



*APPROVED by CDC 8-26-2003*  
**MINUTES**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**Tuesday, July 22, 2003, City Council Chambers**

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Cobb called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

**Roll Call:** Connie Eldridge called the roll. A quorum was present.

**Commission Members Present:** Fred Cobb, Chris Diana, Alice Englebretsen, Robert Lewis, Joanna Shisler, Umesh Thakkar, Dennis Vidoni

**Commission Members Absent:** Anne Heinze Silvis

**Others Present:** Bob Grewe, Connie Eldridge, and Mike Loschen, Community Development Services; Jim Rose, Homestead Corporation; Naomi Jakobsson, State Representative.

**Approval of Minutes:** *Chairperson Cobb asked for approval or corrections to the June 24, 2003 minutes. Commissioner Vidoni requested the following addition to line 5, paragraph 3 under Approval of Minutes. "He stated that every neighborhood's mission statement would **directly or indirectly** include a goal to maintain property values." Commissioner Diana agreed that this change sounded appropriate. Chairperson Cobb noted it was the consensus of the commission to insert this addition. Commissioner Thakkar moved to approve the corrected minutes. Commissioner Diana seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

**Petitions and Communications:** Naomi Jakobsson, State Representative, has returned to the district from the State Legislature's Spring Session. She thanked commissioners for serving on the CD Commission and encouraged them to contact her office. Commissioner Vidoni thanked Ms. Jakobsson for attending the meeting.

**Staff Report:** Mr. Grewe distributed a staff briefing, the Draft Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, and a Summary of Changes to the Analysis of Impediments. The CD Commission will review the Analysis of Impediments at its August meeting. Commissioner Thakkar remarked that the Analysis of Impediments took a lot of work and thanked staff.

Mr. Grewe updated commissioners on the Home Equity Loan Program (HELP), the HOME Consortium Renewal, the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation and Review (CAPER), and HUD Grant Agreements for CDBG and HOME funds for FY 2003-2004. Commissioner Vidoni asked about the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) questions concerning the HOME Consortium Renewal. Mr. Grewe mentioned the short timeframe and noted both HUD and the HOME Consortium were satisfied. Commissioner Vidoni requested a copy of HUD's questions and the City's responses.

Mr. Grewe also commented on the completion of the Eads at Lincoln Subdivision, HOME Consortium Policies and Procedures, and Lakeside Terrace Redevelopment. Concerning the HOME Consortium, Commissioner Lewis inquired about the difference between a subrecipient and intergovernmental agreement. Mr. Grewe explained that HUD is requiring Urbana, as lead entity, to enter into subrecipient agreements with the City of Champaign and Champaign County. The prescribed template for the subrecipient agreement would restate the Annual Action Plan and dollar amounts. Commissioner Lewis believed that HUD was looking for accountability.

Mr. Grewe distributed a spreadsheet and a Lakeside Terrace overall redevelopment strategy provided by Brinshore Development, the developer selected by the Housing Authority to pursue the redevelopment of Lakeside Terrace and Burch Village. The spreadsheet reviews phases of development and the financial resources needed. Mr. Grewe noted that HOME and City of Urbana funds could help this effort. Later there will be a comprehensive briefing with staff's recommendations.

In response to Commissioner Diana, Mr. Grewe did not know the source of the private loan. However, he noted there are several sources identified, such as Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). This gives an idea of the magnitude of the project. Chairperson Cobb asked about prototype structures. Mr. Grewe replied the developer probably has an intuitive sense but has not provided any sketches or elevations. He mentioned that last year's CDBG funds were used for preliminary architectural and engineering work, and this has been helpful to Brinshore Michaels to see what would fit on the site.

**Old Business:**        **Proposed Changes to HOME-funded Tenant Based Rent Assistance (TBRA) Program** – Mr. Grewe reviewed staff's recommendation to include Prairie Center and Developmental Services Center as referring agencies in the TBRA Program. Discussion at the last CD Commission meeting concerned the eligible pool of applicants and the selection criteria. Staff level discussions showed it was difficult to reach consensus because everyone valued different things. Due to high turnover at participating agencies, Ella Coleman had felt promoting rather than changing the program would have a greater impact.

