

CITY OF WEST LAFAYETTE  
COMMON COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
March 2, 2015

The Common Council of the City of West Lafayette, Indiana, met in the Multi-Purpose Room at the Morton Community Center on March 2, 2015, at the hour of 6:30 p.m.

Mayor Dennis called the meeting to order and presided.

The Pledge of Allegiance was repeated.

Present: Bunder, Burch, DeBoer, Dietrich, Hunt, Keen, and Thomas.

Also present were City Attorney Burns, Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes, Public Works Director Buck, Facilities Director Clark, Police Chief Dombkowski, Parks Superintendent Fawley, Human Resources Director Foster, Fire Chief Heath, WWTU Director Henderson, Street Commissioner Payne, and Director of Development Poole.

MINUTES

Councilor Keen moved for acceptance of the minutes of the January 29, 2015, Pre-Council Meeting, and the February 2, 2015, Common Council Meeting. Councilor Burch seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

COMMITTEE STANDING REPORTS

STREET, SANITATION, AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT UTILITY

Councilor Bunder presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND ORDINANCE

Councilor Keen presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

Councilor Hunt expressed appreciation to the Police Department, Neighborhood Resource Team, and the Parks Department for clearing snow on sidewalks for pedestrians going to a basketball game.

PURDUE RELATIONS

Councilor DeBoer reported on events at Purdue University.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Councilor Hunt presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Councilor Thomas presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

PERSONNEL

Councilor Burch presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

BUDGET AND FINANCE

There was no report.

REPORT OF APC REPRESENTATIVE

Councilor Keen reported that on March 4 the Executive Committee will be discussing the resolution to amend the bylaws of the APC to include West Lafayette and Purdue University Joint Board as a checkpoint agency for zoning and subdivision cases located within the City-Campus-Community Collaboration Zone.

Councilor Bunder reported that on March 26 in the West Lafayette Public Library there will be a neighborhood meeting to allow the APC to introduce the zoning revisions that would implement the land use plan. Also on April 1, following the APC Executive Committee meeting, there will be a meeting of the Ordinance Committee.

SPECIAL REPORTS:

Mayor Dennis noted that this is the last Council meeting for Chris Kulesza as President of the Purdue Graduate Student Government.

PUBLIC RELATIONS:

Council Appointment to the Economic Development Commission

Councilor Bunder motioned to reappoint Linda Cohen to the Economic Development Commission. Councilor Keen seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

FINANCIAL REPORT

There was no report.

LEGAL REPORT

City Attorney Burns stated that this report is on file.

Councilor Dietrich asked City Attorney Burns to give a summary of what we are thinking about doing on the sign ordinance.

City Attorney Burns stated that there have been some issues raised in the residential neighborhoods about having perennial "For Rent" signs up when, in fact, there may not be anything for rent. He stated that there is a group including Councilors Dietrich and Bunder, himself, and other staff members who have discussed possibilities for dealing with that, so that landlords who have the need for those signs can have them, but those who have them up all the time have limitations. He stated that they have some solid ideas about how that can be done with very little fuss and muss, while taking care of the needs of both the landlords and the other citizens who do not want to see those signs up 365.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Ordinance No. 07-15 An Ordinance Requesting An Additional Appropriation For The Motor Vehicle Highway Fund (Prepared by the Clerk-Treasurer) PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Dennis read Ordinance No. 07-15 by title only.

Councilor Keen moved for passage of Ordinance No. 07-15 on second and final reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

There was no discussion.

Councilor Keen moved to open a public hearing on Ordinance No. 07-15. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch, and the motion was passed by voice vote.

Mayor Dennis said, "All right ladies and gentleman, we are in a public hearing." He re-read Ordinance No. 07-15 by title only, and said, "public comment, public hearing."

Zachary Baiel (124 Connolly Street) said, "Real briefly, I mean for just the public's sake since we have a public hearing, if you want to maybe give a little detail about this transfer for, I believe it was vehicles, if I remember correct looking at the ordinance, no? Someone have it?"

Mayor Dennis said, "Dave, come on up."

Mr. Baiel said, "Thank you."

Public Words Director Buck said, "It's actually for the 2015 funding budgeted for Cumberland Avenue, Phase 3. It's construction, not vehicles."

Mayor Dennis said, "It's just to continue the construction project."

Director Buck said, "Continuing construction project, 2015."

Mayor Dennis said, "All right, any questions for Mr. Buck? Further discussion? Hearing none, I will entertain a motion to close the public hearing."

There were no further comments.

Councilor Keen moved to close the public hearing on Ordinance No. 07-15. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch, and the motion was passed by voice vote.

There was no further discussion.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes called the roll call vote:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Bunder	✓			
Burch	✓			
DeBoer	✓			
Dietrich	✓			
Hunt	✓			
Keen	✓			
Thomas	✓			

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes stated that the vote was 7 AYES and 0 NAYS.

Mayor Dennis announced that Ordinance No. 07-15 passed on second and final reading.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Ordinance No. 08-15** An Ordinance Vacating Platted Easement In The City Of West Lafayette, Indiana (Submitted by Reiling Teder & Schrier, LLC)

Mayor Dennis read Ordinance No. 08-15 by title only.

Councilor Keen moved for passage of Ordinance No. 08-15 on first reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

Councilor DeBoer stated that we went over this extensively at Pre-Council. He stated that he believes that the central point that was made is that nothing will actually change if we were to vote this down. He asked the counselor to reiterate on those points.

Ryan Munden (Reiling Teder & Schrier), representing the petitioner, Family Express Corporation, stated that the easement that they are requesting be vacated was created by the convenience for the Northwestern Gardens subdivision in 1927. The convenience provided for a 30-foot easement along the southern boundary of the subject property, and 25 feet of Elm Drive currently occupies that easement. He stated that as a condition to the approval of the minor sketch for the subdivision, APC required that this easement be replaced with a right-of-way. The first step of accomplishing that is to file this petition, which vacates the easement. He stated that it does not transfer the property. The property is currently owned by Northwestern, LLC, so as a result of this petition, if granted, the easement would be extinguished. The next step would be that the 25 feet of Elm Drive then be dedicated to the City of West Lafayette, so the City would become the record owner of that property. He stated that the owner of the property is giving up property, not getting property. He stated that at Pre-Council a question came up about the difference between an easement and a right-of-way. Mr. Munden explained that an easement, in general terms, is that you have the right to access someone else's property and do certain things on that property. A dedicated right-of-way makes you the record owner of the property. He stated that if this petition is approved, the City will own the property that Elm Drive currently occupies. The net result in terms of the easement, of that easement only 25 feet of it is actual street. There is a portion of easement that extends beyond the boundary of the street; that will remain with the current owner. He stated that the benefit to the owner is that approximately 5 feet of their property will no longer have the easement that is currently on it.

Mayor Dennis asked if this is a benefit to the City.

Mr. Munden responded that it is. He stated that as Director Buck mentioned at Pre-Council, the City has requested this, and the APC is requiring it as part of the subdivision.

Councilor Hunt stated that this is an ordinance, so we will vote twice, and next month we will have a public hearing. She asked if those adjacent people have been notified.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes responded that following passage of the first reading, her office will send the certified mail notifications and the legal advertising required by statute.

Mr. Munden stated that obviously this project is not popular, but this petition will not affect the actual project. He stated that if this is denied, the project will continue. The only result would be that they would have to go back to the APC and explain to them why they cannot comply with the condition that the easement be converted to a right-of-way. It would result to an amendment to the subdivision. Mr. Munden confirmed for Councilor Thomas that this is a housekeeping issue to clean up documentation. He stated that the neighbors and the people who use Elm Drive, from a practical standpoint, will not know there is any difference. The difference is just in who owns the property. It is currently owned by Northwestern, LLC, and if the petition is granted the City will own it.

There was no further discussion.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes called the roll call vote:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
--	-----	-----	--------	---------

COMMON COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES, March 2, 2015, CONTINUED

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Bunder		✓		
Burch	✓			
DeBoer	✓			
Dietrich	✓			
Hunt	✓			
Keen	✓			
Thomas	✓			

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes stated that the vote was 6 AYES and 1 NAYS.

