

CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MINUTES

November 1, 2016

The City Council of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in a Study Session at 5:30 p.m. in the Municipal Building Conference Room on the 1st day of November, 2016, and notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Municipal Building at 201 West Gray, and the Norman Public Library at 225 North Webster 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

PRESENT: Councilmembers Allison, Castleberry, Chappel, Clark, Heiple, Hickman, Holman, Karjala, Mayor Miller

ABSENT: None

Item 1, being:

DISCUSSION REGARDING STAND ALONE SENIOR CENTER SITE LOCATIONS AND FUNDING OPTIONS.

Mayor Miller said in a previous Study Session Council decided they needed to focus on a stand-alone site for the Senior Citizens Center (Senior Center) because that is what the most involved senior citizens have been requesting. A resolution was approved on August 9, 2016, directing the City Manager to explore possible stand-alone sites and funding options to pay for a stand-alone Senior Center if the City was not going to use the existing library for a Senior Center. The information gathered was considered by the Norman Forward Senior Center Ad Hoc Advisory Group and is now coming before Council for review.

Mr. Rick McKinney, McKinney Partnership Architects (McKinney), said on August 14, 2016, McKinney made a presentation to Council regarding preliminary concepts for the renovation of the existing library site as a Senior Center. On January 5, 2016, Meyer, Scherer & Rockcastle, Ltd. (MSR) made a presentation on location options for a new Senior Center that included site options, an alternative design study for a stand-alone Senior Center, and a site analysis of six locations for a stand-alone Senior Center incorporating information from McKinney's study. The six sites included Option EL, the existing library site; Option AP, Andrews Park; Option L1, Senior Center conjoined with new central library; Option L2, site north of new library site; Option L3, site west of new library site; and Option L4, purchasing additional land on Acres Street facing Andrews Park (now occupied by condominiums). At that time, MSR recommended Options EL, AP, and L4 be further considered and Options L1, L2, and L3 be eliminated from further consideration.

Mr. McKinney said tonight Council will review basic design and funding options for Option AP as well as four variations of Option L4 (Options L-4-A, L-4-B, L-4-C, and L-4-D).

Site Locations

Option AP is located just south of Acres Street across from the new Central Library site. The proposed site presently contains a skate board park, parking lot, abandoned underground concrete water storage tank, two basketball courts, and an open recessed drainage ditch that conveys stormwater south to the existing stone channel. Option AP would provide a single story 21,000 square foot Senior Center with 111 parking spaces that is entirely out of the floodplain and will cost approximately \$8,658,002.68 with an additional \$775,000 for a commercial kitchen, if desired. Fully accessible pedestrian walks from every parking space would lead directly to the Senior Center and a Cleveland Area Rapid Transit (CART) bus stop will be located adjacent to the Senior Center that will be connected to a broad, covered entry drop-off via an accessible walkway. A wide, well-lit section of Legacy Trail will also extend from the Senior Center to the Central Library entry directly across from Acres Street (approximately 120 yards). Exterior covered and shaded courtyards will offer unobstructed broad views to the park and activity areas while a service area will allow for convenient food delivery and remote pickup. Mr. McKinney said specific floor layout plans and functions have not been designed.

Mr. McKinney said all proposed plans for Option L4 include a single story 21,000 square foot Senior Center along with varying amounts of parking and access. The site is bordered by the Central Library entry drive on the east, Acres Street and Andrews Park on the south, residential and industrial lots on the west, and a portion of the proposed parking for the Central Library on the north. Currently, the site contains three two-story condominium buildings with linear concrete parking lot.

Option L4 has some issues that includes 72 parking spaces anticipated to be shared with Library users, which would be first come, first serve with high demand; however, purchasing an additional 1.11 acres could provide dedicated parking west of the facility for Senior Center parking; a commercial kitchen would require semi-truck delivery circulation for meals that would conflict with library parking reducing parking at times of delivery; underground detention would be required; Senior Center building design would need to be respectful of the site planning, features, and building aesthetics of the proposed 80,000 square foot Central Library to create a harmonious complex; the narrowness of Option L-4 facing Acres Street minimized views from the Senior Center to Andrews Park; and all L-4 options require rezoning and platting.

