

MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE TOWN COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, JULY 19, 2011 IN ROOM 207, TOWN HALL, 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410

Present

Budget Committee Chairman David Schrumm; Committee Members Thomas Ruocco. Council Members: Tim Slocum, Stephen Carroll, Andrew Falvey, Patti Flynn-Harris
Absent: Michael Ecke, Sylvia Nichols, James Sima.
Staff: Michael A. Milone, Town Manager; James Jaskot, Finance Director; Dennis Dievert, Superintendent, Waste Water Treatment Plant; Mario Panagrosso, Tax Assessor; Tim Pelton, Chairman WPCA.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll and a quorum was determined to be present.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

3. DISCUSSIONS RE: FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 FIVE YEAR CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PLAN AND ANNUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BUDGET.

OVERVIEW

Page 10 - There are 56 projects in the five year plan for a total of \$80,448,000, which is \$7.5 million less than what was requested. Of this total \$30 million is for the treatment plant. The Annual Capital Expenditure Budget FY 11-12 is \$38,003,000, compromised of 21 projects. The net total is about \$63 million; there are offsetting grants, CNR funds, and some other items totaling \$17.4 million bringing the gross down to \$63 million.

Mr. Milone reported on the impact the treatment plant has on this budget. It is very large and very important, and not much could be done with the \$30 million number. This project crowded out some other projects or reduced or deferred them. The treatment plant project represents 73% of the first year of the five year plan, and about 38% of the overall plan. Other items which drove the budget up beyond last year's numbers are technology (not planned for to a great extent last year), land acquisition is higher, there are Public Works projects, and Education had some costs which were not visible last year or at lower levels.

In his transmittal letter Mr. Milone said he emphasized that he wants to find a way to reduce the total cost of the waste water treatment plant project. His concern is Cheshire not having the benefit of State grants and qualifying for the Clean Water Fund grant/loan program (20% grant, 80% loan at low interest rate). Mr. Milone has sent OPM the Town's request for 25% support of the plant upgrade due to the prison which uses 25% of the treatment at the facility. It is hoped that the Town will hear on this funding before the Council has to vote on this budget. The Clean Water Fund program is uncertain, and money will not be available before adoption of the capital budget. The

longer the Town puts off borrowing for the treatment plant project, the greater the likelihood there will be Clean Water Fund money, using it for the lion's share of the project. It is hoped that if funds do not come through in year 1, they will come through in years 2, 3 or 4.

The treatment plant had value engineering done by a consulting engineer, and good suggestions were received, including treating phosphorous with chemicals rather than a construction initiative to deal with phosphorous at this stage. AECOM engineers believe there are economies of scale with the project. A problem is that the Town does not know what DEP wants in levels of the treatment; the technology is somewhat new; and there are many intangible and moving parts. Without an upgrade of the treatment plant the Town would not be doing phosphorous for a few years out. Mr. Milone said he understands the benefits of economies of scale, but this must be weighed against \$6 or \$7 million in expenses which would not be incurred if a shovel were not being put into the ground.

Debt Service is now at 9.1% of the operating budget; 10 years ago it was 13.1%; and it will continue to drop. With the exception of the treatment plant, it will continue to drop. Cheshire is borrowing less than what is being retired, with the exception of the plant. Next year debt goes down by \$250,000. When the debt analysis projections were done there was assumption of cash flow that is more aggressive than AECOM has indicated it would be. This means the Town will be able to defer a lot of the debt more significantly than was anticipated and identified by AECOM. All the analysis which are show assume a 5% borrowing assumption, and in February borrowing was at 3.5%.

Mr. Milone advised that the \$4.5 million in the debt service reserve account has not been touched, and there is no commitment by the Council on how to use these funds.

In the CEP process, Mr. Jaskot will identify some of the de-authorizations, about \$600,000 to \$700,000 in capital borrowings which will not have to be used. This brings down the authorized but un-issued debt. The Town continues to sustain a high credit rating, but will not be into the market until December 2012.

Page 9 – Capital Expenditure Summary 1985-2011. The Town has about \$234 million in assets, and the Town has spent about \$225.7 million in capital investments, spread across many programmatic areas.

