

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION
ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Klara Komorous, Chair
Ben Fu, Vice-Chair
Chris Andrews
Marcus Johnson
Alison Lenci
Tim Mollette-Parks
Craig Rice**

.....

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION
ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES:**

**February 7, 2022

Special Meeting: 5 PM

Via: Tele-Conference**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY: Vice Chair Fu @ 5pm

ROLL CALL: PSR, Deb French

**Board Members present: Fu, Andrews, Lenci, Mollette-Parks, Rice
Board Members absent: Komorous, Johnson
Staff present: Secretary August, Deb French, Betty Marvin, Michael Branson**

WELCOME BY CHAIR - Acting Chair Fu welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Board Secretary August, to give a helpful explanation on the meeting and some pointers on how this works for everyone in attendance either by Zoom or by phone.

By Zoom: Secretary August asked all attendees to lower any hands that are raised and only raise them if you're interested in speaking on an item when it's called. This will help us avoid confusion and calling speakers for the wrong item. The system will keep track of the order of hands that are raised and it's important that once you raise your hand, keep it raised, unless you change your mind about speaking on that item. Lowering and raising your hand will bump you to the end of the line. Each speaker will have a maximum of 3 minutes to speak and during this time, speakers cannot concede time. When it's your time to speak, the City will unmute you and then you will need to unmute yourself on your device to begin speaking.

By phone: you press *9 to engage the raise your hand feature. When it's your time to speak, the City will refer to you by the last four digits of your phone number and then press *6 to unmute yourself. If you do not wish to speak on any item, you can also view the hearing on KTOP Live on television as well, instead of this platform if you so choose.

BOARD BUSINESS

Agenda Discussion - Secretary August and Deputy City Attorney Michael Branson – An erroneous detail was posted by Planning Staff Wysong on the website regarding the start time of this LPAB meeting. She stated the meeting started at 3pm. However, the meeting was always scheduled to start at 5pm. Since actual time was later, people were not prevented from attending. Apologized for any inconvenience it may have caused.

Board Matters –

Acting Chair FU – At the last LPAB meeting, we did propose to have a formal vote on the matter of Board Member's cameras' being on during this meeting. Motion to turn on cameras, seconded, call for vote.

PSR French – did a verbal roll call – **5 ayes, 2 absentees, 0 nays. Secretary August – motion passes**

Sub-committee Reports – Introductory Info Report on Subcommittees – None (BM Johnson was absent and not able to present).

Secretary Reports – None

OPEN FORUM – Andrew Carpentier, trustee, Camron-Stanford House (LM #2-Ord. 9120, 1/07/75), also, formerly chair and member of the LPAB for 11 years. Described issues with homelessness and vandalism (sleeping on the porch and breaking windows). From July 2021 to the present, Camron-Stanford House board has spent over \$30,000 on security/repairs and is still having the same issues. A non-profit can't afford to spend this much money every year. We're looking for opportunities to work with OHA and the City, to come up with some long-term solutions. We've also looked at hiring security that can stay on the property 24/7. We want to know if the LPAB would agree to this approach and whether it is allowed under our lease with the City.

Omowale Fowles, Manna from Heaven Breakfast Program and A Roof Over Their Heads, Emergency to Permanent Housing – located in Oakland, we do emergency housing for people that were mentioned by the previous speaker, Mr. Carpentier. Our intake and vetting process is a lot faster than most programs. We take their critical information and place our clients in hotels for three days, with the intent of finding them transitional housing. We are asking for funding to take more people off the streets and get themselves back in to human equilibrium and have somewhere to live. We are trying to find ways to do this. We can be reached at our website: www.telegraphcenter.com. We thank you for this opportunity to come forward and, we look forward to hearing from you with some funding ideas so we can get more people off the streets and back into circulation.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Board will take a single roll call vote on the item listed below in this section. The vote will be on approval of the staff report and recommendation on the case. Members of the Board may request that the item on the Consent Calendar be singled out for separate discussion and vote.

