

**Waltham Conservation Commission**

**May 28, 2015**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Attendees**: Chairman Bill Doyle, Brad Baker, Tali Gill-Austern, Gerard Dufromont, Maureen Fowler, Daniel Keleher, Philip Moser

Meeting called to order at 7:02 p.m.

**Open Discussion**

**Re:** 136 Hardy Pond Road

Chair Doyle stated that this property is for sale. There have been many people who want to do things to the property and they have been asking what can be done there. Opened discussion to audience to ask their questions. Stephanie Pham asked what can be done with that land. Chair Doyle replied they are up against Hardy Pond. There is a Wetlands Protection Act which we are here to administer on the City of Waltham’s behalf. Recommends getting a consultant to look up the Act and they will need to come before this Commission with a plan to get approval for what they want to do and the Commission will determine what is OK based on the WPA. Hardy Pond is a state-owned body of water. You’ve got to do research, get a surveyor to identify where the property and wetlands lines are. The Commission cannot say what you can and cannot do. We are not consultants, we interpret the Wetlands Protection Act.

Franklin Davis said they are interested in building something in the same footprint. They also want to build up the second floor. Is it simpler to stay within that same footprint? Chair Doyle: Generally, yes, however you will be up against all the newer codes and regulations and the Engineering and other departments will have to get involved. Mr. Davis asked if they will have to raise up the elevation. Chair Doyle stated that the Building Department will require that they are above the ground water but he does not know what that calculation is. Mr. Davis asked about building up the property. Mr. Doyle said height and zoning restrictions are not Conservation. Mr. Dufromont stated it isn’t also the height, it’s also pushing out the structure which blocks the view of the neighbors. Chair Doyle said the Commission cares if they build closer to the water. Mr. Keleher mentioned that what the Commission looks at is what are the current conditions versus what they are proposing.

Nanette Bisher noted there are a lot of turtles in the back. Is this organization responsible for any conservation of any protected or endangered species? Chair Doyle referred her to the National Heritage website. They will tell her if there is or isn’t something there, but they won’t tell what there is because they don’t want poachers to take them. They have a map telling if there is an endangered species.

Stephanie Pham asked she can find out the health and the depth of the pond. Marc Rudnick stated there is no testing on the pond by the Health Department of the City. If there is a complaint, then the Health Dept. will come and test. Mr. Rudnick is a member of the Hardy Pond Association and they have a huge amount of data on the water. No one swims in the pond. He isn’t aware of anyone eating the fish (catch and release only). It’s a very nutrient-filled pond that has ice-skating, nice fishing and great boating. Mr. Moser noted they dredged it a few years ago so it’s now deeper than it’s been in a long time. Mr. Rudnick stated that the depth is typically 10 – 12 feet. Ms. Bisher asked if boats are allowed. Mr. Rudnick stated they are, however gasoline-powered motor boats are not.

Mr. Doyle asked if people can go to a website for information on Hardy Pond. Mr. Rudnick stated they can go to hardypondassociation.org for more info.

Sarita Bhalotra, 82 Hardy Pond Rd. resident stated she pretty much raised the place and put on a second story. Did check with her neighbors ahead of time about the view and there were no objections.

Mr. Gill-Austern mentioned that regardless of what you want to do, during that process we will probably have some say on protection of the water. There will be additional construction restrictions due to the proximity of the water.

Ed Boudreau (Homeowner of 136 Hardy Pond Rd.): people have asked about flooding. During the worst storm in the 20 years lived there, the pond level came in his backyard just beyond halfway mark in the backyard. Still stayed 20 feet from the house. Also, the outflow works better now than during that flood.

Mr. Rudnick noted that his house has flooded four times in 37 years, however he’s noted Mr. Boudreau’s house hasn’t flooded - water only gets into the backyard.

Chair Doyle stated that the process is the process. The Commission’s just here to administer it. He would like to move on to the next public hearing.

**Public Hearing** (continued from 5/14/2015 meeting)

**Notice of Intent:** DEP File # 316-689 (**DEP comment:** It appears the project does not meet the stormwater standards and cannot be approved as designed. The proponent must submit the stormwater checklist and calculations. All new impervious area must meet the stormwater standards fully. The property owner must sign the NOI application since they are not the applicant.)

**Applicant**: Windsor Property Management

**Property** **Location**: 976 Lexington Street

**Project Type**: Site Improvements

Steve Poole represented the Applicant. He stated that at the last meeting, they discussed stormwater management and the two proposed infiltration systems. These were designed to take the 2200 sq. ft. of additional pavement. Collect the water and infiltrate it with no overflow. Chair Doyle stated the calculations for volume and rate looked fine to him. Mr. Moser had questions on the stormwater management report. In Table 1 for the 2, 10, 100-year storm events, could you clarify the 100% decrease for the 2-year and 10-year? Does that mean there's no water leaving the site? Mr. Poole replied there is no overflow, and that it pertains strictly to the new, impervious area. Mr. Moser suggested adding a condition clarifying it in the final documentation. What duration are the storm events? Mr. Poole stated they are 24-hour storms. Mr. Gill-Austern asked if they have calculations for the rest of the property in general. Mr. Poole replied no, they were just focusing on the project. Higher intensity storm will be more like a 1-hour storm. Chair Doyle asked if everyone else had a chance to look at the reports. It's pretty standard. It just needs to be done regularly.

