



Minutes

Roseville Economic Development Authority (REDA) City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive Tuesday, July 17, 2018

1. Roll Call

President Dan Roe called to order a meeting of the Roseville Economic Development Authority (REDA) in and for the City of Roseville at approximately 6:12 p.m. Voting and Seating Order: Willmus, Etten, McGehee, Laliberte, and Roe.

Present: President Dan Roe and Board Members Robert Willmus, Jason Etten, Tammy McGehee, and Lisa Laliberte.

Others Present: Attorney Martha Ingram, Executive Director Pat Trudgeon, Assistant City Manager Rebecca Olson, Community Development Director Kari Collins, and Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Jeanne Kelsey

2. Approve Agenda

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, adoption of agenda as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

3. Public Comment

4. Business Items

a. Discuss Rice/Larpenteur Funding Scenarios

Community Development Director Collins stated that on November 28, 2016, the City Council obligated TIF District 12 Funds, with a fund balance of \$781,054, for redevelopment and revitalization improvements along the Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue corridor. At that time, the Cities of Roseville, Maplewood, and St. Paul (in partnership with Ramsey County) were working together to engage the community in a yearlong visioning plan for the gateway. Now that the visioning plan is complete, the Cities are beginning discussions to identify where funding may align with short/mid-range goals outlined in the plan. TIF funds are restricted to qualifying redevelopment projects. Examples of qualifying projects may include undergrounding of utilities, improvements to businesses/properties along the corridor, or acquisition/assembly of sub-par buildings and land for redevelopment. She noted that undergrounding utilities has been discussed, as part of the improved streetscape and landscape plans. An initial estimate shows that the fund balance would only cover a portion of the undergrounding costs. There are other options if undergrounding of utilities is not a priority at this time, including smaller scale improvements.

She then invited Public Works Director Culver to speak to the process of undergrounding utilities.

Public Works Director Culver recalled that the City did undertake an undergrounding project in 2013, when the Rice Street interchange with Highway 36 was redone. Xcel continues to say it is more difficult to maintain lines underground rather than above ground. A community can request the undergrounding, but that community is then responsible for the costs. Staff was given a rough cost estimate, and in 2013 there was some cost-sharing with Little Canada as well. The total cost was just under \$500,000. The cities put up about \$120,000 up front, and Xcel financed about \$345,000 through a surcharge on electric bills. Residential customers throughout all of Roseville were charged 54 cents per month for 36 months. Small commercial properties may have been charged as high as \$1.62/month and large commercial properties were charged \$2.16/month during that time frame. It was paid off in 34 or 35 months, because as additional new customers come in, they also have the surcharge and it is paid off sooner.

Public Works Director Culver continued that undergrounding for this project would likely be three times the cost. He does not know if Xcel would extend the repayment period to 48 or 60 months, but it may be an option. There are other complications. There would be additional costs to everyone who has their service on those lines. If there are not new power lines from the distribution line into their building, or if their electrical service is not up to code, that would have to be upgraded in order to connect to the panel. There are potentially significant costs to the property owners as well.

Community Development Director Collins noted that 18% falls within the St. Paul jurisdiction, and there may be a possibility that Maplewood may have to share the costs as well. That would all be fully vetted as part of the process.

Member Etten commented that Ramsey County is rebuilding Rice Street south and then Rice Street north. He asked if it is better to wait until it is being rebuilt.

Public Works Director Culver stated that may potentially be the case.

Community Development Director Collins added that yesterday she received an email from Ramsey County about their plans for Rice Street. The County plans for a full reconstruction up to Larpenteur Ave beginning in 2021. She would encourage the three communities and the County put together a design framework for the corridor so when opportunities do come up, they are not lost out. Prior to any expenditure of funds, that should be task #1, to put that design framework in place.

Member Willmus commented that exploring cost-sharing options should be top priority.

Member McGehee asked how delaying the project until 2021 relates to future pathways in the area.

Public Works Director Culver responded any substantial infrastructure in this area should wait for the project.

Member McGehee stated the crosswalk for the school is her main concern. She also suggested making pedestrian crosswalk signals solar-powered so that the light will flash in a very noticeable manner. She suggested this is a year's worth of design work and planning to see how the whole corridor will look aesthetically.

