

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL
HELD IN THE 10th FLOR CONFERENCE ROOM
2400 Washington Avenue
April 28, 2009
1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Tina L. Vick; Joseph C. Whitaker; Dr. Patricia P. Woodbury; Herbert
H. Bateman, Jr.; Joe S. Frank; Madeline McMillan; and Sharon P. Scott ----- 7

ABSENT: None ----- 0

OTHERS PRESENT: Randy W. Hildebrandt; Stuart E. Katz; Mabel Washington Jenkins; Alan Archer; Neil Morgan; Cynthia Rohlf; Lottie Vincent; Allen Jackson; Gregg Jones; Lisa Cipriano; Rhonda Everton; Robin Rose; Monique Warren; Chad Pritchett; Steve Carpenter; LaVerne Lovett; Florence Kingston; Yvonne Manning; Izabella Cieszynski; Scott Fuller; Glenn Butler; Eileen Leininger; Lillian Taylor; Steve Cooper; Doug Clever; Chris Vitarelli; Thad Holloman; Chris Levesque; Bill Ermatinger; Sabine Hirschauer; Jennifer Walker; Cleder Jones; Kim Lee; and Jerri Wilson

I. Newport News General Hospital Site Redevelopment Proposal

City Manager Hildebrandt stated interest had been shown from S. L. Nusbaum Realty to acquire a 26 acre site on Marshall Avenue that was once occupied by Newport News General Hospital. City-owned property was included in the 26 acre site, which was important in terms of the proposal. The City had worked with Nusbaum Realty to compose a development project that was appropriate for the 26 acre site. Nusbaum Realty required a letter of support from the City as a condition of their application to the State to obtain Tax Credit Financing. The deadline date to submit the application was May 15, 2009. The letter would also include a notation that the City would have to consider a rezoning application for the site if Nusbaum Realty's Tax Credit Financing application was approved. He introduced Mr. Steve Cooper, representative of Nusbaum Realty, to offer background information on the plan for the property and what the City planned to do with its property that was connected to the site to make it a mixed-residential area.

Mr. Cooper stated Nusbaum Realty had been in business since 1906. They developed multi-family housing, shopping centers, and commercial and industrial office space. Nusbaum Realty proposed building 264 apartment units on the 26 acre site to include single family housing that would be built by the Newport News Redevelopment and Housing Authority (NNRHA). He introduced Mr. Doug Clever, Architect for the project, to explain what Nusbaum Realty and the City envisioned for the property.

Mr. Clever stated the apartment units would be built in two phases. Phase One would include a total of 144 apartment units and Phase Two would include a total of 120 units.

Nusbaum Realty envisioned and proposed a park like development that mixed high quality apartments with single family homes, a 2,500 square foot club house, and a swimming pool. The development would provide two means of ingress and egress and would be a gated community for purposes of safety. It would offer a nice lifestyle for those who chose to live in the development. (Information concerning S. L. Nusbaum Realty Company is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

City Manager Hildebrandt stated the City would convey the portion of its land, located in the 26 acre site, to the NNRHA for development of single-family homes. He anticipated the development would include 20 to 24 single-family homes. He introduced Ms. Karen Wilds, Executive Director, NNRHA, to offer insight on the single-family homes.

Ms. Wilds stated NNRHA anticipated building 20 to 24 single-family homes, for first-time home buyers, with a median Newport News income. NNRHA proposed a \$200,000 price range for the homes. She felt the timing of the project was adequate because development would occur in 2011 or 2012, when the housing market was expected to improve.

City Manager Hildebrandt pointed out that Nusbaum Realty would develop and build a second access road, which would provide the City with a road to serve the single-family homes to be built by NNRHA. The City, nor the NNRHA, would be required to make any investment in the road and would allow the City to start developing the single-family lots without costs.

Councilwoman Scott inquired about the second access road and its location in the development. Mr. Clever replied the second access road would extend out to Marshall Avenue and would be part of Phase One of the apartment development.

Councilwoman Scott inquired about the price points for the apartments. Mr. Cooper replied the apartments would rent for \$650 to \$950 per month, which was considered workforce affordable housing.

