



HEALTH, EDUCATIONAL, AND HOUSING FACILITY BOARD
City of Chattanooga, Tennessee
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
Virtual Electronic Zoom Meeting
for
January 27, 2021
12:02 p.m.

Present were Board Members: Hicks Armor (Chair), Gregg T. Gentry (Vice-Chair), Lloyd Longnion, Nicole Watson, Amanda Jelks (Secretary), and Dr. John A. Schaerer. Absent was Richard Johnson.

Also present were Phillip A. Noblett (City Attorney); Donna Williams and Sandra Gober (ECD); Cindy Barnett (Adams & Reese); Chase Cain and Joshua Haston (LGD Multi-Family) (The Reserve at Mountain Pass); Taylor Caleb; Helen Burns Sharp (ATM); and Mike Pare (Times Free Press).

Mr. Armor called the meeting to order, confirmed the meeting advertisement, and established that a quorum was present.

MINUTES APPROVAL FOR THE DECEMBER 16, 2020 MEETING

On motion of Ms. Jelks, seconded by Ms. Watson, the minutes of the December 16, 2020, meeting, were approved by roll call vote 6-0.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBER
DR. JOHN A. SCHAERER

Mr. Armor introduced a new distinguished board member, Dr. John A. Schaerer. Dr. Schaerer says it is an honor to be a part of such a fine group and looking forward to learning more about the total operations. Dr. Schaerer's latest development is in terms of promoting higher education among those adults that started but have not completed. He is currently working with computer science students at the university with digitizing information about economic development labor force and the importance of collaboration among institutional stakeholders.

Dr. Schaerer's background in more recent years has been at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in administrative services Dean and Department Chair. Prior founding Superintendent of Schools in Alabama, as well as a former employee of the Chattanooga public schools before its merge in the 1960's. Dr. Schaerer has a keen interest in education and particularly in connection with higher education and K-12. The housing piece is relatively new to him, and he will try to get up to speed with that. Dr. Schaerer appreciates any support or help provided in particular with the element of housing. Mr. Armor says Dr. Schaerer is a great asset

to this community and is dating himself back to the City school system. We are fortunate to have him do something like this, and he is a great addition to the Board.

There was no person present wishing to address the Board.

TEFRA HEARING

THE RESERVE AT MOUNTAIN PASS, LP (THE “APPLICANT”), A TENNESSEE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, HAS INFORMED THE ISSUER THAT THE APPLICANT DESIRES TO FINANCE THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND EQUIPPING OF AN APPROXIMATELY 240 UNIT MULTIFAMILY HOUSING FACILITY TO BE LOCATED AT OR NEAR 4905 CENTRAL AVENUE, IN CHATTANOOGA, HAMILTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE (COLLECTIVELY, THE “PROJECT”).

Mr. Noblett stated that this matter has been scheduled for a TEFRA hearing today that is required for any bond issuance to make sure it is a non-profit issue and is going back before the Board. The federal tax laws require notification to be occurring and a public hearing needs to be had at this point in time that the issuance of bonds, the location, and the nature of facilities that will be financed are appropriate to be issued by this Board. The federal government has recently changed the notice requirements date to seven (7) days as opposed to fifteen (15) days. The notice has been published in accordance with the federal tax laws. This is an opportunity for anyone from the public to have input into the discussion of the issuance of these bonds.

Ms. Barnett has provided an alternate version of the Inducement Agreement that provided more protection for this board. The only change was in Section 4 regarding the limited obligation which is no liability of the City but also wanted to include a general obligation of the Issuer and not an obligation of the Board of Directors.

Mr. Longnion asked Ms. Williams to compare this project with the other PILOTs in our portfolio to help what is being proposed and how it aligns with the rest of the portfolio of projects.

Ms. Williams stated that this body, unlike some boards and commissions, is really governed by state laws that are already in place. There are state laws and city policies. This Board is executing upon laws and regulations that have already been in place. Ms. Williams stated this Board is one of her favorites because everybody on this board understands the mission of the Board and has taken a lot of personal time to understand the ins and outs of the responsibilities and powers of this board not to exceed that and not to shy away from that.

Ms. Williams stated that the City has a number of projects which this board and City Council have allocated PILOTs which is in the capital stack and another stack is bonds (not all include bonds). By the City’s current PILOT program, at least 50% of the units in the building or complex must be affordable for folks at 80% of the AMI provided they do not spend more than 30% of that number. Ms. Williams gave an example of the numbers. If the number was \$100,000 (and it is not), you can only spend up to \$30,000 for housing. Some people will say that 30% is not affordable. That is what HUD and the banking industry says is affordable. Anyone spending in excess of 30% of their income is essentially their house burning.

Ms. Williams stated that the City has different projects that serve different AMIs, 80% for the PILOT number. Some of our projects are built for price where the rents are affordable for folks who are 30% of the AMI, some 50%, some 60%, and some go up to 80%. Many of them are a mix. We have some projects where all the units, where all the income is for folks are 60% of the AMI and below, and then we have projects that are mixed, which is nice, those are the better ones. You will have folks of different incomes and different opportunity levels who have the chance to meet and greet and become neighbors, networks intersect, which mean to greater employment and social opportunities. Ms. Williams said that this one is most similar to Chestnut Flats.

Mr. Longnion asked what percentage of this project will be 4%? Ms. Williams said that would be in financing. The Reserve at Mountain Pass is 100%, 80% AMI, or lower. Everybody that will be able to rent they will have incomes at 80% AMI or lower.

Mr. Joshua Haston (LDG Multi-Family out of Louisville, KY) runs the Nashville office. Mr. Haston stated that on this particular project, as Ms. Williams was mentioning, 100% of the units, will be at 100% AMI or lower. They are using a tool called “income averaging” that allows for certain units to be restricted to certain AMIs. Some of the units will be at 80% AMI, some will be at 60% AMI, Chestnut Flats is 100%/60%, some of the units will be lower than that. All together, the average income of the property cannot be more than 60% AMI. Rents ranging from around \$850-\$900 per month for a two-bedroom 60% AMI up to whatever the market can pay for at 80% AMI, a three-bedroom 80% AMI we could potentially charge up to probably around \$1,400, but the market in Chattanooga would not allow that. That’s way too high. The rents for an 80% AMI for a three-bedroom might be around \$1,100 in this area. The \$900-\$1,100 is about what you would see max rent wise.

Ms. Williams stated that what is provided by HUD every year is a chart provided an AMI numbers by households. HUD says in Hamilton County, the City of Chattanooga, the AMI for a household of one is \$40,700, or less, falls within the 80% AMI. If a household of one is making more than \$40,700, in Chattanooga, they are not eligible to be in what we call a PILOT unit. If you make \$42,000, you have to pay market rate rent. Many people in Chattanooga make half of that. There are provisions, type of financing, to help developers pay, it subsidizes the tenant so that he or she is not spending any more than 30% of their income, that is the most they can pay.

For many people, they driving around right now trying to find a place that they can afford, because we do not have enough subsidized housing because it is impossible to build affordable housing for someone who can only spend 30% of \$20,000 a year. When we are doing PILOTs, we are assisting, in that subsidy layering, so that folks who are anywhere at or below 80% of AMI so that they can have fit, decent, and affordable housing. This project, all of the 240 units, will be reserved for folks whose income is 80% of the AMI or below. It goes from 30% to 80% of the AMI and if you make more than that you cannot live in this development.

Mr. Gentry asked the \$40,000 give or take dollars, is that W-2 income or is it based on something else? Some people work two jobs a \$22,000 and \$20,000. Ms. Williams stated it is their total income. It is W-2 income.

Mr. Longnion did a quick bit of math from the January 22, 2020, report produced by Ms. Williams' department. One regret he has is that we do not have that on the meeting agenda today. In his dissatisfaction, he will continue. What the proposal on the table is 240 units for \$35 million, that would make \$146,000 per unit. Whereas, Chestnut Flats asked for a little bit less than that \$22 million, per unit \$110,500. There is no availability there right now for anybody. But they are charging in what Mr. Haston said one and three-bedrooms \$753-\$1,199, two-bedrooms \$1,099, 1,339 sq. ft., that's what that market and piece of property comparison. Mr. Longnion asked if The Reserve at Mountain Pass intends to go forward with a PILOT request? Mr. Noblett stated that this is only for the bond issuance today. Mr. Longnion stated that Chestnut Flats was the first, in his experience, a bond issue and then a PILOT.

Ms. Williams stated we are talking about the financing of the project. The financing is based upon the total cost of construction, operations, etc. When you see rates advertised, this unit is \$700 per month, I may not pay \$700 per month because my income may be 30% of AMI wherein someone may pay \$700 per month because they have a higher income. It is a little tricky when developers are advertising unit costs. It is based on the different subsidy layers in the project. Every single project, cannot think of not one project, whether it was a preservation project or a new construction project, where the first units to go were the income restricted units. In this case, the entire development is income restricted, and they lease up very quickly. It is the old-fashioned supply and demand. We have a lot of people, this is pre-COVID, who cannot find decent and affordable housing at a price that they can afford based upon their annual wages. We are excited about this project. The Housing Authority is participating by virtue of some vouchers. We are waiting for HUD approval for some parts of the HUD financing to move the project forward which is why the PILOT application is not before the Board yet. Once that has been completed, the developer will bring their PILOT application before the Board.

Mr. Noblett stated that this is a hearing concerning the units and location involved at 4905 Central Avenue and 240 multi-family housing units in this request. We need to open up if there are any other questions for the Board. Ms. Helen Burns Sharp was present but did not have any comments. No one else had any comments, and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Armor presented the next order of business: **“A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED THIRTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS (\$35,000,000.00) MULTIFAMILY HOUSING REVENUE BONDS, IN ONE OR MORE SERIES (THE “BONDS”), THE PROCEEDS OF THE SALE THEREOF TO BE LOANED TO THE RESERVE AT MOUNTAIN PASS, LP, TO FINANCE THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND EQUIPPING OF AN APPROXIMATELY 240 UNIT MULTIFAMILY HOUSING FACILITY TO BE LOCATED AT OR NEAR 4905 CENTRAL AVENUE, CHATTANOOGA, HAMILTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE.” (HEB2021-01)**

Mr. Noblett stated that on behalf of the Board's attorney, Ms. Barnett is preparing documents for us as well the aspect of do you have authority under Title 48 to issue or sell bonds. It has to be an issue that would be a project within this Board's power, the aspect of improving, constructing, equipping, owning, leasing and disposing of property for multi-family housing facilities fits within the definition of project under the statute that is involved here. You have the authority to do so if you think it is in the best interest of the welfare, prosperity, health, and living

conditions of the people here in Chattanooga. Ms. Barnett stated that her firm will be providing the closing on this project.

Mr. Longnion was told by one of her professional colleagues in the bond lawyering career path, that when we deal with bond issues different from the other PILOTs and some other activity of the Board, the but-for question needs to be asked. In addition to that, why would we say no to you or this project? The information says that the company has 600 + units in Nashville. Any of those projects operating effectively?

Mr. Haston said yes, they currently have 240 units that are operational. This property opened in 2018 and it is fully leased. They also have three other projects that are under construction as well and one is already leasing up at the end of this month and next month. They have 40 units already pre-leased and this is before they are available to rent. They have had a very good track record and that is even throughout not just Nashville but throughout the southeast as well. They have over 16,000 units in their portfolio and in 2019 they were named Number One Affordable Housing Development in the country in terms of new units started. Mr. Longnion stated that answers the question about construction project, etc., what is the timeline being proposed once you get to the project itself, what is the timeline for the construction?

Mr. Haston stated that the timeline from today is that they expect to be hopefully applying for bonds tomorrow, send the application to the state agency, and from there continue doing due diligence as Ms. Williams eluded to with investors and HUD, and then expect to start construction in late 2021, 2022, most likely 2022. A project this size would take a complete 24 months to complete construction. However, they expect to start delivering units (multiple buildings) sometime in 2022.

Mr. Noblett stated that at one more statement is that they will have to sell bonds in connection with this process to get it going and construct. The agreement itself actually provides there is going to be the sale and delivery of those bonds on or before December 31, 2021. That is another thing to make sure this project does not languish around in connection without the funding available.

Mr. Gentry asked is there any surrounding residential community are they supportive of this project? Mr. Haston stated that they have had multiple community meetings with the help of Councilman Oglesby, and they were able to rezone the project several years ago. Most recently held a community meeting this past summer where they addressed some of their concerns with regard to buffers and density. They have addressed those concerns in the designs submitted to the permit office.

After further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gentry, seconded by Ms. Watson, and the resolution was unanimously approved by roll call vote 6-0.

Mr. Armor presented the next order of business: **“A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TO AMEND THE GUIDELINES FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUND TO ALLOW UP TO FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$500,000.00) TO BE UTILIZED FOR RENT, MORTGAGE, AND UTILITY ASSISTANCE FOR LOW-TO-MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS IMPACTED BY COVID-19, CONTINGENT UPON CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL.” (HEB2021-02)**

Ms. Williams stated that the Mayor and the City Council voted to fund what was then a newly established Affordable Housing Fund with General Fund dollars. Up until that point, all of the money that was provided to assist with the development of income restricted housing either came from the federal government through HUD or the PILOT through the HEB. This community needed additional funding to support projects for which HUD funding was not available or the projects were not large enough and otherwise did not fit the PILOT guidelines. The Affordable Housing Fund was established with the commitment of \$1 million a year for five years to go into that fund.

The Board may remember allocating funding to the Housing Authority not long ago, Adamson Developers, Habitat for Humanity, and the study for the Community Land Trust. What is happening right now is that the City and many cities across the country have received lots of funding from HUD to help households who have been impacted by COVID. We are going on 10-11 months now where some folks have been unemployed and some of those jobs may never come back as a result of COVID. A vast number of those families are not eligible for any funding that comes through HUD. We get our money from CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) money and there are a lot of restrictions to that money. Even though we have been able to help hundreds and hundreds of families, there have been thousands of families we have not been able to assist.

The Affordable Housing Fund, though it is not expressly stated in the guidelines, the intent always was that the money would be used for what we refer to as “sticks and bricks”, much like the awards the HEB allocated previously. Typically, we were envisioning that there would be a project, renovation or new construction that for whatever reason eligible for HUD funding and would use funds from the Affordable Housing Fund to supplement those projects. Very few projects are moving forward right now for obvious reasons. We have money in the Affordable Housing Fund and would like to take \$500,000 to assist families (probably thousands at this point-hundreds at least), of households who are subject to eviction if their landlord is not paid back rent. We are asking City Council and this body to allow us to use \$500,000 of the money that is in the Affordable Housing Fund (right now \$1.3 million) \$500,000 of that to go towards assisting households who need mortgage, rent, and utility assistance.

Mr. Armor asked which department is going to be responsible for getting the applications and checking to make sure what the situation is to ensure that the dollars being dispensed for the needy? Ms. Williams stated that would be managed through her department the Department of Economic and Community Development. They have been doing that since March with federal funds. That is how we know the level of the need (we track the data to help make decisions). The data led them to the realization that even though we have federal money and some extra federal money (grateful for that), that money does not help most of the families that are in need.

Examples would be if someone is outside the Chattanooga City limits, they cannot receive CDBG funds (HUD money). If they are behind more than three months, we can only pay three months of rent. But many people are behind way more than three months. Some are looking at ten months in back rent. We can only pay three months. We have hundreds of households who live in extended stay hotels. Some live there until they get permanent housing. There are many, many, many people that's where they live. They live there one year, three years, five years, they have applicants who have lived in the same extended stay hotel for ten years. You cannot use HUD money to pay for that and on and on. Without this funding, we really could be looking at a tremendous backlog of folks being evicted and you can imagine how expensive it is if you were to get kicked out of your apartment. You got an eviction and now you have to find somewhere you can afford, security deposit, find somewhere to move, etc. This money will help stave off that ripple effect of folks being evicted.

Mr. Armor said what he heard is that Ms. Williams addressed and know about federal money or at least talks about it without getting into details. Mr. Armor heard that a lot of the people that are getting this might be ones who kind of fall through the crack on for instance living in a facility in the City but not being a City resident. We are filling some cracks that are needed and Ms. Williams has identified with the City Council a way to do that is a fair assessment. Ms. Williams said yes, sir.

Mr. Gentry asked Ms. Williams if she has any staff that negotiates on behalf of the family renting to negotiate down, if it's ten months, to negotiate for the owner, that will give five plus call it even? Is anybody engaged in that dialogue in discussion kind of a workout plan? Ms. Williams said not on her team partially because economic and community development they support businesses too. Landlords are small businesses. We have a partnership with Community Foundation, CNE, and Legal Aid of East Tennessee. They have been fabulous. What they do is when someone submits a request for assistance through the City's COVID website, someone from her team (Sandra Gober manages the process), will call and say the application was received and eligible for our program. If not, other partners in the City may be able to assist. The first question is, have you received an eviction notice or are you in the process of eviction now? If they say yes, as soon as we get off the phone, they would need to call CNE because they have an eviction prevention program going on. The application continues to be processed because when they get to court, there is a representative from Legal Aid. Legal Aid is in constant contact with ECD and will negotiate with the landlord on behalf of the tenant if they are staring at an eviction.

After further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gentry, seconded by Ms. Jelks, and the resolution passed unanimously by roll call vote 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Longnion welcomed Dr. Schaerer to the Board and wanted to explain the process for Board membership and authorization. Mr. Longnion suspects, based on this morning's e-mailed roster, Dr. Schaerer actually replaced Ms. Sinkfield. Mr. Noblett stated that there is a term of office that applies for any member of this Board and if there has been an appointment at this point, that appointment is for the end of that term. Normally, under state law it is for a six-year term. Mr. Longnion asked if Dr. Schaerer's position is a replacement for Ms. Sinkfield's vacated position and term. If that appointment is for this specific term, there is also floating a request for an addition of two members of this body that has to be filed with the Secretary of State. That is so each Council member will have a person representing their district. The Board is currently a seven-member body which would be the ability of every Council member. This was not brought up at the last meeting. Mr. Longnion said that the roster says Dr. Schaerer is District 4 and so is Mr. Gentry. Mr. Longnion knows we are not doing it by the district because we do not have nine members. When Ms. Sinkfield left, Mr. Longnion is not sure, first of all we were not notified and communicated with about that exit, we discovered it by default looking at the roster, her name was no longer there. Mr. Longnion would like for someone to explain to him the process of getting on and off the Board. Is it based upon term? Four board members' terms are expiring February 3rd. Is that correct? Mr. Noblett stated that is the number the Mayor's office has kept up with. Mr. Longnion said for the four of us after February 3rd, what actions, if any, do we take, make, execute to determine whether we continue for another term or end the term?

Mr. Armor responded and Phil may answer that you stay until either you resign or reappointed. Mr. Armor is in the same category as Mr. Longnion, and Ms. Watson. If there is a meeting in February after the 3rd, then the three would stay on the Board until you decide you want to stay or not or be reappointed and based on that would go before the city commission and you would be reappointed. They have not always done it by district so at times we have had more than one person in a district to fill the slots they did that. Phil is adding slots so that if for example District 5 could in the future have an opening for someone from their district be appointed.

Mr. Noblett stated that in T.C.A. Section 48-101-307 is the law for how the Board of Directors for Health, Educational, and Housing Facility Boards are established. The provisions under that section under state law say that you have to have a Board of Directors that cannot be less than seven people. That is the reason for years since the 1980's when this Board was originally established as a corporation, you have a seven-member board. This occurred all before there was a nine-member City Council created in 1990 by the voting rights lawsuit that occurred at that point in time. It has only taken us 30 years to get around the point of realizing that maybe some of the members of the Council might want to have some of decision-making into people who would be on this Board.

The requirements of Section 48-101-307 clearly say that the way you get to be a director of this corporation for health, education, and housing facilities matters is that you have to be elected by the governing body of the municipality. The governing body of the municipality and all of the decision-making that we have told them has always been the Council which is defined under state law as the governing body. It is not the Mayor's appointment. There has to be an election and approval by the Council of the members that are on this corporation. That is why we are trying to at least get it to the point where you have nine members, that there might be a nine-member body that would have some opportunity for representation out of each district. The current requirements

under state law do not mention anything about districts. They simply say that you have to have a number of directors not less than seven who have to be duly qualified electors and taxpayers of municipalities and that is the only requirement in the statute.

Mr. Longnion confirmed with Mr. Noblett that there are duly qualifying electors indicating they are taxpayers in the City. Mr. Longnion thinks he understands going forward that process. Mr. Longnion announced that he does not intend to seek his term coming up. He will be exercising that going forward. Mr. Noblett stated we will miss Mr. Longnion and enjoyed the discussion. Mr. Noblett is at least trying to make sure we have nine members so we do not have any district disputes.

Ms. Williams stated that all boards and commissions, the activities of those boards and commissions, are within the Charter. Unless that Charter is modified, it is as written. The Council has indicated that they would like for each of them to have a representative from their district. However, that change is from the State. Mr. Noblett stated that it needs to be an amendment to the current charter and that has not happened yet. This confusion should have and could have been avoided. Ms. Williams and Ms. Manalla will work with everybody to figure out exactly where we stand with the number of folks that are legally allowed by the Charter and the Council can do whatever it needs to do when the time comes it is legally appropriate for them to add two additional members. That is not the way it works up until this time. We will get it all sorted out so we are doing everything properly and in order.

Mr. Noblett stated that what the statute provides is that as long as you are willing to come, if your term expires, it does not mean that you do not continue to hold office. That is one of the things that the state statute under T.C.A. Section 48-101-307 says that until someone is put in and substituted for position, then you continue to serve. You do not have to. Ms. Williams said to reconsider. Mr. Gentry stated that the Board appreciates Mr. Longnion's intentionality and the discipline that you brought to this Board, and it has been a pleasure serving with you. Mr. Longnion said back to you.

Ms. Williams would like to add that she has both taken credit and responsibility for strongly encouraging Lloyd Longnion to be on this Board. She really appreciates his service, and she means it from the bottom of her heart. It has been awesome.

Mr. Armor said to everyone, that as he welcomes Dr. Schaerer, the role that Amanda, Richard, Nicole, Gregg, as well you Mr. Longnion, it is a balancing of personalities and experiences. I think everyone here has the right motivation. He was thinking earlier we had a good agenda going from the TEFRA hearing to approving the bonds and as we go into future meetings PILOTs and including the last resolution where we are providing help for people who have gotten help maybe there is a need for something else.

Mr. Armor always felt that this Board did good work if we are honest. Not many of us understand all the pieces we are doing especially him and that is where he thinks Ms. Williams, Mr. Noblett, and Ms. Manalla and other people inform us on what we are doing, the purpose of it, so we can put the pieces together. Mr. Armor addressed Mr. Longnion for his number of years on the Board, your discipline of reviewing the documents, go back to your tenacious work on the annual report. Mr. Armor thinks Mr. Longnion brought significant contributions to this process

and sometimes you are criticized for it but that's okay. You knew that you posed some discipline on a lot of us that needed it. Thank you for that.

Mr. Armor is going to double down on what Ms. Williams said if you would stay, Mr. Armor would write you a letter of recommendation until the next meeting if you want. It takes people of different disciplines, different personalities. Mr. Armor has known Mr. Gentry a long time, known Ms. Watson, and Dr. Schaerer and he go back a long way. Mr. Armor thinks we all bring something different to it and that is our strength. You definitely have the discipline and attention to detail. As one I think you have made a significant contribution to this Board, and Mr. Armor hopes Mr. Longnion feels the satisfaction and appreciation that you deserve for it. Mr. Longnion, said thank you, and he will consider the appearance of the next annual report in celebration of that.

The closing documents will be forwarded to the Chair and Secretary for electronic signature for Ms. Barnett after the meeting.

Mr. Armor apologized for the length of the meeting but thinks the things we did were important.

Ms. Williams stated that we will have the annual report on the agenda next month, and Sandra Gober and Ms. Williams will also prepare for you a brief of the Community Land Trust Report that the HEB funded a few months ago.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Amanda Jelks (Feb 24, 2021 18:49 EST)

Amanda Jelks, Secretary

APPROVED:



Hicks Armor (Feb 24, 2021 18:48 EST)

Hicks Armor, Chair

**The electronic Zoom presentation is kept on record by the Health, Educational, and Housing Facility Board.*









(3) 01-27-2021 Minutes

Final Audit Report

2021-02-24

Created:	2021-02-24
By:	Maria Manalla (mmanalla@chattanooga.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAovs2EIKnFA-UTzngrOrqwTXlkpffZFik

"(3) 01-27-2021 Minutes" History

-  Document created by Maria Manalla (mmanalla@chattanooga.gov)
2021-02-24 - 7:49:35 PM GMT- IP address: 68.53.194.145
-  Document emailed to Hicks Armor (hicksarmor@gmail.com) for signature
2021-02-24 - 7:50:30 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Hicks Armor (hicksarmor@gmail.com)
2021-02-24 - 9:17:00 PM GMT- IP address: 69.14.236.178
-  Document e-signed by Hicks Armor (hicksarmor@gmail.com)
Signature Date: 2021-02-24 - 11:48:23 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 69.14.236.178
-  Document emailed to Amanda Jelks (amanda@jelkslaw.com) for signature
2021-02-24 - 11:48:26 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Amanda Jelks (amanda@jelkslaw.com)
2021-02-24 - 11:48:51 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.88.79
-  Document e-signed by Amanda Jelks (amanda@jelkslaw.com)
Signature Date: 2021-02-24 - 11:49:12 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 107.77.234.170
-  Agreement completed.
2021-02-24 - 11:49:12 PM GMT