

CITY OF WEST LAFAYETTE
COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
MINUTES
MAY 19, 2015

The Common Council of the City of West Lafayette, Indiana, met in the Multi-Purpose Room at the Morton Community Center on May 19, 2015, at the hour of 4:00 p.m.

Mayor Dennis called the meeting to order and presided.

The Pledge of Allegiance was repeated.

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

Absent: Keen

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, WWTU Director Henderson, Fire Inspector Imel, and Director of Development Poole.

Mayor Dennis noted that as this is a special meeting we will be dispensing with the usual preliminary business usually handled during Council meetings and go straight to the New Business agenda items.

NEW BUSINESS:

Resolution No. 10-15 A Resolution Approving The First Supplement To The Interlocal Cooperation Agreement With Purdue University Concerning The U.S. 231 Annexation (Sponsored by Mayor Dennis)

Mayor Dennis read Resolution No. 10-15 by title only.

Councilor Burch moved for passage of Resolution No. 10-15 on first and only reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Dietrich.

Mayor Dennis noted that Adrian Allen and Eldon Peterson are here from Purdue University, along with Redevelopment Commission (RDC) President Larry Oates, and our financial advisor, Jim Treat. Mayor Dennis stated that this is furtherance in the process of the State Street and Western Gateway projects. He stated that there have been several presentations about this, and most of the people in attendance have been involved in this project. He noted that at the March 2, 2015, Council meeting the Council approved a memorandum of understanding between the City and Purdue. He stated that most recently the Purdue Board of Trustees has approved the Project Development Agreement (PDA), and now it is our turn. He stated that there are many people here to answer questions, and the Council and RDC have been given an overview of this project and of these two agenda items.

Councilor Burch asked what PPA stands for.

RDC President Oates responded that in the PDA, on Page 6 under Paragraph 1.2.28, PPA is defined as the agreement or the agreements entered between the Joint Board the the

Developer of the Project. He stated that he believes that PPA itself is Public-Private Agreement.

Councilor Burch stated that this resolution has an attached Exhibit "A," and within the Exhibit "A" it refers to Exhibit A, Description of State Street Project, but it has no further attachment; it is just a blank page.

City Attorney Burns stated that on the PDA there are three exhibits, and one of those exhibits is the resolution we are talking about right now, the First Supplement to the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement. The second exhibit would be the Description of Infrastructure Works Package, and the third is Request for Qualifications (RFQ), which will actually be attached later when the RFQ is finalized and becomes a public document. Until that time it would not be possible to put that on.

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 6 AYES and 0 NAYS.

Mayor Dennis announced that Resolution No. 10-15 passed on first and only reading.

Resolution No. 11-15 A Resolution Approving A Project Development Agreement In Cooperation With Purdue University Concerning The State Street Project (Sponsored by Mayor Dennis)

Mayor Dennis read Resolution No. 11-15 by title only.

Councilor Burch moved for passage of Resolution No. 11-15 on first and only reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Dietrich.

Councilor DeBoer asked, regarding Section 7.1 of Resolution No. 11-15 Exhibit "A," where it talks about eminent domain authority. He stated that he wanted to get clarification on how that was going to work under Indiana statute. He asked if that would go through the Board of Works, or if that would be an independent organization that is assigned the authority, or if it would be the Council.

City Attorney Burns responded that the way the property acquisition goes is that there are offers made to individuals, and if there is a voluntary sale then it does not need further procedure. He stated that we are talking about very few and very small eminent domain takings to go through corner-cuts under the current plan. He stated that if there are people or business entities that do not want to sell, and if it is necessary to do the powers of eminent domain, then the procedure would be that the RDC, being the acquiring body paying for it with TIF funds, would

ask the Council for permission and to direct the City Attorney to go forward with that. It becomes an item that the Council has to deal with.

Councilor DeBoer stated that is what he wanted to hear. He stated that he has a question regarding Section 5.8, the Naming Rights provision. He stated that this is where the university can name the road based on donors. He asked for clarification on how that came about and why we are abdicating that.

City Attorney Burns stated that the current naming rights are a creature of statute. He stated that part of that procedure is to go through the Area Plan Commission (APC) and things of that nature. He stated that the ultimate authority in making decisions for naming rights would rest with the Board of Works as far as a City street, and that would be for any renaming rights. He stated that this involves Purdue Research Foundation's (PRF) recent change of doing development through the PRF, and PRF's involvement with the financing. He noted that PRF is going to put forward essentially a credit line of \$60 million. He stated that he believes this is their way of going out to their donor base with an opportunity for certain naming rights with a donation. He stated that this provision puts the onus on PRF to bring that forward and take it to the Joint Board.