Debt Analysis of March 16, 2011 – WPCD Upgrade. Page 1 of the analysis

Page 10, FY 11-12 of the CEP, the Town Manager's recommended capital budget is just over \$38 million, \$2.4 million more than what was in the CEP last year. One of the biggest reasons for this increase is the Linear Trail. In the 11-12 plan, \$875,000 was earmarked for the trail; it is proposed to cost \$2.5 million. The plan for the trail was changed from starting with the Dalton piece and go north. The Council decided on trying to reallocate state and federal money for the West Main Street to Jarvis Street portion of the trail. As a result, the priorities are different. One fourth of the difference

is in the BOE request for utility tunnels at the high school, and this was not in the CEP last year. Public Works had proposed \$1.3 million for road repaving and chip sealing in each year of the CEP. Mr. Milone recommended that the request be increased to \$1.5 million as that many miles of road can be attained. Also, the cost of asphalt has increased, and we can get more roads done with more money. The past winter did a lot of damage to the roads. \$120,000 is for brick pavers around Town Hall and Town Center, as the sidewalks are in need of replacement.

For FY 11-12 to FY 14-15 has \$5 million more than what was in the CEP last year. The other \$2 million is in land acquisition. Mr. Milone recommended \$1.5 million in each of two years. \$900,000 is in the CEP for technology needs.

Page 11 – Grants and Other Funding Sources. Mr. Jaskot identified grants which are known at this time to offset the capital budget. There is a fire truck in year 2 at \$925,000, with \$50,000 coming from the Fire Department Gift Account. LOCIP grants of \$185,000 in each year of the CEP. \$7.5 million for WPCD. Based on the \$30 million treatment plant project, it is unlikely the Town will get the Clean Water Fund money at 2% interest. In the past the Town has received a 20% grant, and 80% loan at 2% interest. The Town is working on something with Cheshire Correctional Institute (CCI) for 25% of the cost of the treatment plant project upgrade.

Linear Trail has \$812,000 in grants, with \$250,000 from the State and \$562,000 from the U.S. DOT. There are also two pending grants for the trail - \$500,000 STEAP grant, and a request to the federal government for an 80% grant for the balance of the trail work. At this time it is unknown whether the Town will get these grants.

Education – roof replacement and repairs has a 25% grant from the State, \$180,000 in total throughout the CEP.

Energy improvement, window replacements has a total of \$464,000 over the five year plan. Energy improvements for the heating system and retrofit at CHS is \$400,000, and this is a CL&P energy rebate for 10% of the cost. All these grants reduce what the Town must borrow.

Page 10 – Summary of the CEP. Mr. Jaskot noted the bottom of the page which summarizes the different funding sources to offset the costs of the projects. CNR will be \$558,000; LOCIP grants \$185,000; \$32,000 in education grants; \$7.5 million for the WPCD proposed grant; and Linear Trail grants of \$812,000. Of the \$38 million proposed, about \$9 million will be funded through grants and CNR.

Page 12 – Summary of CNR Funds. Mr. Milone explained that over the past few years due to budget constraints, the Town has not been able to do all of the projects to which CNR funds were assigned. Some of these projects were frozen to make CNR money available to help balance the operating budget. Given the uncertainty of what will happen with the State budget, Mr. Milone decided not allocate the entire \$1.1 million which the Council appropriated in FY 11-12 operating budget.

Looking at FY 2012, Mr. Milone pointed out the "Revaluation" with \$313,000 attributed to this project. The revaluation will cost the Town \$663,000; it will be bonded at \$350,000, and CNR of \$313,000. This will prevent the project from going to referendum. There is \$245,000 for vehicle and equipment replacement. Only \$558,000 was allocated out of the \$1.1 million which was appropriated.

Under "Available Funds" Mr. Milone identified \$50,000 in interest account; \$1.1 million was appropriated in FY 11-12; and \$542,000 is not allocated. The Town closed out projects from previous years that were paid for with CNR funds; there were residual balances; these were accumulated, and along with accumulated interest from prior years represents the \$185,436. We now have available \$569,436. Once projects are approved by the Council, the Town will not be borrowing money for them for quite some time, probably not borrowing until 2012. There will be enough cash on hand to pay for the projects going forward. This will allow the Town Council to see where FY 11-12 budget is going, without freezing capital projects in order to free up money to balance the operating budget. The Town will be able to reduce borrowing costs beyond what has already been identified. How much beyond that amount will be determined by the Council over the next 6 to 9 months.