Community Development Director Collins stated as this moves along, staff can work with other communities to see what pools of funds are available, and also work alongside the Rice Street/Larpenteur Alliance that is being formed from the visioning process. The stakeholder group may have good ideas in how to pull resources for what can be done collectively. The goal tonight is informational and to let the Board know the TIF funds can stay there.

Member McGehee stated her priority is to get a safe crosswalk across Larpenteur to the new school.

Member Laliberte concurred it is important for Roseville in the near term to determine what the City has, in addition to these funds, to devote to the area. It is also important to determine what other communities may contribute and what the County may be doing in addition to road construction. It will not make sense for Roseville to devote money to the west side of the road if it will not happen on the other places as well.

President Roe stated it makes sense to do the undergrounding in conjunction with the street project and it also makes sense to do the outreach to the local property owners who may have to foot some of the bill to do updates to their own service. He would not be supportive of using the entire balance of this fund to pay for a part of undergrounding. That is the least bang for the City's buck. But to the extent it might make sense to help leverage other funds to bring down the balance that would have to go in to the financing program through Xcel, that makes more sense. There are enough short-term smaller projects out there already identified in the vision plan that can be accomplished with a little money from each entity. That school crossing is one of the highest priorities. In conjunction with that, there can be some talk about things like restriping Larpenteur Avenue, potentially reducing lanes, and also looking at speeds. There should not be kids crossing streets to school in a 45mph zone. Also important when moving forward with the Alliance is buy-

in from the business community. There could be leveraging from grant funding or other third-party entities that the Alliance can bring to the table.

President Roe offered an opportunity for public comment.

Public Comment

Roger Hess, 1906 Wagner Place

Mr. Hess stated that even with a crosswalk with lights at the school, that is still a dangerous crossing. What would be better is to find the funds to build a pedestrian bridge. He would like to see the Council focus on crime first. The Police Chief wants to have a sub-station in the Rice Street/Larpenteur area. It would be nice to have the City become five sectors (rather than the existing four) from the hours of 10pm – 5am in order to better address crime. The lighting really needs to be improved. That is why Stargate has problems. There are no problems in the club, but the issue is in the parking lot. The beach and boat landings are incredibly dark, and he encouraged staff to talk to Ramsey County about improving the lighting. It would also be nice to have grants to improve some of the buildings along Rice Street. Lastly, he commented on there are only two areas that would work for combining properties for redevelopment, and one is his property and the one south of it would make one combination. The north would be the gas station, printer, and office building to the north. Those are the only options.

President Roe thanked Mr. Hess for his comments.

b. Review EDA Budget and Tax Levy

Community Development Director Collins provided a brief summary of the budget and tax levy as detailed in the staff report and attachments dated July 17, 2018. She noted that per the by-laws adopted by the Roseville Economic Development Authority (REDA), the REDA must review and recommend a preliminary budget to the City Council. To request a preliminary EDA levy, the REDA must adopt a budget for consideration by the City Council via Resolution. Once the initial EDA levy request is approved, the levy may be lowered but cannot be raised above the preliminary level. The maximum amount the REDA can levy for in 2019 is \$870,999. A preliminary levy of \$622,730 is being proposed for 2019. A preliminary levy of this amount would result in a \$13.29 increase in annual property taxes, or approximately \$1.11 per month for a median valued home of approximately \$254,900. The proposed levy represents a 72.9% increase from the 2018 Levy and operating budget. No additional staff is being proposed in 2019. She highlighted portions of the draft budget, as included as an attachment in the RCA.

President Roe asked whether the Gap Funding is intended to be an ongoing contribution to build up a fund, or whether it is a one-time levy for expenditures for a particular purpose, and then it potentially goes away.

Community Development Director Collins responded it is being proposed to replenish funds used by the McGough project; staff recommends making this a reoccurring line item to stay ahead of future projects.

Member Willmus asked whether SW Roseville initiatives at \$50,000 are one-time or ongoing.

President Roe stated it is ongoing at some level.

Community Development Director Collins concurred.

Member Willmus asked about the reserves and the intent of reserves with the EDA. He recalled the discussion last year that there needs to be some funds there for professional services. He also noted that community development has a fund balance target of 25-50%. He asked whether there is a range with the EDA reserve fund or if it is set at 35%.

