

City Council Work Session

March 2, 2009
5:30 PM
Community Center

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor/Council (please check) x Tussing, x Ronquillo, x Gaghen, x Brewster, x Pitman, x Veis, x Ruegamer, x Ulledalen, x McCall, x Astle, x Clark.

ADJOURN TIME: 8:10 p.m.

Agenda

TOPIC #1	<i>Public Comment</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

- **Tom Zurbuchen, 1747 Wicks Lane**, commented on the March 1 article in the Billings Gazette regarding the City’s budget. He urged the City to get the word out about the rest of the story. He said the City was laughed at because it did not understand its own budget. He stated there were two simple facts – the budget indicated that employees made up 29% of the City’s expenses and a 4.3% raise was given and reserves had to be used. He said those numbers meant that total expenses increased about 1.5% and the article stated that revenues increased 1.8%. He said the rest of the facts needed to be brought out.

TOPIC #2	<i>Legislative Report</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Lobbyist Ed Bartlett joined the meeting by phone to review his weekly legislative report. Mr. Bartlett reviewed the following items from his report:

- Nothing new to report on the property reappraisal issue.
- The bonding bill for roads would be heard in the House Local Government Committee March 3. Councilmember Veis would attend that hearing and had talking points from Public Works Director Dave Mumford.
- The bill sponsored by Senator Taylor Brown on the local option fuel tax failed the second reading in the Senate on February 14, so it was probably a dead bill.
- HB 102, sponsored by Representative Cary Smith, at the request of the City of Billings, about increased penalties for second and subsequent sexual assault offenses, passed the House on January 21. Senator Taylor Brown agreed to sponsor the Bill in the Senate and it would be heard March 10 in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

- SB 57, to revise laws governing special districts, would be heard March 3 in Local Government Committee.
- Representative Elsie Arntzen was still pursuing amendments on her three bills. Those bills were not subject to transmittal deadlines and were still alive.
- SB 486, sponsored by Senator Taylor Brown, to require municipalities to use revenue from public safety mill levies for the purpose stated in the request, would be heard in Senate Taxation Committee on March 10, at 8 a.m. Direction from the Council was needed.
- SB 451, to repeal the Megalandfill Siting Act, passed the Senate by a vote of 48 to 0. It was referred to the House Natural Resources Committee.
- HB 531, to prohibit the use of cameras at intersections to issue traffic citations, passed the House 65 to 35. Chief of Police Rich St. John and several other cities opposed the bill.
- HB 472, regarding sidewalk maintenance on state roads, passed the House 75 to 25 on second reading and was re-referred to the House Appropriations Committee.
- Senator Branae's bill on scenic byways passed the Senate and went on to House Transportation.

Councilmember Ulledalen asked about opposition to Senator Brown's bill on fuel districts. Mr. Bartlett said the bill did not have support, and even though it got out of committee, it failed on second reading. Mr. Bartlett said he thought it was because it concerned a fuel tax and that was a hot button in the legislature.

Councilmember Pitman asked about HB 531. He said discussion was scheduled that evening about red light cameras and he wondered if it should be continued. Mr. Bartlett advised that Chief St. John gave an excellent statement during the hearing for the bill as well as representatives from other cities. He said it came out of committee with strong support in the House, but he thought it would be tougher to pass through the Senate and the Senate would understand that administrative not criminal citations would be issued. Mayor Tussing asked what happened if it failed in the Senate. Mr. Bartlett said it would then be dead, and if it passed the Senate without amendments, it went to the Governor for approval. Mr. Bartlett said he did not expect any amendments.

Mr. Bartlett reported that SB 486 was the only bill in Senate Tax the morning of March 10. He noted that Senator Essman chaired that committee and indicated he would allow 15 minutes each for the proponents and opponents of the bill. Councilmember Ruegamer asked if the point of that was that anytime there was a controversial bill, the testimony would be limited so they did not have to listen to it. Mr. Bartlett commented that bills with emotional attachment were often given limited time for testimony. He said Senator Essman wanted the testimony to stay focused on the bill. Councilmember McCall noted that the committee chair had the ability to run the meetings however they wished.

Councilmember Ulledalen asked if HB 531 included all types of cameras for red lights and speeding. Chief St. John explained that it prohibited cameras on fixed traffic signals only.

Councilmember Gaghen asked about the inspection agency on HB 548, the dog breeding facility bill. Mr. Bartlett advised it would be the State Veterinarian. He said that bill was not dead even though there had not been any action on it.

It was Council consensus to increase the meetings with Mr. Bartlett to weekly and notice of those meetings would be published, but the meetings would be canceled if necessary. Mr. Bartlett stated he would send a weekly report for the Friday packet distribution. It was decided to meet at 6 p.m. on the nights of regular Council meetings, at 5:30 p.m. during Work Sessions, but not at all on the fifth Monday of March.

Councilmember McCall asked Mr. Bartlett if he planned to attend the stimulus meeting scheduled the next morning. Mr. Bartlett said he did and would provide an update afterward. He said he expected some presentations but mostly comments. He said that meeting was with the Senate only.

Councilmember Clark stated that the stimulus would be discussed by the Transportation Committee March 4. Ms. Volek advised that Councilmember Veis planned to attend that meeting.

TOPIC #3	<i>Senate Bill 486 – Public Safety Levy</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Ms. Volek advised that there were varying viewpoints among the Council so direction was requested. She indicated that Mr. Bartlett would attend the hearing and she was prepared to fly to Helena for it and Councilmember Ruegamer was willing to drive to Helena to attend as well. She referenced an email from the Chamber about its opposition, and said she understood that the League of Cities and Towns also opposed it.

Mayor Tussing asked what harm the bill would do if passed. He said the same answer about how the funds were spent would be given at a public meeting to someone who asked the question even if the bill did not pass. Ms. Volek explained that the bill required an independent third-party investigation, which included an audit that could be costly. She said an audit of the Animal Shelter cost \$10,000. She said it was her opinion that the bill resulted in State interference in a local matter. She commented that she felt a dangerous precedent would be created and it allowed less than 1% of the population to initiate the audit and there was no limit on the number of audits that could occur on a particular issue, so it could happen over and over.

Ms. Volek advised that during a 2007 meeting, the Council agreed to the three steps that were necessary to move money from the current public safety levy to cover the firefighter lawsuit. She said an advertised public hearing was held and three people showed up to testify. She said the decision made by Council was allowed by State law and the municipality was allowed to borrow money, pay debt and expenses, to hire, direct and discharge employees, and to appoint and remove board members. She said those options were exercised and she was concerned that action by 100 people could prevent the City's ability to manage debt to pay debt by managing staff. She said she prepared a fact sheet that could be used during discussion if the Council decided to oppose the bill.

Councilmember Ruegamer commented that it was nothing but a budget issue and a way that he saw the union leadership of the firefighters trying to get a hand in the budget process, or to retaliate against the City for paying back wages out of their budget. He said he asked several civic and business leaders around town how that should be done when that issue came up and almost everyone agreed it should be paid from that budget. He said

Councilmembers were elected to approve the budget and that meant to him that they had to manage, analyze and cut the budget as necessary. He said he did not want 100 people controlling that and any budget amendment that could impact the public safety levy had to be reviewed by a committee.

Councilmember Ulledalen stated he felt it should be opposed. He said there was ambiguity in it such as who the third party would be, how it was funded, and how resolution was ever reached. He said he felt it opened the door to litigation and there was also an issue of the budget in limbo if there was an open-ended process. Councilmember Gaghen said she agreed.

Councilmember Pitman stated that when he started discussing the issue, his concern was government transparency to assure people that the City was spending the money the way it said it would. He said he informed Senator Brown that he had major issues with the bill. He suggested a larger number of petitioners and that it should address all mill levies, not just one in particular. Councilmember Pitman stated he would not testify on the bill and felt a better one could be brought forward.

Councilmember Veis said he opposed the bill as well because it was ambiguous. He said he also felt that if people thought the money was not being used as intended, there was an election every two years. He said a future Council could deplete the General Fund and there was nothing in the bill that prevented that.

Councilmember Astle stated he agreed with Councilmember Pitman that the number should be larger than 100 people or 5% of the population. He said it seemed to be brought forward by the fire department, but the police department was also part of the mill levy so it should apply to all levies. He said the school district could be impacted as well. He asked if there was a downside for a group of 100 to initiate the audit and investigation. He said he was opposed to it.

Councilmember Clark said he was also opposed for the same reasons already given. He said he understood that the testimony had to be on the bill and the merits of it. He noted that the committee chairman had a lot of authority during the hearing.

Councilmember Brewster commented that Councilmember Veis hit the nail on the head because the public safety dollars were already supplanted with about \$17-18 million. He said he felt it was a harassment bill.

Councilmember McCall stated she was very opposed to it and felt it was a payback bill. She said it was a local issue that was trying to be solved at the state level. She noted that needed to be said quickly during the testimony. She added that the bill did not contain parameters or limitations.

Mayor Tussing asked Mr. Brooks what a citizen's remedy was if a levy was passed and they felt the funds were not being used for the purpose stated on the ballot. Mr. Brooks said he needed to do some research to determine all options, but did know that people could request all budget and reporting information; obtain a declaratory judgment in District Court; or seek an injunction and all of those options had to be paid by the individual. Mayor Tussing stated that he agreed that the definition of "independent" was not defined so anyone could state they did not think the money was properly spent. Mr. Brooks added that the public could seek a referendum.

Councilmember Veis stated that the money had been spent in ways not consistent with the intended purpose -- Fire Station #7 was built well in advance of when the City intended and two fire engines were purchased in advance. He said that bill removed the ability to

make decisions to move things up or slow them down. He commented that it came back to when Councilmembers were elected.

Ms. Volek pointed out that levy language indicated it was to support maintenance and equipment for public safety; and did not specify a promise of a number of people to be hired. She said they talked about plans for the money but those funds had to be traded to pay the back wages for firefighters. She noted that had the wages been paid over the years, it would have meant less operating money during those years. Mayor Tussing stated that he was in the forefront to get the levy passed and at every presentation he attended, the intentions were outlined but a guarantee of what would happen five years from then was not given. Ms. Volek said staff attended numerous meetings and had the same discussions. She said the real question was if it was not taken from that fund, where else it could be taken from. She said the City’s operating situation was such that other departments and the General Fund would be penalized and most of those departments had voluntarily reduced staff over the past several years to keep their own budgets in line.

Councilmember Ulledalen said if a future Council was faced with budget constraints and a fire station had to be closed, another levy would have to be passed or the City would have to live with the resources available.

Council consensus was to oppose the bill. Councilmember McCall indicated she may attend the hearing on the bill along with Councilmember Ruegamer. Ms. Volek advised that she would distribute her fact sheet and comments or changes could be forwarded to Mr. McCandless while she was out of town. Councilmember Veis noted that written testimony was usually accepted as well.

It was agreed to move directly to the discussion of the red light cameras while Mr. Bartlett was still connected to the meeting.

TOPIC #7	<i>Red Light Cameras</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Police Chief St. John advised that two proposals were received in response to the red camera RFP. He said a committee comprised of Councilmembers, the City’s Traffic Engineer and a Deputy City Attorney selected one proposal and wanted to begin contract work. He indicated there were issues with HB 531 that would outlaw the red light cameras attached to traffic signals, but he recommended proceeding with the program, while contacting Senators to oppose HB 531. He noted that Bozeman was ready to implement the cameras and Missoula was considering it. He reported that Billings, Bozeman, insurance companies and the Montana League of Cities and Towns testified against the bill at its hearing, but it was a 12-2 vote for it out of committee.

Chief St. John advised that he spoke with RedFlex, the company selected, and explained that the contract would be canceled if the bill passed. Chief St. John noted that it might be possible to use mobile cameras but signal cameras were preferred. Councilmember Clark asked if the camera could be hung on a streetlight or another pole other than the signal pole. Mr. Brooks explained that the legislation was vague and he was not sure what would be allowed, but it indicated that the camera was prohibited on a fixed traffic control pole.

Mayor Tussing asked if any of the Billings legislators voted for the bill. Chief St. John responded that Representative Arntzen voted for the bill. Councilmember McCall advised

that she would review the vote because 65 representatives voted for it, and knowing who voted could help with strategy to address it on the Senate side.

Councilmember Ruegamer pointed out that RedFlex would not require administration costs from the City, as had been experienced by other cities that used the red light camera system. Chief St. John explained that Bozeman paid 50% of the ticket to RedFlex and the fine was structured so that the system did not cost the voters any money. He stated that the cameras were entirely a safety issue. Councilmember Veis asked if any ordinances would have to be changed to be consistent with the proposal. Chief St. John said an ordinance was needed that made it a civil infraction and the level of enforcement would be set by Council. He noted that education and public relations would be needed.

Mayor Tussing stated he was troubled that all the discussion about the issue had been at work sessions and there had never been a public hearing on the issue. He said he felt it was important to allow public opinion and he wondered if the Billings legislators who voted for the bill had heard from constituents. Councilmember Brewster said the City attempted it before and there was so much opposition it was not pursued. Councilmember Veis stated he agreed with the Mayor that a public hearing was necessary and that there would be a lot of opposition to it. Councilmember Ruegamer stated he had not heard any opposition to it. Councilmember Pitman agreed that a hearing should be held and that it would buy time in the event the legislature passed the bill.

Councilmember Veis asked if the Council would decide where revenue went. Chief St. John responded that it would. Councilmember Brewster stated that making it a more public process would impact that legislation one way or another. Ms. Volek noted that the April 6 agenda included a discussion of Code Court and that would be an item in the Code Court, along with code enforcement, decriminalizing many violations.

Councilmember Astle commented that for the last year he had heard that the cameras would be used and he knew that Chief St. John went through a lot of work, but now Council decided it needed public input. He stated he was against the bill because it removed local control and he did not think the Council should back up until it had a proposal. Councilmember Veis stated that an official vote was never taken on the issue, it was a Council Initiative. Mayor Tussing pointed out that the initiative was to explore it, not implement it. Councilmember Veis said the issue had inherent support of the Council, but Councilmembers changed.

Councilmember Ulledalen pointed out there was a big article about the cameras in the Billings Gazette that did not generate opposition. He stated that the most consistent complaint he received since joining the Council was about red light and speeding violations. Councilmember Ronquillo said discussion was held about putting the cameras at the locations where most accidents occurred. He noted that the insurance companies were happy with the concept.

Councilmember McCall stated that she felt the legislators who supported the bill felt it was an infringement on personal rights. She said the list of who voted for it needed to be obtained and Senators needed to be contacted. Councilmember Veis stated he did not think legislators heard about local traffic issues.

Council consensus was to oppose the bill. Council also agreed that a public hearing should be held prior to award of a contract. Councilmember Gaghen stated that she thought people did not understand what consisted of a red light violation so more education was needed.

Councilmember Veis asked if the company would identify the appropriate intersections. Chief St. John responded that it would.

Mr. Bartlett disconnected from the meeting.

TOPIC #4	<i>Annexation Committee Recommendations</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Planning Manager Wyeth Friday reported that the Annexation Committee had several recommendations for 2009 and wanted direction to present them for action at future meetings. Mr. Friday explained that the current annexation policy and annexation map were adopted in March, 2008. He advised that the Annexation Committee reviewed the policy and annexation map internally during the current year. He noted that there were no outside requests for changes to the map. He said a late request was received but the committee decided not to recommend it at that time. Mr. Friday reviewed the committee's six recommendations as follows:

- No changes to the red area.
- Eliminate the orange area, the 10 year annexation, and reclassify it as a long-range planning area.
- Eliminate the yellow area entirely because it was considered uncertain with no time frame.
- Two adjustments to the orange area based on service limitations and the proposed Inner Belt Loop.
- Draft of best growth areas overlay.
- Consider codifying the annexation policy and consider repealing the urban planning study.

Councilmember Veis asked if large landholders had been asked about their time horizons. Mr. Friday said they had not, but developers typically disclosed their plans.

Councilmember Ulledalen asked if the growth area overlay was the committee's response to the Strategic Plan's item related to annexation priorities. Mr. Friday said it was.

Mr. Friday displayed the current Limits of Annexation Map and reviewed the proposed changes to the orange and yellow areas. He noted that the less complex items would be presented to Council in April and overlay districts and code changes would be presented in June.

Councilmember Ulledalen asked if any of the recommendations led to infill incentives. Mr. Friday responded that the information and density analysis fit into development of an infill policy.

Councilmember Astle asked why annexation areas were outside the zoning jurisdiction. Mr. Friday said the jurisdiction extended past the current zoning area, but the proposal was to include only the areas within City serviceability and then it would be within the zoning area.

Councilmember Veis asked for a comparison of the time horizons for the northeast corner and the area south of the Rehberg Ranch. Mr. Friday explained that services were in the Rehberg Ranch area and a transportation corridor was proposed so there was greater

potential to service it than the northeast corner that did not have services. He added that the northeast corner had less existing development than the other area. Councilmember Veis asked if developers might consider that northeast area if the mine in the Roundup area got going. He said he did not see what it hurt to keep that area in the orange area. Mr. Friday noted there was the possibility of development and the Dover Ranch development was in that area. Deputy Public Works Director Vern Heisler explained that the area was originally intended to be in the yellow area for the same reasons Mr. Friday mentioned, and then it went away when the yellow area went away. He noted that the Annexation Plan was reviewed every year and something like the mine could be considered next year or the next. Councilmember Ulledalen stated he thought the Dover Ranch had a 15 year buildout, which was potential development for several years. Councilmember Veis said he thought it would be odd to go from a white section there to a red section if a credible amount of development was to occur there, and he thought it could happen in other areas with the changes to the yellow and orange areas. Councilmember Brewster said he thought it would be a good idea to keep what was west of Highway 87.

Councilmember Ulledalen mentioned the development along Bench Boulevard and that the same could happen with that land west of Highway 87.

Councilmember Veis recommended going forward with what he proposed, but allowing options for amendments by Council.

A brief recess was taken

TOPIC #5	<i>New Federal Requirements for Pools</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Recreation Superintendent Joe Fedin stated he was present to review a new federal law regarding the operation of public pools. He said it was named after former Secretary of State James Baker’s granddaughter who drowned when she was sucked onto a pool drain and could not release herself. Mr. Fedin noted it was one of the few times that Federal government adopted pool standards. He advised that compliance was tough because it came about quickly and manufacturers were slow in production of the compliant equipment. Mr. Fedin advised that the new drains would be raised and some of the existing drains were undersized for the pools. He stated that the South Park pool was just about to the end of its usable life. He said staff needed direction about what to do with that pool. He added that it needed a second drain and major concrete work was needed to get it back in shape.

Mr. Fedin provided a history of the wading pools and spray deck conversions. He reviewed costs of operation and maintenance and noted that spray decks were less expensive than wading pools. He noted that wading pools required a lifeguard on duty for 12 hours each day and spray decks did not have that requirement because there was no standing water. Mr. Fedin advised that wading pool costs were \$41,637 per year for three pools, and the cost to operate spray parks was \$4,640 per year for four spray parks. He noted that neither wading pools nor spray parks generated any revenue. Councilmember McCall asked about building costs. Mr. Fedin explained that building costs depended on the building site, but the minimum cost for a wading pool was \$225,000 and \$175,000 for a spray park. Councilmember Veis asked about the cost of converting a wading pool to a spray park. Mr.

Fedin advised that that he did not know an exact cost because there were so many variables. Ms. Volek stated that she appreciated the presentation, but the cost of water at the spray parks was needed before a complete analysis could be done. Councilmember Veis asked if the water and wastewater study took that into consideration. Ms. Volek said it did. Mr. Fedin pointed out that the spray decks used less water than wading pools because the spray could be regulated.

Mr. Fedin stated that all pools could be converted to meet federal law except the South Park wading pool without a budget amendment or increase unless something unexpected occurred before summer. He said there was nothing that could be done with the South Park wading pool because of the drain. Councilmember Ronquillo stated he did not want anything done to the big pool except to make it a bigger pool complete with the same amenities as Rose Park pool.

Councilmember Veis asked if the South Park pool was in the CIP. Mr. Fedin said several others were, but that one was not and was not considered a priority to get there. Councilmember Veis stated that if something was done with that pool, other priorities would be passed over.

Councilmember Ronquillo said the City was not taking care of its own property and when it fell apart, the solution was to tear it down. Mr. Fedin responded that more was being done with fewer people and budget constraints did not allow the needed maintenance. Councilmember Veis added that O&M had been held in the budget for many years and that was a result of it, not just at South Park, but all across the City.

Ms. Volek pointed out that the Parks and Recreation Department was only given \$30,000 from the General Fund during the last year and the scarce resources had led to these problems. She said that was a reason business plans would be developed for each area. She said the critical issue was how the Council wanted to treat the South Park wading pool. She noted that given the financial condition of the City, she would not recommend many capital improvements. She stated that Councilmember Ronquillo expressed his preference to close the South Park wading pool and maintain the big pool.

Councilmember Ulledalen pointed out that the far west end had zero pools and land owned by the City needed to be rationalized, and if some parks would never be developed, the land could be sold.

Councilmember Astle commented that there were more needs than money. He suggested taking out the wading pool at South Park and replacing it with a spray park that would serve neighborhood kids. Mr. Fedin stated that Council direction was needed if that was to be done. It was consensus to explore the cost of the spray park at South Park. Councilmember Ulledalen stated that the funds from the sale of the South Billings Boulevard property could be used toward the construction of the spray park and would be a better use of the funds than a master plan for Pioneer Park.

Councilmember Pitman asked if the department had sufficient funds to get the remaining pools in compliance. Mr. Fedin said he believed it did. Parks, Recreation and Public Lands Director Mike Whitaker estimated \$8-10,000 to upgrade all but the South Park pools.

Councilmember Gaghen asked if there was any opportunity for stimulus funds for that type of project. Mr. Whitaker responded that he had not heard anything certain on that but it was on the list of federal projects.

Councilmember Veis advised that he agreed with Councilmember Ulledalen and would be happy to consider selling some parks to raise capital for parks. Ms. Volek explained that

some subdivision agreements would prevent parkland sales and park maintenance districts became an issue. Mr. Whitaker advised there were 39 park maintenance districts and they consumed 40-50% of the Park Superintendent’s time to balance the books in the districts.

TOPIC #6	<i>Review of Lockwood Transportation Study</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Neighborhood Planner Lora Mattox explained that the document was intended to provide information so the Council’s PCC representative had the view of the Council. She said the study would be on the March 9 Council meeting agenda, and the Board of County Commissioners would hold a public hearing March 31. She noted that the Planning Board met the previous week and would forward a recommendation of approval.

Councilmember Brewster asked if an Emerald Hills interchange was considered. Ms. Mattox responded that she did not believe that was planned at the current time. She said she thought a connection between the Heights and Lockwood could be considered in the future.

TOPIC #8	<i>Rimrock Foundation Alley</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

City Attorney Brent Brooks explained that a difference of opinion existed about part of the settlement agreement concerning an alley that ran north/south between Vuecrest Drive and 8th Avenue North. He said the alley was gravel and about two-thirds of it was developed. Mr. Brooks provided five options identified by City staff and the associated costs. He said staff recommended Option #4.

Ms. Volek reviewed the sketch of property boundaries. She said the City would likely be obligated to develop the alley to Rimrock Foundation’s property line and the property owners in the southwest corner would be affected no matter what happened. Planning Director Candi Beaudry said she contacted property owners to the north of Rimrock Foundation to determine if they objected to opening the alley. She said there were three property owners and all were anxious to have the alley opened. Councilmember Astle asked about the cost. Mr. Brooks advised that \$24,000 would be the total cost for that option, but during discussion, Rimrock Foundation agreed to pay for the gravel so the City’s cost would be about \$13,000. Councilmember McCall said what was proposed as Option #4 was contained in the agreement so it should be negotiated.

Ms. Volek advised that the alley could be graveled as indicated in Option #5, but it would require future, expensive maintenance. Councilmember Veis stated that the right language was not in the agreement, so that was probably the best option and the alley would be constructed to City standards. Mr. Brooks added that the statement could have been clearer, but now a reasonable option was being identified. Councilmember Veis explained that Rimrock Foundation wanted the alley open so it was more open and allowed police and fire access.

It was consensus to allow the City Attorney to negotiate Option #4. Deputy Public Works Director Vern Heisler explained how the alley would be constructed. He added that the project needed to be done sooner than City crews could complete it so it would be contracted.

Mr. Brooks stated he did not think the agreement needed to be amended. Councilmember Veis stated he preferred to put it into writing by amending the agreement so it was clear for all parties and for the long term. He said he wanted the amendment to include building it to City standards, costs for each party, and that it concluded all obligations.

Additional Information:
