

MARGATE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD

REGULAR MEETING April 14, 2021

MINUTES

Present:

Joanne Simone
Antonio V. Arserio
Arlene Schwartz
Anthony Caggiano, Vice Chair
Tommy Ruzzano, Chair

Also Present:

Cale Curtis, Executive Director
David Tolces, Weiss Serota Helfman Cole & Bierman

The regular meeting of the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency having been properly noticed was called to order at 5:04 p.m., on Wednesday, April 14, 2021, by Chair Tommy Ruzzano. There was a moment of silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken.

This was a virtual public meeting held via Zoom. Board Attorney David Tolces read the Findings and Procedure for a Virtual Public Meeting. Those physically present in the Commission Chambers were: Chair Tommy Ruzzano; Vice Chair Anthony Caggiano; Board Member Arlene Schwartz; Cale Curtis, Executive Director; Joseph Kavanagh, City Clerk; and Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator.

1A. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL - (3/10/2021 Regular)

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title, Ms. Schwartz made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Arserio:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 5-0.

2. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

No comments were made by the public.

3A. RESOLUTION 659: AWARDING CONTINUING SERVICES AGREEMENTS WITH CALVIN, GIORDANO & ASSOCIATES, INC., CHEN MOORE & ASSOCIATES, INC., KEITH ENGINEERING, INC., AND KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.,a FOR REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS MCRA RFQ 2021-02 GENERAL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the resolution title, Vice Chair Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Schwartz:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

There was no discussion.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 5-0.

3B. RESOLUTION 658: APPROVING THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE NEW BUSINESS INCENTIVE GRANT BETWEEN THE MARGATE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND CULVER'S OF MARGATE, LLC, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CULVER'S RESTAURANT LOCATED AT 5510 WEST COPANS ROAD; PROVIDING FOR THE INCLUSION OF MEDALIST RESTAURANT, LLC, AS PARTY TO THE AGREEMENT

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the resolution title, Vice Chair Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Schwartz for discussion:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

Ms. Schwartz clarified that the item was administrative to correct paperwork for an existing grant. Cale Curtis, Executive Director, reiterated that the item was not for a new grant, and he explained that the original agreement was made with Culver's of Margate but some of the project's expenses were funded by their sister company, Medalist Restaurant, LLC, and the agreement needed to be amended in order to provide reimbursement.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 5-0.

4A. **DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION:** AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE CONTINUING SERVICES AGREEMENTS FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES WITH THE TOP FOUR RANKED FIRMS

David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item.

Vice Chair Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Schwartz for discussion:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO AUTHORIZE STAFF TO ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS

Ms. Schwartz asked the difference between the architectural firms. Cale Curtis, Executive Director, said all of the firms were well-rounded architectural firms but some were more specialized in different areas and provided the MCRA with the ability to obtain competitive quotes from multiple firms.

She asked if hiring a firm was a better option than hiring a staff person. Mr. Curtis said that it was.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 5-0.

4B. **DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION:** AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED WITH RELEASE OF REVISED MCRA MATCHING GRANT PROGRAMS FOR COMMERCIAL FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS, LANDSCAPING IMPROVEMENTS, AND COMMERCIAL DEMOLITION

David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title.

Commercial Property Façade Improvement Grant Program Discussion

Chair Ruzzano pointed out the grant guidelines allowed for architectural drawings; he commented that he would like to have an intern or an in-house architect that could be utilized to proactively promote the programs by preparing mock-ups of what the businesses or shopping plazas could look like.

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, explained the guidelines allowed for a MCRA appointed architect such as Stephen Fett, who had developed the Business Design Guidelines, to work with the business owner on a conceptual design, the cost of which would be split between the MCRA and the owner. The conceptual design would need to be approved by the Board and, once approved, the next step would be for the property owner to engage an architect for formal design and construction.

There was a short discussion about the use of two architects. David Tolces, Board Attorney, explained that the architect for the conceptual design was important because that person would know what the MCRA was looking for, while the architect that prepared the construction drawings would assume the liability versus the government entity.

Vice Chair Caggiano commented that he was in favor of the businesses working with an established architectural firm rather than someone fresh out of school.

Chair Ruzzano commented that the MCRA did not do many façade grants because businesses were not aware of them and he would like to provide them with a conceptual of what was available to them. Mr. Curtis agreed that spending some money up front without engaging the business owner would be a very proactive approach to the program. He said perhaps it was something that could be started with one plaza or business but it would be a separate initiative which Paul Robinson could promote.