Councilor DeBoer asked if it is correct that any revenue they get from that would only go towards covering their part of the cost and has nothing to do with our part of the cost at that point in time.

City Attorney Burns responded that is right. He stated that the overall project is structured so that every dollar that is put in by the City is going to be matched by Purdue. He stated that they are going to be using a credit facility where they essentially borrow from their own internal sources. As the Purdue TIF, also called TIF 2, starts to pay off, then it is going to replace the need for them to borrow from themselves. He stated that this would be another way they would seek to pay that off. He stated that the project benefits from it, but the benefit is particularly for Purdue because they would not need to advance as many funds from the credit facility.

Councilor Hunt asked if the statute referred to is State statute.

City Attorney Burns responded that there is State statute that outlines the APC's roll in naming rights. He stated that the APC is a check-off body to make sure that there is no confusion and things of a technical nature. He confirmed for Councilor Hunt that it would not come through the Council, explaining that street names and renaming are not Council activities.

Councilor Hunt asked if the City has anything to do with the Purdue TIF.

City Attorney Burns responded that it is a City TIF. We call it the Purdue TIF for ease of reference so that people understand that it is the Western Gateway. It is like any other TIF in the City. He stated that in his view it is an opportunity that has been presented to make sure that it grows more quickly, robustly, and with more taxpaying entities than it would otherwise. He stated that it this creates a desire on the part of Purdue, now and in the future, to do as much as they can to develop that TIF as a taxpaying part of the City.

Councilor Hunt asked if it is correct that Purdue can do independent fundraising, while one of our main contributors would be the money we get from the TIF when Purdue does the enhancement in the area.

City Attorney Burns responded that is correct. He stated that the primary source at the beginning, as far as the TIF funds, is the Levee/Village TIF. He stated that it is a very strong and robust TIF district, and so it would be a portion of that that would go to the availability payment. He stated that the dollars put in by the Levee/Village TIF are matched by Purdue.

Councilor Hunt asked Jim Treat to provide his input.

Mr. Treat (O.W. Krohn & Associates) stated that the primary question he came to address is affordability. He stated that we are talking about the commitment that is on the table right now, and frankly it may change as we go forward. What the City is committing to now is up to approximately \$60 million for the City's half of the transaction. Purdue, through the mechanism that City Attorney Burns described, would match that with \$60 million, though it is a little more complicated. He stated that what we want to look at is if we are committing to \$60 million over the next 25 years is how that impacts our Levee/Village TIF. He stated that for this year, based on the actual billings for Levee/Village, we should be collecting approximately \$5.1 million in tax increment. There are also two major projects in that area that have been completed but the first year on the tax rolls will be next year. Those projects are the 225 Northwestern apartments and South Street Station apartments. With those projects we are expecting the amount to jump to approximately \$5.6 million for next year. He stated that if we use that as a base, we are looking at availability payments of \$2.1 to \$2.3 million as it scales up over the term. He stated that if we say that we are going to spend \$2.3 million of our \$5.6 million as our commitment to this project, it leaves approximately \$3.5 million. He stated that the only other existing commitment for this area is a bond commitment for the parking garage in the amount of \$590,000, which pays off in 2021. There is one other commitment that will be discussed at tomorrow's RDC meeting involving the legacy TIF bonds. He stated that the important aspect of that is that we want to maximize the term that we will be collecting increment. The older TIF areas will sunset if we do not issue some bonds to maximize that. It will be \$18-\$20,000 per year. He stated that what that means is that in these early years where we still have some existing bond obligations, we are looking at approximately \$2 million of uncommitted funds, even after the State Street payment and these other bonds. He stated that as the TIF area grows and the garage bonds fall off, we are looking at approximately \$3.5 million. He stated that he is assuming the Levee/Village will continue to grow, particularly with this project going on, to finish some of the areas that have no developed yet, so the gap will be even more. He stated that we feel pretty comfortable with that. It stated that it gives the City room for other pay-as-you-go projects like we typically do with road projects and other support of the City, and it gives more room depending on what happens with the bids come in and we see what the real numbers are.

Councilor Dietrich asked Mr. Treat that is he is comfortable at \$60 million, then where does his comfort level start waning as the number goes up.