Mr. Cooper pointed out all the amenities for the development (club house, pool and sizing of pond to accommodate Phase Two) would be built in Phase One of the project. Nusbaum Realty developed and maintained their properties. They were the developer, owners, and managers of their housing developments, which was important in terms of quality and workmanship in the short and long-term. Concerned about occupancy, Nusbaum Realty required a credit and background check on all proposed residents. History would show that their properties were well maintained and heavily landscaped.

Vice Mayor Whitaker voiced concern with the number of apartment units that were proposed for the development. It was his hope that the development would include for sale

condominiums and more single-family homes. He did not disagree with developing the property, but did disagree with the number of apartment units proposed for the project.

City Manager Hildebrandt stated the option would have been to provide more single-family homes at the front of the development, but staff felt it was better to leave the wooded and wetland area in its natural state. The other issue was the financial prudence of Nusbaum Realty building an apartment complex and the number of apartments needed to make the project work. Originally, Nusbaum Realty proposed 300 apartment units, but the City swayed them to reduce the amount of units to 244, which he felt was reasonable.

City Manager Hildebrandt agreed with Vice Mayor Whitaker about the abundance of apartments in the area surrounding the new development. The City had been looking at studying the Newsome Park apartment complex which posed the most challenges and issues. He stated the project would provide affordable housing for residents displaced from public housing in the Southeast Community due to the redevelopment of the waterfront and would allow those residents the ability to stay in the area. He felt the proposed housing would be an attractive safe environment. The annual income requirement would be \$17,000 and up.

Vice Mayor Whitaker supported more home ownership in that area, and suggested that townhomes be considered for the development. He resided across the street from the Newsome Park apartment complex where he experienced the sound of gun shots daily.

Mr. Cooper stated such incidences would not occur in the apartment complex that Nusbaum Realty proposed to build, as they would bring in their own private security company.

Vice Mayor Whitaker disagreed with the number of apartments and the income level requirement of \$17,000 per year.

City Manager Hildebrandt indicated he spoke with the developers to inquire whether they would consider including more single-family homes in the development, but they indicated they were not in the single-family home development business. That was the reason the City proposed building single-family homes on the land it owned connected to the development.

Vice Mayor Whitaker pointed out the City was experiencing problems in the single-family home development of Jefferson Park because of certain residents who resided in the Newsome Park apartment complex.

Councilwoman Vick stated the difference between Newsome Park and the proposed development were the amenities (green space, a clubhouse for activities and a pool).

She expressed support for the project. As the City moved forward with redevelopment of the downtown waterfront, some displaced residents preferred to stay in the area. The proposed development allowed those residents the opportunity to continue to reside in the South District, which was amendable. She felt comparing Newsome Park to the proposed project was like comparing “apples to oranges” because of the amenities.

Mr. Cooper stated one of the advantages to the Tax Credit Financing Program was that it provided over \$39 million for the proposed development, which provided the City with outstanding market rate affordable housing.

Vice Mayor Whitaker stated he lived in the area all his life and would like to see the area revitalized with single-family homes. He was not discouraging the development, but felt something had to be done about the crime that occurred in Newsome Park. He asked the developer to work harder to include more for sale housing in the development.

Councilwoman Scott felt townhomes and condominiums could be an option over apartment units. It would be an asset to include more for sale units in the project.

City Manager Hildebrandt stated he would work with the NNRHA to inquire whether they could develop more attached single-family homes in the development, rather than detached single family homes. He stated the City needed to address the crime that was taking place in Newsome Park. Until crime was addressed, the Jefferson Park area would not improve. He proposed talking with the Newsome Park apartment owners to determine whether there was an opportunity to improve the development and reduce its density.

- II. AREVA Project Update and
- III. Technology Zone Briefing

City Manager Hildebrandt reminded on October 23, 2008, Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding and AREVA NP announced the location of a project that would create 540 new jobs and more than \$363 million in new capital investment in Newport News. In order to deliver two of the local incentives to the AREVA project, the City had to enact a Technology Zone ordinance, which described the boundaries of the Technology Zone and authorized a Technology Zone Business Incentive Abatement. The Technology Zone Business Incentive Abatement would be available to qualifying companies locating in the Technology Zone, including Newport News Energy, LLC. The Technology Zone would also allow the Economic Development Authority (EDA), through a funding agreement with the City, to provide grants for qualifying projects, including AREVA Newport News. He introduced Mr. Chris Vitarelli of Northrop Grumman, to report on the project.