Ms. Schwartz suggested that every business in the MCRA should receive a flyer to promote the programs. Mr. Arserio commented that the MCRA had grant programs in the past that received very little interest. He said he wanted to make sure there would be a plan in place to properly sell it to the business owners.

Chair Ruzzano said the best program the MCRA had in the past was the one that brought new businesses into Margate. He said the MCRA should not pay for poorly run plazas. He preferred to have a simple grant program that would pay up to a certain dollar amount, and then work with interested businesses on a case-by-case basis. He commented about using the incentive to fill vacant properties with businesses that the MCRA wanted.

Discussion ensued about the methodology used to determine the frontage square footage amounts. Mr. Curtis explained that the grant programs had been written by the former Executive Director and approved by the Board and had been on hold pending completion of the Building Design Guidelines. He said the programs were coming back before the Board to see if they still met their vision for property improvements. He acknowledged that many of the plazas were not being maintained well noting that a lot of it had to do with code compliance. He pointed out that many of the plazas were old and outdated and the goal was to incentivize reinvigoration and redevelopment of them. He said he liked the program but he understood the possible need for a fourth program to attract new businesses. He stated that the dollar amounts were low and might need to be revisited.

Discussion ensued about releasing the three grant programs and tweaking them if necessary. Mr. Curtis said the Communications and Marketing Manager could design a handout that could be distributed through Development Services as well as work on reaching the businesses through social media posts, the website, and other means, including cold calls. Ms. Schwartz suggested meeting with the owners versus cold calling.

Mr. Curtis recommended the addition of a third tier to the program, i.e., 0-60 linear foot; 60-120 linear foot; and 120 linear foot and above, and doubling the incentive amount to appeal to the larger plazas.

There was a short discussion about successful grants that had been done in the past: Lonestar Plaza, Jasmine Thai, VoAn Vietnamese Restaurant, Annie's Pizza, and Lester's Diner. Chair Ruzzano said he would like to show before and after pictures on the flyer. He agreed with updating the dollar amounts.

Mr. Curtis recommended the following amounts: 0-60 linear foot=\$60,000; 60-120 linear foot=\$120,000; 120 linear foot and above=\$250,000, noting that the cost of construction had increased significantly from 2019 when the program was first adopted. He said he would provide examples of each of the frontages and the associated dollar amounts.

Mr. Curtis stated that the current MCRA budget for property improvement grants was \$1.2 million.

Discussion ensued about the need for plazas to be maintained according to the original plans. It was mentioned that many of the plaza owners lived out of town, and the property owners that were local showed more pride in their properties. Mr. Arserio asked that the grant programs contained proper language that the business owner had an obligation to maintain code compliance, and Mr. Curtis said the documents included language about expiring liens. David Tolces, Board Attorney, said the security agreement also specified the obligations that required compliance.

Ms. Schwartz commented that there were several shopping centers looking to sell and it might be a good time to renovate which might incentivize neighboring plazas to make improvements.

Mr. Curtis summarized his direction which was that he would come back with recommended tier structures based on linear footage along with recommended grant amounts and images for each, as well as an incentive program to attract new businesses.

Commercial Property Landscape Improvement Grant Discussion

Mr. Curtis said he could take the direction the Board provided for the façade program and apply it all three programs. He commented on the value of landscaping and that he would like to increase the amount from \$10,000. Mr. Arserio agreed that landscaping provided instant curb appeal.

There was a short discussion about having the improvements as part of the same grant as opposed to businesses receiving two or three separate grants. Chair Ruzzano said a program for new businesses could include all three into one program. Mr. Arserio commented about the need to also have a grant for older businesses in need of

improvements. Several Board members suggested putting out all three grants programs and gauging the response. Mr. Curtis said the MCRA had no obligation to award the full amounts or multiple grants to the same business. Board Attorney Tolces said there was language in the grant documents that indicated that final determination for all aspects of the grant program were at the MCRA Board's sole discretion.

Chair Ruzzano asked to have the plans reviewed for a self-storage unit on U.S. 441 that did not have any landscaping to see if they were in violation of the Code and to speak to them about the landscape program.

Mr. Curtis said he would research and come back to them with a recommendation on the grant amount. Mr. Arserio suggested it be doubled.

Commercial Demolition Incentive Grant Discussion

Discussion ensued about the rationale behind offering a demolition grant. Vice Chair Caggiano commented that the previous Executive Director, Jeff Oris, said the idea was to offer an added incentive to bring in new business by helping demolish the old business instead of trying to make something fit. Ms. Schwartz commented about the office building that Wawa took down at its expense when it decided to locate to Margate. Mr. Curtis explained that it was one of several tools that the MCRA had and could be used to attract businesses under the right circumstances.

Chair Ruzzano said he wanted to incentivize businesses to come to Margate and he would rather it be bundled into one incentive grant. He said he was not in favor of a demolition grant. He polled the Board to find out if they wanted to keep the Commercial Demolition Incentive grant:

POLL TAKEN: Ms. Simone, No; Mr. Arserio, No; Ms. Schwartz, No; Mr. Caggiano, No; Mr. Ruzzano, No.

Mr. Arserio said he would want it bundled in a new business incentive grant, but not as a separate grant. Chair Ruzzano said he would like to see it replaced with an incentive program to attract businesses to come to Margate. He commented about a previous grant program that reimbursed five percent of building costs up to a capped amount, required the business stay for five years, etc. Mr. Curtis said he would research it.

4C. DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION: ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1303 NORTH STATE ROAD 7

David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title.

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, explained that the MCRA entered into a Purchase Agreement on March 10, 2021 for the purchase of property at 1303 North State Road in the amount of \$1.66 million. He said it was currently in the due diligence period and a few limitations had been uncovered, as follows:

- Phase I Environmental report had triggered the necessity for a Phase II Environmental report to be done because the property to the south had been home to a former gas station and while remediation had been done, there was a potential it could be reopened. The environmentalist suggested having a Phase II done. This would require an extension of the due diligence period which was set to expire on April 15th.
- Inspection of the property revealed needed improvements costing about \$100,000 to bring it up to Code, i.e., roof was 20 years old, electrical panels needed to be upgraded, air conditioners needed to be upgraded and/or replaced, and interior renovations.
- A pawn shop occupied three spaces on the first floor and had a lease to occupy it until 2029.

Attorney Tolces explained that the lease commenced in 2014 with the right for three, five-year renewals. He said they renewed in 2019 until 2024 and have the right to renew for another five years thereafter, and there was no out-clause.

Mr. Arserio asked what the annual gross revenue was based on the leases. Mr. Curtis said he did not have the total leasable space at hand but the tenants were currently paying about \$12 per square foot. He commented that the MCRA's mission was to eliminate slum and blight and it would be a difficult decision to buy a property with a pawn shop with a lease that superseded the MCRA. He suggested the possibility of relocating them or negotiating additional terms with the seller that required them to negotiate something with the tenant.

Discussion ensued about the terms of the sale. Mr. Curtis explained that when the price was negotiated, he was not aware of the full lease terms of the tenants which is what the due diligence period was for. Attorney Tolces said the

MCRA did not have the right to see the lease documents or to access the property to do any inspections until a signed contract was in place. He said the contract could be terminated. Mr. Curtis said the building was 46 years old. Mr. Arserio commented that it was worth the money spent thus far for appraisals and inspections. Ms. Schwartz agreed it was an attractive piece of property for the MCRA to purchase but she could not in good conscience keep a lease for an unwanted business in a building that would likely be demolished. She suggested the seller try to work out another arrangement with their tenant.

Attorney Tolces asked whether the MCRA would want to spend money to do a Phase II Environmental without knowing the status of the tenant. Mr. Curtis said it would cost \$3,500-\$5,000.

Mr. Curtis suggested telling the seller that the MCRA could not purchase the property unless it were tenant-free and, if they were amenable to that and could provide something in writing, the MCRA would move forward with a Phase II.

Attorney Tolces said an extension of the due diligence period was being negotiated for an additional 45 days noting that the Phase II report would take several weeks to complete.

There was a short discussion about the profitability of the building. Mr. Curtis said the owners were getting \$12 per square foot and there was 8,900 square foot of leasable space which amounted to \$107,000 annually. He said there were about six tenants in the building that were on month-to-month leases and the overall cost of maintaining the building would be included in the final report along with a recommendation.

James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, said that in addition to the three limitations previously mentioned, if the seller and MCRA reached an agreement, the MCRA would still have expenses of about \$100,000 in order to bring the property up to the MCRA's standards. In addition, he explained that the MCRA would need to determine the fair market rent should it decide to extend leases to the existing tenants and to rent the six vacant spaces. He explained the process of negotiation after negotiation process after the due diligence period. There was a short discussion about the cap rate which Mr. Nardi said would be about 2 to 3 percent on the building compared to the average rate of 7-10 percent.

Mr. Nardi said he reviewed the lease and it was a unilateral agreement by the tenant to extend the lease in five year increments and the rent amount was set.

Chair Ruzzano gave Cale the direction to determine whether the status of the long term lease was negotiable, and if was not, the MCRA would not move forward with the purchase.

4D. DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION: CONSIDERATION OF RENT REDUCTION FOR PETE'S BARBERSHOP LOCATED AT 5829 MARGATE BOULEVARD IN ACE PLAZA

Chair Ruzzano read the item title. He said he spoke to Steve Strouse, owner, last week who asked him if the MCRA would consider reducing his rent with the renewal of his lease. He said Mr. Strouse paid \$18.09 per square foot, the highest rate in the plaza. He commented that the business had been there for 60 years and Mr. Strouse had been a good tenant through the good times and the bad, always paid his rent on time, and would appreciate anything that could be done. He commented that the businesses were not all the same and they should be treated on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Schwartz commented that Mr. Strouse's lease had expired and she questioned why the MCRA operated with expired leases. James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, explained that tenants' leases were allowed to expire until the MCRA completed discussions on the potential implementation of Common Area Maintenance charges. Ms. Schwartz commented that Mr. Strouse's rent had been reduced in the past year when the MCRA granted three months' free rent due to the pandemic. She said other tenants might also come forward.

Mr. Nardi commented that 12 out of 26 leases were expired and those leases were in the process of being renewed based on recent direction from the Board; however, each of the tenants had asked for something, i.e., rent reduction, or assistance with improvements. He said Mr. Strouse had been a fantastic tenant. He said Pete's Barber Shop's rent had been reduced in 2008 due to the impending future redevelopment from \$894 to \$752 and it had not changed since then. He said the barbershop in the Chevy Chase Plaza currently paid \$17.67 per square foot. He explained that the MCRA assisted new tenants in making capital improvements which dropped their lease rate down when compared to other tenants. He mentioned that the MCRA maintained an ADA (Americans with Disabilities) bathroom that was used by several tenants.

David Tolces, Board Attorney, commented that each tenant's relationship with the MCRA was different based on various factors.

Discussion ensued about rent concessions given to the tenants. Mr. Nardi stated that eight of the current 26 tenants were original tenants. He said it had been necessary over time to provide incentives in order to fill the building and keep the tenants as the lease terms being offered were for three years with a 12-month termination clause.

Ms. Schwartz referenced Mr. Nardi's earlier comment about the requests coming from the tenants whose leases were being renewed based on recent Board direction, and she asked if the leases had been signed already. Mr. Nardi said they were not signed yet, but all tenants had been given notice of the terms being offered for the next three years and all but one tenant were agreeable to the new lease. He said 15-18 of the tenants had asked for some type of rent relief.

Vice Chair Caggiano said he would not vote for a single rent decrease being that their rent had not increased for 12 years, in addition to the additional three years being offered. He mentioned the plaza improvements that had been made by the MCRA including signage.

Chair Ruzzano commented that it was the right time to discuss the tenant requests on a case-by-case basis as the new lease contracts were being negotiated. As a point of comparison, he asked whether the two barbershops had bathrooms. Mr. Nardi said Pete's Barbershop was not ADA compliant, while Barbershop USA had an ADA compliant bathroom.

Chair Ruzzano asked Attorney Tolces whether the MCRA could have five-year leases with its tenants designed like the lease at 1303 N. State Road 7 property. Attorney Tolces said it would be a Board decision but he would not recommend giving the tenant the right to renew without the landlord having the right to deny the renewal. He said a provision might be able to be put in the lease that the lease would be subject to termination upon 90 days' notice in the event the property owner decided to sell.

Steve Strouse, Pete's Barber Shop, commented that he understood all the points that had been made but he did not think it hurt to ask because his rate was more than \$3.00 higher than the other tenants. He said he asked because it was his understanding that in the future, the leases might provide for annual rent increases. He said had owned the shop for 12 years and worked there for 25 years.

Chair Ruzzano passed the gavel to Vice Chair Caggiano and made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Arserio:

MOTION: TO REDUCE THE RENT TO \$15.00 SQUARE FOOT

Discussion ensued about the rent rate and Ms. Schwartz asked the rate that the latest tenant paid and how it was determined. Mr. Nardi said there were two: Alex's Sausage at \$14.70 square foot; and Sneaker's Connect at \$14.77 square foot. He explained that the establishment of a fair market rent had been a challenge from day one based on the lease the MCRA offered due to the 12-month termination clause and the needed improvements. It was difficult to bring in businesses that had an investment to make such as a restaurant. He said the MCRA would be able to get \$20.00 or more per square foot if the MCRA offered longer term leases. It was mentioned that Ace Hardware had a longer lease but it still had the one-year termination clause, as did Thrift City and Beautyland.

Ms. Schwartz commented that prior to the MCRA owning the plazas, she recalled "first right of approval" whereby in the event of development, the tenants had the first right to refuse or be given a space in the new development. Mr. Nardi said the MCRA's leases never had a "right of first refusal" clause but the MCRA would like to ensure that tenants in good standing had opportunities with the new development.

Ms. Schwartz told Mr. Nardi that she assumed that the current code would be discussed with each tenant before their leases were signed and issues were allowed to remain as they were.

Chair Ruzzano commented that the rent for new tenants was \$14.70 and suggested that Mr. Strouse be treated as a new tenant since it was a new contract versus a reduction in an existing contract.

Discussion ensued about the last new tenants. Mr. Nardi said both had significant expenditures and he explained that Alex's Sausage spent 3-4 months in permitting and spent about \$15,000 which included the addition of a triple sink, drainage, grease trap, etc. He said a new tenant was moving into the space and would be putting in flooring. Chair

Ruzzano commented that Mr. Strouse had also put in new flooring and he asked the amount of rent the new tenant would be charged. Mr. Nardi said the new tenant would pay the same rent of \$14.70 and he would receive three months free rent to make some improvements including new flooring.

Chair Ruzzano commented that Mr. Strouse had no lease and if he were to leave and come back with a new lease and ask for an incentive, he would likely receive it. He asked that Mr. Strouse be considered as a new tenant.

Mr. Nardi explained that new tenants always had more of an investment than what the MCRA provided as incentives. Discussion ensued about the MCRA's role in paying for tenant improvements. Ms. Schwartz commented that it was difficult to deny Mr. Strouse's request after hearing that the new tenant moving into the space vacated by Alex's Sausage would receive MCRA incentives to replace the flooring that Alex's Sausage had received incentives to replace recently. Mr. Strouse said he had put in a new floor and two air conditioners and he did not receive anything from the MCRA.

Chair Ruzzano commented that new tenants moving in were paying lower rates than Mr. Strouse and receiving incentives.

Mr. Strouse asked whether language could be put in his lease so that his rent rate would not be increased when increases were implemented for the other tenants. Mr. Nardi responded that his lease renewal had no rent increases for the next three years to which Mr. Strouse responded that neither did the other tenants.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, No; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 4-1.

Ms. Schwartz commented that this request had extraordinary circumstances and she would not agree to the "what you do for one, you do for all" mantra.

Vice Chair Caggiano said his point of view would be the same for any tenant. Ms. Schwartz commented that the rent reduction was equivalent to the cost of a new floor.

A SHORT RECESS WAS TAKEN; MEETING RECONVENED AT 7:39 PM

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, welcomed Arlene Walcott, Project Specialist, to the MCRA team, and he mentioned the various projects she had already started to work on. He provided updates on the following capital projects:

Sports Complex Covered Field – He said the project had been moving along very well and substantial completion was anticipated for early June. Staff was working closely with Florida Power & Light on installation of the electric. He notified the Board that a design change from an overhead transformer to a ground-based transformer required a budget transfer of \$16,000 from the Contingency account.

5A. TENANT UPDATES

Ms. Schwartz asked which two spaces were not rented in Ace Plaza. James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, said there was 3,200 square foot at 5825 Margate Boulevard and 3,000 square foot at 5901 Margate Boulevard.

Vice Chair Caggiano asked Cale Curtis about the possibility of putting up a wall on Atlantic Boulevard on the property that was west of 80th Terrace and east of 77th Avenue. Cale Curtis, Executive Director, said it was being discussed as part of the Atlantic Boulevard streetscape improvements. Ms. Schwartz mentioned that the City had obtained permission from the homeowners on the north side of the street.

6. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Simone: No additional comments.

Mr. Arserio: No additional comments.

Ms. Schwartz: Asked if there were plans in the near future for the concert series. Cale Curtis, Executive Director, said funds had been budgeted for summer and fall events and the plan was to bring back some of the concerts as the various programs were phased back in.

Mr. Caggiano: Asked about plans for the 4th of July. Mr. Curtis said a normal, pre-COVID July 4th event was being planned.

Chair Ruzzano: Said he would like to do a big grand opening for the Covered Sports Field, including a big concert. Mr. Curtis said it would not have a sound system but there would be connections and power in place for bands to use. Mr. Ruzzano said he thought July 4th would be considered the independence day from COVID and would be a big push to open things up. He said there was a new order coming out regarding outside distancing. Ms. Schwartz said Mayor Geller had a really good, phased plan for opening things up.

He asked about the possibility of selling property and he suggested putting up a "For Sale" sign on the recently remediated property to see what interest the MCRA would receive.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tommy Ruzzano, Chair

Transcribed by Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator

