EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010, Boston, MA 02108
April 22, 2005
Minutes Approved at the May 13, 2005 Meeting

Present: John Sanchez, ARLINGTON; Ed Sullivan, CANTON; William Hadley, LEXINGTON; Katherine Haynes Dunphy, MILTON; Lou Taverna, NEWTON.

Also in attendance: Andrew Pappastergion, MWRA BOARD OF DIRECTORS; Joseph Favaloro, Cornelia Potter, Ryan Ferrara, Andrea Briggs and Mary Ann McClellan, MWRA ADVISORY BOARD STAFF.

I. Approval of the March 18, 2005 Minutes of the Executive Committee

Chairman Katherine Haynes Dunphy called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. A Motion was made **TO APPROVE THE MARCH 18, 2005 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

II. Action Item: Advisory Board Lease at 11 Beacon Street

MWRA Executive Director Joseph Favaloro stated four years ago, in 2001, the Advisory Board signed a one-year lease for $38.75 per square foot. The last negotiation resulted in a three-year rate of $26.75 per square foot.

Proposed for the Executive Committee's approval is a new lease for five years fixed at $23.75 per square foot. It also includes language for leasehold improvements, such as replacing rugs. Though the market is still experiencing a 20 to 25% vacancy rate, Miller properties are at 98% occupied. Website listings for available space in Miller property buildings are listed at $25.75 per square foot.

A Motion was made **TO AUTHORIZE THE MWRA ADVISORY BOARD TO SIGN A FIVE-YEAR LEASE AT A FIXED RATE OF $23.75 PER SQUARE FOOT WITH NATHAN MILLER PROPERTIES, INC. FOR OFFICE SPACE AT 11 BEACON STREET, SUITE 1010.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

III. Preview: FY06 Advisory Board Budget

Mr. Favaloro noted through April 30, 2005, the Advisory Board is running on budget, with spending at 99%. There is a little float in discretionary line items such as *Conferences*; however, *Electricity, Payroll* and *Lease* costs are just about at 100%.

The major difference for the FY06 Budget is that the MWRA has agreed to move *Health Insurance* out of the Advisory Board's line item and directly into their budget, which provided the Advisory Board the float to have Executive Session discussion on personnel items. Pending the outcome of Executive Session, the overall budget will have a net reduction of 4.6%.

The FY06 *Rent* line item reflects a blended rate because the new lease does not begin until October. The full value of the rent reduction won't be seen until next fiscal year.

Equipment Lease costs have increased because the Advisory Board's copier has reached over 1.1 million copies and has had numerous service calls over the last three months. Staff has begun to look at the next generation of copiers and may have to lease a new copy machine early in the fiscal year. *Maintenance* would decrease because the purchase of a new copier would include maintenance for some portion of the first year.

The *Public Meetings* line item has increased because it costs a bit more each year to provide lunch at Advisory Board meetings.

Because of the shift in *Health Insurance*, the overall request to the Authority goes down to $425,000, including some surplus funds to offset the overall increase.

A Motion was made **TO APPROVE THE ADVISORY BOARD'S FY06 OPERATING BUDGET.** It was seconded.

Bill Hadley asked if the budget would be affected by Executive Session. Mr. Favaloro said it could be affected if the Executive Committee disagrees with the proposal. The vote can be incorporated into the May meeting.

The Motion was withdrawn.

IV. Action Item: Wilmington's Request for a Six-Month Emergency Water Connection Through Woburn

Mr. Favaloro stated Wilmington has requested a third emergency water supply activation, which triggers a higher water rate, as well as a higher price for a piece of the fixed costs based on the System Expansion Policy. The Mayor of Woburn has provided a letter expressing Woburn's support for this activation. The only paperwork that has yet to be received is the actual Declaration of Emergency from DEP; however, it is not an issue and will be sent.

Lou Taverna asked if Wilmington has a Water Conservation Policy. Mr. Favaloro replied that Wilmington does have a stringent Water Conservation Policy.

A Motion was made **TO ALLOW THE TOWN OF WILMINGTON (WILMINGTON) TO ACTIVATE A CONNECTION TO THE MWRA WATERWORKS SYSTEM, VIA THE CITY OF WOBURN (WOBURN), FOR A SIX-MONTH PERIOD, WITH A START DATE IN APRIL 2005. THE CONNECTION IS SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN WILMINGTON AND WOBURN THAT ADDRESSES ISSUES OF ASSESSMENT AND CHARGES PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION BY THE MWRA BOARD OF DIRECTORS. ADVISORY BOARD APPROVAL IS CONTINGENT UPON RECEIPT OF A LETTER FROM WOBURN INDICATING THEIR SUPPORT OF THE INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH WILMINGTON. AVERAGE DAILY DEMAND SHALL NOT EXCEED 1 MILLION GALLONS PER DAY. WILMINGTON WILL ABIDE BY THE RULES STIPULATED UNDER MWRA EMERGENCY WATER SUPPLY WITHDRAWALS (POLICY #OP.05), INCLUDING PAYMENT OF 110% SURCHARGE OF THE MWRA'S PREVAILING RATE PLUS 110% OF 2/3 OF THE ANNUAL PAYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE ASSET VALUE CONTRIBUTION PAYMENT (ENTRANCE FEE EQUIVALENT) AMORTIZED WITH INTEREST OVER 15 YEARS. RULES GOVERNING PREMIUM CHARGES AND ASSET VALUE**

CONTRIBUTION ARE INVOKED WHEN WATER IS TRANSFERRED FROM THE MWRA TO WILMINGTON. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

V. Action Item: Reviewing Fringe Rate Charge

Mr. Favaloro stated the Advisory Board was pleased last year that it was successful in creating a Water Supply Protection Trust (Trust) that moved funding for the Division of Water Supply Protection (DWSP) out of the State General Fund and into a Trust.

Staff knew the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) billed the MWRA (now the Trust) for an overhead charge for the portion of employees that spend only part of their time working on watershed related issues, such as personnel from their Legal, Human Resource and Finance Departments. It is a bone of contention on how the methodology was established, but no one would reasonably argue that there isn't some interaction.

In addition to the DCR charge, the Comptroller's office charges a percentage of *Personnel* line items (health insurance, pension and long term disability) called the fringe rate. That number changes every year; this year, for instance, it is 27%. If the personnel number was $10 million, the State would multiply $10 million by 27% and charge a fringe rate of $2.7 million.

Three weeks ago, a third overhead charge came to light. State Administration and Finance (A&F) now charges their overhead rate, which is in excess of 20%, and adds another $1.6 million to the overall cost of supporting the DWSP. When all is said and done, before one foot of watershed area is protected, the first overhead rate, the fringe rate and the A&F overhead rate add up to nearly $5 million, over and above the expenditures of the DWSP.

Advisory Board and MWRA staff met with the State Comptroller's Office and had a good discussion on the fringe rate. The Comptroller's staff asked if there is a better way to assess the fringe rate and said they would not have a concern if an Auditor was brought in to assess and develop a better methodology. It was determined it would be best if the Advisory Board initiated the audit of the fringe rate, how it is assessed, how it could be altered and implemented.

The Advisory Board had discussions with auditor Daniel Dennis and Company and they have agreed to put together an engagement letter based on an hourly rate. The Deputy Comptroller has signed off on the audit to evaluate the fringe rate. The audit can begin by the middle of May and a report should be available by the first June meeting of the MWRA Board of Directors.

Mr. Favaloro requested authorization from the Executive Committee to utilize the Advisory Board's Legal/Consultant fund to have Daniel Dennis and Company evaluate and make a proposal on the fringe rate as the Comptroller's office currently has it construed. State government can be difficult to traverse, especially if the auditor has to spend some of that time at DCR. There could be many roadblocks in the way of getting and evaluating information. Mr. Favaloro suggested providing $10,000.

MWRA Executive Director Fred Laskey has committed to reimbursing the Advisory Board for the audit.

Chairman Dunphy said it is clearly our role and responsibility to do this kind of investigation work on behalf of the ratepayers. This is an issue that needs to be clarified.

Mr. Favaloro noted the amount of money that could be saved through a different approach on the fringe rate could be as high as $0.5 million. Currently, the annual rate is calculated by taking the entire work force for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and coming up with a percentage to recover all of their costs. The flaw with that is the Authority's portion is only 145 employees. If the auditor can find a way to isolate those 145, the Authority will be in better shape.

Mr. Pappastergion asked if the Comptroller's Office has provided assurances that after this exercise they will accept the results. Mr. Favaloro said nothing is iron clad. The Comptroller's Office determines what the assessment should be so they have the flexibility to do it and said they would.

Mr. Pappastergion asked if the Comptroller's Office is part of the Administration. Mr. Favaloro said the power vests with the Comptroller's Office, but he is sure they communicate with A&F and other entities of State government. The Comptroller bought into this approach. To date, in three subsequent conversations with Eric Berman, the Deputy Comptroller, they have not balked and have been very helpful. At the very least, if they decide to balk, the Advisory Board will be armed with a report by an independent auditor that will make recommendations and staff will have something that could most likely be sold to the Legislature and others.

No one at the Advisory Board, MWRA or Senator Brewer's office had any knowledge of the A&F overhead charge for the Trust; however, the Administration was aware of it because this is not the only Trust that ever existed.

The Advisory Board will file Amendments to the House Budget to waive the Trust fees through Representative Ron Mariano. Currently there are two versions and staff will determine next week which one to file.

Mr. Pappastergion asked how long that charge has been around. Mr. Favaloro said since at least 2003. The Secretary said she didn't know about it; however, in an April 1 press release by the Secretary, Endangered Species Trust received a waiver from A&F costs for FY04 and FY05. The press release was the last step of a long negotiation, so the information was available and discussed within the state.

Mr. Pappastergion said if you assume the Secretary knew about this charge, it begs the question why the previous Secretary, the Advisory Board's consultant on the Trust, didn't know about this charge. Mr. Favaloro said it is a good question.

Chairman Dunphy noted it is possible that with the state budget problems and an Administration that doesn't want to raise taxes, or even retain taxes at their current level, that there has been a big shift toward fees. When this fee was established is a good question; it may have been recent.

Mr. Favaloro said it does not make a lot of sense to expend political good will and fight to get this through the House and Senate Budgets so the Governor can veto it. Further, the Governor is going to veto Debt Service Assistance, so the Advisory Board will have to work to override Debt Service Assistance and the Trust fees. If you are a legislator in a community, which one is more important? It is clearly Debt Service Assistance. A&F can issue a waiver.

The Advisory Board has a trump card in that its Chairman is on the Board of Trustees. The Authority is going to demand that DCR provide a budget that is $2 million less so that there won't be an additional charge to communities. If the watershed budget has to incur another $2 million in an overhead rate, then DCR will have to reduce the Direct costs to cover the fringe rate charge without an increase in dollars.

Mr. Pappastergion said the MWRA doesn't have any power over that. Mr. Favaloro said it is no longer a state budget. Chairman Dunphy said there is a Trust of five members and she assumes that the MWRA (Fred Laskey) and she would vote that this should not be passed on to the ratepayers. Chairman Dunphy noted her plan to send an email requesting two budgets, the one that was presented in February and a budget that is cut in the amount of this proposed fee and what the effect would be on programs, personnel, recreation and water quality. Further, Chairman Dunphy planned to contact the other Trustees to ensure that they are aware of this charge.

The Executive Committee offered the Chairman their strong support to express their dismay that the state misled members when the Trust was established and feel this is a misuse of ratepayers' monies.

A Motion was made **TO AUTHORIZE EXPENDITURE FOR A FRINGE RATE AUDIT NOT TO EXCEED $10,000. ANYTHING OVER AND ABOVE MUST COME BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

VI. Recap: Advisory Board Comments and Recommendations to the Authority's Proposed FY06 Capital Improvement Program

Because the March Advisory Board meeting was cancelled, Cornelia Potter brought the Executive Committee up-to-date on the shape and scope of the Advisory Board's comments on the FY06 Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

The Authority to date has spent over $6.3 billion since its inception in 1985 and the proposed budget includes future spending of $1.4 billion for the period FY05 forward. The proposed CIP is a significantly lower budget than has been seen in previous years. The Authority reduced future spending from $1.8 billion to $1.4 billion for a net reduction of $410 million, or nearly one-quarter of the budget.

The Authority did have a number of cost increases and new projects included in the budget of $195 million, including contingency cost estimates, which was more than offset by $605 million in projects and sub-phases that were deleted from the existing budget. Most of those reductions were from non-mandated projects such as wastewater piping and pumping and water distribution and pumping projects. Most of the reductions fall within the next capital spending cap timeframe of FY09-13. Spending for that same five-year period is closer to the amount budgeted two budget cycles ago in the FY04 CIP.

In addition, another $165 million in new and expanded projects that had been proposed by Authority staff were not included in the CIP. Therefore, there are a total of $770 million worth of projects that staff have identified, both water and wastewater, that are not included in this budget. The Authority notes that staff will need to reevaluate the need for these projects and what their priorities and schedules ought to be. It is the master planning process that will grapple with the question of when and which projects will come back into the budget as the Authority is facing a period of limited financial resources.

The five-year cap was set at $1.134 billion for the period FY04-08. FY05 will complete the second year of the five-year cap. The MWRA's Proposed FY06 Budget does comply with the cap and is just $4.6 million below the cap. The other condition for the cap was that each year may vary plus or minus 20% of the initial amount. The Authority reaches this provision for each year except FY08, which exceeds that 20% limit by $28 million. The Authority has time to work that fifth year out in future budgets.

The Advisory Board continues to support the Authority's remaining within the overall cap and recommends reducing or updating some of the contract costs, which total $9.2 million, as a tool in staying within the five-year cap.

Debt service payments are a huge part of the overall Current Expense Budget. It has grown from 50% of the budget just a couple of years ago to now 60% of the proposed budget and is projected to increase to nearly 65% in future years. Furthermore, these are higher percentages of much larger budgets.

The Authority has been able to absorb the growing impact of debt service by the way in which it has restructured the payment stream. Over the first twenty years or so, the Authority repaid less than $100 million a year in debt service principal. MWRA has repaid under $1 billion of the $6 billion borrowed. The sobering statistic is that total future principal and interest payments just to support the next ten years of the budget plus the last twenty years of borrowing is over $12 billion.

The CSO Program is the dominant feature for future spending. It is more than one-third of all spending from the first year of the cap forward for ten years. It is 40% of all spending from this year forward and it is 50% of all spending in FY08.

The North Dorchester Bay/Reserved Channel project is the single largest project at over $300 million in the most recent projections. These are estimates in current dollars (December 2005), it does not represent the cost to complete.

Furthermore, the total cost of the CSO Program has increased by $100 million in just the last twelve months. There is the potential for additional cost increases and this includes all the projects that are still under discussion: the Alewife, Charles River and East Boston.

Mr. Favaloro noted the Judge's response to the Authority's last filing. Two outstanding issues needed to be addressed. The first was non-precedent setting of stormwater; the Authority was going to capture stormwater for the North Dorchester Bay project. The second issue pertained to the holistic approach. MWRA staff came to the Advisory Board regarding the expansion of the North Dorchester Bay projects, provided in the context that additional dollars and levels of control achieved or incorporated on the beaches of Boston would be tied into a holistic approach with all of the basins, specifically Alewife and Charles and East Boston. Decisions would be made so they would know exactly the limit of control for the Charles.

The Authority in their last court report identified that this is the approach they were taking and reinforced it by acknowledging the actions taken by the MWRA Board of Directors in deferring a vote on Section 61 of the North Dorchester Bay project until there is a determination of the holistic approach and the stormwater precedent.

The Judge's comment as far as the stormwater precedent is clear; the Judge acknowledges to all the court parties that there is no precedent setting as relates to stormwater. He also acknowledges the discussion amongst the court parties as relates to the holistic approach of all the basins. He raises the concerns that the Department of Justice brought forward that there is no relationship between North Dorchester Bay and meeting those milestones and the other basins. One was not contingent on the other. At the end of the Judge's report it says, "Therefore, the Board's concerns should be sufficiently alleviated and the MWRA should submit proposed milestones to be incorporated to Schedule Six with its next Quarterly Progress Report." At this juncture, there is no holistic approach as relates to CLF, Justice, EPA and now the Judge.

As it stands now, unless the Board takes a different action, the Authority is going to provide the court parties with a schedule for beginning the next phases of the Boston beaches projects and all of the other discussions will just stay out there. These projects are on a three-year variance and there is a lot of potential for those projects to grow bigger and steeper. In many ways, it is even more reason to support no movement on the North Dorchester Bay projects.

Mr. Pappastergion asked who the driver is in all this. Mr. Favaloro said if you are the second in command at EPA, you know that Mr. Varney is not always going to be there. The second tier of upper level management are the ones that run the show. When Fred Laskey sat down with Mr. Varney he most likely agreed with the holistic approach, but it doesn't do any good until it is in writing. If push comes to shove in the next Board meeting, what is the Board going to do? Mr. Pappastergion said the Board will probably vote the schedule. Some of us might vote against it, but it will pass.

Mr. Favaloro said the day the Board sets the schedule for the North Dorchester Bay projects, it ends all dialog regarding the other basins. The only leverage out there is North Dorchester. Ms. Potter said it was a negotiating strategy and the Authority staff got way out ahead on North Dorchester Bay to demonstrate its cooperation and willingness to work with all parties, but deep in the background was the Charles, the Alewife and the East Boston projects and resolution and agreement about the eventual scope and schedule for that work. Those three projects have gotten lost in the mist and because they are not resolved it leaves open the potential for additional costs in the future.

Chairman Dunphy said MWRA, in good faith, moved up the South Boston beaches projects and the regulatory agencies have delayed resolution on the other projects, when they should be working to come to an agreement. Ms. Potter said it will isolate the decisions for those other projects by leaving the Authority with no leverage.

Ms. Potter said the CSO Program has gone up by $100 million in the last twelve months and spending during the cap period for the next three years went up by $110 million. Even though the Authority has remained within the cap, a lot of other non-mandated projects had to be pushed out of the next three years, as well as the next five beyond that.

Staff recommends that the Authority freeze spending on the North Dorchester Bay project and on any of the four projects until consensus on all four can be reached. As part of the consensus, water quality standards for the Alewife and lower Charles should be set at Bcso. If the Cottage Farm facility, which by definition is a CSO facility, is ever to be operated, MWRA must have the okay to do it.

The increased costs and accelerated schedule for North Dorchester Bay are the principal drivers of rate increases over the next several years. Despite the reduction in the overall capital budget, over the ten years rates are $33 million higher because of faster spending on CSOs in the next several years. This means earlier and greater borrowing to be carried over for multi-year periods. MWRA staff should rethink some of these schedule decisions so rate increases aren't exacerbated in the next several years.

The Authority should rebuild its internal master planning process with a committee that represents not just the Planning Department but key players from across the agency. Further, MWRA should reevaluate the master planning schedule and accelerate the outline.

VII. Update: FY06 Current Expense Budget Review

[The Comments and Recommendations of the CIP had been approved at the March meeting of the Executive Committee and will be considered by the full Advisory Board at its April 28th meeting.]

Ms. Potter stated MWRA Budget Director Carl Erickson will be at the next Advisory Board meeting to give an introduction to the Proposed FY06 Current Expense Budget (CEB). In its simplest form, the CEB includes $550 million in expenses. Revenue totaling $70 million (consisting of just over $40 million from investment income and other charges, plus $27 million from the rate stabilization funds and $3 million from variable rate savings) reduces the rate revenue requirement to $480 million for FY06. It is an increase of 5.86% after the Chicopee Valley Aqueduct adjustment.

The key elements of the $550 million budget are *Direct Expenses* of $182 million, *Indirect Expenses* of nearly $38 million (that is where the Division of Watershed Management and related expenses are) and *Capital Financing Expenses* of $329 million. The fastest growing segment of the budget has been, and continues to be, debt service. The debt service budget is a $31 million increase, or 10% over the amount budgeted in FY05 and is three-quarters of the total increase to the budget in FY06.

There is $5 billion in principal payments and $3.5 billion in interest outstanding. Future capital spending and related debt service will bring the overall total to $12.2 billion. Advisory Board staff acknowledges that the Authority's budget is reflecting an increasingly disciplined budgetary process, particularly on the *Direct Expense* side. There have been reductions to a number of budget categories and tightening of a number of others that demonstrate that the agency has a growing commitment to fiscal restraint.

The budget reflects a number of areas of risk, which could result in additional costs including rising electricity and diesel fuel prices, inflationary pressures, rising interest rates, regulatory requirements, watershed related expense and health care.

Staff suggests the Advisory Board recommendations be used to reduce spending and to increase non-rate revenue to offset the use of rate stabilization. This budget includes the largest amount of rate stabilization monies the Authority has ever used, except for getting through FY03's debt service assistance shortfall, at $27 million. The Advisory Board is looking at ways to save some of these monies for future years since the Authority anticipates the current balances in the rate stabilization funds will expire within three years.

Such reductions to the use of rate stabilization funds, whether it is the rate stabilization or bond redemption fund, should be reserved to offset future rate increases. Any Debt Service Assistance that is received in FY06 should be used to reduce assessments in FY06. The Authority should begin to assemble the components of a multi-year action plan, which include addressing some of the regulatory requirements that cause cost increases; change and tighten operating strategies, always looking for ways to control peak power demand and self generate by way of example; modify and tighten budget management (staff urges the Authority to re-look the reserves and tighten and be more aggressive, within appropriate boundaries, for investment income strategies); continue to stay within the cap; and expand other non-rate revenue.

VIII. Legislative Update

Mr. Favaloro stated the Governor's House 1 budget did not include Debt Service Assistance (DSA). For FY05, DSA was $10 million. Currently, the House Ways & Means Budget provides $12.5 million. Staff expects the Senate Budget to include more. Staff is hopeful that DSA will get through Conference Committee reflecting $15 million.

Rep. Mariano will file the Advisory Board's Trust waiver language; however, Rep. Kulik is also seeking a permanent waiver for the National Heritage Trust. Massachusetts Audubon is watching MWRA's efforts for a waiver and will try to seek a waiver also. That may prove a problem; in this fight, there is not strength in numbers.

IX. Preview: State Changes to Water Conservation Policies

Mr. Favaloro stated the Water Resources Commission (WRC) is discussing implementing a 65 gallon per capita per day restriction for stressed basins that potentially could have significant impacts on cities and towns.

This restriction would end all outdoor use of water, which would be a difficult thing to sell to communities. Further, it would require massive water conservation within households, including retrofitting of toilets and faucets and new washing machines. That is the only way to get close to 65 gallons per capita.

At this juncture, the MWRA would not fall under the same rules because it is not in a stressed basin. However, the regulators could make it a state-wide requirement.

X. Action Item: Interview/Nomination for Advisory Board Representative to the MWRA Board of Directors

Mr. Favaloro noted that John Carroll was away on vacation; however, since Mr. Carroll is a long-term member of the Board, there should not be a huge amount of questions that could not be answered at the full Advisory Board meeting. Chairman Dunphy stated if there were another candidate, the Committee should wait for an interview; however, since there is no other candidate, the Committee can go ahead and nominate Mr. Carroll if that is the desire.

A Motion was made **TO NOMINATE JOHN CARROLL TO THE FULL ADVISORY BOARD TO SERVE AS AN ADVISORY BOARD REPRESENTATIVE ON THE MWRA BOARD OF DIRECTORS FROM JULY 1, 2005 TO JUNE 30, 2008.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

XI. Approval of the Advisory Board Agenda for April 28, 2005

A Motion was made **TO APPROVE THE ADVISORY BOARD AGENDA FOR THE APRIL 28, 2005 MEETING.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

XII. Executive Session

A MOTION WAS MADE TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 9:53 A.M. TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL MATTERS. It was seconded. A roll call vote was taken:

Yes	No	Abstain
Dunphy		
Hadley		
Sanchez		

Sullivan, Ed
Taverna

After discussion regarding personnel matters, **A MOTION WAS MADE TO RETURN TO OPEN SESSION AT 10:16 A.M.** It was seconded. A roll call vote was taken:

Yes	No	Abstain
Dunphy		
Hadley		
Sanchez		
Sullivan, Ed		
Taverna		

No further votes were taken.

XIII. Adjournment

A Motion was made **TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:17 A.M.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Sullivan, Secretary