City Manager Trudgeon responded that the reserve target is to help with cash flow as taxes are collected. That 35% is what staff has concluded that is the right amount to keep cash flow throughout the year.

Member Etten asked about the current balances on the various funds.

Community Development Director Collins responded that Finance Director Miller did a quick update to fund balances this afternoon. She noted that multi-family housing & development fund has approximately \$1.6 million; general EDA programs fund balance is \$193,800.

Finance Director Miller indicated the proposed \$250,000 in the budget for Rice/Larpenteur and gap funding is funded by tax levy, so depending on the time of when the \$250,000 is being appropriated, some cash will still be needed. He also commented that most of the funds are restricted.

Member Etten asked whether any of the funds are not restricted.

President Roe commented that perhaps the multi-family fund can potentially have the broadest use.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey responded that staff received an opinion from the EDA Attorney on this issue. Since those funds were raised underneath the HRA levy, they can be used for redevelopment. That is why they were used for McGough. However, any of those funds are restricted to only those activities or housing activities. Pretty much all the funds in the HRA balance are restricted.

President Roe asked whether they can be used for paying salaries of economic development personnel.

REDA Attorney Ingram commented salaries would be permissible as long as they are staff members working on HRA-related activities. The primary restriction is that new economic development cannot be supported by these funds. In the case of a business who wants to come in and wants to redevelop or not do housing, most of these funds would not be available.

Member Willmus stated he would like to look into fund balances a little deeper. As the budget creeps up, the ongoing expenses at year-end are directly related to professional services. He wants to ensure REDA is not levying for reserve dollars that are not needed in any individual fiscal year.

Member McGehee asked about the economic development gap financing and whether it is related to the policy for new subsidies. She asked about the policy behind it. If someone comes in and wants to do something and they apply for a grant and do not receive it, she asked whether the City automatically covers that.

Community Development Director Collins stated if someone is soliciting subsidy funds, they would be subject to the goals identified in the subsidy policy and would need to come before the REDA for approval.

Member Laliberte expressed appreciation for all the information. There are a few bench handouts that should have been part of the packet tonight. She would not be comfortable adopting this as a resolution tonight. As the REDA gets further along, this document needs to be adapted to show actuals vs. budgeted and then reflecting where there are some reserve amounts. That needs to be collated into a living document.

President Roe commented that format would be similar to the City budget.

Member Laliberte stated this is a proposed 72.9% increase, and the public should not have to search for a bench handout; the public needs to be able to find the information in a document or two.

President Roe noted many of the bench handouts did end up in the electronic version of the packet on the website.

Member McGehee stated it would be helpful to see what the fund balances are. She also commented that the REDA becomes an umbrella, and the HRA is underneath the REDA with somewhat lesser powers. The REDA can exercise all the powers of the HRA plus a few. She asked to clarify whether the REDA can utilize some of the previous HRA funds for redevelopment and housing but not for any new economic development.

REDA Attorney Ingram confirmed that is correct. If those funds were levied through an HRA levy, those are restricted to those purposes. Thus, the EDA cannot use that funds for economic development purposes that are not HRA-related.

Member McGehee commented that going forward, the REDA should keep those funds that were arrived at under the old HRA separate so they will not be incorrectly spent.

REDA Attorney Ingram stated it is a good idea to keep track of which fund is in which account. It looks as though that has been done up until the present. That is a good practices opinion rather than a legal opinion.

President Roe clarified the restriction is they have to be used for redevelopment or housing, which is most of what the REDA will be doing. New development would have to be funded through REDA levy funds.

Community Development Director Collins noted the economic gap fund would not be restricted in that way, as it would be created by the REDA.

Member Willmus asked whether community development funds can fund EDA activities.

REDA Attorney Ingram responded she is not prepared to answer that question at this time.

Member Willmus asked for an answer to that question. There is a healthy balance in the community development fund. He would like to know if that is something that can fund one-time EDA initiatives with those dollars. If not, he would like to re-examine the fee schedule. One contributor to the expense of residential projects is regulation and permitting. Those are all aspects he would like the REDA to look at, with such healthy balances.