Mr. Treat responded that it depends on a lot of things. Part of it is what we are putting the extra money in for, and part of it is that it is not a level payment. He stated that he has seen various curves. He stated that we are not putting these numbers together. There is a KPMG International accounting firm that specializes in these procurement projects, which the group has retained to do these calculations. He stated that he would not want to cut it closer than \$1-\$2 million of uncommitted funds out of the Levee/Village TIF. He stated that what the total is depends on how the transaction is actually designed and how the payments scale up over the years, so he looked at what the uncommitted funds were and not so much the total. He stated that right now this is what the City is committing to, and if we look at a bigger commitment we will have to address that when we have the actual numbers. He stated that there is room for other things, whether it is this project growing or other projects that we do not know about. He stated that he would have to see what those numbers are to give a more specific answer.

Councilor Dietrich stated that it is not reassuring because we do not have hard numbers now. He stated that we have a floating \$60 million figure out there, and he is asking Mr. Treat to use the same magic as using the \$60 million to determine that uncomfortable feeling. He asked if it is \$70 million, \$80 million, or \$65 million.

Mr. Treat responded that it is probably more like \$90 million or more.

Councilor Burch asked if Mr. Treat has done a scenario in case Levee/Village does not grow, or if it downsizes for whatever reason.

Mr. Treat responded that he really just looked at the \$5.6 million and that without any growth we should not drop below that. He stated that we should still be at that comfort level. The tightest years are going to be the first three or four years when we are trying to put aside as much money as we can towards this, because we do not start payments to the developer until 2019. That does not mean that are not going to commit funds; we are going to try to set aside as much as \$3 million per year starting next year towards this project. He stated that the more we can set aside before those availability payments start, the more we can buy-down what has to be financed by the contractor. He stated that as we do now, we try to pay as much as we can with cash on hand rather than financing it. He stated that \$5.6 is the lowest he looked at, but when we are talking \$1-\$2 million in gap, whether it is lower increment or for other projects, that would be a similar concept.

Councilor DeBoer asked if Purdue has a price where it becomes too expensive to continue with the partnership. He asked if there is anyone here from the University that knows that.

There was no response to Councilor DeBoer's question.

Councilor Bunder stated that he would like to share questions he has been asked by constituents. He asked about the increased traffic in the area.

Public Works Director Buck stated that we have studied that a lot and are continuing to study. He stated that there is a spectrum of school of thought on how well it needs to work in terms of reducing the amount of traffic volume on State Street versus how much you want it to work. He stated that it is a two-edged issue as we do not want it to become a barren wasteland with tumbleweeds. We want activity there, but we want an appropriate level of activity that can be supported in a downtown type of environment, with the normal grid of two-way streets with on-street parking, and wide sidewalks. The State Street Master Plan also includes the two-way bike path the entire length of State Street. He stated that we are looking at the components of not just the State Street Project, but also the Perimeter Parkway Project, and ensuring that enough of the Perimeter Parkway, hopefully all of it, can be constructed with this deal. He stated that this is why we want to see what the market can construct for a given dollar amount, and it will hopefully be the whole thing. He stated that what is in the PDA is basically a base bid, with an add-alternate approach if you think of typical bidding where we often take alternate bids to see how much more something would cost, or conversely how much we would save by not doing something. He stated that the base project scope as it is defined in there as project Sections 1 – 5 gets us the southern part of Perimeter Parkway in a four-lane configuration. Hopefully that will reduce traffic on State Street to a level that is acceptable enough. He stated that he is concerned that we need to do the entire Perimeter Parkway, including the western and northern segments, so the expanded project scope in Section 6, is included to see how much it would take to be able to afford the entire thing. He stated that we are keeping both ends of that spectrum that we are considering on the table going forward so that we have that flexibility to make an informed decision when we start seeing numbers.

Councilor Bunder asked Director Buck to tell him how close he was with his answer, because he said that we will work on the Perimeter Parkway before we close State Street. He asked if he is wrong or half-right.

Director Buck stated that it is our working understanding at this time. The market may have a greater or better idea, and they still have the flexibility to come back to us with that.

Councilor Bunder stated that Mr. Treat answered the next question. He stated to keep in mind that in his district he has ex-City Councilmen and people who are on the APC. He stated that one question is if we would still be able to buy fire trucks out of the RDC. Councilor Bunder stated that another question is if his neighbors wanted to ask the RDC for money to put in street lights, then we might still be able to get that. Councilor Bunder stated that the basic question is to confirm that all of the money is not gone.

Mayor Dennis confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Treat stated that to add to that answer, one of the things that we talked about in our related discussion was where we expanded that Levee/Village TIF area so we could do the Neighborhood Support Program. He stated that we absolutely did not want to be in a position where we had to say, "Sorry guys, there is nothing left for you."

Councilor Bunder stated that another question that comes up in his neighborhood is to ask if this will be like Wang Hall. There is concern that we are being over-promised in terms of the return and if the City will see property tax dollars out of this.

RDC President Oates noting that he was not involved in Wang Hall at all, stated that part of what we did on this was to take a completely different attack to this than we did for Wang Hall. He stated that with Wang Hall the University came to us saying that they want to build this, and some of it may be tax related, or it may not; it will be decided along the line how it will work. He stated that what we have done here is taken this project, since Purdue has decided that this would be a great project for them also, and put the money together, and came up with a vehicle to pay Purdue back over time. He stated that the bottom line is that this road, when it is finished and all of the infrastructure that goes with it, is owned by the City of West Lafayette. He stated that if we had there wherewithal to come up with \$120 million today then he would be the first to say that we should to pay it out of current cash, but it is not the reality of where we live to be able to do this kind of a project. He stated that especially not when we take this project and finish it in three or four years. He stated that it is very different from the situation of a current project, Cumberland Avenue. We are in year six of building Cumberland Avenue, and we are going to finish this year, but it has taken six years to do that in small chunks. So that has been six years of paying for just that section of the City. We are looking at a much larger section that we are going to be able to turn in a quicker time by putting the two forces together. He stated that with that concept in the back of our mind, the next thing that came up is to ask how we can incentivize Purdue to be able to develop the lands out there. Not just for us to go as a Redevelopment Commission and put in the infrastructure and have it sit. That goes back to the old bridge-to-nowhere concept to someday build a road to it when we get around to it. He stated that we did not want to be in that situation. He stated that we have this TIF district there that encompasses Purdue land, and almost every piece of parcel in that US 231 TIF district, is owned by either Purdue University or PRF. He stated that we incentivize them by saying that if Purdue will front-end load your \$60 million by making it available to get this project done, then the carrot is that we will put in the infrastructure for the area and what Purdue needs to be able to do is develop the area. By developing it and putting it on the tax rolls it will generate increment that will come back to the RDC. At that point the RDC will pledge that increment to

paying back the \$60 million to Purdue. He stated that if Purdue does not do anything, then at the end of 23 years they would have spent \$60 million and will not get paid back. He stated that this agreement goes for that 23-year period, and then it is done. He stated that if Purdue does not build in the TIF district, then they have no possibility of getting paid back. The Levee/Village TIF district is not back-stopping Purdue's half. It is only back-stopped by the US 231 portion of it. He stated that this is how this is very different from Wang Hall. There is an incentive right from the start for Purdue to do something out there to be able to get paid back. At the end of 23 years the agreement is done, and the tax increment goes back to the City and all of the underlying tax jurisdictions. At the end of 23 years it is a big win, especially if they have done big development there. He stated that it does not have to end there because if they have done enough development that it is in excess of paying them back, then increment comes back to the City. He stated that that increment is not controlled by Purdue; it is controlled by the City to do additional projects. He stated that if you look at where that TIF district is, this infrastructure is what will make that TIF district happen. He asked if this answers how this will be different from Wang Hall.

Councilor Bunder responded that it does. He stated that hopes that the people who live in West Lafayette appreciate how clever and how cutting-edge, and how absolutely important this is to go forward. He stated that this is much different from anything we have ever done before. It is the equivalent in our time of railroad relocation in the City of Lafayette. He stated that the Federal and State government does not work as it did during those days when John Myers and Jim Riehle could count on decades of government support over a long period of time. He stated that it is also important that anyone who has a question gets it answered because this is not anything like we have ever done before. He stated that one thing that could go wrong is that it may be that this is not a big enough project to attract the kind of people that we would like to see be responsible for this project. He thanked everyone who answered his constituents' questions.

Mayor Dennis stated that to continue with that, this is not just something that is big for us here; it is also big for the State. It is establishing new parameters on how to get things done and get things done quickly. He stated that one of the big issues that communities our size, and even larger, have to struggle with. When looking at a major infrastructure project, oftentimes what you struggle with is the inconvenience it causes for your population. He stated that credit to the Council body, the RDC, and Purdue, as there are lot of people who do not have the political intestinal fortitude to put up with that. He stated that, again, credit goes around the room. It does take a lot of creativity. It does take asking hard questions. It does take a bit of a poker face at times as well, because you want to make sure that the ante is there. He stated that the team on this side of the podium as well as that side has done an amazing job.

Councilor Thomas stated that he has another citizen comment. He stated that he and Director Buck have had discussion about the roundabout that is going at the bottom of State Street Hill. He stated that there was a conversation with the consultant about how they could monitor the traffic flow through there. He stated that there is still some real concern about if that roundabout can handle the amount of traffic that is seen in that spot on a daily basis.

Director Buck stated that if there was no State Street Master Plan, and if there was no Perimeter Parkway, then it would still be a good intersection for a roundabout even with more volume than it has today. He stated that to the question of if the traffic in the roundabout would work, there is no doubt in his mind that there is enough capacity at a roundabout intersection at that location. He stated that it is a better match, given all of the other master planning that we are talking about having, and a gateway feature to boot, for that intersection. He stated that the traffic volume at the intersection should come down from today, but it will still have a lot of traffic go

through it on opening day of completion of the project. It will still have a lot of pedestrians, and it will be signalized for ADA crossing on each leg. This will affect traffic flow to some degree, but it will also be a much safer situation for pedestrians. He stated that we feel very comfortable with that roundabout there.

Councilor Burch asked if the Council and the public will get to see a traffic study of this potential roundabout, because she is opposed to the roundabout at River Road and State Street.

Director Buck stated that we have done multiple studies, and we will look at a comparison of keeping it as the signalized intersection that is there today versus changing it to a roundabout. He stated that most of what we have looked at has analyzed it as a roundabout and what level of service it will function at, but we will make sure to have that comparison. He expressed his expectation that the traffic signal option will fail.

Councilor Burch asked if there is an estimated date of when the Council would have that.

Director Buck stated that he would have to get with the technical advisors and team. He stated that we have a lot of that already, and it will probably be just a matter of compiling it together a format that would be worthwhile for the Council. He stated that the traffic signal option is something we have not taken forward very much, because as said, it will fail.

Councilor DeBoer asked what will actually come before the Council after this, and when and what is it.

City Attorney Burns responded that the procedure from here will involve the Council's vote again on the financing. He stated that whenever there are proposals that have actual numbers, then it will be necessary for the EDC and the RDC to make recommendations to the Council, and for the Council to pass a final financing package. He stated that it is really a bond. The difference is that instead of having a bond where you go out and borrow money from a bank, this is a bond structure that gets paid off over the years from the availability payment. He stated that as far as timing, it would have to be after the proposals come back.

Director Buck stated that the general schedule will be upon completion or acceptance of the PDA. He stated that we would release the RFQ as early as Thursday this week. He stated that with the teams then forming in the marketplace and putting together their statements of qualifications in response to that, those would be due by July 2. He stated that the month of July would then be used by the project technical advisor team to review those submissions to three top teams. Then the Request for Proposals (RFP) process would begin. These are formal proposals that would take us through the rest of the year with some type of financial decisions being made during the first quarter of 2016.

Councilor Dietrich stated that since there are no secrets in this world, he assumes that word is out that this is pending. He asked if there have been any advanced interest or questions.

Director Buck stated that there have been quite a bit, and the website has been live since the Road School. Since then we have had multiple market-sounding sessions and questions. As the RFQ process begins, that stops in terms of the back-and-forth because we are live then with the project. The communication level will become much more formal, and more so once we begin the RFP process.

Councilor Thomas asked Mr. Treat if the affordability cap is the \$90 million dollar mentioned earlier.

Mr. Treat responded no and explained that the affordability cap is related to the estimated total amount of availability payments. Currently that amount is approximately \$60 million each from the City and from Purdue.

Councilor Hunt asked Director Buck to talk about a previous discussion about the project with the Ohio River because they used this process, and there was a savings.

Director Buck stated that it was a larger project with an estimated cost of around \$1 billion. They saw a savings of approximately 20% versus the tradition design, bid, build model. The build, operate, transfer (BOT) model, also called the public-private partnership, saw that type of net savings.

Councilor Burch asked what liability the City has. She stated that she was reading Article 10, General Matters, Section 10.3 Liability Between the Parties.