Regarding the revaluation, Mr. Schrumm stated that this is State mandated, and would not be required to go to referendum for a vote under the Town Charter.

Mr. Milone replied that this issue has been discussed with the Town Attorney. The Town Attorney felt this is not mandated in the sense that the Charter talks about a judgment imposed by the State of Connecticut. In the past revaluations, the cost was covered through CNR. Attorney Johnson looked at this issue very thoroughly, and in reading the Charter he felt that it did not meet the definition of a "judgment or demand" from the State. The Town can be fined and have penalties imposed. If the revaluation went to referendum and was defeated, Attorney Johnson advised that the Charter could not be used and the revaluation would have to be done.

Page 13 – 2012 lists the actual borrowings by projects; CNR and grants have been taken out; this is the net amount of what would actually be bonded if the capital budget proceeds as proposed. The net bonded projects total \$29 million. Mr. Milone stated that the Town does not go out and borrow \$29 million, but looks at borrowing in increments of each of the projects, as none are done in totality in year one. The \$29 million will be borrowed over 3 or 4 years.

Mr. Jaskot stated that with the exception of the LOCIP grants, the other grants are one time grants. The Linear Trail grant of \$812,000 is a given. Education grants are usually solid, but come in different percentages.

With regard to the CCI funding for the treatment plant upgrade, Mr. Milone is hopeful for this money from the State. 350 more prisoners are being transferred to the Cheshire facility. In agreements with other prison towns it is written that the State will pay for and

share in costs of the sewer treatment plant. Cheshire is not asking for anything different from any other prison community, and Mr. Milone believes the State will support his request. The only argument would be the 25% request, and there is justification for 20% to 22% of the project cost.

WPCD Upgrade – Debt Analysis as of March 16, 2011. Mr. Milone reviewed the analysis, and said that this reflects the current adopted capital budget. The information on other aspects of the capital budget will change with the proposal he has submitted. The highlighted columns will not change unless the Council changes the amount of the treatment plant upgrade.

On page 1 of the analysis, column (4) \$31.5 million for the upgrade at 5% interest assumption, with no grant or loan under Clean Water Fund or any other funding from the State through the DOC. This data could change a little bit due to the assumption of borrowing at 1/3, 1/3 and 1/3. Numbers from AECOM show \$5M in year 1; \$13M in year 2; \$13M in year 3; and \$1.3M in year 4. This takes a lot of pressure off 2012, and means the analysis is more conservative than it will be because borrowing will be far different from what was thought 6 months ago. It is likely borrowing will be later with the impact not felt until 2014.

Page 2 of the analysis, column (4) is the same \$31.5 million borrowed, with the assumption of the grant and loan program from CWF...loan 80% at 2% interest and 20% grant. Over the first 10 years there is a difference in repayment of \$21.9 million and repayment of \$10.8 million. This shows the significant impact of the CWF grant and loan program. If Cheshire does not qualify in year #1, it is hoped that the Town would qualify in years 2, 3 or 4...so the longer the borrowing is delayed the greater the opportunity to take advantage of any success with CWF.

A copy of the \$1 million bond issue amortization schedule was given to the Council by Mr. Jaskot.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Tim Pelton, Chairman WPCA and Dennis Dievert, Supt. Of the Treatment Plant gave a presentation to the Council on the sewer treatment plant upgrade.

Mr. Pelton submitted a report on the treatment plant upgrade and reviewed the report with the Council. The highlights of the report were presented by Mr. Pelton.

The process of planning the upgrade to the plant started 4 years ago. The design goals are preservation of public health, quantification of the treatment capacity needs of the Town for the next 20 years, operation of the facility 24/7/365, having the capacity to better handle peak flows after storm events, building in compliance design for known CT DEP regulations, utilization of cost effective energy efficiency technology, and going “green” where financially viable.

The plant capacity needs to be increased to meet the sewage needs of the Town for the next 20 years. A comprehensive study was done by AECOM and analyzed by the WPCA, with evaluation of projected residential, industrial and CCI growth. The Town's federal permit allows for process and discharge of 4 million gallons of wastewater per day. In order to not exceed the 4.0 MGD threshold, the WPCA must continue with efforts to identify and address sources of infiltration and inflow to the sewer system, such as sump pumps.