Mr. Vitarelli recognized Mr. Chris Levesque, President and General Manager, AREVA Newport News, LLC, who would run the facility in the North Yard of the Shipyard. Mr. Vitarelli stated, as a result of the venture between Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding and AREVA NP, two new companies were created, AREVA Newport News, LLC and Northrop Grumman Newport News Energy, who would produce heavy components for the commercial nuclear power industry and provide engineering services to the industry, respectively. Mr. Vitarelli pointed out there would be no radioactive materials in the new facility. (A copy of the presentation, "A Recap of AREVA Newport News," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Mr. Vitarelli reported Newport News Energy and AREVA currently were located on the 10th floor of Rouse Towers. The groundbreaking for the actual facility, to be located in the North Yard of the Shipyard, was scheduled for July 22, 2009, with completion by the end of 2012.

City Manager Hildebrandt stated many of the employees hired by AREVA Newport News would opt to live in surrounding localities, but Newport News had an opportunity to capture a number of the employees to the Huntington Heights neighborhood, the downtown area Navy housing neighborhood as well as the new Southeast Waterfront development. The true economic advantage, however, was that AREVA and its subsidiaries would pay taxes on machinery and tools that were invested in the facility. He introduced Mr. Thad Holloman, Chairman, EDA to report on the AREVA Incentive Package and how the incentives would be implemented by the EDA.

Mr. Holloman stated the City partnered with the Commonwealth of Virginia to provide the incentives necessary to secure the decision to place the AREVA project in Newport News. The State incentive package totaled over \$26 million. The package included a \$5 million Virginia Investment Partnership Grant, which AREVA would not be able to receive until after 2012. The incentive package also included a \$3 million Governor's Opportunity Fund Grant (GOF) and AREVA would receive \$2 million of that grant immediately, with the remainder being paid upon completion of the facility and capital improvements. The GOF grant required an equal match and local incentives. The GOF grant also required AREVA to sign a Performance Agreement with the City and the EDA. The Performance Agreement set out jobs and investment targets and repayment of the grant monies should targets not be met. The City would receive the GOF grant and disperse it to the EDA, who would disperse it to AREVA. The City Manager would ask City Council to authorize the execution of the GOF Performance Agreement and appropriation of the GOF grant funds so that the grant could be received and dispersed.

Mr. Holloman stated the local incentive package included: 1) a Technology Zone Energy and Defense Infrastructure Grant, which was estimated to total more than \$6.5 million

over four years and represented 38.5% of the \$17 million in real estate, machinery and tool taxes received by the City through 2017. After 2017, the City would keep 100% of the taxes; 2) a Technology Zone Business License Fee Abatement, which was estimated to be more than \$1.1 million and represented 50% of the Business License Fee levy earned by Newport News Energy during a ten year period; and 3) Rouse Tower Rent Incentive for space on the 10th and 11th floors of Rouse Towers. Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding was the actual tenant and would provide space to AREVA Newport News and Newport News Energy. The Shipyard and the EDA had secured a seven year lease for the Rouse Tower space. The shipyard and, indirectly, AREVA, would receive a rent incentive equal to 100% of the market rent for the space in 2009. However, in 2010, the rent incentive would be 75% of the market rent and would decrease gradually for the next two to three years. It would decrease to 50% of market rate rent in 2011 and 25% of market rate rent in 2012. In 2013, the incentive would end, and thereafter, the Shipyard would pay full market rent to the EDA. Over the course of seven years, the rent incentive would total 21% of full market rate rent. (A copy of presentation, "AREVA Newport News Incentive Package, is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Mr. Holloman stated there was a provision in the lease that AREVA and Newport News Energy employees may move out of Rouse Towers, if they occupied a new office building in Newport News, or an existing building approved by the EDA. The EDA would not anticipate this happening unless Newport News Energy outgrew the Rouse Tower space, or the Shipyard built a larger office building for its engineers with enough space to accommodate Newport News Energy. He introduced Ms. Florence Kingston, Director, Department of Development, to report on local incentive cash flow details.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether the rent incentives would end if Northrop Grumman vacated the Rouse Tower building to move into another building that was approved by the EDA. Mr. Holloman replied the rent incentives would be terminated should Northrop Grumman vacate the Rouse Tower building.

