

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
CITY OF RAMSEY
ANOKA COUNTY
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The City of Ramsey Economic Development Authority (EDA) conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, January 14, 2021, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Jim Steffen
 Member Brian Burandt
 Member Scott Cords
 Member Ryan Heineman
 Member Chelsea Howell
 Member Chris Riley

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Sean Sullivan, Economic Development Manager
 Tim Gladhill, Deputy City Administrator
 Bruce Westby, City Engineer
 Mark Riverblood, Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent
 Grant Riemer, Public Works Superintendent

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Steffen called the Economic Development Authority meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Member Cords, seconded by Member Heineman, to approve the agenda.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Cords, Heineman, Burandt, Howell, and Riley. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

3. APPROVE MINUTES

3.01: Approve Meeting Minutes Dated November 12, 2020

Motion by Member Riley, seconded by Member Burandt, to approve the November 12, 2020, minutes as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Riley, Burandt, Cords, Heineman, and Howell. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

4. EDA BUSINESS

4.01: Consider Second Amendment to Purchase Agreement with Gigi’s Salon and Spa, Inc. (Portions of case may be closed to the public)

Economic Development Manager Sullivan presented the staff report.

Chairperson Steffen commented that this is similar to the last request from the applicant and seems reasonable.

Motion by Member Cords, seconded by Member Heineman, to recommend to City Council approval of the Second Amendment to Purchase Agreement and Right of Re-Entry Agreement, subject to City Attorney review.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Cords, Heineman, Burandt, Howell, and Riley. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

4.02: Consider Loan Application for Restaurant Subsidy Program: Water Availability Charge Program for Pleasant Valley Sunrise Group LLC dba Aurelio’s Pizza

Economic Development Manager Sullivan presented the staff report.

Member Cords stated that he likes this idea, especially with the current economic conditions and impacts to the hospitality industry. He stated that the business started this expansion last fall, and it was delayed because of shutdowns. He commented that he would support providing this assistance.

Member Riley commented that residents continue to make the comment that Ramsey needs more restaurants and that is why the subsidy program was created. He stated that this seems to be a good use of this program, to help an existing business expand.

Chairperson Steffen agreed.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan continued to present the staff report details.

Chairperson Steffen referenced the comment made by staff that the program has never been used but noted that he recalls two restaurants that used the program.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill confirmed that Acapulco was the first project to use a similar program and one other applied, was awarded but never used the program.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan explained that his comment was related to the program since last updated in 2018.

Member Cords asked if the allocation would come from the EDA budget. He asked if the \$16,000 would come from the \$50,000 amount proposed.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan stated that he would suggest having this \$16,000 loan come from the \$50,000. He confirmed that staff would recommend that the \$50,000 come from the EDA cash balance.

Chairperson Steffen commented that the loan dollars would still fund the City WAC charges.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan confirmed that the loan dollars would still be used to pay the City WAC fee and the only dollars that would go outside of the City would be the SAC charges that are paid to the Metropolitan Council.

Member Heineman asked if this information would be made public to all Ramsey businesses, so that businesses that wish to expand could apply.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that when the City Council approves something it is public information. He stated that it could make sense to publicize this information further. He noted that the intended use of the program is to attract new businesses but there is a provision that allows exception for existing businesses. He agreed that the program could be highlighted further.

Member Heineman commented that if this is going to be used for this business to expand, it would be wise to make other Ramsey businesses aware that if they wish to expand this program would be available.

Chairperson Steffen clarified that this is a restaurant program and would only apply to that type of business.

Member Riley agreed that it should be used for a new or existing business but noted that the change has to be big enough to add enough seats that it would change water use.

Member Cords stated that he was under the impression that the term exception applied because typically this is only applied to one of the charges and in this case, it is applying to both WAC and SAC.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that the exception word was used for the new versus existing. He stated that perhaps that language be clarified moving forward so that it is understood that both SAC and WAC could be considered.

Member Burandt stated that if a business is expanding to the point where additional SAC and WAC is needed, he would not differentiate between new or existing as business growth is business growth.

Member Riley asked if the EDA likes the idea of allocating the \$50,000 versus taking applications as they come. He stated that he questions \$50,000 as the program has been in place for three years without use. He stated that applications could continue to be reviewed as they come.

Member Burandt agreed that the program has not been used so funds do not necessarily need to be allocated and the group could leave the program open and review applications on a case-by-case basis.

Chairperson Steffen agreed.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan noted that in this case six SAC and WAC units were requested but with a new restaurant that number could increase quickly. He stated that if three new restaurants came forward with requests that could easily be \$70,000 which the City would be inclined to support. He noted that his intention was not to provide an open checkbook.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that the policy does not obligate any amount of support. He stated that there is underwriting that occurs and review that is done to determine what is actually needed for a project.

Chairperson Steffen asked if this would only apply to full-service restaurants.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan confirmed that only full-service restaurants would be eligible.

Motion by Member Burandt, seconded by Chairperson Steffen, to recommend to City Council to amend the Restaurant Subsidy Program to allow for both SAC and WAC charges to be eligible for loans and approve of 70 percent, zero percent interest, forgivable loan for both the SAC and WAC charges in the amount of \$16,170 for Pleasant Valley Sunrise Group, LLC dba Aurelio's Pizza, subject to satisfactory underwriting.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Burandt, Cords, Heineman, Howell, and Riley. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

4.03: Anoka Area Chamber of Commerce: Manufacture Cohort: 2020-2021 Renewal

Economic Development Manager Sullivan presented the staff report.

Peter Turok, Anoka Area Chamber of Commerce, stated that in 2015 there was a need identified for the manufacturing industry, which was different than some of the other business sectors. He explained how the cohort was developed with input from the manufacturing businesses. He stated that 30 percent of the Ramsey workforce is in manufacturing. He stated that the cohort is one of the best things the Chamber has done.

John LeTourneau, Anoka Area Chamber of Commerce, reviewed the mission statement of the cohort and highlighted some of the manufacturing businesses in Ramsey that the cohort has interacted with. He stated that over the past several years the focus has been on workforce acquisition, incumbent workforce development, and continuous improvement. He provided a highlight of the different networking that took place in the third quarter of 2019 and into 2020 and the issues that were discussed. He recognized that COVID-19 brought its own challenges, noting that the cohort assisted in directing businesses towards PPP opportunities and other lending and

funding opportunities. He reviewed the work plan that was developed for 2020/2021 with input from the manufacturing businesses. He stated that this program is another way the City can extend its touch and benefit businesses in the community. He stated that the cohort is for manufacturing by manufacturing and is driven by that input.

Member Cords stated that the presentation was very informative. He referenced the budgetary request within the case and asked for additional details on that budget and what it is used for.

Mr. LeTourneau replied that the budget is focused on the mission and 98 percent of the budget is used to benefit the users and to deliver the outcome. He stated that the request from Ramsey is \$5,000 and those funds will be used in a way that provides benefit to the businesses in Ramsey. He stated that the budget is flexible and different every year. He stated that there are some miscellaneous expenses, which are minor.

Member Heineman commented that this seems like a great program and asked if the budget includes salaries. He asked how much of the budget is used for things like signage, social media and other things that benefit businesses compared to the percentage that is allocated to payroll.

Mr. LeTourneau commented that he is a contracted employee with the Chamber, and he facilitates the cohort effort based on the direction of the Chamber Board. He stated that all of the activity is focused on the effort and 98 percent of the activity is the effort he puts forward. He stated that the effort would not exist without the help of the trusted partners. He stated that the contributions from the trusted partners equates to about \$15,000 per year with 98 percent of that allocated towards the programming and about two percent towards miscellaneous costs and expenses.

Mr. Turok commented that it is legal to have an employee to do this work. He stated that this was never a John LeTourneau push/effort noting that the direction came from the Board of Directors and it was recognized that help would be needed. He commented that the Anoka Area Chamber is one of the largest in the state, with one of the smallest staff as they only have two staff members and therefore, they knew additional help would be needed to implement this program. He stated that the bottom line is the outcome of the program.

Member Howell asked if any other cities contribute to the program.

Mr. LeTourneau confirmed that Anoka contributes a similar amount.

Member Howell stated that she likes to see itemized benefits to the City and while this information is good, it is very broad which makes her uncomfortable.

Chairperson Steffen asked if other cities have declined participation.

Mr. LeTourneau stated that the focus is appropriate, and the effort of the program is growing. He stated that they do ask for participation. He stated that the cities that are able to understand the depth of the value choose to invest in the program. He stated that his interest is in interacting with the industry and making changes, using the example of working with the school district to rewrite outdated curriculum that provides a focus on manufacturing.

Member Burandt commented that he was around and Connexus was one of the original companies that provided funding. He stated that the names of businesses on this list is the bulk of employment within Ramsey. He stated that a person is needed to facilitate this program and the amount of participation within Ramsey from its businesses is substantial. He stated that the bulk of the programming continues to be done in Anoka and Ramsey.

Motion by Member Burandt, seconded by Member Riley, to recommend to City Council to continue its contribution to the Anoka Area Chamber of Commerce Manufacture Cohort.

Further discussion: Member Riley stated that they would like to see other cities participate. He commented that this is a good use of EDA effort and funds, noting the number of manufacturing businesses in Ramsey. He commented that the function of the EDA is to support local businesses and for \$5,000 this is something that specifically helps the businesses in Ramsey. He stated that the challenges with workforce continue to be an issue and this cohort is attempting to tackle that issue in a different way through partnerships with the School District. Member Heineman commented that it is important to support local businesses and manufacturing and agreed that there are challenges ahead. He stated that in terms of transparency he believes this could be seen as lobbying. He stated that he agrees with the mission but based on transparency he will not be supporting this action.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Burandt, Riley, and Cords. Voting No: Members Heineman and Howell. Absent: None.

4.04: Consider Water Treatment Plant Selection Recommendation

City Engineer Westby presented the staff report.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that the Council asked that both the EDA and Planning Commission make a recommendation, noting that the Planning Commission recommended the public works site because of the operational efficiencies.

Chairperson Steffen asked where the \$32,000,000 cost is coming from.

City Engineer Westby explained that is the cost to construct the plant and the functions within. He stated that there are funds available within the water treatment fund as this was an anticipated expense.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that there have been similar projects within the state, where state dollars have been allocated and staff can look at that as an option if desired by the Council. He confirmed that the water treatment funds have come from fees paid by residents and developers.

Chairperson Steffen asked what the building will look like when it is done, whether it would look like a warehouse or commercial building.

City Engineer Westby replied that the buildings are typically lower end with brick and stone, but additional architectural features can be added as desired.

Member Cords stated that some of the cons of the other sites were required trips to site and asked how often those trips to the site would occur. He asked if additional staff would be added as well or whether existing staff would handle these duties.

City Engineer Westby replied that someone would visit the site several times per day. He commented that they do not intend to hire additional staff and believe that existing staff could maintain the site.

Chairperson Steffen asked if someone would still need to drive to the site or whether there would be an office there.

City Engineer Westby replied that there would be a working office at the building. He stated that if it were on the public works site, staff would walk from building to building.

Member Heineman asked if there is filtration on the pumps for the existing wells.

City Engineer Westby replied that there are eight wells, six within The COR. He stated that there are three pump houses within The COR with two wells feeding into each pump house. He stated that the treatment occurs within the pump houses, but filtration is not currently provided.

Member Heineman asked if it would not be feasible to add filtration to the existing pump house locations.

City Engineer Westby replied that in order to add filtration at the four pump house locations, the City would need to build new pump houses, expanding the footprints of the site and adding the feature which would be more costly and cause additional staff time as staff would need to visit each site rather than a central location.

Member Burandt commented that he has been to several water treatment plants, and it makes sense to have the facility on the public works site because of operation and maintenance savings that would be provided over the life of the facility.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that the building will point towards the industrial area and will be an industrial looking building that blends well into the area.

Member Heineman asked if the \$32,000,000 cost includes the architectural treatments.

City Engineer Westby replied that cost estimate is based on a typical water treatment plant with typical architectural treatments. He noted that the sketch shown in the case was fairly typical but perhaps on the higher end with the entryway and glass treatments. He stated that some cities use the water treatment plants as learning centers, noting that those are optional add-ons that would be above the typical cost.

Member Heineman asked and received confirmation that the decision tonight would be related to the site selection and not whether the water treatment plant is wanted or the design of it.

Chairperson Steffen referenced the cons of the public works site noted in the case, which are related to economic development. He noted that this site is probably the best site with the most interest in the past. He commented that the site is also shovel ready.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that the deals have been close in the past but have not been able to close. He stated that there has been ongoing interest in the site in the past but per the direction of the EDA and Council he is not currently marketing the site.

Member Riley commented that it is clear that the discussion should look at City owned sites, which takes away the site to the west. He referenced the B and A site that will be impacted by Highway 10 and would perhaps not be marketable as it would not have access or visibility from the highway. He asked for more input on that site as it is close to the preferred site.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that a lot of that property will take up with the slope for the highway project. He stated that if the site were used for this purpose, retaining walls would be needed and additional costs could be needed because of the proximity to the railroad. He stated that a deep dive was not completed on the site because of the challenges.

Member Riley commented that he misread the number for that site within the case. He acknowledged that this case is not discussing the necessity for the water treatment plant but noted that this cost and usage only applies to the users on City water.

Chairperson Steffen asked if the B and A site would not be likely to ever be developed following the highway project.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that there will be less buildable area than there appears to be today but noted that the adjacent user may have some interest in that site.

Chairperson Steffen asked the last offer for the public works site.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan replied that the offer was \$675,000 for seven acres. He stated that if the water treatment facility were located on the public works site it would be hard to say exactly what would be left for economic development because of storm water needs.

Chairperson Steffen asked where the funds would have gone if that land had been sold, whether it would go to the EDA or general fund.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan stated that whatever source was used to acquire the parcel, it would be prorated back to that source. He believed it was acquired using public works funds but was not 100% positive.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that the site was purchased for public works and therefore if there were any land sales, those funds would go back to public works.

Chairperson Steffen stated that originally be believed that the use should go on the least desirable parcel but is inclined to support the staff recommendation for the public works site.

Motion by Chairperson Steffen, seconded by Member Howell, to recommend to City Council to approve of the Public Works Site for the proposed Water Treatment Plant.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Howell, Burandt, Cords, Heineman, and Riley. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

4.05: Center Street Area Framework and Policy Plan

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood presented the staff report, providing a highlight of the Center Street Area Framework and Policy Plan.

Member Howell referenced the public restroom and plaza seating area and asked if that would be an additional expenditure to the \$240,000.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that cost is what would be needed for the architectural treatments of the pump house along with the plaza improvements and would not include the panels or restroom as those would be items for future consideration. He commented that the restrooms would enhance the walkability and use of the plaza area.

Member Heineman stated that he agrees that a restroom would be a great addition. He asked for information on the cost versus benefit for the solar panels.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood confirmed that he is working to determine the payback that solar panels could provide. He stated that the pump house would continue to remain there for a great length of time and therefore if the payback is 30 to 35 years, it could still be beneficial. He stated that it could also contribute to sustainability and provide a canopy/shelter from the sun. He stated that he will continue to work on that.

Member Heineman cautioned against investment in technology that could have a lower cost in the future as that technology continues to improve. He stated that the restrooms are a needed facility.

Member Cords commented that he likes the idea of public restrooms but believed that almost everything else would be nice to have but is not in the best interest of the City. He referenced the infiltration basin that was just constructed to hold rainwater and the other elements would be nice to have but would have ongoing maintenance costs. He stated that the City just imposed a large cost on residents to repair roads that have not been maintained and asked why additional funds would be spent at this time.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood referenced the Sapphire Street sidewalk, which is a City obligation. He commented that the City would like to identify what streetscapes along Center Street should look like and how those will be paid for, noting that some of the improvements could be funded through development and others could be funded through

the Public Improvement Revolving fund. He stated that it could also be seen as something that could attract and incentivize development and be funded through TIF. He confirmed that some of the improvements would be funded through private development.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill noted that funds, such as park dedication, cannot be used for road improvements and asked staff to provide additional details.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood used the Affinity project as an example, noting that project paid park dedication fees of approximately \$375,000. He stated that when a private developer pays the park dedication there is a connection between those fees and the related demand, in this case park improvements in the COR. He stated that both the Affinity and Sapphire projects have paid park dedication fees that should be used to fund improvements in Municipal Plaza.

Member Cords stated that he is not suggesting that the City not meets its obligations, but this looks excessive. He commented that the pump building treatments seem excessive as it is just a pump building.

Member Riley commented that the infiltration basin allows all of the properties in the COR to fully utilize their land explaining that one central treatment location was provided rather than requiring all of those properties to provide their own water treatment on their individual sites. He recognized the comment that this seems excessive and noted that other comments are made to that regard but on the other side there are comments that this is exactly what other residents want. He stated that the attempt is to try to find the balance between the two sides, which is perhaps beyond the purview of the EDA.

Member Heineman asked if the commitments made to developers were made by City staff or the City Council.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that every development goes through multiple Commissions and then the City Council for review and approval.

Member Heineman stated that it sounds like the City has made some commitments and it has taken longer than agreed upon. He stated that it would be nice to see things go forward that were committed to.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that there were not specific timelines identified for the improvements. He noted that this plan solidifies those plans so that the improvements could move forward.

Chairperson Steffen asked if there is a timeline involved in this process.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that some of the elements within the document have been underway for some time beginning in 2012. He stated that this process refines those elements further. He stated that this plan is timely as the streetscape and design plans need to be agreed upon for that the Sapphire Street improvements could move forward

this spring. He stated that he would like to see the pump house area move forward this spring in order to improve that area that is adjacent to development that have invested significant amounts of money. He stated that the Park and Recreation and Planning Commissions have reviewed and provided input on the plan. He noted that the plan does not authorize expenditure but solidifies the plans. He stated that after the review by the EDA, he would like to bring this forward to the Council for review of the plan and with a request to move forward on the pump house elements in January or February.

Member Burandt stated that streetscaping is in alignment with the vision of the COR and would help buildout the COR which helps economic development. He agreed that it could seem excessive but there are citizens that want this. He stated that the Council will make the ultimate decision on what moves forward.

Member Howell asked if the Sapphire Street improvements are the only hard and fast obligation.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood confirmed that is the only hard obligation.

Member Howell stated that she likes the style of Edina and Wayzata but practically speaking she wondered how much interest a façade on the pump house would generate in terms of attracting business. She stated that she would love to see it look that way but \$250,000 does not seem a reasonable expense for the project.

Chairperson Steffen asked if the \$240,000 has been earmarked for the project or whether staff would lobby for that money.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that the funding for the pump house treatment would be from the water utility fund. He commented that those funds are available. He stated that while cheaper materials could be used, there should be an aspect of longevity in the lifespan of the materials because the pump house will remain in perpetuity. He commented that the City should reflect the same standards that developers are held to in this area as this is in the center of this district.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill asked staff to share the feedback that was received from an adjacent development that chose to make an investment into this area.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that the developer of the Sapphire project was very displeased with the building in its raw unfinished state, especially in the timeline when the City was talking about the base requirements for the Sapphire building. He commented that the developer was investing over \$18,000,000 in his project and was displeased with the poor aesthetic of the adjacent City pump house.

Member Cords asked the annual income for the water utility fund.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood estimated that the annual operating budget of the water utility is \$10,000,000. He commented that the funds are available, and this

project had been outstanding for over 15 years. He confirmed that the balance in the fund grows each year outside of the operation and maintenance expenses. He commented that the Council would consider the balance of that fund when making the decision as to whether to expend those funds.

Member Heineman asked if the water utility funds could be used for the water treatment plant.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that would be detail that staff at this meeting would be guessing at. He noted that staff can prepare information on how the funds come together and how those funds are intended to be used for future projects. He noted that the Finance Director could be brought in for that future discussion.

Member Heineman stated that he would caution that people think about where money is coming from and where it is going in terms of the water treatment plant compared to a façade.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that the rate study incorporates the proposed improvements that would be needed over time along with the anticipated needs along with operation and maintenance.

Chairperson Steffen asked if the pump house item would be the first priority.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that the sidewalk on Sapphire would be the first priority as that project is leasing and the pump house would be the second priority.

Chairperson Steffen recognized that funds were saved when the pump house was constructed and this would be the time to improve that element.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood agreed that the vision for this area is now known and therefore the design should be solidified so that these elements can move forward.

Chairperson Steffen commented that the pump house is in the center of this area that is used for many different events. He was unsure that a solar canopy would be needed but noted that he would leave that to staff. He stated that if an eyesore of a pump house could be improved to the point where people want to congregate in that area, kudos to staff. He stated that he believes that something needs to be done out there. He stated that the plans are beautiful and whether that full scope is recognized, something needs to be done.

Member Howell stated that the plans are lovely. She stated that perhaps priorities of the City and residents should be kept in mind as residents are the customer of the City. She stated that there are large expenditures on the horizon and perhaps this is the wrong priority and timing. She hoped that this could be delayed as she did not believe it is smart to be doing this now.

Member Cords stated that he is also against this as it is excessive. He recognized that commitments need to be met but did not believe this the best way to spend money right now.

Member Heineman commented that the City is looking to create a magnificent water treatment plant and perhaps rather than adding the additional architectural design elements on that project (archway and glass) and use those funds to improve the COR in this manner.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood confirmed that he has the input necessary in order to provide the consensus and input from the EDA when making the ultimate presentation to the Council.

4.06: Receive 2020 Business Retention and Expansion Presentation

Economic Development Manager Sullivan presented the staff report.

Chairperson Steffen asked and received confirmation that 30 of the visits would be businesses that received grants this past year and that staff has a list of an additional 20 businesses that would total 50 visits for the year. He agreed that it would make sense to ask a business whether they would prefer an in person or phone visit. He commented that he would be happy to attend if staff gets back to in person visits.

4.07: City of Ramsey 2020 COVID-19 Business Assistance Program Summary

Economic Development Manager Sullivan presented the staff report and provided a summary of the City of Ramsey 2020 COVID-19 Business Assistance Program.

Chairperson Steffen asked if the Ramsey funds have been depleted with the expectation that additional funds are not coming.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan confirmed that to be true, noting that any CARES Act funds had to be expended by November 2020.

5. MEMBER / STAFF UPDATE

The EDA reviewed the Staff Update.

5.01: Receive Update on Ramsey Gateway Project (US Highway 10/169 Plan)

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill provided a brief update on the status of the preliminary engineering efforts by Anoka County on the Ramsey Gateway Project. It was noted that over half of the funding for this \$138,000,000 project has been secured and is now a reality for a 2023/2024 construction start date. An open house for the public will be held in February and that information will be shared with the EDA once available.

Member Cords asked when the Anoka project will begin.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill noted that there is great information on the City of Anoka page noting that construction will occur during 2022 and 2023.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Member Cords, seconded by Member Burandt, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Steffen, Members Cords, Burandt, Howell, Heineman, and Riley. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

The regular meeting of the Economic Development Authority adjourned at 10:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Sullivan
Economic Development Manager

ATTEST:

Wendy Schlueter
Economic Development Administrative Assistant

Draft by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.