

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2011
ADVISORY BOARD OFFICE**

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 14, 2011 MEETING

Present: John Sullivan, BOSTON; John Sanchez, BURLINGTON; Jay Fink, LYNN; Katherine Dunphy, MILTON; Wiff Peterson, NATICK; Lou Taverna, NEWTON; John DeAmicis, STONEHAM; Carol Antonelli, WAKEFIELD; Walter Woods, WELLESLEY; Zig Peret, WILBRAHAM.

Also in attendance, John Carroll, MWRA BOARD OF DIRECTORS; Steve Remsberg, MWRA STAFF; Joseph Favaloro, Matthew Romero, Maggie Atanasov and Mary Ann McClellan, MWRA ADVISORY BOARD STAFF; Cornelia Potter, MWRA ADVISORY BOARD CONSULTANT.

I. Approval of the December 10, 2010, April 15, 2011, May 12, 2011 and June 10, 2011 Minutes of the Executive Committee

Chairman Katherine Haynes Dunphy called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m. A Motion was made **TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 10, 2010, APRIL 15, 2011, MAY 12, 2011 AND JUNE 10, 2011 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

II. Action Item: Nomination of the FY12 Executive Committee

The following slate was presented to the Executive Committee, acting as the Nomination Committee, for its consideration:

Chair:	Katherine Haynes Dunphy, Milton
Vice Chair of Finance:	Bernie Cooper, Norwood
Vice Chair of Operations:	Jay Fink, Lynn
Secretary:	Lou Taverna, Newton
Treasurer:	John P. Sullivan, Boston
At-Large:	Carol Antonelli, Wakefield
	John DeAmicis, Stoneham
	Andrew DeSantis, Chelsea
	William P. Hadley, Lexington
	Timothy MacDonald, Cambridge
	Zigmund Peret, Wilbraham
	Winfield Peterson, Natick
	John Sanchez, Burlington
	Walter Woods, Wellesley
	(3) Vacant

Hearing no nominations from the floor, a Motion was made **TO SUBMIT THE LIST OF NOMINEES TO SERVE AS THE FY12 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO THE FULL MWRA ADVISORY BOARD.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

III. Status: Upgrades to the Advisory Board's Publications / Website

MWRA Advisory Board Executive Director Joseph Favaloro stated that over the past few years the Advisory Board has tried to update its methods of communication, which includes going to paperless correspondence and utilizing the internet and various other tools such as Twitter and Flickr that make things more accessible and easily obtainable for members that can't come to a particular meeting or just want different pieces of information.

The Advisory Board is now updating two more methods of communication. The first is the Advisory Board's website, which wasn't as current or easily adaptable to the Advisory Board's needs as it should have been. Over the summer Maggie Atanasov and Matt Romero worked on updating the Advisory Board's website. The second item to be revamped is the Board of Directors' summaries, in recognition that interested parties may not want to read through eight pages of text to find the information most pertinent to them.

Ms. Atanasov stated that she felt there might be more efficient ways to handle communications with members and the communities. Staff did some research and developed a new site. The "Home Page" is similar to the old site with additional pictures and access to the Advisory Board's video that was created two years ago that explains what the Advisory Board does and what it has accomplished. The center section of the site will list the most recent happenings and on the right hand side are links to the Advisory Board's Twitter and Flickr accounts.

Additionally, the upcoming events section will provide a schedule of all of the pertinent meetings. Clicking on a particular meeting will provide more details about the meeting and directions to the location. Mr. Romero noted that eventually attachments will be added to the events, such as the agenda and handouts and the minutes will be included as well upon completion.

Mr. Favaloro said the website is still under construction and will be evolving over the coming months with the goal of providing information more readily. If members would like to provide input, please contact staff.

Zig Peret asked for information on Twitter. Ms. Atanasov said Twitter is a short, efficient way of getting your information across. Instead of writing a whole paragraph explaining what is going on in a particular meeting, you would write a short "blurb" within 140 characters to get your message across. Mr. Favaloro added that it is instantaneous information that you have access to.

Lou Taverna requested a link to staff summaries, for instance on the Water Loan Program or the I/I Program. Mr. Romero said staff summaries could be made available on the website. An explanation on how the financial assistance programs work, and links to the correct contact people if there are questions, will be posted. A communities tab has been added with the intention of providing information about the consumption of water and sewer use online; staff will try to update that on a regular basis. Rate assessments are also something that people are interested in. Local news is something that staff hopes to get some feedback on from members. If there are any stories or programs in the cities and towns that members feel are worth sharing, that is where it would be posted.

Ms. Atanasov said staff has worked on a new format for the Board Summary. Feedback received thus far from members overall has been positive; however, staff is open to suggestions if there is further information that members may need or for other ideas.

The first part of the new format was a Board Voting Summary Sheet, which essentially listed certain Board items with the vote that was made and an asterisk next to items that were heavily discussed. The Board Summary itself will list the discussion that was held on these items. Attachments that pertain to the particular topic will also be posted and a link to the Advisory Board's voted position on a particular topic will also be posted.

Mr. Romero noted that the official language will be "grayed out" to distinguish it from the discussion of the Board. He also emphasized that staff would now be providing even more information than in the previous format while organizing it in a better way for people to access as general or detailed a level of information about the Board meeting as they wanted.

John Sanchez said he thinks the changes to the website are terrific but that his concern is the amount of work that may be required to keep it up-to-date if staff tries to convert a lot of things; after four months the information may be stale. He suggested that staff concentrate on a couple of areas that people really want to see updated.

Mr. Favaloro said Maggie and Matt have put a lot of time into this process. This change is not going to happen overnight, it continues to evolve. He said he is pleased with the direction the site is heading in.

IV. Status: Initiative Petition # 11-10 (Imposition of 2.5% Cap On Increases to Retail Water and Sewer Rates)

Mr. Favaloro said an Initiative Petition # 11-10 has been filed and has been certified by the Attorney General that could significantly impact communities in setting their water and sewer rates.

MWRA General Counsel Steve Remsberg said this is a difficult topic to speak about because the petition itself is not a model of clarity. Secondly, there has been an attempt to draft this petition based on legislation that was used to impose the 2½% limitation upon property tax increases and impose that methodology for assessing water and sewer charges, which are wholly different.

In the early 1980s, legislation, by virtue of an initiative petition, was passed by the voters, which limited property tax increases by a 2½% level. As part of that initiative petition then, there was a corresponding provision whereby the legislature was prohibited from imposing unfunded mandates upon cities and towns. So communities had both the Chapter 59 limitation whereby they could not go more than 2½% above the last levy amount and also had a limit whereby the Commonwealth (and in the old days MDC, counties, and regional districts) could not impose greater than a 2½% increase upon cities and towns. Any charges, fees or costs that they had authority to impose downward from a state level to a city level were also limited to 2½%.

This Initiative Petition attempts to graft some of those provisions to do two things; it would propose to limit the annual increases imposed by cities and towns upon residents' water and sewer charges to 2½%. Correspondingly, at the state level, the intent is to limit charges, costs or fees imposed by a state, county and regional district level upon cities and towns that limits those types of water and sewer charges again to 2½%. The most obvious example at the state level is the MWRA.

Mr. Remsberg said that it is his opinion that there are some rules of statutory construction that apply here and would make MWRA not subject to the Initiative Petition's limiting provisions.

The proponents of the Initiative Petition are trying to “fiddle” with a 1980 provision. While that legislation was applicable to the MDC, the MWRA’s Enabling Act legislation was passed in 1984. The 2½% limitation that was imposed under Chapter 59 no longer applied to the MWRA, which had its own independent methodology for imposing rates upon cities and towns. The 1980 legislation purported to apply to public authorities; however, the 1984 Enabling Act cancels out the 1980 provisions relative to MWRA.

The 2011 provision purports, at least on its face, to say that the MWRA must follow suit with every other state level or regional entity that wants to impose charges, costs and fees upon cities and towns. The problem with that is that nothing in the 2011 petition language changes MWRA’s Enabling Act, nor does it change anything in the 1980 Act. That does not mean, however, that the provisions might not have applicability to the cities and towns and sewer and water districts that are members of MWRA’s water and sewer service areas. That is a matter that will take some time to work out. We all remain hopeful that this petition does not gather the appropriate number of signatures to eventually get it to the ballot.