The plant infrastructure needs to be upgraded. AECOM completed a comprehensive study of the existing facility, with results analyzed and final design elements authorized by the WPCA. The Authority signed off on the preliminary waste water treatment plan elements and AECOM commenced with plant upgrade design work early in 2011.

Value Engineering – an outside firm (not AECOM) reviewed the proposed preliminary design with a fresh set of eyes. The focus of the value engineering effort was to review the elements of the proposed upgrade with an eye toward reducing the project costs while achieving the same goals. The value engineering firm submitted its report on July 8, 2011 and it is currently under review by AECOM, Town staff and the WPCA.

The VE team identified areas of the upgrade where alternative methods were suggested to reduce the project cost, and these will be examined in detail to determine pros and cons as well as cost reductions.

WPCA is projecting the total cost of the treatment plant upgrade at \$32.3 Million and is requesting that amount be sent to referendum in November 2011.

Potential offsets of the overall cost of the project to the Town were reviewed by Mr. Pelton, who noted that these offsets have not been confirmed.

Dept. of Corrections funding - \$6 Million. The Town is in discussions with the DOC, focusing on their funding 25% of the plant upgrade costs since CCI contributes 20% to 25% of the wastewater entering the system. Nothing has been affirmed in writing at this time.

DEP Clean Water Fund - \$6 Million. This program provides 20% in grants and 80% in low interest loans. There is also a possibility for additional funding for the phosphorous component. This could add another \$500,000 in funding.

Mr. Pelton commented on the larger cities already getting CWF funding for major projects. There is lobbying that this is unfair to the smaller municipalities. If the larger cities do not have their projects ready to go, the question is whether the money will be reallocated to smaller municipalities. The goal with the funding is to drive down the overall cost to the Town.

It was stated by Mr. Milone that the CWF funding for FY 11-12 was increased to \$180 million. In discussions with the OPM Secretary, Mr. Milone informed OPM about the

350+ prisoners coming to CCI's North Block, and Cheshire getting CWF funding for the treatment upgrade. He will continue to pursue funding through CWF. With value engineering there may be some cost savings, and these savings will be discussed as part of the referendum number.

On the assumption there will not be a turnaround in the construction market in the next year, Mr. Pelton said the WPCA is optimistic there will be favorable pricing coming back on the plant upgrade bids.

One issue with the VE report is the age of the old equipment. There are sets of pumps which are run only during storm events, and it can be argued that they have consumed only a small portion of their useful life. Mr. Dievert noted that these pumps are tested and run every Friday to insure that they are operating.

Phosphorous – Mr. Pelton explained that phosphorous must be kept out of the waste water, and we are trying to design a plan for the next 20 years based on the data from DEP. Phosphorous measure, reduction and removal is a new science. There could be limits out to 2011 to 2014. 0.2mg/l is the level for 2011, and this could be higher in out years, and the question is whether a plan is designed to treat phosphorous numbers in the future years. The cost of the treatment of phosphorous is about 15% of the plant upgrade.

VE has advised Cheshire to do more chemical treatment which is less expensive, but it is not sure this will work. Without doing anything with phosphorous the CWF funding will go away. The Town must show a good faith effort with chemicals, ultra-violet lights or mechanical removal of phosphorous. The question is whether to create a footprint for the future regarding phosphorous, what is the best strategy to meet DEP regulations, and how to best spend money and how much to spend.

Projected timeline –this was reviewed by Mr. Pelton, as follows: May 2012 advertise project for bids; September 2012, start construction; duration of construction is 27 months; post construction is 12 months.

Projected cost per year without offset adjustments – 2012 - \$5M; 2013 - \$13M; 2014 - \$13M; 2015 - \$1.3M.

Mr. Pelton stated that the projection of \$32.3 Million is a reasonable number for the treatment plant upgrade. The WPCA will endeavor to pursue the potential offsets in an effort to reduce the overall project cost.

