

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Urban Renewal Authority



STAFF

Andy Smith, Redevelopment Manager
Amani Chamberlin, Acting Secretary

SUBJECT

Motion to accept corrections made to the titling of the Resolutions Nos. 130, 131, and 132, from the April 25, 2024 board meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is an administrative matter, “housekeeping” in nature. At the April 25, 2024, URA Board meeting, three resolutions were passed that were later determined to contain minor, immaterial errors. The motion approves corrections to each of the previously passed resolutions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the motion.

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION

At the April 25, 2024, URA Board meeting, three resolutions were passed that were later determined to contain minor, immaterial errors. The motion approves corrections to each of the previously passed resolutions.

1. Resolution No. 130: The title of the original resolution was erroneously listed as “Resolution No. 2024-130”. The correct title is simply “Resolution No.130” as reflected on the revised Resolution.
2. Resolution No. 131: The title of the original resolution was erroneously listed as “Resolution No. 2024-131”. The correct title is simply “Resolution No. 131” as reflected in the revised Resolution. Additionally, the title of the original resolution did not contain language specific to the subject matter, which was a supplemental budget request for bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the Prospect South Plan Area. Finally, the last sentence of the original resolution stated that the resolution was approved by an “*affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the eleven (11) Commissioners*”, which is only a requirement when amending the by-laws. The revised resolution contains a subject specific title and deletes the two-thirds statement.
3. Resolution No. 132: The title of the original resolution was erroneously listed as “Resolution No. 2024-132”. The correct title is simply “Resolution No. 132” as reflected in the revised Resolution. Additionally, the title of the original resolution did not contain language specific to the subject matter, which was a supplemental budget request for on-call consultant services. Finally, the last sentence of the original

resolution stated that the resolution was approved by an “*affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the eleven (11) Commissioners*”, which is only a requirement when amending the by-laws. The revised resolution contains a subject specific title and deletes the two-thirds statement.

URA FINANCIAL IMPACTS

None.

BOARD / COMMISSION / COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

None.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

None.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Resolution Nos. 130, 131, and 132.