The legislative language itself is imprecise in the extreme; it deals with four basic areas. One is filing of rates by cities or towns or water or sewer districts. Two, it imposes a rate approval process for those rates and assigns that approval function to the Department of Public Utilities (DPU). Three, it provides the possibility of an override for cities and towns that can convince their residents that a greater than 2½% increase is necessary for a given year. Four, it provides an exemption for those cities and towns that have an outstanding bond issue for water or sewer infrastructure improvements for which debt service is due (the bond issue has to have existed as of the date that this petition is passed, if it gets passed); someone in the city or town government can decide that the existence of that amount of debt service requires greater than a 2½% increase, then the setting of the rates is exempt totally from the 2½% limitation and the increase is allowed to go ahead whether or not there is an authorizing override vote. Staff believes this exemption is included because all statutes must pass constitutional muster. If a provision in a statute impairs the ability of a private citizen or a public entity’s ability to perform a contract, then that statute or provision is deemed to be unconstitutional. This provision would save this petition from a constitutional challenge.

The language throughout the petition is imprecise; for example, with respect to filing of rates, it is relatively clear that those provisions apply to any city, any town, any other municipal corporation, any water district, or any sewer district. At the DPU certification stage of the petition, it literally applies only to cities and towns. It does not say a water or sewer district, a water and sewer commission or an authority has to submit its rates for approval. The proponent’s use of language is poor draftsmanship and imprecision.

The same thing happens with the override provisions. Cities and towns are able to seek an override, but there is no provision that allows water or sewer districts or water and sewer commissions to do so. The districts and commissions do not have registered voters; they are an arm or a branch, or an independent body politic of municipal government. It doesn’t have its own voter constituency so there is a problem with the statute, which, if it passes, will have to be dealt with.

Finally, cities, towns and districts all seem to have the ability to rely on the exemption provisions. What will become of this statute and how to challenge it, if necessary, will be difficult because courts will try to bend over backward to find a way to knit all of these provisions, even though they are imprecise and the language is not perfectly consistent and congruent throughout, to try to make them work as a whole.

The Attorney General's task in reviewing an initiative petition is to do a factual investigation about what its impact is. Additionally, its job is to not certify petitions that cover a topic that is an excluded matter. Excluded matters include things like if someone wanted to say we will no longer have freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion – that is not the subject of an initiative petition. If there was an adverse decision from a court, an initiative petition cannot reverse that decision. Most applicable to this situation, an excluded matter includes petition topics that are not of statewide concern; rather they are excluded if they have concern only to particular localities within the Commonwealth or particular districts within the Commonwealth.

On that issue, the Attorney General recognized that there was a possibility because of the imprecision in the language, because it drew distinctions between cities and towns on the one hand and water and sewer districts on the other hand and didn't treat water and sewer commissions at all and really didn't treat the MWRA at all, that there was the possibility to try to geographically determine that the provisions of the petition applied so non-uniformly across all the cities and towns that it should be regarded as a matter that deals only with localities and is not a matter of statewide concern.

MWRA staff worked with the Attorney General, and in particular with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), to come up with a list of primarily sewer and water districts, mostly in the western part of the state and some in the southeast and on Cape Cod where the provisions of the petition clearly would not apply because the town is not seweraged or the town does not provide municipal water services. If they don't provide the services, they are not going to charge rates and they are not covered by the statute.

There was another category. Water or sewer districts, though they provide water service at a municipal level, the towns or cities themselves are not seweraged and that would also be a category where this petition language would not have applied. Unfortunately, after a lot of work, staff only came up with 75 cities or towns out of 351 that could clearly be demonstrated to the Attorney General that the petition language would definitely not apply to, which was not enough; they ultimately determined that it is a matter of statewide concern. Therefore, it has been certified this week.

Mr. Remsberg said unfortunately this petition seems to have been drafted as an afterthought. He said he does not mean to suggest that the idea of a limitation on increasing of rates is either good or bad, but why not go to the particular chapters of the general laws, like Chapters 40 and 41, where the communities derive their authority to impose rates and try to make some changes there. We are left with a series of provisions where you derive your authority to impose rates and now we have this other competing and conflicting set of provisions, which, if passed, are going to clash and will likely result in a court contest to sort them out.

