

**Florida Housing Finance Corporation
Board of Directors' Meeting Minutes
March 18, 2016**

TIME: 8:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Tallahassee City Hall
300 South Adams Street
Tallahassee Florida

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Barney Smith, Chairman
Natacha Munilla, Vice Chair
Renier Diaz de la Portilla
John Hawthorne
Taylor Teepell
Len Tylka
Howard Wheeler

CORPORATION STAFF PRESENTING:

Stephen P. Auger
Hugh Brown
Cecka Green
Nancy Muller
Jacqui Peters
Ken Reecy
Eric Sonderling
David Westcott

OTHERS PRESENTING:

Michael Donaldson, Carlton Fields
Donna Blanton, Radey Law Firm

Chairman Smith called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

MINUTES

Item A, Approval of Minutes of the January 29, 2016, Board Meeting. Chairman Smith asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the January 29, 2016, Board Meeting.

Motion to approve the Minutes was made by Mr. Hawthorne with a second by Mr. Tylka.
Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Smith welcomed Taylor Teepell, Director of the Department of Economic Opportunity's (DEO) Division of Community Development, who will sit on Florida Housing's Board of Director as the DEO ex officio member. Mr. Teepell thanked Chairman Smith.

AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT

Natacha Munilla reported that the Audit Committee met by teleconference on March 4, and reviewed and approved the minutes of October 29, 2015, committee meeting. She stated that the Audit Committee Charter and the Office of Inspector General Charter were discussed and approved. She stated that the planning considerations for the 2015 annual audit were discussed. She stated that the Inspector General notified the committee that the random number generation process had been changed to eliminate the seed numbers previously used for the generation of random numbers.

Motion to approve items discussed and actions taken at the March 4, 2016, Audit Committee meeting was made by Ms. Munilla with a second by Mr. Hawthorne. Motion passed unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Jacqui Peters stated that it was a great year of accomplishment in the Legislature for Florida Housing issues. She stated that the Housing Assistance Bill passed both the House and Senate chambers with no opposing votes, and the bill provides several significant and positive changes to Florida Housing, including the authority to award forgivable State Apartment Incentive Loan Program (SAIL) loans to build small properties, mainly in rural areas; targeted to homeless persons; the ability to ban developers for any appropriate period of time, including permanently, depending on the circumstances related to material misrepresentation or engagement in fraudulent actions; and language that reserves the minimum of 5 percent of the annual State Housing Trust Fund appropriation for forgivable loans to projects serving persons with a disabling condition with priority given to projects serving persons with developmental disabilities. She added that the bill provides revisions to the SAIL program to continue to require that these funds be made available across designated geographic areas of the state while providing Florida Housing with some flexibility to better manage its current application process. She stated that it provides modifications to the demographic reservations so the farmworker and fish worker demographic is at not less than 5 percent, and the remaining demographics are at not less than 10 percent, aligning with data and market trends over the past few years, and provides for rent restrictions on rental units financed through the SAIL program.

She stated that the bill also made revisions in the State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) Program, including modifying the definition of rent subsidies and clarifying the instances in which SHIP entities can provide ongoing rental assistance for homeless households, providing that up to 25 percent of SHIP funds may be used for rental purposes, as well as requiring a minimum of 20 percent of allocated SHIP funds be used to serve persons with special needs, and giving local governments the ability to pool SHIP resources through regional partnerships to target homelessness.

She stated that the bill provides language regarding the National Housing Trust Fund to encourage the state entity designated to administer these funds, which is Florida Housing, to propose an allocation plan incorporating strategies to reduce homelessness.

She stated that Florida Housing is grateful to both bill sponsors, Representative Miller and Senator Simmons, for championing this legislation through its final passage.

She then briefed the Board on the General Appropriations Act and the final outcomes for Florida Housing funding the year. She stated that after budget conferencing and negotiations settled, the final appropriation to Florida Housing was a total of \$200.1 million, with \$64.6 million appropriated from the State Housing Trust Fund, and \$135.5 million appropriated from the Local Government Housing Trust Fund. She stated that the total of \$200.1 million is the largest affordable housing appropriation Florida Housing received in nine years.

She stated that the \$64.6 million appropriated from the State Housing Trust Fund for affordable housing programs includes a proviso that at least 50 percent of these funds be used for the SAIL program; \$10 million for competitive grants to serve persons with developmental disabilities, a frequently recurring proviso in the past few years; and \$20 million for statewide work force housing. She stated that there is also implementing language under this budget category to modify the demographic reservations to align with the data and market trends similar to the Housing Assistance Bill. She stated that the \$135.5 million appropriated from the Local Government Housing Trust Fund to the SHIP program includes a proviso that at least 20 percent of the funds be used to serve persons with special needs, which is also in the Housing Assistance Bills; and provides \$5.2 million to be transferred to DEO and DCF as Florida Housing has been doing in the past for homeless services. She stated it also includes \$500,000 for the Catalyst Program, and includes a proviso that local governments can pool resources through regional partnerships to target homelessness, which is also included in the Housing Assistance Bill. She stated it also includes implementing language under this budget category to allow local governments the ability to use SHIP resources for rental assistance, which is also a part of the housing assistance bill, as has been the case in the past.

She stated that the budget provided back of the bill language that would expand the use of the foreclosure counseling dollars that Florida Housing received a few years ago, and language that unobligated guarantee funds be used for SAIL and contains sweeps totaling about \$116.9 million. She stated that while the governor received and signed the budget bills on March 17, his office released veto lists earlier this week, and thankfully none impacted Florida Housing issues.

She thanked the Legislature and the Governor for the appropriation and for their continuing support of affordable housing. She also thanked Florida Housing staff, the affordable housing stakeholders and the Board Members for their support in helping to achieve significant results this year to provide affordable housing options across the state.

Mr. Auger stated that there was also a lot of involvement by stakeholders such as the Coalition of Affordable Housing providers, the Florida Supportive Housing Coalition, the Sadowski Coalition, and others. He stated that in working on the bill over the last couple of years, particularly with regard to SHIP, working with the realtors and the homebuilders, the Sadowski Coalition education effort, a lot of the special needs stakeholders, some of the disability and special needs advocates, and others were very engaged and helpful to Florida Housing. He added that many of the multifamily developers contributed significantly, as well as the SHIP administrators working with their stakeholders. He stated that it was a collective effort on everybody's part and that helped with the advocacy.

Mr. Auger stated that another highlight is that Catalyst funding will come out of the SHIP appropriation and expressed a desire to get that going on a regular basis as opposed to relying on Florida Housing to have not only an appropriation, but some discretionary funding, as well, to fund it, as it is in the current fiscal year. He stated that by having the catalyst funding come as a subset of SHIP it would ensure that training money will be there every year. He stated that Florida Housing has not received that much money since 2007.

Mr. Auger stated that legislative staff went to the legislature and the governor's office and asked to use the Guarantee Fund money for SAIL and they allowed Florida Housing to keep that money to do that.

HARDEST-HIT FUND

Item A, Request Approval to Accept Fifth Round of Hardest-Hit Funding. David Westcott stated that on February 19, 2016, the US Treasury announced it would exercise its authority to obligate up to \$2 billion in additional Troubled Asset Relief Program funds to the Hardest Hit Fund Program. He stated that in addition to the additional money they are making available, they also agreed to extend the end date of the Hardest Hit Fund Program from December 31, 2017, to December 31, 2020. He stated that the first phase of their allocation of the additional billion dollars uses a formula-based program, and based on that formula, Florida Housing's allocation for the fifth round funding, phase one, is \$77,896,538. He asked the Board to approve staff's recommendation to accept the additional Hardest Hit Fund allocation and to authorize staff to amend Florida Housing's agreement with Treasury subject to further approvals by Florida Housing counsel and appropriate staff.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Mr. Tylka with a second by Ms. Munilla.

Chairman Smith asked if there was a phase two coming with more money. Mr. Westcott stated phase two is the application piece for states that want to apply for more money, and based on the additional funding Florida Housing will receive as part of the new allocation, there are no plans to ask for more of the original funds.

John Hawthorne stated that \$77 million seems like a fairly low number given that Florida Housing was one of the hardest-hit areas. He asked why that allocation was so low and if it is because of the money Florida Housing still has available to spend. Mr. Auger stated that there was a formula used, but it definitely included how much Florida Housing had available. He added that of the 18 states, Florida's formula piece was the fourth or the fifth highest amount. He stated that he believes they are trying to

help out the Rust Belt states and some other states that economically haven't been able to come back like Florida has, so that second billion they're trying to steer to some of those areas that don't have the robust economy that Florida's been able to regenerate.

Motion passed unanimously.

HOME – DEMONSTRATION

Item A, Request Approval to Implement a Pilot to Serve Homeless Schoolchildren and their Families Living in Rural and Small Communities. Nancy Muller stated that the Florida Department of Education administers a program called the Homeless Education Program wherein there are homeless liaisons in all of the school districts throughout the state that identify homeless children and then have some list of services that they can provide, such as transportation to and from school, free school meals, tutoring, etc. She stated that the idea is to try to keep that child in school, as there are findings that show when a child is mobile or highly mobile, they have lower test scores and there is more possibility of failing out compared to children who don't change schools.

Ms. Muller stated that there are over 73,000 homeless children in Florida's public schools identified last November, and these programs and limited resources they have do not provide any funding for housing. She stated that the overwhelming majority of homeless school children are members of families, and typically these families are not chronically homeless out on the street, but are homeless because of a single episode or a couple of episodes of family crisis. She stated that staff has been looking at this issue from the point of view of school children who are homeless living in rural or small communities, because as was discussed at the last board meeting, rural communities have far fewer resources in terms of agencies and money to help homeless families, particularly those with children in school.

Ms. Muller stated that in addition, in these communities there is often a lack of housing choices. She added that even if prices are a little lower in rural areas than in some of the bigger urban centers, where families have to go out to look, they typically range far, and they've got to travel a long distance to get that child to school, buses aren't available for that, etc. She stated that Florida Housing is one member of the Council on Homelessness which includes other state agencies and a number of stakeholders throughout Florida working on homeless issues. She stated that through that council and with the Department of Education, Florida Housing has over the last six to eight months been meeting with folks to understand more about this issue. She stated that staff met with DCF's Office on Homelessness, the Department of Education and their homeless education folks, and some school district homeless education liaisons from rural counties to understand what the issues are and where the holes are in providing housing.

Ms. Muller stated that ultimately what came up was that short-term rental assistance could be a critical resource to assist these families regain housing, so the notion that if you give them a little bit of a leg up, whether it's giving them first and last month's rent and their security deposit or something else, it can help get them restabilized and allow their children to remain in the school of origin.

She stated that staff proposes the use of HOME funding for a pilot to provide eligible households with rental assistance for up to 24 months. She stated that the HOME program allows this short-term concept which could also be used for moving expenses. She stated that Florida Housing already uses HOME funding through 19 public housing authorities around the state to perform short-term rental

assistance in 15 counties. She stated that most of those are the larger counties in the state, but none of them do this particular thing or focus particularly on homeless families with school children. She stated that Florida Housing would execute a contract with a public housing authority with the qualifications, capacity and interest in administering such a program. She stated that it would have to be working in rural communities and ideally, at least some contiguous counties in case housing stock is not available near to the school, to be able to range out. She stated that they can live in one county over and get transportation resources if they are lacking for that family to keep them at their school. She stated that the idea would be that the homeless education liaisons would be referring families to the public housing authority which would then have the job that it normally has of vetting that family for eligibility in the program according to the HOME guidelines, and also working with landlords to make sure that the housing the family moves into is decent.

Ms. Muller stated that staff proposes to work with about four rural school districts to be able to see what the differences are that school districts would administer something like this from their end. She said staff is interested in seeking a public housing authority that currently administers Section 8 housing choice vouchers in multiple, ideally contiguous, rural counties and that also has a satisfactory report from HUD on compliance administration of federal rental assistance.

Ms. Muller asked the Board to authorize the use of up to \$1.5 million in HOME funds for the pilot, to authorize Florida Housing staff to seek a public housing authority to administer this funding in its current rental assistance service area, and to authorize Florida Housing staff to develop memorandums of understanding with interested, eligible public school districts within that housing authority service area to participate in the pilot by identifying, screening and referring homeless households with children in the district's homeless assistance programs for short-term rental assistance.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Mr. Hawthorne with a second by Ms. Munilla.

Renier Diaz de la Portilla suggested that perhaps Florida Housing can bring the schools to the children in creating partnerships with charter schools, for example, in some of these communities. He asked if any thought had been given to that concept instead of working with the traditional public school system. Ms. Muller stated it had not and the reason for that at this point is because in the school district, those homeless liaisons are working in the public systems, Florida Housing is not in the business of building that side of the capacity, so it would be a little bit of a stretch just as it is. She stated that it was a very interesting idea that could possibly be explored if the proposed plan proved successful. Mr. Diaz de la Portilla suggested that it might be a more cost-effective model to just create a charter school in that community.

John Hawthorne thanked Steve Auger and his staff for continuing to develop programs to assist small and rural areas. He stated that this item is near and dear to his heart in his capacity as the low-income advocate on the Board and also from a homeless standpoint. He stated that according to HUD's website, there are 107 public housing agencies in Florida, 22 of which do not provide Section 8 assistance. He stated that the challenge is going to be finding an agency that is contiguous with those smaller areas that don't provide Section 8. He also expressed concern that the allocation to those agencies and how much of that is going to those contiguous counties is sufficient; and if not, maybe needing to prioritize these families for some of those Section 8 vouchers, because that could become an issue.

Mr. Hawthorne also expressed concern about trying to target families who in a short period of time could perhaps get back on their feet, but in the end aren't able to, because you typically find folks in this category that aren't professionals or who may have gotten into the life crisis situations described, but it's a little bit more difficult to find the better paying jobs in these small and rural areas. He suggested that staff may need to also consider whether to extend the assistance beyond 24 months in case they don't find that job that is going to help them.

Mr. Hawthorne asked if a medium or large county that has some small, rural counties contiguous choose not to participate in the program, if there is an option for a provider that is not contiguous to those counties to leapfrog those that are contiguous and provide that assistance if they choose to. Ms. Muller stated that the problem with that is capacity and a county's willingness to have somebody a couple counties over do that. She stated that there are over a hundred housing authorities and many of them just serve cities and many of them just serve a single county, so one of the things that has not been explored is a sort of partnership between PHAs. She added that with this pilot it is important not to bite off too much; but on the other hand, if it is successful and Florida Housing wants to think about doing this in other places, creative ways to develop partnerships in that regard would need to be discussed.

Motion passed unanimously.

LEGAL

Item A, Vaca Bay Senior Apartments, L.P., and Keys Affordable Development, II, LLC., vs Florida Housing Finance Corporation. Hugh Brown stated that Vaca Bay Senior Apartments and Keys Affordable Development versus Florida Housing involves two applications in the medium/small county request for applications, both in Monroe County. He stated that both applications were deemed eligible with perfect scores, but Vaca Bay was selected for funding due to the leveraging tiebreaker. He stated that both Vaca Bay and Keys Affordable filed petitions challenging this result and challenging each other's applications. He stated that Keys Affordable alleged that Vaca Bay was ineligible for funding because they selected an ineligible demographic, and Vaca Bay alleged that Keys Affordable was using a previously funded site and therefore was also ineligible for funding. He stated that the two cases were consolidated and settlement discussions commenced, during which the parties came to an agreement that provides that the case will be dismissed and that Keys Affordable will be funded and not Vaca Bay. He stated that the reason this matter was being brought before the Board rather than just handling it as a dismissal at the staff level is that it involves a change in the Board's recommendation for funding.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Ms. Munilla with a second by Mr. Tylka. Motion passed unanimously.

Item B, Douglas Gardens V, Ltd. v. Florida Housing Finance Corporation. Hugh Brown stated that Douglas Gardens challenged La Joya's application on the grounds that La Joya used an ineligible certification form and La Joya intervened and argued that the use of this form should have been considered a minor irregularity and that it didn't make any difference. He stated that an informal hearing was held at Florida Housing, during which Florida Housing aligned with the Petitioner in this case and agreed that they had made a mistake in declaring La Joya ineligible. He stated that after the hearing, the hearing officer issued the recommended order that is before the Board, and the hearing officer recommends that the Board find that the use of the incorrect form by La Joya was a minor irregularity and that La Joya should receive funding as they originally did. He stated that Florida Housing

and Douglas Gardens disagree with this result and recommendation, and they have both filed joint exceptions to the recommended order to which La Joya has responded. He instructed the Board that they needed to specifically rule on the exceptions filed, either to accept them or reject them, as well as to rule on the recommended disposition of the case. He stated that both parties had counsel present to address these issues specifically and answer any specific questions from the Board.

Mr. Auger asked if a motion needed to be made before discussion. Mr. Brown indicated that it would be appropriate for the motion to be made after discussion.

Donna Blanton, representing Douglas Gardens, asked the Board to change four paragraphs in the Hearing Officer's conclusions of law, and stated that is something that state agencies, under the Administrative Procedure Act, are allowed to do because they're deemed to have expertise over the statutes and rules that they administer, and if a hearing officer or an administrative law judge gets it wrong, the agency head can change those conclusions of law. She spoke further in support of Florida Housing's position.

Eric Sonderling, representing Florida Housing, also spoke in support of changing the hearing officer's recommendation and conclusions of law.

Michael Donaldson, representing La Joya Estates, expressed his agreement with the hearing officer's recommendation and conclusions of law.

Chairman Smith stated that the language says you have to use the right form, and in this case, the wrong form was used and another application was disqualified for the very same issue. He stated that it must be consistent from application to application.

Natacha Munilla stated that it is a slippery slope if Florida Housing blatantly disregards something that is written, and it is very clear in the RFA - if the applicant provides any prior version of the surveyor's certification form, the form will not be considered. She stated that is not a minor irregularity, and is blatant disregard if we now go to that slippery slope. She stated that in that case, anything the Board ever says is required is then really not.

Mr. Wheeler stated that the conclusion he came to was if an RFA is clear, and it is, that becomes what the Board should stand by. He stated that the definition of a minor irregularity says in the RFA that it may be waived, and it may not.

Mr. Diaz de la Portilla asked if there were any legal repercussions in going with the recommended order as far as past applicants coming back.

Mr. Brown stated it would set this precedent, and it was entirely up to the Board what kind of precedent it wanted to set.

Mr. Brown stated that he wanted to make sure the Board understands what the standards are for overturning conclusions of law. He stated that the Board has to find that it has substantive jurisdiction over this issue, and he believes it does. He stated that the standard for overturning this hearing officer's conclusions are that the Board's conclusions have to be as reasonable or more reasonable than those

conclusions, and that's the standard, which is a pretty broad one. He stated that the Board has the freedom to act either way.

Mr. Brown asked the Board to approve staff's recommendation to reject conclusions of law 40, 41, 42 and 43 of the recommended order, to reject the recommendation of the recommended order, to substitute conclusions of law in accordance with the exceptions filed, and to award funding to Douglas Gardens subject to credit underwriting.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Mr. Wheeler with a second by Ms. Munilla. Motion passed by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Tylka casting the dissenting vote.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Item A, Request for Applications (RFA) 2015-113 – for Housing Credit and SAIL Financing to Provide Affordable Multifamily Rental Housing that is a Part of Local Revitalization Initiatives. Ken Reecy stated that RFA 2015-113 was issued to solicit applications for \$2.2 million in housing credits and \$2 million in SAIL funding to finance affordable multifamily rental housing that is part of a local revitalization initiative. He stated that 13 applications were received. He asked the Board to approve the review committee's recommendation to adopt the scoring results for the 13 applications and authorize the tentative selection of one application for funding and invitation into credit underwriting. He stated that all housing credit and SAIL funding available in the RFA would then be awarded. He stated that if no notice of protest or formal written protest was filed in accordance with Florida Statute, staff would then proceed with the credit underwriting process; but if a notice of protest was received, any recommended orders would be brought to the Board prior to beginning the credit underwriting process.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Mr. Hawthorne with a second by Ms. Munilla. Motion passed unanimously.

Item B, Request for Applications (RFA) 2015-114 – Elderly Housing Community Loan (EHCL). Ken Reecy stated that RFA 2015-114 was issued to solicit applications for \$1.8 million in EHCL funding to applicants proposing to provide life safety, building preservation, health, sanitation or security related repairs or improvements to developments currently serving elderly residents aged 62 or older. He stated that one application was received and was deemed ineligible for funding by the review committee. He asked the Board to approve the committee's recommendation that the Board adopt the scoring results of the review committee, which leaves the balance of \$1.8 million to be distributed as approved by the Board.

He stated that though the RFA was written contemplating that all applicants would have a first mortgage and must therefore provide certification evidencing that the first mortgagee has reviewed and approved the applicant's intents to apply for the EHCL funding, there is no such requirement in Florida Statutes, and given that the applicant indicated that there is no mortgage in the addenda section of the application they submitted and there's no requirement for EHCL applicants to have a first mortgage, staff recommends that the Board authorize this application for funding and invitation to credit underwriting. He stated that all future EHCL RFAs will be written to structurally allow applicants who do not have a mortgage to apply. He stated if there is no notice of protest or formal protest filed in accordance with Florida Statutes, staff will proceed with an invitation to credit underwriting to the application. He stated it is unlikely that there would be a protest filed in this case since there was only one application.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Ms. Munilla with a second by Mr. Tylka.

John Hawthorne expressed his concern that this was similar to the previous item on that slippery slope. He asked if the RFA was specifically written to say that this was a requirement. Mr. Reecy stated that the RFA was written to specifically say that this was a requirement to have a first mortgage and that is why the review committee did not waive it as a minor irregularity because the review committee did not have that authority to waive that as minor irregularity, and instead submitted it to the Board which does have the authority to change the provision of the RFA. Mr. Hawthorne expressed his concern that if it was a specific requirement that was put in the RFA, then should it be overlooked and the application be funded. Mr. Auger stated that the difference here, and it has been done before in instances where there was no other applications, is that there was only one applicant. He stated that the alternative is modifying and reissuing the RFA to get the one applicant back. He stated that the precedent was previously set when the Board said where there is no other competition, no one is harmed. He also stated that the review committee members correctly did not make that determination, so it is consistent with that scoring.

Motion passed by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Hawthorne casting the dissenting vote.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION (PSS)

Item A, Request for Proposals (RFP) 2016-01, Website Design, Development and Hosting Services.

Cecka Green stated that at the December 11, 2015, meeting, the Board authorized Florida Housing staff to issue a solicitation to procure a firm that will redesign and host the corporation's website. She stated that the request for proposals was issued on Wednesday, January 6, 2016, and four responses were received by the deadline: Fig Leaf Software, Incorporated; Rock Orange, LLC; SGS Technology, LLC; and Technisource. She asked the Board to approve the review committee's recommendation to authorize Florida Housing to enter into contract negotiations with SGS Technology, LLC, and should contract negotiations with SGS Technology, LLC fail, the review committee recommended issuing a new solicitation for these services.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Mr. Tylka with a second by Ms. Munilla. Motion passed unanimously.

Item B, Request for Proposals (RFP) 2016-03, Lender Dinner, Venue and Lodging. Cecka Green stated that at the December 11, 2015, meeting, the Board authorized Florida Housing to issue a solicitation to procure the venue and lodging for attendees of the 2017 lender appreciations award dinner and one response from the Marriott Orlando World Center was received, but was deemed nonresponsive for failure to include Florida Housing's mandatory certification statement as required in section five of the RFP. She stated that the certification requires respondents to agree to all of the conditions of the solicitation, certify that the information in the response is true and correct, and provide assurance that the proposal is being signed by the respondent's authorized personnel. She stated that upon subsequent analysis of the project, staff determined that the direct financial impact of the procurement of the catering, lodging and venue will likely be less than the \$35,000 competitive solicitation threshold, and she recommended that the Board authorize staff to issue a notice of no responsive bid for RFP 2016-01. She also asked the Board to authorize staff to move forward with a request for quote process as opposed to another RFP which complies with Chapter 67-49.0021(a), Florida Administrative Code, which outlines the corporation's practices for purchases under the competitive solicitation threshold.

Motion to approve staff's recommendation was made by Mr. Tylka (who corrected the RFP number to 2016-03) with a second by Mr. Hawthorne. Motion passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Smith asked for a motion to approve the items on the Consent Agenda.

Motion to approve the items on the Consent Agenda was made by Mr. Tylka with a second by Ms. Munilla. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were offered.

Chairman Smith adjourned the meeting at 9:49 a.m.