

**THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CIVIL CITY OF NEW ALBANY, INDIANA,
HELD A WORK SESSION IN THE SUPERIOR 1 COURTROOM IN THE CITY/
COUNTY BUILDING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2013 AT 7:00 P.M.**

The meeting of the **New Albany City Council** was called to order by President Pat McLaughlin at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Coffey, Mr. Caesar, Mr. Phipps, Ms. Benedetti, Mr. Blair and Mr. Gonder. Ms. Baird and Mr. Zurschmiede were not present.

OTHERS PRESENT: Mayor Gahan, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Duggins, Mr. Robison, Mr. Hall, Mr. Lorch, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Frierson, Mr. Triertsch, Mr. Stenson, Mr. Estopinal, Mr. Wilson Ms. Deatherage and Ms. Glotzbach

Mayor Gahan thanked everyone for coming and said that these efforts are about making the city of New Albany competitive. He stated that the projects to be discussed are amenities that the city should already have. He said that it is important that you know that he is in support of all of the plans and it is even more important that you know that our city is financially strong enough, without raising anyone's taxes, to make all of these projects a reality. He said that we have a duty to reinvest in ourselves and it is our responsibility to make sure New Albany residents have facilities that promote both health and economic development and these projects do all of that and more. He said that our Redevelopment Commission is capable and eager to focus on revitalizing these sites. He also said that they have done a great job pointing out these sites and you will see firsthand where they are and what impact they will have. He stated that if the Redevelopment Commission is allowed to carry out their mission, it will transform the entire city and change the way people look at New Albany and has the potential to positively impact every resident. He stated that the absence of these types of quality of life projects have left our city at a disadvantage and the projects that are being discussed tonight are vital to our community and will help make sure that our city remains competitive. He directed the attention of the council to tab 3 in the TIF packet that included a press release that summarizes where we are and asked the council to read it so they would know. He stated that the last sentence is of particular importance where it says that the New Albany City Council's and the Redevelopment Commission's input will be crucial in carrying out these once in a lifetime plans to make New Albany all that it can be.

Mr. Gibson handed out the budget to actual for yearend so that the council would know where we are and how we finished the year. He said that he thinks that the council will see that the budget that was passed two years ago was a good budget and that the administration was able to live with and abide by. He said that we actually came into the black in the General Fund and every other fund that we have. He added that it has been over 10 years since the General Fund and other funds have been able to finish in the black. He said that shows that we are moving in the right direction and made some really good strides last year. He stated that in tab 2 of the EDIT packet you will see that we have already received what our projected income is for EDIT which is \$215,000.00 each month and the cumulative effect of that for the end of the year is almost \$2.6M so that is more than we received last year.

Mr. Caesar asked if the encumbrances have been taken out.

Mr. Gibson replied no, that is purely so that you know what is coming in 2013. He then moved on to tab 3 which gives the balances of EDIT, Riverboat and Rainy Day as of December 31, 2012. He said that the first piece is to show you budget to actual of last year and how everything ended up under budget. He stated that the next piece shows what we are expected to get in EDIT and the following piece is to show what the ending and beginning balances are this year. He said that tab 4 is the budget for EDIT this year.

Mr. Coffey stated that some EDIT has been going to fund the sewer utility and it looks like it is getting on solid footing. He then asked if at some point in time that money will be able to be brought back in house.

Mr. Gibson replied that the city's commitment of EDIT to the sewer fund is \$570,000.00 per year and the sewer utility is obviously getting on a better financial footing. He said that last week he took steps to have an analysis done to see if that commitment can be reduced or ultimately withdrawn if possible. He also said that Crowe is present and is working on steps to do that and Mr. Pittman is present to help with the bond issues which we will have to go through SRF to get that component pulled out.

Mr. Coffey wanted to confirm that we can do that without raising any rates.

Mr. Gibson replied that is correct. He added that they are also looking at a TIF component which is \$240,000.00 so that would be another part.

Mr. Caesar stated that he does not want to see any rate increases in sewer, TIF or anywhere if we are going to go down this road.

Mr. Gibson stated that this EDIT bond is based upon the income that we get from the EDIT so there will be no new taxes in that respect either. He said that there will be no new taxes with regards to the TIF because we are not even close to spending what our yearly income is in those TIFs.

Mr. Duggins stated that Mr. Thompson was present to talk about the street paving plan portion and why it is necessary.

Mr. Blair asked where the amortization schedule is for the bond.

Mr. Duggins stated that there is no amortization schedule at this point because we don't know exactly how much bond amounts we are going to talk about. He said that they are looking at a \$5M note and when they ran the numbers so it looks like it would be about \$400,000.00 a year over 20 years.

Ms. Benedetti asked if they could do a 5 year out of EDIT.

Mr. Duggins replied that the payment would be much higher.

Mr. Blair stated that we will have to replace roads two or three times in 20 years so you can't bond for 20 years for road pavement.

Mr. Duggins stated that it is more of a catch up to where we would need to be and then start fresh from there. He added that they have been looking at multiple terms based on what the feel of the council would be and it will be the council's decision.

Ms. Benedetti asked if it would be possible to pay it off in 5 years.

Mr. Frierson stated that would probably not be possible given the revenue stream.

Mr. Blair asked why we wouldn't just put a paving plan together and fund it out of cash flow every year because we obviously have a lot of cash flow coming in from EDIT.

Ms. Benedetti stated that is we've done the past 4 years.

Mr. Blair stated that the other thing that he does not see is projected financial statements. He said that there is 1 year but if we are going to do a 20 year bond, we need to project out past a year.

Mr. Coffey stated that he really doesn't like the 20 year bond either but believes that it can be lowered because with the sewer utility doing so well, we will have an extra \$574,000.00 per year coming into EDIT.

Mr. Blair stated that we could use that every year for pavement.

Mr. Thompson went over 1a in tab 1 and stated that it shows an original summary of the survey of \$8.17M and page 1 shows what is left from that \$8.17M which is \$3,948,189.00. He said that for all of the work they have done, they still have \$4M worth of streets left out there. He stated that the survey included streets that were rated 1-6 and 7-10 didn't need to be done but the longer it is put off those 7-10 are going to need to be done.

Ms. Benedetti asked if there are any major or minor arterial areas that are adjacent to TIF areas that we can use for infrastructure out of TIF area funding.

Mr. Duggins stated that they were asked to look at everything that was necessary at this point. He said that Jacobi, Toombs & Lanz reviewed all of the streets that were 6 and at that point were moved down to 1 of what needed to be done.

Mr. Thompson stated that they started with the major arterials and moved down to minor arterials and then to collectors and they are now down to local streets, alleys and local industrial.

Ms. Benedetti stated that she just wants to see something worked out so that we don't have to do the 20 year term.

Mr. Duggins stated that we can do different terms based on the appetite of the council.

Mr. Frierson stated that the \$400,000.00 that he gave from an estimation standpoint is something that would be done over 20 years but they can shorten it down but it will increase the payment and then you will have to look at how that would compare to where you EDIT budget is.

Ms. Benedetti asked if there was any way to look in the TIF areas first to see what is adjacent to them and if we could do something through the TIF area.

Mr. Coffey stated that has been discussed in the Redevelopment Commission and we are looking at that.

Mr. Duggins stated that there is also a sidewalk review that the Redevelopment Commission has done, conducted and presented so the sidewalks are important also. He said that the main focus of the packet tonight is to show where we are, what needs to be done and the cost and how we can move forward from that.

Mr. Blair asked if we could look at doing it without a bond issue by just paying with our normal cash flow every year because if you shorten the length of the bond issue then your cash flow should be equal to the debt service anyway. He added that it could then be done gradually and put a plan in place.

Mr. Duggins stated that the bond has to go through several different steps and we could meet with Mr. Thompson and take a look at the streets and make sure everything is on there that you think needs to be on there and we can get an accurate cost. He said that

way you can look at what needs to be done and the total dollar figure then decide how the council wants to proceed.

Mr. Thompson stated that you also have to factor in the cost of materials because the survey was done in 2008 when asphalt was \$44.00 a ton and last year it was \$62.00 a ton. He added that the longer we spread this out, the more materials are going cost and the worse conditions that the roads are in then the more it will cost to fix them.

Mr. Coffey stated that when they start the bridges, the cost of material and labor is going to go through the roof in this area. He also asked if this was on the agenda to be voted on at Thursday night's meeting.

Mr. Gibson replied that it is but it is a resolution not an ordinance. He said that they will come back with an ordinance on this one because it is EDIT. He also said that the resolution will allow them to move forward with finding out if this is an interest or not before they have Mr. Frierson do a lot of work on different scenarios. He stated that the ultimate ordinance of what the rates are will come back in ordinance form to be voted up or down.