The Option L4-A proposed building would be wholly contained within the original L4 site plus additional industrial land area of 7,500 square feet to the west for service and delivery. Access to the facility would be shared via the Central Library entry drive that leads to the main north-facing Senior Center entry. Accessible parking would flank the covered entry while all parking and drives would be shared with the Library and laid out parallel to the building front. There would be no dedicated Senior Center parking. Patrons would collect on wide sidewalks that lead to a central crosswalk towards the entry. The estimated cost is \$7,998,664 including land cost.

The Option L4-B proposed building is also wholly contained within the original L4 site with additional land area of 40,950 square feet (residential lots, condominium lot, and partial industrial lot). Access to the facility and parking will be from a south drive that aligns with Park Avenue with accessible parking located along a walk that leads directly to the main covered entry. There will be 82 parking spaces dedicated to Senior Center parking and all walks/drive lanes lead directly to the main entry. Space will be provided at the south end for outdoor courtyards while service/delivery will be tucked in the northwest corner of the facility. The estimated cost is \$9,027,454 including land cost.

The Option L4-C proposed building would be laid out north/south within the L4 site and partially extends into the north parking area. Additional land area of 27,442 square feet (residential lot, condominium lot, and partial industrial lot) would be needed to the west to allow for 69 dedicated parking spaces and delivery bays. Access to the facility and parking will be from a south entry drive that aligns with Park Avenue and accessible parking will be located along the curb that leads directly to the main covered entry. The south lawn area will be set aside for outdoor space and a north entry connects to the Central Library via a protected crosswalk. The estimated cost is \$8,696,478 including land cost.

The Option L4-D proposed building is laid out north/south similar to Option L4-C plus additional land area of 48,351 square feet (three residential lots, condominium lot, and larger industrial lot) would be needed to the west to allow for 103 dedicated parking spaces that will be accessed from a south entry drive that aligns with Park Avenue. The majority of parking will be oriented so that collection sidewalks lead directly to the main entry. Accessible parking will be placed along the front walk that also leads directly to the entry. Space will be set aside along the south face of the facility for outdoor activities while a north entry will lead to the Central Library via a protected crosswalk. The estimated cost is \$9,199,912 including land cost.

Mr. Jud Foster, Director of Parks and Recreation, said in Option L4-A, the condominiums consist of 26 residential units and a small portion of industrial property (.17 acre); in Option L4-B, the total residential units is 32 (two condominium properties are involved) plus the .17 acre in the industrial portion; in Option L4-C there is a total of 30 residential units plus the .17 acre; Option L4-D consists of 32 residential units plus two industrial portion of .24 acre.

Mayor Miller asked if all of the proposed buildings will have approximately 21,000 square feet and if the internal designs will support the same types of programming and Mr. McKinney said yes, all of that has been carried over to each site.

Mr. Foster said the Senior Ad Hoc Group discussed the commercial kitchen and programming options. He said Ms. Kathleen Wilson, Aging Services Director, made a presentation to the Senior Ad Hoc Group about its current operations at the existing Senior Center and indicated the Aging Services Board of Directors has been updated on the possibility of moving to a new site. The Director states that Aging Services appreciates their nearly 40 year relationship with the City and appreciates the fact that the City would consider adding a new commercial kitchen to a new building. While they felt this would be nice, it is certainly not necessary because they can continue to operate at the existing location. Aging Services provided the Ad Hoc Group with general information about their budget, number of meals served, and delivery boundaries.

Councilmember Clark asked if Ms. Wilson had mentioned anything about senior citizens being able to take leftovers home if they brought their own containers. She said that would be a huge selling point for a new commercial kitchen because food would not be wasted and Mr. Foster said Ms. Wilson is in attendance tonight and can answer that question, but the Ad Hoc presentation did not get into that level of detail. Ms. Wilson said that is an option even if Aging Services stays at the current location and Councilmember Clark felt that everyone needed to be aware of that option.

Councilmember Allison asked if the City owns the equipment in the current commercial kitchen and Mr. Foster said most of the equipment, yes. Councilmember Allison asked if the City receives rent or any sort of payment for use of the facility and Mr. Foster said yes, approximately \$425 per month to cover the natural gas bill. Councilmember Allison asked if the City would be equipping the new kitchen if Council went in that direction, which would basically be duplicating what is already owned. He said the equipment in the current facility would become obsolete because no one else is going to make use of that facility and Mr. Foster agreed the City would be duplicating the space. Councilmember Clark thought some of the equipment could be moved from the current facility to a new facility and Mayor Miller said it was her understanding that some of the newer equipment could be moved, but some equipment is built-in and cannot be moved. Mayor Miller said the City has a great relationship with Aging Services and wants to keep supporting them and Aging Services has a great relationship with the senior citizens, but it is important to understand it is not a City program, it is a County program. Aging Services serves food to senior citizens throughout the County. Councilmember Clark asked if anyone has discussed the County funding a new commercial kitchen and Mayor Miller said no because Council has not decided if a new commercial kitchen will be built.

Councilmember Castleberry said if the City does not put a commercial kitchen at the proposed stand-alone Senior Center, would that free up space for additional items and Mr. Foster said no, the 21,000 square feet represents the programs developed and does not include kitchen space. He said approximately 1,500 square feet would have to added to any of the site options to accommodate a commercial kitchen, which is the main reason the estimated cost of \$775,000 is an additional cost option for each site. Councilmember Castleberry asked if there was a breakdown to that \$775,000 because that seems expensive and Mr. Foster said he did not have a breakdown, but that figure was derived from recent bids that Lifespan Design provided to McKinney based on actual construction costs.

Mayor Miller said there had been discussion of a catering kitchen that would allow senior citizen access all the time. If they have a commercial kitchen, will senior citizens have access to it? Mr. Foster said no, but they do not have access to the current commercial kitchen either. Mayor Miller asked Mr. McKinney if Council will be reviewing both a catering kitchen and a commercial kitchen and Mr. McKinney said yes, there would be a serving/catering kitchen that could be used during the day to prepare meals for senior citizens and in the evening for catering events or functions for senior citizens.

Mr. Foster said the Senior Ad Hoc Group voted four to one to recommend the inclusion of a commercial kitchen facility with the new Senior Center. They also voted five to zero that all of the Option L-4 sites, with the exception of Option L4-A, be further considered. Councilmember Holman said a couple of Ad Hoc members have said that if condemnation was required for the condominiums their vote would switch to Option AP.

Mr. Foster said a public meeting was held on October 26, 2016, regarding programming ideas developed from previous meetings for the new facility and no other ideas were brought up by the public; however, Staff asked senior citizens to forward any new ideas to the City for consideration.

Councilmember Chappel asked Mr. McKinney if he had any professional preferences on any of the proposed options that would best fit what the City is trying to accomplish. Mr. McKinney said Option EL because the existing library is an excellent building in very solid condition and it would be scraped down to the structure and completely rebuilt. It has a new roof, new mechanical system, and new lighting system. It would be part of the Municipal Complex, which is a concern to some seniors. The layout and functions have already been designed. He said Option AP is a nice site that takes advantage of the park, has plenty of parking, and is across the street from the Central Library although there are technical issues in requiring a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Permit for a floodplain amendment, which would cost approximately \$1 million plus. He does not believe L4-A would work because sharing parking with the Central Library is not realistic and Options L4-B, L4-C, and L4-D provide dedicated parking to the Senior Center with convenient entry to the facility; however, there are some food delivery issues with semi's or large vans driving through the parking lot on a daily basis. All of the sites have pluses and minuses and he would not point to one as being stronger than the other.

Councilmember Allison said, currently, the City is allowing \$250 per square foot for the Senior Center and asked if the City can build something nice for that amount near the Central Library because the Central Library is going to be really nice. Can the City build something to match the quality of the Central Library for \$250 per square foot? Mr. McKinney said it would not match, but would be compatible. Councilmember Heiple agreed that a Senior Center near the Central Library would absolutely have to look as good as the Library. Councilmember Allison said he has not seen many Senior Centers that look as good as what the Norman Central Library will look like so he wants to make sure a Senior Center facility of comparable quality could be built for that price.

Funding Options

Mr. Anthony Francisco, Director of Finance, highlighted various funding options for a stand-alone Senior Center and all funding options exclude the cost of a commercial kitchen. He said he based his funding assumptions on \$9.2 million, the most expensive site option.

Funding Options, continued

Option A consists of a new General Obligation (G.O.) Bond issue with the assumption of a 20 year maturity bond at a 3.1% interest rate that equals \$1.03 per month of property tax on a \$150,000 market value home. This option requires a vote of the people, but will be a tax increase, which faces some opposition. Voters approved a G.O. Bond for a Senior Center in 2008 so this could cause possible confusion with voters. He said ballot language will need to be clear so voters will understand what they are voting on. There is also the expense of an election.

Option B consists of a re-vote on the 2008 G.O. Bonds to repurpose \$4.2 million of the funds previously authorized for a Senior Center and Municipal Offices at the existing library site. These funds would be put toward a stand-alone Senior Center; however, that amount would not be sufficient for any of the stand-alone options so there would need to be an additional source of revenue. This requires a vote of the people and there is the risk of voter confusion since voters may believe they are voting on the same issue twice. If the vote were defeated there would be the potential risk of invalidating funds for Municipal Offices at the existing library. The mix of having a 2008 authorization with a new G.O. Bond could cause legal ambiguity and could reduce Council's discretion on the use of 2008 G.O. Bond authorization.

Option C consists of utilizing 0.7% Capital Sales Tax by reprogramming FYE 2017-2018 Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) funds to the Senior Center Project, which would be redistributing approximately 64% of FYE 2018 Capital Sales Tax funds to a Senior Center. This does not require a vote of the people, but would have a significant negative impact on other capital projects that includes street and park maintenance projects, vehicle replacement, etc. He said this is a sales tax so putting off capital projects puts further burden on sales tax revenues.

Councilmember Castleberry said capital projects would only be delayed for one year not cut out completely.

Option D consists of reallocating James Garner Boulevard Extension Project funds from the Norman Forward Sales Tax (NFST) Budget for a Senior Center; however, this option would only be an option if expected federal matching funding (in FYE 2021) in the approximate amount of \$3 million is received from the Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG). He said \$3 million is not sufficient for a stand-alone Senior Center and there would need to be an additional source of funding. This option would not require a vote of the people; however, progress on a Senior Center would be delayed until ACOG funding is secured and there is a risk that federal funding may not be received due to federal budget cuts.

Option E consists of extending the NFST an additional six months or increasing the rate by 1/16th of one cent to fund a stand-alone Senior Center. This would require a vote of the people and this would add a sales tax burden to the public although it would address NFST cash flow problems expected in FYE 2021.

Councilmember Hickman said he understands there is expected to be a cash flow problem in 2021 and would like to discuss that further in a later meeting.

Councilmember Holman would be interested in having more information on Option A and Option C, and he would like see a list of the capital projects that would be delayed for one year under Option C.

Discussion Questions/Comments, continued

Mayor Miller said Staff goes through a very complicated process of making decisions about capital project needs each year and the City already has problems with funding projects and maintaining infrastructure. If Council is looking at removing capital projects she wants them to remember that a lot of time went into making that project list and Council are talking about removing a huge amount of projects. Councilmember Holman said he likes that option because there is no tax increase and does not require a vote of the people. He likes the idea of extending the NFST as well, but without raising the rate.

Councilmember Castleberry said Option A is the only option in his opinion. Option B is too complicated; Option C is not a good option because the City has a five year Capital Projects Plan; Option D is too far out in the future; and Option E would be too early vote another tax increase vote because the City is only a couple of years into the NFST and he does not believe an extension or rate increase would pass. Mayor Miller said Option A is definitely the cleanest option.

Councilmember Clark agreed Option A was the cleanest, but if the City is about to ask for the creation of a stormwater utility do we really think a G.O. Bond is going to pass? The City risks both issues failing if they are combined. She agrees that people will question an extension and rate increase of the NFST this early into the tax. She is still not clear on the Attorney General's (AG) response regarding use of the 2008 G.O. Bond for a site in Andrews Park because the answer is so vague and is really a non-answer. Mr. Jeff Bryant, City Attorney, said state law is pretty specific that bonds have to be used for the purpose approved by voters. He said the AG looks at the bond proposition language and information sent to voters and because that bond was tied to a new library which was a separate proposition that failed in 2008, the AG answered that the money cannot be used for a project other than reconstructing or refurbishing the existing library building for a Senior Center and Municipal Offices. He said the AP and L4 sites are not considered by the AG to be municipal buildings within the municipal complex. The AG said the most conservative approach would be to spend the 2008 G.O. Bond funds on the existing library as voted on or go back to the voters to repurpose the funds for a stand-alone Senior Center. He said the AG does not give hypothetical opinions which are really what the City was asking for.

Mayor Miller said the AG will not definitively say the City can use the 2008 G.O. Bonds for a different site or building and the City's Bond Counsel has recommended the City not go in that direction. Council is basically asking the City Attorney to give an opinion that the City can use the money elsewhere. She said if Council thinks there is voter distrust right now, that is nothing compared to what could happen if even one voter raised a question about the non-compliant use of those funds. She would not be in favor of using the funds for anything other than what voters approved. Councilmember Clark said she understands the AG's recommendation for the best conservative approach, but speaking as a citizen, she would appreciate the City biting the bullet on the budget to fund a stand-alone Senior Center.

Councilmember Hickman said he interpreted the AG's opinion as putting the onus on the City Attorney to make the decision on how the funds can be used. He felt the City could use the 2008 bond money for a Senior Center and take the remaining amount needed from the capital fund OR the City could go back to voters to reauthorize the 2008 bonds and reprioritize funds for a Senior Center instead of refurbishing the current library for a Senior Center and Municipal Offices. Mayor Miller said it would be very precarious for Council to say is okay to use the money for a stand-alone Senior Center and Bond Counsel would have to sign the bonds, which is against their legal advice. Councilmember Castleberry said it would be stupid to go down that road when the AG and Bond Counsel will not sign off on the sale of the 2008 bonds for a stand-alone Senior Center. He said even if the City used the money for a stand-alone Senior Center, it is not enough money and does not solve the problem. He said if the City is going to have a vote to repurpose the bonds why not just do it right and have a vote to raise the full amount needed. He believes the public will support a Senior Center.

Discussion Questions/Comments, continued

Councilmember Chappel would be in favor of Option A, but if Council decides to do that, what happens to the 2008 bond authorization for municipal office improvements and Mr. Francisco said the \$11.2 million authorized for a Senior Center and Municipal Offices (Municipal Court, Police Department, Development Center) at the current library would remain intact to be used for the purposes citizens approved. Councilmember Holman said he would have to agree that Option A is the best option and should be pursued further. Councilmember Heiple said he is in favor of Option A as well.

Councilmember Karjala said the problem with Option A is that citizens believe they approved to fund a Senior Center in the NFST vote. If the City goes back to the voters for a Senior Center they are going to be confused and it will be hard for her to get behind something like that.

Councilmember Hickman asked if Council is willing to vote on a Senior Center prior to a SWU. It seems clear to him that a substantial amount of Council is leaning towards Option A knowing there is discussion about putting the SWU back on the ballot. He said the logical question from seniors will be if Council would be willing to commit to putting this up for election before a SWU. He said this is fundamental to his level of commitment to the concept because the likelihood of success or failure does in part depend on the answer to that question. In his opinion, the City should absolutely put it to a vote before a SWU election.

Mayor Miller understands the concerns about going back to citizens for more money, but the fact is Norman is a growing City with lots of infrastructure and the City does a good job of providing services, but it costs money. She said citizens have to vote on every utility increase whether or not we have a new utility and that is one of the reasons citizens feel like the City is always coming back to them because we are, we have to, and there is nothing else the City can do about it. It is the City's job to tell citizens what is needed and educate them on why it is needed. She said citizens have been very supportive of the City's needs, but if the City does not get it right it has to come back to voters again and that is the reality of living in Norman. She said citizens want a Senior Center, but in Council's rush to provide that she cautioned everyone not to start tossing out all the things that the City has promised to do.

Councilmember Holman said he would not have a problem adding a stand-alone Senior Center vote to the City Council election in 2017.

Ms. Joy Hampton, The Norman Transcript, said an amendment to the NFST ordinance proposed by Council allowed for flexibility to use NFST funds either on a stand-alone Senior Center or to assist with the remodeling of the current library into a Senior Center and City offices because there was not enough money. She does not remember any Councilmember ever promising that Norman Forward money would be used for a stand-alone Senior Center or it ever being advertised. What she documented in writing was that citizens were hoping there would be extra money from NFST to be able to construct a stand-alone Senior Center. She asked if the City has any idea if any of the property owners are open to selling on the L4 sites. Mr. Bryant said no one has been officially contacted regarding selling their property.

Councilmember Chappel said he would like to go on record as preferring Option L4-C.

Councilmember Castleberry said he has a big problem using eminent domain to condemn anyone's property for an amenity. There is no doubt Norman needs a Senior Center, but it is not a core function of government. He said the SWU and Senior Center are two totally unrelated projects so he does not care which one comes first, but hopefully both will be dealt with within the next 12 months.

Discussion Questions/Comments, continued

Councilmember Hickman said the fair, proper, and imprudent decision is Option A. He asked the deadline for finalizing the Capital Budget for FYE 2018 and Mr. Steve Lewis, City Manager, said April 2017. Councilmember Hickman said he would support a G.O. Bond being voted on prior to the Capital Budget deadline and if the vote fails he will advocate taking money from the Capital Budget. He said the City did not need to take all the money needed for a Senior Center in one year, but could take it over a period of five years or so and quit kicking a Senior Center down the road. Mayor Miller said the current library is still a site option for Senior Center so if the vote does not pass the current library is still an option because the City already has authorization for that money.

