

CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE MINUTES

December 8, 2015

The City Council of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in a conference at 5:07 p.m. in the Municipal Building Conference Room on the 8th day of December, 2015, 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 48 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

YEAS: Councilmembers Allison, Castleberry, Heiple, Holman, Jungman, Lang, Miller, Williams, Mayor Rosenthal

NAYES: None

Item 1, being:

UPDATE OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SEX DISCRIMINATION JURISPRUDENCE AND DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTION R-1516-65 REQUESTED BY THE NORMAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION.

Mr. Jeff Bryant, City Attorney, said a Human Rights Commission (HRC) meeting was held on October 26, 2015, and the City Attorney's Office presented a legal update of sex discrimination jurisprudence, specifically regarding cases focused on discrimination claims grounded in disparate treatment due to sexual orientation and gender identity. After the update, the HRC requested the information be presented to City Council and encouraged City Council to adopt a resolution providing policy clarifications regarding the administration of City policies and ordinances as well as the interpretation and enforcement of Chapter 7 of the City's Code of Ordinances, which addresses discrimination policies and Civil Rights.

Mr. Bryant highlighted federal law and said on July 21, 2014, President Obama signed an Executive Order prohibiting discrimination on the basis of gender identity in the federal civilian work force and prohibiting federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) adopted the Equal Access Rule (Rule) on February 3, 2012, to implement a policy to ensure that its core programs are open to all eligible individuals and families regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) is the federal agency charged with enforcement of federal laws prohibiting unlawful discrimination by federal government agencies and by private employers with more than 15 employees. The EEOC adopted a Strategic Enforcement Plan (SEP) in December 2012, that listed "coverage of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals under Title VII's sex discrimination provisions , as they may apply."

On July 15, 2015, the EEOC decision in *David Baldwin v. Anthony Foxx* reiterated the EEOC's position that Title VII's prohibition against sex discrimination incorporates a prohibition against discrimination on the basis of an employee's sexual orientation or gender identity. The issue was whether an employer relied on sex based considerations when making an employment decision. Mr. Bryant said federal law protects individuals from discrimination based on handicap, sex, religion, race, etc., and the point of that is employment decisions should be made based on bona fide job qualifications or based on performance of a particular employee, not on considerations that do not have anything to do with job performance. Sexual orientation discrimination is sex discrimination because it entails treating an employee less favorably because of the employee's sex.

Item 1, continued:

In *Macy v. Department of Justice*, the EEOC focused on discriminating against an individual because the person is transgender stating it is unlawful discrimination based on sex and violates Title VII. The decision recognizes a limited exception for an employer to take gender into account only when gender is a bona fide occupational qualification.

In *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) recognized that employment discrimination based on sex or gender stereotypes, such as assumption and/or expectation about how persons of a certain sex should dress, behave, etc., is unlawful sex discrimination. An accounting firm employee was denied a promotion because the partners felt that she did not act as a woman should act. The Court found that “sex stereotyping [when] an employer acts on the basis of a belief that a woman cannot be aggressive, or that she must not be, that employer has acted on basis of gender” and that constitutes sexual discrimination under Title VII.

In *Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services*, an employee was being harassed by his same sex co-workers and the employer felt it was disruptive and made an employment decision adverse to the employee being harassed. SCOTUS held that same sex harassment is sex discrimination under Title VII although this case was not decided on same sex harassment, it was based on the fact that the employment decision was not made on job performance, but on a factor related to the employee not acting “male enough.”

In *Obergefell v. Hodges*, SCOTUS ruled on June 26, 2015, that the Fourteenth Amendment requires a State to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out of State. SCOTUS addressed a Circuit Court split on the issue and held that the right to marry is a fundamental right inherent in the liberty of the person and that therefore same sex marriage was protected by Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment thereby legalizing same sex marriage across the country.

Mr. Bryant highlighted other Federal Court Cases throughout the United States, such as *Rosa v. Parks W. Bank and Trust Company*, *Smith v. City of Salem*, and *Glenn v. Brumby*. The Courts determined that Title VII prohibits discrimination against transgender individuals based on gender stereotyping. Persons were terminated or discriminated against because they were transitioning from male to female or female to male or because their employer felt they did not dress or act the way they should for their particular gender therefore considered gender stereotyping.