Ms. Benedetti asked if the TIF bond would be in ordinance form back to the council.

Mr. Gibson replied no.

Mr. Blair said that he has an amendment for that.

Mr. Coffey asked Mr. Frierson if he could come back to Thursday's meeting with what the cost would be for 5 year, 10 year, 12 year, 15 year or whatever it would be. He also stated that one of the complaints that the council members get time and time again is the roads.

Mr. Frierson stated that would be no problem and that they just wanted to see what the council's appetite would be.

Mr. Blair asked if they could do it without a bond issue.

Mr. Coffey said no and that they've tried that.

Mr. Blair asked how long the life expectancy of the street is after it is milled up, repaved and sealed.

Mr. Thompson replied that you should get 10 years out of it.

Mr. Blair asked if all the projects are just milling and replacing and there is no bridge work or anything.

Mr. Thompson replied that is correct and right now we are mostly down to local streets and alleys.

Mr. Blair stated that he would maintain that if the life expectancy is 10 years then we have to be somewhere between 5 and 7 on a bond issue. He added that you don't want to be paying for something that you no longer have the benefit of.

Mr. Thompson stated that if we can get caught up then we could look at a maintenance plan of going back to seal those streets after a couple of years and try to get a few more years out of them.

Mr. Blair stated that if you have a bond issue and you are paying debt service every year then you don't have any money for maintenance the following year so 10 years from now we will be back to where we are today.

Mr. McLaughlin said that our alleys have never figured in for a long time and have been neglected. He stated that many people use their alleys for access to their garages or the back of their homes and it is falling on this administration and this council for the maintenance on those.

Mr. Thompson stated that before the council did additional appropriations for paving they used to try to do it with LRS money. He added that if we can get caught up then we can use the LRS money for maintenance.

Ms. Benedetti asked how much money is left in LRS.

Mr. Thompson replied that he wasn't sure and that he was going to be meeting with Mr. Rosenbarger and Ms. Prestigiacomo to look at that.

Mr. Caesar asked what the time line is on knowing whether the \$570,000.00 for sewer utility will be freed up.

Mr. Gibson replied that the process has been started and it is hard to give an estimate but maybe in about 2 months.

Mr. Frierson stated that once the books are closed then it will probably be a 2 month process to do a financial review and then work with SRF to say that the revenues are there on the utility side and then get them to release.

Mr. Blair stated that the other thing that needs to be considered is that we may have an unfunded liability coming out of EDIT with the police and we don't know what that is going to be.

Mr. Gibson stated that we know the maximum.

Ms. Benedetti stated that we don't know how it is going to affect the other areas.

Mr. Gibson stated that there is \$1.9M in there and that is not a reoccurring thing so it affects your balance with a one-time hit assuming it does. He also stated that he doesn't think that affects Mr. Frierson's financial analysis.

Mr. Frierson stated that they don't take into account cash balance when looking at matching debt service. He said that when you look at 10 years the payment would probably be around \$700,000.00-\$800,000.00 a year. He also said that he thinks once he comes back to the council with the additional draft numbers on potentially 7 years and 10 years, you need to go back through it with the understanding that you do have the EDIT budget in your packet. He explained that the council should keep in mind where the EDIT budget is currently and meeting the capital needs within a time frame that everyone feels comfortable with. He also explained that the council wants to look at where they want to be from a cash balance standpoint.

Mr. Gibson stated that he would have Mr. Frierson and his firm run the numbers for 7 years and 10 years and see where we are.

Mr. Blair stated that the other thing that they need is projection financial statements because we need to project out further than one year.

Mr. Gibson stated that they can look at the historical value of the EDIT.

Mr. Frierson stated that we held constant based on history.

Mr. Gonder asked what the LRS amount is that we get on an annual basis.

Mr. Gibson stated that he doesn't know right off hand but it is under \$200,000.00.

Mr. Gonder stated that if you take that plus the \$576,000.00 from sewer then you would have almost \$800,000.00 a year and that would be a pretty good hit every year if we keep doing that.

Mr. Gibson stated that if you do that, you will get a \$800,000.00 hit but then that means that the roads will be 1 year used and they are going to just keep deteriorating.

Mr. Duggins stated that tab 1 is the most important in the TIF packet. He explained that it contains a revenue analysis and you also have the up-to-date spreadsheets on TIF balances that were just provided to Redevelopment.