Mayor Dennis announced that Ordinance No. 08-15 passed on first reading.

Ordinance No. 09-15 An Ordinance Requesting An Additional Appropriation For The Parks And Recreation Fund (Prepared by the Clerk-Treasurer)

Mayor Dennis read Ordinance No. 09-15 by title only.

Councilor Keen moved for passage of Ordinance No. 09-15 on first reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

Parks Superintendent Fawley stated that the relocation of the City offices to the Morton Community Center has reduced the amount of rental space to offer to the public. The reduction has caused a shortfall in the 2014 and the 2015 Non-Reverting Operating (NRO) Fund by approximately \$50,000 to \$70,000 at this point. The Parks programs in the NRO have not been making the necessary money to pay all of the full-time staff that is currently in that budget. She stated that the first part of the solution was that the Park Board raised fees for the Community Center for the first time in 10 years. The other part of the solution is to request this \$85,000 additional appropriation to cover half of the full-time wages that are currently in the NRO budget. She stated that as we work toward the 2016 budget we hope to work with the Clerk-Treasurer, the Mayor, and the Council to realign revenue streams, expenses, and various funds to meet future budget expenses.

There was no further discussion.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes called the roll call vote:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Bunder	✓			
Burch	✓			
DeBoer	✓			
Dietrich	✓			
Hunt	✓			
Keen	✓			
Thomas	✓			

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes stated that the vote was 7 AYES and 0 NAYS.

Mayor Dennis announced that Ordinance No. 09-15 passed on first reading.

Resolution No. 03-15 A Resolution Approving Use Of Indiana Code § 5-23 Including Build, Operate, And Transfer Provisions Exclusively For The State Street Project (Sponsored by Mayor John R. Dennis)

Mayor Dennis read Resolution No. 03-15 by title only.

Councilor Keen moved for passage of Resolution No. 03-15 on first and only reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

Mayor Dennis stated that approximately seven years ago we had a collective decision about the future of West Lafayette. He stated that that future started with a conversation about annexation, and that dialog went on for quite a few years and was only recently concluded. He stated that after annexation, the City, with the driving force of the Redevelopment Commission (RDC), had initiated a project about redoing our main street, about redoing our downtown, and that was State Street. That ended up being the State Street Master Plan. He stated that the opportunity to recreate a downtown rarely happens for a city of this size and with our history. He stated that now enters our new partner, not our new partner—our new family member, Purdue University. Mayor Dennis stated that when conversations started with Purdue, they were well aware that we needed to have a new gateway for our community. Regardless of what we do on the north end or the far west of our City, the focal point and where the predominate concentration of traffic flow and citizenry is, is right here in central West Lafayette and towards the east, towards Lafayette. He stated that it was imperative that as we start talking about how we are going to recreate this downtown vision and incorporate this relationship with Purdue, and how we are going to make it not just better, but historic in size and scope, we thought, “How about we do a complete redo of State Street and the ring road?” He stated that we could not have asked for a better partner. Purdue will help to make this an actual project, not just a pile of documents sitting on a shelf. It will be something that will get the appropriate funding, guidance and input of engineers, and have the supervision of our Council and our public. He stated that this requires a process, which requires a first step. That first step is these two resolutions in front of the Council tonight. He stated that it is the beginning of something big, and something that will truly change the scope of the City.

Councilor DeBoer stated that this is a project of immense scope and consequence, and he believes the future of the City hinges on this project moving forward. He stated that the only way it will move forward is with both the support and buy-in of the City and the University. He stated that for too long this basic organ of our City was controlled by the State and left out of our hands, and this is the chance we have been waiting for to finally take control of West Lafayette. He stated that with due diligence and wisdom, we must continue to provide oversight to this project, but there will not be a project without this first step. Councilor DeBoer stated that he appreciates the comments that Mary Cook made at Pre-Council. He stated that the basic thrust of her argument is that we need this road first. There are many people who have a particular vision for the outcome of the project, and we all have a tendency to project our own vision and desires of this project given its size and scope, but fundamentally this is going to be about building a road. He stated that it is going to be about resuscitating the heart of his district and the heart of our downtown. He stated that when the road is complete, we as a community will have the opportunity to shape its basic nature, but none of that is possible if we do not do this tonight. He expressed his support of this starting point.

Councilor Burch asked what the return on investment is for the private individuals that invest in this project.

City Attorney Burns responded that the return on investment for a contractor would not be fully known or appreciated until after the first steps are taken. He stated that to make any kind of judgment on that at this point would only be speculation.

Councilor Burch stated that we do not have an exact dollar amount. She asked if she understood correctly that this is to be split 50/50, and Mayor Dennis confirmed that is correct. Councilor Burch stated that this is just to see if we can get the project done.

Councilor Hunt stated that these two resolutions are paired together, and she has difficulty separating them. She stated that on the second resolution, No. 04-15, there is a document added to the agenda, the Purdue Board of Trustees State Street Corridor document. She stated that that document is reassuring to her. We have been talking about how Purdue is going to support this project, and that document says it. She noted that this is a complicated issue and the Council members had some training sessions about this project. She asked Public Works Director Buck to talk about BOT (Build, Operate, and Transfer), the uniqueness of this type of project, and the possible cost savings.

Director Buck stated that this is the first time the City or the staff has looked at doing something like this. He stated that his partners at Purdue have done, in previous careers, some projects that fit this mold, and INDOT has done some very large projects. He stated that BOT is the State statute that allows a municipality to do a project. It is synonymous with P3—a public-private partnership. He explained that this is a little different from our normal procurement method. In the past we have always done design, bid, build (DBB), which is where we design a project, take it to the market and bid it, and then take the lowest most responsible bidder. He stated that it sometimes works in our favor while other times it creates a challenging work environment at the build end of things. He stated that on a project of this scale, magnitude, and complexity, it may be a good fit to do a public-private partnership. He stated that this is a process in which we would develop a very detailed request for proposals, but only to approximately 25% complete on design. He stated that we would package that and take it to the open market. Teams would form in the marketplace of engineers, designers, bankers, financiers, and contractors that would put together proposals to respond to that. We would grade those proposals and select one that is best qualified on a lot of fronts. It may be the cheapest, it may not, but it would be the most qualified and best response as to how to do this complex project. He stated that this is the process he is asking the Council to approve. In passing the BOT we would begin the market-sounding and question-asking to see if this is going to be a good fit for that. He stated that most public-private partnerships are actually bigger than this. He provided an example of the scale of some projects, stating that the east-end crossing over the Ohio River was estimated to be approximately a billion-dollar project for the DBB method, and the BOT method saved that project approximately 22%, which is several hundred million dollars. He stated that we are not talking about a project nearly that big, but we are talking about something just as complex. There are also other components to look at besides State Street. He stated that the master plan was done with an assumption that most or all of the Perimeter Parkway was complete and operational, so that the downgrading of traffic on State Street could be successful. He explained that some of the components of the Perimeter Parkway need to be built to be able to do the State Street project in the foreseeable future, so some of those components would be rolled into this request for proposals as well, and we will see what the response is from the market.

Councilor Dietrich stated that he also supports this project, but he has some questions about scope. He stated that as he reads through the documents from the Purdue Board of Trustees, they talk about scope and schedule and mention the Perimeter Parkway. He stated that he does not want us to be fooled into thinking that we are talking about State Street Re-State plan

as the scope is going to be much more than that. Infrastructure-wise there are things that need to happen to make State Street a logical plan. He stated that he is mainly concerned about the reference in the Purdue document to the Western Lands as that seems to be a long distance from State Street. He stated that while he thinks there is some merit to that, he wants to make sure that the City is well aware of what we are getting into with this. He asked Director Buck to talk about the financial aspects of just doing this all at once—would Perimeter Parkway slow down this project, can they be done simultaneously, and the western properties that appear to be more of a development issue aside from this road project itself.

Director Buck responded that the first part of that is the good part of what has been going on when looking at these projects, because in many ways the Perimeter Parkway being dovetailed with State Street works hand-in-hand and can be built almost as a detour for construction while the work is done on State Street. He stated that he is sure it will allow us to build it faster by doing the projects together.

Councilor Dietrich asked if the Perimeter Parkway has been defined, and Director Buck answered affirmatively and described the route.

Director Buck stated that regarding the Western Lands, as the Trustees documents mention, that is an area they are looking at to potentially make ready for development. Should things need done under State Street prior to it being approved we want to identify those issues are in advance, especially from a stormwater component.

Councilor Dietrich asked if that will be the responsibility of the developers or if there is infrastructure that we need to put in place with this plan in order to develop the area.

Director Buck responded that it is possible it would be both, and we do not know yet. He explained that developers sometimes come to the RDC and ask for assistance on the development costs. It is possible some of these could be incorporated, especially if it makes sense to be built with State Street. An example is that a culvert under Todd's Creek would need to be built with State Street, and that would facilitate the State Street project, but be designed in a way to also facilitate potential future development to avoid tearing it back out in the future.

Councilor Dietrich stated that there has been a lot of concern about the inability to have finite numbers for the beginning stages. He asked why the Council should not assign a not-to-exceed figure.

Director Buck stated that they have gone back to try to estimate a ballpark figure with our team and partnership with Purdue. He stated that it is very hard to know because we may get into this process and determine very quickly that this is not a good fit, so our tab would be much less. If we were to go all the way through to the end and get to the point of having that project development agreement, it would be several hundred thousand dollars. He stated that we are comfortable framing that figure somewhere between \$350,000 and \$500,000 for our share. That is getting to the end of that process, and likely if we get that far we will be telling the Council that yes, this is an absolute no-brainer and a great opportunity. He stated that the market feedback at that point would be strong and would take us all the way through this process.

Councilor Dietrich stated that we have heard a lot of talk about the City's cap with this. We are looking at a project with numbers from \$60-\$85 million. He asked where the City maxes out, even with this BOT plan, or if there is a number where we say that we cannot bring our half to the table.



Director Poole stated that we have been wrestling with how to put a cap on the City's involvement without breaking the TIFs, without committing so many funds as to not be able to do other projects within the TIF. He stated that we are looking at a maximum outlay from the RDC of \$60 million. That is going through installment payments through 2039. He stated that it is cash on the table, and there will also be financing costs and things like that as we get going into the actual BOT. He stated that the project may come in for less than that, but that is what we feel very comfortable with maxing out at this time.

Councilor Dietrich stated that his concern is that when he looks at the Purdue TIF, there is not a lot of money coming into that TIF. He stated that his understanding is that our goal is to finance both our part and the University's part from the Purdue TIF. He asked what happens if that does not develop in time or to that stature. He asked where the City will come up with the rest of the dollars.

Director Poole stated that the \$60 million comes out of the Levee/Village TIF only. It does not take into consideration the US 231 Purdue TIF. He stated that it is a 50/50 partnership with Purdue, and the way it is set up behooves Purdue and Purdue Research Foundation (PRF) to develop the US 231 TIF as fast as possible with taxable properties. They will be on the hook for their share of whatever we agree to as the total project cost. As they are building out there, and as they are selling off parcels to build taxable property, that increment goes to pay for that. He stated that it is either coming out of their pocket in some way, or it is coming out of the TIF.

Councilor Dietrich stated that right now we are buying other things out of the Levee/Village TIF such as fire trucks and police cars. He stated that he is concerned that we will not be able to fund those out of the TIF, and he needs to make sure that the department heads are not going to see the Council as the heavy in this. If there is not money there is not money, and it is going to be a new way of doing business for all of us as we have gotten to be reliant upon TIF money for some things that used to come out of our budget.

Director Poole stated that working with Jim Treat (O.W. Krohn & Associates) and Larry Oates (RDC President) to forecast the potential involvement of the TIF over the next 25-plus years, right now it averages approximately \$2 million coming out of the Levee/Village TIF and that is less than half of what the TIF generates in increment right now, and it will become substantially less than half. He stated that we looked at the long-term health of the TIF to make sure we are not putting so much pressure on the TIF so as to break it, that we cannot continue to pay for other things in the future. He stated that we are looking at it and that number will fluctuate somewhat we go through and start this BOT process.

Councilor Dietrich asked if we have calculated the figures to know what this would cost the City has a bond issue compared to this.

Director Poole stated that he does not think we have done that yet, and he does not think that we can support a full \$100 million bond at this point in time. He stated that it will be part of the analysis that will be done to see if the BOT can be successful or not. He confirmed for Councilor Dietrich that some projects have saved approximately 20% by using the BOT method, and we expect to see some savings like that as well, but it is part of the process to find out if it is even a big enough project.

Councilor Dietrich asked if do we have the other method as contingency if it not a big enough project. He stated that his opinion is that we may as well do it all at once, and we are never going to have the opportunity to do it again as cheaply or quickly, and maybe not without the partnership.

Director Poole stated that is why talk about the Perimeter Parkway is important.

Councilor Dietrich asked if we are participating in the development of the western lands, as shown on a map from the Purdue Trustees.

Director Poole stated that it the western lands is everything west of Airport Road, and it is now being called the Gateway District. He stated that it is some parcels in play between the University and PRF.

In response to a question from Councilor Burch, City Attorney Burns stated that we are not selling or leasing anything. He stated that the Operate part of BOT would be turning it over to keep it up. The Transfer would be giving that back, which is the obligation to do crack fill and potholes.

Councilor Burch expressed disappointment that there is not someone from the Purdue Board of Trustees in attendance.

Councilor Keen stated that he supports this project. He asked for an explanation of the DBB process versus the BOT in upfront costs and longevity of the project.

Director Buck stated that the longevity of the project for us as a City, and maybe even with help from Purdue, is large enough that it would possibly take several bonds. It would take several years to physically build it, as well as do the design in the first place. He stated that it would be a much more lengthy process just by format. He stated that for upfront costs we would have a significant percentage, several million dollars in engineering fees and costs, which we would incur initially for the design of the entire project. There would also be inspection services. He stated that the big thing that the BOT process does is risk transference. It takes all of the design, the utility locates, weather, and everything that goes into a construction contract, and puts more of that the team that will be turning in these proposals while taking more of it away from the City. The risk in a DBB project, when we own and develop the drawings, if there is something wrong with those drawings it comes back to the owner as a change order. Change orders are not part of the BOT model. He stated that it is hard to quantify and it is one of the things we want to determine if it is a good value for the money to help gauge what kind of savings we might be able to see. He stated that the numbers and cost estimates we have been doing, while they have been escalated for the potential year of construction, are based on a DBB model for an apple-to-apple comparison.

Councilor Keen asked what the estimated time is if we did the entire project with the DBB process.

Director Buck stated that it is being worked on now because that will be the baseline of comparatives in the value analysis. He stated that roughly speaking we are talking decades. He confirmed for Councilor Keen that with the BOT it has the potential to be a three-year project.

Councilor Keen asked what the potential is for change orders, and the amount on change orders, on a project of this magnitude with the DBB process.

Director Buck stated that it could be substantial. Any project can have the potential for 10-15% for change orders. He stated that the marketplace has become more competitive, and it is his opinion that it has become antiquated for us to still be doing the DBB model and always taking the absolute low bid. He stated that many states are looking at doing it other ways involving a

combination of factors, where the low bid is one piece of the formula but does not necessarily get the project awarded. He stated that the environment in the job office trailer can get heated at times because a low bid may not have included everything needed to complete the project, so it is difficult to do a project with the DBB process. He stated that with something of this size and magnitude, it would be scary to him to approach it as a DBB method. He gave an example of a project on Harrison Street that could have benefited from the type of creativity that is built into the BOT model. He stated that a change order would be part of the BOT process only if we brought something new to the table.

There was no further discussion.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes called the roll call vote:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Bunder	✓			
Burch	✓			
DeBoer	✓			
Dietrich	✓			
Hunt	✓			
Keen	✓			
Thomas	✓			

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes stated that the vote was 7 AYES and 0 NAYS.

Mayor Dennis announced that Resolution No. 03-15 passed on first and only reading.

Resolution No. 04-15 A Resolution Approving A Memorandum Of Understanding In Cooperation With Purdue University Concerning The State Street Project (Sponsored by Mayor John R. Dennis)

Mayor Dennis read Resolution No. 04-15 by title only.

Councilor Keen moved for passage of Resolution No. 04-15 on first and only reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

Mayor Dennis stated that this is Part B of the discussion on Resolution No. 03-15.

There was no further discussion.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes called the roll call vote:

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Bunder	✓			
Burch	✓			
DeBoer	✓			
Dietrich	✓			
Hunt	✓			
Keen	✓			
Thomas	✓			

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes stated that the vote was 7 AYES and 0 NAYS.

Mayor Dennis announced that Resolution No. 04-15 passed on first and only reading.

### COMMUNICATIONS

► Councilor Bunder reported that on March 26 there will be a meeting with the New Chauncey Neighborhood Association and the APC to discuss the zoning changes that are implied in the land use plan that are implied in the land use plan that the City has passed for New Chauncey.

► At the request of Councilor Burch, Mayor Dennis spoke about his trip to Washington D.C. He stated that it was a great trip and our elected officials were receptive, informed, and welcoming. He stated that he and Lafayette Mayor Roswarski brag about being the shining star when it comes to local government cooperation between Tippecanoe County, Lafayette, and West Lafayette. He stated that they cannot get over what we do when we are working together to make projects come to the area.

Councilor Burch stated that is not just in the State, but probably across the United States.

Mayor Dennis stated that it does not happen very often. He spoke about the recent case of the G.E. plant in Lafayette. He also spoke of how the younger generation in attendance at the Chamber trip were informed and educated.

► In response to a question from Councilor Hunt, Councilor Keen stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting that includes the Family Express sign variance request is on March 25. He stated that people may speak at the meeting or submit written comments, but cannot speak with the members of the Board beforehand.

### CITIZEN COMMENTS

► Mr. Baiel spoke about several topics, including that he supports the State Street project; however, he expressed concern about the quality of developments and businesses if we are only concerned about time to generate quick money in the TIF district. He requested that the public stay informed of what happens during the BOT process.

► Donnie Spencer (Tarkington Hall, Room 156, 1165 W. Stadium Avenue) stated that he is a candidate for the newly annexed Purdue District 3. He stated that Purdue has updated its political canvassing policy. He explained that the candidates for the new districts now have more opportunity to canvas the University halls and interact with their constituents. In response to a question from Councilor DeBoer, Mr. Spencer stated that the big change is that candidates are now allowed in open areas and to go door-to-door, and it allows each hall to decide certain rules and parameters.

► Chris Kulesza (190 Burke Court, Apt. 312), President of the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG), stated that this is his last meeting as PGSG President and stated that it has been an honor to serve PGSG. He spoke of how PGSG has grown in the time he has been with the organization, including the new graduate student community center and the grants they offer. He stated that it has been an honor to work with the City Council members and he thanked them for all of their interactions with PGSG, which has led to graduate students who are involved and engaged with the community.

► Councilor Bunder asked if it is correct that the next item related to the State Street project that the Council will see is the project development agreement, and City Attorney Burns confirmed that is correct.

Councilor Dietrich stated that after that agreement there will not be a lot of Council or public input into the design, development, and progress from there. He stated that it will be like any other road project, done at the contractors level. He asked if that is correct.

Mayor Dennis stated that is correct.

City Attorney Burns stated that one of the most important features of the BOT process is that the final proposal will be brought to a formal public meeting that will probably be in front of the Joint Board. The public will have the opportunity to look at it beforehand and make comments, which the Joint Board would consider before taking final action. He confirmed for Councilor Dietrich that Council only has one more approval in this process, except that perhaps when the financing issue comes up.

Councilor Dietrich stated that he gave Mr. Baiel some bad information. He stated that it is not to approve the project, but it is to approve the obligation. City Attorney Burns confirmed that is correct.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business at this time, Councilor Burch moved for adjournment, and Mayor Dennis adjourned the meeting the time being 7:58 p.m.