# 1	Location:	Citywide
	Accessor's Parcel Number:	N/A
	Proposal:	Renew The Adoption of a Resolution Determining that Conducting In-Person Meetings of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board And Its Committees Would Present Imminent Risks to Attendees' Health, And Electing to Continue Conducting Meetings Using Teleconferencing In Accordance With Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Resolution, dated October 11, 2021, and renewed at every Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board meeting thereafter, to Allow Continuation of Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Meetings.
	Applicant:	Karen August, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
	Phone Number:	510-238-6935
	Owner:	NA
	Case File Number:	NA
	Planning Permits Required:	Renew the adoption of Resolution Pursuant to AB-361
	General Plan:	NA
	Zoning:	NA

Environmental Determination:	Exempt pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) (Common Sense Exemption).
Historic Status:	NA
City Council District:	NA
Status:	NA
Staff Recommendation:	Receive public testimony and consider renewing the adoption of Resolution
Finality of Decision:	Decision Final.
For further information:	Contact case planner Karen August at 510-238-6935 or by e-mail at kaugust@oaklandca.gov

PSR French – did a verbal roll call – 5 ayes, 2 absentees, 0 nays. Secretary August – motion passes.

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS - None

PUBLIC HEARINGS / APPLICATIONS

#2	Location:	5616 Martin Luther King Jr. Way
	Proposal:	To demolish existing building that housed the first headquarters of Black Panther Party and construct a 5-story 20-unit mixed-use development.
	Applicant:	Gunkel Architects
	Phone Number:	510-984-1112
	Owner:	Kim McClure
	Case File Number:	PLN21084
	Planning Permits Required:	Regular Design Review for demolition of existing building and construction of a new mixed-use development involving 20 residential units on the upper floor and ground floor commercial
	General Plan:	Neighborhood Center Mixed Use
	Zoning:	CN-3
	Environmental Determination:	To be Determined
	Historic Status:	X
	City Council district	1
	Status:	Pending
	Staff Recommendation	To confirm the findings of the Historical Resource Evaluation for the project and allow the project to proceed through the Regular Design Review
	Action to be Taken:	Review Historical Resource Analysis and provide comments to staff
	For further information:	Rebecca Wysong: Phone: 510-238-3123; Email: rwysong@oaklandca.gov

Rebecca Wysong, case planner – staff is asking the LPAB to review the Historical Resource Evaluation (HRE) as well as take public testimony from interested parties and to advise staff as to whether or not the Board agrees with the findings and conclusions of the HRE. This project is a proposal to build a mixed-use building at the current location of It's All Good Bakery, including twenty residential and two commercial units, on the site of the first Black Panther Party Headquarters located in North Oakland. The project was submitted in April, 2021. Staff instructed the applicant to procure a consultant and produce a draft HRE of the site. The HRE has determined the site is historically significant under California Register criteria and should be reviewed under CEQA. The site was also evaluated on the National Register criteria for historic significance and integrity. Staff asked the Board for advice on the HRE findings of significance based on events and persons but ineligibility in terms of integrity.

Kim McClure, owner, It's All Good Bakery - stated that he and his family were all born and raised in Oakland. He didn't realize when he bought the property 20 years ago, that it was the first headquarters for the Black Panther Party (BPP). As a young child, he participated in the breakfast program run by the BPP. Myself and Fredrika Newton, from the Dr. Huey P Newton Foundation, want to rebuild the location, with a new state of the art bakery, a commemorative wall for the BPP and building. He has provided housing and jobs for the community and wants to continue this service. Excited about keeping the history and relationship with the BPP alive, which is a very important part of our Black history.

Fredrika Newton, widow of Huey P. Newton, co-founder and president of the Dr. Huey P. Newton Foundation - stated that the mission of the Foundation is to preserve and share the lasting-legacy of the BPP, which includes the preservation of locations relevant to that history. We understand there's great concern about the redevelopment plans for this location. Since 1999, the foundation has led BPP legacy tours to sites of historical significance, including It's All Good Bakery. Over the past 20 years, we've had a wonderful working partnership with Mr. McClure and he has always opened his doors to us so we could share the BPP history at his bakery, and in November 2021, we installed a beautiful new legacy wall there to preserve this history. The building has been modified significantly since the BPP office and because of this, we believe the appropriate path forward is to support a Black, Oakland owned redevelopment, that will welcome us to expand our footprint and showcasing this site, with all the important work that's been done there to uplift our community.

