

**MINNETONKA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**JUNE 29, 2009  
6:00 P.M.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

EDA President Peter St. Peter called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

EDA commissioners present: Ellen Cousins, Dan Duffy, Bunny Robinson, Peter St. Peter, Tony Wagner, Brad Wiersum, and Bill Yaeger.

Staff present: Julie Wischnack and Elise Durbin.

**3. APPROVE MARCH 23, 2009, MARCH 30, 2009, AND MAY 11, 2009  
MINUTES**

Wiersum moved, Duffy seconded a motion to approve the March 23, 2009 meeting minutes. Cousins, Duffy, Robinson, St. Peter, Wagner, Wiersum, and Yaeger voted yes. Motion passed.

Duffy moved, Wagner seconded a motion to approve the March 30, 2009 meeting minutes with a modification to the last paragraph on Page 7. Cousins, Duffy, Robinson, St. Peter, and Wagner voted yes. Wiersum and Yaeger abstained. Motion passed.

Wagner moved, Cousins seconded a motion to approve the May 11, 2009 meeting minutes with a modification to the first paragraph of Page 7. Cousins, Duffy, St. Peter, Wagner, Wiersum, and Yaeger voted yes. Robinson abstained. Motion passed.

**4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Wagner moved, Yaeger seconded a motion to nominate St. Peter to serve as president and Duffy to serve as the vice president of the EDA commission for one year. Cousins, Duffy, Robinson, St. Peter, Wagner, Wiersum, and Yaeger voted yes. Motion passed.

**BUSINESS ITEMS**

**5. 2010 PRELIMINARY BUDGET REVIEW OF LIVABLE COMMUNITIES  
ACCOUNT, DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNT, AND HRA LEVY**

Wischnack gave the staff report. She explained the origination and allowed uses of the funds and reviewed the worksheets included in the agenda packet.

Duffy asked if feedback had been received from West Hennepin Affordable Housing Land Trust (WHAHLT). Wischnack explained that the 2009 total amount is \$250,000; \$50,000 more than the previous year. Of the \$250,000, \$150,000 will come from the Livable Communities account. WHAHLT is happy to be receiving an increase in funds.

In response to Wagner's question, Durbin explained that funds were carried over from last year to this year. Wagner asked how the purchase of the house located on Hopkins Crossroads and Oak Knoll Road will be reflected in the 2009 and 2010 budget. Wischnack said that a note will be added to the issues listed at the bottom of the page. It is preferable to purchase and sell it in one budget cycle, but the income may not return to the account until 2010.

Wagner asked for the definition of "housing activities" in the Livable Communities account. Wischnack stated this particular fund can be used only for affordable housing purposes. The development fund is not as clear cut. St. Peter recalled the fund did not cover rehabilitation of existing homes when it was created. The Metropolitan Council and Hennepin County guidelines fund rehabilitation only as part of a larger project that includes new development.

Wiersum stated that \$317,703 in 2008 is an actual number. He understood the cash flow aspects of the figure. He questioned if, after the expenditure of \$317,703 was carried over, then is the cash flow balance zero or is there still money left over from 2008 that potentially could be expended in 2009 and make the actual expenditure potential greater than \$150,000. Durbin said the 2008 funds do have an outstanding balance, and it is possible the 2009 actual will be higher than \$150,000. Wischnack will tally each year so that commissioners may more accurately depict the cash flow. It is not uncommon for a project to be started in one year, but not request funds until the next year. Wiersum would appreciate knowing what the carry amount is each year. Then the accounting would be equivalent for each year. Wischnack stated that it will also be noted in the budget issue section to be used as a reference.

St. Peter asked if there are other commitments that the city has previously made not reflected in the figures other than the WHAHLT commitment. Wischnack answered in the negative. The development fund incurs incidental costs expended from the fund, but that does not happen in this

fund because of the use restrictions. WHAHLT is the only one in this fund that has a carry-over commitment.

Wiersum reflected that, policy wise, the commission may want to create a position on how to handle carry-over amounts. Wagner agreed.

Wagner did not think levy dollars were being funneled through the fund. It is a separate fund. He would like an indication on the report explaining that the total WHAHLT commitment is higher.

Wiersum felt having an expiration point makes sense. Just like a college scholarship, the college wants the individual to utilize the money, but if the money is not used in a timely basis, there may be more effective ways to use those dollars in the future. A short extension may be available. It would provide more flexibility to see that dollars are being used most effectively when they are being used. He agreed that it should not be a hard and fast, rigid condition because then the fear is that the funds would be spent badly so it is not lost. Somewhere between those extremes is an answer that allows funds to be used efficiently for the purposes identified.

Wagner suggested tracking the amounts of funds spent and for what they were used for over the past two years. That information could provide discussion. The purpose of the funds is to ensure long-term affordability.

St. Peter suggested that looking at WHAHLT is something commissioners can easily do in the funding cycle in October.

Cousins asked if the HRA Levy or the EDA's budget is allocated first. Wischnack stated that Livable Communities is done first and HRA last. A fund balance can remain in the HRA Levy. The 2009 HRA funds are to the WHAHLT organization. If the EDA wishes to recommend changes, the city council would need to approve the change and amend the budget.

St. Peter noted that it may be appropriate to make a policy recommendation that WHAHLT funds first be taken from the Livable Communities Fund since there is more flexibility with respect to the HRA Levy for other projects if a balance is carried over. Duffy agreed. The current market situation, where housing values are decreasing, will beg the question why is the amount of funding holding steady. Maybe there are more affordable houses that may be purchased without the city's assistance. It should be evaluated on a timely basis.

Wischnack suggested that grant extensions be used to follow WHAHLT. CDBG is different because parameters are already in place.

St. Peter said he served on three foundation boards which had a general rule that if funds are not expended within a fiscal year that it go no further than six months beyond or an extension process is used. It provides accountability and a way to administer an extension. The applicant has the ability to meet with the EDA again to justify the need for requesting more funds.

Wischnack reported on the Development Account established in 1993. It has more flexibility and may be used on costs associated with Minnetonka's redevelopment and economic development activities. Some examples are Glen Lake, Minnetonka Boulevard and County Road 101, and membership to the Twin Cities Community Capital Fund. The fund receives grant funds and reimburses costs for projects. Wischnack reviewed the budget page and provided examples. The fund may also be used for incidentals. Major expenditures will be listed on the budget page. Forecasting for the fund shows a decreased balance.

Wiersum was curious if the principle, interest rate, or combination of both determines the decline in the interest income. Wischnack believes the results to be a combination of interest rate and principle. She said there are huge fluctuations based on grant income into the fund. Sometimes the balance appears very high, but really the funds have already been allocated. It is harder to explain in terms of health of the fund. Without the grants, the fund is in a pretty poor situation in terms of what will be left in the fund within a few years.

Wiersum stated he was aware that the city does not over budget revenues, and understood Wischnack's estimates were conservative. He asked if the ending fund balance in 2008, of \$1.358 million, was not carried over to the 2009 budget. Wiersum figured that since the ending fund balance was not available, the beginning fund balance was assumed at the time the budget was done. Wischnack agreed. It was done before the audit was complete and the fund balance was verified. St. Peter stated that the 2009 revised column may need to show the carry over. Wischnack will check with finance staff, but explained that the budget page for 2010 is presented as it has been traditionally. Wiersum noted that the audit had no comments this year.

St. Peter felt the cash flow in the account bears careful watching. The expenses are incurred prior to receiving the grant. From a cash flow stand point, he imagined that for a significant portion of the year, the fund would be operating marginally. This would pull down the interest income, and is a justification for the HRA Levy. If there is no working capital balance sufficient in this account or another fund that can be accessed, then there is no ability to respond to market conditions and opportunities to participate. The projections were based on other grants coming in to cover

some of the costs. It may be necessary to borrow from other city funds to be able to finance any type of activity on a cash flow basis.

Wagner commented that will be an interesting city council discussion. He requested a refresher on the drivers of the projection. Wagner confirmed that not receiving tax increment finance (TIF) reimbursements is part of the projection. If the situation turns around, and higher increment is received, then the balance would be higher than currently predicted.

Wiersum agreed with St. Peter's comments regarding cash flow. He noted that one fund can loan money to another fund. He questioned if the development fund is in a cash flow problem, then would it be a big deal or little deal if the development fund borrowed from a city fund for a relatively small period of time. Wischnack felt borrowing to cover until a reimbursement-type grant would be received is not a big deal. If it would be for expenditures without reimbursement, then it would be a bigger deal.

Wagner felt this type of discussion should occur on a regular basis. Raising the HRA Levy for cash flow purposes would be an impossible sell to the city council. The fundamental policy decision made by the city council last year is to fund projects that will further the city's goals.

St. Peter questioned if staff should begin accumulating possible projects. He mentioned Shady Oak Road, light rail, the YMCA on Ridgedale Drive, and the north side of Interstate 394. The timing is unknown, but specifics would be helpful. The majority of the expenditures for this fund went directly to the city council last year. He did not disagree with any of them.

Wagner agreed. Expenditures for the fund were on the city council consent agenda, and he felt a review by the EDA would be helpful prior to city council action. Criteria for project recommendations would be a good topic for the July or August EDA meeting. Wischnack stated it would be beneficial to have money in a fund to be used to complete research to determine if a developer's proposal is feasible. Examples include the Baker Road corridor study and geotechnical work needed on the Cattle Company site. It was very expensive and luckily the city received grant money to cover its completion.

St. Peter recalled five or six single-family residences that have been sold to other boards or commissions at cost. It saved money within the city, but if held in individual accounts, perhaps a policy that does not transfer things at cost should be taken into account. Wiersum felt he made a good point. He considered if that is done anywhere else in the city. This is a fund that is under some pressure. The EDA does not operate to make a profit, but if the costs can be covered and make \$30,000 of interest income increase to \$50,000 that would make sense. He was interested in an opinion from

Finance Director Merrill King to find out if the complexity would be worth the value and if it would pass the smell test. He acknowledged that a fairly large amount of money is providing interest-free loans, while fund balances are under pressure, and it deserves further consideration.

Wischnack expects transactions to be reviewed by the EDA routinely from now on before the transactions take place. The process will better inform commissioners about the gains and losses in some cases. Each situation is handled differently.

Wischnack and St. Peter discussed examples of different transactions. Going forward, the EDA will be given an opportunity to ask questions. It should not be the assumption that the property will go back. It is not necessary for the finance department to compute monthly interests, but it goes to the pricing on the transfer out of a property. He requested an inventory of city-owned properties be available for the discussion with the city council as well as a supplemental report showing the outstanding commitments that are not reflected for other development projects that have occurred during the year. Wischnack clarified with St. Peter that he referred to the terms of which the money will be taken from the fund for the remainder of 2009.

Wischnack confirmed with St. Peter that he is looking for expenditures from the Livable Communities and/or Development Funds used by the EDA to purchase properties. Wischnack will prepare a list.

Wiersum considered an example of \$200,000 with 6 percent interest that would equal \$12,000 a year. The EDA is not trying to make a profit, but covering costs is appropriate because the fund is under duress.

Wagner commented that staff brought up a reasonable consideration for the EDA to flush out during the budget session: How to move the comprehensive guide plan goals forward from a development standpoint. He was willing to entertain some discussion on whether that should be a formal request to the city council during the budget discussion. That is a fair statement for the EDA to consider with the HRA Levy.

St. Peter preferred that some preliminary information be provided at the July meeting before meeting with the city council to have a chance to discuss the information. Wischnack confirmed the issues to be how many houses had been purchased from the fund over the years; understanding the ending fund balance of cash flow; proposal for criteria for participating in or making a decision to expend funds out of the fund for particular projects; and looking at the individual village areas approved in the comprehensive guide plan and any other areas staff is considering looking at over the next 24-month period such as Baker Road and Shady Oak

Road redevelopment. Wischnack suggested adding the policy for the expenditure of funds out of the development fund when it is project related onto the TIF policy that addresses use of the development fund.

Robinson asked if the notion of needing funds for research was suppose to be incorporated into a policy. Wischnack suggested that staff bring back a proposed amount to the EDA, and it is not defined. The EDA is not responsible for expenditures out of the fund in terms of what staff proposes, rather it is a city manager function. He approves the expenditures up to a certain dollar amount and then it must be approved by the city council. Wischnack wanted to share the amount with the EDA prior to its implementation. St. Peter agreed.

Wagner felt the staff report should discuss how this is different because it is more of a study for staff time fee recovery. St. Peter added that the likelihood of recovery would be useful.

St. Peter noted that, hopefully, UnitedHealth and Syngenta are the only two that are looking at full recovery of the expended staff time and other studies. Wischnack clarified that all of the studies for UnitedHealth Group are being funded by UnitedHealth Group. The city council has had a fee rearrangement for development so the larger the development, the larger the fee. That would directly affect large projects like UnitedHealth Group, and is an attempt to recover staff costs. St. Peter expects a reimbursement of the fees collected instead of going into the general fund.

Robinson confirmed that the EDA paid for a portion, not all, of the cost of updating the comprehensive guide plan.

Wischnack reported on the HRA Levy cited in the description of services. It was set at \$100,000 for 2009. There is a certain time period in which the city finds out how many tax capacity dollars are available to determine the levy revenue. The assessed market value is almost the same as last year. Rates will be done in August or September. Last year's expenditures were only for WHAHLT, but a number of options are available. Through the budget process, the levy is set at the same time so that it comes with the budget and the public hearing process for that.

Yaeger asked why the proposed program amount totaled \$200,000. Wischnack explained the calculation is an example from last year's discussion.

Cousins noted that the key measures actual figure in 2007 and 2008 is \$327,000 for the median value of Minnetonka homes, but the percent difference from the previous year listed 3 percent. She asked if it should be 0 percent. Wischnack will look into and correct those pages.

Cousins noticed that WHAHLT had estimated 32 units in Minnetonka, but actually did 30 units. St. Peter recalled that Sanctuary is one of the incomplete projects. One of the issues to be addressed includes identifying the projects carried over in terms of commitment made that have not been expended. Durbin explained that an estimate is requested 6 months prior to the start of the budget year, and is fairly accurate.

Duffy noted that the EDA requested \$800,000, but the city council approved \$100,000. WHAHLT is part of the Livable Communities Fund. To avoid confusion for future budgets, he suggested keeping the whole \$250,000 in the Livable Communities Fund. St. Peter noted that the city council made the change and only approved the funds for WHAHLT. Wischnack commented that there was an agreement on what to expend the funds for and WHAHLT was the easiest tool to explain and identify. There were many different ideas tossed around for the use of the funds.

Duffy asked if the HRA Levy of \$100,000 could be used for something other than WHAHLT. St. Peter stated that city council approval would be needed to change the expenditure. That is why he made the recommendation that, as a policy, any amount unused be placed in this fund because the Livable Communities Fund has the restrictions. This fund, at least with city council approval, could be redesignated.

Wiersum said Duffy's suggestion makes sense; however, that would be a nonstarter for the city council with the perspective that the HRA Levy could sit there with no projects and no vision with how it would be used. It comes back to the EDA to say what projects and development work would be necessary and identify and articulate it well. If that is done, then the suggestions on the table make a lot of sense.

Wagner agreed. Perhaps kick-starting a project would be beneficial. He advocates the process being used for the Minnetonka Mills area. It is a worth-while discussion to find out what residents want. He gave a property in the area of Highway 7 and County Road 101 as an example for the city to purchase and fund a project.

Duffy felt it is critical to find out as soon as possible what could be happening in the city and what the EDA could be potentially funding or be a catalyst to make happen and then figure out what fund to use.

St. Peter felt it was an advantage that staff has just gone through several large projects to have a better idea of the costs involved.

Wiersum was struck that Minnetonka is a reactive instead of proactive development city. The city looks pretty nice, but he wondered how nice it

could be if a more proactive approach is used. Determining types of things residents really want and are needed in some of the locations has been difficult because of the current market. He did think it is an area that the EDA should consider. The demographics of the city are changing, and there are some specific comprehensive guide plan goals for village centers as well as the issue of attracting younger families to the community. If the EDA could do some idea generation and so forth, then something great for a long-term vision could get some support. Minnetonka has been well served by its approach. The fact that the city is fully developed and the types of development anticipated in the village centers, without some proactive development leadership by the city, will result in the city not getting what it wants in those areas because it will be very difficult to put parcels together and make it happen. It will take some out-of-the-box thinking. Light rail coming to Opus potentially could prompt that type of thinking. This is an opportunity area for the city council, staff, and EDA to work together to do some visioning.

Wischnack suggested that staff put together a proposal or two. Highway 7 and County Road 101 has been on the minds of staff for some time. There has been developer interest on the west side of County Road 101, and K-Mart announced its closing last week. There seems to be an interest in redevelopment in the area. The market is not there yet, but staff sees that has potential. Ridgedale also deserves attention. The YMCA communicates on a regular basis and Trader Joes will be coming to the area. She will pull together some numbers to help consider the cost of redevelopment. The comprehensive guide plan talks about master planning these areas as part of the village concept. Commissioners unanimously supported Wischnack's suggestion.

Wagner requested a one-page update on WHAHLT funds for this year to provide a heads up when the EDA is making its. Durbin explained that the funding applications are due August 7, 2009. The EDA will not see them until October.

Wiersum added that as visioning is discussed, that he wanted guidance from staff on how it might be done effectively. It is great to talk about ideas, but making them come to fruition is not easy and he requested staff guidance on how to wrap their arms around some of the issues and do it in a constructive, positive way and make progress. It is easy to say and hard to do.

St. Peter felt good, better, and best scenarios for recommendations would be beneficial. Wischnack understood a range of options with a range of dollar figures would be beneficial.

## **6. TIF DISTRICT MODIFICATION SCHEDULE**

Wischnack gave the staff report. The city council agreed with continuing the Beacon Hill TIF district. Modifications are scheduled to be reviewed in August. Wagner asked if the EDA will hold a public hearing. Wischnack responded in the negative.

Wischnack explained that due to the legislative action to extend the Glen Haven TIF district 7 years, the school district and Hennepin County will need to be informed. In terms of the plan modification for Beacon Hill, the school district and Hennepin County have sign-off authority. Wischnack felt the July EDA meeting would be better to discuss the TIF policy than the August meeting.

St. Peter suggested that each EDA member look at it carefully and e-mail questions or comments to staff who can then disseminate them in the staff report.

Cousins commented that the public should know that TIF money has a lot of different criteria versus just affordable housing criteria. There are 5 different criteria that are looked at. She felt that the EDA has looked at affordable housing for TIF only. Wischnack asked if she was supportive of making the criteria more broad. Cousins answered positively. St. Peter heard other members wonder why more commercial redevelopment has not been supported. Wischnack said it would be a structural change.

Wiersum looked at the history of the last year. Getting the HRA Levy passed caused public concern regarding not understanding the need for affordable housing. The city, city council, and EDA have a strong position on affordable housing. It is appropriate and he supports it. He also thinks that the new comprehensive plan has new challenges. The broader context is important as well. Affordable housing is not the only thing the EDA does. Considering the aging population in the city and anticipated changes in the city during the next 20 years to 30 years, a broader and more enlightened approach will be the right thing to do. He thought the public will support that as well.

Wagner thought the city council shared Cousins' view in that there are some benefits to use this and open it up. He does not think the door was open wide, but there was recognition in the first bullet stating that it must be compatible with the comprehensive guide plan and redevelopment objectives which is related to the village centers and the two regional centers of Ridgedale and Opus. He sensed there would support to use it for more than it has been used historically as long as it meets the criteria of blight and so forth.

St. Peter would use the 2008 comprehensive guide plan language parenthetically so that it is not the direct language in the policy.

## **7. STAFF REPORT**

Durbin followed up on the Enclave unit. It moved forward with the sale. Additionally, 127 notices have been sent regarding the maximum sale price. She had one phone call from someone at Cloud 9. The maximum sale price this year is less than what they purchased the unit for 2 years to 3 years ago, although the price is a lot higher than the assessed value placed by the assessing department.

Durbin provided the update on the light rail. The May 13, 2009 open house was attended by a number of residents. She provided comments from the meeting, including protection of the natural environment, access to stationary and new development, pedestrian and roadway connections, and housing, retail, and office uses were wanted. Concern were density, over building retail ,and too much parking. The bulk of the questions had to do with the light-rail study itself rather than the stationary study. The next open house is Thursday, August 13, 2009, and will be done in conjunction with an open house for the light rail study. Wagner asked if the consultant on the station study could provide an update at the July EDA meeting so the EDA could provide feedback for preparation of the open house. Wischnack said the public does not understand the difference between the station area study and the DEIS. Staff wants participants to make sure that one evening would provide all of the information on both studies.

Wischnack stated that another improvement requested is for better materials for the public to understand who makes the decisions, who the advisory committees are, and that eventually the decision lies with the Hennepin County Rail Authority. There is a misunderstanding on the part of the public because it is not being communicated properly. The materials need to be specific and easy to understand in terms of who makes the final decision. Duffy added that it is confusing for the public. Hennepin County has been doing a good job trying to get as much information out to the public as possible. The policy advisory committee will be having a meeting to answer questions from the public regarding the process.

Wiersum asked if there is anything that the EDA can do to get the local press to publicize the meeting. He is very sensitive to the critique that things get so much momentum before a resident learns what to do to get informed. The more notice and the more a project is broadly publicized works to everyone's benefit. There will be thousands of people impacted by whatever happens with light rail in the southwest corridor compared to

the small percentage of people at the meetings. The vast majority are not going to participate or be aware. He felt it is a big deal.

Wischnack was surprised that there were many people who had never been to a light rail meeting prior to the last one. The individualized post-card notices really helped, and Durbin added that Minnetonka residents within a half mile of the route received personal notice.

St. Peter felt it would be appropriate to pitch this meeting to be covered by the *Minneapolis Star and Tribune* for the Metro West section. Wischnack stated that a press release will be released. A notice will also be placed in the *Minnetonka Memo*.

Wagner noted that the light rail project started eight years ago. It has started picking up momentum. The realignment has been changed to match where business density is desired. The more information provided and more publicizing of meetings the better.

St. Peter intentionally stayed out of the process since two of the seven commissioners are involved in the process already. He asked if more participation of EDA commissioners is wanted.

Wagner felt the City of Minnetonka is well represented at all of the meetings by staff. He felt a lot more will be seen about it in the newspaper soon. The eight years of studies will come to a head this fall when a decision will be made. Deciding the alignment when it enters Minneapolis may be controversial. Wischnack noted that staff occasionally attends the citizens' advisory group to see what is going on from the citizens' point of view, and also attends all of the policy meetings.

Durbin pointed out on the DEIS study that technical review will be available to the public July 29, 2009. The policy advisory committee will hold a public hearing September 17, 2009. Two pages of the city's website are devoted to the light rail project.

Durbin recapped the Minnetonka Mills initiative. Four meetings have been completed during the last couple months. The April 14, 2009 meeting provided background information and discussed issues in small groups. Information was gathered. The second meeting was May 18, 2009 and had a block, interactive exercise. Meeting three was a question and answer session with a developer panel. Meeting four presented the draft of the development objectives for the area. Small groups provided feedback to the objectives. There was a consensus to agree on the development objectives that were listed. Wischnack added that she was refreshed by the process. It took a couple meetings for participants to

understand that a plan had not already been created and ideas were being gathered.

St. Peter noted the information and links are available on the website for those interested in getting up to date. He suggested the website be explicit in stating what participants need to know for an upcoming meeting to actively participate.

Wagner agreed that the process was a good one. The outside facilitator did a good job, and staff did a very good job providing background information. He was surprised most by the strong belief of a subset of the participants that there was a hidden agenda by the city. In the end, the result was good.

Wiersum did not attend the meetings, but is aware of the process. He saluted staff for being open to a new, much more proactive process that was different. Getting the typical resident to think like a developer is very difficult. There is a lot of education needed. There is not the time, staff, or money to go through this type of process for every project. It was very time consuming. In the future, it would not be as cheap. Learning from the process and continually improving the process will be a great benefit from going through this process.

Wager said that staff did a great job outlining the studies. The overhang of the comprehensive guide plan change emotionally charged some residents. For this area, it is worthwhile because it is a focal point of the city. Wischnack responded that it is difficult to talk about a change in use when that has never been contemplated in a neighborhood; however, it did solve a conversation she was having with a developer. Ridgedale or another property might have been an easier, realistic, and understandable in terms of redevelopment and density.

Durbin announced that the Minnetonka Mills corridor as well as the Opportunity City Pilot Program results will be reviewed by the city council August 3, 2009. She encouraged EDA commissioners to attend that meeting and she will provide them with those reports prior to the meeting.

## **8. OTHER BUSINESS**

Durbin announced that:

- The next regular EDA meeting will be July 20, 2009 at 6 p.m.
- The next light rail meeting will be August 13, 2009.
- Submitted several funding applications to the state to improve the Bren Road and State Highway 169 interchange.

Wischnack noted that Syngenta is expected to get its certificate of occupancy this week.

St. Peter reminded commissioners that the July and August meetings will be serious policy discussions. It is important that commissioners provide feedback even if absent from the meeting.

Wagner requested looking into rescheduling the December 28, 2009 EDA meeting. Wischnack will check into the availability that month.

## **9. ADJOURN**

Wiersum moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. All voted yes. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.