City Attorney Burns responded that the liability in the standard design bid largely comes back toward the owner. All bucks stop at the owner. If there is a change order, they come to the owner and say "please pay," and there tends to be more change orders on complicated projects. He stated that the risk under the BOT model is lessened in that regard, because you have a developer or contractor who is going to be receiving a set amount of money that is known up-front. The risk then shifts to them, so if they do not build it correctly they have 23 years to live with the decision they made. They are not going to build it, receive their money, and move on. They are going to build it and be here for 23 years operating. So, the decisions they make are all going to be paid for by them, to look at it that way. He stated that he thinks that it greatly minimizes risk.

City Attorney Burns stated that he has an item before the vote. He stated that the Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes reminded him to mention that there is a resolution that was just filed today and will be taken up at the next regular meeting. It is a resolution of the Common Council authorizing the City Attorney to exercise the City's power of eminent domain, which goes back to a question from Councilor DeBoer. He stated that it involves a project that he will ask Director Buck to discuss. It is a small take, clipping off a corner.

Director Buck stated that it involves one parcel of 399 square feet, 90 of which appears to be an unrecorded existing right-of-way. He stated that we have done an appraisal and made an offer which has been rejected. It is germane to the Northwestern Avenue Phase 4 contract that Milestone Contractors is working on right now. He stated that we would like to move forward quickly to be able to build the turn lane in the way that we would like it at the corner of Fowler and Northwestern.

City Attorney Burns stated that this is before the Council now and has not been in the past because until recently the RDC had its own power of eminent domain. Now that power is overseen by the Council. It is a change in the State law, so they may see more of these as time goes forward.

City Attorney Burns stated that the only other thing that he would ask for, in relation to the exhibits Councilor Burch asked about. There are three exhibits. The first one is Resolution No. 10-15 as just passed by this Council. The last one is the RFQ that cannot be attached until later. Then there is one that has been provided to the Council, Exhibit 6.1, which is a short exhibit with the Description of the Infrastructure Works Package. He asked the Council to add this exhibit by amending Resolution No. 11-15 by attachment.

Councilor Dietrich moved to amend Resolution No. 11-15 by attachment. Councilor Burch seconded the motion, and the motion 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 6 AYES and 0 NAYS.

Mayor Dennis announced that Resolution No. 11-15 (Amended) passed on first and only reading.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

► Mary Cook (Harry's Chocolate Shop, 329 West State Street, owner) stated that she has been coming to this community for 59 years when she came to college here. She spoke about the changes to the Levee/Village areas over the years. She stated that of the four restaurants she has owned, every single one of them had anywhere from 6 months to four years of having access completely cut off due to road changes. She stated that whatever this ends up being, people will learn the new route. It benefits some, it hurts some, but people learn and figure it out. We have a very transient community. She stated that if this project is, as promised, start to finish in three years, then by the end of the time that the average Purdue student is here, no one will have any idea how well the project has been done, but they will also not remember the trouble. For those living here, time is of the essence. She stated that everyplace that has been done here has been done in chunks. It is not continuous. It benefits or it hurts in big chunks of time, and then it does not go anywhere. She stated that it makes sense to do this, for this area, in a fast period and have it flow. She stated that pretty buildings and artwork can be put in later. If the infrastructure and the road is done in one fell swoop, then everyone will benefit when it is over. She stated that she hopes the Council supports this. It is a starting place and launching pad, but it is a lot better than the way the majority of the things have been done. She stated that it is not only done that way in this community, and spoke of an expressway project which was a deterrent in Evansville. She stated that the way State Street is now is that it is a freeway, and the traffic changed dramatically when it changed to a one-way. With the accidents, and the speed, it does not matter what is posted, there is no way to control it. She stated that going back to two one-ways makes sense, but it is a lot of property to cover, and it needs to be done quickly.

► Jan Myers (1909 Indian Trail Drive) stated that she is left with one what-if question. She stated that the question was developed because she often attended the public meetings on the project which were held on the Purdue campus, which were more informal than the ones held the library. She stated that the consulting firm had several people here from headquarters, and they said that they idea of downtown was to build things close to the street, and that Purdue planned to fill with multi-use buildings all the way along State Street. She stated that they were

quite vocal and open with this. She stated that today she is only hearing talk about the western corridor, and not taking away all of the grass and green trees through campus, but it was brought up at one of the meetings that a driving force for Purdue was to be able to put in multi-use buildings along State Street. She stated that taxpayers would wonder if the buildings are put on University property, and it is not part of the TIF, where some of those costs would come from. She stated that especially if you follow what is happening with campus student body population, with the number going down in number throughout the U.S. and the world.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business at this time, Councilor Burch moved for adjournment, and Mayor Dennis adjourned the meeting the time being 4:52 p.m.