Mark Hulbert, Preservation Architecture, historic resources consultant, author of the HRE – he's proud to be a collaborator on this project and wanted to acknowledge information from the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS) and the African American Museum and Library including the National Register nomination for Old Merritt College and its association with the BPP. The HRE found a definite basis for a finding of historic significance for the Bakery under the applicable California Register of Historical Resources evaluation criteria, specifically as a site and location associated with the founding of the BPP in 1967. However, for an overall finding of significance, a site needs "integrity," i.e., a significant quality and/or characteristic needs to be present in order to convey a message of significance in the present. The conclusion of the HRE is that the existing property and its buildings do not convey the identified historical significance (the BPP were "just tenants" in an ordinary building), with the important exception of the commemorative wall that displays a portion of the history of the BPP, and thereby connects this site and location to the identified historic events and persons.

Brad Gunkel, architect, Gunkel Architects – in designing the project, we worked closely with Mr. McClure and his family, to make sure this is a unique building that represents the character of events that occurred on this site. We looked at Black Panther graphic arts, bold angular components and, at African American quilt patterns for the fenestration of the building. The commemorative wall that's currently in the Bakery, will be expanded and made permanent along the entire north wall. It will be open to the public during work hours and continually curated by the BPP. We will also be dedicating the wall

at the center of the ground floor, next to the Bakery, for public art commemorating the BPP, and a plaque as well.

BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – **BM Rice** – asked what are the dates the BPP was associated with the location dates, and does the building still maintain the original materials and footprint? **Hulbert** – the space was finished in Dec. 1966, based on construction records; it was leased from Jan. 1967 to July 1967; the entire building is intact and has the original storefront.

BM Andrews – wanted clarification on a statement made in the HRE regarding the “historic context” of the report and felt it should have been identified as part of the report. **Hulbert** – my focus was on one historic resource, the building in its context. I tried to grasp the nature of the broad historical subject and get as much background information as I could. **BM Andrews** – asked the architect, had he ever worked with African American cultural resources and responding sensitively to them, and whether his firm had any African-American staff. **Gunkel** –we’ve worked with a number of historically Black churches, to create housing on campuses that they own here in Oakland.

Acting Chair Fu – asked, if the former BPP offices were accessible to the public. **Newton** –the public was welcomed at later BPP offices, it was a community resource. She added that the display wall was created by the Foundation, not the BPP proper.

BM Lenci – had not seen the two photos referenced in the staff report and HRE, where were the attachments? Also, asked Hulbert to expand upon the National Register Criteria Consideration (exception) ‘F’ for commemorative properties as a separate category of eligibility. Did his recommendation consider the building as well under Criteria 1 (events) & 2 (persons), or is he recommending them as separate considerations. **Wysong** – said she received the HRE with attachments but was not able to attach the link for the photos. **Hulbert** – yes, I’m ‘hanging my hat’ on the commemorative significance, along with Criteria 1 & 2.

BM Rice - asked how the existing building maps onto the proposed site plan. **Gunkel** – the original storefront building is 1 of 2 buildings on the property, separated by a parking lot and the site is the depth of both buildings with a little alley behind.

BM Andrews – asked the applicants if they’ve reached out to other persons and community groups that represent interest in the BPP. **McClure** – yes, BPP members David Hilliard and Bobby Seale “used to come and talk about the office.” Newton noted concern online about the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS –

Omowale Fowles, Executive Director of the Civic Action Coalition – is concerned about the loss of the community’s footprint, the BPP office, the barbershop, and It’s All Good Bakery - and, it is good, I eat there frequently. No amount of money can take the place of the historic value that’s in this community.

Kieron Slaughter, Board Member, Dr. Huey P. Newton Foundation – enthusiastically supports this project moving forward. We’ve been in a close partnership with Kim and It’s All Good Bakery for the greater part of 21 years. We see this as an opportunity to breathe new life into the history that we’re trying to interpret and tell. And, also for McClure to pursue his rights and improve the conditions at his property.

Cathy Leonard, Oakland resident –stated that she and her family have lived here for four generations in the Santa Fe neighborhood, across from the Bakery. Had concerns that some people weren’t notified about this project, the low-income housing units have gone down from 4 to 2, there are no Black architects with the firm, and this project highlights gentrification in the neighborhood.

Ronald Muhammad, Oakland resident – we are in full support of this project and its owners, our family has lived in this neighborhood since the 1940's. It's unfair to call this gentrification, the owners are the historical, cultural relevancy and have revived this legacy. We are the people, for and in the Town. He quoted Ron Dellums, "Don't let them talk about us without us."

Dana King, sculptor, Black Bodies in Bronze – recently created the bust of Dr. Huey P. Newton at 9th and Center Streets. The McClure family bought this building, and without them, no one would know outside of the community about the BPP. I thank the McClure family, for raising up the legacy of the BPP. I support this development and the integrity the McClure's have shown in continuing the history of the BPP and, for it to be told to generations to come.

Daniel Levy, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA) – in general, we agree with the staff's questions about the scope of the HRE and its finding that the building itself is not of historic significance. We urge that the HRE be 'beefed up' with additional information since the applicant plans to demolish the building. We fail to understand why there wasn't a bibliography or list of references included in the HRE. We are aware that there are plans for commemorative space inside and outside of the new structure and that staff supported this idea. None of this information was captured in the plans submitted to the LPAB, and it should be so that the community and the public will know. We ask that the building be designed with context to the neighboring building.

Ally Cannington, Oakland resident, neighbor of the Bakery – big fan of the Bakery, the barbershop and neighborhood. Eager that the Bakery is creating this new space and will continue to support it. What's important to me, are the jobs for the people that work at the Bakery and the barbershop, that they be supported during the construction. Also, that the units will be deeply affordable units and accessible.

David Peters, Board President, West Oakland Cultural Action Network – I like so many previous speakers, I too am a multi-generational native of West Oakland and attended the school that the first breakfast program run by the BPP. The Panther legacy is the very foundation in developing my identity. I support this project, this community has a legitimate interest in historical preservation and what this site means to the community. The owners have a right to being in control of their property and make a legacy for his family and generations to come.

Cameron Morgan, East Oakland native, student at SF State University –his family has been in Oakland for 75 years and he supports the McClure family and their initiative to further their wealth. They've taken on this huge responsibility for the original founding place of the BPP and the history that comes with it. Concerned with the lack of communication to other members of the Party that didn't know this was happening and, also the 'butterfly' effect it may cause on the property value of the neighborhood.

Clarence Williams, Oakland resident – has known the McClure family for a quite a few years and, knew Kim when he participated in the breakfast program run by the BPP. He's achieved something that some of us only dream of achieving. All the years that he's owned this building, no one cared or got involved. Kim is the one that brought attention to the community, that this was the first office of the BPP. I would like for the community to not only consider the value of the building and the things that Kim is doing but also the value of his personal life and what it means to his family, going this point forward.

Grace Joseph, Oakland resident – where will the current tenants be housed during the redevelopment of the building and will they be able to return once it's finished? Will affordable units be lost?

Omari Hudson, nephew of Mr. & Mrs. McClure – anyone who speaks of this as gentrification, doesn't know what this term means. Any of the neighbors, past and present, will tell you that the Bakery has supplied numerous jobs to the people of this community and an opportunity to change their lives. It's been a life changing and a thriving Black owned business, that has contributed a lot more to the community than most.

Acting Chair Fu – explained to the public that the job of the LPAB is to look at historic structures and evaluate the HRE analysis. In terms of the CEQA review, we make a recommendation on that basis, not on the development, nor on the benefits of the project to the community. We make sure the proper steps are taken and the process is gone through for evaluation of the historic nature of the properties.

BOARD COMMENTS – BM Andrews – appreciates all the comments from folks concerned with gentrification and notes that this is a Black owned business that supplies jobs and contributes to the vitality of this area. I've had some desserts from there, they are a fantastic business. I'm not convinced that the HRE was fully done and concerned that the proposed building design does not respond to the African American culture at all. It's a generic dominant-culture building design that you can find anywhere in the world. I'm hoping the architect can find and hire an African American designer, that can point out African American cultural design. Glad to hear they will continue to use the Barbershop and the Bakery but I challenge the owners, the architect, and the HR consultant, to dig deeper and understand what the African American culture is all about. I celebrate this business, I want it to move forward, pass the generational wealth on, and be part of the history legacy of this building.

BM Mollette-Parks – asked Mr. McClure to respond to the question of housing for his tenants during construction and will they able to move back in.

McClure – yes, my current tenants will have the first opportunity to return to the building once it's completed.

BM Mollette-Parks – Seconded BM Andrews's comments on the scope and depth of the HRE and asked staff to talk about the timeline and if there would be another point where a project update that would come through the LPAB again.

Wysong – it depends on what you want in terms of another Landmark hearing on this project and if you continue the item. Review of the actual design is the Zoning Manager's decision. There won't be a hearing but they will be noticing 300' in the same manner that was done here.

BM Mollette-Parks – in the plans we saw tonight, the commemorative aspects are presented with just markings on a plan in diagram form. I would encourage the applicant team to think about a broad community conversation about what a commemoration looks like in this circumstance, which could be very powerful.

BM Rice – it's unfortunate that this was not a known Landmark for all these years and is a definite burden on the property owner. Since it has been on tours and recognized, was any solution studied to save or preserve a portion of the building's storefront but still allow housing above?

Gunkel – initially, we did look at options with regards to the existing building but the building itself could not support any additional floors. The McClures' intention is to bring their Bakery to the next level, as far as capacity and a good space for people to work.

Hulbert – having studied this building, gotten to know what it is and what it conveys, I certainly thought about something to salvage, and would it be meaningful. It is clearly a possibility but, I concluded that it is not a meaningful gesture. The overall building (interior/exterior) does not convey significance.

Acting Chair Fu – I've been in Oakland for 25 years and have also been to the Bakery. The challenging part for us here, is we appreciate what Mr. McClure is doing and has been doing for the community. We are looking at the HRE and whether that has supplied enough information for the project, not the development. I too, like BM Andrews, feel that more could have been done with the HRE, maybe a multi-site evaluation should have been considered. I wish there was more information to support the analysis itself. He asked the Board, what kind of recommendation we want to make a motion on, for instance to request the applicant to come back with stronger documentation.

BM Lenci – I agree, there's additional information that could be added to the evaluation. I would like to see the figures and attachments. Is there a way we could provide direction for the project to move forward while also gathering additional information to supplement the HRE for the record, given that the conclusion is, it's a historic resource under the 2 criteria.

Secretary August – there would be a number of options the Board can take. For example, there could be a continuance with the direction for the HRE to be strengthened and come back to the LPAB. Likewise, there could be a proposal to consider mitigation methods for the loss of the historic resource. Or there

could be suggestions regarding further design aspects to the project. This is at the discretion of the Board. In terms of meetings, March 7th and April 4th will be open for this item.

BM Andrews – there needs to be an acknowledgement, that staff has brought this project to us and they also expressed a desire for more detail in the HRE. I'm also loathed to make a sweeping motion for a continuance. If this project gets delayed, it does affect the development. I'd love to hear from the architect, the client and the HR architect, about what they think can be done to respond to these things. The things I hear from the community, staff and this Board, it's just not quite there. I agree with BM Lenci, we have to find a means by which we don't hinder the project moving forward in a timely way, that our concerns are addressed.

Gunkel – I think that's an excellent idea. As part of the commemorative wall, the public art and the exterior commemoration process, I think that it could be a condition of approval, that there be a public outreach component and laid out so, it would bring some voices who can help us narrow in on what those elements are.

Hulbert – this could readily be finalized as a document. Some information that can be added to it but, I would caution against a broad evaluation because it would fall on the hands of a single property owner and, that's a rather broad task to ask them to undertake. There's some detail that can be added as I noted in this "draft" that was submitted here and was not finalized. The bibliography was not included in the "draft" so, things like that can be easily typed up and I'd be more than glad to do that. If there are specific questions that want to be answered, please provide them and we will address them.

BM Rice – if we requested a completion of this documentation and then identified some mitigation items to be added to the conditions of approval, when would those need to be determined, here in this meeting or could those be proposed while the project continues and added at a subsequent time.

Wysong – if it's continued but, you are welcome to recommend conditions and we will review the finalized version.

Gunkel – if this did precede, we'd be happy to come back before the Board with the results of the outreach and design for the various mitigation measures of the commemoration of the events that occurred on site.

Acting Chair Fu – will there be an opportunity to provide some additional content to the analysis within that time frame.

Gunkel – yes, we can make sure to do that as well.

DCA Branson – wanted to clarify; the Board has the option to continue an item but, this is a recommending body and there could be recommendations to include certain measures, conditions or the recommendation could be that the HRE be modified and returned to this body. It's a subtle difference between continuing the item versus a recommendation to have a modified HRE, addressing certain topics. Wanted to advise the Board of their options.

BM Lenci – based on what the staff is asking us in the report, they also don't quite have enough information to make a strong decision or recommendation and, they are asking us to do three things: provide direction on the HRE as well as, the appropriate review processing project design. Per Wysong, we could continue to provide a recommended mitigation measures but, would we be doing it as a continuance or a back & forth with the project team and the City, regardless if rather the Board continues this item or not.

Acting Chair Fu – I would hate for us to come up with mitigation measures, that's something the development team can work with the staff and keep the process moving forward. My concern would be, the ability to 'beef up' the HRE and address more of a multi-site evaluation. I'm fine if there's a motion to include that and evaluated by staff for the project to come back to the Board (later in the process) to show us how its evolved and, how it addressed our comments and, giving us a chance to look at it again as well. I'm open to any other comments or suggestions.

Gunkel – the general consensus is, the site is historic and needs to be commemorative and, the events that occurred on the site also. That commemoration can occur through multiple means possibly the new and permanent wall as well as, exterior public art, plaque etc. That more neighbor/community outreach needs

to occur, in order to really account to the best way to commemorate the events that have occurred on this site. You would ideally like to see what those mitigating measures are but not prevent the project from moving forward and, a more comprehensive HRE, when those other measures come back before you. Can it be a condition of approval, that we come back before you with the results of the outreach, the design of the public art commemorative wall and, an upgraded HRE at the same time.

Acting Chair Fu – asked the Board to make a recommendation for a motion:

BM Lenci, made the following motion: we would be recommending to staff, that the project move forward through the review process at staff level with the expectation that the City would work with the applicant team to develop a further outreach program, to ‘beef up’ the HRE and the citations, and come back to the LPAB to communicate the results of that as well as mitigation measures, given the property is a historic resource. That would be all captured under a condition of approval along with the commemoration component that would come back to us as well. **Seconded by BM Andrews.**

Acting Chair Fu – before we get into further deliberation or voting, I want to give, Director William Gilchrist (Planning & Building), an opportunity to speak.

Director Gilchrist – I appreciate the diligence you’ve brought for discussion and, you’ve landed in a good spot. I want you to be mindful when we’re talking about anything related to conditions and, also moving the project forward. I understood the conversation, you all are leaning in to be able to help them move forward in addressing both what has been presented to the report but, we also need to have some of the ‘gaps’ filled. All of you have caught that wonderfully and there’s still more information we need in the report. Staff will be working with the applicant, looking for the information to be supplemented that we need. In terms of mitigation, I think to some instinct, we are going to need to see where the report lands to know exactly what mitigation measures would be appropriate around respecting the historicity of the site and the building. It’s a little ‘chicken and the egg’ but I didn’t want us to get to far down the road of the project moving forward and then finding out we have some mitigation concerns that might make us take a few steps back. We’re going to have to walk in some good tandem here, the information for the report we don’t have, we need to get that. Then based on that fuller understanding, we’ll have a better sense of how the project can be effective in addressing those concerns, as it moves forward. He thanked the Board for giving staff guidance and to BM Lenci, for her expertise, insight and ‘fresh eyes’ that she brought into the discussion. The history is very important and glad to see this discussed in the context in which you all have fashioned.

Acting Chair Fu: as a friendly amendment/addition to the previous motion: the developer will continue to work with City Staff on of this application and make sure staff has that opportunity to evaluate depending on where the report lands, then look at mitigations, and bring it back to LPAB, as based on what Mr. Gilchrist has communicated. **Seconded by BM Andrews**

PSR French did a verbal roll call, **5 ayes, 2 absentees, 0 nays** – **Secretary August** – **motion passes**

ANNOUNCEMENTS - None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – for: September 13, 2021, November 8, 2021, December 13, 2021

PSR French did a verbal roll call, **5 ayes, 2 absentees, 0 nays** – **all minutes were approved**

ADJOURNMENT – **7:11pm**

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: March 7, 2022

Minutes prepared by: **LaTisha Russell**