr asked for clarification of the height differential at grade between the existing and new building, as well as the difference in size between the footprint of the existing and proposed structures.

Mr. Heddinghaus shared that the top of the proposed building is 588' above sea level and the current Delmar building is 568' above sea level, while the new building would be two stories taller. He noted that the footprint of the proposed new building would be longer but not significantly larger than the existing building.

Ms. Mackey-Ross made a plea for the removal of the blue awning. She said she appreciated the absence of the "racing stripes".

Mr. Towerman said that Tri-Star's partner in the project said that Tru may give up the colors in the canopy. Mr. Heddinghaus said it would be changed to bronze instead of blue, and the yellow element would become either bronze or red brick. Mr. Klahr clarified that the angled wall in the design would be bronze. Mr. Heddinghaus said the angled element would be either metal or EIFS, and that the dark bronze colors would match in any case. He noted that in his experience it can be a worse outcome to try and create a classical look when the building is modern. He further described the detail elements around the windows, as well as the areas of transition between the alternating brick colors, each with a soldier course of bricks at the transition point.

Ms. Leach asked what the building would look like at night. Mr. Heddinghaus said there would be understated but dramatic upward light which would graze the brick, and some light under the entrance canopy.

Ms. Jacobson asked what the developer meant by stating that this was a "pedestrian-oriented" hotel. Mr. Heddinghaus said Tru hotels have active lobbies with limited food service. This would encourage guests to head on foot to the shops and restaurants in the Loop district nearby. Mr. Heddinghaus also clarified the choice of office and hotel uses as being complementary in terms of their parking needs. Ms. Jacobson clarified that the parking lot across the street was part of the proposal. Mr. Heddinghaus confirmed this.

Mr. Cross clarified the process. This is the first step in the process: review by the HPC. The developers would then come before the Plan Commission for a planned development concept plan and re-zoning application for a Planned Unit Development. The shared parking ratios, additional lighting and landscaping, and similar details would be considered as part of that process. Anything that came from the HPC will be a recommendation and would not be set in stone. There are still changes that can take place throughout the process.

Ms. Marin referenced the Zoning Code, Chapter 400, Article VI, in regards to Historic Landmarks and Districts under Intent and Purpose, #1: "...to identify and preserve the distinctive historic and architectural characteristics of University City which represent elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political, and architectural history..." She said this case is not just about a building, but about the social, economic, and architectural history. She also cited the same article and section, #2, "...fostering civic pride in the beauty and noble accomplishments of the past..." She said that tearing

down the Delmar building we would lose a noble accomplishment, and that the proposed replacement would not be a “noble accomplishment” that would fit in with the Civic Center.

Mr. Klahr asked if the Commission would now discuss the demolition or if the design would be voted on before moving to the discussion of demolition. Mr. Cross recommended two separate actions that needed to take place; a recommendation for the demolition, which would be permitted by the Zoning Administrator based on the recommendation, and the comment and review on the design, which would ultimately be a recommendation to City Council. Ms. Marin noted that if demolition was recommended and occurred, but the design was inadequate, the City could be left with an empty lot. Mr. Cross noted that the applicants could request a stand-alone demolition without a proposed design. Mr. Cross said if the commission was not going to approve the design, they may want to deny the demolition. Mr. Klahr stated the reason for his question was to determine whether it would be more efficient to allow the developers to present their case for the demolition before moving to public comments.

Ms. Marin began the public comment period.

Jen Jenson, 706 Pennsylvania, requested that if the Delmar building was demolished the developer would save the tiled murals (which she believed were done by Ittner) on the sides of the buildings, and that these be donated to the School District or the City. She also asked that the developers consider turning the Delmar building into a hotel.

Barbara Chicerio, 720 Harvard, said that she was saddened that the building would possibly be taken down and replaced with the proposed hotel. She said she would love to see the building repurposed. She also said that as an environmentalist it concerns her that the windows to the hotel would not open. She felt the design did not fit well with the Civic Plaza. She said she was opposed to the demolition, and if it was to be demolished, she felt the design needed a lot of work.

Dean Smith, 6934 Dartmouth, felt that it would be interesting to make something around the Civic Plaza, which he said is the “beating heart” of our historic district. He said the buildings are anchors to the neighborhood. He suggested the building should be lower, that a sloped roof could make it appear lower, and that the current design elements make it look more vertical – he suggested a single-color brick façade and possibly dormer windows.

Cirri Morran, 6652 Kingsbury, said she lives three blocks from the Civic Plaza and attended Delmar Harvard. She agreed with Ms. Marin that the buildings reflect the political, historic, and cultural aspirations of the City of University City. She said she was not opposed to change. She felt a hotel would be good for the area. However, she felt that to take down an Ittner-designed building and replacing it with a “cookie-cutter” building. She asked the developer to think outside the box, and not build something that was an “institutional box.”

Ms. Chicerio asked what the back of the proposed hotel would look like. Mr. Heddinghaus said the back would be a mirror image of the front.

Mr. Chilton asked to read from a book on University City Landmarks and Historic Places. He read a passage from the book describing the history of the Delmar and Harvard Buildings, which were designed by William B. Ittner, who designed all but three of University City's schools. Mr. Chilton asked then to read some of the district standards to refresh the commission's memory of the criteria they were working with. He read paragraph 2 of the District standards, Chapter 400.1760, subsection A, 2: "No specific architectural style shall be required for the construction of a new building, building addition or other structure; but the Commission shall not approve such proposed undertaking unless it makes a determination that it is compatible with other buildings and structures in the district, and with open spaces to which may be visually related in terms of form, proportion, scale, configuration, arrangement of openings, rhythm of elements, architectural details, building materials, texture, color and location on the lot."

Ms. Marin asked for guidance from staff on the next step. Mr. Cross recommended that the commission act on both matters as separate actions at the same time. He noted that with demolition recommended, staff would most likely approve a demolition permit. The applicant could then appeal to the Board of Adjustment and the decision would be made by Council.

Mr. Towerman began a presentation on the demolition of the Delmar Building. He said the windows were not designed to be operable, but it was not a design request from the developer. He stated that the first idea for the Delmar building when Tri-Star bought it was to try and turn it into a hotel. He stated that Tri-Star would love to save the building but could not figure out a feasible way to do this. He said there are presently eight (8) Ittner buildings they could find that were sitting vacant in the St. Louis region. These eight buildings have been vacant for an average of thirteen (13) years. He said the average asking price per square foot in these buildings was \$5.80 per square foot, while the cost to construct the building new would be an estimated \$40/square foot.

Mr. Douglas showed several examples of historic schools that Tri-Starr was in the process of developing. He then listed the reasons why the renovating the Delmar School would not be a feasible project. These included the building being below grade so that the lowest floor is partially underground, the aging mechanical systems above the drop ceilings, the structural damage due to settling and demonstrated by cracking in the foundation and walls, the low ceilings in the basement floor and lack of natural light in the building as a whole (due to windows mostly in hallways), the lack of reasonable handicap accessibility and the design of large hallways which would not be usable space.

He showed a diagram of the usable versus common space. Barely over fifty percent of the gross space would be usable, according to Tri-Star's calculations. He demonstrated that the other schools being developed by Tri-Star had designs with central hallways that made a hotel a feasible economic use.

Mr. Towerman re-capped the challenges to renovation – the structural damage, the subterranean floor, the limited natural light, the limited usable space, and the limited accessibility. He then stated that if they could make the Delmar building a usable office, which would have been the easiest re-use, given the constraints of the space Tristar

would need to charge about \$46 per square foot. He said the average office rent in the Loop was about \$18 per square foot. He stated that if they could not develop this building, it would sit vacant for a long time. He stated that the Harvard building would be renovated regardless of the Commission's decision, but that a vacant building would not be good for the community.

Ms. Leach asked if the two buildings could have been a hotel instead of one being an office space. Mr. Douglas explained an indenture line in the middle of the lot would limit the uses.

Ms. Jacobson asked if this would be a candidate for historic tax credits. Mr. Douglas said the building would have to be nominated for the national historic registry. Mr. Towerman said that the office use for both buildings would make parking infeasible.

Ms. Jacobson said that the Ittner buildings they used as examples were in economically disadvantaged areas. Ms. Mackey-Ross and Mr. Klahr said that in Clayton at the highest end of the market there would not be \$46/square foot.

Mr. Towerman stated that they like the project because the Loop is such a cool area, and the walkability of a hotel in the neighborhood is a positive amenity.

Ms. Mackey-Ross stated that she was resigned to the fact that this building would be demolished due to economic conditions. She said that as committee members they must approve projects, and she said that the proposed building and what it looks like were the problem – not just the hotel use.

Ms. Marin asked if, like some buildings in midtown, they could preserve the façade of the building. She said she was not against the hotel. She applauded the applicant's efforts with this hotel, but she felt this design was too jarring of an impact. She said that the commission are willing to compromise, but they did not want just any hotel.

Mr. Towerman said that he had been in this position in another community. He said they do not have any pride of authorship and that it was Tri-Star's intent to fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. Cross noted that University City does not have an architectural design committee although this could potentially come out of the Comprehensive Planning process.

Mr. Klahr asked if the Tru brand would allow striping of bricks in a horizontal direction.

Ms. Marin asked what the commitment was to Tru Brand hotel.

Mr. Towerman stated that Gary Andrews, a prominent hotel consultant in St. Louis, for advice on what type of hotel would be suitable here. Mr. Andrews used deductive reasoning – how many hotel rooms would be on the site, the price point, who the clientele would be, and other competing hotel brands in the area. He said through this process Tru was the brand Mr. Andrews recommended. He stated that if a brand wants to be there bad enough they will bend on the design. He asked for a unified voice from

the commission and said Tri-Star could then incorporate those ideas. He said they were afraid of the project falling off, and that the hotel market may be filling up.

Ms. Leach said that more horizontal lines in the brick work would be helpful – she asked if the Tru brand would be amenable to this idea. Mr. Heddinghaus said he thought it was possible that they would bend on the design. He distinguished between boutique hotels and new build hotels.

Ms. Leach explained that there are other hotel designs out there that would conform more to the Civic Plaza.

Mr. Heddinghaus stated that there were items he could present to the brand including the horizontal brick elements. He again noted

Ms. Marin asked for discussion on whether or not to vote tonight or to postpone.

Ms. Leach asked if the commission could vote on the demolition tonight pending the design element. Mr. Cross said unless they are giving a permit for demolition but recommended that they both items voted on at once, making it clear that once demolition was recommended, a permit could be issued.

Ms. Marin asked if demoltion could be recommended with the condition that the architectural elements would be removed and given to the City or School District or Historical Society.

Mr. Cross said they could set conditions as part of their recommendation such as the preservation of the tiles. Mr. Cross said they were taking action on two separate parts of the Historic Preservation ordinance. He explained that the City defines our historic landmarks and districts and have an additional eleven districts that have their own set of standards. The demolition would involve the general provisions of the ordinance and associated with the permit to demolish. This would be an action that the HPC could take. The design action whether it's consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Cross stated that staff would need very clear documents as to what the design requirements would be.

Mr. Klahr asked the petitioner if the removal of the tiles was feasible.

Toby said that removal of the tiles is feasible, and that they had discussed keeping these on site in the Harvard Building

Mr. Klahr asked Mr. Towerman what their preference with respect to requesting a vote this evening as opposed to a referral to a future meeting to discuss the design elements.

Mr. Marin asked about scheduling a special meeting within two weeks.

Mr. Cross said this could be done as long a quorum could be insured and it was posted properly. He also noted that this is just the start of the process, that there would be

further meetings with the Plan Commission and most likely requirements of a fiscal impact study, traffic study, and parking study from the applicant.

Mr. Towerman asked if the vote tonight for demolition passed based on the HPC's recommendation of design would then be a recommendation to Council.

Mr. Cross said the next steps would be applying for re-zoning for a Planned Development, which would include two actions – a re-zoning to a Planned Development, and preliminary approval of a concept plan. These would be reviewed by the Plan Commission who would make a recommendation to Council. This would be followed by final approval.

Mr. Towerman clarified that the vote tonight would be on demolition subject to further meetings on the design, and that the HPC would remain a recommending body on the design standards. Mr. Cross again clarified that the demolition would not go to Council.

Mr. Klahr stated that even though there are two separate standards as far as the demolition and design, the petition has asked for action on both. The HPC could give an indication that they would recommend in favor of demolition subject to final disposition of the petition as a whole which would include the commission's recommendation with respect to the design elements and how they conform with the district standards. He said it should be treated as a preliminary recommendation with respect to demolition.

Mr. Towerman asked if they could get interim feedback from the commission. Mr. Cross said the iterations could be submitted to him. Ms. Leach said they could submit commissioner comments through Mr. Cross. Ms. Marin said that Mr. Hamilton should be communicated with. Ms. Leach recommended that the petitioners have conversations with people like Ms. Jenson to identify other items that may have historical significance. Mr. Douglas said they would be happy to have discussions with people who were interested in historic preservation, and that on other projects they had worked with people interested in the historical significance of the buildings to preserve elements important to the community.

Mr. Towerman asked if the commission could share images of projects that fit the kinds of changes they would like to be made. He said they could go back to Hilton with a new design and negotiate. He said they may start from a new design instead of continuing to try and tweak the prototype. It would be more like the process of designing a boutique hotel.

Mr. Chilton brought up the district standards in Section 400.1760, paragraph 2 again, and asked the petitioners to use that list of design aspects as a checklist.

Mr. Cross said he would get the ordinance to the petitioners.

Ms. Marin asked for a motion from Mr. Klahr.

Mr. Klahr thanked the petitioners for their flexibility and openness to input from the commissioners. He stated that the designs had come a long way from the work session, and he thanked the public for their input.

Mr. Klahr moved that the commission preliminarily recommend demolition of the Delmar building pursuant to the petition submitted based on the various items identified including the subterranean level of the building, the aging mechanical systems, alterations made which block natural light, limited ADA accessibility, and lack of usable space due to placement of the corridors, but that the demolition should be contingent on satisfactory resolution of the petition for design review by this commission.

Ms. Leach seconded.

Ms. Jacobson clarified that through this vote the commission reserved the right to vote against demolition if they don't achieve a design that meets the standards of the HPC. Mr. Klahr said that ultimately, they could either approve or deny the demolition after design review. Mr. Cross clarified that staff would not issue a demolition permit until the HPC had voted to approve the entire petition.

Mr. Chilton voted nay on an initial vote.

Ms Jacobson asked for further clarification from Mr. Klahr. He stated that a preliminary recommendation for demolition only indicates to the petitioner that the commission would approve demolition subject to approval of a design. When the HPC makes a final vote on the petition they would be able to either approve or deny the demolition as part of the petition. Ms. Leach described it as a conditional vote.

Ms. Marin asked for a roll call vote:

Mr. Chilton voted Nay
Ms. Mackey-Ross voted Aye
Ms Leach voted Aye
Ms. Marin voted Aye
Ms Jacobson voted Nay
Mr. Klahr voted Aye

Vote count was four (4) Ayes, two (2) Nays. The motion carried.

Mr. Cross recommended another action to table the design review for another meeting and said he would poll the commissioners for a meeting time and date.

Ms. Mackey-Ross moved to table the decision of the design. Ms. Leach seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cross encouraged members of the public to contact his office and look at the website for updates on when the meeting would be held. Ms. Marin also stated that if the public is unable to attend the meeting, their comments could be sent to Mr. Cross,

and put into the into record. She also encouraged the commissioners to follow up with design input for the developers.

3. Other business

B. Commisison members attendance

Mr. Cross - Rule 38E of the staff liaison boards and commissions policy manual says that a commission member has more than 3 unexcused absences members can be requested to be removed. Mr. Cross said he would hold members to this policy and have the clerk's office reach out to members who have unexcused absences, and if they fail to respond, Mr. Cross will follow through with the process of removing those members and requesting that Council appoints a new member.

Mr. Chilton noted that we have Esley Hamilton on the commission who is an architectural historian and also a very busy person who has regularly missed meetings. Mr. Hamilton said he had received a thank-you letter for his time on the commission (according to Mr. Chilton), and he thought he was off the commission. Mr. Cross said all the departments are working with the City Clerk's office to clear up some of these mix-ups.

Ms. Leach said she was not notified when she was up for re-nomination.

Mr. Cross said Mr. Rose has begun to have more joint study sessions with the boards and commissions. Mr. Cross said that staff are in the process of bridging gaps from the past.

Mr. Cusick clarified that Ms. Leach had been nominated and approved by City Council. She stated that she has not received a letter to that effect. Ms. Marin is not eligible for re-appointment. The City Clerk clarified that she was not eligible. Ms. Marin clarified that they would sit in their current position until the seat is filled even if the term is up.

Ms. Leach clarified that nomination of Chairperson, Vice Chair, and designated alternate was required. She asked if there was a current vice-chair. Ms. Marin said yes, Esley Hamilton was the Vice-Chair.

Ms. Leach said the Commission would need notification a week before a meeting. Mr. Cross stated the process by which Ms. Mathis was asked to notify the commission. Ms. Leach asked if text was possible. Mr. Cross said yes. Mr. Cross said the agenda will always go to email. He stated that it can also be accessed via the website.

Mr. Chilton stated that he used to have a page in the commission binder listing all the members and that this page needed to be updated. Mr. Cross explained that the City will be hiring a zoning administrator who will be responsible for keeping all the boards and commissions up to date in general. There was discussion about the form in which information would be transmitted from staff to the commission

Mr. Cross stated that the City has seemed inconsistent due to a lack of clear policy and that staff will be writing a policy guide departmentally. Mr. Cross stated that staff could not table a meeting due to lack of materials (as in the case of this Tristar application). There was discussion about developers/petitioners getting the materials to the commission as early as possible. Ms. Marin asked how long a project needed for submittal before being heard by the HPC. Mr. Cross stated the initial application should be at least fifteen days before a meeting. Mr. Cross stated staff would work to get materials from petitioners ten days before the meeting, but there still may be cases where staff does not have all the materials. There was discussion about ways to clarify from petitioners what the HPC would like to see. Mr. Klahr suggested that the standards by which the commission would judge applications should be more clearly indicated to petitioners before the HPC meetings. He also advocated for staff to continue making a staff recommendation.

There was discussion about the standards required for a demolition of a historic structure.

C. Election of officers

Chairperson: Ms. Mackey-Ross nominated Ms. Leach and Ms. Jacobson seconded. The motion carried unanimously

Vice Chair: Ms. Marin nominated Mr. Klahr, Ms. Mackey-Ross seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Alternate: Ms. Leach nominated Mr. Chilton for Alternate, Ms. Mackey-Ross seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Leach asked about publicizing the need for commission members more broadly. Mr. Cross said he would look into the possibility of publicizing the need for commissioners as well as the possibility of a 3rd Term for commissioners.

There was discussion about the requirements for a number of architects or engineers on the commission, and that in Ms. Marin's absence another architect or engineer would need to be nominated to the commission.

4. New Business

5. Council Liaison Report

Mr. Cusick announced the unveiling of student artwork in parking garage

He also noted that the Stormwater Task Force would be presenting their findings to City Council at next council meeting.

Ms. Leach asked about the MSD project. Mr. Cusick said MSD was going back to the drawing board as to how to meet the requirements of the consent decree.

Mr. Cusick said I-170 Development is still on schedule. He said there was an idea of groundbreaking this Spring, but City is still waiting for developer to confirm date with Costco. He noted the City would be opening office in the area to provide relocation assistance. He also said the ten million dollars was still coming to the City.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40PM

Prepared by Adam Brown