

February 1, 2018

Meeting Notes

Adopted by group on February 8

Amity Station Development Agreement Facilitated Negotiation

Orientation Session (Meeting #1)

Friday, January 19, 2018 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Chapel Hill Public Library

Participants: Jessica Anderson, Donna Bell, J.B. Culpepper, Ben Hitchings, Dan Jewell, Christopher Johnson, Judy Johnson, Ralph Karpinos, Jared Martinson, Nancy Oates, Michael Parker, Francisco Rios, Larry Short, and Roger Stancil. Andy Sachs, facilitator.

Observers: Rachel Chang (NCCU law student), Andy King (MHAworks, Inc.), Roy Piscitello (Breadman's Restaurant).

Convene

The participants adopted the Desired Outcomes and made the following changes to the Agenda that had been distributed in advance of the meeting:

- The forty minutes at 3:00 on the proposed agenda for Team Preparations was divided into two twenty minute segments, with the first segment to occur after completing Convene and immediately before discussing Protocols, and the second segment to occur immediately before the meeting Wrap Up.
- A discussion point was added to the Wrap Up agenda item: "What does any participant need (from others at the table, from Town staff, etc.) to go forward in the process to the next meeting?"

Councilmember Anderson said that due to inclement weather the Town Council was not able to meet on January 17 to reconsider the composition of the Council team (i.e., shifting her role from alternate member to full member).

Up to fifteen minutes had been set aside on the agenda for public comment (up to three minutes per speaker). None of the observers accepted the invitation from the facilitator to address the negotiators.

Preliminary Caucus

Each of the negotiating delegations met in separate rooms for approximately 25 minutes.

Members of the public remained in the main meeting room while the Town team caucused there in open session.

Protocols

The negotiators reconvened following their caucus sessions to review the Draft Protocols for the Facilitated Negotiation on a Development Agreement for Amity Station (January 12, 2018 draft) that had been distributed by the facilitator prior to the meeting.

A revised set of protocols (Proposed Protocols for the Facilitated Negotiation on a Development Agreement for Amity Station, dated January 23, 2018) is attached to these notes. Group members agreed to review the attached revised protocols, let the facilitator know prior to the next meeting if the revision is acceptable or what further changes are desired, and seek formal agreement on the protocols at the start of the next negotiation session.

In addition, the following key points were made during the group's discussion of the draft Protocols:

- The Council's team said it had decided during its caucus that it must have at least three of its four members present at any meeting to constitute a quorum for convening and decision making. The Council team will strive for unanimity, but will accept three members in agreement for a Council team decision.
- In reply to a question from Councilmember Parker, Mr. Hitchings explained the respective competencies of the two consultants chosen by the principals to advise them jointly during this negotiation. Noell Consulting Group is a market analyst that has worked with both public and private sector clients. Lord Aeck Sargent was the lead consultant on the development of the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines. If the Council desires to have an analysis of the developer's pro forma or other financial background information, then David Laube with Noell Consulting Group will bring that expertise.
- The Amity team said it does not anticipate making the judgment that financial information the Town might ask for in this process is proprietary or confidential, including Amity's pro forma (containing assumptions about rents, vacancies, assumptions on operating expenses).

Schedule and Agenda Outlines

The group reviewed the Draft Agenda Outline for Future Meetings (January 12, 2018). A revised Agenda Outline for Future Meetings is attached to these notes reflecting the facilitator's understanding of the group's discussion during this and the next agenda item.

In addition, the following key points were made during the group's discussion of the schedule and agenda outline:

- Councilmember Oates said she can accommodate the proposed schedule through meeting #3, but will need reconsideration of the March 8 date proposed for meeting #4. Ms. Johnson agreed to send a Doodle poll to the group to identify a new date for meetings #4 and #5.
- In reply to a question from the Council team, Mr. Hitchings explained that none of the five site plans submitted by Amity for this property have been deemed complete by Town staff, and so none have been accepted by staff for review. Councilmember Anderson said she would like to understand if one or more of those submissions comply with what can be built “by right,” because if they are then they could define a “no agreement” scenario which could be compared to alternatives proposed during this negotiation.
- Mr. Hitchings reminded the Council team that staff had generated a table outlining the range of parameters associated with the development of this site. The list of issues has been categorized by staff into three buckets: major policy decisions appropriate for the Council team’s attention in this process (for example, allowable uses, height, massing, floor area ratio, community benefits). These are the items that essentially define the scale of the development and are necessary for the applicant to describe a project. A second category is legal issues. These fall within the purview of the Town Attorney and include such items as the structure of the Development Agreement and key legal provisions. The largest category is technical issues for which standards already exist in ordinance and for which the project applicant and Town staff could evaluate compliance together (such as stormwater requirements or solid waste collection). Ms. Johnson distributed the table.
- Mr. Jewell said that the Amity team will be able to provide a concept plan acceptable to the Town after the team truly understands what the Town’s priorities for the site are. We can provide as many community benefits as the Town wants, he said, provided the project scale supports those benefits. We would like to understand the Town’s priorities in terms of the community benefits so we can target those benefits in our next presentation to you. In reply to a question from Councilmember Oates, Mr. Jewell said that the applicant has not developed any new ideas since the last time it presented to Council. We want a fresh conversation in terms of development intensity vs. project benefits, he said. The conversation of community benefits needs to be given equal weight to the conversation about scale, he said.
- Councilmember Parker said that he is interested in hearing about the aspects of the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines causing the developer “angst.” Amity team members said they are interested in hearing from the Council team a prioritization for this site across the community benefits included in the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines.

- Mr. Short said that he is hearing about affordable housing over and over again, that he believes that affordable housing is the primary wish of the community members who participated in forums about this project thus far. That’s what we based our last concept plan on, he said. If that’s not the case – if there are other community benefits more important or as important as affordable housing for this site – then we need to understand that, he added. When the time is right, we can share with the Council team all the parts of the Rosemary Street Development Guidelines that we thought we had addressed in our last concept.
- Mr. Martinson said that during meetings #2 and #3, the shared consultants can help the negotiating teams understand together how the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines apply to the Amity site. Let’s establish Council priorities so we can put “pen to paper/pixel to screen” before meeting #4, at which the Amity team would then present the Council team with a new concept plan.
- Councilmember Anderson said that the Council team is interested in working *within* the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines. It sounds like the Amity team is interested in identifying *pieces* of the Guidelines, she said, that Amity thinks some of the Guidelines won’t get done. I wonder if we have enough common ground to move forward, she said. Councilmember Oates said she was discouraged to hear that affordable housing was the primary community benefit Mr. Short has heard about from the community. I heard Council give a lot of feedback on such matters as height, too many students, a need for parking, a need for entrepreneurial work space, other uses, she said. Mr. Short said that it seems to him that affordable housing was always the top on any list from the Council and the larger community. Councilmember Parker said he “would struggle” to say that the community’s highest priority is affordable housing; there were lots of things the community talked about. The Council has talked about affordable housing, but I don’t think the Council has set affordable housing as a priority, he added. Mr. Short said that this feedback is exactly what he wants to understand. Mr. Jewell said he would like to hear Lord Aeck Sargent explain what its expectations were for this site when developing the Guidelines. I do not think Lord Aeck Sargent expected all of the “fifty” things in the Guidelines to be solved by this one piece of property, he added.
- Councilmember Bell said that the concerns most important to Council should be easily marked in the documentation generated by this process. Details in a document can mask what is important, she said. All agreed that clarity is good.

Post-negotiation Review of the Development Agreement.

The purpose of this agenda item was to clarify what will happen after this group reaches agreement on policy recommendations and before the Town Council considers the Development Agreement. Amity and Town staff will be engaged in a parallel and/or follow-up process

developing technical and legal elements of the Development Agreement: What if anything is the role of this group relative to that staff work and when might any such efforts by this group occur?

The revised Agenda Outline for Future Meetings attached to these notes reflects the facilitator's understanding of the group's discussions during this agenda item.

In addition, the following key points were made during the group's discussion:

- Mr. Karpinos said that his operating assumption is that he would write a draft Development Agreement after this group has developed its recommendations. It would include legal formalities and the specific technical details. The full Council would then consider whether to submit that draft to public hearing or make some adjustments to the draft. We have earlier Development Agreements to use as templates and certain statutory requirements to follow in creating the draft, he said.
- Councilmember Parker asked whether the negotiators should “bless” the draft Development Agreement before it goes to the Council. Councilmember Anderson said that the Council team should be in the position of recommending the draft to its Council colleagues. Mr. Karpinos added that the Council agenda item would probably be a report from the Council team to the full Council asking the Council to bring the draft to a public hearing.
- Councilmember Parker said it would be important to have a check-in with the full Council after Meeting #3, because at that point the Council team would have suggested to the Amity team some principles and policy directions to guide the next concept plan. It would behoove all of us to ensure we are not getting too far ahead of the Council at that point, he said.
- Councilmember Bell reiterated the importance of keeping the most important items at the forefront of any presentation to the Council; the most critical and pertinent elements should not get lost in the details. Mr. Hitchings said the group at some point will need to decide what information and how much detail would be attached to the Development Agreement as exhibits (site plan, building elevations, etc.). Councilmember Bell said that she would look first to staff to recommend what documentation and graphics would be helpful in ensuring that the Amity and Council teams are describing their areas of agreement in an effective and unambiguous way at this table, to the public, and to the Council. She asked the Town staff to be proactive in providing information that would be useful to the Council team.
- Mr. Johnson asked what the status is of the document, “Timeframe for Amity Station Development Agreement,” amended October 11, 2017, prepared by Planning and Development Services, that was attached to the Council's resolution initiating this

negotiation. Ms. Johnson said the timeline would need to be updated. Mr. Johnson asked that dates be applied to some of the tasks in the timeline. Ms. Johnson said staff has developed (but has not yet distributed) a working revised timeframe that would enable the Chapel Hill Town Council to open the public hearing on the development agreement in April 2018. It includes the negotiation sessions, public information sessions, and check-ins with the Town Council. We wanted to hear the conversation today, she said, before going forward with any revision in the timeline.

- Councilmember Parker suggested that this group review the comprehensive draft Development Agreement before it goes to the full Council, to ensure that the Council team understands and is comfortable advocating for any technical exceptions made by staff to the standard rules. I don't want to be involved in the conversations that yield the technical exceptions, but I want us to be able to understand and advocate to the Council for the technical exceptions, he said. Councilmember Anderson agreed. Councilmember Oates added that the group's review of the comprehensive draft Development Agreement also would ensure that the policy elements agreed upon in the negotiations have remained intact after staff and Amity have agreed upon the technical and legal elements. Mr. Stancil said he also was hearing in the Council team's conversation an interest in ensuring that there be no surprises in the draft Development Agreement, that the team understand the consequences of the policy, technical, and legal elements of the document. We will not make exceptions to the Council's ordinances or requirements unless you want us to do that, he added. Councilmember Anderson said that good documentation of the discussions will ensure a shared memory of what was intended by each of the provisions of the Development Agreement, should questions arise in the future.
- Mr. Martinson called the group's attention to the role of the Town's advisory boards. He asked if the advisory boards also will be evaluating the technical elements of any draft Development Agreement. They are a key component to the timeframe attached to the Council's resolution, he said. That review will help all of us to flesh out the technical details, he said. Ms. Johnson recommended that the technical details be worked out in advance of advisory board review. The advisory board review milestones will be included in a revised timeline to be developed by staff for this group's review, she said.

Wrap Up Caucus

Each team met separately for a five-minute final caucus of the day.

Meeting Wrap Up

The negotiators reconvened to make final comments. Mr. Jewell said that this is a good group and he is heartened by the way things are going; we are opening up and having a good conversation. I did not hear any dissention today, he added. Mr. Johnson said he is feeling optimistic: everybody is sharing and he hopes it will produce good results. Mr. Rios said there

was good communication today: everybody was open and he is looking forward to the next meeting. Mr. Short said that the participants all spoke honestly, which is what all need to do as we continue to the rest of the meetings. Ms. Culpepper said there was good conversation.

Mr. Stancil asked to hear from Council team members on a) whether they are willing to meet in another negotiation session, and b) what they need from staff or the Amity team before the next meeting. Councilmember Oates said she would like a second meeting, and asked the Amity team to keep in mind the *gestalt*, the whole of what the Council team is trying to accomplish. It does not work well, she said, when an applicant says to the Council, “you said you wanted x and we gave you x, but now you are saying you want y.” There are multiple elements to this, she said, a whole that we will be trying to describe that we will want you to understand.

She asked the staff for the link to the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines, and for the date of the Council meeting at which the negotiation process was authorized so she could go back and look at the background materials. Ms. Johnson said she is preparing a webpage and will put links to everything there.

Councilmember Parker said that things went well today. He wants a second meeting. He requested that staff distribute all materials for the second meeting significantly in advance so that the Council team can prepare for what looks to be an ambitious agenda. He asked the whole group to remember to be flexible, so that as we work through this and we learn we can make changes to the meeting agendas.

Councilmember Anderson said that the group accomplished its goals for today’s meeting and that the meeting facilitation was helpful. Another meeting is absolutely warranted, she said. Eventually I will need to understand the alternative to agreement, she said, and asked staff for help in reaching that understanding: what other proposals are on the table and are they compliant with what the applicant actually can do? We need to know what “no” means. She agreed with Councilmember Parker’s request to receive materials for the second meeting well in advance.

Councilmember Bell said she is hearing hope in the room. She looks forward to the conversation ahead. It will be interesting to see, she said, how we can talk about the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines without talking specifically about Amity Station. I’m expecting meeting #2 to be an education piece about the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines, and not a conversation about the concept plan. It is difficult to talk about what we want in general for West Rosemary Street without having a conversation about this particular project. We first need a conversation about the Guidelines and the financial tradeoffs that would be considered on any project, separate from a conversation about this project. It will take a lot of discipline to structure the conversation in that way, to allow some slippage in that structure where we need it, and to cover all the things we say we want to cover in that second meeting.

Councilmember Bell asked staff to provide whatever information it thinks the Council team needs to be well informed participants in this process, and to provide it “in chunks” so that we’re getting some things earlier rather than waiting to get everything all at once but later.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00

February 1, 2018

Proposed Protocols for the Facilitated Negotiation on a Development Agreement for Amity Station

For group review and adoption on February 8

The principals and technical resource persons identified herein adopt the following operational protocols in order to ensure that this facilitated negotiation works efficiently and fairly.

1. The purpose of the negotiation is to develop policy recommendations to the Chapel Hill Town Council on terms to be incorporated into a development agreement for Amity Station or an explicit decision that no such agreement is possible.
2. The timeframe for this process will enable the Chapel Hill Town Council to open the public hearing on the development agreement in April 2018 or sooner. This will not become an artificial deadline that rushes the process and results in less than optimal decision-making.
3. There are two sets of principals in this negotiation. One set is the four-person subcommittee appointed by the Chapel Hill Town Council as follows: Donna Bell, Nancy Oates, Michael Parker, and Jessica Anderson. The other set of principals is the Amity Station project applicant group composed of Larry Short; Christopher Johnson and Francisco Rios, CA Ventures; and Dan Jewell, Coulter Jewell Thames. Each set of principals may make changes to its own composition after consultation and mutual agreement with the other.
4. Each set of principals will determine for each meeting the minimum number of its members needed to be present to constitute a quorum for convening and decision making.
5. The principals have agreed to involve the services of two sets of consultants to advise them jointly during this negotiation: the Noell Consulting Group and Lord Aeck Sargent. These joint technical resource persons may share their perspectives within their areas of expertise as part of group discussions, either in reply to questions from a group member or at their own initiative.

6. In addition to the two shared consultants, each set of principals is supported by its own set of technical resource persons. For example, the Town Manager, Town Attorney, and Planning staff are technical resource persons supporting the Council's team, and the project applicant has retained the services of J.B. Culpepper, Consulting Planner; Jared Martinson, MHAworks, Inc.; and Dan Jewell, Coulter Jewell Thames, PA. The technical resource persons supporting each set of principals may share their perspectives within their areas of expertise as part of group discussions, either in reply to questions from a group member or at their own initiative.
7. The principals have agreed to involve the services of Andrew M. ("Andy") Sachs, Dispute Settlement Center, Inc., as facilitator for the negotiation process. He will not participate substantively in the group's discussions and will not vote on group decisions. He may give procedural direction or make procedural suggestions to assist the group in communicating, fact-finding, problem solving, resolving conflict, and otherwise conducting its business. He may "shuttle" between individuals and/or the teams and/or facilitate internal discussions for either team, in the service of these negotiations.
8. It is acknowledged and acceptable that the Town of Chapel Hill has contracted with the Dispute Settlement Center for the facilitator's services and that the project applicant is providing the funds to the Town for those services. The contract between the Town and the Dispute Settlement Center is available from the Town for review by any interested party.
9. The facilitator will support both sets of principals and the technical resource persons in being effective participants in this process. The principals and technical resource persons will bring to the facilitator's attention any concerns about his performance and will attempt to resolve those concerns in collaboration with him and, if necessary, the other participants in this process.
10. Individuals who are neither principals nor technical resource persons are welcome to observe the facilitated negotiation sessions. There will be no participation in the negotiation discussions by observers unless both sets of principals agree to it. Observers are expected to behave consistently with these protocols.
11. Fifteen minutes will be set aside at the start of each negotiation session for a public comment period. Each presentation from members of the public during

this period will be no longer than three minutes, to be administered by the facilitator. A sign-up sheet will be provided by the facilitator, and the presentation times will be allocated on a first come first serve basis. In addition, the principals group at times of its choosing will identify and provide other opportunities for the general public to provide input to its deliberations.

12. A record of the joint sessions of this negotiation, including any public comment, will be maintained by a clerk to be provided by the Town. The Town will create a clear mechanism by which members of the public may provide written comment.
13. The parties to this negotiation note that earlier public processes have generated information to be considered in their individual and collective deliberations.
14. The facilitator will draft an agenda for each negotiation session in advance based on consultations with the principals and, as needed, technical resource persons. The principals will have an opportunity to review, revise as needed, and adopt as a group their agenda at the start of each negotiation session.
15. The facilitator will prepare and distribute to the group a simple draft record of each negotiation session, indicating the meeting date, location, principal and technical resource attendees, and his notes on key information shared at the meeting and decisions reached by the principals. The facilitator may audio record the negotiation sessions for his own use to aid in this drafting. The principals will have an opportunity to raise and discuss revisions to the draft before the facilitator issues the final meeting record.
16. Ground Rules for Civil, Efficient, and Creative Deliberations
 - Meetings will begin and end on time.
 - Group members will listen attentively to each other, without interruption.
 - Group members will share the time available for speaking, with no participant dominating the discussions.
 - Group members will focus their efforts on the tasks and topics specified on the agenda, and avoid tangents.
 - It is important to raise concerns, differences in perspective, and doubts as early and as clearly as possible so the group can understand how each of its members is thinking and feeling and develop good solutions; disagreements will be expressed respectfully.

17. All principals and technical resource persons participating in this process will:
- Accurately represent to one another their own interests and concerns and the interests and concerns of any business partners, constituents, or organizations that they represent,
 - Accurately represent to the business partners, constituents, or organizations that they represent the progress of these discussions and the interests and concerns expressed by the other participants in these discussions,
 - Provide ongoing opportunities for their business partners, constituents, or organizations that they represent to consult with them on the issues being discussed and on the progress of these discussions.
18. Each set of principals will get one “vote” during group decision making. A proposal will be adopted as a group decision only after both sets of principals have explicitly stated that they are in favor of the proposal. Each set of principals will follow its own process of internal decision making.
19. Time may be requested by either set of principals during a negotiation session to caucus apart from the other for a limited amount of time, consistent with applicable open meetings requirements. The Amity team agrees voluntarily and as a matter of courtesy not to attend open-meeting caucuses of the Council team. Both teams agree not to take public comment during their respective caucus sessions.
20. Anyone may communicate with anyone else in-between negotiation sessions, consistent with applicable open meetings requirements. These communications need not be disclosed to others, and will be consistent with the purposes of this process.
21. Task groups may be formed by consensus of the principals to address specific issues and make recommendations back to the negotiation group. The process under which such task groups will operate will be determined by the principals if and when they are formed.
22. Both teams agree to provide the news media with opportunities for direct observation of these open meetings and access to the meeting minutes and audio recordings that will be posted by the Town on its website. The teams and their respective members will not comment about these negotiations to the news media over the course of this process, except through joint statements developed by the teams together as needed. Concerns or disagreements should

be raised -- and good faith efforts made to clarify and resolve the concern or disagreement -- through direct discussions within the group or within an appropriate task group, or one-on-one with the facilitator, another principal, or technical resource person.

23. The principals and technical resource persons will not involve the facilitator, the Dispute Settlement Center, Inc., or any of the Dispute Settlement Center's employees or volunteers, in any adversarial proceedings, nor will they subpoena or compel any of them to be called as witnesses to testify in any court or administrative action involving any of the issues associated with this facilitated negotiation.
24. The principals will define together the ways in which any agreements reached in this process will be documented.
25. The principals may make changes to these protocols.

February 1, 2018

Revised Proposed Agenda Outlines for Future Meetings
Amity Station Development Agreement Facilitated Negotiation

Meeting #2 Mutual Education on West Rosemary Street Guidelines and Development Economics, Thursday, February 8, 2018, 4:30 – 7:30 PM, Town Hall 1st floor conference room.

Lord Aeck Sargent and Noell Consulting Group each will provide presentations and support group discussions to provide us with information we need to think together about a) applying the guiding principles and design guidelines in the West Rosemary Street Development Guide to the Amity Station site, and b) the potential economic value of the site, the cost (and value) of impact mitigation, and the cost (and value) of community benefits. At the close of this meeting (as for all the sessions in this process) the group will check-in on whether it thinks there is enough common ground to move forward in the process.

a) West Rosemary Street Guidelines

- Refresher by Lord Aeck Sargent on what's in the West Rosemary Street Guidelines and the public process that generated it.
- Discussion:
 - What aspects of the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines has Amity found itself challenged to integrate into its concepts and designs for this site, and why?
 - Can all of the principles, benefits, and guidelines in the Guidelines be implemented through development of the Amity site? If not, then which community benefits, guiding principles, and design guidelines within the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines to prioritize for this site?
 - What are the implications of Neighborhood Conservation District overlay and alternative scenarios (no-build, SUP, or by-right scenarios) for any principles we create to guide the development of this site? To what extent is there staff and Amity agreement regarding whether one or more of those submissions comply with what can be built "by right?"
 - To what extent can a Development Agreement scenario better enable us to advance the principles and interests in the West Rosemary Street Development Guidelines than the no-build, SUP, or by-right scenarios?

b) Development Economics (Noell Consulting Group)

- How are the finances of a real estate deal such as this is structured? What should we know together about how this particular deal is structured? What is a developer's "pro forma" in general, and what can we know about the pro forma for this development?

- How can we know together what value or budget is available from a development such as this to allocate to community benefits?
- How can we know together the cost of different community benefits?
- How can we know together the cost of different impact mitigation measures?
- What formulas are available to help us trade across density/height and affordable housing?
- What models are available to help us understand the cost/benefits of residential vs. commercial development; the impact of market rate residential supply on affordable housing?
- How do we understand how much it costs for different kinds of housing to be brought to market, and who pays those costs?
- What factors should we identify/get costs for so we can compare the overall economic value of the project, and its components (including the costs of mitigation measures and community benefits) to both the Town and the developer, across different scenarios (non-Development Agreement scenarios) and then work together to exceed the value of the best non-DA scenario for both the Town and the developer?

Meeting #3 Discussions in Preparation for New Concept Proposal, Friday, February 16, 2018, 2:00 – 5:00 PM, Chapel Hill Public Library.

Apply what we have learned together about the West Rosemary Street Guidelines and Development Economics to generate ideas together for the Development Agreement. Follow a structured approach that resolves the more general questions before defining details. For example:

- Clarify terms/interests as needed
 - Affordable vs. workforce housing, *e.g.*
 - Stories (height), *e.g.*
- Create guiding principles for this site.
- Clarify the opportunities for adding value through a Development Agreement to both the developer and the Town.
- Identify specific options at a policy level for advancing shared guiding principles and for adding value to both the developer and the Town for one or more of the following:
 - Scale of the development
 - Uses
 - Mix of uses
 - Housing
 - Fiscal Impact
 - Community Benefits
 - Neighboring lands, context compatibility, buffers
 - Other?

- Further instructions/agreements to guide the Amity team in creating a new concept based on the common ground reached through these meetings so far.
- Preparations as needed for Council team to check-in with Council.

Meeting #4 Review New Concept Proposal, date, time and location TBD

Clarify and revise the new concept proposal, as needed.

Meeting #5 - Final review of new concept proposal, TBD

Meeting #6 –Review the comprehensive draft Development Agreement before it goes to the full Council, to ensure that a) the policy elements of the Development Agreement agreed upon in this process have remained intact after staff and Amity have agreed upon the technical and legal elements; there are no surprises, b) the policy elements remain in the forefront of the agreement, and c) any technical exceptions are acceptable to the Council’s negotiating team.