



*Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge*

City of Sherwood  
**SURPAC Meeting**  
(Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan Advisory Committee)  
**Civic Building - Community Room**  
22560 SW Pine Street. Sherwood, OR 97140  
**Date: August 11, 2011 – 6:30pm**

## A G E N D A

1. **Call Meeting to Order** Vice-Chair Harbick
2. **Introduction of members** Vice-Chair Harbick
3. **Approval of Minutes** Vice-Chair Harbick  
(3/16/11) & (5/12/11)
4. **New Business**
  - a. **Election of Chair and Vice-Chair** Vice-Chair Harbick
  - b. **Cannery updates** Tom Nelson
    - i. **Streets/Infrastructure**
    - ii. **Paver Replacement**
    - iii. **Plaza Update**
    - iv. **Product Manufacturing move**
    - v. **Community Center development**
  - c. **Report on Maximum Indebtedness** Tom Nelson
5. **Adjourn**

**Next meeting: SURPAC will be meeting, Thursday, November 10, 2011 at 6:30pm in the Community Room at the City of Sherwood Civic Building.**



# SURPAC MEETING MINUTES

MEETING TITLE	SURPAC Meeting Notes
DATE & TIME	March 16, 2011 6:30PM
LOCATION	Sherwood Civic Building – Community Room
FACILITATOR	Charlie Harbick – SURPAC Vice-Chairman
NOTES TAKEN BY	Tom Nelson

## ATTENDEES

	<b>Name of Board or Group</b>	<b>City Staff</b>
Absent	Cam Durrell (Chair) Charles Harbick Vacant Bob Silverforb Mark Cottle	Tom Nelson
Absent	Ken Marlow Scott Johnson	
	<b>Others In Attendance</b> Lee Weislogel - BOOTS Linda Henderson	<b>Council Liaison</b> Matt Langer

## MEETING NOTES

**Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm by Vice-Chair Harbick
2. **Approval of Minutes** – Mr. Cottle moved and Mr. Harbick seconded the motion to approve the January 13, 2011 minutes. The vote was 4-0 in favor.
3. **New Business**
  - a. **Cannery Square Design Elements:**  
Mr. Nelson began the discussion by reminding the committee that they had seen many of the drawings, budgets, and features of the Cannery Project over the past two years, as they were being developed since he reported on the project at each SURPAC meeting. He also said he had thought that there was general consensus among the committee that the URA Board should approve the design, and that the URA Board had actually approved the design elements at its June 1, 2010 meeting.

He said that some members of the council had questioned the wisdom of the art and grass elements at a recent Council Work Session, and had subsequently asked that

staff request recommendations from SURPAC and the Parks Board which led to the scheduling of this special meeting.

Mr. Harbick asked to first discuss the art, and asked why it was being reconsidered. Mr. Nelson responded that some councilors expressed that in these economic times, it may not be a good time to be spending \$50,000, the budgeted amount, on art, and that waiting might be a better option. Mr. Nelson told the committee that the art element was recommended by the City's landscape architect because it was something that was included in most public places that the firm designs. He described that a selection process had been developed, a committee had been identified to get public input, and that a consultant to lead the process (Regional Arts & Culture Council) had presented the City with a proposal, and that organization had experience in that work throughout the metro area.

Mr. Harbick stated that if the City did not do the art element at this time, it probably wouldn't get done. There was general consensus that art was an important element of the project, and that it should be done. Mr. Nelson pointed out that the URA has loan funds to pay for art during the development of the project, but once the loan was closed-out with the State, those funds would not be available. Mr. Cottle moved and Mr. Silverforb seconded a motion to include the art element in the project, but to wait until the end of the project to commission the artist. The motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Cottle indicated that he liked the grass element, but stated concerns about maintenance and wear during the rainy season. He offered a diagram from the handouts with a "checkerboard" look, indicating that intermittently placing pavers or concrete in the grassy area would eliminate the wear. There was general discussion among the committee on various options. Mr. Harbick and Mr. Silverforb both indicated that they didn't feel comfortable changing designs at this time, and said that should be left to the experts. Mr. Nelson explained that a Plaza Design Committee had met with architects in several meetings over a year's time, that there had been at least one Open House to get public input, and that the design was based on that input. He also explained that the architect had designed other plazas in the metro area that included grass, and that they also included a drainage system that had proven to work in other areas.