In *Hall v. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company (BNSF)* the Court recognized sexual orientation discrimination as sex discrimination when a male married to a male was not afforded health care benefits. The Court found this unlawful because the employer was treating female employees with male partners more favorably than male employees with male partners simply because of the employee’s sex.

In *Centola v. Potter* the Court stated that “stereotypes about homosexuality are directly related to our stereotypes about the proper roles of men and women. While one paradigmatic form of stereotyping occurs when co-workers single out an effeminate man for scorn, in fact, the issue is more complex. The harasser may discriminate against an openly gay co-worker that he perceived to be gay, whether effeminate or not, because he thinks “real” men should date women and not other men.”

Item 1, continued:

Mr. Bryant said the City of Norman is in the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals District, which is located in Denver, Colorado, and encompasses the District of Colorado; Districts of Eastern, Northern, and Western Oklahoma; District of Kansas; District of New Mexico; District of Utah; and District of Wyoming. He said the 10th Circuit has not specifically called out sexual orientation, transgender, or transsexuals as specific protected classes under Title VII. The 10th Circuit seems to be following the reasoning from the SCOTUS cases in that “like all employees,” Title VII protection against sex discrimination extends to transsexual employees “if they are discriminated against because they are male or because they are female.”

Mr. Bryant said a more recent case working its way through the 10th Circuit is the United States of America and Dr. Rachel Tudor v. Southeastern Oklahoma State University. In this case, the plaintiff alleged sex discrimination and retaliation under Title VII following her transition from male to female. Dr. Tudor alleged that at the time she announced her intent to change gender, her employer began treating her differently, ultimately denying her tenure application. Her employer filed a Motion to Dismiss, arguing that she was not a member of a protected class since the 10th Circuit held in *Etsitty v. Utah Transit Authority* that a transsexual individual is not a member of a protected class. The 10th Circuit denied the Motion to Dismiss, finding that the 10th Circuit’s *Etsitty* decision merely held that transsexuals could not claim protection under Title VII based solely on their status as a transsexual but that they, like other employees, could assert a claim of discrimination based on their gender. Title VII protection extends to transsexual employees only if they are discriminated against because they are male or because they are female. Here, it is clear that the Defendants’ actions as alleged by Dr. Tudor occurred because she was female, yet Defendants regarded her as male, which Dr. Tudor saw as discrimination based on the employer’s dislike of her presented gender.

Mr. Bryant said SCOTUS and District Courts all seem to be applying Title VII jurisprudence to the point of needing to make decisions based on the appropriate criteria not on inappropriate criteria such as use of assumptions or stereotypes of how an employee should or might act. If an employer is basing a decision on sex instead of appropriate criteria, then that will violate Title VII.

Mr. Bryant said the HRC requested a resolution reflecting recognition of development in federal law to be applied to City policy and ordinance administration. The area the City can most effectively impact these types of policy decisions is in the administration of City of Norman personnel policies. The City has personnel policies that require job descriptions that outline minimum qualifications, outline performance criteria, and have a performance review process to evaluate job performance based on the employee’s ability to do their job. He said more effective remedies lie in federal courts or other agencies. He said the draft resolution is primarily a policy statement and Staff believes it meets the spirit of the HRC’s request.

Mr. Bryant said Resolution R-1516-65 acknowledges the stated policy of the City of Norman and the Civil Rights Ordinance in Chapter 7 passed in 1986; it acknowledges a resolution Council passed in 2008 that joins the National League of Cities Inclusive Community goals; acknowledges federal law developments regarding same sex marriage; acknowledges interpretation and application of Chapter 7 to prohibit discrimination based on the use of assumptions and stereotypes associated with sexual orientation or gender identity in consistency with federal law reviewed; directs the City Manager to administer City personnel policies and the provisions of Chapter 7 of the Norman City Code in such a manner that respects Council’s policy guidance to guard against use of assumptions or stereotypes associated with sexual orientation or gender identity; and requires notice of the resolution to be made accessible.