Ms. Kingston reported by FY 2010, the annual cash flow, from AREVA Newport News to the City was expected to turn positive, and in FY 2013, with new real estate and machinery taxes being generated by the project, the cumulative cash flow would turn positive. The City would not begin funding the Technology Zone Energy and Defense Infrastructure Grant until 2013, when the new facility was operational. The EDA also expected that Newport News Energy would not request the Technology Zone Business License Fee Abatement until its gross receipts were stabilized, which was projected to occur in 2012. By 2023, the City was expected to receive more than \$4.6 million annually from the project, and would have a net cash flow cumulative revenue surplus of more than \$35.8 million.

Ms. Kingston reported just as the State required a Performance Agreement for its GOF grants, the EDA required companies to sign Performance Agreements it would deliver. The City Attorney had determined that, even though it was the City that would be delivering the

Technology Zone Business License Fee Abatement incentive to Newport News Energy, the EDA could enforce the performance standards for the incentive. Thus, the City would not be a signatory to the agreement, but would be a third-party beneficiary. The Performance Agreement would be between the EDA, AREVA Newport News and Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding. Northrop Grumman would sign for Newport News Energy, its wholly-owned subsidiary. The Local Incentive Performance Agreement set out the delivery of each of the local incentives and established post-incentive performance standards. City Council would be asked to approve the agreement even though it was not a direct party to the agreement.

Ms. Kingston stated the post-incentive performance standard for the Technology Zone Energy and Defense Infrastructure Grant to AREVA Newport News ensured that any future expansion by AREVA, in North America, would occur in Newport News. Unless there were physical constraints preventing such an expansion, if AREVA built a similar facility somewhere else in North America, during the grant period or within three years after the last grant was received, AREVA Newport News would have to pay back one half of the grant amount it received. The post-incentive performance standard for the Technology Zone Business License Fee Abatement was designed to ensure that jobs created by Newport News Energy would stay in Newport News and that any expansion by Newport News Energy would occur in Newport News. If Newport News Energy moved or created new jobs outside Newport News, within a 75-mile radius of its Newport News office during the abatement period within three years after receiving its last abatement, the company would have to pay back the last three years of the abatement, and forego half of any future abatements it may be eligible to receive. The final provision was designed to discourage Newport News Energy from moving all of its employees outside the City if it should trigger the post-incentive repayment.

If Newport News Energy and Northrop Grumman did not retain at least 170 Engineers employed at Rouse Tower (or another building if they moved in accordance with the lease provisions) for at least three years after the rent reduction period ended, then Northrop Grumman would repay a part of the rent reduction amount proportional to their failure to meet the employment target.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether Northrop Grumman Shipyard would be required to reimburse the City for any incentives it received should AREVA go bankrupt. Ms. Kingston replied the project was between Northrop Grumman and AREVA and through their joint venture agreement, both would be responsible to reimburse the City for incentives paid should either default on the project.

Ms. Kingston explained Technology Zones were different from Enterprise Zones. First, the localities could create Technology Zones without State designation. Secondly, the State did not offer any Technology Zone Incentives. Because only local incentives were offered in Technology Zones, Technology Zones did not have to be by right, as they were in Enterprise

Zones. While a locality may bar a company from receiving both local Enterprise and Technology Zone incentives, a company receiving Technology Zone Incentives could still receive State Enterprise Zone incentives, if it was also in an Enterprise Zone.

The Technology Zone ordinance that City Council would be asked to approve did two things; 1) It created the Technology Zone and established its boundaries; and 2) It enacted a Technology Zone Business License Fee Abatement. The Technology Zone Energy and Defense Infrastructure Grant would be provided by the EDA and the City Council would be asked to approve a funding agreement between the City and the EDA so that grants made by the EDA could be funded.