Mr. Harbick mentioned that Veterans Park gets a lot of use during festivals, and it often is raining during those times, but that while the grass gets a little matted, it comes back, and that it does not get muddy. Mr. Nelson reminded that it also doesn't have a drainage system like the one planned for the Plaza. After considerable discussion, Mr. Harbick summarized the discussion by stating that it appeared that each person on the committee endorses the idea of grass in the plaza. Mr. Cottle moved and Mr. Silverforb seconded a motion to include the grass element in the plaza, but to suggest that pavers or concrete be placed intermittently throughout the area.

Mr. Cottle expressed concern with the trees in the plaza. Mr. Nelson responded that he did not remember the type of tree, but that the landscape architect had selected a type of tree that has minimal shedding.

Mr. Cottle also remarked something about blue poles, but the rest of the committee immediately voiced that they didn't want to discuss that. Mrs. Henderson did indicate the type of pole that was in the design. Mr. Cottle indicated that he hoped they didn't have expensive bulbs, and Mr. Nelson responded that the pole would have customary bulbs.

Mr. Cottle asked why we weren't using stamped concrete rather than pavers due to the problem the City has experienced with pavers in the downtown streets, and his assumption that concrete would be less expensive.. Mr. Nelson said that the only pavers the City had problems with were those that moved because of buses turning over them, and that stamped concrete could not be made to look like a paver. Mrs. Henderson indicated that stamped concrete would detract from the look the design committee had envisioned for the plaza. Mr. Harbick and Mr. Silverforb, again, expressed discomfort in making those kinds of changes to the design at this time, indicating that the committee should leave that to the experts.

Mr. Harbick asked if that was all that needed to be discussed, and everyone agreed that it was.

**4. Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.



# SURPAC MEETING MINUTES

MEETING TITLE	SURPAC Meeting Notes
DATE & TIME	May 12, 2011 6:30PM
LOCATION	Sherwood Civic Building – Community Room
FACILITATOR	Charlie Harbick – SURPAC Vice-Chairman
NOTES TAKEN BY	Tom Nelson

## ATTENDEES

	<b>Name of Board or Group</b>	<b>City Staff</b>
	Tim Heine	Tom Nelson
	Charles Harbick	
	Vacant	
Absent	Bob Silverforb	
Absent	Mark Cottle	
Absent	Ken Marlow	
	Scott Johnson	
	<b>Others In Attendance</b>	<b>Council Liaison</b>
	Lee Weislogel - BOOTS	Matt Langer - Absent
	John Foxwell, Ash Creek Assoc.	

## MEETING NOTES

**Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:36 pm by Vice-Chair Harbick
2. Mr. Nelson introduced new SURPAC member Tim Heine.
3. **Approval of Minutes** – Due to the lack of a quorum, this item was postponed to the next meeting.
4. **New Business**
  - a. **Election of Chair and Vice Chair:**  
Due to the lack of a quorum, this item was postponed to the next meeting.
  - b. **Cannery updates:**
    - i. **Streets/Infrastructure:** Mr. Nelson reported that the Streets/Infrastructure portion of the project was over 60% completed, and that with the completion of SW Columbia and SW Highland, the project should be completed by the end of June/2011.
    - ii. **Paver Replacement:** Mr. Nelson reported that with the completion of the paver replacement at SW 1<sup>st</sup> and SW Pine this week, one intersection remained to be

completed on the paver replacement portion of the project, and that it would probably be completed in the next week.

**iii. Plaza Update:** Mr. Nelson reported that the bids for the plaza were opened last week, and that the low bid went to JP Contractors, Inc., that their low bid was \$57,000 less than the engineer's estimate; that the bid should be accepted by the URA Board at its next meeting, and that construction should be underway in June/2011 with completion by November 23, 2011 in time for the official tree lighting the following week.

**iv. Product Manufacturing move:** Mr. Nelson reported that he expected a letter within the next week from Product Manufacturing outlining plans to being to move into a new location in Canby in September/2011 with completion of the move by November/2011. He further reported that the company had exhausted all attempts of finding a suitable location in Sherwood, and reluctantly, was forced to choose the Canby location.

**c. Cultural Arts Community Center:** The committee members discussed the recent joint meeting with the URA Board concerning the CACC Business Plan presented by PARC Resources. The consensus was surprise at the projected amount of funds necessary to run the center. Mr. Nelson told the committee that he would send them the complete report when it is received, and asked that they respond with questions and comments once they had a chance to study it. Various points were made about which group had the capacity to operate the center. Mr. Johnson stated that the Chamber board had discussed operation, but that the Chamber did not have the capacity to program the building. Mr. Nelson advised Mr. Johnson and Mr. Heine, who are both on the Chamber Board to stay involved in the conversation, and that a consortium of interested stakeholders had been mentioned as a possibility to provide oversight for operations.

**d. URA Budget Update:** Mr. Nelson reported that the budget committee had approved the URA Budget the night before, and asked the committee if they had any questions. Mr. Harbick noted the reduction in some expenses in the Operations Fund, and Mr. Nelson commented that a new Capital Outlay Fund had been created, and that some of the expenses had been moved to that fund. Mr. Nelson also noted that engineering and professional services budgets had been decreased since those expenses are directly related to project budgets.

**e. Report on Maximum Indebtedness:** Mr. Nelson reported that Tashman-Johnson, and Associates had been retained to provide several services to the URA; one of which was the Annual Report that was shared in a prior meeting, and next was a report on Maximum Indebtedness that should be completed soon. Mr. Nelson said he would share it as soon as it was available. Mr. Tashman will also be providing the URA Board and SURPAC recommendations on additional projects, and a potential increase to Maximum Indebtedness allowed by indexing. Mr. Harbick asked if sufficient funds remain to complete the downtown streets project, and Mr. Nelson responded that he believed there was.

**5. Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

**Date:** June 28, 2011

**To:** Jim Patterson, URA Administrator

**From:** Tom Nelson, URA Manager

**RE:** Urban Renewal Update



The recent report completed by Jeff Tashman of Tashman Johnson, LLC indicated that the URA had a little more than \$6 million left before Maximum Indebtedness of \$35,347,600 is reached. This should be sufficient to complete the three phases of the Cannery Project based on projected expenses.

These are the major projects completed to date for which the URA is servicing debt:

<b>Debt Instrument</b>	<b>Amount Incurred</b>
2003 OECDD Civic Building/Streets Loan	\$5,846,000
2003 BOA Civic Building Loan	2,435,000
2004 Cannery Demolition Loan	350,000
2006 OECDD Streets Loan	6,400,000
2006 BOA Streets and Crossings Loan	1,800,000
2008 BOA Line of Credit (Water, Cannery, Signal)	7,065,000
BOA Old School and Sports Fields Loan	830,000
IFA Cannery Loan (to date)	2,046,642
<b>Total Debt to date</b>	<b>\$26,772,642</b>

In addition, the URA has spent \$5,267,596 of tax increment on administration and capital projects since its inception. These expenditures include Façade Grants and other capital projects for which loans were not needed, as well as administrative expenses. They are listed in the following table:

<b>Non-Loan Tax Increment Expenditures</b>	<b>Amounts</b>
Downtown Streetscapes Phase B	25,079
Cedar Creek Trail and Senior Housing Development	365,038
Cultural Arts Feasibility Study	26,715
Façade Grants	181,071
Redevelopment of Sherwood High School Grandstands	100,000
Purchase of the Robin Hood Lot	250,000
Purchase of 15804 & 15824 SW 1st	264,000
Purchase of Machine Shop	925,000
Demo of Old School House	69,627
Civic Building Capital Improvements	916,507
Administration	2,289,039
Less Program Revenue	-144,480
<b>Total Non-Loan Tax Increment Expenditures</b>	<b>\$5,267,596</b>

The remaining Maximum Indebtedness coupled with the repayment of an Interfund loan to the water fund left \$6,359,577 as of April 30, 2011 to spend on URA priority projects. Since the Cannery Project has been the URA's top priority, those funds will be allocated toward that project. The URA also owns property that will be sold in the future. The funds generated will not count toward Maximum Indebtedness, and can be used to fund priority projects. Property sales could generate in excess of \$3 million, depending on market conditions.

Remaining Funds for URA Projects	Amount
Maximum Indebtedness of Plan	35,347,600
Long Term Debt Issued and Incurred	-26,772,642
Total Non-Loan Tax Increment Expenditures	-5,267,596
Repayment of Water Loan	3,052,215
<b>Balance Remaining Funds for URA Projects</b>	<b>\$6,359,577</b>

Staff and the URA Board have identified some priority projects still needed to successfully complete the URA plan, and the removal of blighted conditions in Sherwood. We have been working with our attorneys at Beery Elsner to develop a strategy to increase Maximum Indebtedness to complete these projects. We will ask Community Development to determine projected costs of these projects in future years. Jeff Tashman is also analyzing the URA's ability to service additional debt in the future. These projects include:

- Completion of downtown streets
- Redevelopment of Oregon Street to the roundabout
- Extension of infrastructure to the Tonquin Industrial Area
- Administrative expenses through the completion of the plan
- Additional allocation for Façade Grants
- Other projects yet to be identified by SURPAC and the URA Board

Amount	Non-Loan Tax Increment Expenditures
25,079	Downtown Streetscape Phase B
355,038	Cedar Creek Trail and Senior Housing Development
38,732	Cultural Arts Feasibility Study
187,071	Façade Grants
100,000	Redevelopment of Sherwood High School Grounds
350,000	Purchase of the Rain Hood Lot
254,000	Purchase of 15804 & 15824 SW 1st
925,000	Purchase of Machine Shop
60,827	Demolition of Old School House
918,507	Civic Building Capital Improvements
2,388,038	Administration
-144,480	Less Program Revenue
75,287,598	Total Non-Loan Tax Increment Expenditures



To: Tom Nelson and Craig Gibons  
From: Jeff Tashman  
Subject: Remaining Maximum Indebtedness  
Date: 13 June 2011

---

This memo summarizes our firm's analysis of the remaining Maximum Indebtedness of the Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan ("Plan"). The Maximum Indebtedness of the Plan is \$35,347,600.

Tax increment revenues must be spent on payments of principal and interest on indebtedness incurred to carry out the Plan. The Maximum Indebtedness is the total principal amount of indebtedness that may be incurred under the Plan that is paid from tax increment revenues. Included in the principal amount of indebtedness is the expenditure of annual tax increment revenues for any purpose except payment of interest on debt. Payment of project and/or administrative expenses from the proceeds of debt or from income other than tax increment revenues is not subject to the Maximum Indebtedness.

The analysis of the debt that has been incurred under the Plan and the amount remaining within the Maximum Indebtedness is based on accounts of revenues and expenditures provided by the City of Sherwood. This is shown in the Table 1, below, as \$3,307,361.74. The Urban Renewal Agency also has unexpended proceeds from prior borrowings and repayment of loans made by the Agency that can be spent on carrying out the Urban Renewal Plan, as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 1: Remaining Maximum Indebtedness

	Debt Amount	Balance
Maximum Indebtedness of Plan		\$ 35,347,600.00
Long Term Debt Issued and Incurred	\$ 26,772,642.08	\$ 8,574,957.92
Expenditures of Tax Increment Revenues For Contract Debt	\$ 5,267,596.18	\$ 3,307,361.74

Note that the Long Term Debt Issued and Incurred excludes amounts not drawn down from the IFA as of April 30, 2011. Contract debt is debt incurred by the Agency to carry out the Plan but not received from formal borrowings.

Table 2 shows the principal amounts of debt issued and incurred.

Table 2: Debt Issued and Incurred

Debt Instrument	Amount Incurred
2003 OECCD Civic Building/Streets Loan- Rev Src 35	\$ 5,846,000.00
2003 BofA Civic Building loan - Rev Src 34	\$ 2,435,000.00
2004 Cannery Demolition Rev Src 36	\$ 350,000.00
2006 OECCD Streets Loan - Rev Src 38 & 40	\$ 6,400,000.00
2006 BofA City Streets & Crossings Loan - Rev Src 41	\$ 1,800,000.00
2008 BofA Line of Credit - Rev Src 49	\$ 7,065,000.00
2005 BofA Old School & Sports Fields Rev Src 37	\$ 830,000.00
2011 IFA Cannery Loan Rev Src 45	\$ 2,046,642.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 26,772,642.08</b>

Table 3 shows the Expenditures of Tax Increment Revenues for Contract Debt.

Table 3: Contract Debt

Uses	Amounts
Administration	\$ 3,205,545.93
Capital	\$ 114,333.67
Non Capital Projects	\$ 2,092,196.52
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,412,076.12</b>
Program Income	\$ (144,479.94)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,267,596.18</b>

Table 4: Remaining Proceeds of Indebtedness Deducted from Maximum Indebtedness

Estimated Funds Deducted from Maximum Indebtedness Remaining to be Spent	
2006 B of A Streets & Crossings Loan	\$ 13,798.93
Repayment of Water Loan	\$ 3,038,417.23
<b>Total Unspent But Deducted</b>	<b>\$ 3,052,216.16</b>

Summary:

With a balance of \$3,307,361.74 in available Maximum Indebtedness (Table 1) and a balance of \$3,052,216.16 in remaining proceeds of indebtedness (Table 4), \$6,359,577.90 was available for URA projects as of April 30, 2011.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Tom Nelson  
FROM: Jeff Tashman  
SUBJECT: Proposal for Substantial Amendment of Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan  
DATE: 30 June 2011

---

**I. UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT**

The City of Sherwood's Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan (the "Plan") has a Maximum Indebtedness ("MI") of \$35,347,600.00, of which \$3,307,361.74 remained to be issued as of April 30, 2011. This means that no more than the \$3.3 million, plus proceeds from prior debt and program income, can be spent on urban renewal projects and administration over the life of the Plan. This financial capacity is not sufficient to complete the projects under the Plan and other projects that may be necessary to cure and prevent blight in the Sherwood Urban Renewal Area ("Area"). Because of this, the City of Sherwood ("City") wishes to consider an amendment of the Plan to increase its maximum indebtedness ("Proposed Amendment"). The increase would be limited to an amount which is 20% of the current MI as modified or "indexed" under ORS 457.220(4).<sup>1</sup>

The Proposed Amendment is considered a substantial amendment under the Plan and under Oregon statutes. As such it requires the same procedural steps that would be required for a new urban renewal plan and it also requires a report on the Proposed Amendment ("Amendment Report"). The City has asked us to prepare a scope of work and budget for assisting the City and the Sherwood Urban Renewal Agency in preparing the Proposed Amendment and Amendment Report, as well as drafts of related notices and staff reports. Our proposal below includes a proposed scope of work, budget and schedule.

---

<sup>1</sup> (4) On or after January 1, 2010, the urban renewal agency may amend a plan that is not a large metropolitan plan as defined in ORS 457.470 to increase the maximum indebtedness, provided that:

(a) The aggregate of all amendments under this subsection may not exceed 20 percent of the plan's initial maximum indebtedness, as adjusted pursuant to paragraph (b) of this subsection.

(b) For purposes of computing the 20 percent limit on increases in maximum indebtedness, the initial maximum indebtedness may be increased annually on the anniversary date of initial approval of the plan by the index used in the urban renewal report to compute the future costs of projects that will be financed under the plan, beginning on the later of July 1, 1999, or the first anniversary of plan approval. This increase may be applied only to the first amendment to the maximum indebtedness that is made on or after January 1, 2010.

*Proposal for Substantial Amendment of Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan*

**II. PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK**

**A. Public Involvement**

The proposed scope of work includes public involvement, which is required in “all stages in the development of an urban renewal plan.”<sup>2</sup> In our experience a good way to involve and inform the public regarding the Proposed Amendment is a public meeting prior to beginning the formal adoption process. Additional opportunities for the public to participate will be at the Planning Commission meeting and at the public hearing before the City Council.

**B. Draft Urban Renewal Plan Amendment**

The essential parts of the Proposed Amendment will be to define the projects that are to be undertaken, determine the costs and urban renewal share of such projects, project future tax increment revenues, estimate the borrowing capacity of these revenues and compare borrowing capacity to projected expenditures. This would provide the basis for a new maximum indebtedness figure but which will be within the statutory 20% limits cited above.