Upon certification, the matter goes from the Attorney General to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State prints the blank for voter signatures, which need to be in within several months. If there are a sufficient number of signatures, then the matter goes to the legislature and it has to pass through both houses of the legislature; it will more than likely, Mr. Remsberg predicts, not pass there. Then it is incumbent upon the proponents to gather another group of signatures. If they are successful there, it then goes on the ballot on the next general state election.

John Carroll asked why Mr. Remsberg thinks the legislature would not pass this petition. Mr. Favaloro said the legislature can take three avenues: it can ignore it; it can pass it; it can reject it. With two of the three options the legislature has, the proponent still has the opportunity to go back and get approximately 12,000 signatures to get it on the ballot. There is always going to be an avenue for the proponent to get it on the ballot regardless of what the legislature does.

Mr. Carroll said he couldn't see it not getting on the ballot. Mr. Remsberg said his reasoning for saying it will be rejected is that the provisions are just a mess, reviewing the language as a lawyer. Mr. Carroll said if someone stands outside of Stop and Shop, people are going to say where do I sign? Mr. Favaloro said that is why we have jumped on it quickly to work with it where we thought the best approach would be to create a constructive argument so that the Attorney General would not certify it. That did not occur. So now we are on a road to the ballot and if it is on the ballot, it is going to pass.

Chairman Dunphy asked if this is for the November ballot or the primary ballot. Mr. Favaloro said it is for the November 2012 Presidential Ballot.

Lou Taverna asked if there is any argument that his city's water and sewer rates are really a user fee for use of the service. How can they impose a limitation on a user fee? Mr. Remsberg said the SJC said, with the original 2½, that the intention of the proponents was to place a limit on state and local taxation. The language of 20A of Chapter 59 back in the 1980s didn't deal with taxation; its language was charges, costs and fees. The entire Proposition 2½ package held and the concept of limitations on taxation was coupled with a limitation on fees to the extent that there was an imposition of costs, charges or fees at the state level down to the cities and towns.

Jay Fink asked if Mr. Remsberg is indicating that there appears to be enough conflict that this would not impact the MWRA's ability to raise rates higher than 2½%. Mr. Remsberg said for two reasons. First, there is the statutory construction argument that MWRA's 1984 Enabling Act trumps contrary language in the 1980 provision and the 2011 changes in the petition don't do anything to change either the 1980 or 1984 legislation. Second, even if a court wouldn't agree with that, the MWRA has the ability to rely upon the exemption because it certainly has bond issues for which there is debt service that needs more than a 2½% increase annually.

Mr. Remsberg said the next question is how these provisions mesh when you have cities and towns imposing not only their own rate increase but MWRA's wholesale rate increase on top of it. The petition is silent on that other than to say if you qualify for the exemption, speaking of the MWRA, then the rate limitation provisions are just deemed to be wholly inapplicable. So the Board of Directors could put forth a 5% increase; one argument is that cities and towns within the MWRA service area would be able to pass along the 5%, then would be limited to just another 2½% on top of that.

Mr. Favaloro said it is a political and perception nightmare for communities. The voters put in a 2½% increase limit and then basically, and rightfully so based on the language as it is written, no one will ever meet it.

Chairman Dunphy said Proposition 2½% includes a way that a town can go out and not have an operating override but to have a debt exclusion override, which does not seem to appear anywhere in this language. If a town decided ten years from now that they had to go out and borrow money for infrastructure improvements, can they do this under this petition? Mr.

Remsberg said no because the exemption only exists for bond issues that were in place as of the date that the petition is passed, if it is passed.

The language of the petition, as it relates to the cities and towns at a local level, imposes a 2½% limit. There are no other additions. When you get to the state level, counties, districts, authorities, of which MWRA is not going to be one, there are two components that have to be added together to get to the permitted amount of increase. One is simply the 2½% above what you have assessed in the prior year but then the language of the petition goes on to say and any other costs which are typically incurred at the local level; those can be added in. Mr. Remsberg said he does not know what that means because that is not the way that MWRA casts its rates and it is not the way the communities cast their rates.

Walter Woods said if they selected a more realistic figure than 2½% it might be palatable, more like 5%, because nothing goes up 2½% now. Towns will be laying off people. Mr. Favaloro added, even worse than that, not meeting future infrastructure needs because they will never be able to borrow to do them.

Mr. Remsberg said the proponent is the master of his or her own petition language; the legislature cannot fiddle with it by switching 2½% to 5%. There can be clarifying language changes, but it cannot change the substance. The legislature can adopt a parallel provision on its own to compete with the petition.

Mr. Remsberg noted that the exemption applies as MWRA is climbing up the debt service mountain; once it gets to the other side of it, the exemption is not necessarily going to apply to the MWRA because even though there is preexisting bond indebtedness, it might be hard to say that if the MWRA sees a 3% decrease in debt service from one year to the next.

An argument could be made that the Enabling Act of the MWRA establishes what was intended to be an integrated rate setting structure, which not only affects how MWRA sets its wholesale rates but there are provisions that talk about a complementary system where MWRA rates and the cities and towns rates are then the rates that go out to the residents. If you affect half of that model and you exempt half the model, then there is an argument that all of the members under MWRA's umbrella are equally affected and they should be exempt. That is a more difficult argument to make because even though MWRA may be exempt, its member communities are still cities and towns in addition to being members of the MWRA service area.

Wiff Peterson asked if this legislation would have an impact on the rating of bonds. Would the bond rating agencies see increased risk and would passage of this legislation drive up bond rates? Mr. Remsberg said yes. In Chapter 40 or 41 and somewhere in federal regulations, there is a requirement that cities and towns set their rates in a manner so that they can recover all of their costs for operation, maintenance, personnel, etc. That is the biggest conflict between the limitations of the provisions of the petition and existing case law. If there is a better way to get to this result, it would have been more sensible to try to dovetail the limitation provisions with existing language, which is the polar opposite of this limitation language. This sets up an absolute clash between the two sets of statutory provisions.

Mr. Peterson said by imposing greater risks on bondholders and increasing the costs of borrowing, it could put the cities and towns in a squeeze, which causes their water and sewer systems to be unsustainable from a rates standpoint. Mr. Remsberg said these are the arguments that would be made if the matter gets to the ballot. Again, John's point is who is going to be against paying less for water and sewer.

Mr. Peterson said this issue demands education.

Mr. Remsberg said a final issue is what are the implications of a limitation on an increase in water and sewer rates when communities are being deluged daily by environmental agencies and being required under administrative consent orders and other enforcement steps to invest in more infrastructure, to spend more and more money to prevent CSOs? It is again a countervailing cross current that the proponents have just not even begun to think about.

Mr. Carroll asked who the proponents are. Mr. Remsberg said they are about 13 individuals. Mr. Favaloro said a law firm is involved as the facilitator who filed and 15 taxpayers signed. There doesn't appear to be a common link. The firm is from Georgia and the person that filed is Heidi Verougstraete from Lawrenceville, Georgia. The legal firm of Bill McDermott does not seem to have an express water, sewer, infrastructure or litigation on environmental issues as the major thrust of their actions. The 15 taxpayers that filed the petition don't seem to be "activists" per se. There doesn't seem to be a common link. They are from the Burlington, Reading and Stoneham areas.

Chairman Dunphy asked when they talk about charges and rates, how is that determined? Mr. Remsberg said if your revenues in from residents was "X", the community cannot raise its rates to receive more than 2½% more than that revenue from the prior year.

Mr. Woods asked if an election would be held every year to override the 2½%. Mr. Favaloro said yes, that is the only way they can do it. It is onerous because they would have to request an override vote six months prior to the setting of the budget so logistically it doesn't even work.

Mr. DeAmicis said what do we do now? Mr. Favaloro said the next steps would be that the petitioner needs 68,000+ votes between now and mid-November; from that point if they get certifiable votes by the Secretary of State, it goes to the legislature. If the legislature rejects or ignores the petition, the proponent has to get another 11,000 plus signatures to get it onto the ballot in November 2012. The Executive Committee will determine if and when it wants staff to take any action. At some point in time, I expect that Mr. Laskey will bring to the Board of Directors the same presentation that Steve just made to us and the Board of Directors will decide if and when they want to do anything.

Chairman Dunphy asked if the legislature could make modifications if the bill were passed. Mr. Remsberg said the legislature could amend the language. Mr. Peret also noted that the legislature could create parallel legislation, which could be used to nullify this language. Mr. Remsberg said it would not necessarily be to nullify the language but rather to go into competition with the ballot initiative.

Mr. Favaloro said once it gets through the legislative process, the legislature can come up with its own plan to be in competition with this initiative. The proponents can then, for clarification purposes, tweak their initiative petition as it arrives to the ballot, but beyond that, there is nothing else that can be done. Mr. Remsberg said other than perhaps an education process currently, which might intercede to prevent folks from signing the petition.

Chairman Dunphy said if a town tries to do an override for infrastructure, it would require a two-thirds vote. That isn't going to happen.

Mr. Favaloro noted that in the MWRA's 25+ year history, the increase for retail water and sewer rates has never been under 2½%. For next steps, I would recommend that we do nothing for

the short term to see if there is a ground swell of support for this petition. Getting 68,000+ certifiable signatures is a huge task. If we bring attention to the matter, we may just fuel the debate. Mr. Favoloro said he felt it was important for the Executive Committee to hear about this petition and that it be flagged for the Advisory Board, but then staff feels we should take a step back and wait and see.

Mr. Remsberg echoed that sentiment. He noted that the Attorney General, during this process, sent an email to Bill McDermott, who is the counsel for the proponents, asking some very specific questions about the intent of the petition and why the language was not parallel, why there is a lack of congruency, and the email was ignored. They may have other priorities that are more important to them; this seems to me that it was done in such a careless way that it was an afterthought. It may be a low priority for them; it is also possible that this is their top priority, we just don't know.

V. Updates:

Budget

Matthew Romero said staff has already been in communication with the Finance staff to schedule fall briefings. MWRA usually provides an update after the first quarter has been completed on where they are planning to go for the next year. Staff has already seen some previews of what MWRA proposes their CIP and CEB are shaping up to be.

Mr. Favoloro added that the Rates Management Committee, which was formed at the Advisory Board's request, has received the information it needed from the bond counsel on the process for releasing the reserves and that Committee will convene this month.

Legislative

Staff has met with House Majority Leader Ron Mariano, who is also the MWRA's Caucus Chairman, and learned that there will be no funds from the casinos going toward water and sewer infrastructure. He did say there would be a significant effort to include funding in the next budget.

The MWRA Board of Directors in June asked the Advisory Board to come up with a summary of where we are to date with the Clinton Wastewater Treatment Plant. The topic will be before the Board of Directors for discussion next week to see if there can be a change in the current status of the plant.

One idea moving forward is a sunset provision; however, a provision that says by FY16 the plant will be turned over to Clinton has very little chance of success. A provision that says by FY36 may be successful but then the MWRA would have imposed upon itself an additional 20-year term.

Policy/Operations

MWRA is working on two system expansion requests. One on the wastewater side – a research park in Hingham had two manufacturing firms that many years ago were granted entrance into the wastewater system. Those firms have since gone under. Now the South Shore Collaborative, which is a collaborative of South Shore special needs schools, wants to build in that area and they are looking for a connection into the MWRA service area. This is the part of Hingham that is not part of the MWRA system. It is a relatively insignificant amount of flow but they still have to go through the entire process. All of the requirements are in place, including a four to one reduction of I/I.

The second system expansion is in the water system. The Town of North Reading will be meeting with the MWRA and the Advisory Board next week. Some serious discussion is expected at this meeting about North Reading joining the system.

Framingham has filed legislation to reactivate its wells. They have decided they want to use their own local water source and come off of the MWRA system.

In the bigger picture, if Framingham goes off the system, they are using seven to eight million gallons per day and this would make the costs go up for other communities in the system.

John Sanchez said a community that belongs to the MWRA is paying for some bonds that have been issued to service them all the way until today. If they were to all of a sudden leave for a period of time and then were to come back ten years later, what would happen? Mr. Favaloro said it is their right to pursue their own local sources but if they want out, they are out. They won't be able to get the water back. Mr. Sanchez said so if they leave and want to come back, they will have to pay an entrance fee. Mr. Favaloro said if they want that redundant supply, I have no problem giving it to them; however, they will have to pay for it.

VI. Approval of the Advisory Board Agenda for September 15, 2011

A Motion was made **TO APPROVE THE ADVISORY BOARD AGENDA FOR THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2011 MEETING.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

VII. Adjournment

A Motion was made **TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:34 A.M.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Lou Taverna, Secretary