Mr. Pitman stated that when a Redevelopment Commission does direct financing of this sort, it has a limit on the amount of debt that it can issue and that limit does not apply when the financing is structured as a lease development.

Mr. Coffey asked if this is the same tool that we used to do the YMCA.

Mr. Pitman replied yes.

Ms. Benedetti stated that we only pledged \$137,000.00 a year out of EDIT for that.

Mr. Frierson stated that we are looking at basically a TIF bond issue with a property tax backup. He explained that we are looking at that purely at a marketing standpoint because when we go out to issue bonds, individuals who are looking to buy bonds are more comfortable with that property tax backup and you get a better interest rate. He added that they do not anticipate at all going to the property tax backup.

Mr. Duggins stated that there are 7 TIFs in the area and we are using 5 for the financial analysis. He stated that they will all be encumbered but internally, we are leaving 2 out which are Park East and Grant Line because there are large projects in the hopper for those areas. He said that something important to look at in this TIF structure is that we are looking at roughly \$1.5M payment after the third year and we are generating over \$3.2M a year in TIF revenue so there is money and basically two thirds will not be tapped in looking at this bond. He added that the TIFs were created for economic development projects such as these.

Mr. Frierson stated that from an approval standpoint, they always ask what the maximum amount will be and the maximum project fund is \$16M so that is what you see and what they pretty much ran off of in page 10. He said that there is also a debt service reserve fund which is actually just held there in case there is a particular issue with debt payment.

Ms. Benedetti asked if that is required.

Mr. Frierson replied yes. He then moved on to page 11 which shows where the debt service is going to be. He added that the interest rates are estimated. He said there is also an amortization schedule of potentially what the debt service is going to be.

Mr. Blair asked why this has to be a lease agreement.

Mr. Pitman explained that the alternative to a lease agreement would be direct debt financing where Redevelopment Commission issues the debt and pays for the project. He stated that when a Redevelopment Commission issues that directly then that debt counts against the constitutional debt limit that applies to direct debt. He said that the debt limit in New Albany is not high enough and payments that are made on leases are not treated as debt but payments made on bonds that you issue are so you make it possible to do this aggregate amount of projects but you also leave available for other projects that you might want to finance directly.

Ms. Benedetti asked how it would come into play if the project being done is adjacent to one of the five TIF areas.

Mr. Pitman stated that when you're dealing with the type of projects you have here it is easier to show that they serve the entire city.

Mr. Gibson explained that what we find nice about being able to fund these projects is that there are no new taxes, it doesn't deplete the TIF revenues and it doesn't prevent other projects from happening. He added that there is still more than ample ability to do other TIF projects.

Mr. Blair pointed out that if this does spur additional economic activity, a further development is going to increase the tax base and actually put more money into TIF.

Ms. Benedetti asked why this is being introduced in resolution form rather than ordinance form.

Mr. Pitman replied that the council is in more of a secondary position on the TIF projects because the Redevelopment Commission is viewed as being in the first position. He added that it is different with EDIT because the council is the sole body in the driver's seat.

Ms. Benedetti asked how the public could weigh in on this when you do it by resolution and only one vote.

Mr. Duggins stated that there have been public hearings already set and it has been to Redevelopment twice.

Ms. Benedetti stated that she understands that but she didn't start getting calls on it until it hit the papers.

Mr. Pittman stated that the law does not require the council to hold a public hearing on its resolution but it does require the Redevelopment Commission.

Ms. Benedetti stated that it is all pretty well done once it is passed by the council.

Mr. Blair stated that he asked that the council have final approval as the plans and designs are finalized and before any funding can occur.

Mr. Gibson stated that it would come back to the body with estimates as a resolution before ground is ever broken.

Mr. Duggins stated that the public could have weighed in on it as it passed through Plan Commission.

Ms. Benedetti stated that a lot of people don't understand that process.

Mr. Duggins stated that everything the council sees tonight is conceptual and obviously not set in stone.

Mr. Wilson began his presentation with pictures of aquatic centers from similar sized cities and towns so that they could size the pool appropriately for the size of the population that New Albany has. He said that they used the formula of 1 pool occupant for every 18 residents in New Albany and 1 parking space for every 10 occupants. He added that he feels that they sized this appropriately. He said that they are trying to pull some of the best elements from other aquatic centers that he showed and put those into this project. He said that they are looking at the Camille Wright site and why that site would be attractive. He pointed out that it is very walkable for the many residential areas surrounding the site. He also pointed out that it is easily accessed by automobile and plenty of room for parking. He stated that there is less property acquisition and less environmental issues.

Mr. McLaughlin asked about property acquisition.

Mr. Wilson stated that right now they are talking about 3 properties and showed those properties on the map of the project. He said that they are trying to use as much of the existing parking lot as possible.

Mr. Gonder asked how many parking spaces there are on the map of the project.

Mr. Wilson replied 193 and said that there are presently just over 80.

Ms. Benedetti asked what type of drainage would have to be put in.

Mr. Wilson stated that they would have to go before the Storm Water Drainage Board and would have some kind of detention because obviously with the creek coming through the property, drainage will be a key concern because you don't want to create problems downstream.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding zero depth entry into the pool and various water slides.

Mr. Coffey asked if the YMCA is an integral part of this.

Mr. Duggins replied yes. He stated that they have met with them several times and had discussions on how to attract older kids to the pool. He stated that they said with their experience, it is to have more adrenaline type slides.

Ms. Benedetti asked if they are going to operate it.

Mr. Duggins replied that they haven't made that final decision but have wanted their input to make sure the budgetary numbers are pure and good and what features would make an attractive facility.

Mr. Triertsch stated that those discussions with the YMCA have been a really good post-occupancy review of the design work that our same team did at their aquatics facility.

Mr. Coffey asked if we are going to lease it to them or pay them to run it or what.

Mr. Duggins stated that they haven't gotten that far in discussions.

Mr. Coffey stated that we need to.

Mr. Caesar pointed out that the 2014-2015 school year is going to be year round and asked how that would affect this.

Mr. Duggins explained that in the operating plan, the opening time is 10:00 a.m. and closing time is 6:00 p.m. but they will adjust the hours to make sure the facility is available such as changing the time from 12:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. when the school schedule changes.

Mr. Wilson moved on to numbers for the total site concept which was a range from \$1.6M - \$1.85M and stated that they would come back to the council with more definitive numbers. He said that the pool and the building would be in the range of \$3.5 – \$4.2M for a subtotal of \$5.1M - \$6.1M. He said that they are also looking at ad alternates to get the most projects for your dollar. He stated that they are looking at two ad alternates for the slides which would be in the range of \$525,000.00 - \$550,000.00. He also stated that realigning Coyle Drive and installing the new bridge across the creek would be in the ballpark \$200,000.00. He estimated deck furniture would be between \$130,000.00 and \$200,000.00. He then estimated all of the general project costs such as geotech, survey, environmental reviews, property acquisition, etc. at \$1.28M to \$1.3M so total project cost including both alternates would be \$7.3M - \$8.4M. He went on to staffing costs which would be about \$320,000.00 per year. He said total utilities would be in the range of \$330,000.00 and chemicals would be in the ballpark of around \$25,000.00. He stated that miscellaneous items such as concessions, painting, maintenance, etc. would be around \$32,000.00 so total estimated operating costs would be around \$700,000.00 per year. He then said that the revenue estimate would be around \$932,000.00 so a heated pool with 153 days would put the net gain at about \$225,000.00.

Mr. Blair stated that he would be interested in seeing the financial reports for Clarksville's and Jeffersonville's aquatic center.

Mr. Duggins stated that he has spoken with both and they say they don't make money but they don't lose money and they are happy with their operations. He also said that he would request those reports.

Ms. Baird stated that she knows that the prices at the YMCA are based on income and asked if that would be the same here.

Mr. Wilson stated that they haven't work through all of those details yet but they have had discussions on how to keep it affordable for the low-income residents and make it accessible to everyone.

Mr. Duggins stated that has come up in some of the public meetings with Redevelopment and the main focus is to make it available to everyone. He then introduced Mr. Stenson to go over the other two projects.

Mr. Stenson stated that his firm is 75 years old and is based in Indianapolis. He said that they have a lot of park experience and a lot of recreational facilities and sports field experience. He then showed a preliminary plan for the Hoosier Panel site.

Mr. Duggins stated that the Hoosier Panel site has been determined by Redevelopment for about 9 years for a site that would benefit for redevelopment for the area. He stated that they wanted to put it in this area because there are a lot of kids that live there and it will be used. He showed on the plan where there could be 2 youth football fields and said that they could be used for multi sports. He said that the site is basically 15 acres and would also have an indoor facility. He stated that they have taken all of the environmental information that's been given and turned it over to a company in Indianapolis for review. He also stated that they have had an independent review to say

that a multi sports park setting is an appropriate use for that site. He stressed that the purchase of the property for the redevelopment of that area is very important.

Mr. Blair asked about cost estimates.

Mr. Duggins replied no but they do have the purchase price of the land which is \$1.3M but the property was just appraised at \$1.75M.

Mr. Gibson stated that what they have heard from some constituents is that there is a need for playing fields. He used youth football as an example because they only have the Scribner field to use. He said that the other need they heard come up was an indoor facility.

Mr. Coffey stated that in the past few years we have spent millions of dollars on one program and the city used to give the football league money every year to help them out. He said that under a mayor three terms ago they stopped that and the league was only asking for \$1,000.00. He also said that program reached a lot of children.

Mr. Duggins stated that the thing he is passionate about is that this is in the inner city and inner city kids play football.

Ms. Benedetti asked if baseball is now out.

Mr. Duggins replied yes.

Mr. Coffey stated that if he is not mistaken, we are looking at refurbishing Billy Herman Park.

Ms. Benedetti stated that is the practice facility for little league.

Mr. Coffey stated that it may be but it belongs to the city of New Albany. He also stated that he has talked to some of the people who founded the inner city league and they are willing to help again.

Mr. Duggins stated that the way Mr. Pitman structured the bond, baseball facilities are still in there so if we wanted to upgrade the Billy Herman Park then we could. He added that there is obviously a flood plain issue there.

Mr. Coffey stated that it is a flood plain; however, they used a different type of soil at that park so that it drains quicker and they put drainage in. He said that it can get flooded but then four hours later it is down and the next day you can run the tractors on it.

Mr. Blair asked the acreage of Binford Park.

Mr. Duggins stated that it is 22 acres.

Ms. Benedetti asked when they will finalize the plan.

Mr. Gibson stated that they would like to get Mr. Stenson to firm up the costs of the multi use complex and also add the amendment that Mr. Blair asked to be added to the resolution. He added that the amendment would require it to come back to the council for final approval.

Mr. Duggins stated that he met with the soccer organization last week and they have a growing soccer community that needs different sizes of fields. He said that they looked

at Binford Park because it is an underutilized park and the acreage is a good size for the fields. He presented a conceptual design and budget for the project.

Mr. Coffey stated that the park is underutilized because we took out the tennis courts and basketball courts and wouldn't keep the park mowed. He added that the soccer community has Cannon Acres and he doesn't feel that they should have this park as well. He also stated that soccer is not the only sport around and instead of talking just to the soccer league, why didn't we talk to other leagues like the football league to see what we could do for them.

Mr. Duggins stated that when he went to the meeting, they were happy to have any facilities that we are looking at.

Mr. Coffey stated that the other leagues would too but no one asked them.

Mr. Duggins stated that they are trying to incorporate more people into their league.

Mr. Coffey stated that they have for a long time. He added that the kids that will be playing there will not be the ones living there and that's not right.

Mr. Duggins explained that most of the money being spent there is for drainage and irrigation. He stated that the fields there can be used for soccer and football. He added that you can change the lines from a soccer field to a football field very easily.

Mr. Blair stated that accessibility for the inner city kids is an advantage to having this facility for soccer. He explained that soccer is a very easy sport for kids to pick up and it is inexpensive. He added that he thinks we are going to have a huge demand from kids in this area to play that sport.

Mr. Caesar stated that he thinks Binford Park will be a great area for soccer.

Mr. Gibson stated that it is going to be designed for multi uses.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if this is going to fall back to the operations of the Parks Department.

Mr. Gibson replied yes. He stated that the Parks Department will help with the programming and making sure that it is programmed out.

Mr. Coffey stated that he would just like to see some of the programs that the Parks Department took out be put back in.

Mr. Gibson stated that Kathy Wilkerson is passionate about programming and she is coming up with all kinds of ideas for programs to start reaching out that she felt were not available under the old structure.

Mr. Coffey stated that it is just not about one sport.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that any improvement to Binford Park would be an improvement.

Mr. Gibson stated that we don't want to pigeonhole one site for one particular sport especially when there is so much ability in making it multi use.

Mr. Coffey stated that he doesn't think that it is fair to dedicate one whole park to one sport.

Mr. Duggins stated that they can show the layout striped differently for football too. He said that they are going to redo basketball also.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the board, the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Pat McLaughlin, President

Vicki Glotzbach, City Clerk