

The following are notes, not official minutes. For an official transcript, go to the Delanco Municipal Building at 770 Coopertown Rd.

Township Committee March 31, 2008

Devinney, Hinkle, Templeton, Ouellette Fitzpatrick

Also Present: Steven Corcoran, Twp. Administrator, Mr, Kearns, Twp. Solicitor; Karen Zimmermann, Deputy Municipal Clerk; Bob Stewart, Twp. Auditor; Ed Parsons, Chief of Police; Kevin Sheehan, COAH Counsel, Barbara Fegley, Township Planner

Promotion APPOINTMENT to promote Police Officer Donald Nesbitt to the position of Police Sergeant effective March 31, 2008.

Parsons: (hard to hear) 10 years on the job; did well on the test...

Passed unanimously

Ouellette: We were under budget last year...leftover 2007 dollars. We need to authorize auditor to apply those dollars to uncompensated absences account. This is an account that has been underfunded.

Fitzpatrick: Do you have the amount? I seem to recall \$48,000. I think we should wait until the next meeting.

Ouellette: We can authorize the auditor to do up to \$100,000.

Fitzpatrick: I thought document was \$48,000

Ouellette: We have already appropriated dollars to that account that were left over. If we don't do something with these dollars, they will roll into the budget. If we have to take greater cuts, some employees may want to leave and we will need to have that money available.

Fitzpatrick: When do you need that decision?

Stewart: Can't make any changes to your reserve after March 31. You can pick a number. You are just authorizing the auditor to move those dollars into that account. Whatever would be over, would go into reserve.

Fitzpatrick: I understood that we had \$160,000 in reserve.

Ouellette: Let's say there are \$75,000, can we change to move 50,000 to that fund and 25,000 to another?

Stewart: Can't change the reserve after March 31.

Fitzpatrick: In that case, I move to authorize up to \$100,000 for that account.

Templeton: You asked me to ask Bob Hudnell about that. Is this in addition?

The reason I'm asking is that if there is already \$170,000 in there, it would be nice to know that.

Stewart: As of Dec. 31 – absence account had 87,895.

Fitzpatrick: What about reserve that we didn't spend last year?

Stewart: I don't have that

Corcoran: If that was done in the budget process, that won't appear until the budget is approved.

Motion to move unspent 2007 dollars up to \$100,000 to uncompensated absence

Passed unanimously

Ouellette asked Bob Stewart, Township auditor, to address the financial situation raised by Zurbrugg.

Stewart: We're into third year of financing so, by statute, you have to start raising 1/10 of the note - \$162,000. You don't have to raise it in the budget if you are going to sell or if council decides to sell serial bonds for 15-20 year period. That pays off the note, and raises the repayment over the next 15-20 years. It is imperative for council to make a decision to include down payment in budget or disclose to state that we are going to do a bond sale.

Fitzpatrick: When do we have to do that?

Stewart: Before introduction of budget. Talked to state today – they want budgets introduced as soon as possible.

Templeton: It doesn't sound like there is a deadline on this tonight.

Stewart: You have to introduce a budget very soon.

Templeton: I was under the impression we had to make this decision tonight.

Stewart: I need to know the direction tonight because it all plays into the budget process.

Templeton: Is there a state requirement? Townships that passed budgets are already rescinding the budgets they passed reflecting the state cuts.

Stewart: March 1 was the deadline. What can they do to you? Nothing. They already cut your state aid. The longer you delay, the further you push back your tax bills. We are low on cash. If money doesn't come in, you won't be able to make county and school. County will charge you a late fee.

Devinney: Which sword of Damocles? Some of the issues are complicated by state's surprise action. If it costs us a little bit more time, we should take it. I feel a responsibility to both parties, but if we need a little bit more time, we should take it.

PRESENTATION BY ZURBRUGG PARTNERSHIP FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF ZURBRUGG MANSION

Kent Smith: On behalf of Zurbrugg Partnership LLC, I'd like to compliment for Heinold on redevelopment proposal and site plan that will be a positive solution to a conundrum placed on this township by the state.

Templeton: Question for Mr. Stewart – We are waiting for \$280,000 from state for roadwork, can that be used to offset that?

Stewart: No

Templeton: The other is \$420,000 for Zurbrugg Waterfront. Can that be used for the 10% value?

Stewart: Green Acres was for purchase?

Templeton: Yes

Stewart: Yes. We would have to pick that up as a budgeted revenue.

Fitzpatrick: We don't have the papers signed so we can't do that.

Kent Smith: Proposal (handed copies to Township Committee) Transfer of 14 COAH from Ryan Homes (RiversEdge) agreement is ready to go to Joint Land Use Board tomorrow night. If approved, we can close by June 30. Contingencies for title and other matters– removal of mold and underground storage tank. Proposal is for up to 24 senior

independent apartments in the mansion – addition to rear of mansion of 12 feet to create units as per COAH standards. 12 apartments would be in rear and the other 12 in existing structure. Site plan is the one this committee had reviewed prior when presented by J2. The addition is the only change. Plan reflects increased setbacks from Delaware and reservation of Willow and Delaware by township and comments we had received upon initial review. Project schedule negotiated for closing on June 30, 2008 – cash closing. We write check and get the title. We are projecting completion of mansion renovation by end of 2009 and total completion by Oct. 1, 2010. Affordable housing impacts associated by Ryan will be absorbed by Mr. Rahenkamp. He can describe how those units are calculated and how proposal will address.

Craig Rahenkamp: 14 units transferred from Ryan – if there is a growth share for third round, they would be part of the units in the mansion. Our view is that that isn't likely to happen. Units currently in the mansion count in the total number of housing units even though they aren't developed. Town has the same number of overall units in it. We aren't expecting a third round obligation. On site – 8 new townhouses could generate an obligation, but we would be in the envelope on site.

Kent Smith: Redevelopment plan has flexibility of Creekside obligation. Our intent is that township won't gain an additional exposure from the transfer of the Ryan units. With Joint Land Use Board approval tomorrow night, the last contingency to be satisfied by April 30 is for court to sign a consent order. We used the form that had previously been negotiated. Many provisions are identical to those that had been discussed. One change is that NJDEP Stormwater Management regulations will be complied with as they are today.

Fitzpatrick: Ed and I were in a subcommittee for the agreement and met with Doug regarding our concerns. One question – set-back lines on Delaware – increased set-back to 30 ft. It is on one and not on the other.

KentSmith: Right. Unit 1 is where the right-of-way is and it is two feet from it. We average 32 feet.

Ouellette: Still have two units without 30 foot setbacks.

Templeton: Unit 4 is at 20 and Unit 8 is at 20.

Kent Smith: This isn't the right plan. The average is 30.

Fitzpatrick: One is 20, one is 30 .

John Rahenkamp: They average 30

Ouellette: One is 20

Kent Smith: Measurements are being taken from front porch,

Fitzpatrick: It is my understanding, that if there is an issue of providing more COAH units, Creekside won't be transferred into there.

Kent Smith: Priority is that the township doesn't acquire any additional obligation. We would prefer to take Creekside and the second would be to give two to the township.

Rahenkamp: (Missed this)

Fitzpatrick: If Creekside units come over, there would only be one additional market value

Shannon: At whose option do the additional units come from – the township or the developer at Creekside?

Fitzpatrick: My understanding is that you would allow us to put our two units in there.

Cherkis: The reason we want to make that an option is that once we understood the total from there, we were concerned that we wouldn't be able to fit them in there. We need more time to decide what we want to do regarding Creekside. We thought it would fit, but now it doesn't. We were told to prioritize the Ryan units.

Templeton: These are all age restricted? That hasn't changed.

Kent Smith: All age-restricted.

Hinkle: Confirmed management of Lutheran Services?

Kent Smith: No, working hard to do so.

Templeton: Have you submitted financial or business plan?

Kent Smith: Exhibit K

Templeton: I don't have a copy of the agreement so I don't know.

Kent Smith: Exhibit K

Fitzpatrick: Can you go over this so everyone can hear it?

Templeton: I was looking for how you are going to sustain this when it is up and running.

Fitzpatrick: Answer Mike's question because it is important. This is a cash deal for us.

Cherkis: We weren't in a position to cement a relationship with Lutheran until we were approved. Director of Lutheran came to subcommittee meetings. They would be in a better position to answer, but they would operate as their other properties – state monies and rents and set-aside reserves for future repairs. They are a non-profit.

Templeton: Your group is going to retain ownership. What do you expect them to pay you?

Cherkis: Just reserves for repairs. For us, the mansion is a break-even. Once we subdivide the property, our goal is to develop the other 9 properties.

Templeton: I'm just trying to get six months – five years down the road. You are doing extensive renovations to the addition, but you still have a monster in the front. I'm looking for the solvency that you have the pockets and you are going to stay with this. Under second round, there are stipulations you can get out from under a COAH if there is a financial hardship.

Shannon: No

Templeton: I had a discussion with Mrs.(missed her name) and she seemed to think there was.

Shannon: (Missed this)

Templeton: Is this transfer under second or third round?

Shannon: Third.

Cherkis: 1.8 million offer - cash payment of 1.7 million – Ryan escrow + difference from us in cash. We may get financing, but it's not contingent. \$25,000 at closing for recreation for township to purchase anything for waterfront properties. In addition, professional fees to township for a total of 1.87 million. In addition, we will be paying \$12,500 per town home on closing. Mansion renovation will cost 1.5 million. Once we have closed on property, we would submit to state DCA and feds for loans. There are questions regarding which department we go to. We would be financing renovations. At that point Lutheran would operate. Construction of townhouses 3.14 million + marketing and fees 3.7 million. Over 7 million dollar budget.

Fitzpatrick: Public should know that we have applied for Green Acres for \$220 – 250,000 for waterfront. ½ from Green Acres, 25% from county and 25% from Township which we have already paid.

Kent Smith: We agreed to higher purchase since payment will be coming from the \$100,000 when townhouses are complete.

Templeton: A section of the agreement reads, "Township will pass ordinance restricting use of waterfront properties as passive recreation. (There was more. I don't have the exact wording, but basically restricts township from building anything on the site other than a replacement for the gazebo that was there.) Can we do this under Green Acres?"

Fitzpatrick: This is an agreement between two parties.

Devinney: I think Mike's comment had to do with whether this was an appropriate part of the document.

Kent Smith: It's in the structure of language...– if you acquire through Green Acres, we're covered. If not, the open space is very important to us.

Corcoran: What portion is taxable?

Kent Smith: Entire property – assessor must assess mansion as per COAH restrictions.

Ouellette: If we don't permit the Ryan transfer?

Kent Smith: That is absolutely essential

Fitzpatrick: Kevin, any comments regarding transfer in regards to COAH?

Shannon: One of the original concerns was whether Rivers Edge would be considered inclusionary. He would recommend that they would be treated as inclusionary. Town would be protected

Kent Smith: Paragraph to go to judge says project would be inclusionary.

Fitzpatrick: It is my understanding that we don't need court approval to sign

Kent Smith: Right.

Ouellette: If COAH were to stay at Rivers Edge, the town is still whole and complete as it stands right now.

Shannon: For second round, yes.

Ouellette: If that stayed and we got into round three?

Shannon: COAH identified # of new residential units and jobs and obligation will be based on that. Classification of warehouse units may be classified as something else, so I can't give you that number right now.

Fitzpatrick: Would someone address a concern regarding institutional use? It's my understanding that it couldn't be considered a boarding house. We don't want DCA involved or a state loan even if Lutheran Homes takes over.

Rahenkamp: Your redevelopment supercedes zoning so you still retain control of use of property after it changes hands. It's not suitable for assisted living – too large with kitchens, etc. You have alteration of building and land use controls.

Cherkis: That is why Ryan transfer is key. It allows us to convert the building. If we don't, you would just have a boarding house.

Devinney: What are the consequences of apartments being for sale as opposed to for rent?

Rahenkamp: We are retaining ownership, so there can't be a sale. 10 units will be senior rental for the third round.

Ouellette: So what happens to the other four?

Rahenkamp: They are second round.

Templeton: For sale units tend to be more stable for the community than a rental,

Cherkis: Why are you making that assumption? One entity renting them out has more control over the whole property.

Fitzpatrick: I didn't know that you sold apartments in a unit.
(don't know who said this): They could be condos.
Shannon: Rental obligation in third round. These rentals will help. Mr. Templeton was concerned about affordability controls if they are rental
Rahenkamp: Not a concern for senior units.
Devinney: I think you could understand why the question was asked. We went through a very traumatic experience before.
Shannon: Doug hadn't seen exhibit L
Kent Smith: Above ground storage tank in the basement of carriage house and one on the corner of the mansion. Mold and main building is to be removed. We understand that this is under contract.
Corcoran: It's completed.
Templeton: Tanks haven't been pulled.
Corcoran: Committee will have a contract discussion.
Kent Smith: Two tanks will be removed.
Ouellette:
Shannon: Developer will put up an escrow of \$10,000 for professional fees. You had asked \$20,000.
Templeton: We waited 7 months for previous developer to pay \$40,000 in escrows.
Shannon: Not as much work to be done this time.
Fitzpatrick: That agreement took three months. We already had it to use as our basis. It costs at least \$100,000
Corcoran: Correct.
Fitzpatrick: JLUB was also working on the redevelopment plan. Met with Bill Matelewicz and Ann Moore and planning board.
Corcoran: Consider an increase.
Cherkis: One of the conditions of us coming back to propose was to place a limit on professional fees for \$10,000. One of our professionals had a bad experience with professional fees in this township.. That's why we wanted a cap of \$10,000.
Templeton: I'm saying that from our experience, this township was short \$40,000 for several months. The taxpayers covered that.
Shannon: Liens will be required on property. Any lender will be required to complete the project as per the agreement. If not, the township gets the property back free and clear.
Kent Smith: Language refers to COAH deed restriction and timeline. We are committing to them. COAH will be completed within the time frame.

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Resident of Delaware: Is there a difference when COAH judges look at age-restricted as opposed to family units?

Shannon: 25% limit on age-restricted. Going forward you can age-restrict 25% of your growth share. You would be well within that.

Resident: Original plan was never seen by JLUB when it was a B&B. A couple of members of JLUB had seen it. Based on this framework, we are moving forward without the opportunity to make changes.

Fitzpatrick: JLUB doesn't sign the agreement. This is a redevelopment.

Resident: If the JLUB decides that this isn't in the best interest of the town, then what?

Resident of Burlington: tax question – how will the COAH units be taxed?

Fitzpatrick: COAH taxed 60-70%

Shannon: Deed restriction has to be taken into account.

Fitzpatrick: We don't know that figure.

Resident: The original redevelopment plan – did that call for addition to the mansion. So when you go to JLUB tomorrow night, are you expecting an answer tomorrow night? There were a lot of neighbors out to those meetings. Don't you have to notice those neighbors?.

Fitzpatrick: The agreement is the same.

Resident: They can't just say there are going to put an addition on the mansion without getting approval.

Fitzpatrick: The building is there; they are just adding square feet.

Corcoran: JLUB tomorrow night is only regarding whether they will allow for the transfer of the Ryan units to the mansion.

Resident of Maple: Idea of use by senior is admirable. Question how it is being done...is this the same group that came forth 15 months ago? A totally different group?

Cherkis: No. Partnership of J2 John Rahenkamp and Hooper. In the interim, John Rahenkamp approached our company – 6 principals and John who brings experience and the plan. Agreement could be used for any applicant.

Resident: This seems like the cart before the horse.

Cherkis: Plan would need to be submitted later to JLUB. Tomorrow night will just be consideration of transfer of Ryan.

Resident: Concern – 15 months ago – rush rush for budgetary reasons. There was a dissolution of agreement and they walked away.

Devinney: No agreement.

Fitzpatrick: Never signed.

Resident: How much was spent on advertising?

Fitzpatrick: 15,000

Resident: Then you took it off the market and assigned it to one specific buyer.

Devinney: Not true.

Resident: Real estate board here. Was going to be a bed and breakfast.

Devinney: Made a proposal but we never signed a redevelopment agreement.

Resident: How are we protecting the township's interest?

Devinney: Agreement that a number of lawyers including our own worked on. Followed procedures and criticized the results and plugged the holes.

Resident: Why doesn't some of the income flow back to Delanco? Lutheran Home...why doesn't that come back to Delanco?

Devinney: We get our money from taxes.

Fitzpatrick: Actual for sale properties will generate more taxable properties than the mansion by itself.

Resident: Waterfront. 10 years down the road, why would we be locked into that? Many issues.

Devinney: There have been other proposals that didn't pass scrutiny.

Resident: If it is so beneficial, why couldn't the town keep 10% of the deal?

Fitzpatrick: We won't own it.

Devinney: My personal opinion is that ownership isn't a good idea. When we bought the property, we had to take that action. The idea was not to keep that property.

Resident: How could we have bought the property with the oil tanks?

Fitzpatrick: We were in the situation that the state was going to take that property. Stein was in a position that he was going to make a few dollars. We offered the same deal \$1,000,000

Resident: It needs to be disposed of graciously. Thank you for your efforts.

Resident of Russ Farm Way: Are there any other offers on the table?

Ouellette: Still another group out there.

Resident: Having heard everything, I would encourage you to accept the offer and let it be done.

Resident of Pennington Ct: Total cost close to \$8 million.

Cherkis: Selling price of townhouses - \$500,000. It may be two years before they are sold.

Resident: The tax flow is a heck of a lot better than the out flow.

Resident of Union: How many COAH units does the town have now?

Shannon: 60

Resident: We need to generate 212 units, so if we keep playing the shell game from one place to another. Newton's Landing doesn't have any.

Fitzpatrick: Savannah Mews – 24 included there. Creekside inclusionary, but they would be transferred if they could. We would be adding 10.

Corcoran: One of the problems with the 172, they are using the warehouses as office space. We are appealing and expecting a correction and that to significantly change.

Office space need is substantially higher than warehouse.

Resident: What can town do to keep COAH from falling apart? At that point, they could walk away.

Devinney: We have the agreement, the money from Ryan Homes comes back as does the property, but we would pay the balance between what Ryan paid and what they put in.

Do you have any other thoughts?

Resident: I liked it, but it fell apart the last time and I'm opposed to having my view blocked. We enjoy our view. That's why we bought the property.

Fitzpatrick: Can you see the river in the summer?

Resident: (missed reply)

Resident of ShippsWay: Town is keeping river parcel?

Ouellette: Yes

Resident: How many units in second round?

Shannon: 14

Resident: Any bonuses?

Shannon: No

Rahenkamp: Town has already gotten them from other units.

Resident: We do have one COAH

Fitzpatrick: From Newton's Landing there are two on Rancocas and two on Washington; one on Walnut. Some were RCA.

Resident: Pulte in different town. Do we get any credit?

Shannon: We got credit.

Resident: Will we get credit in third round? After 30 years, do we get credit or do we need new credit?

Shannon: Can get new credits...who knows by then.

Resident: On JLUB agenda for tomorrow it says they would hear Ryan's difficulty with selling senior units at RiversEdge.

Shannon: Ryan came to Township Committee first asking that. This project not generated by Ryan.

Resident: Even though this committee said Ryan had to go to JLUB, they can go with the new proposal?

Shannon: Yes.

Devinney: We moved that we had no objections; we didn't endorse. It's not up to us.

Resident: COAH senior 14 units – senior now?

Shannon: Yes.

Resident: By moving them, you can sell at market value.

Shannon: No, there is a transfer of obligation over to The Columns.

Resident: So they will be market value homes at Ryan. What you are moving to The Columns will be run by the Lutheran Home. I think that's a good idea. I would like to see it made available to residents first. I can tell you from the school board, we see a big increase in special needs related to COAH. If we don't have an agreement by budget, every time we sit here, we spend money on The Columns. I don't care where there money is coming from.

Resident of Burlington: Question regarding oil tanks for Kate. I thought you had some plan for that?

Fitzpatrick: I thought there would be some remediation... there isn't. We can get a grant.

Corcoran: Removal for \$8-9000 – no further environmental impact.

Fitzpatrick: May be a grant available. Contract was as is. We may have a problem with that remedy.

Resident of McCay: Ryan Homes that are now market value will generate \$60,000 in taxes.

(Not sure who answered): Yes

Cherkis: We're listening to comments from Township Committee and public. Intent is to take vacant property that is an expense to the town. Agreement if approved, fixes environmental issues and preserves waterfront lots for recreational use. We would be renovating the property and adding nine new units that will block some people's view at some times of the year. Pros and cons on every deal. Thanks to attorneys for their efforts on the deal.

MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

DISCUSSION BY TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

Ouellette: I got the latest version of this agreement at 4:00 this afternoon. We are going to JLUB tomorrow for their input on the proposal. We put them on the agenda for Monday night's meeting. That will give everyone time.

Hinkle: I thought we were going to act tonight.

Hart Smith: We would request that we know where we stand tonight.

Devinney: Tonight we had some citizen input. Ideally I would like the JLUB to make their decision without feeling that we are telling them what to do. If I vote for this proposal, I wouldn't want it to be interpreted that way. They will have their full time to discuss the plan. I presume that you are expecting and amenable to that.

Hart Smith: We know that. We will work with the JLUB and come back to Township Committee. We will go back to JLUB for public input. We have to know that we are on the right path.

Fitzpatrick: Ed and I worked as subcommittee and reviewed initial contract. We commented and met with Doug. Our conditions were met. Items we were concerned about were changed. I think we have a great contract here. Town has held on this property long enough. We will get credits we need and have taxable income. The idea of bonding even the short term note – I won't vote for a budget for that. If the last deal had gone through...I still believe it could have happened. There were so many issues with the idea of a bed and breakfast with the neighbors. This is an answer to that. Ed and I did a job. I am ready to sign this agreement – sign this resolution.

Shannon: If there is a resolution... language in (mentioned a section)

Hart Smith: Authorized you to sign consent order?

Shannon: Authorizes parties to perform any task.

Fitzpatrick: Kevin, do you have the exact additional wording? Can it be read so everyone can hear it?

Templeton: Township Committee isn't in a position to vote since all members haven't seen a completed document. This is vastly more complex than what we dealt with last year. Some of our professionals just saw this six or seven hours ago. I don't believe it's in the best interest of the township to rush into this. There's no way to vote on an agreement that's a work in process.

Hinkle: I would be willing to vote on this agreement. I trust our professionals and Kate and Ed and I can honestly say, I would be giving this township a disservice not to.

Templeton: Committee is famous for rushing into things – liquor license – redevelopment that jeopardized. This has permanent implications for this town. If it's a good idea tonight, it's a good idea next week.

Fitzpatrick: Budget – we didn't start until the end of March. We should have cut it more. I was upset. We should have started December. We were told it would start in September by the mayor at a public meeting. We didn't have all the information we needed. We know this is a major issue. We knew this had to be done. These proposals came in December, maybe January. There's not great planning. This agreement doesn't have any loophole. We need to move forward. The past is the past. You can't do anything about it. What are the problems now? We approved the other agreement. What is wrong with this agreement?

Ouellette: All we are asking for is that the JLUB look at this tomorrow night. At 4:00 this afternoon we got a revision of this agreement. I need a little bit more time. It looks good. I like the expansion on the back of the building. It makes more sense converting the units to apartments. Am I happy with the amount of building on the property? No. I know there are tradeoffs. We should send it to JLUB and go and have them do a presentation. I feel you are on the right track. If we sign this as it is now, we tie the hands of the JLUB.

Devinney: Parties need to confer. Will a week sink this proposal?

Resident: JLUB has one part to pay. You have to raise the revenue.

Devinney: Mike won't mind me quoting him, "This should be a real partnership." The whole township should be on the playing field.

Siebold (Ryan Homes): The reason we are asking for your direction tonight. We need relief. We did an alternative relief. We are willing to do what you want. With us going to the board tomorrow, we are going in with a development plan, not what you want. We understand that these 14 units in transfer are vital. The only thing to be presented is the COAH plan at RiversEdge – nothing about Zurbrugg.

Hart Smith: We have to know what this committee's desire is. A week is too long. Bonds related to the budget require decision.

Hinkle: I would be willing to vote on this tonight and have it go to JLUB tomorrow night.

Resident of Third St: We have someone here who is ready to go. We have a chance to put ratables on the books.

Templeton: We didn't dilly dally on the previous proposal– J2 proposal fell of its own accord. The Township didn't prolong it.

Devinney: Does a vote tonight set agreement in stone?

Kearns: All approval processes will be in place.

Devinney: Suppose there is something that shows up, what do you do?

Kearns: Then you don't approve the redevelopment plan. It takes the majority of the entire township committee, not a majority of present members.

Ouellette: Clarify this again. This agreement...

Kearns: The resolution authorizes you to sign.

Ouellette: When we were dealing with J2, setbacks on the plan are less than specified.

Hinkle: I make a motion to accept agreement

Fitzpatrick: Second with revisions.

Shannon: Doesn't need revisions... agreement is already conditional to final review.

Resolution 2008-54

Devinney: Had a chance to look closely due to meetings with Grapevine and Heinold.

Not an easy decision. Group here says you should take it because you need the money; this group says we need more time. Agreement says it's subject to final review.

Vote Yes

Templeton: No

Ouellette: No for reasons stated earlier – not enough time to review or for JLUB to review.

Next meeting – Monday, April 7 @ 7:30

Submitted by Maureen Barrett