Work on the proposed Amendment would include the following:

1. Inventory Existing Conditions in Urban Renewal Area and Document Conditions of Blight

A substantial amendment of the Plan requires that the City Council find that the Area continues to be a blighted area as defined in statute. There are no precise tests of whether an urban renewal area is blighted or not, but some conditions of blight that were found when the Plan was adopted still remain and others will be inventoried. The inventory of existing conditions will include need for public facilities to support redevelopment, improvement to land value ratios (a measure of whether a parcel is underdeveloped), street and sidewalk conditions, and utility conditions. We will rely on City staff to provide data on street, sidewalk and utility conditions.

2. Determine Necessary Urban Renewal Projects

We will consult with city staff to determine what urban renewal projects and programs are required to complete the Plan and cure and prevent blight in the Area.

3. Determine Project Costs and Urban Renewal Share

We will rely on City staff to provide cost estimates of the projects listed in Task 2.

4. Project Tax Increment Revenues and Borrowing Capacity and Determine Required Maximum Indebtedness

The financial analysis is a critical part of the Proposed Amendment and the Amendment Report, and is the basis for the City Council making a finding that the Proposed Amendment is economically feasible. We will project the tax increment revenues likely to be available for the Plan, identifying and taking into

---

<sup>2</sup>(ORS 457.085(1))

## *Proposal for Substantial Amendment of Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan*

account development and redevelopment opportunity sites, land use regulations and the impacts of the anticipated urban renewal investments.

We will then project the borrowing capacity of the tax increment revenue stream, and provide a suggested schedule of long and short term borrowings. We will coordinate all this analysis with the Finance Director.

### 5. Review Provisions for Plan Amendments

We will review the current provisions for future plan amendments and discuss with staff whether changes to those provisions may be appropriate. If changes are desired we will draft the necessary language.

### 6. Draft Proposed Amendment

The elements described above will be compiled into a draft Proposed Amendment, consisting primarily of the elements discussed above and other required elements such as the relationship of the Urban Renewal Plan to local objectives as stated in the Comprehensive Plan and its implementing ordinances and codes.

## **C. Draft Amendment Report**

We will prepare the Amendment Report as required by law<sup>3</sup>. The report is primarily a technical document that provides background information and is a basis for the findings that the Council must make in adopting the plan. Little public review is normally devoted to the report. It is not adopted by Council and is not legally binding on the Urban Renewal Agency.

## **D. Adoption Process**

The consultants will provide the ordinances, notices and the substance of the staff reports required for adoption of the Amendment. The Planning Commission must review the proposed urban renewal plan (primarily for conformance to the City's Comprehensive Plan) and make a recommendation to Council.

The Proposed Amendment and Report will be sent to the overlapping taxing districts, and the City should offer to meet with representatives of those districts to discuss the potential service demand and property tax revenue impacts. A meeting with the County Board of Commissioners is required, but no action need be taken by the County. We assume City staff will conduct the meetings with the County and overlapping taxing districts.

The Council must hold a public hearing before adopting a non-emergency ordinance approving the Proposed Amendment. Notice of the hearing on the Proposed Amendment must be sent to each individual household in the City. Finally, a notice of Plan adoption must be published and the plan recorded and transmitted to the County Assessor.

---

<sup>3</sup> ORS 457.085(3)

*Proposal for Substantial Amendment of Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan*

The consultants will also prepare summary documents and display graphics for the Planning Commission and Council meetings and will assist in the presentations for these meetings.

**III. PROPOSED BUDGET**

The work will be completed for a fee not to exceed \$17,525.00 on a flat-fee basis. Monthly invoices will cite the progress made on the project and show a percent of completion accomplished in the billing period. Though we propose a flat-fee compensation method, the following table of hours and tasks is the basis for the proposed fee. The Notes in the table show our assumptions on attendance at public meetings.

Task	Hours	Expenses	Cost	Notes
	Tashman			
Public Information Meeting Materials	6		\$ 1,050.00	Tashman available by phone
Preparation of Amendment and Report	55		\$ 9,625.00	
Preparation of Notices and Staff Reports	12		\$ 2,100.00	
Planning Commission Hearing		\$1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	Subcontractor attends. Tashman available by phone
Council Hearing	10	\$2,000.00	\$ 3,750.00	Tashman attends one hearing
TOTAL			\$ 17,525.00	
Hourly Billing Rates				
Tashman	\$ 175.00			

**IV. SCHEDULE**

The work can be started immediately and will take 4 months to complete, subject to timely scheduling of public meetings and assuming one Council hearing.