The Technology Zone included three separate geographic areas in the City. The reason for establishing the Technology Zone was to deliver incentives to the AREVA project. The Technology Zone also was a tool to further motivate other technology-based companies to locate in Newport News. Ms. Kingston explained the benefits of Technology Zones. (A copy of the presentation, "Newport News Technology Zone," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Ms. Kingston concluded her remarks by reiterating that the Technology Zone Business License Fee Abatement would deliver the Business License Fee reduction promised to Newport News Energy. Newport News Energy would be able to apply for the incentive any time through 2014. Establishing the Technology Zone allowed the EDA to deliver the grants promised to AREVA Newport News through the Technology Zone Energy and Defense Infrastructure Grant. The grant period would run from 2013 through 2016. She introduced Mr. Bill Ermatinger, Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding, who offered a few words about the importance of the proposed Technology Zone for Northrop Grumman.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired about the amount of money the City needed to provide local incentives to AREVA Newport News. Ms. Kingston replied the City would not need any funding to provide the incentives to AREVA. The project would provide the revenue for the City to deliver the incentives.

IV. FY 2009 Third Quarter Financial Report

City Manager Hildebrandt introduced Mr. Gregg Jones, Director, Department of Budget and Evaluation, to report on the third quarter financial results for FY 2009.

Mr. Jones recalled the City projected a General Fund revenue shortfall of \$8.4 million as a result of the deteriorating economy at the end of the first quarter of FY 2009. Most of the deficit revenue was due to reductions in revenue received from BPOL, sales, lodging, and meal taxes. Fortunately, the \$8.4 million deficit was offset by an expenditure surplus of \$6.2 million, which taken together resulted in a forecasted fiscal year-end net deficit of \$2.2 million.

In response to that forecast and the deepening national crisis, the City Manager instructed his Management Team to curtail all spending that was not absolutely necessary to maintain basic services, which was in addition to the hiring suspension already in place. As a result of the expenditure controls put in place by the City Manager and a small improvement in revenue collections, third quarter results of FY 2009 projected a year-end surplus of \$1,877,665, which was 0.4% of the revised budget. (A copy of presentation, "FY 2010 Third Quarter Financial Report," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

V. Pension Trust Fund Benefit Alternatives

City Manager Hildebrandt introduced Ms. Cindy Rohlf, Assistant City Manager, to report on Pension recommendations and alternatives proposed by City Council. He asked City Council to offer their consensus on which recommendation and alternative proposals they wanted to forward to the City Actuary for study.

Ms. Rohlf reported the Pension recommendations proposed by the City Manager were: 1) Reduce the Multiplier from 2% to 1.9%; 2) Increase the retirement age by five years; 3) Prospectively exclude non-salary earnings from annual financial compensation calculation; 4) Prospectively use time actually worked for computing retirement eligibility; and 5) Close Schools' supplement plan to new hires. Alternative proposals as recommended by City Council were: 1) Reduce multiplier to 1.85%, 1.80%, 1.75%, or 1.70%; 2) Increase vesting period for new hires to 7 and 10 years; 3) Increase retirement age to age 57 for Public Safety employees and 67 for all others; however, State law established the Retirement age at 65; 4) Grandfather employees with 15 or more years of service; 5) Place a cap on the dollar amount of overtime that could be earned or phase in the change over several years; 6) Make spousal annuity an elective option; 7) Ad-hoc or defer eligibility of COLA for one year; 8) Close Defined Benefit Plan to new hires; and 9) Require employee to contribute towards their Pension. Ms. Rohlf noted alternative scenarios for the above recommendations and alternatives. (A copy of the presentation, "Pension Fund," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

After ongoing discussion by City Council, there was consensus to ask the City Actuary to study the costs impacts for the following recommendations: 1) Reduce the Multiplier to 1.85%; 2) A five to seven year Vesting period for new hires; 3) Increase retirement age to 55 for Public Safety personnel and 60, 63 and 65 for all other employees; 4) Grandfather employees with 10 years or more of service; 5) Prospectively use time actually worked for computing eligibility for retirement.; 6) Grandfather the calculation of overtime in annual final compensation for current employees and exclude for new hires; 7) Prospectively exclude non-salary compensation from annual final compensation; 8) Defer COLA for one year for new hires; 9) Allow elective option for Spousal Annuity for new hires and calculate the way done by the

Virginia Retirement System; and 10) Continue the Defined Benefit Plan for new hires and provide City Council with more information.

There was consensus among City Council to not require current or future employees to contribute salaried earnings toward their retirement.

Mayor Frank asked for a side-by-side comparison of the impacts and cost benefits of the recommendations when the City Actuary reports back to City Council in June 2009. City Manager Hildebrandt stated he would provide City Council with a side-by-side comparison.

Miscellaneous Item

City Manager Hildebrandt advised, in the refinancing of the City's bonds, Waterworks was able to save \$1.7 million in FY2010. He spoke with Mr. Brian Ramaley, Director, Department of Public Utilities, about using some of the savings to provide some relief to water rate payers. Mr. Ramaley recommended and the City Manager supported using one-third of the \$1.7 million savings to reduce the water rate increase from 5.3% to 4% in FY2010 and using another one-third of the savings in FY2011 to mitigate those costs so the rates would stay between 4% and 5%.

There was consensus among City Council to support the City Manager's recommendation to use one-third of the \$1.7 million savings to reduce the water rate.

VI. FY 2010 Budget – Open Discussion

Mayor Frank stated he had received memos from Council members McMillan, Vick and Woodbury, regarding their proposals to adjust the FY 2010 recommended operating budget. (Copies of the memos are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Councilwoman McMillan suggested that City Council review her recommendation and report back to her on their findings.

Councilman Bateman stated he appreciated the efforts made by the members to find ways to reduce the budget; however, he felt it would be beneficial to have the City Manager study the information and provide City Council with his overall view. He had confidence in the recommendations made by the City Manager and work done on the budget thus far. He would continue to look for savings and would like to have time to process the impact of the proposed recommendations, which could not be done in one afternoon. It was important for City Council to understand how the reductions would impact the City.

Councilwoman Vick agreed with Council Bateman.

Councilwoman McMillan stated most of the cuts she proposed, with the exception of Community Support funding and a few larger items, were in travel, dues and subscriptions.

City Manager Hildebrandt agreed with Councilman Bateman. He needed to study the recommendations and provide City Council with the impacts of the proposals and whether they were achievable. He pointed out that the FY 2009 total General Fund budget for travel amounted to \$782,000. He reduced travel by \$162,000 in FY 2010, which was a 22% reduction over FY 2009. Of that amount \$50,000 was allotted to the Non-Departmental budget category, which was discretionary and used for emergency situations. It provided training money for a Department which did not have enough funds in their budget to provide needed training for their staff. He stated City Council had the option of eliminating the funding if they chose. He wanted to study the suggestions to reduce the budget that were raised by the Council members.

Councilwoman Woodbury stated, after meeting with members of the budget staff, it was her recommendation to eliminate the Non-Departmental discretionary travel funding since most departments had their own travel budgets. City Manager Hildebrandt stated it could be done with no impact to the budget.

Mayor Frank asked the City Manager to provide a memo to City Council with his recommendations, regarding the alternatives proposed by City Council, by Friday, May 1, 2009, and inquired whether the members of City Council were available for a Special Budget Work Session on Tuesday afternoon, May 5, 2009.

There was consensus among City Council to hold a Special Budget Work Session on May 5, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. to finalize alternatives and recommendations for the City Manager's Recommended FY 2010 Operating Budget.

Miscellaneous Matter

Mayor Frank reminded City Council of a memo from the City Manager to City Council, dated April 24, 2009, regarding expected funding requirements for FY 2012. (A copy of memo is attached to these minutes.) He stated City Council would have to come up with \$30 million in additional funding for the FY 2012 operating budget. He encouraged members of City Council to read the memo because it offered context on what they were now doing and what they would be required to do in FY 2012.

VII. 2009-2010 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development

City Manager Hildebrandt inquired whether City Council had questions regarding the 2009-2010 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development. He stated the

Page 12
Minutes of Work Session
April 28, 2009

matter was on the evening meeting agenda for consideration by City Council. (A copy of memo to the City Council from the City Manager, dated April 7, 2009, regarding the Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development for FY 2009-2010, is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Mayor Frank inquired whether the City had been notified of the grant amount it would receive from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for FY2010. City Manager Hildebrandt replied the City had not been notified of the grant amount for FY2010.

There was consensus among City Council to support the FY2009-2010 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS,
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 4:42 P.M.

Jennifer D. Walker, CMC
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Joe S. Frank
Mayor
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk