

MINUTES
MEETING OF IMPACT HARRISBURG
May 5, 2016, 10:30 A.M.
Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency
211 North Front Street, Harrisburg

Officers of the Board Present:

Neil Grover, Chair
Brian Hudson, Secretary

Board of Directors Present:

Dale Laninga, Director
Gloria Martin-Roberts, Director
Russ Montgomery, Director
Jackie Parker, Director
Karl Singleton, Director

Board of Directors Absent

Doug Hill, Vice-Chair
Brittany Brock, Treasurer

Others Present:

Sheila Dow-Ford, Executive Director
Fred Reddig, Coordinator for the City of Harrisburg
Anne Morrow, Recording Secretary

Mr. Grover called the meeting to order at 10:21 a.m.

Ms. Dow-Ford provided a brief update on the public presentations that took place over the past 2 weeks. Five community sessions were held at the following locations:

- Tuesday, April 19 – Latino Hispanic American Community Center (LHACC) at 5:30 p.m.; 17 participants attended
- Wednesday, April 20 – Hamilton Health Center at 5:30 p.m.; 17 participants attended
- Monday, April 25 – Heinz-Menaker Senior Center at 5:30 p.m.; 13 participants attended
- Thursday, April 28 - Latino Hispanic American Community Center (LHACC) at 5:30 p.m.; 6 participants attended
- Monday, May 2 – Madeline L. Olewine Library at 5:30 p.m.; 15-17 participants attended

Major questions and concerns by the community:

- Match: hard versus soft

Further Board discussion will take place in executive session after the presentations are given by Capital Region Water (CRW) and the City of Harrisburg.

Mr. Grover's opening statement noted that the Board has been given the responsibility of being good stewards of public money, and the Board is performing their due diligence with what the court has entrusted to them as a Board.

Past year Accomplishments by the Board

- The creation of a Non-profit Corporation;

- The process of selecting an Executive Director, Financial Advisor, Accountant, Auditor and Depository Bank.
- Creation of a website and branding of Impact Harrisburg,
- Project Application Kits and
- Public Presentations

The Board's commitment is to release infrastructure improvement funds to CRW and the City, the only two applicants able to receive these funds, by year-end. The infrastructure fund has a little over \$6 million available to be granted to these entities. The Board acknowledges that the needs for infrastructure in the City far exceed the available funds.

The Board's intent from the last Board meeting was to have both parties come before the Board at the same time to present each entity's infrastructure needs. The purpose of these presentations is to help the Board prioritize current and/or future projects and to see how CRW and the City can partner together on projects and to see how the funds can be best leveraged.

Presentations were provided by Capital Region Water (CRW) and the City of Harrisburg with relation to infrastructure project for the City of Harrisburg.

I. Capital Region Water (CRW) - Proposed Infrastructure Projects

Ms. Shannon Williams, CEO of CRW, noted CRW stewards the public water resources servicing the Harrisburg area: drinking water, wastewater and stormwater. CRW oversees a combined annual budget of nearly \$60 million including \$24 million in Capital Projects. The following proposed projects have not been officially approved by CRW's Board of Directors but are projects that Ms. Williams and her staff have identified that fit the criteria for eligibility and are the basis for these funds.

Team Members that spoke on behalf of CRW were: Ms. Shannon Williams, P.E., CEO, Mr. Marc Kurowski, P.E., Chairman and Ms. Lexie Grant, Grant and Funding Coordinator

- A. **City Beautiful H₂O: Wet Weather Compliance (MS4 & CSO) Projects within the City of Harrisburg** (Total Project Cost: \$17 million [\$5 million IH Funds Request; \$12 million CRW Match])
 - i. Blue or green roofs on City buildings
 - ii. Improvements to City parks and playgrounds that include stormwater management
 - iii. Conversion of blighted properties to green space (parks, gardens, etc.)
 - iv. Other green stormwater infrastructure on City-owned properties (Through the Strong Plan a Shared Services Agreement was entered into by CRW and the City, interconnecting both parties.)

- B. **City Beautiful H₂O: Community-Based Greening** (Total Project Cost: \$700,000 [\$350,000 IH Funds Request; \$350,000 CRW Match])
 - i. Programs focused on wet weather compliance including green stormwater infrastructure

- C. **Harrisburg City-wide Failing sewer Replacement Project** (Total Project Cost: \$1.5 million [\$750,000 IH Funds Request; \$141,760 H₂O PA Grant Awarded; \$608,240 CRW Match])
 - i. Continue operation of the system
 - ii. Avoid the formation of sinkholes and other complicating issues associated with pipe failure
 - iii. Extend the useful life of the existing system

- iv. Decrease the costs associated with conveying and treating groundwater infiltration and stormwater inflow
- v. Improve the hydraulic capacity of the system
- vi. Decrease the probability of further failure and deterioration in the system

D. CRW finished Drinking Water Reservoir Rehabilitation Project (Reservoir Park) (Total Project Cost: \$870,000* [\$435,000 IH Funds Request; \$435,000 CRW Match]) *Project costs may change depending on the findings of the cleaning and inspection portion of the work

- i. Exhibits issues expected from a facility of its age and level of maintenance
 - a. Evidence of tank leakage by the surfacing of springs with chlorine residue
- ii. Draining, cleaning, inspection and rehabilitation of upper finished water reservoir

E. Harrisburg AWTF Headworks Screening Project (Total Project Cost: \$5.5 million [\$3 million IH Funds Request; \$2.5 million CRW Match-requested through PENNVEST]) CRW will be applying for funding through PENNVEST on May 11 and expects notification on an award within a 60 day period.

- i. Will provide the necessary protection for CRW's new biological nutrient removal system improving system efficiency and reducing the cost of treatment borne by City ratepayers

F. Arsenal Boulevard Sewer Rehabilitation Project (Total Project Cost: \$1.5 million [\$750,000 IH Funds Request; \$750,000 CRW Match]) *Project is not budgeted.

- i. CRW and PA DEP identified release of wastewater to an unnamed tributary to Asylum Run caused by a series of damaged sections of CRW's Asylum Run interceptor.
 - a. Repair this severely damaged section following the recommendations made within a condition assessment of the Arsenal Blvd. area's sanitary sewer CCTV investigation
 - b. Address the severe structural, operational and maintenance deficiencies
 - c. Due to the severity of these deficiencies and their adverse impact on health and safety, CRW will need to complete this project as soon as possible even though it was not included in the 2015-2016 budget.

G. Citizen Assistance Program for Water/Sewer Line Repair/Replacement* (Total Project Cost: \$5 million [\$2.5 million IH Funds Request; \$2.5 million CRW Match]) *Contingent upon legal ability to implement such a program under the Municipal Authorities Act. *Project is not budgeted for this year.*

- i. As a benefit to Harrisburg residents that cannot afford required maintenance of their service laterals, CRW will develop, operate and maintain a revolving loan/grant program to assist with the financing costs associated with sewer/water lateral repairs or replacement.
- ii. The Water/Sewer Line Repair/Replacement Program will provide a way for City residents to pay for the cost of repairs to their sewer and water service line(s). Repair work will be completed, and the cost will be placed on the property owner's water and sewer bill and paid over a five-year period at a low interest rate.

Board Questions and Answers:

Ms. Dow-Ford: What is the expense for a home owner?

Ms. Williams: It can range between \$5,000-\$10,000 but depends on variables; how deep or how long the lateral is or if the repair is under a sidewalk or roadway.

Ms. Dow-Ford: Is CRW doing the research to confirm if it is permissible under the Municipal Authorities Act?

Ms. Williams: Yes, CRW is doing the research. It may be different under sewer vs water because of the impact on our Wet Weather Program.

Ms. Martin-Roberts: How many home owners do you think are affected?

Ms. Williams: CRW doesn't have a good handle on the number of property owners who are affected at this time. CRW is currently aware of a hand full of residents. They are working with the City to make sure they are collaborating on issues that arise as well as sharing information with the home owner regarding the home owner's responsibilities.

Ms. Parker: The City dealt with a shared lateral issue and the City was able to help the property owner.

Ms. Dow-Ford: Are there other funding sources for this project? The questions being asked have come up at the community meetings.

Ms. Parker: No, the funding is limited. But as more come up Ms. Williams has a point that it's related to aging structure.

Ms. Grant: Once a program is established, CRW can leverage additional funds from private donors for this type of program.

Mr. Grover: Would it be that the laterals are basically as old as the sewer?

Ms. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Singleton: Is there something specifically we can do for home owners when a lateral/party line is involved, if it's indicated that the project is for a senior citizen? Understanding we may not be able to assist everyone but is there something CRW can drill down on to assist some home owners?

Ms. Williams: As CRW develops this program, we would establish our eligibility requirements and depending on the additional fund sources, there may be additional pockets of money available to match that's related to the senior population and/or related to low income population or some other type. This program is in the conceptual stage but it's something that is on our list of projects. It's being presented today to see if this is something IH is interested in funding.

H. **Water & Sewer Incentives for Economic Development*** (Total Project Cost: \$498,000 [\$249,000 IH Funds Request; \$249,000 CRW Match]) *Contingent upon legal ability to implement such a program under the Municipal Authorities Act. *Project is not budgeted for this year.*

- i. The City Beautiful H₂O Water and Sewer Economic Development Project will subsidize water and sewer rates for new businesses and provide water and sewer fee forgiveness for previously vacant or blighted properties within the City of Harrisburg.

Board Questions and Answers:

Mr. Hudson: That cost could be greater depending on the number of blighted properties in the city as you move forward with this project?

Ms. Williams: Yes.

Ms. Dow-Ford: Are there funds set up in other cities that you've researched?

Ms. Williams: There has not been much research on this project at this time.

Ms. Martin-Roberts: Have you prioritized these projects?

Ms. Williams: These are the projects that CRW has identified and were presented to the Board at the last Board meeting 2 weeks ago. There were several questions that were raised from the Board members that couldn't be answered. She hoped to get some guidance from IH as we move forward.

Ms. Williams ended CRW's presentation by stating some of these projects are shovel-ready projects. Any funds Impact Harrisburg is willing to grant towards these projects will be beneficial. There may be some projects that arise from the City's Comprehensive Plan or out of the CRW Green Infrastructure Plan that would also benefit from these funds. If IH is looking to spend the money right away then these are the projects IH can review to fund. If the desire is to wait to see what the City's Comprehensive Plan recommends and for both CRW and the City to work on a larger project together, to leverage additional funding thru FEMA or the Core of Engineers, then those projects are not ready at this time but CRW is more than willing to enter into a conversation to assess these types of larger projects.

Mr. Kurowski reiterated CRW presented several projects today that are ready to go projects if this is the direction IH wants to proceed with. However, from the perspective of the CRW's Board, with the City's Comprehensive Plan near completion and IH's infrastructure application kit pending, it may be that IH might want a bigger footprint, a wider base for innovative economic development/infrastructure projects for the City. That type of project will take a little longer to evaluate and isn't something CRW can identify today. With that said it may be best to hear what projects the City has identified to see what project(s) makes the most sense to everyone.

Board Questions and Answers:

Mr. Hudson: Of the list presented which project(s) would you identify as being more critical because it would either be more costly or have a negative impact on City residents down the road?

Mr. Hudson: Also, is the source of CRW's match on these projects from your fund balance?

Ms. Williams: Yes, if those projects are identified with a CRW match then it's currently identified as a project CRW has allocated funds for. We are continuing to find alternative funding but a lot of the projects are included in our Capital Program budget.

Mr. Hudson: With regard to the request for PENNVEST assistance, where does that stand?

Ms. Williams: CRW has submitted an application in the last funding round but our permits weren't quite buttoned up in time.

Ms. Grants: CRW will be applying on May 11, 2016 and should receive a response in 60 days as to whether CRW will get funded.

Mr. Reddig: What is the scope of that project?

Ms. Williams: That's the Headworks Project.

- Mr. Reddig: Have you talked with PENNVEST about the MS4 project? I've had discussion with them with respect to other communities and they are very interested in stormwater related projects.
- Ms. Williams: CRW continues to dialog and work with them on projects CRW has identified. A lot of the upfront work right now on the City Beautiful work involves a lot of planning and design type work as opposed to implementation. Once we get to the implementation phase we anticipate requesting help from PENNVEST. We will also be looking at potential bond funding on some of the projects as we move forward.
- Mr. Grover: Is there a priority from this list that CRW presented? It's a long list and the Board would like to know which project(s) CRW wants to move forward on first?
- Mr. Kurowski: This was the question CRW was coming to the table with as it depends on what lens you want to apply to prioritization. CRW could build every one of these projects and all are needed tomorrow. CRW would like direction from IH on what type of projects IH wants to fund. It may be best to wait to see what projects are put on the table by both parties, see the criteria matrix and then make a decision.
- Mr. Montgomery: Regarding the Citizen's Assistance Program, is this project budgeted?
- Ms. Williams: No, this project is not budgeted. The last 3 projects are not budgeted for this year; Arsenal Blvd. Sewer Rehabilitation Project, Citizen Assistance Program for Water/Sewer Line Repair/Replacement and Water & Sewer Incentives for Economic Development.
- Ms. Parker: The last project for the Water & Sewer Incentives for Economic Development, working with other communities, most water authorities will work with developers, especially if they are large water users. To me that isn't something that we would need to use IH money for. Shouldn't CRW be doing that since you'd be helping with economic development project?
- Ms. Williams: Again, it depends on the legalities of it. I don't know which customers they are. My understanding of the law is that we cannot provide different rates for different customers. We can provide different rates for different customer classes but not for particular customers. There are ways that this can be done and worked through but we would have to make the business case for it to show that it's in the best interest of our rate payers.
- Ms. Parker: And the forgiveness, you can do this also for vacant or blighted properties in the city?
- Ms. Williams: If it were a holistic program, yes.
- Mr. Reddig: The Arsenal Blvd. Sewer Rehabilitation Project you said is not budgeted, though that would have an adverse impact on the health and welfare, would it not?
- Ms. Williams: Yes, it absolutely would.

II. City of Harrisburg (City) - Proposed Infrastructure Projects

Mayor Papenfuse advised the City's presentation will reflect infrastructure projects that have been determined and prioritized, presented to the public, ratified by City Council and are critically essential to the City's economic recovery. Wayne Martin, City Engineer, will begin by talking about what the infrastructure priorities are of the City, Geoffrey Knight, Director of Planning, will discuss how the City's priorities mesh with the public's priorities as expressed

during the recent Comprehensive Planning process and Bruce Weber, Director of Finance, will end the presentation by talking about why IH's funding is necessary for these projects to move forward and will talk about the dire financial straits of the City and why the City can't afford to wait for funding. The City doesn't have the opportunity to borrow or the luxury of waiting for other types of funding. Mayor Papenfuse stressed that these projects will not be able to happen without the funding support of Impact Harrisburg.

Team Members that spoke on behalf of the City were: Mayor Papenfuse; Mr. Wayne Martin, P.E. Esq., City Engineer; Mr. Geoffrey Knight, AICP, ASFPM, Director of Planning; and Mr. Bruce Weber, Director of Finance.

A. Harrisburg Streetlight Project (Recommended through the Harrisburg Strong Plan; Total Cost: \$3.1 million)

- i. Replacement of 6,127 metal halide/mercury vapor and high pressure sodium roadway luminaries into energy efficient LED roadway luminaries.
- ii. The cost savings per year will be \$422,395 (This savings is enough to power electricity to 293 homes every year.)
 - a. With the cost savings over 7 years, the City will be able to seal 500,000 linear feet of cracks (this is the most efficient, cost effective way to seal and maintain asphalt roads),
 - b. Repair 63,000 square feet of potholes (average pot hole is 4' x 4'; total would be a little less than 4,000 pot holes),
 - c. Pave over 2 miles of neighborhood streets, and
 - d. These savings will also help CRW (inlets would be replaced or have rehabilitation completed).
- iii. Annual Maintenance savings will be \$157,379
- iv. This will lead to a reduction of crime and encouragement of private investment/development.
- v. 4,012 of 4,250 of cobrahead fixtures have been installed (94% completion)
- vi. 1,420 of 1,824 of the decorative and miscellaneous fixtures have been installed (78% completion)

Board Questions and Answers:

- Ms. Dow-Ford: How would this coordinate with CRW? Citizens are always talking about when the streets are dig up what's going on underneath?
- Mr. Martin: Two streets were completed last year on South 17th & 15th Streets. First thing the City did was notify all the utilities. CRW is a utility and was notified. UGI and NRG identified some problems with their facilities. Through the Shared Services Agreement the City handled and paid for all the design work, specifications, and bidding. CRW reimbursed the City for all this cost.
- Ms. Martin-Roberts: Regarding potholes, Mr. Martin said this would help with the employment of City residents. What does that mean? I know you have union issues so you can't just hire people off the streets. Tell us how this is specifically going to help employ City residents.
- Mr. Martin: Currently the City budgets approx. \$200,000 a year to repair streets. Most of the money is used for materials, like asphalt. If the City tripled the amount of money available for repairs, which is essentially what the City is proposing. The City would like to hire additional employees to assist with items a. & b. above. This would save using State Liquid Fuels Funds and would be allocated by City Council for other purposes. Funds could be allocated to labor, maintenance, or contracted forces. It's the

Administration's proposal to do a blend with its annual allocation. Some of the work would stay in-house with the City's own forces but some work may need to be sourced out.

Mayor Papenfuse: This would give the City the option of potentially continuing to grow our Unionized Neighborhood Services workforce, which the City grew last year and had a positive impact on City services. Without the funding the money would simply go to the bank and we would not have that option.

B. MultiModal Project (Recommended through the Harrisburg Strong Plan; Total Cost: \$3 million) The Strong Plan didn't lay out how the Department of Transportation was to give the City of Harrisburg \$10 million dollars. Through various meetings and collaboration, the parties determined the MultiModal grant program would be the mechanism for the Department of Transportation to provide funds to the City, however, there is a 30% matching requirement.

- i. PennDOT committed to working with the City to assist with its transportation infrastructure needs by providing \$2 million for eligible highway and bridge projects in the city for each calendar year from 2014 through 2018.
 - a. City street resurfacing: 15th Street from Herr Street to State Street; 17th Street from Sumner Road to Hanover Road; Marion Street from Reily Street to Verbeke Street (Total Cost: \$960,000; [Local Cost: \$288,000; State Cost: \$672,000]) Project Completed/Funds received
 - b. 3rd Street resurfacing: Chestnut Street to State Street; Forster Street to Muench Street and Maclay Street to Seneca Street (Total Cost: \$3,740,000; [Local Costs \$1,122,000; State Cost: \$2,618,000]) Issued design RFP Sept. 11, 2015; Construction: July-October 2016
 - c. Berryhill Street pedestrian improvements: 19th Street to Cameron Street (Total Cost: \$750,000; [Local Cost: \$225,000; State Cost: \$525,000]) Construction: 2020
 1. Will improve pedestrian safety and multimodal function,
 2. Roadway improvements,
 3. Signal improvements at Derry Street/Berryhill Street and 19th Street and
 4. Traffic calming measures.
 - d. N. 17th Street reconstruction: Herr Street to Arsenal Blvd (Total Cost: \$1 million; [Local Cost: \$300,000; State Cost: \$700,000])
 1. Replace traffic signal at North 17th Street and Arsenal Blvd. with a modern-day roundabout,
 2. Reduction of crashes at awkward intersection,
 3. Improve the level of service,
 4. Reduce vehicle conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists and
 5. School District use of land as a bus transportation center.
 - e. North Second Street, North 7th Street and Division Street MultiModal: Second Street from Division Street to Mulberry Street; 7th Street from Maclay Street to Division Street; Division Street from 7th Street to Front Street (Total Cost: \$7,835,714; [Local

Cost: \$2,350,714; State Cost: \$5,485,000]) Construction: 2017-2018

1. Converting North Second Street to a Two-Way street,
2. Remove traffic signals along North Second Street,
3. Improve pedestrian crossing at North 7th Street between Herr Street and Reily Street (PHEAA),
4. Other improvements stated in the PennDOT letter to Mayor Papenfuse dated February 12, 2015,
5. Retime lights along Maclay Street corridor,
6. More pedestrian and bicycle friendly,
7. The project will impact the most vulnerable residents,
8. Traffic flow with proposed composting facility,
9. Utility coordination is already completed,
10. Ties in with other projects and
11. History for project but also fits current planning trends.

Second Street Study

- Projects will involve the replacing of inlets and rehabilitation; partnering with CRW.
- PennDOT deemed this project ¹feasible but must be supported by a number of improvements on Second Street as well as other area roadways in order to safely accommodate redistributed traffic."
- ²"By converting Second Street to a two-way street, southbound traffic will have additional access to Forester Street allowing local travelers a more convenient route to the central business district and Capitol Complex."
- ³"Once Second Street has been converted to a two-lane, two direction roadway, commuters currently traveling out of the City via Second Street will need an alternative route."

Board Questions and Answers:

Mr. Grover: Is there any coordination with the School District (SD) on their needs regarding the Berryhill Street pedestrian improvements project? Is the SD able to put anything on the table to help match the funds?

Mr. Martin: The City has had discussions regarding the SD's involvement and input. Good ideas were discussed about what could be done with this intersection. As far as the SD committing dollars, we have not had that discussion yet but the SD is willing to coordinate with the City.

Ms. Martin-Roberts: Has the City surveyed residents on Second Street to determine whether they are comfortable with having that increased traffic pattern?

Mr. Martin: Yes. In the past the City has taken a survey regarding the Second Street project. At the time of the survey there was overwhelming support in favor of this project. A survey has not been taken over the past 5 years. Mr. Knight can respond further when he speaks regarding his current involvement with community outreach and the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Grover: It's a theory that the traffic will decrease on Second Street. At least that's the concept.

Ms. Dow-Ford: What is the timing in terms of the sequencing of these projects and their prioritizations?

¹ Michael C. Keiser, P.E., PennDOT District Executive, communication by letter, February 12, 2015

² Michael C. Keiser, P.E., PennDOT District Executive, communication by letter, February 12, 2015

³ Michael C. Keiser, P.E., PennDOT District Executive, communication by letter, February 12, 2015

- Mr. Martin: The City's timeline on these projects is outlined above. The Streetlight project is the top priority, which we can reinvest in neighborhoods right away and then the MultiModal projects would follow.
- Mr. Hudson: The letter from PennDOT recommended the Tri-County Planning Commission. Are they involved in the MultiModal project now?
- Mr. Martin: Tri-County Planning Commission did some modeling for the City on Second Street. They will be involved when the preliminary engineering is done and are very much at the table.
- Mr. Grover: Has anyone been able to speak to the point of an alternative corridor?
- Mr. Martin: There are a lot of theories on traffic flow. The one that seems to be getting a lot of attraction, at least with some of the things that New York City is doing, is induced demand.
- Ms. Dow-Ford: Is there dialog currently between the City and CRW regarding the Green infrastructure program?
- Mr. Knight: Yes, I meet with CRW at least once a month to talk about aligning the City's codes and regulations so that we are better able to be in concert with one another when we are doing projects. We bring CRW in whenever we are doing a Planned Development plan and whenever someone comes to us with a big project we reach out to them immediately. We are in constant contact with one another.

Mayor Papenfuse ended the presentation by stating that the City will either need to pay on their debt service loan over the next 7 years for the streetlight project or with the help of IH the City will be able to repave city streets. Simply stated, the City cannot do both. The Mayor further noted he would not have gone forward with the loan or the streetlight project had he not felt it was an appropriate infrastructure project for Impact Harrisburg to fund. The Strong Plan also described this project as being a necessary component of the City's recovery. The next debt service payment is due June 26, 2016 in the amount of \$500,000.

Ms. Dow-Ford advised both CRW and the City that the Board has constructed a one-month time frame for receiving infrastructure applications once applications are available. Fund distribution will be discussed further when the Board reconvenes to finalize these steps. The Board acknowledged they are aware the funds are desperately needed for infrastructure projects and that they will be released as quickly as possible.

Mr. Grover thanked both CRW and the City for presenting their infrastructure project to the Board. The Board will take their fiduciary responsibility seriously in considering funding for these projects.

Mr. Grover asked for a motion to go into executive session.

It was moved by Mr. Laninga and seconded by Mr. Hudson that:

"The Board voted to go into executive session to further discuss the Infrastructure presentations by Capital Region Water (CRW) and the City of Harrisburg, matters relating to project applications and further legal matters. The executive session began at 12:43 p.m. and ended at 2:01 p.m."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. Executive Director Report

It was moved by Mr. Hudson and seconded by Ms. Martin-Robert that:

"The Economic Development and Infrastructure Project Application packages be ratified along with the scoring matrix."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Regular and Executive Meeting Minutes of April 19, 2016

It was moved by Mr. Hudson and seconded by Mr. Laninga that:

"The minutes from Impact Harrisburg Board of Directors executive session of April 19, 2016 be approved as printed."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

It was moved by Ms. Martin-Roberts and seconded by Mr. Hudson that:

"The minutes from Impact Harrisburg Board of Directors regular meeting of April 19, 2016 be approved as printed."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Board had no further business to discuss.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

Meeting minutes were submitted by Recording Secretary, Anne Morrow.

The next Board meeting is scheduled for May 17th, at 10:30 a.m. at the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency, 211 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA.

Approved this 17th day of May, 2016.


Mr. Neil Grover, Chair


Mr. Brian Hudson, Secretary

