

PORT OF GREATER CINCINNATI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
November 15, 2007
7:30 am at 3CDC Conference Room, Suite 1420

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Love called the Port of Greater Cincinnati Development Authority Board of Directors meeting to order at 7:42 a.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bailey, Clifford
Budig, Otto
George, Louis
Love, Steve
Siebenburgen, David
Zimmer, Joe

EXCUSED:

Hull, Betty
Johnson JioDucci, J. J.
Muller, Paul
Otto, Charlotte
Rouse, Jack

STAFF:

Richardson, Connie
Robb, Deborah
Russell, Christine
Satzger, Kim
Schafer, Ray
Thomas, Susan

GUESTS:

Engel, Mark – Bricker & Eckler
Lewis, Don – Vorys, Sater, Semour & Pease
Phillips, Bonnie – City of Cincinnati

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Love asked Board Members if there were any changes to the minutes. There being no changes to the October 18, 2007 minutes, Mr. Love asked for approval of the minutes.

Motion: Mr. Budig made a motion to adopt the minutes of the October 18, 2007 Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Siebenburgen. The motion was approved unanimously.

III. BROWNFIELD PROJECTS UPDATE

Ms. Russell provided the following brownfield project updates to the Board.

5025 Carthage Avenue, Norwood, OH (Linden Pointe) – There has been no change on this project since the last Board meeting. The environmental consultant is working to finalize the No Further Action (NFA) letter. Once the NFA letter is finalized, it will go to legal counsel for Al. Neyer, Inc. for review. Once that review is completed by legal counsel, the NFA letter will be submitted to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA).

320 South Anthony Wayne Avenue, Lockland, OH (Hamilton County Regional Business Park) – Work began in the middle of October on concrete crushing. The crushed concrete will eventually be used for on-site back fill. As mentioned last month, demolition and excavation in Identified Area 1 is complete. Identified Area 3 was originally supposed to be excavated. Due to a private industrial water line that runs through that Area, the remedial action has been changed. The Port Authority is working with the Certified Professional to prepare the paperwork associated with that change.

4101 Spring Grove Avenue, Cincinnati, OH (American Can Building) – The asbestos abatement was entirely completed at the end of October 2007. The Port Authority and the American Can Building, LLC continue to work towards finalizing the low interest loan through the Brownfield Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund from the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD). As part of that loan process, the ODOD came to Cincinnati on November 8th and toured the American Can Building site. The ODOD stated that they were very comfortable with everything presented, and the proposed timeline for closing the loan is mid-December 2007.

Mr. Siebenburgen asked the dollar value of the loan.

Ms. Russell said that the loan would be for \$750,000.

Mr. Siebenburgen asked what the budget was for the project.

Ms. Russell said that American Can Building, LLC estimated that they needed an additional \$850,000 to complete the project. Originally, the LLC paid for the acquisition and the environmental assessments, and planned that the \$750,000 grant would cover the clean-up.

Ms. Satzger added that the loan from the ODOD Brownfield Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund was in addition to the original \$750,000 grant.

Ms. Russell said that the loan has a 1 to 1½ % interest rate with a two-year deferred payment, and a seven year term. She said that the loan from the ODOD Brownfield Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund is much the same as the grant in that the loan is on a reimbursement basis. This meant that ODOD would not be sending a check prior to the work commencing, but rather the work would be performed, and then documentation would be sent to ODOD for reimbursement.

Ms. Russell told the Board that Ms. Satzger would be presenting an update to the Kemper Road project.

3603 East Kemper Road, Cincinnati, OH (Kemper Crossings at Park 42) – Ms. Satzger reported that this is the property that the Port Authority cleaned up and then sold to Kemper

Crossing, LLC, which is Neyra Properties. Kemper Crossing has requested an amendment to the development schedule included in the Declaration of Restrictions and Easements agreement. After the Port Authority sold the property to Kemper Crossing, it filed a Declaration of Restrictions and Easements on the deed that stipulated that Kemper Crossing would proceed with a development that would be essentially the same in terms of size as that proposed to the ODOD in the Clean Ohio Fund application, approximately 80,000 square feet of office-flex space. Kemper Crossing committed to build 87,440 square feet of office space and start the development within a relatively short time period. However, modifications to the adjoining property, a worsening real estate climate, and increased construction costs have delayed the start of construction on the 3603 East Kemper Road site.

Ms. Satzger said that Kemper Crossing owns the adjacent 26-acre property ("Park 42"). When combined with the 9.3 acre 3603 East Kemper Road property ("Kemper Crossings at Park 42"), the entire site will be more than 35 acres. After purchase, while attempting to market the subject property, Kemper Crossing determined, based on market feedback, that renovations to the existing building on Park 42 were required. This was necessary as the back of the building on the Park 42 property was a loading dock. This made it difficult to market the Kemper Crossings at Park 42 as office space. Kemper Crossing is implementing a renovation and redevelopment approach for the combined properties that will result in an integrated office campus. During 2006, and through June 2007, Kemper Crossings renovated its existing Park 42 building on the adjacent property. These renovations resulted in the conversion of 41,000 square feet of warehouse space to office space. The conversion attracted an office tenant, Data Recognition Corporation (projecting 508 full time employees at full employment). The new tenant, Data Recognition Corporation, required 510 committed parking spaces. Kemper Crossing could not meet the parking count on its existing Park 42 property; therefore, 391 parking spaces would need to be placed on the Kemper Crossings at Park 42 site.

Ms. Satzger indicated that Kemper Crossing sought approval from the City of Sharonville regarding the change in the Kemper Crossings at Park 42 site plan. The City of Sharonville approved the change, as it would mean 508 new jobs to the City (158 more jobs than previously anticipated for the 3603 East Kemper Road property alone). Ms. Satzger contacted a representative from the City of Sharonville, and they have indicated that they are very pleased with the development to date. They stated that without the 3603 East Kemper Road property being remediated and ready for development, the City of Sharonville would not have had the opportunity to attract a new tenant to the City/County. Currently, Kemper Crossing has paved one 32,950 square foot building area (identified as Phase III on the Development Plan) on the western most portion of the Kemper Crossings at Park 42 property for parking, and has committed 105 parking spaces from the Phase II, 32,950 square foot building site located in the center portion of the Kemper Crossings at Park 42 property. This means that for at least the next seven years, the Phase III 32,950 building on the western most portion of the property will not be constructed and will remain as surface parking instead. The Phase II central portion of the property will provide some parking for Data Recognition Corporation but the parking may be taken out when Phase II is initiated. Phase I and Phase II will commence when the market responds. The site is currently being marketed by a real estate agent. Kemper Crossing has asked for an extension in the time period that it has to develop the property.

Ms. Satzger said that the resolution under consideration provides that the first and second buildings on the property (Phase I and Phase II) shall be under construction by December 1, 2009, with construction completed by December 1, 2010. Construction on the third building ("Phase III") shall be under construction by October 1, 2014, with construction completed by September 30, 2015. Ms. Satzger noted that Kemper Crossing has not asked for any amendment

with regard to the size of the development. Further, she stated that the City of Sharonville has indicated, in writing, their support for this development.

Mr. George asked what options that the Port Authority had should the stated obligations not be met by the developer.

Ms. Satzger asked Don Lewis of Vorys, Sater, Semour and Pease to explain.

Mr. Lewis said that under the existing agreement, if the developer does not carry through with their obligations, the sole remedy of the Port Authority is the right to take back the property for the original sale price.

Mr. Love asked for a motion to adopt the resolution.

Motion: Mr. Budig made a motion to adopt the resolution authorizing a first amendment to Declaration of Restrictions and Easements, to extend the development schedule for the 3603 East Kemper Road property. Mr. Siebenburgen seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Ms. Russell reported to the Board that the OEPA was hosting their first brownfield conference on November 27th and 28th, and Ms. Russell would be speaking on a panel entitled "How Port Authorities can assist in Brownfield Redevelopment, Cleanup, and Assessment."

IV. FINANCING PROJECTS UPDATE

Ms. Thomas provided the following financing project updates to the Board.

Galbraith Road at I-71, Sycamore Township, OH (Kenwood Towne Place) – This is the \$20 - \$25 million TIF Bond financing to fund a parking garage that is associated with Kenwood Towne Place, which is situated between Kenwood Towne Center and I-71. The lead developer is Bear Creek Capital. The Board approved a preliminary resolution in April 2007. The preliminary agreements were signed in September 2007. Sycamore Township approved the TIF resolution last month. The Port Authority continues to work actively with Bear Creek Capital and Sycamore Township to put together the final structure of the deal. There is not a resolution for the Board this month, but the Port Authority staff hopes to bring a resolution before the Board next month for bonds that will be marketed and closed either before the end of the year or in January 2008.

3000 Disney Avenue, North Oakley, Cincinnati, OH (Millworks Town Center) – This is a TIF and special assessment financing that the Port Authority is undertaking in cooperation with the City of Cincinnati and Vision Development. This is the site off of Marburg Avenue in North Oakley. At the October 2007 Board meeting, the Board approved a resolution that increased the maximum bond amount to \$55 million and expanded the use of proceeds to include the Kennedy Connector. At that time, it was mentioned that Vision Development needed approval from the City of Cincinnati for those changes, as well as an updated development agreement. Those discussions are ongoing with the City of Cincinnati. If the developer receives those approvals, then financing can be locked-in and the developer can assemble the land. Timing remains uncertain.

Mr. Siebenburgen asked if the project was still going to move forward.

Ms. Thomas said she had not heard anything to the contrary from the City of Cincinnati. Ms. Thomas went on to explain that the City Administration and the developer took a development agreement to the City of Cincinnati Finance Committee approximately ten days after the Port Authority Board passed the resolution in October. A couple of questions were raised at the Finance Committee meeting, and the City Administration and the developer are working to address those issues.

Cincinnati Empowerment Corporation – The Cincinnati Empowerment Corporation (CEC) has been designated to manage a federally designated Empowerment Zone. The Cincinnati Empowerment Zone comprises parts of nine neighborhoods, all within the City of Cincinnati. As a part of that Empowerment Zone designation, the CEC has the ability to authorize the issuance of up to \$130 million of tax exempt Empowerment Zone bonds to raise funds for Empowerment Zone businesses. The proceeds from the sale of the bonds would be used by businesses for job creation and economic development in the Empowerment Zone. These are conduit bonds, and the Port Authority will not pledge any of its revenues and will not be liable for any payments on the bonds.

Mr. Budig asked how the Port Authority would be involved.

Ms. Thomas said that the Port Authority would serve as the conduit issuer for the Empowerment Zone bonds.

Mr. Budig asked if the Port Authority would be reimbursed in any way for being the conduit issuer.

Ms. Thomas said that after the Port Authority was approached by the CEC, in order to benchmark fees, we contacted three other comparable Empowerment Zone issuers. The fee schedules of these organizations range from 50-100bps and are in line with the for-profit conduit bond issuer fee schedules for these organizations. In spite of the higher Empowerment Zone bond fees nationally, staff believed that conceptually it made sense that fees for the Empowerment Zone Bonds should not exceed our existing for-profit conduit bond issuer rate. Because of the involvement of the CEC and our desire to be a part of the vital community revitalization effort, we felt a discount to this schedule was appropriate. Therefore, in the initial draft of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that was forwarded to the Empowerment Zone, the Port Authority offered reduced fees.

Following discussions at the last Board meeting, the Port Authority staff revised the MOU to incorporate feedback received from the Board, as well as to respond to comments received from the CEC on the initial draft of the MOU. Included was a further reduction to the already proposed reduction of the standard fee that the Port Authority would receive for being the conduit issuer. The revised MOU was sent on October 31, 2007. There have been several conversations with CEC since the MOU was sent, but the Port Authority has not received a formal indication of response to the MOU or the revised fee schedule.

Ms. Thomas explained that it might be helpful to the Board to walk through some of the major differences between the Empowerment Zone bonds and the conduit bonds that the Port Authority has issued in the past.

First, the three conduit bonds that the Port Authority has done in the past have all been for non-profit entities. In the case of the Empowerment Zone bonds, the borrowers will be for-profit entities. From preliminary discussions with CEC, the Port Authority anticipates that the

borrowers will be, for the most part, prominent developers in the City of Cincinnati and large national corporations.

Second, in the case of Empowerment Zone Bonds, there is a post-issuance risk. In traditional conduit bonds, the tax-exempt nature of the bonds is determined by the non-profit status of the borrower at the time of issue. There is no post-issuance risk. In this case, under the Empowerment Zone legislation, there is a post issuance employment requirement that mandates that at least 35% of employees be residents of the Empowerment Zone. This must be monitored on an annual basis.

Mr. Budig asked what would happen if the employment level fell below 35%.

Ms. Thomas said that if the employment level drops below 35% and is not corrected within either the start-up window or the grace period provided, usually between four and six years depending on the timing of the bonds, then, in theory, the IRS could declare the bonds to be taxable. The Port Authority, in order to mitigate this risk, would structure the bonds to include a Letter of Credit and a tax call. Then, if the IRS did declare the bonds taxable, the bonds would become immediately callable and this call would be funded by the Letter of Credit. At this point, the Port Authority would be taken out as issuer of the bonds and the discussions would then be between the bank that issued the Letter of Credit and the developer.

Mr. Siebenburgen asked if the feature of the Letter of Credit had been agreed upon.

Ms. Thomas said that the Letter of Credit was an item in the MOU.

Mr. Love asked who would be performing the monitoring of employment levels.

Ms. Thomas said that as the issuer of the bonds, monitoring is the responsibility of the Port Authority. Part of MOU is that the Port Authority would contract with the CEC to perform these duties. The CEC would do the work with the Port Authority receiving copies of reports and certifications on an annual basis. The MOU contemplates a post-issuance annual monitoring fee that would go entirely to the CEC as long as the service was performed. The proposed EZ Bond fee schedule represents a significant reduction to the existing conduit fee schedule. This proposal, in aggregate, represents a fifty percent reduction to the standard fee schedule, and also reduces the upfront fees from \$4,000 to \$1,500.

Ms. Thomas indicated that the Port Authority staff was interested in working with the CEC to take advantage of the Empowerment Zone Bonds, and as such, a significant amount of staff time and legal time were spent learning about Empowerment Zone Bonds and crafting the MOU. Approximately \$10,000 in legal costs has been spent to this point in time. These costs are incurred by the Port Authority and are not reimbursable out of any potential issuance.

Mr. Budig asked that in light of expenses already incurred and the reduction in fees, would the Port Authority ultimately be upside down.

Ms. Thomas said that whether or not the Port Authority ended up upside down depended on how much of the \$130 million in potential Empowerment Zone Bonds were actually issued. To the extent that that number is smaller, the sunk costs have less to be distributed over; to the extent that over the next couple of years, \$100 million in bonds are issued, that amount would be more than sufficient to cover the costs incurred to date. Ms. Thomas went on to explain that while the

Port Authority will be represented by issuer counsel as separate from bond counsel, the issuer counsel is paid for by cost of issuance that is paid for out of the proceeds of the bonds.

Mr. Love asked if Ms. Thomas had a projection as to when the MOU might be placed in front of the Board for consideration.

Ms. Thomas said no, as we are waiting on a response from the CEC.

Mr. Love said that the Port Authority and the CEC were still in a period of negotiation.

Ms. Thomas concurred.

Mr. Bailey said that he was concerned about completing the negotiations and moving forward. Therefore, he offered to convene a meeting with Joyce Powdrill and Kim Satzger in order to finalize the negotiations.

Mr. George said that he was concerned about a Board Member getting involved in the process, as he believes that Board members should be sensitive to crossing over into staff areas of responsibility.

Mr. Love said that there are past examples of Board members providing assistance. He said that he believes that it would be appropriate, given the relationship of Mr. Bailey with the CEC.

Mr. George said that he was fine with Mr. Bailey participating in the process. But he cautioned the Board, in general, to be careful when participating to speed up a process to insure due diligence is done to protect the Port Authority.

Mr. Love asked Ms. Thomas to confirm that the borrowers would most likely be prominent developers.

Ms. Thomas said that nationally Empowerment Zone Bonds have had a very heavy real estate component. The national experience is that the minimum size of the Empowerment Zone bonds is generally too large to make them financially attractive for small manufacturing facilities.

Mr. Love asked if there were any other questions for Ms. Thomas.

There were no further questions.

V. ECONOMIC INCLUSION UPDATE

Ms. Robb provided the Board with the following updates.

4000 Red Bank Road, Fairfax, Fairfax, OH (Red Bank Village) – This site is now ready for the Wal-Mart development. Wal-Mart will most likely start developing lot pad 1 in March 2008. The next section of the project that the Port Authority will be involved in is the police sub-station. The Request for Proposals should go out in March 2008. Based on the Development Agreement with Regency Centers which owns the land, the economic inclusion requirement flows down to the entire site. The Port Authority will also be working with Miller-Valentine concerning economic inclusion requirements since Miller-Valentine has purchased a portion of that site.

320 South Anthony Wayne Avenue, Lockland, OH (Hamilton County Regional Business Park) – Evans Landscaping was awarded the bid for concrete crushing, and is using leased demolition equipment from Acme Construction which is a Minority Business Enterprise (MBE).

Sisters of Mercy – This project involves two high schools, McCauley High School and Mother of Mercy High School. The Mother of Mercy High School portion of the project is complete. The McCauley High School portion of the project is ongoing. This portion of the project is renovation of the auditorium. Messer Construction is leading the effort and is doing very well as far as economic inclusion is concerned.

Kenwood Town Place – The Port Authority continues to attend weekly construction meetings as well as any additional meetings that may be required. The Port Authority is working diligently with Bear Creek Capital in order to get accurate inclusion data. Bear Creek placed ads in the paper seeking qualified suppliers for future portions of the project. The Port Authority has spoken with Bear Creek Capital in regards to these ads and where the ads are placed to get the maximum response. Bear Creek Capital is waiting for final approval to run the additional ads, as well as change some of the existing verbiage in the ads.

Mr. Siebenburgen asked Ms. Robb if she was comfortable with Bear Creek Capital performing these duties as expected.

Ms. Robb said the concern was not with Bear Creek Capital but with some of the prime contractors that did not have as much experience with economic inclusion initiatives. She added that she had compiled a list of all the prime contractors and noted that some of them are historically not as successful as others with regard to economic inclusion. To address this issue, Ms. Robb is working on a presentation to facilitate a conversation with the prime contractors about the importance of supplier diversity.

National City Bank – National City Bank has provided a proposal to the Port Authority regarding providing gap financing for Minority Business Enterprise (MBE), Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and Women Business Enterprise (WBE) companies on brownfield projects. This is in relation to some of the issues that the Port Authority came across this summer in regards to the Clean Ohio Funds reimbursement period being too long for some MBE, WBE, and SBE; thus precluding these businesses from participating in brownfield projects. The proposal has been reviewed and Port Authority has talked to several financial experts to confirm whether the proposal would be attractive to MBE, SBE and WBE businesses. The Port Authority is now confident that the proposal is a good one. The next step is to obtain a legal opinion to ensure that there is no risk to the Port Authority.

Mr. Siebenburgen asked if the proposal from National City Bank had been reviewed by any MBE, SBE, or WBE businesses to see if the proposed offer would be attractive.

Ms. Robb said that Mr. Bailey, who is himself an MBE, reviewed the proposal and then referred the Port Authority to other resources to get additional opinions on the proposal.

Mr. Bailey said that he had referred Ms. Robb to some bankers who had previously worked with gap financing and had them review the proposal and make additional suggestions. Further, Mr. Bailey said that he believed that MBEs, SBEs, and WBEs would surely take advantage of the program.

Ms. Robb said that one of the plusses in regards to the proposal is that National City Bank is willing to take a subordinate position on collateral. National City Bank will not take vehicles or equipment as collateral but are willing to really work with small business and minority owned business.

Mr. Love asked who the point person was at National City Bank.

Ms. Robb replied that the point person was Mr. Ken Mittman.

National Minority Supplier Development Council (NMSDC) Conference – Ms. Robb reported that she had represented the Port Authority at the NMSDC conference in Miami, Florida. The event was extremely well attended. Ms. Robb attended workshops on: creating a communication plan to MBE, SBE, and WBE businesses; how to assist MBEs in building capacity; and second tier purchasing, which encompasses almost all the projects the Port Authority works on with developers. Ms. Robb also attended sessions on how to make the business case for supplier diversity.

South Central Ohio Minority Business Council (SCOMBC) Gala – The Port Authority staff will be attending the annual awards gala on Friday, November 16, 2007. One of the Board Members of the Port Authority, Mr. Clifford Bailey, has been nominated to receive the Legacy Award.

Ms. Robb reported to the Board that the economic inclusion numbers on the report were the same as those reported last month. Once accurate numbers are received from the Kenwood Towne Place project, the report will reflect the current level of activity.

Ms. Satzger told the Board that Ms. Robb was also the Prevailing Wage Coordinator for the Port Authority and is collecting certified payroll for the Kenwood Towne Place project, as well as on all Port Authority projects.

VI. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Love gave the Board an update on the Banks project. He said that the Banks Working Group had succeeded in getting the City of Cincinnati and Hamilton County to agree on the project approach. Mr. Love said that one of the remaining critical steps is that the remaining financing for Phase I must be secured within sixty days of the vote which took place two weeks ago. The development team understands that the clock is ticking, and the belief is extremely high that the efforts to get new equity partners on board will be successful. A Request for Proposal (RFP) will soon be released for the project architect. A RFP is also being developed for an economic inclusion consultant. Construction on the Banks project will not take place until the first quarter of 2008. Mr. Love said that the Banks Working Group has agreed to stay through the transition to whoever the joint City-County steering committee decides will oversee the project has been put in place. There has been no discussion by the Banks Working Group as to which entity should be used.

VII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Ms. Satzger asked Mr. Schafer to present the Financial Report to the Board.

Financial Report – Mr. Schafer reported the following to the Board.

Cash at the end of October is \$725,000. Year end cash will be somewhere around \$550,000, excluding grant revenues from the City of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, and revenue from Kenwood Towne Place closing. Mr. Schafer said that Expenses are running below budget. These have been previously discussed, and there are no new issues concerning expenses. The projects like the Economic Impact Study update have been discussed as well as the additional expenses in regard to the Bi-Annual Report.

Audit – At the back of the Board packet is a copy of the audited financial statement, and clipped to the back of that statement are three letters from BKD, LLP with regard to their review. BKD, LLP is required to provide this communication to the Board, which describes how the scope for the audit was set, and reflects on the results of the audit in terms of whether or not there were any weaknesses in internal control, financial reporting, or other issues on which BKD, LLP is required to report. There were no weaknesses noted and the opinion was an unqualified clean opinion. The information has been discussed with the Finance Work Group, as is standard practice.

Mr. Schafer asked the Board to look at the statement in the binder that reflects the Assets, Liabilities. The totals have been broken out into bonds (Cincinnati Mills and Springdale-Pictoria) and operations. These breakouts also enable the Port Authority to better respond to financial statement questions. It more clearly reflects that the Port Authority assets are primarily due to the bonds and not operations. The bond transactions over the life of the bonds will zero out, thus the assets will diminish. The same applies to the Statement of Revenues and Expenses. A final column titled Operations Appropriations Budget is included for comparison to actual. This was previously discussed and is very similar to the unaudited results of operations that the Port Authority reviewed last February.

Economic Impact Study – Ms. Satzger reported to the Board that the Port Authority was proceeding on the Economic Impact Study update. There has been a minor delay as there has been some difficulty coordinating with project team members and getting the input that is required for the University of Cincinnati (UC) to assess the developments. There are a lot more projects to work on now than when the Economic Impact Study was first done, and the Port Authority has asked UC to not only review the projects that were measured last time but also to look at the new projects. The process is nearly complete.

Off-Site Retreat – The Staff had an off-site retreat on November 1, 2007 and worked on Strategic Planning in order to develop a Strategic Budget for next year. Once the process has been documented, the Board will then be engaged in the planning process.

Mr. Bailey asked about the impact to the Port Authority if Cincinnati Mills were to have financial problems.

Ms. Satzger asked Ms. Thomas to respond.

Ms. Thomas said that the bonds are backed by a special assessment. Every year an administrator looks at the amount of money the Trustee has in the account and the amount that is expected from the Hamilton County Auditor, and then determines if there is an anticipated shortfall. If there is, then the cities put in place a special assessment paid by the owner of the property that raises the necessary funds.

Mr. Siebenburgen pointed out that a special assessment has the same priority as a tax lien.

Ms. Thomas concurred.

Mr. Love asked the Board if there was any other business.

The response was no.

Mr. Love then asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Mr. Bailey made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Siebenburgen seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 a.m.

Respectfully,

Kimberly Satzger
Secretary