Councilmember Heiple requested that the City no longer use the Oklahoma Public Finance Law Group as Bond Counsel because so much of the misinformation and confusion was based on the guidance they gave the City. Mayor Miller said that would be a subject for the Finance Committee.

Councilmember Clark asked how the City could even consider site options that require additional property if property owners have not even been approached to see if they want to sell? Mayor Miller said she finds it almost impossible to believe the City can negotiate with several property owners who will all want to sell. Councilmember Castleberry said the amount of property needed depends on what option is chosen. Councilmember Allison said there are basically 30 tenants so that would be 30 families or people being displaced. He said when you start negotiating with property owners, they are not going to care less about their tenants and personally it would be tough for him to displace people. Mr. Bryant said the condominiums have 26 units and one is owner occupied, in Option B, there are three single family homes and two are owner occupied, and in Option C, there is an additional single family home that is vacant. Ms. Kathryn Walker, Assistant City Attorney, said the condominiums have six owners.

Councilmember Hickman said he has represented property owners in eminent domain cases and tenants do have rights and are protected under the law as far as getting compensation and assistance with relocation. He is sensitive to that, but at the same time, Council cannot make decisions about a site if they are not even sure the property owner wants to sell. He said if Council does not want to go down that road, then Option AP is the best option since the City owns that property and it would not require purchasing additional property. He said Council should move forward with Option A and if that does not pass Council can discuss the other options. Councilmember Holman agreed since the some of the L4 sites have displacement of residents and potential land costs. He has been very upfront that he also considers Option AP to be the best option because the City already owns the property. He likes Options L4-B and L4-C the most with Option L4-B being his preference of the two. He felt Option L-4-A could be eliminated because of the shared parking issue and Option L4-D has a problem logistically with delivery trucks. Councilmember Clark said she could get behind Option AP.

Mr. Art Briepohl said the Board of Directors of the Friends for a 21st Century Senior Citizens Center considered the sites and are unanimously okay with Option AP, but the current library is clearly not an option for seniors.

Ms. Nadine Jewell said Option AP's proposed parking is just as horrible as the current library's. She suggested putting the building in the middle with parking all the way around because some seniors cannot walk from the proposed parking lot to the Senior Center. Councilmember Allison did not agree and said there needs to be controlled access to the building plus if parking is all around the building, there is no room for expansion.

Mayor Miller said there seems to be consensus for Option AP for the site and Option A for funding. Councilmember Hickman said this should be done with an understanding this is going to be on the April 2017 ballot.

Discussion Questions/Comments, continued

Councilmember Hickman suggested Council look at more options for parking designs on Option AP.

Mayor Miller felt more discussion was needed regarding the Senior Center and SWU before Council set an election date for April 2017, and Councilmember Castleberry agreed.

Ms. Donna Johnson, member of the Board of Directors of the Friends for a 21st Century Senior Citizens Center, said she has visited Senior Centers in places where she traveled and has been told there are possible grants available for funding buildings for Senior Centers. Mayor Miller said that has been discussed and is worth looking into.

Councilmembers requested Staff provide information regarding a vote in April 2017.

Items submitted for the record

1. Resolution R-1617-17
2. Letter dated December 31, 2015, from Richard S. McKinney, Jr., AIA, President, The McKinney Partnership Architects, to Mr. Steve Lewis, City Manager
3. Norman Forward Senior Center Ad Hoc Advisory Group minutes of October 12, 2016
4. Memorandum dated October 28, 2016, from Anthony Francisco, Finance Director, to Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
5. Senior Citizens Center Information meeting minutes of October 26, 2016, with the New Norman Senior Center Suggested Activities to be Accommodated; Norman Senior Center Feasibility Assessment Study Overview and Summary from Lifespan Design Studio; and Norman Senior Center Architectural Program for Fit Study Program versus Designed Footage Comparison
6. Letter dated October 5, 2016, from Cara N. Rodriguez, General Counsel to the Attorney General, State of Oklahoma, to The Honorable Emily Virgin, State Representative, District 44
7. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Norman Senior Citizens Center Site Options AP and L4," City Council Study Session, November 1, 2016

* * * * *

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Mayor