

<b>Committee Members</b>	
Jon Crimmins- District Three	<b>X</b>
Alton Palmer- District Four	<b>x</b>
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	<b>x</b>
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	<b>X</b>
Liz Blackwell-Moore	<b>x</b>
Katherine Cahoon	<b>x</b>
Courtney Kemp	<b>X</b>
<b>Staff Members</b>	
Sandra Warren	<b>X</b>
Travis Kennedy	<b>x</b>

**Call to Order**

Jon Crimmins Committee Chair Called meeting to order at 10:02 am

**Item 1.** Continued Review of T1 &T2 full applications and score summaries. Application and corresponding reviews and motions are as follows:

**Staff Description-** Habitat for Humanity Greater Portland\_ New Home Build Program South Portland & Standish New Home Build Program- Habitat for Humanity Greater Portland is seeking ARPA funding to support the construction of twenty, energy-efficient, single-family homes, for low-income first-time homebuyers. The homes will be located in both South Portland and in Standish. Applicants Funding Request \$2,600,000.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points – 1<sup>st</sup> Reviewers Comment-** Recommend funding 100% housing in steep falls/Standish, 8 units and additional 4 units and 50% of the South Portland Housing project. **Second Reviewer’s Comments-** Habitat for Humanity is a long-running, successful organization that provides homes to lower-income individuals and families. There is evidence of support from partner organizations. HfH is seeking approximately 22% of the total budget from ARPA funding. The project will go forward without full ARPA funding, albeit at a slower pace. A recommendation for funding would be to fund this project at \$750,000. **Third Reviewers Comments-** It’s great to build more housing for these income-level families. It's not clear to me if the mortgage stays at a reduced rate for the next buyer making the unit affordable or is it only affordable to the first home buyer? For the cost, there are other projects that get the same level of housing for the long term and at a lower cost. **Fourth Reviewers Comments-** Recommend funding at \$1,200,000. The South Portland project is shovel-ready with town approvals. The Standish project, while certainly needed in that area, is not as ready. **Fifth Reviewer’s Comments-** I would recommend funding the South Portland Project at a level not to exceed \$10,000 per unit or a total of \$80,000. From an efficiency of use of funds standpoint, the Applicant is requesting \$130,000 per unit compared to other Applicants (Avesta and Westbrook Housing) that are requesting approximately \$10,000 per unit. The Applicant has not demonstrated why they should be funded at a level 13 times other Agencies that are providing a similar benefit. I would not support funding the Standish project, as I question the viability of the model that provides housing for individuals at less than

80% AMI in an area that likely will not support their local employment, nor provide any access to public transportation.

**Motion:** Motion by Racheal Hendrickson to fund South Portland at \$750,000. Seconded by Pedro Vazquez Roll call:

**Motion:** Carries 7-0

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	x		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	x		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Motion:** By Racheal Hendrickson to fund Standish Portion of the Project at \$250,000. **Seconded by Pedro Vazquez. Roll Call: Motion: Carries 7-0**

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	x		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	x		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Staff Description: Seavey Street** – Avesta Housing is seeking American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to help acquire a 2.5+ acre parcel in Westbrook, ME. The parcel is located on Seavey Street, on the site of an old rail line, and is within a qualified census tract (QCT). Avesta would develop 60+ units of affordable housing on the site with all units restricted to 60% of AMI or below. The units will be all one-bedroom units; the target population will be older-adults 55+. This development is part of a larger effort to reinvigorate an infill site in the heart of Downtown. Applicants Funding Request \$350,000.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points-** Avesta is seeking \$350,000 from ARPA funds. Total budget is \$17,500,000. Funds would be used to help repay a loan for the property that is being developed in Westbrook. My Recommendation would be that this project is funded with up to \$200,000 from ARPA funds. Second Reviewer’s Comments-I thinks that it's great the funds can be spent immediately and have an exact place to go but curious why it should only be for 55+ when the housing need is so crucial for all ages and family sizes. Third Reviewers Comments- I don't recommend funding for this project because it does not address the immediate need of those impacted by COVID and there are other funds that are structured to finance this type of program. Fourth Reviewer’s Comments- This appears to be a great

project. I have questions about permitting and how do we know which housing projects are ready to go or not. This is a general question and not specific to this one. Also, the budget questions are hard for me to determine. The amount requested seems appropriate for land acquisition but they weren't asked to justify it and I don't really know whether it is or not. Also, I'm not sure where to find the information line item in the budget documents that details how the funds will be spent. Fifth Reviewer's Comments- \$180,000 A primary concern is that the project scheduled for the land is not "shovel-ready." The need is there, but the building will not be started until 2023.

**Staff Description:** Meadowview II – Avesta Housing is proposing to use the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to help acquire a 7+ acre parcel in Gray, ME. These funds will have an immediate impact in helping to preserve land for affordable housing. Avesta will develop 27 units of affordable housing on the site with all units restricted to 60% of AMI or below. This development is part of a larger effort to reinvigorate an existing affordable housing site and create a campus atmosphere in the Village Center of Gray. The addition of these 27 units to the existing campus of 20 senior units will also allow Avesta to bring more scale to this site and will make community services more comprehensive and readily available. **Applicants Funding Request \$250,000.00**

**Reviewer's discussion points-** This project is seeking \$250,000 of ARPA funds to add to a budget of \$8,000,000 for 27 affordable housing units in Gray, ME. While the organization has partnered with several entities within Cumberland County the land is not yet purchased and the project may not get started within CY2022. If the land cannot be purchased where does any money that is awarded from ARPA go? This question was not answered in the application. Second Reviewer's Comments- After reviewing the application and associated documents, it is clear that the project has merit in trying to build 27 units of affordable housing. I do question the sustainable aspect of the housing and how often it may turn over for other residents. I believe that Avesta has the resources to fund this project without ARPA funding. My funding recommendation is that there be \$0 funds awarded to this project. Third Reviewer's Comments-Avesta is requesting funding for the full amount of the land purchase. Given the relatively low price of the land and the lack of affordable housing in Gray, I recommend the full amount of the request - \$250,000. This project is not precisely shovel-ready, but the purchase of the land will enable it to go forward. Fourth Reviewer's Comments- This appears to be a great project. I have questions about permitting and how do we know which housing projects are ready to go or not. This is a general question and not specific to this one. It's hard for me to assess the budget questions given that there are so many sheets. It seems like \$250K for land makes sense but it's hard for me to tell.

**Staff Description:** Village Commons –Avesta Avesta Housing is proposing to use the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to help acquire a .44+ acre parcel in Scarborough, ME. Avesta will develop 31 units of affordable senior housing on the site. There will be 30 one-bedroom units and one efficiency in a three-story elevator building. The units will be restricted to older adults, 55+ and all units will be affordable, reserved for individuals or couples earning less than or equal to 60% of AMI. A further 19 of these units will be set aside for individuals or couples earning less than or equal to 50% of AMI. All utilities are included in the rent helping to facilitate affordability by reducing the burden of housing expenses. **Applicants Funding Request \$350,000.00**

**Reviewer's discussion points-** Avesta is seeking \$350,000 for a budget of \$8,800,000 for 31 single-person units. The project will go forward without funding from ARPA. Avesta has numerous applications seeking funds from ARPA currently. Would recommend the total ARPA funding for this project be no more than \$175,000. Second Reviewer's Comments- I don't recommend funding for this project because it does not address the immediate need of those impacted by COVID and there are other funds that are structured to finance this type of program. Third Reviewer's Comments- It's hard for me to

assess the budget questions given that there are so many sheets. It seems like \$350K for land makes sense but it's hard for me to tell.

**Questions for applicants:** 1.) *Please explain and outline your developer fees, please be sure to specifically outline how much of your development fee will go back into this project.*  
 2.) *Please provide a snapshot of your internal DEIA practices.*

**Motion** by Committee Chair to postpone voting on any of the Avesta Housing projects until questions can be asked by staff and more feedback provided. **Seconded** by Racheal Hendrickson

**Motion:** Carries 7-0

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	x		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	x		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Staff Description:** VERTICAL HARVEST MAINE - The Vertical Harvest Maine project is a public-private partnership (P3) with the following components: a (i) Vertical Farm, (ii) 60 Units of Affordable Housing, (iii) a Parking Structure which acts as infrastructure to the Affordable Housing and contains commercial space; and (iv) Sewer & Stormwater upgrades and relocation. The project is being developed and executed in partnerships among TDB LLC, the City of Westbrook, Community Housing of Maine, and Vertical Harvest L3C. TDB LLC has submitted the application to the County as one of the partners in this project. The Project request was \$8 million in ARPA funding for the following: \$4.605 million to be spent on the infrastructure for the affordable housing which is contained within the parking structure. The parking structure has four levels and the affordable housing is located on levels five and six that sit on top of the parking structure. \$2.707 million shall be spent on the upgrades for the sewer & stormwater infrastructure. \$702,000 shall be spent on the construction of the 60 units of Affordable Housing located on floors 5 & 6 of the structure. The Committee had a hard time identifying the funding gap based on the information provided by the applicant. The Committee requested additional feedback, and still felt that the available materials from Vertical Harvest were not sufficient to recommend funding. Applicants Funding Request \$8,000,000.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points:** This project is a multipart project including retail space, a parking garage, a hydroponic farm, and affordable housing. It also includes a major renovation of water lines within Westbrook. The overall housing beneficiaries are less than 70 people. The project has a funding request for \$8,000,000 or 7% of the overall cost. Due to the expansive nature of the project and the various items included it is difficult to see a widespread benefit that is needing ARPA funding. Additionally, it is stated in the application that the project will not go forward without the full \$8,000,000 funding level. My recommendation for this project is that it receives an ARPA funding of \$0. Second Reviewer- While this endeavor is appealing because of the partnerships to begin the construction of the apartment units, it does

not ring true to the objective of addressing vulnerable populations impacted by the pandemic. I do not recommend funding because I believe that funding can be found elsewhere. Third Reviewer - The applicant is requesting @\$8M of a \$103.8M project, but has indicated that the project will not continue if the entire amount requested is not received. It appears that there is @\$26M needed before the housing or farm would be constructed, with the majority of that money going to site preparation, sewer restoration, and parking garage infrastructure. The project itself is innovative in its approach to farming and to the housing and employment of individuals with disabilities. Given the amount of funding available through this application process and the applicant statement concerning the inability to continue without the full amount, it would be advisable to wait until the next round of funding or until it is possible to break up the project into funding "chunks" that can be considered individually. Recommendation: No funding at this time. Fourth Reviewer- The infrastructure improvements are not a priority for ARPA funding. They didn't talk about how they would advance racial equity. They talk about their partner's experience managing publicly funded projects but not their own. Didn't fill in CEO compensation. Cannot find the budget that details where the \$8 million requested would be spent.

**Questions for applicants:**

- "1.) Please describe TBD, LLC's experience with managing publicly funded projects, you outlined those of your partners but not TDB, LLC. Please provide your experience managing publicly funded projects.***
- 2.) Please list your CEO's Compensation***
- 3.) You provided a financial statement for the City and did not include one for your company TBD, LLC. Please provide a budget that details where the \$8 million requested would be spent.***
- 4.) Please provide a snapshot of your internal DEIA practices."***

**Motion by Committee Chair** to table funding for the project. Need more information about project's funding sources and overall budget. Seconded by Al Palmer Motion: Carries 7-0

**Motion: Carries 7-0**

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	x		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	x		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Staff Description: Building a Brighter Future** - Youth and Family Outreach are seeking County ARPA funding to support an expansion of existing Childcare facilities that will include affordable housing above to support the overhead of the daycare. The funds will be used for infrastructure; the construction portion of the development. Applicants Funding Request \$300,000.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points:** Based on the program and the overall impact on the expansion of child care it is recommended that the project receive \$200,000 from available ARPA funding. Second Comment -While it will take two years to completion of the construction, most elements of the project are ready to go. Quality child care will be a continuing need in the community, even after the pandemic. This project reflects a solid investment for the future. Recommendation: \$300,000. I need additional information to allow scoring of this application. While the Application is for the Building a Brighter Future program, the majority of the project budget, finances, etc. are "blended" with the housing project and it is difficult to separate the cost components of the various "projects". The Application should be clarified to provide separate budgets and financing for the BBF Program vs the Housing Program so that a clearer picture is provided (and able to be tracked) as to how the ARPA funds would be used. As an example, none of the County funds should be used to pay the City Impact Fee for Trees due to the Housing Project. The Project Expenses includes a \$2.15M Developer Fee, with only \$1.4M Deferred, resulting in a \$750,000 shortfall. If all of the Developer Fee were deferred, would the ARPA funds of \$300,000 be necessary?

**Questions for applicants:** 1. please provide a separate budget and financing for the BBF Program. Currently, the developer fees associated with the project are listed at \$2.15M, only differing \$1.4M, resulting in a \$750,000 shortfall. Based on this information, if all of the Developer Fee were deferred, would the ARPA funds of \$300,000 be necessary? 2.) Please provide a snapshot of your internal DEIA practices. **Motion by Committee Chair** to fund the project at the requested amount. Seconded by Racheal Hendrickson Motion: Carries 7-0

**Motion: Carries 7-0**

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	x		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	x		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Staff Description: Growing Project HOME**- Quality Housing Coalition sought ARPA funding for Administration funding as well funds to support an Insurance fund. The insurance fund would support persons and families seeking housing that are hard to house, by providing funds to support obtaining and retaining rental housing. Applicants Funding Request \$150,870.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points:** While this proposal seems like it’s on to something, it’s unclear how it will be executed. The authors are headed in the right direction and a lot of people could benefit from their services. However, the execution of the services needs to be more developed. I do not recommend funding at this time and think that it will benefit from future funding. Second Reviewer’s Comments- The organization is seeking 100% of the funding from ARPA funds. It is recommended that the funding from ARPA money be limited to up to \$75,000. Third Reviewer’s Comments- This project is a cost-effective and timely process to successfully house homeless families in Cumberland County. Due to its small size, the corporation could not provide an audit. If funding is contemplated, I suggest Cumberland County request that the applicant provides statements from current funders such as the United Way as to their experience with the organization. In the future, for ARPA purposes, the grantee should be prepared to at least provide a financial statement from a third party. Recommendation: \$150,870

- Questions for applicants:** 1.) *Please describe in greater detail how your project will be executed.*  
 2.) *Given that you are a small organization, could you provide a statement from current funders such as the united way, as to your experience with the organization, and your grant performance?*  
 3.) *Please provide a snapshot of your internal DEIA practices.*

**Motion by Committee Chair** to fund the project at the requested amount. Seconded by Racheal Hendrickson Motion: Carries 5-0. Two members Abstained.

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four			x
Liz Blackwell-Moore			x
Katherine Cahoon	x		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Staff Description:** Direct Support Access- Maine Pretrial Services is seeking ARPA funds to assist 74 clients with room and board fees associated with recovery residences. These funds with Dovetail with existing funding and allow for each of the 74 clients to be housed for 3months. Applicants Funding Request \$175,000.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points:** This seems like a great project but not sustainable. **Second Reviewer’s Comments-** I recommend 100% funding for this initiative because it is a small financial request that aligns with the County’s mission to address and prevent homelessness for vulnerable and underserved populations. **Third Reviewer’s Comments-**ARPA funding being sought by Maine Pretrial Services is more than 96% of the total project budget. There is little proof of sustainability other than it is the continuation of a current program. This project will not go forward without ARPA funding. Due to the high percentage of the project's funding coming by way of ARPA funding and the limited number of beneficiaries it is recommended that the project receive no more than \$100,000 in ARPA funding. **Fourth Reviewers Comments-** In the proposal, they said this is an expansion of work which would mean they have other financial sources, even though they only put in the cost of the expansion- I think they deserve more points in the financial support column but I don't know how much money they put towards other parts of the project. It's a great way to ensure that people who are most at risk for homelessness, overdose, or repeat criminal offenses, have safe housing upon release. **Fifth Reviewers Comments-**The specific project is new and will primarily be run with ARPA funding. However, the total agency budget is substantial and the agency shows evidence of being able to run an effective program that addresses one particular aspect of the homelessness problem in Cumberland County. The agency has indicated that the project is all or nothing in terms of ARPA funding. Recommendation: Staff inquires if the agency is willing to work with a smaller number of clients and conduct an evaluation of its longer-term success rate. If the agency is willing to do that, recommend funding of \$120,000

**Questions for applicants:** 1. *Would your agency be willing to work with a smaller number of clients and conduct an evaluation of its longer-term success rate?* 2.) *The application notes this project is an expansion of existing funding, yet this funding is not associated with the budget and thereby does not show sustainability. Can you outline these existing funds and thereby the sustainability of your project.* 3.) *Please provide a snapshot of your internal DEIA practices.*

**Motion by Committee Chair** to fund the project at the requested amount. Seconded by Courtney Kemp  
Motion: Carries 7-0.

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	X		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	X		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Staff Description: Building Hope and Creating Community** - Portland Recovery Community Center request Cumberland County ARPA funding to support building renovation that makes existing space COVID-19 friendly and thereby allows for expanded services. The building renovation will allow more people affected by addiction to receive effective in-person recovery support despite COVID-19. Applicants Funding Request \$515,152.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points:** This project will allow PRCC to serve 3,000 to 4,000 individuals. While the amount of sought funding is almost 70% of the total budget the number of individuals served is a compelling reason to fund this project. The recommendation of funding from ARPA funds is \$400,000. **Second Reviewer’s Comments-**It is not clear exactly what the ARPA funds would be spent on. There is a construction budget line but it's not detailed on what that is compared to the other line items for HVAC, and the 4 line items related to outdoor construction work. **Third Reviewers Comments-** While the cost of the total project is clear, as is the need in the community, the specific request and the budget documents are less clear. The narrative seems to request funding for phases 3 and 4 of the project, but the budget submission indicates less funding is required for those phases than the total amount of the request. Staff should seek clarity on how many or which phases of the renovation would be included in any funding award and the costs associated with each. If the applicant is seeking funding for renovation costs that have already been assumed by the client, that is, I believe, allowable under the funding guidelines, but should be clarified. Recommend funding for phases 3 and 4, amount TBD. Fourth Reviewer -I need additional information to allow scoring of this application. While there is significant information provided for the services to be provided, there is less detail provided regarding the building program for which funding is requested. The Applicant has signed a Construction Contract in 2021 for approx. \$500,000 for which they presumably had funding in hand. The Application indicates that the Construction Contract is for Phases 1 & 2, and that funding appears to be requested for Phases 3 (? Additional HVAC Improvements) & 4 (Exterior Improvements). In the Project Budget, the apparent line items for Phase 3 & 4 appear to have an "all-in" cost of \$118,000 while \$515,000 is requested from ARPA? Why the discrepancy?

