

City of Lauderhill

*City Commission Chambers at City Hall
5581 W. Oakland Park Blvd.
Lauderhill, FL, 33313
www.lauderhill-fl.gov*



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Monday, July 10, 2023

5:00 PM

City Commission Chambers

Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting (CRA)

CRA Executive Director Sean Henderson

LAUDERHILL CITY COMMISSION

Mayor Ken Thurston

Vice Mayor Sarai Martin

Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn

Commissioner Denise D. Grant

Commissioner Lawrence Martin

Desorae Giles-Smith, City Manager

Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk

Angel Petti Rosenberg, City Attorney

I CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Thurston called to order the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Meeting at 5:02 PM.

II ROLL CALL

Present: 5 - Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn, Commissioner Denise D. Grant, Commissioner Lawrence Martin, Vice Mayor Sarai Martin, and Mayor Ken Thurston

Commissioner D. Grant arrived at 5:34 PM.

ALSO PRESENT:

Sean Henderson, Executive Director
Angel Petti Rosenberg, City Attorney
Constance Stanley, Police Chief
Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk

III THIS WILL BE A LIMITED AGENDA MEETING. THE ONLY ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED WILL BE:

CRA Executive Director Sean Henderson requested the Board take the agenda out of order, hearing item number two first to accommodate the persons present to speak on the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Commissioner M. Dunn, that the agenda be taken out of order, hearing item number two first to accommodate the persons present to speak on the item. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner L. Martin and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

Off Dais: 2 - Commissioner D. Grant and Vice Mayor S. Martin

2. TAX REIMBURSEMENT PROGRAM (TRP) UPDATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [July 10 - CRA meeting](#)

Mr. Henderson stated the development projects currently affected by the City's TRP were Le Parc, 441 Arthouse, and 38th Hill; he invited the developers, two of whom were present, Le Parc and 441 Arthouse, to address the Board regarding their current situation in relation to the City's TRP to keep the Board updated on the status of these projects. Vivian Dimond, the developer for the Le Parc project, and he recently met with Ralph Stone, Executive Director of Broward County's Housing Finance Authority, to determine if there was anything the County could do to assist with a TRP; as he alluded to the Board in the June CRA meeting, construction costs were increasing, as were the interest rates associated with the funding the projects, thus creating a similar situation to that happening with the CRA's infill housing program. Mr. Stone informed them the County had no specific program,

but he mentioned examples as the City of Oakland Park where they were doing a similar TRP to that of the City's, but it was being done on the County tax portion, and Mr. Stone stated the five to seven-year timeframe was similar to the City's TRP, and it could be used to bridge the gap for some of the subject projects without it costing the City anything out of pocket. Mr. Stone indicated there would be about \$20 million available at the beginning of the next fiscal year on October 1, 2023, and Ms. Dimond's project was 120 percent area median income (AMI), and the County was looking for more workforce housing, to which they would allocate about \$5 million of the \$20 million for the entire County. He said the funds would be awarded via a competitive bid basis, so the City would compete for the \$5 million for the three projects; this was the only assistance available from the County. Mr. Henderson noted the City's CRA had no tax increment financing (TIF), which other CRAs had, increasing their ability to access funding to put in place agreements with developers to make their projects work; Mr. Stone informed them the County was considering doing a TRP for CRAs with no TIF in a similar model to the City's TRP. In relation to Ms. Dimond's project, as it was going through permitting, staff ran her estimates in 2022, and they showed Le Parc was a \$70 million project; Ms. Dimond recently informed staff it was now a \$90 million project due to increases in construction costs, and inflation affecting other prices, and the interest rates from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) moving from 2.5 percent to 7 percent. Mr. Henderson said the aim was not to give up taxes the City did not have to facilitate the vision the City had for the type of commercial and multifamily housing being sought.

Commissioner L. Martin wished to know how many Broward CRAs had no TIF.

Mr. Henderson replied there were four: Oakland Park, Dania Beach, Fort Lauderdale, and Lauderhill.

Commissioner L. Martin asked if all four cities currently had large development projects.