Item 1, continued:

Councilmember Castleberry asked if the resolution takes away a person's ability to go through Federal Court and Mr. Bryant said not at all. If a complaint is filed, the City would first speak to the individual about the type of remedy they are looking for or what they are trying to resolve then try to direct them into a path that would be a more effective remedy than a fine in Municipal Court.

Councilmember Castleberry asked if the City is extending federal law onto employers with less than fifteen employees and Mayor Rosenthal said the City is not extending federal law, it is extending interpretation of sex under federal jurisprudence to cover people who are not named under Chapter 7.

Councilmember Miller said the HRC has brought an important issue to Council's attention. There are tax-paying, law-abiding citizens in Norman who feel they are not being protected in the same way as other citizens. Chapter 7 states, "It is the policy of the City of Norman that all citizens of this community shall have an equal opportunity to purchase, rent, lease, or occupy housing accommodations, or to avail themselves of public accommodations, and have an equal opportunity in the job market and the social and economic life of the City without regard to race, color, religion, ancestry, sex, national origin, age, place of birth, handicaps, or familial status. It is further declared and determined to be the policy of the City of Norman that all citizens of this community should be provided with an opportunity to reach their full potential as human beings, without being inhibited for conditions relating to race, color, religion, ancestry, sex, national origin, age, place of birth, handicaps, or familial status." She said those groups have been pointed out because they have been the victims of bigotry and pervasive discrimination. She said Norman's citizens have been discussing and working toward inclusivity and diversity in every aspect of the community over the past 35 years. Councilmember Miller said when citizens ask her why City Council is bringing this up she has told them that one of the HRC's duties is to make recommendations to the City Council and the City of Norman for action it deems necessary to the furtherance of equality and our rights, including the recommendation of legislation to promote the objectives of Chapter 7. She said the HRC has hosted various Inclusive Community Dialogues with different citizen

populations to gain input from the public on how the City could serve those populations better. She said the HRC is doing what they have been charged to do and she thinks Council needs to take action on this resolution.

Councilmember Jungman agreed and said Council should move forward with the resolution as submitted.

Mayor Rosenthal said she strongly supports the resolution and that it aligns with the preamble of the City's Charter, which states, "We, the people of the City of Norman, in order to secure the benefits of home rule, to encourage efficient and business-like methods in the transaction of municipal affairs, to promote civic advancement and general welfare, and to protect the human rights and personal dignity of all persons do ordain and establish this Charter for the City of Norman."

Mayor Rosenthal said there seems to be consensus on moving forward with the resolution which will be scheduled for City Council's consideration for adoption on December 22, 2015.

Item 1, continued:

Items submitted for the record

1. Memorandum dated December 4, 2015, from Kristina L. Bell, Assistant City Attorney, through Jeff Harley Bryant, City Attorney, to the Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers
2. Memorandum dated October 26, 2015, from Kristina L. Bell, Assistant City Attorney, through Jeff Harley Bryant, City Attorney, to Norman Human Rights Commission
3. Legal Update, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Protection dated October 26, 2015
4. Draft Resolution R-1516-65 dated December 4, 2015
5. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Legal Update and Resolution R-1516-65, City Council Conference, December 8, 2015"

* * * * *

Item 2, being:

UPDATE ON UNIVERSITY NORTH PARK TAX INCREMENT FINANCE DISTRICT.

Mr. Bryant said from October 2006, to September 2015, \$51,301,994 in sales tax has been generated in the University North Park Tax Increment Finance (UNPTIF) District. He said a transfer adjustment in the amount of \$9,502,918 has been made to the General Fund leaving a balance of \$41,802,073 and the UNPTIF portion of property tax is \$1,513,848. He said the apportionment for the transfer adjustment is 60% for project plan components and 40% to the General Fund.

Mr. Bryant said in July 2015, Staff updated Council on traffic and roadway improvements within the District that includes Robinson Street west of I-35, the Garver Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) in the north half of the UNPTIF, and a fifth intersection along 24th Avenue N.W. He said Robinson Street/I-35 costs are estimated to be \$4.5 million with \$3.5 million provided through the Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG) funding leaving a supplemental balance from the UNPTIF Fund in the amount of \$1 million. He said the estimate from the 2009 UNPTIF for improvements was \$1.1 million and Staff is waiting on concurrence from the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Mr. Bryant said the original contract with Garver Engineers was approved by Council on July 29, 2014, for Phase A Services for a TIA in the amount of \$38,540 and a report was reviewed by Council on January 23, 2015. The contract for Phase B Services was approved by Council on February 10, 2015, in the amount of \$59,800 to project what additional improvements will be needed at full development. The Phase B report is expected to come before Council in January 2016, and an I-35 Corridor Study is progressing. He said some suggestions Staff is anticipating from the

Phase B report include slip ramps at Rock Creek Road; one-way conversion of a portion of Interstate Drive; and additional intersection improvements at Mount Williams, Conference Center Drive, Legacy Park Drive, and the Kohl's driveway. These improvements are expected to cost \$9.5 million with funding to be determined.

Since the July update, Council has approved a Planned Unit Development (PUD) amendment that reduced the setbacks and streetscape buffer requirements for the "panhandle" area of the development to

Item 2, continued:

accommodate over 115,000 square feet of office space and approved the Final Plat and Final Site Development Plan for 8.3 acres of proposed multi-family development adjacent to property owned by the Norman Economic Development Coalition (NEDC), which will bring 303 apartment units and a parking garage to the north half of the UNPTIF.

Council will consider another PUD amendment on First Reading tonight for the south half of the UNPTIF with Second and Final Reading on December 22, 2015, that will allow three additional uses 1) mixed building (buildings with office or commercial uses on the bottom and dwelling units on the upper floor), 2) bar, lounge, or tavern, and 3) live entertainment venue in the Lifestyle Center area as well as a nearby outparcel where the World of Beer is proposed to be located.

Mr. Bryant said previous Council concerns included extension of the timeline for the Cultural Facility land purchase option; incentive criteria being too low; north half uses and the need for Master Planning; walkability and connectivity of Lifestyle Center; and solidifying a funding plan for entrances. He said a proposed amendment to Development Agreement No. Five addresses coordinated Master Planning; construction of entrances into the District and Lifestyle Center; incentive criteria updating and clarification; and timeline extensions for Lifestyle Center and Cultural Facility development.

Coordinated Master Planning

The property in the District north of Rock Creek Road owned by UNP, L.L.C., (subsidiary of University of Oklahoma (OU) Foundation) has moved forward with development in accordance with Special Planning Areas (SPAs) that allow a certain mixture of office, industrial, and residential uses. Currently, retail is excluded from being an allowable use on land north of Rock Creek Road. This development includes the NEDC Industrial park, NEDC Office Park, the office park located on the panhandle area, and the high density residential complex approved in October.

Before moving forward with additional development north of Rock Creek Road, Staff and UNP, L.L.C., has agreed an update of the Master Planning for this area is appropriate. UNP, L.L.C., has engaged the services of RTKL, a Dallas firm involved in the original Master Planning effort, to re-engage and provide such an update after completing additional market analysis. Staff supports the update given the level of development being reached in the south half of the UNPTIF, the near completion of an updated TIA, discussion over the past year about an Exposition Center, and other potential sport or entertainment uses.

At Staff's request, RTKL has agreed to include a similar market based Master Planning effort for the area known as the Lifestyle Center. In the past, Council and the developer have struggled with whether the original Lifestyle Center concept is economically viable with the need for potential modification of the concept formally recognized in Development Agreement No. Five. RTKL has been asked to evaluate the Lifestyle Center property considering urban design concepts, walkability, and connectivity. Staff anticipates gaining additional information concerning the viability of these concepts not only for the Lifestyle Center area, but also for the remaining undeveloped land north of Rock Creek Road. RTKL's efforts will cost \$40,000 and UNP, L.L.C., will pay half the costs relating to property north of Rock Creek Road. The remainder of the study cost is proposed to be borne by NTIFA from the professional services allocation of the Project Plan.

Item 2, continued:

Coordinated Master Planning, continued:

Councilmember Jungman said he is concerned that using the same firm and same people that did the original study will get the same results, which did not work well the first time around. He said in 2006, RTKL did not seem to have any concept about walkability and connectivity. Councilmember Lang agreed and said he has the same concerns as Councilmember Jungman. Mr. Bryant said the City would be the client this time and will make sure these things are addressed as specified.

Councilmember Miller asked the timeline on the Master Planning Study and Mr. Bryant said approximately six months.

Mayor Rosenthal said there have been changes in Councilmembers since 2005/2006, and a lot of progress in the UNPTIF so it is hard for some people to understand what has happened and where the development is headed and it is good to have this update.

Councilmember Allison wants assurance that sidewalks will be constructed so visitors and citizens do not have to walk through grassy, uneven areas to get from the Conference Center to the retail section of the UNPTIF. He said \$20,000 is a lot of money to spend on a plan that could not be utilized. He said it will also cost of a lot of money to construct sidewalks and the developer is not going to want to fund that.

Construction of Entrances into the District and Lifestyle Center

For several years Council has expressed a strong interest in constructing an entrance into the UNPTIF to help convey a sense of place. The proposed amendment in Development Agreement No. 5 sets forth a timeline and funding mechanism for the proposed entrance into the development at Robinson Street and the proposed entrance into the Lifestyle Center.

In regards to the Lifestyle Center, parties recognize that anchor tenants in the Lifestyle Center may want significant input into the entrance design. For that reason, although funding is addressed in the agreement, design and construction will not be finalized until the first anchor tenant has committed to the Lifestyle Center. The design agreement for the entrance on Robinson Street would be finalized in the spring with construction being completed in late 2016.

Funding for the entrance improvements would be shared equally between three funding sources:

- 1) UTC (the developer),
- 2) Norman Tax Increment Finance Authority (NTIFA), and
- 3) UNP Business Improvement District (BID) funds.

Councilmember Heiple said he does like the current design proposal for the entrance. He wants the font to be in line with Legacy Park's entrance as well as some type of arch design to tie in aesthetically and architecturally with Legacy Park. Mr. Bryant said there may be height restrictions at the entrances.

Item 2, continued:

Incentives

Mr. Bryant said the Lifestyle Center is proposed to include high-end retail that will draw shoppers from the region and complement existing retail. He said currently, \$8.25 million has been authorized for incentives that include no other retail within 21 miles, retail generators of \$175 per square foot for larger stores and \$275 per square foot for smaller stores, public improvements reimbursement obligation, and the developer could build the shell space and avoid the obligation.

Mr. Bryant said Ms. Sara Kaplan, Retail Marketing Coordinator, presented Council with information that indicated the retail performance levels for incentives may be a little low if the goal was to attract certain types of higher end stores. This information was provided to the developer and he has agreed that the “floor” for retail incentives should be raised. He said the amendment to Development Agreement No. Five proposes the following criteria for incentives:

- The retail store does not exist in Norman
- The retail store can demonstrate anticipated minimum sales volumes of no less than \$300 per square foot for stores larger than 10,000 square feet or no less than \$400 per square foot for stores of 10,000 square feet or smaller
- The parcel development plan incorporates urban design elements of walkability and connectivity

The primary difference is removal of the 21 mile radius as separate qualifying criteria in exchange for higher retail sales performance standards and incorporation of urban design elements into the criteria.

Councilmember Rosenthal asked what kind of stores might be incentivized and Mr. Bryant said he will get information on the types of stores that might fit the criteria to Council.

Timeline Extension for Lifestyle Center and Cultural Facility Development:

In previous discussions, Council has focused on the shared desire of the developer and the City that the Lifestyle Center be developed in conformance with the vision the parties shared in 2005/2006, while recognizing market conditions have changed considerably since the 2008 recession. Although the developer has had a number of stores requesting to be located in the Lifestyle Center area that would have enabled UTC to avoid reimbursement of public improvement costs associated with failure to timely develop the Lifestyle Center, the developer has consistently turned these stores away or encouraged them to develop in other areas of the UNPTIF because these stores were not consistent with the vision of the Lifestyle Center.

Although the timeline for shell completion of 250,000 square feet of retail space in the Lifestyle Center was changed with a previous Development Agreement No. Five from January 1, 2016, to January 1, 2018, the development of a Lifestyle Center is a three year process at least. To date, the desired retailers for the Lifestyle Center have yet to formally commit to locate there.

The current national retail landscape continues to exhibit signs of recovery with store expansions occurring on a smaller scale and at a slower pace. While smaller stores are rebounding more quickly, larger box stores have been slow to expand into new areas. Recent trends indicate that large anchor tenants may be more likely to open new locations that afford the opportunity for a smaller footprint.

Item 2, continued:

Timeline Extension for Lifestyle Center and Cultural Facility Development, continued:

Additionally, many shopping centers are filling with small stores and opportunities for entertainment, such as movie theatres, concert halls, etc. As recently as this fall, after the opening of Legacy Park, the developer met with a national company known for Lifestyle Center development to explore a potential partnership to assist in this type of development.

The developer has agreed that extending the Lifestyle Center construction deadline to June 30, 2023, gives sufficient time to focus on developing the Lifestyle Center in accordance with the original vision. If mutually agreeable concepts of urban design, walkability, and/or mixed use are utilized, the deadline is further extended through June 30, 2026. Credit against the obligation to reimburse the NTIFA for public improvement costs associated with failure to timely develop the Lifestyle Center square footage can be granted if the stores meet the following criteria even if not seeking UNPTIF funding from the Lifestyle Center project costs:

- Location of store is in area five on Exhibit F to Development Agreement No. Five;
- The stores were not operating in Norman prior to construction of the Lifestyle Center; and
- The stores are able to demonstrate an average of \$175 in sales per square foot for a full year following completion of 145,778 of square feet in the Lifestyle Center.

In exchange for providing an extension of the deadline, the developer has agreed to grant a similar extension of the deadline the City must develop the cultural facility land (identified as land to the south and east of the Conference Center) to June 30, 2026. This would allow for a substitute donation so the new potential site for a cultural facility would be adjacent to the Embassy Suites. The developer has also agreed to sell the NTIFA/City an additional 1.5 acres of land adjacent to the substitute donation site at five dollars (\$5) a square foot.

Councilmember Castleberry said Council was told that Lifestyle Centers are dead and going away, but Staff is now saying they are coming back so which is it? Ms. Kaplan said not many new Lifestyle Centers have been built since 2008 and their success depends on the market at the time of construction. She said the Lifestyle Center envisioned in 2005/2006, with retail anchor stores would need to be re-evaluated to determine what will work in today's retail environment as the retail landscape is vastly different than ten years ago.

Councilmember Castleberry asked for the current deadline to develop the cultural facility and Mr. Bryant said the proposed amendment to Development Agreement No. Five extends the timeline to 2026.

Additional Council Comments

Councilmember Jungman said the City needs to work on getting the money not going to the General Fund to the General Fund and the path we are on right now will not get us there. He said none of this discussion gets the City any closer to getting money back into the General Fund.

Mayor Rosenthal said there have been a number of questions and concerns raised by Council tonight and approving an agreement on December 22, 2015, seemed too fast. She would not object to the Finance Committee reviewing the amendment for additional discussion and then hold a Council Conference to review their input and Councilmembers agreed.

Item 2, continued:

Additional Council Comments, continued

Councilmember Allison would like to discuss additional parking at Legacy Park because there is a need. Mr. Bryant said there had been few designs for additional parking in the original agreement, but Council did not like those ideas. He said Staff can bring those designs back to Council for review.

Items submitted for the record

1. Memorandum dated December 7, 2015, from Kathryn L. Walker, Assistant City Attorney, through Jeff Harley Bryant, City Attorney, to Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers
2. Amendment No. 1 to Development Agreement No. 5 Related to Development of the Norman University North Park Project
3. Letter dated September 15, 2015, from Jeff Gunning, AIA, Senior Vice President, RTKL Associates, Inc., to Mr. Guy Patton, Manager, University North Park, L.L.C., and UNP Realty Investors, L.L.C., with Attachment A, Rate Schedule by Classification effective May 2015, and Attachment B, Terms and Conditions
4. Letter dated October 5, 2015, from Jeff Gunning, AIA, Senior Vice President, RTKL Associates, Inc., to Ms. Susan Connors, City Planning and Community Development Director with Attachment A, Rate Schedule by Classification effective May 2015, and Attachment B, Terms and Conditions
5. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "University North Park Tax Increment Finance District Update, City Council Conference, December 8, 2015"

The meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Mayor