**Questions for applicants: 1.) Your application narrative identifies request funding for phases 3 and 4 of the project, but the budget submission indicates less funding is required for those phases than the total amount of the request. Please clarify how many or which phases of the renovation would be included in any funding award and the costs associated with each. 2.) Please provide a snapshot of your internal DEIA practices.**

**Motion by Committee Chair to fund the project at the requested amount. Seconded by Courtney Kemp Motion: Carries 7-0.**

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		
Pedro Vazquez – District Four	X		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	X		
Courtney Kemp	x		

**Staff Description: Randall Street Affordable Housing Project** - Greater Portland Community Land Trust is seeking ARPA funding to support the creation of 16 affordable homes located at 21 Randell Street Portland, Maine. The AAC did not recommend funding under this round. Current Architectural plans do not clearly reflect ADA federal requirements and would need to be finalized and clearly outline the proposed Best Practices asked of developers by the committee. Applicants Funding Request \$500,000.00

**Reviewer’s discussion points:** I recommend that pending remaining funding by the ARPA Advisory Committee, this project receives at least half of the requested funds for their proposal. **Second Reviewer Comments-** The project is for 16 houses for 22 to 52 people in total. The project will not go forward without full funding. ARPA request is more than 9% of the total budget. Most of the overall budget will come from the sale of the homes after they are sold to customers. The recommendation for funding from ARPA monies is no more than \$250,000. **Third Reviewer Comments-** It's a cool project that could have great outcomes for the people who live in the homes. Given the cost, it will serve fewer people than some of the other housing projects. It's not clear that the project will definitely happen given there needs to be a rezoning process for the project to move forward. **Fourth Reviewer’s Comments-** While the need for workforce housing is clear, there remain too many unknowns in the application. If there is a second round of funding in a year, the applicant should be encouraged to resubmit after basic details have been finalized. No funding is recommended. **Fifth Comment-**Greater Portland Community Land Trust. In reviewing the above-referenced application in the Neighborly Software, it was unclear as to how this project would conform to the Fair Housing Act of 1968, including amendments. As proposed the eight first floor units are all 1-bedroom units, presumably with barrier-free access from the adjacent sidewalk. The other eight units (located on the second and third stories) are proposed as a mixture of 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units, all accessible by stairs. No elevator is proposed. The design as proposed would appear to preclude a person with disabilities from having the opportunity to buy/rent the 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units as they have no accessibility to an individual in a wheelchair. It has been my experience that this situation could be addressed by providing both 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units on the first floor, with an accessible route (barrier-free access) to each unit. While the Applicant submitted a letter from the City of Portland regarding zoning conformance, that review does not consider accessibility. For me to continue to review/score this application for ARPA funding, I would need to understand how the Concept Design would meet the Fair Housing Act. I would recommend that the Applicant submit evidence of conformance to the Fair Housing Act, and if they are unable to do so at this time, that the Application is deferred to a later date. As I am not a licensed Architect, I would defer to others for the final review of whether the Applicant’s submittal meets these requirements. If the Applicant submits additional information, I recommend that the County consider consulting with Jill Johanning of Alpha One to ensure conformance with the appropriate regulations prior to the approval of any funding.

**Questions for applicants: 1. please identify your approach to barrier-free access within your project’s buildout. Your proposed design has larger units only shown on higher levels without wheelchair access. Could you speak to this and what if any additional ADA and or fair housing build designs for your project is adopting? 2. Please provide a snapshot of your internal DEIA practices.**

**Motion by Committee Chair** to table funding for project. Need more information about the projects funding sources and overall budget. Seconded by Al Palmer Motion: Carries 7-0

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain
Jon Crimmins- District Three	x		
Alton Palmer- District Four	x		
Racheal Hendrickson – District One	x		

***Motion: Carries 7-0***

Pedro Vazquez – District Four	x		
Liz Blackwell-Moore	x		
Katherine Cahoon	x		
Courtney Kemp	x		

***Item 4: Other Business***

**Item 5: Adjoin** - Motion by Chairmen Crimmins to Move to adjournment. Motion by Racheal Hendrickson, Second by Courtney Kemp. Motion moved for adjournment.

DRAFT