Mr. Henderson answered yes; he received a copy of the County's interlocal agreement with Oakland Park, which he gave to the City's legal staff to begin drafting a similar agreement for Lauderhill; the interlocal agreement detailed how Oakland Park was able to leverage county dollars versus city dollars. Mr. Stone stated ten years might be too far out, but five to seven might work from a reimbursement perspective.

Commissioner L. Martin noted, in reference to the 441 Arthouse and 38th Hill, some of the questions he had for them included the timeframe during which the City received zero tax dollars from them; Ms. Dimond was the first to benefit from the TRP with the City.

Mr. Henderson affirmed Ms. Dimond was the first developer to benefit from the TRP; he explained the abatement process to the Board, and how the CRA would overcome that with the new TRP that differentiated Ms. Dimond's project from the other two projects was she would deed to the City a piece of her property that allowed the City to cut through her property for the NW 38th Avenue continuance.

Vivian Dimond, developer for the Le Parc project, mentioned she had been working on the Le Parc project for close to five years, stating, initially, there was significant interest in selling the property to develop Section 8 housing, which both the City and she rejected, as they desired a better housing product on the site, such as market rate, which she agreed to do. In exchange, she would deed almost an acre of land to the City at no cost, which was more than just an easement. They, too, desired the whole area to look better, as it would benefit her property, and the area in general. She said the City helped her via the TRP, but, unfortunately, when they began the process, they had no financing, and when they went to HUD, they were told it would take six months to a year, which was fine, as they needed time to finish the plans. Ms. Dimond said the plans were now ready, and in about two to three weeks they hoped to have the permit in hand. When the project began, construction costs were at \$56 million, and the interest rate was at 3.5 percent. She stated the past Friday, the papers came back from Greystone, and their construction costs alone were \$90 million, which was not doable, so they had to find ways to reduce those costs, and the interest rate was now at seven percent. The higher the interest rate, the more they were taking away from the loan, which was to be expected, as they had to support whatever money they borrowed. Ms. Dimond remarked she had a variety of obstacles to overcome, but she encountered challenges before, so she was confident she could overcome them, she only asked for the City's continued support, as they had to complete the project, as it was costing them \$900.00 a day, considering the process had been going on for five years.

Matthew Jacocks, developer for the 441 Arthouse mentioned they received Planning & Zoning (P&Z) approval the past Friday, noting when they began the project, the conceptual construction costs were roughly \$45 million; it was now \$84 million, and rising. Their rents currently remained at 120 AMI, and even with rising construction costs, there was a limit to rents, which they knew when they started the subject project, and the City desired a development that was transformative for the area. He said they explored various housing products the area would support, such as Section 8 and workforce housing, which the City declined, so they went through the special exception process, and, working with City staff, they developed the 441 Arthouse project consisting of residential, and 7,000 square feet Class A retail in three buildings with a beautiful lobby, along with art programs for the community. The art program piece would consist of four artists lofts they would furnish, and rent to artists at a substantial discount; the artists would commission work to the building that would be displayed in the lobby, the goal being to support local artists. He noted when they began the subject project two years ago, they knew they needed to partner with the City with regard to getting tax abatements, so they started dialog with the City, providing a tax abatement study to show what it would look like for the project with the tax abatements, and without the tax abatements; the study showed the project would not work without the tax abatements. He said they always received positive feedback from City staff, so they continued moving forward with the project. Mr. Jacocks mentioned the value of the City's incentives was roughly \$9.5 million with a seven-year tax abatement, and permit fee waivers, but with the new TRP resolution, this was reduced to about \$2 million, a substantial difference for the same project. The situation was exacerbated by increases in construction costs, despite their continued efforts to find ways to lower those costs without sacrificing the integrity of the project they promised to deliver to the City. He

said, like Ms. Dimond, they continued their exploration of ways to deliver the project for which they were recently approved, and about to begin the design phase, but they could not proceed with the latter until they received an incentives package that showed the project as financially feasible, and financeable. Their lender, too, was Greystone, and Greystone wished to see the City's participation in the project, so they were waiting for a developer agreement to allow them to proceed to the next stage with HUD to have a conceptual meeting. He believed they, as the developer, did everything the City wanted with regard to the quality of the project, so they hoped the City would meet them halfway to allow the project to progress.

Mr. Henderson commented that the key was to manage expectations, which included staff bringing the market to the Board, as there were parameters in play that were not in the CRA's control, so he wished the Board to have a better understanding of the situation. His staff and he had a "don't quit" attitude with regard to finding resources and solutions.

Commissioner L. Martin believed some of his questions had to do with expectations and/or understanding, and part of the subject discussion had to do with taxes, and there were those in the community who put the City in the forefront regarding Lauderhill's current tax rate, asking what the City Commission planned to do about it. He said, in comparing Lauderhill to surrounding cities, it seemed the latter had lower taxes, but most of them had significant development taking place that helped to offset residential tax rates. Understanding there were cost increases across the board, would this, hypothetically, affect market-rate rents.

Mr. Henderson answered yes, but there was a breaking point at which rents became so unaffordable that people went elsewhere; property owners had to find that happy medium between what a person was willing to pay versus what they could pay. When looking at cost per square foot, and comparing Lauderhill to other cities, based on Broward County studies, Lauderhill was among the least expensive.

Commissioner L. Martin surmised either the City found ways to help developers meet some of their financial needs, which meant taking money away from taxpayers that the City was depending on, from a budgetary standpoint, to lower other costs, or developers could choose, based on new State law, a different development path that led them to moderate rental rates for certain residential products that would not give Lauderhill the high end development it sought; instead, the City would get similar housing to already existing housing in the City.

Mr. Henderson thought the City was looking at workforce housing, and if there was a proliferation of affordable housing, his perception was it would put a stronger demand on much of the City's complementary services, such as fire and police, that were unseen at present, impacts the City had to deal with once the buildings became occupied. When looking at development from a planning perspective, projections had to be ten to 15 years out, not just on immediate impacts.

Commissioner L. Martin sought clarification on the difference between workforce and affordable housing.

Michelle Davis, Lauderhill resident and mortgage professional, replied they were one in the same with minor differences, as both were based on a person's income, and their ability to pay, along with the number of people in their household.

Commissioner L. Martin restated the State recently passed legislation, whereby, if a developer chose to develop affordable/workforce housing, they were required to dedicate at least 40 percent of the units to affordable housing, asking if this meant Section 8 housing, or did it have more to do with the amount of rent a developer could charge.

Ms. Davis stated it was a set amount.

Commissioner L. Martin wished to confirm it would not be subsidized housing.

Ms. Davis answered right; but the set amount was still unknown.

Commissioner L. Martin surmised the City had four options related to the proposed projects on the three subject properties: 1) stay on the current path, with developers delivering the product they proposed, and the City finding ways to help bridge their financial shortfalls; 2) get assistance from the County to help developers make up the shortfall; 3) developers building workforce/ affordable housing projects that would not give the City the desired residential product with the potential rent levels, and removing the ability of the City to receive by statute anticipated revenues; and 4) developers could walk away from the projects, leaving the properties in their current state.

Mr. Henderson assumed there was a strong demand for the three properties, in light of the recent State legislation, so further discussion was necessary between the City and the developers.

Commissioner L. Martin felt CRA and City legal staff needed to clearly lay out possible impacts for the benefit of the Commission and taxpayers, along with input from the developers if they wished.

Mr. Henderson added, the key was to identify the opportunity cost, and try to quantify it. The next action and concept would be to keep working the deals until they were no longer workable, and the County was willing to work out a deal with the City; as the City drafted its language for its interlocal agreement, the County could do the same with the City's legal team, as the County's financial advisor worked on development deals, running the numbers, and the pro forma on the sources and uses, while the City's financial advisor worked on bond deals, etc. He indicated, with regard to transparency, as long as developers shared the documents the County requested, City staff would work alongside the developers in relation to due diligence, so the project continued to move forward, managing expectations, utilizing the City's TRP, and working with the County to create a County TRP for CRAs without a TIF similar to that of the City's.

Commissioner L. Martin observed, in light of the \$7 million gap 441 Arthouse mentioned, even if the City received the entire \$5 million in County funds, it still left a \$2 million shortfall. The Board needed more information, understanding the present

discussion was just an update.

Mr. Henderson affirmed staff would keep the Board updated as matters unfolded, reiterating the purpose of the subject agenda item was to manage expectations by all parties involved; no consensus was being requested of the Board, as the discussion was for informational purposes.

Commissioner L. Martin asked if it was possible to give a date certain for the 441 Arthouse, and the Le Parc projects; that is, for them to either find a solution or abandon the project.

Ms. Dimond indicated they should have their building permit in a few weeks, as they were already approved by HUD, though the lending commitment was less than expected due to rising interest rates. One of HUD's suggestions was to wait another 60 days to see if interest rates decreased, of which there was no guarantee. She had numerous decisions to make, the first being whether she could still count on the TRP agreement she signed with the City, on which she continued to rely, adding she constantly received inquiries about selling the land, for which she could forward evidence of if staff desired. Her response to those inquiries was the land was not for sale, explaining she made a commitment to the City to develop the land as promised. She urged the City to meet her halfway, and continue to honor their commitment to her, as she would work to honor her commitment to the City. It was very important for her to know where the City stood.

Hope Calhoun, representative for the 441 Arthouse project, responded they had no date certain at present, but they were in a different situation than Ms. Dimond, as they were behind their development schedule. They previously came before the CRA Board to articulate their needs, but, unlike Ms. Dimond, they had no development agreement with the City. She mentioned Mr. Jacocks's statement regarding the project recently receiving P&Z Board approval to forward their project to the City Commission, but they did not anticipate being able to do so for site plan approval until August 2023. As things currently stood, the 441 Arthouse project neither had an approved project, nor an approved development agreement, but, similarly, the developer needed to know what they could and could not move forward with. In response to Commissioner L. Martin's question, she stated her client's property had been vacant for a very long time, so the City would lose nothing; it would only be a matter of delaying the time when the City would receive an actual benefit from the land's development; the property was not currently generating any revenue.

Mayor Thurston acknowledged for the record the attendance of Commissioner Grant.

Commissioner Dunn recalled at the last meeting in the discussion of the subject matter, she understood the previous Commission approved the TRP for Ms. Dimond's project.

Mr. Henderson affirmed this to be the case.

Commissioner Dunn believed at the same meeting she went on the record as

saying the City should honor its agreement with Ms. Dimond, but she also stated that had she been a member of the Commission at the time, she would not have voted to approve the TRP for Ms. Dimond; that is, to approve giving up so much of the City's taxbase. She agreed with her fellow colleagues that development in Lauderhill should be encouraged, not only to provide beautiful living spaces for working families, but doing so in a manner that expanded Lauderhill's taxbase, which, in turn, promoted economic prosperity and mobility for the entire Lauderhill community, providing jobs, and opportunities for small, local businesses to do work. She appreciated CRA staff continuing to have dialog with the City Attorney, working to find some middle ground; she was not personally comfortable with giving up tax revenue, though she understood the position the developers were in at present; the shortfall seemed sizeable.

Mr. Henderson stated, eventually, there would be a development agreement brought before the Board, and this would be the chance for the CRA and the developer to negotiate, restating his staff and he would put their best effort forward.

Ms. Dimond reminded the Board she was dedicating almost an acre of her land to the City to facilitate road improvements, and to making that area beautiful, so the waivers and abatements she was receiving were not 100 percent free. She said the City had a signed agreement with her, on which HUD's approval for her project was based, so it would be difficult to go back to HUD to say the City changed its mind. If the City changed its mind, she would respect their decision, as she could not force the City to do anything; the project either worked for the City or it did not, but she hoped the City would stand by the current developer agreement it had with her.

Mayor Thurston commented he was a member of the Commission that approved the development agreement with Ms. Dimond, noting when it was approved, it was done in an environment of there being no new construction approved in the City for a very long time. The thought of the then Commission was it was important to get started with some quality development in the City, and Ms. Dimond presented a beautiful project, including daycare, and it helped stimulate development in the City. He did not think it had been the then Commission's opinion that the TRP for Ms. Dimond's project would become a template for future development in the City; the agreement with Ms. Dimond included the City receiving a land dedication needed to complete NW 38th Avenue all the way to the Lauderhill Performing Arts Center (LPAC). The hope was to see Ms. Dimond's project progress to fruition, and attract other development to the City, as it was via development that tax rates could be lowered. He said it was unfortunate that both interest rates and construction costs were both on the rise, and at an unanticipated rate of increase. He, too, supported continuing forward, working on solutions that satisfied the City's and developers' needs, so the development projects could proceed as planned, as the City was starving for new housing of any kind.

Deputy City Manager/Finance Director Kennie Hobbs added at the last CRA meeting he pointed out the new reimbursement plan approved by the Commission included putting caps in place, so in order for the City to move forward, even with Ms. Dimond, there needed to be further approvals, as the TRP did not include an abatement plan. Thus, even if it was the will of the Board to proceed, matters could

not move forward on the current model approved by the Commission, which focused only on the TRP; the Board was asked to keep this in mind. As CRA staff and City staff worked with the City Attorney on the development agreements, there had to be additional approvals; ultimately, all three developments would be considered under the new TRP that had certain caps in place; he was sure the City Attorney would guide staff on how to get to a solution.

Commissioner L. Martin sought clarification on how the new TRP recently approved by the City Commission affected the City's agreements with Ms. Dimond, and the previously approved TRP that had no expiration dates attached.

Mr. Hobbs explained the City renegotiated a second agreement with Ms. Dimond that had expiration dates attached; thus, the dates included stated possible outcomes if certain things did not happen by a certain time, there would be certain clawbacks. Secondly, as staff began working on the other two development projects, they were informed by then City Attorney Earl Hall the previously approved TRP was not legal, meaning the City could not carry out what was approved by the Commission at that time, hence the City and Ms. Dimond renegotiating the second agreement; staff made Ms. Dimond aware that this was the opinion of the City Attorney, and the City had to abide by the new TRP, and if there was anything she needed to request of the City beyond what was allowed under the new TRP, her request had to be submitted to the City; the same applied to 441 Arthouse and 38th Hill; that is, their requests had to come before the Board for consideration. Mr. Hall informed staff that in order for the City to grant such significant tax abatements, it would require a public referendum.

Commissioner Dunn said it seemed, based on Mr. Hall's determination, there was no agreement.

City Attorney Rosenberg clarified there was an agreement, but it was later determined the grounds on which the agreement was based were not legal, so legal staff researched the matter, and found a TRP was permissible, so the existing TRP was modified, and for any differences in the amounts County funds and/or programs could not make up, City staff and the developers had to explore alternative funding sources.

Mr. Hobbs recapped the original TRP approved by a previous commission was for a 100-percent tax abatement for Ms. Dimond's Le Parc project, which the present Commission did not support, so City staff amended the original TRP, and the Commission recently passed the current TRP, which capped the abatements at 75 percent for property taxes, and 50 percent for permit fees.

Ms. Dimond acknowledged her project had certain deadlines attached in her renegotiated developer agreement with the City, but everything they did was based on the earlier agreement with the City; when the City came back and said the original agreement needed to be renegotiated, she could not go back to HUD to assure them everything was fine when it was not. If the City failed to stand by its original agreement with her, her project would be delayed, and she would have to explain to HUD why the City changed the terms of the signed agreement she already provided to HUD.

Commissioner Dunn sought clarification on what the next steps would be.

City Attorney Rosenberg said the developers had to go through their numbers to determine exact dollar amounts, and compare them with what the City offered under the current TRP. A development agreement still needed to be entered into under the current TRP between 441 Arthouse and the City, and between 38th Hill and the City, each requiring approval via ordinance that needed two readings to take effect. If approved, the development agreement(s) needed to be recorded within 15 days. She said once the developers worked out the numbers, if the shortfall was too large, the developers needed to inform City staff, so they could both explore alternative funding sources, one being the possibility of County funds being available to help.

Commissioner Dunn asked when staff anticipated having these factors and/or recommendations ready for presentation to the Board.

Mr. Hobbs replied staff would have the information ready by the next CRA meeting on August 28, 2023, and staff would provide the Board/Commission with their recommendation ahead of time.

Commissioner Dunn hoped staff would provide the information well in advance, so the Board could review it and ask questions.

Mr. Hobbs understood from the last CRA meeting the Board wished to see the three projects move forward, hence staff exploring other financial assistance options to help close the gap, including speaking with the County. If, ultimately, all efforts yielded a number that was still not sufficient to justify proceeding with the projects, there had to be some action by the City, such as amending the TRP, etc., so staff could present real options to the Commission.

City Attorney Rosenberg pointed out the Commission could opt to increase the reimbursement caps, as that would reduce the gap.

Commissioner Dunn surmised the bottom line was all stakeholders needed to make compromises to reach a solution, it could not be just the City on the backs of its taxpayers; the developers and the City had to find a way to meet in the middle. She was pleased to hear everyone was open and willing to have such conversations.

Commissioner L. Martin said, in light of the recently approved TRP, it was simply a matter of both sides plugging in the numbers as they currently stood, and seeing what the exact shortfall was. His concern was that Ms. Dimond's position was she received her building permit, so she was ready to proceed, hopefully sooner than later; the other two projects had more flexibility, having no development agreement with the City as yet. He thought, with the 75 percent and 50 percent caps under the TRP, staff should be able to give those numbers sooner than August.

Mr. Hobbs affirmed staff could provide the numbers earlier, adding some of the hesitation to do so was there were price escalations, and City staff met with the

City's financial advisors to review what the City proposed to ensure it made sense from a financial perspective. In going through the development agreement, the TRP spoke to the difference between existing and proposed, and what needed to be clear was that even though the developer said a project was \$90 million, the ultimate number would be based on the Property Appraiser's valuation.

Commissioner L. Martin urged staff to make the calculations as soon as possible, using the current numbers the developers were alluding to, then the Commission could better determine what next steps to take, which could include adjusting the City's TRP to help move these projects closer to what they needed to proceed, along with staff's exploration of other sources of financial assistance for the developers.

Ms. Dimond asked that the City not treat her project differently than the other projects, but she reminded the Board she was the first developer willing to take a chance, working with the City to bring forward a desired development, along with dedicating land to the City, as stated before.

Mr. Jacocks stated he discussed with City staff the challenges in the subject location, and they agreed to purchase some retail properties, and spoke with the property owners to try to turn the area around. When they embarked upon the 441 Arthouse project, they did a study for the City concerning retail at the subject location; that is, what it would cost to bring Class A retail uses to the area, and attract high quality tenants. He said the cost of the retail portion of their project was roughly \$15 million, as it took away from their parking, for which they received no return, but they were willing to work with the City to improve the area, bringing in jobs the retail uses would support. It was worth mentioning that the retail the subject area would result in new revenue in the \$2.5 million range that would become annual revenue. He pointed out, not only would the City benefit from the tax revenue when the abatement period expired, there would be new revenue generated from tenants spending their disposable income in Lauderhill. They did not embark upon the project looking for tax abatements, as the project they first presented to the Board did not need the support of tax abatements, which did not include retail, as the area needed more quality housing, but the City wanted a transformative project. He said the 441 Arthouse project was designed to have a product above what the market would actually bear, hence the need for tax abatements. Mr. Jacocks remarked one element that drove tax abatements was rents, which he kept the same, despite the increase in the quality of the housing product they promised to provide; they were at 120 percent AMI in the area, so they were not seeking to raise rental rates. Rents were capped at what the lender believed the market could bear, so they were being conservative in their models. He restated the property had never been developed, and it was rare to find undeveloped, vacant land in Lauderhill; they embarked upon the project in good faith with the City, without a developer agreement, but two years ago when he met with individual members of the Commission, and City staff, they were informed as to what was needed for the project to proceed in the manner the City desired, and in using their own capital, they already took substantial risks to keep the project going, pushing it forward as fast as the City allowed them to. He mentioned they already had their approvals and permits pulled with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), so they were ready to proceed, if the City provided the path

forward that allowed them to deliver complete project.

Commissioner L. Martin stated one factor that kept him supporting the 441 Arthouse project was the developer agreed to develop a space that had never been developed, and they agreed to do so in a very transformative way.

Mr. Hobbs stressed City staff was doing nothing to hold any process back, as they continued to work move things forward, hence staff asking the developers to attend the present meeting to update the Board on the status of their projects, and the challenges they faced. He assured the Board staff would get them the numbers for all three projects by close of next day's business, and staff would continue working with the developers, the County, etc.

1. CRA HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEAN HENDERSON).

No discussion.

IV ADJOURNMENT - 6:00 PM