Chairperson Cobb remembered suggesting a threshold by which participants were selected as opposed to selecting "the best" or applicants with peak qualifications. He did not see that recommendation included. Mr. Grewe explained the TBRA Program has thresholds that are basic and general, for example, an applicant in good standing with a case manager. Staff did not identify any other thresholds than what were previously identified.

On page 3, section 6.0, Chairperson Cobb questioned selecting applicants that evidenced the greatest likelihood to become self-sufficient. He suggested changing the wording to "select applicants that reach a threshold to be established by staff to become self-sufficient and evidenced an acceptable likelihood to become self-sufficient." Discussion continued on whether this change would be included in the actual TBRA Program Description or just in staff's notes. Chairperson Cobb understood the change to be just in staff's notes.

Recalling discussion of a threshold, Commissioner Diana suggested using the eligibility requirements in Section 6.2 as a threshold.

Mr. Grewe discussed income criteria (30% versus 50% Median Family Income). If there is a huge demand, staff may tighten requirements or request additional funding.

Commissioner Thakkar asked if fair housing issues related to the TBRA Program. Mr. Grewe mentioned the general parameters are on solid footing and are not discriminating. Commissioner Lewis mentioned that one of the biggest problems with this type of document was the need to be nebulous to stay within parameters; however, this could be misconstrued when applying other documents such as fair housing.

Mr. Grewe mentioned the difficulties with value judgments, such as education versus job training. Until there is a greater demand, there may not be a need to limit participation.

In Section 3.0, page 3, fourth paragraph, Commissioner Vidoni asked if the TH Coordinator's case management services referred to initial review. He suggested adding the term "administers" since the City's TH Coordinator does not manage all cases. Mr. Grewe said the TH Coordinator determines the TBRA applicant has case management, even if it is not with her. Commissioner Diana suggested "...assistance to participants with housing procurement, and *oversight of case management services.*"

Commissioner Vidoni recommended that all bullet points be consistent throughout the document. Also on page 10, Section 10.0 the last sentence is incomplete.

Referencing outreach to prospective TBRA participants, Commissioner Thakkar discussed offering an open house to reach a more diverse population. Mr. Grewe agreed that an open house would generate more interest.

Commissioner Lewis asked how much carryover there was to the actual agreement. Also, he asked if the case managers' responsibility to participants was spelled out. Mr. Grewe replied yes; there is a series of agreements that restate eligibility, requirements, etc. Commissioner Lewis felt the accountability issue should be in the agreements.

In Section 6.1, page 6, Commissioner Diana stated it was not clear where the waiting list occurred. He assumed that agencies first determined if an applicant met the eligibility requirements. He also assumed the forwarded applications were the waiting list. Mr. Grewe believed this was the understanding and the practice, but it was not stated. Discussion continued on sequence and whether the waiting list included screened or not screened applicants. Mr. Grewe said maintenance of the waiting list would be similar to the Section 8 waiting list. If someone was no longer eligible, their name would be removed from the list. Commissioner Diana asked if the waiting list was being reviewed periodically for eligibility requirements. Mr. Grewe noted in the past there has not been a long list; however, this would be considered in the future.

Commissioner Thakkar requested reconsideration of the waiting list's first-come, first-served basis. Since the program focuses on developing self-sufficiency, Mr. Grewe felt an applicant's

initiative was important. Commissioner Thakkar wondered how staff ensured that groups are not excluded. If the program used first-come, first-served, Commissioner Thakkar said the outreach should be very active to include all groups. Mr. Grewe noted that although all programs are required to do affirmative marketing, many applicants learn about the program in different ways, such as word of mouth. If demand for the TBRA program outstrips current resources, staff will revisit the guidelines. Mr. Grewe suggested at this time using first-come, first-served.

If there was a deadline, Commissioner Thakkar suggested having a lottery. He preferred a long deadline to give many people a chance to participate. Mr. Grewe mentioned that staff had considered many different options. However, he noted the budgeted funds of \$40,000 would provide rent for only six to eight families if they stay for the entire two years. He did add that some people only stay for two months and then find different living arrangements.

Commissioner Shisler wondered if there were more applications in a particular season. Mr. Grewe replied no, every situation is unique. Commissioner Shisler asked how many units were available and how many landlords participated. Because the rents varied, Mr. Grewe said it was better to think of available slots, depending on the rent. Landlords were not identified because participants get coupons and chose their own apartments. Mr. Loschen added this program would operate in a similar way to Section 8. Commissioner Diana felt the lottery idea was interesting. On an outreach program for first-come, first-served waiting list, he suggested good control and documentation of outreach. He wanted a level playing field for all the initial applicants.

*At this point Commissioner Englebretsen left the meeting.*

Commissioner Thakkar was concerned with getting the information to applicants. If the first-come, first-served approach had a short window, many applicants could not get in. He preferred having an open house on a particular day to advertise the program. Mr. Grewe responded that the e-mailed announcement goes to participating agencies who then must forward the announcement to interested individuals.

Commissioner Shisler suggested reviewing applications on the 15<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup> of each month. Because she did not want to exclude potential applicants, she did not like the idea of using a limited time to accept applications. The participating agencies should know when to submit applications on a regular basis. Mr. Grewe agreed and felt a set date would create a goal. Commissioner Shisler felt the review should be conducted at least monthly and asked how many applications were received. Mr. Grewe replied a dozen. Commissioner Diana believed a monthly rolling deadline would create more interest. He also wanted to incorporate a review of applicants already on the waiting list to check for qualifications. This would produce a fluid list rather than a list compiled once a year.

Commissioner Vidoni commented that the difficulty was not managing numbers of applicants; rather, getting the number of participants up was the problem. He asked about the maximum number of participants at any time. Mr. Loschen said that during one two-month period there were four to five clients participating. Commissioner Lewis asked what the typical gestation period for a typical family. Mr. Grewe replied there was nothing unique. One individual moved

from transitional housing, to TBRA, received her Associates Degree, and then became self-sufficient. Other persons use TBRA as a stop-gap measure. Although two years is the maximum program length, Mr. Loschen noted that fewer than half of the participants stayed for the entire two years. Mr. Grewe reviewed TBRA programs from other cities and noted they appeared to be a holding program until the participant receives a Section 8 certificate. In response to Commissioner Lewis, Mr. Loschen said in the past participants he chosen a Section 8 Certificate rather than stay with TBRA since TBRA is limited to 24 months.

Commissioner Shisler asked if people who are waiting for Section 8 certificates are being informed about the TBRA program. Mr. Grewe said it was not clear if someone on the public housing waiting list would qualify for the TBRA Program. There are posters advertising the TBRA Program at the Housing Authority. In response to Commissioner Lewis, Mr. Grewe said the criteria were similar, but he was not sure which was most stringent. There was discussion about income criteria.

Commissioner Diana remembered the biggest difference appeared to be the case management component, with TBRA being more stringent with its case management requirement. He felt the implication was the participating agencies shied away from the case management aspect. If the goal was to have the program running at capacity, Commissioner Diana suggested the outreach should be geared toward the best way to generate a waiting list and create enthusiasm.

Commissioner Lewis agreed that TBRA's key component was case management. He thought perhaps it was one of the most significant reasons why people would not want to apply. Some applicants are willing to accept case management, and some are not. Commissioner Lewis believed there is still a need for case management even if applicants were not eager to accept it. He suggested softening the language and marketing the concept of assistance and self-sufficiency. Commissioner Diana agreed and noted the program would be looking for persons who wanted to become more independent. Commissioner Shisler said case management sounded bureaucratic and suggested referring to a counselor. Commissioner Lewis suggested stressing the relationship rather than overview.

Referencing last month's discussion on TBRA, Commissioner Vidoni stated he was still trying to get a sense of what the issues were. It was clear to him the program was underutilized but the reasons were mysterious. Commissioner Vidoni understood there are limited resources and other priorities. However, if there was real interest in TBRA and if this would be a higher priority, there should be a more in-depth, systematic study.

Mr. Grewe was willing to explore this idea and requested suggestions. Although past participants are difficult to reach from a customer standpoint, staff could ask the opinions of the recommending agencies.

Commissioner Vidoni referenced Ms. Coleman's comments on the program "breaking down" in different areas for each client. He wanted to know where the program was falling down. Mr. Grewe asked if more research should be done before any program changes were made. Commissioner Lewis felt the many program variables were due to the varied participants. Success depends on a one-to-one relationship to understand what each client might need. The

City of Urbana and participating agencies must work together to mentor each participant. Commissioner Lewis said the agencies should be able to recommend persons who will succeed before they enter TBRA.

Commissioner Vidoni supposed the complexity might lead to the nebulous nature. He proposed proceeding with the changes. If the program was not working, then staff should consider a more full-fledged assessment. Mr. Grewe mentioned tracking responses. Commissioner Shisler said the agencies' lack of program awareness is one problem--people not wanting to apply for a certain reason is a different problem. She recommended contacting the agencies every three to four months. Commissioner Diana added that staff should assess their own assessment process.

Mr. Grewe summarized the proposed changes: creative marketing at staff level, formatting text, changing the TH Coordinator's position to read "oversight" of case management services, including deadlines for submitting applications related to wait list. For example, if an applicant is eligible, he/she is placed on the wait list. If the applicant becomes ineligible while on the wait list, he/she would be removed. Mr. Grewe asked if the TH Coordinator would set the application deadline or leave as a marketing tool at staff's discretion. Chairperson Cobb suggested the CD Commission's examples of reviewing applications twice each month and holding an open house for agencies. Commissioner Thakkar preferred a set of open houses, not just one. He wanted to give people more attempts to participate. Chairperson Cobb suggested using a lottery in the event of an oversupply of applicants. Discussion continued on first-come, first-served, rolling application dates, and using a lottery. Mr. Grewe reminded commissioners there are potentially only six to eight slots available. He proposed revisiting this issue if the pool expands since there would also be budget considerations.

Commissioner Lewis wanted to make the TBRA Program more flexible and asked what was needed to make it a success. After looking at the variables, staff should gather data during the first year. Staff will need to determine who are the actual clients and how the new agencies impact the program. At that time commissioners and staff can tighten the program guidelines for the long term.

*Commissioner Lewis moved to recommend the proposed changes to the TBRA Program to City Council. Commissioner Thakkar seconded the motion. Chairperson Cobb clarified this recommendation was Option 2 with the additional changes as discussed by the CD Commission. The motion carried unanimously.*

**New Business:**      **Property Acquisition – 1310 West Dublin Street** – Mr. Loschen said this property, which is in the King Park neighborhood, is a vacant corner lot with several trees. It was part of a double lot. The current owner will demolish the outlying shed that is on the property line. Mr. Loschen is working with a realtor since the owner lives in South Carolina. The cost is \$12,000, with \$500 for administrative costs. The City of Urbana will use either CDBG or HOME funds to purchase this property.

When this property is acquired, the City would own four vacant properties for future construction of affordable housing. Commissioner Shisler asked if the other three lots were near this property. Mr. Loschen replied yes, all are in the King Park neighborhood. Chairperson

Cobb asked about negatives. Mr. Loschen responded that the site layout of the land is low so there will be engineering work to help with site drainage. He was not certain about the cost.

*Commissioner Vidoni moved to recommend approval of the sales contract without amendments to purchase 1310 West Dublin Street to City Council. Commissioner Shisler seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

**Conveyance of 914 West Eads to Homestead Corporation and an Amendment to the Eads at Lincoln Homebuyer Project** – Mr. Grewe reviewed how the property was returned from the Urbana School District. Staff felt it was advantageous to include this property in the completion of Eads at Lincoln subdivision rather than bid it as a separate project at a later date. The Eads at Lincoln agreement with Homestead Corporation is being amended to add 914 West Eads to the list of sites, to provide an additional \$39,300 in HOME funds to construct the house, and to increase the number of homes from five to six. The total investment would now be \$252,477. Because HOME funds from FY 2003-2004 would also be used, the agreement must reference that source of funding. One lot is already in the homeowner's name so there is no need to convey it.

Mr. Grewe reviewed the developer fee, management fee, and downpayment assistance. The developer's and management fees are less than the earlier agreement. This is because there are economies in cost and time since Homestead's project manager and contractor are already building homes in the area. Downpayment assistance was increased by \$18,000 to allow a maximum amount of subsidy for a homeowner. The sliding scale would remain the same. Mr. Grewe noted other Eads homebuyers were fortunate that Homestead Corporation could get additional downpayment subsidies from Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) and energy awards from the Department of Commerce and Employment Opportunity. Staff had wondered about making the project stand alone or making the downpayment subsidies similar to the more recent Eads at Lincoln projects. The City of Urbana will provide as much as \$9,500 in an additional HOME subsidy if no other subsidies are available.

Fiscal impact of this project would leave a balance of \$73,404 in the FY 2003-2004 HOME new owner-occupied housing unit line item. Mr. Grewe reminded commissioners that when Homestead Corporation decided not to expand its rental program, it returned \$35,000 in HOME funds to the City of Urbana.

Referencing the Amendment to Exhibit 3, Commissioner Diana asked if the professional fees of \$6,000 and management fees of \$1,000 were correct. Mr. Grewe replied the professional fees should be \$5,000. Jim Rose clarified that \$6,000 of professional fees included \$5,000 for the developer fee and \$1,000 for A&E services.

Mr. Rose is working with a potential homebuyer and has gone over the preliminary plans. He noted that two banks in the community still have downpayment subsidies available for low-income homebuyers. KSF Bank and First Federal participate in Downpayment Plus, a Federal Home Loan Bank program. Mr. Rose suggested the homebuyer contact one of these two banks.

The contractor is interested in building this additional home, and Mr. Rose felt this was a good opportunity to finish the Eads at Lincoln subdivision project without starting the bidding process again.

Mr. Rose believed there may be additional funds left over in the current contract. He hoped to use less than the original \$213,000 that the City had allocated. Mr. Rose mentioned adding a sixth home to a future contract with the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity for an additional subsidy. If the homebuyer works with a participating bank, there could be savings to the City of Urbana. Chairperson Cobb asked about the likelihood of the homebuyer needing the entire \$9,500 subsidy. Mr. Rose felt it was very likely the City's subsidy could be reduced to \$3,500. He has worked with the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity over a number of years and understands the requirements. Homestead would need to add energy efficient items to get an additional \$2,000 subsidy.

Commissioner Thakkar asked if other local banks were interested in providing funding. Mr. Rose answered the homebuyer was originally working with Busey Bank; however, the bank ran out of subsidy funds. Mr. Rose checked with the Federal Home Loan Bank to see which other local banks had funds available for this program.

Noting the downside is the transfer of funds from the owner-occupied housing unit, Commissioner Vidoni asked about the loss. Mr. Grewe answered that the funding is removed from programming to pursue new housing development. Commissioner Vidoni asked if this would be Urbana-sponsored. Mr. Grewe replied yes, possibly using donated lots. He thought funding could be replaced when Homestead returned funds. If the other subsidies came through, it might be possible to make the project line item whole. The upside is closing out Eads at Lincoln subdivision and having another affordable house.

Commissioner Vidoni asked how quickly the City would be moving ahead with new housing development. Mr. Grewe explained that after Whole House Rehabilitation, TBRA and staff delivery were allocated, the remainder of HOME funds was packaged as new home construction. He anticipated that funds from FY 2004-2005 would also be needed before working with a housing developer. Commissioner Vidoni had wondered if this transfer of funds would stop a program that was ready to proceed. Mr. Grewe replied no.

Noting that the property acquisition bank was low, Commissioner Diana had not anticipated the City proceeding with housing development. Mr. Loschen said over the past eight years the City has purchased the easily acquired lots. Now the only lots available have difficult title issues to clear up.

Commissioner Thakkar asked if City Council would look at fair housing concerns. Mr. Grewe has tasked Homestead to insure everyone has access to learn about programs. City Council will review the amendment and changes to the Eads at Lincoln homebuyer agreement.

Chairperson Cobb asked how Homestead Corporation solicited clients. Mr. Rose said the first four homebuyers were identified by the previous developer, John L. Johnson. Mr. Rose has worked with the homebuyers since the City of Urbana transferred the project to Homestead. One



homebuyer was qualified for a construction loan and had the property in her name. The fifth homebuyer was already talking with Busey Bank. Because the current housing market is very active, there was no need to market the program. The mortgage lenders see all types of homebuyers, including lower income homebuyers, and they have provided referrals. The last homebuyer for 914 West Eads also was referred by a lender.

Mr. Rose commented that he is getting phone calls from persons inquiring about Homestead's homebuyer program. Mr. Grewe added that affirmative marketing is a HUD requirement, and a new program would require affirmative marketing. Mr. Rose agreed that Homestead would follow HUD regulations.

Referencing the TBRA Program, Mr. Rose described HUD's procedures concerning a waiting list. Preference points may be given if an applicant works through an agency that deals with homeless persons. Waiting list information is good for only 180 days. Homestead takes an initial application and does a full screening to collect all information. Homestead may put a number of people on an active waiting list; however, their turnover rate may be only two or three per year. Mr. Rose noted a waiting list takes a lot of effort since the information changes. He was not certain if HUD would allow a lottery system.

Mr. Rose felt one difficulty getting applicants would be that agencies participate in other programs such as Shelter Plus Care. Also, agencies with their own residential facilities would fill their own programs first before applying to TBRA.

Referencing page 50 of the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, Commissioner Thakkar asked if Homestead could encourage establishment of resource centers. Mr. Grewe stated that the primary mission of Homestead Corporation as a CHDO is affordable housing. To do other programs is difficult, and non-profit agencies cannot go in many different directions. Commissioner Thakkar noted the first bullet point did not include low-income housing issues, and the resource centers should not be just for children. Chairperson Cobb suggested addressing this later.

*Commissioner Vidoni moved to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed Amendment to the Eads at Lincoln Homebuyer Project and conveyance of 914 Eads Street to Homestead Corporation. Commissioner Diana seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

**Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) Operating Funds Agreements for Homestead Corporation (FY 2003-2004)** – Mr. Loschen stated this is the first agreement for the new fiscal year FY 2003-2004. HUD has awarded the HOME Consortium over \$1.1 million of HOME funds, of which up to five percent can be used for operating expenses for CHDOs. This year \$58,915 will be split between Urban League and Homestead Corporation. This agreement is for \$31,783 for Homestead Corporation. CHDO operating funds are used for administrative costs. These funds were already budgeted in this fiscal year's Annual Action Plan.

Commissioner Vidoni questioned why the CD Commission would vote on this agreement. Mr. Grewe noted the Annual Action Plan is a budget document, and subsequent agreements that actually give the funds are approved by the CD Commission and then City Council. Commissioner Diana understood the CD Commission's obligation was to review all agreements before City Council. Commissioner Vidoni asked if this was a separate agreement. Mr. Grewe replied yes; this is one of the new fiscal year agreements that did not need any changes.

Commissioner Lewis inquired how the City of Urbana allocates funding ratios between the CHDOs. Mr. Grewe said the CHDOs requests for funding were very close to the amount of available funding. Mr. Rose added that both CHDOs anticipate the amount of available funds and take this into consideration when requesting funding.

*Commissioner Diana moved to recommend to City Council approval of the Urbana HOME Consortium Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) Agreement with Homestead Corporation of Champaign-Urbana for CHDO Operating (FY2003-2004). Commissioner Lewis seconded the motion. Chairperson Cobb clarified that this was Option 1. The motion carried unanimously.*

Referencing page 50 of the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, Commissioner Thakkar re-stated that the first bullet point was not related to his recommendation. He felt the wording was not action-oriented and only makes a suggestion. Mr. Grewe noted that many recommendations are general to provide flexibility. At this point the function of this document is to identify impediments. It is not yet clear who will pursue the action item. Commissioner Thakkar intended his recommendation to encourage parents to use the resource centers for their professional growth. If the resource centers only focus on children, they will miss the focus on the parents. Chairperson Cobb mentioned that this document would be revised later.

Mr. Grewe said the CD Commission earlier agreed to convey 914 West Eads to Homestead Corporation; however, the motion also needed to recommend the proposed amendment. Mr. Rose also thought only the property was conveyed. Commissioner Vidoni replied that he had read verbatim Option 1. Chairperson Cobb clarified the intent was to recommend the amendment and convey the property.

**Adjournment:** Chairperson Cobb adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Recorded by Connie Eldridge