The Council was informed by Mr. Pelton that the Value Engineering Team noted the cleanliness and squared away appearance of the Cheshire Treatment Plant. Having visited hundreds of sewage treatment plants around the country, the VE Team had rarely seen a plant as clean as Cheshire's. This speaks well to the leadership of Supt. Dievert and the pride and craftsmanship of his team.

The Council commended Supt. Dievert and his staff on the pristine appearance of the Cheshire plant.

Mr. Schrumm asked about Cheshire not going after the phosphorus and the possibility of losing funding.

According to Mr. Pelton, the DEP provides funding on a ranking system. Going after phosphorus puts Cheshire up on the ranking scale, and doing nothing would put Cheshire on a lower level of the scale to get funding. Doing phosphorus with chemicals is a positive, anything the Town does boosts up its ranking. Doing phosphorous with mechanical treatment involves a new tank for the plant for the water treatment.

Mr. Dievert stated that chemicals are used in both processes, but he is not sure of how the chemicals are managed. The technology of chemical involvement changes daily, and the science is so new it is tested and checked all the time. Mr. Dievert commented on the future requirements involving metals and pharmaceuticals. He has met with plant superintendents of other communities, and reported that Cheshire is on the cusp of design and implementation. Other towns have 3 years left on their permit and are not doing anything with phosphorous. Other towns are in the same situation as Cheshire with the phosphorous. The DEP is concentrating on the Quinnipiac Basin, and is being pushed by the EPA. Standards are being set by DEP and the EPA can step in and set new standards.

It was stated by Mr. Carroll that no one knows the best practices for phosphorous treatment. We are trying to buy as much time as possible.

According to Mr. Pelton, the question is how this would affect CWF money. In a few years Cheshire could need \$4 million for mechanical treatment, and then people will ask why this was not done when the treatment plant was upgraded.

With \$4 million for new mechanicals, Mr. Schrumm said the town could lose \$6 million in offset money from CCI, and the CWF loan and grant.

Mr. Milone did not get the sense that the CCI and CWF monies would be balanced against each other. Regarding losing the grant and loan, Mr. Milone said that making a good faith effort to treat phosphorous includes various things being done. It does not, necessarily, mean building a tank, but demonstrating treatment of phosphorous with chemicals, using best practices.

In moving the clock up 5 years, Mr. Pelton said the Town has good chemical treatment, is at 0.2 mg per liter, and we go to renew its permit. The DEP could then state 0.1 levels and something mechanical must be done because chemical options are maximized. The question is what to do and where to spend the money.

The CWF money is appropriated in the spring of each year. Mr. Schrumm asked about getting a commitment from CCI for \$7.5 million, getting the DEP money out the next year.

Mr. Milone said that the CWF will not be early enough in the project, and the Town will have to commit to borrowing significant amounts of money. There will not be enough money to pay for a portion of the back loaded expenses; and the loan will be on the balance left on the project. There will be a meeting between Mr. Milone, Mr. Dievert and OPM Secretary in the next few weeks. The taxpayers must know about what is happening with the project and the funding for the project.

On the voting machine the Town must state the total amount of the water treatment plant upgrade. Mr. Schrumm said the public will be made aware that the Town is pursuing grants. For the out years, Mr. Schrumm questioned whether the tank for the mechanical treatment should be in place.

This is too far ahead and Mr. Pelton there will be metals and pharmaceuticals into the future, and it does take a long time to get information from DEP. He informed the Council that the Facilities Plan has not yet been signed by DEP, although it was finalized and submitted two years ago.

In the CEP years 3 and 4 there are two more pump stations authorized for design. Mr. Schrumm asked about pushing them out another year (page 65), and the status of these projects.

Mr. Pelton said the designs are being done now, and they will be on the shelf in case of failure. The pump stations are strategically placed in the CEP for when they need to be done. If they fail WPCA will be back to Council for a special appropriation.

I & I is another concern, and Mr. Milone advised that in the upcoming property revaluation there will be inspection of properties for sump pumps. It is hoped there will be data to work with and ability to attack this problem.

Mr. Pelton stated that the size of the treatment plant does not need to be increased, and this is based on an aggressive sump pump program.

FINANCE

Geographic Information System (GIS) page 17. \$135,000 appropriated in FY 10-11. There was a plan to have \$200,000 in FY 13-14. Once a consultant was hired it was realized aggregating the money would not work. It was better to have the funding back to back. Mr. Milone advised that he recommended \$165,000 in year #1. The consultant held meetings with department heads and the committee for the GIS, with Mr. Panagrosso working closely with them.

Page 18 – Mr. Panagrosso reviewed the GIS project. Aerial Mapping is \$90,000; Parcel Layer Update is \$15,000; Sewer & Storm GIS \$80,000; Hardware & Software \$25,000,

Setup and Configuration \$40,000. GIS Applications \$25,000, GIS Consultant – Contingency \$25,000. A needs assessment was done, with what was needed to be done and what the Town wanted done. A plan was submitted for the entire project at \$300,000. Next week the consultant will meet with staff, review the strategic plan, get the RFP done for help from a consultant to go forward. COG initiated this project; it is now Town data; the host company is paid \$3,000 annually to host the site; the pictures are old and current, accurate aerial photography must be done. All Public Works maps are on paper. Once the entire assessment is done it will feed into the CAD system for the Police and Fire Departments.

Mr. Milone explained that the assessor's field cards will be on the CAD for the Police and Fire Departments. With the CAD there is more GIS built in and CAD will take advantage of the GIS upgrade; and the updates will have accurate field card data. About a year and a half ago, RWA did a fly over (\$180,000) and ran into problems in Cheshire. RWA will not discount the fly over information for Cheshire because it will not compromise its position with other towns.

With the new GIS system, Mr. Panagrosso said there will be better integration as a supplement with CAD. There will be training for both users at Town Hall for users and maintenance of the system. The assessor's maps are already done under the COG project. Information on other towns using the consultant is in the proposal and will be given to the Council.

Revaluation \$663000, page 20. There is \$648,000 for the consultant to do the work; in year #2 there is \$80,000 for software; and \$100,000 in year #3. This revaluation must be done by October 1, 2014. The Town will incur expenses for the development of the RFP and contract. Mr. Panagrosso advised that it is estimated to be \$60 per parcel for a full physical revaluation. This has not been done since 1999. The project starts in t Fall 2012; it will take a year and a half to complete the revaluation; our data is good; and there is more credence with the revaluation by walking through a house. This project cannot be put out one year because revaluation must be done every 10 years, and we will be into year 13.

Mr. Milone stated that some of the costs will be bonded and some will be funded through CNR, and legal expenses for appeals will be moved out to 2014.

Regarding the hardware and software, Mr. Carroll asked about the revaluation company hosting the data and not using the Town's equipment.

The Council was informed by Mr. Panagrosso that the company does host the Town's data. Once he sends the grand list, the company turns the data over to the Town. There is an internet site where people can look at the information. The company conducts the hearings, and looks at their web site. The hardware would be for new p.c.'s if they are needed, and the Town must pay for software. Without doing the revaluation, Cheshire would lose 10% of its State funding.

Capital Planning Account (page 19). There is \$91,000 left in this account, and Mr. Milone has funded the account at \$110,000 in year #2 and \$110,000 in year #5. It was suggested by Mr. Milone that there be a meeting of the Council, Town Manager and staff for planning information with appropriate boards and commissions. This will enable staff to go to the Council with better numbers and plans going forward. The account has a good reserve, and the funding will be used more as we go forward with technology concerns.

Technology Reserve Fund (page 21). This is a collaborative effort with the Board of Education for a technology strategy plan going forward. The BOE has greater needs than first anticipated, and the problem is more severe than ever realized. A committee of the Council and staff would meet to bridge the gap over the next few years. The Town has a good software system, but needs hardware to get work done. The technology committee will be formed at the August Council meeting.

Mr. Jaskot stated that there is an RFP out right now for consulting services for projection of what is needed for a technology plan. The RFP responses are due July 29th.

Council Chairman Slocum reported that there will be a special Council meeting on July 27th regarding bids for the turf field project. Based on some bid information there is probable cause to consider the track because of the costs. The Council must discuss this issue in detail, as it cannot approve the bid for the turf field and ignore the track. Mr. Slocum advised that the Turf Committee feels they will have the numbers they need, and before going out to bid the Council must have everything accounted for with this project.

4. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Ruocco; seconded by Ms. Schrumm.

MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk