

Meeting Notes
2017/2018 Fair Housing Working Group
November 15, 2017

ATTENDEES: **Commissioner Evonne Klein**, Co-Chairperson of the Fair Housing Working Group and Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Housing
Rep. Roland Lemar, Co-Chairperson of the Fair Housing Working Group
Rep. Jason Rojas
Erin Kemple, Connecticut Fair Housing Center
Bill Ethier, Homebuilders and Remodelers Association of Connecticut
Betsy Crum, Women's Institute for Housing and Economic Development
Kelly Sinko, Office of Policy and Management
Erin Boggs, Open Communities Alliance
Rafie Podolsky, Legal Assistance Resource Center of Connecticut
Jay Pottenger, Yale Law School
Sean Ghio, Partnership for Strong Communities
Jen Putetti, Office of Policy and Management
Lucia Goicoechea-Hernández, Commission on Equity and Opportunity

Commissioner Evonne Klein opened the meeting at 10:06am. She welcomed the present members of the working group, provided introductory remarks, and asked each member in attendance to go around the room and introduce themselves for the record.

The members of the Fair Housing Working Group introduced themselves.

Commissioner Evonne Klein explained that the purpose of this meeting to discuss potential legislative topics based on input from members in the last meeting.

Commissioner Evonne Klein addressed topics in order of the agenda.

ZONING

Commissioner Evonne Klein referenced the first item, concerning C.G.S. 8-2 and opened the floor for discussion.

Kelly Sinko discussed the existing language of 8-2 and referenced areas of the statute where it says to "encourage" development and suggested that the working group could put forth a proposal to change the language to say like "shall allow" or "require" multifamily development. She mentioned that the adjustments in the language could also be tied to funding. This could be a potential enforcement mechanism.

Betsy Crum thought that much of the language in 8-2 is already adequate to achieve the intent of the statute. However, she believes the issue is mostly centered on the ability for towns to just "opt-out" of complying with the statute with no recourse. A recommendation could be that a mechanism be implemented to enforce noncompliance with the statute.

Commissioner Klein agreed that the statute should contain more “teeth,” potentially tied to state funding if municipalities did not allow for multifamily development. She echoed that there are other good points in 8-2 that should be addressed too.

Sean Ghio mentioned that in 8-30g, relative to the amendments in 2017 where it states the need for an affordable housing plan, he thought that area could be strengthened. He suggested that if the section of the statute requiring affordable housing places could also require certification of some kind by a state entity. Among the elements of certification could be assurances of zoning laws that allow for the development of multifamily housing.

Jay Pottenger echoed those remarks and suggested that C.G.S. 8-2 could also have “teeth” if it required certification by a state entity such as DOH. He noted that C.G.S. 8-2 already requires municipalities to encourage multifamily housing and take into account regional housing needs. He continued that, the current statute doesn’t spell out who is responsible for ensuring that the towns comply with these requirements.

Erin Boggs thought that one way would be to explicitly name an agency that has oversight over these suggested requirements. She also said that towns need guidance on a regional need for housing. She thought that this tied into the need for data and also alluded to fair share housing as a possible parallel with this conversation.

Jen Putetti talked about opening up 8-2 and looking at what we have now. She thought that there are a lot of “code words” that towns use to cover up their requirement to build multifamily housing in the existing statute. She thought the working group could streamline language like “Character of the district” to try to send a strong message to the towns and require more inclusive language.

Bill Ethier said that we shouldn’t just tweak 8-2, it should be totally re-written. While it has been amended countless times over the years, he said it doesn’t need “teeth” necessary, but he thought the statute needs overall clarity, equating it to a run-on sentence. He offered the example of brand new P&Z Commission, with no experience, and explained how this statute could be overwhelming. Going off that though he said that it makes it hard to understand because there’s no clarity on the state’s overall policy regarding zoning. He also said that all of Connecticut’s land use needs to be looked at, such as C.G.S. 8-25 and C.G.S. 8-23. It all needs to be considered together because anyone of those could stop housing. He wants to craft a proposal that could survive the legislative process.

Commissioner Klein referenced that she likes to look at the statute from the perspective of what’s not already in here. She thought that 8-2 could serve as a baseline, and set a tone—then to look at the Plan of Conservation and Development. She said that this doesn’t force us to look at everything all at once, but that it could prompt us to explore other areas too.

Rafie Podolsky cautioned the working group not to try and make too many changes to 8-2. He thought that we could lose some of the most essential perspectives. Particularly where it says that zoning is state law, not local law. He echoed the sentiment that the affordable housing plan could use an enforcement mechanism and that it also doesn’t have a compliance date. A small modification could even be to include a date by which the town must produce the plan, since it’s already a mandatory requirement on municipalities. He said that it also seems that DOH should be able to do something else around that beyond just being a repository for the plan. He also thought that there could perhaps be an equivalent provision for a private right of action in 8-2. If there was some clarity in 8-2, it could be easier for entities to take out a private right of action, or something similar.

Erin Boggs mentioned that one of the issues with 8-2 is that it places fair housing concerns in different areas. She thought that one thing to do would be to pull out the private right of action as a separate element. Perhaps just attaching a private right of action to the fair housing requirement.

Kelly Sinko cautioned the group, relative to the budget and the fiscal impact that any of these proposals may have. Anything that requires extra staff at DOH would not likely move forward.

Commissioner Klein referenced a meeting she had with Rep. Lemar and stated that as we talk through these issues we need to have robust conversations on everything (the big picture)—but that we need to take into account the fiscal impact of all of these proposals too.

Lucia Goicoechea-Hernández agreed that we need “teeth” in some capacity in 8-2. But she recommended that we convene a meeting with CCM and inform them about the economic benefits associated affordable housing—especially has affordable housing helps to lower costs in other areas by helping to end homelessness. She said that it’s more advantageous to have affordable housing on the tax roll.

Commissioner Klein said that DOH has tried to get on the agenda of CCM meetings in the past but there has been no response.

Erin Kemple mentioned that if there is no provision for affordable housing, there should be a way of telling municipalities what they should do. While lawsuits can be effective, they take a long time. She thought that there may be an immediate impact by perhaps removing a municipalities zoning authority. She also thought that there should some inclusionary zoning action—statewide.

Bill Ethier suggested that a start could be that we should break it down by paragraph and subject matter to make it read much better so it’s easier to understand. Then as a group, go back to tweak the language. Do this in a way that makes it easier to proceed.

Commissioner Klein agreed that 8-2 is currently just a run-on sentence.

AGREEMENT TO DRAFT: Lucia Hernandez, Erin Boggs, Kelly Sinko, Rafie Podolsky, Bill Ethier, and Dan Arsenault will work together language changes with 8-2 and OLR staff.

Commissioner Klein moved to next agenda item on TOD zoning.

Jen Putetti talked about how this change could provide an avenue for municipalities and developers to look at zoning on regional level. This could help to mitigate some arguments in towns.

Sean Ghio asked if this would pre-empt local zoning authority.

Jen Putetti said that this idea came from previous legislative proposals. Smaller zones around TOD areas would have authority at the COG or other means to control zoning.

Sean Ghio said that he will leave the political impact on this to others. But he referenced a previous session around a TOD development area.

Rep. Roland Lemar said that this is referenced to a 2016 proposal by the Governor. He said it will be controversial but also said that since the state is making billions of dollars of investments—it's a conversation that needs to happen. He said towns may oppose, but they may not see the vision for Connecticut the same as the state does. It's similar to models in other states.

Bill Ethier said that he agrees with Roland and said that the controversy he remembers was about eminent domain. And said that if we moved it to a regional level, it has to preempt the same power at the local level. There can't be another level of bureaucracy.

Rep. Jason Rojas also said there are development opportunities taking place along the existing rail lines. The hope is that we will have examples to help dissuade fears of what regional decision making may do to a community.

Jay Pottenger referenced that the state preempts most of the coastal zoning authority, and thought that this legislation could also say that TOD is another important resource, so the state needs to manage it.

Erin Boggs mentioned that the history of public transit is very racialized and it's not in higher opportunity areas. The reality of the COGs is that they're suburban dominated and there isn't a proportional vote for the cities. She said she was wondering how this impacts that and why the COGs would be best for this, versus the state level to control it.

Jen Putetti mentioned that the COGS are a great reference point because they're already looking at things from a regional perspective. We would still allow local zoning, but just remove this by one step for certain projects.

Rep. Roland Lemar said that both co-chairs have local leadership experience and know how the local input will be received for a proposal like this. Especially if the proposals come from suburban dominated councils when they're planning for cities, etc. But he said we need to look at these multi-billion assets and plan more constructively.

Commissioner Evonne Klein did point out that there is development going on along the Fairfield County metro-north line. She said we're missing an opportunity there.

Betsy Crum said that this is a great idea. She referenced a regional fair share approach in the 80's. But she thought that if it's well constructed it could drive real development and not just local fighting the way they already do on local boards. She also said that she really supports this around affordable housing developments because if it's successful we will not miss opportunities for market-rate development too, but we could miss affordable housing. She also thought that we could just make a simple change in 8-2 and if it does not happen then their zoning authority is lost—which it could then be bounced to the council of governments.

Erin Kemple mentioned how the state has given the towns the power to do certain things and that if they don't do it right—then they do not get to do it anymore. It's the state's authority, so if they say they cannot do it anymore if they do not comply with certain standards, then it should be taken away.

Sean Ghio, relative to the state's investments in transit, said that these investments have the ability to create a lot of wealth in a given area. But since it's a state money, it should not rest on the COGs to be able to control the zoning. He thought that, perhaps there's a way to structure it so that it's a state's power since its state's

funding. Particularly around metro north, and hopefully on the Hartford line, he doesn't believe we'll see equitable affordable housing developments along these transit routes unless they're 8-30g.

Rep Roland Lemar said that if we know we had the support of advocates and other legislators then this could be a political reality.

Rafie Podolsky thought that the agenda item is worded, the COG piece distracted the group. He agreed that it should be a higher authority that controls the zoning, but not necessarily a regional board. Perhaps this bullet isn't about the COG's but rather how the whole TOD product, with affordable housing, could be done by virtue as a higher board's authority—just not necessarily the COGs. Finding something that's a political reality.

Bill Ethier agreed with all the concerns relative to landing at the COG level. He thought the group should look at that proposal from previous years—and maybe take out the controversial pieces. Perhaps the CT Citing Council could be an avenue if we expand their authority relative to this. It will likely still be controversial. But these proposals impact the whole state, even if they're in just a certain region.

Jay Pottenger thought this may sound like spot zoning. And he agrees that this goes beyond the local area—perhaps this authority could rest with the DOH and DOT Commissioner.

Commissioner Klein asked if there is consensus to look over this proposal and see if there are other areas we can explore for drafting?

AGREEMENT TO DRAFT: Jen Putetti, Sean Ghio, and Rep. Roland Lemar.

Commissioner Klein then referenced the “bad actor” 8-30g legislation. If an applicant came in before P&Z and was denied without having affordable housing, then they could not come back into P&Z for at least a year if that proposal all of a sudden decided to include affordable units. That's the intent.

Kelly Sinko said that she deferred to the group if this a problem that should be addressed?

Erin Boggs said that this current way of doing business is awesome since we get more affordable housing. The other response that we need to question how often this happens. She knew that waiting may not be a realistic options for developers.

Commissioner Klein thought that this would affect developers in the “pocket book” so it would incentivize them to come in with more realistic proposals from the get go. The feeling is that when developers do this it's what gives affordable housing and 8-30g a bad name.

Rafie Podolsky said that for a number of reasons this is not a good idea. Relative to last year's bill, it was said that 8-30g would not be re-opened. He also thinks it's just a bad idea on the merits. This causes a bad image for affordable housing because the “threat” becomes developing affordable housing and demonizes its image.

Bill Ethier agreed that we do not want to open up 8-30g since that what we did last year it was supposed to stop amending this bill for several years. Around 5 years. I agree it's bad on its merits and we should not proceed with this. He also thought that developers' bluff should be called by local P&Z.

Rep. Roland Lemar agreed it's not a uniform problem, but mentioned that there are a small amount of towns where developers "threaten" 8-30g. It makes a bad reputation for the statute and we're asking local P&Z officials to call their bluff, but it's actually a huge political ask. So this was on there as a way to try and get ahead of that issue—he acknowledged that this is likely not to go forward out of this group—but he thinks it's a good reason to acknowledge it does exist in some places.

Sean Ghio said that he agrees with what everyone said on this issue. The Partnership for Strong Communities has discussed this issue—but consensus has not arrived. He said it's about the level of local planning and experience at the local level.

Rep. Jason Rojas appreciates that was some agreement on not touching 8-30g for a few years, but also said that it is not likely to hold forever—or after the next election. He said that for everyone who cares about the issue we need to remain proactive.

Bill Ethier mentioned that there are true reasons to reject 8-30g applications so there is not enough political courage that is necessary—if local boards actually understand the statute.

Jen Putetti mentioned that this proposal at least speaks to the underlying problem that 8-30g proposals can be used by "bad actors" and there is some abuse.

Commissioner Klein acknowledged that there is not support to move forward with this proposal but agreed that we need to educate local boards in a more effective way.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

Commissioner Klein then moved to mandating inclusionary zoning in some form.

Rafie Podolsky said that it was a good idea to mandate inclusionary zoning at least in some form. He said that there could be an inherent danger that it shuts down development but the concept is supported. So he thought that if DOH wants to bring it back—this is the right avenue to vet the proposal.

Commissioner Klein said we're forming sub groups to work on IZ and invited members to volunteer to be on the board.

Rep. Roland Lemar said that we have time before session starts to examine this proposal in more detail.

Bill Ethier strongly disagreed with the inclusionary zoning proposal. He said that it raises the cost on market rate housing to support affordable housing. He said that it's an intrusion on the market, but what we need is proposals that bring down the cost of housing at all levels. From last year's legislation he would not favor it, but will be open-minded.

Rep. Jason Rojas thought that there could be a trade off on some of the 40 proposals that HBRA put forward.

Betsy Crum said that the courts have said there must be some kind of a tradeoff about giving density bonuses or something else along those lines for inclusionary zoning proposals to hold. Opponents have said that this will stop the production of housing but she also said that the same thing happens when people want to build luxury housing. They ask for waivers. She volunteered to join the drafting. She said that she completely

supports the inclusionary zoning as well as a potential fee that could be imposed to build affordable housing. She does not agree that is a bad proposal and said that in a strong market it has zero effect on production.

Erin Boggs said that she was very excited that this was put forth. She thought that there were some things that should be rolled in like whether the use of inclusionary zoning can be something that's triggered by the developer if they decide it's worth it. To help fast track the process. They could automatically use it. We could also attach this to our discussion on 8-2 for some towns that are not doing what they're supposed to do; especially thinking about higher opportunity towns. We also shouldn't apply to places that have a lot of affordable housing or look at a different trigger.

Commissioner Klein mentioned how we initially put forth a very bold proposal. That was to start the conversation. As we talked to stakeholders, we amended based on certain ideas. Developers in Fairfield County she spoke with mentioned that some opposed the concept but they were the same developers who also used 8-30g as a tactic in the past—showing that they can support the affordable units. If we can present it as a zoning tool it could be helpful to municipalities.

Sean Ghio said that he's done some research and can't find a statewide inclusionary zoning tool anywhere else. He cautioned that Connecticut has several different markets. HE also said that he's intrigued about tying it into 8-2.

Bill Ethier said that inclusionary zoning proposals do work in hot housing markets—but for many years in Connecticut it is getting worse and we have declining building permits. He also said he may support the idea that if it was triggered by the developer, they he may be able to work with it.

AGREEMENT TO DRAFT: Rafie Podolsky, Betsy Crum, Erin Boggs, Erin Kemple, Commissioner Evonne Klein, Dan Arsenault

Commissioner Klein moved to the concept of expanding housing authority jurisdiction.

Erin Boggs mentioned that housing authorities already have this power if they enter into an agreement with a border town—they develop or share section 8 subsidies for use in those areas in the first year.

Betsy Crum said that she isn't as familiar with this.

Erin Boggs mentioned that the 30 mile jurisdiction would automatically apply to high opportunity areas and housing authority vouchers and developments could automatically be used in these towns if they classify as higher opportunity areas.

Rafie Podolsky said that it's worth further discussion. There appears to be 2 proposals. One is that historically housing authority jurisdiction is limited to the town they're in. So they can't build public housing in the next town over. That's been a problem because some HA have wanted to do that. He said they're also talking about a federal section 8 rule that says for the first year the voucher can only be used in their own jurisdiction. So if the jurisdiction is expanded by 30 miles to high opportunity areas, we could write something in statute that says that housing authorities cannot impose this restriction?

Betsy Crum advocated that we look beyond just high opportunity areas and look at other areas too to allow for more broadly defined choice.

Rep. Roland Lemar asked that we get info from small and large housing authorities—and that we should engage with CONN-NAHRO.

AGREEMENT TO DRAFT: Rafie Podolsky and Erin Boggs, with Michael Santoro from DOH.

SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Commissioner Klein moved to defining the role of RAP in regional desegregation.

Rafie Podolsky said we need to encourage ways to create more broader dissemination of the RAP program, which would require us to take a closer look—from a data perspective—about where RAP’s are being used now and in certain sub-parts. Such as homelessness, families, etc. He said a little bit of data on this could be helpful. The RAP Education proposal from 20 years ago was to attach the vouchers to people in school choice programs because it promotes regional mobility.

Commissioner Klein said that given this feedback we should not put this in the form of legislation but to go back to DOH and see if we can answer some of these questions relative to the data needed. She also cautioned that we do not have extra RAPs. So if we decide to use RAPs in a certain way it may take some RAPs away from people who may become homeless, etc. Perhaps DOH can help to answer these questions without legislation.

Erin Boggs said that perhaps her, Rafie, and Michael Santoro could help to gather data relative to this?

Commissioner Klein mentioned that it’s Steve Dilella who works with this. But cautioned against any legislation in this matter.

Erin Boggs said that RAP is exceptionally segregated. She said that a large percentage of RAPs are only being used in very low, low, and moderate opportunity areas. She also said that OCA is working on a pilot program to help encourage mobility counseling.

Jen Putetti asked where the term “high opportunity” terms come from.

Erin Boggs said it’s defined on DOH website and from data OCA, Fair Housing, and the State gathered.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Commissioner Klein moved to data collection.

Erin Boggs explained the need for more data is essential to understanding regional and fair share needs of affordable housing in Connecticut.

Kelly Sinko offered to organize a meeting for Erin Boggs and OPM on the Open Data portal.

Lucia Goicoechea-Hernández reminded the group that the universities in our state could be a great resource to help gather this information.

Jay Pottenger mentioned that the colleges and universities would be glad to participate in this. Including trying to gather this information in how it is gathered and submitted to so the data is more usable.

Commissioner Klein still mentioned that we need staff to help facilitate the data collection with university students.

Rep. Roland Lemar said that it's fair because any resources allocated out of DOH's budget would come at the expense of unit production. He said he likes the conversation about talking with Tyler at OPM about data collection.

Betsy Crum mentioned that data is important but also said that the "five guys" at a local board were never swayed by data. But she said when it comes to actually getting housing done in communities it has a limited impact. She would not support taking money from deals and putting it into data.

Sean Ghio referenced Amanda Kennedy and how the SECOG has completed a housing needs assessment for their region. She said that the American Planners Association could also be a good resource.

Commissioner Klein cautioned that the state does not have extra resources to gather data.

Bill Ethier echoed Betsy Crum's statement about how data doesn't change the "five guys" to think differently.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

Bill Ethier also referenced his housing affordability impact analysis and differentiated how it is different than the proposal on general data collection.

Sean Ghio mentioned that local regulations are a major impediment to local development.

Erin Boggs did say that we could also add a fair housing impact analysis onto this proposal.

Commissioner Klein asked for volunteers about drafting this proposal.

Rep. Roland Lemar referenced a Massachusetts bill that passed the senate and was related to an impact analysis like this. He also said that this an important conversation to have since 30% of soft costs are arbitrarily placed on developers.

AGREEMENT TO DRAFT: Bill Ethier, Sean Ghio, and Betsy Crum

LEGAL

Commissioner Klein turned to the private right of action section and asked if Erin Boggs would like to discuss it.

Erin Boggs mentioned that CHFA and DOH have a duty to affirmatively further fair housing and that there is no way to enforce this mandate. The suggestion is that we make it meaningful in the same way civil rights laws are meaningful by allowing a private right of action if these agencies are not affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Jay Pottenger said that the way Connecticut has gone about dealing with these issues is through 8-30g, using developers to enforce those rights. He said that a private right of action would be analogous to that process.

Jen Putetti said that she is concerned about the fiscal impact of frivolous lawsuits and how it could take away resources from the Department. She said that there is a lack of connection to the real problem here because the barriers to fair housing are a local issue so she is not sure how allowing an individual to sue the state would promote it.

Erin Kemple said that this would allow an individual to say that “a group home should be in this neighborhood because it’s best for my child” and it would allow an individual to take action against the state who may have been preventing certain developments like this in certain neighborhoods. She said that this is a tiny piece to promote some equity.

Rep. Roland Lemar mentioned that he and the Commissioner are on separate sides when it comes to this issue. She said that it is important and he did highlight a specific sections that bring him pause and that’s when certain developers say they want this private right of action so they could sue the state if they were not funded. He said he likes this concept but he also wants the state to continue to be protected if we don’t have a Governor and a Commissioner that may not support fair housing like the current administration.

Erin Boggs mentioned that last year this was crafted to mirror federal law. She said this only becomes a concern for a state that is not affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Commissioner Klein said that she’s not convinced that there would not be frivolous lawsuits with this proposal. She also said that we hear the appeals for RAP vouchers within our Department so she thought there could be a way that impacts our ability to hold hearings. Does this make the state risk averse when it comes to awarding funding? Financially, she said that if someone sued us then we would not be prepared to have the financial resources to pay out for the lawsuit.

Erin Kemple said that it sounds like supporting this legislation would not be politically possible for DOH. She asked it would it be possible to just not oppose it?

Commissioner Klein said that as drafted beforehand, we would not sit silent. But we are willing to look at any proposal in the future.

Erin Kemple said the reason she asks the question is that if it’s something that DOH cannot support, it should be drafted outside this committee.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

Commissioner Klein turned to streamlining and amending the process for permitting wastewater systems.

Bill Ethier mentioned that this is another regulation that adds to the cost of housing.

Commissioner Klein asked if we'd like to draft this.

Rep. Lemar mentioned that he will have a hard time in P&D Committee to justify presenting this bill if this is a component of what comes out of the working group. It likely shouldn't start in P&D.

Rafie Podolsky asked that if such a proposal has been introduced beforehand.

Bill Ethier mentioned that this type of proposal was not brought to the finish line before.

Rafie Podolsky thought that this proposal could be combined with relevant stakeholders at the table, DOH, DEEP, DPH, etc. to help reduce housing costs without compromising public safety.

Commissioner Klein said that we'd be open to having these conversations.

Betsy Crum said that the biggest issue is that many communities will not put in sewers because they want to limit development. She likes the proposals as discussed.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

PLANNING

Commissioner Klein shifted the conversation to a discussion on the state Plan of Conservation and Development.

Rep. Lemar said that discussions are currently occurring on the Plan of Conservation and Development plan so we have an opportunity to talk further about this because we're legislatively required to update it and if we have ideas for changes then to please bring them forward.

Jen Putetti reminded everyone to send their comments to OPM as well if they want them to be on the record. She also wanted to flag the limits for the plan and said that it's a guiding document for state agencies. There is not official enforcement mechanism.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

TAXATION

Commissioner Klein moved to the tax on the home builder's inventory.

Rep. Lemar mentioned a proposal that was passed out of P&D unanimously but it did not pass FIN.

Bill Ethier said that this is a big one for HBRA because it adds tens of thousands of dollars because it adds more costs to development and drives up costs to the consumer.

Lucia Hernandez asked where this tax occurs.

Bill Ethier mentioned that it's a property tax that he says is unjustified because it occurs before any individual physically moves into a home after it's been built. They are taxed on it even though no one is physically occupying the space. He emphasized that since it's vacant, no one is using any local services.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

Bill Ethier said that an objective, uniform checklist would streamline unit production. There are 169 different lists that exist right now. We should have a statewide zoning code where every town has the ability to designate the type of development that can occur. That could solve many economic and housing issues.

AGREEMENT TO PASS—No Legislation to draft

Commissioner Klein note the time of the next meeting and closed at 12:42pm