President Roe commented on the statute related to building permit fees. The statute discusses there being a nexus of the cost of services and the fees. It does not talk about how the fee is used. It would be interesting to get a legal opinion as to how those funds could be used. Also, depending on what the restrictions are, it might lend itself to providing assistance through fee relief rather than through direct funding of REDA activities. If there is a project coming through looking for assistance, one option may be to provide that assistance in waived fees, which would eat into the fund balances.

Executive Director Trudgeon responded staff will follow up on legal opinions. Also, in 2007 there was a healthy fund balance in community development, but during the recession, there was a negative cash flow and a staff member was

laid off. He apologized for information being a bit scattered. At the end of the day, staff wants to provide all of the information the REDA needs.

Member Willmus asked that staff bring this item back when the legal opinions are rendered and place it at the end of a regularly scheduled Council meeting.

Community Development Director Collins noted that fee relief is currently not part of the policy, so that would have to be amended if that is the direction of the REDA.

Member McGehee asked about the HRA funds and what happens to them when REDA funds area added.

President Roe explained at this time, the REDA is not contributing anything to those funds; they are endowments now and new REDA levy is not being added in to them.

President Roe also noted that the REDA needs to follow up on adopting a reserve operating policy.

President Roe offered an opportunity for public comment, with no one coming forward.

c. Consider Resolutions of Support for Tax Base Revitalization Funds and Environmental Response Funds and Enter into Development Agreement with Edison Apartments LLC – 3110 Old Highway 8

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey provided a brief summary of these resolutions as detailed in the staff report and attachments dated July 17, 2018. She recalled that on June 18th, REDA authorized entering into a Grant Agreement for Livable Community Development Account (LCDA) Grant Funds from the Metropolitan Council to support environmental aspects of a multi-family residential project located at 3110 Old Highway 8. The LCDA funds will be used to incorporate solar panels, solar car ports, storm water management and sidewalk. The REDA now must officially enter into a Development Agreement with Edison Apartments. Additionally, Edison Apartments discovered through the due-diligence period of the purchase agreement over \$2 million in soil remediation costs due to construction debris buried in the property. In order to mitigate the environmental issues, Edison Apartments, LLC is seeking Tax Base Revitalization Account Funds (TBRA) from the Metropolitan Council and Environmental Response Funds (ERF) from Ramsey County this fall. She noted the applicant is available for questions.

Member Willmus asked if Edison Apartments would be in compliance with the proposed development agreement if they decided to only complete one building.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey responded they would not be in compliance; they must complete all amenities by 2020.

REDA Attorney Ingram concurred that requirement is in Sec. 4.3 of the development agreement.

Member Laliberte asked whether the developer will have a gap in funding if the TBRA and Ramsey County funds do not come forward. She asked what happens to management and support of the 250 units and 1 building already built.

Jamie Thelen, CEO of Sand Companies, introduced himself. Mr. Thelen stated the LCDA funds will not be accessed for the first phase. He will not know about the TBRA funds until January. The solar carports and solar systems could all be added later. If there is a large gap, potentially the next phase may not get built or may look different.

Member Willmus asked what phase the trail or loop would be.

Mr. Thelen explained that is the second or third phase.

Etten moved, Roe seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 25 (Attachment B), entitled "Resolution Approving Contract for Private Development with Edison Apartments, LLC."

Board Discussion

Member Etten appreciated a discussion on how the mechanism works. He also expressed appreciation for the LCDA funds benefitting people in the area as well as the development.

Member Willmus would have preferred that the motions on the TBRA and ERF funds would have come first before the development agreement, so there is certainty they are in place.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey explained there is reference to the TBRA and ERF funds in the development agreement.

President Roe noted the development agreement does not require that those funds be awarded, but it allows for administration if they are awarded.

Member McGehee stated she is not going to support this resolution. She did not support this project in the first place and now she has even more questions on the final result on this site. Many of the things that were added to sweeten

the pot have been potentially deferred, and depending on the pass-through of grants, may not happen at all. There was a desire on the part of the neighborhood to work with this developer, and her contacts in the neighborhood have found no cooperation or contact by the developers. She has not seen a traffic study, though it was discussed, and it is a significant issue. She thinks the type of development proposed here with the two buildings encourages class and potentially racial segregation, and certainly enhances that aspect of division in society, which she hoped would be overcome by combining all people in a similar building with similar amenities.

Member Laliberte commented there were some outstanding issues like the traffic study, and yet the Board is being asked to move forward. She would appreciate more time to answer the questions.

Member Willmus noted that previously, municipal subsidies were on the table. He asked staff to speak to the differences between what was presented previously and what is presented now.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey explained that last year when this development came forward, not only were they looking at LCDA support, they also had support for home funds from Ramsey County. The developer sought support of TIF funding of \$1.2-\$1.5 million. At this time, however, the developer is not seeking any funding from the City whatsoever, instead he is seeking funds from other sources for environmental concerns at the site. No matter who comes along, there will be these environmental concerns.

President Roe asked about the traffic study.

Public Works Director Culver stated there was a traffic study commissioned for the site, paid for by the developer, based on 250 units. Given that, and assuming an annual growth rate of half a percent for background traffic on the roads, they assume 5.44 trips per unit. That is about 1,360 total trips. The traffic study further distributes that and sends some traffic north and some south, et cetera, and then analyzes the a.m. and p.m. peak hours in particular to look at the impacts on intersections primarily. The existing Annual Daily Traffic (ADT) is 2,350 currently. Those figures are from 2017. He explained that adding 1300 trips, that is 3710 total trips on Old Highway 8. Looking at the a.m./p.m. peak hours, the p.m. peak hours are always higher, of 110 additional trips in the p.m. hours. That is 67 trips in and 43 trips out of the complex. These numbers do not change level of service at any of the intersections. There will be a little additional delay at the intersections, but nothing that concerns staff. There will certainly be days when traffic is diverted due to accidents, and queues can extend. Looking at the traffic study based on the numbers and impacts to intersections, staff does not see this as an

issue. He compared the 3,700 trips per day on various roadways like Roselawn, Lydia, and Victoria.

Member McGehee stated this was a major issue in earlier discussions of this project, so she questioned why this was not brought forward to allow for more discussion by the Board as well as by the public. The City has become lax about letting neighborhoods back in when these developments come up. These traffic numbers do not seem like much, but it is significant for the people in the neighborhood who experience this.

Member Etten commented the information was part of what the developer did on his own. Once the TIF financing was taken off the table, that information was no longer required by the Board. At this point, these are pass-through dollars, and the development can go forward without some of these pass-through dollars. This request is the developer asking for support on pass-through money, but he is not asking for permission to build the building. As staff stated, the environmental cleanup will happen someday. This simply allows some of these things that are important, cleaning up the environment, providing healthy pathways.

Member Willmus asked staff about the overall size of the parcel.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey responded it is 9 acres, and there are density bonus opportunities for its location as it relates to transit and as it relates to underground stalls. Staff has calculated that 243 units are allowable on the site.

Member Willmus noted the plan calls for 250 units.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey explained staff is saying up to 250 units at this point, since staff has not seen the site plans, nor have the full calculations been done regarding whether the easement can be counted in the calculation.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey noted that any change to the original LCDA application has to go back through for review. That may be what limits the numbers as well.

President Roe asked about the limits in the zoning code.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey responded that high-density residential allows for 24 units per acre. However, it can be maxed out, and the Code provides for certain credits given based off what is proposed for parking, easement line, and proximity to transit.

Member Laliberte asked for the units planned in first phase.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey responded that 59 units being planned, as that is the amount received for tax credit, and the developer has the financing in place.

President Roe asked whether environmental remediation impacts phase 1.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey stated the contamination is found on the south part of the property. The first phase is being done on the NW corner.

President Roe asked whether the first phase market rate.

Member Collins responded it is affordable housing.

Member Willmus asked about what is in proximity to the site.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey responded there is an apartment building on the south, two commercial properties on the north, townhomes on the west.

President Roe expressed support for the development agreement. The project has been moving through the process set aside for it. He did not support the TIF request because there was no traffic study at that time. He is disappointed about how that study came to the knowledge of the Board and public, but he will not let that influence his decision to support the development agreement.

Member Willmus commented when this originally came to REDA, there was a request for TIF. He has long been on the record of not wanting to utilize TIF dollars for projects that do not provide the City with a return in terms of long-term jobs. That was the disqualifier in this case. Moving forward, there is not desire on the part of the REDA to amend the Comp Plan or amend the zoning to down zone this parcel. At some point in the future, there will be a high-density residential project here. He will support this project.

Member Laliberte expressed agreement that she was not supportive of municipal dollars to go to this project when it initially came here. She will disagree with Member Willmus in that she would like to down-zone this to medium residential, but that is not what she is here to discuss. She has been in favor of looking at all high-density zoning and down-zoning if possible.

Member McGehee expressed disagreement with Member Willmus in that she would be favor of down-zoning this. She will not support this, though she recognizes it could be something else. If it is not this project, perhaps there will be an opportunity to look at this site again.

President Roe commented he is troubled by the argument against the project that it does not mix affordable with market-rate. It has been said many times by the developer that there is intention to have similar amenities, and all external amenities will be available to all. Anyone driving up to the site will not be able to tell which section is market rate and which section is affordable.

Member McGehee stated that absent a site plan, those are aspirational points. The long-time policy in a country of separate but equal failed then and it fails this test.

Member Etten commented when the TIF proposal was originally before the REDA, the reality is the funding mechanisms for affordable housing ask for a concentration of buildings to make it work. The REDA cannot change that unless the City wants to put forward a significant amount of TIF. Also, on the thought of down-zoning, the map was reviewed spots were identified to downzone, and that discussion did not include this parcel.

Ayes: 3 (Willmus, Etten, Roe)

Nays: 2 (McGehee, Laliberte)

Motion carried.

Etten moved, Roe seconded adoption of Resolution No. 26 (Attachment C), entitled “Resolution Identifying the Need for Tax Base Revitalization Account Grant Funding and Authorizing Application for Grant Funds for Edison Apartments, LLC,” and the adoption of Resolution No. 27 (Attachment D), entitled “Resolution in Support of Application for Ramsey County Environmental Response Grant Funds for the Development of Edison Apartments.”

Board Discussion

Member Etten stated that someone has to clean up this site, and it makes sense to have it done as part of this project.

Ayes: 3 (Willmus, Etten, Roe)

Nays: 2 (McGehee, Laliberte)

Motion carried.

d. Receive Economic Development Activity Quarterly Report

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining recent activities and second 5 quarter Golden Shovel activity report are attached.

She highlighted:

- Businesses visited by staff
- Business Council events

- Small Business series
- Energy Audit Activity
- Housing Programs
- Neighborhood Enhancement Program
- Grow Roseville E-News
- Website Activity
- Marketing Efforts
- Social Media
- Development projects around the City as of July 2018
- Available commercial properties

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey also noted that McGough did not receive TBRA funding for \$157,000; in the development agreement the REDA agreed of up to \$1.5 million. The TIF is generating \$1.3 million, so the REDA will have to commit to \$200,000 in other sources. Currently staff is looking at the Sewer Access Charge (SAC) credit balance to help contribute.

Housing & Economic Development Program Manager Kelsey continued that staff is looking for second-tier businesses in Roseville who can qualify for the Ramsey County Economic Gardening Program. She also discussed Open to Business, which is consulting opportunities for working with businesses on how to open up, expand a business, putting together a business plan. All the other Counties have this service available for businesses to access. She also Pro Ironworks, staff worked with a lot of alternative sites to expand their business in Roseville, but due to site constraints, zoning constraints, and funding, they could not make it work and moved further north to Blaine. She also provided an update on 1125 Sandhurst Drive; that property is going before the Ramsey County Board for a transfer of the property. The transfer should happen in August or September over to Habitat for Humanity.

She also provided an update on the Neighborhood Enhancement Program. The inspector has said the door-hanger program has been very effective.

Member Willmus commented on the project at C and Dale. Staff should keep track of that project, especially with seeing issues at this stage.

Community Development Director Collins stated the project is frozen to allow them time to work with public works to get a public improvement contract in place.

President Roe stated they had a foundation footing permit.

5. Board and Executive Director Communications, Reports, and Announcements

6. **Adjourn**
Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, adjourning the REDA meeting at approximately 8:20 p.m.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.



Daniel J. Roe, President

ATTEST:



Patrick Trudgeon, EDA Executive Director