Mrs. Fowler asked about Marc Rudnick’s request from the last meeting re: testing. Mr. Amoroso replied that they are working with Marc separately and he has been in contact with the people that he needs to be in touch with. He will have a response for Mr. Rudnick by Friday or Monday. Mr. Rudnick stated he was asking for two things: one was they would work it out together re: volunteer monitoring of the water level at the outlet structure. The other was asking for a condition to facilitate the City coming to do management of the storm sewer system. There's a lot of effort to put them in every storm sewer that goes into Hardy Pond. He would like a statement that Windsor Village will cooperate with the City of Waltham on its efforts to improve storm drainage. Mr. Amoroso can't see why they would deny it.

Mr. Poole stated the City does have easements where those units are. Mr. Amoroso said he went looking for the gauge but couldn’t find it. Mr. Rudnick replied that it broke off during a storm and is in his backyard. Chair Doyle asked why would the City take on the responsibility of maintaining infrastructure that solely serves a private entity. Mr. Rudnick stated that the federal government gave them money to do it. Mr. Poole replied that Windsor Village does the maintenance.

Chair Doyle would like to request receipts every May from the O & M done and a cover letter be sent to the Commission. Can we get the easement language and attach it to the report to keep on file?

Mr. Poole replied that they will. Mr. Doyle asked if Windsor Village is a member of the Hardy Pond Association and if members pay dues. Mr. Rudnick stated they were a non-profit organization, and Windsor Village was a member at one time, but they stopped being a membership association. Windsor Village is welcome to join the Waltham Land Trust, which Hardy Pond is now a part of. He stated that Windsor Village has been reasonably cooperative.

Special conditions:

1. – Clarify in Table 1 in the Stormwater Report that it isn't 100% of existing, but 100% of proposed additional impervious area;
2. – Provide the Conservation Commission with the legal deed easement language;
3. – Allow the City of Waltham to add access and temporary monitoring of all outlets on the Windsor Village property that lead to Hardy Pond and Chester Brook. There will be no cost to Windsor Village.

Motion to close made by Mrs. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Dufromont. **Motion passed**.

Motion for a positive order of conditions made by Mr. Moser, seconded by Mr. Baker. **Motion passed**.

Motion for a 2-minute recess made by Mrs. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Dufromont. **Motion passed**.

Motion to resume public meeting made by Mrs. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Keleher. **Motion passed**.

**Public Meeting**

**Request for Determination of Applicability**

**Applicant**: Dennis & Catherine Dube’

**Property** **Location**: 108 Woodcliff Drive

**Project Type:** Remove several trees at the back of property near the stream.

Cathy Dube’ and son, Michael Dube’ represented themselves. Late last fall, there was a bad storm and a big tree fell in Mrs. Dube’s backyard. It was a domino effect in that the tree fell on other trees. There are now three dead trees and two other trees that are still living but were affected. They would like to remove a total of five trees.

Mrs. Fowler asked if they would cut them and leave the stumps and roots. Mrs. Dube’ replied they would.

Mr. Dufromont asked how close they are to the water. Mr. Dube’ replied they are approximately 20 feet.

Mr. Dufromont asked what they plan on putting back there to prevent erosion. Mrs. Dube’ said they don’t plan on putting anything back there. Mr. Dube’ stated there is already ground vegetation. He hasn’t seen any significant erosion. Chair Doyle has been to the property. The water from the Paine Estate comes down and hits a ravine right behind their property. This ravine is a manmade drainage ditch and it connects to the practice field behind the high school. There’s also a manmade overflow spillway that is in their backyard. By what he could tell, there’s a 12 or 18-inch pipe that runs underneath it that’s completely full and plugged. Mrs. Fowler asked who owns that structure. Chair Doyle stated this drainage structure is half against their property, and the other is on Vaneria’s property who received a violation from the Commission for not asking for permission to do the same thing the Dubes want to do. Regarding the trees he’s seen back there that they want to take down; two are right up against the water and are in very poor health. The other three trees are more inland and healthier. They are pretty benign except for the two that are on the banks. Contacted Stew Lacrosse from CPW to understand what the pipe and overflow are. He agreed that CPW needs to clean it out. Mr. Doyle told him not to do anything until the property owners go through this process first. As far as he is aware, there is no easement on the property. The pipe is only about 15 – 20 feet long. Mr. Baker requested that they do not disturb the roots of the trees they want to cut down on the bank. Chair Doyle: Negative order with 3 conditions:

1 – All of the work is done from the homeowner’s backyard;

2 – The two trees located on the bank that are being removed need their stumps cut flush at ground level;

3 – CPW will be notified when the tree removal company plans on doing the work in order to coordinate the time to clean out the pipe.

Motion for a negative Determination of Applicability made by Mr. Moser, seconded by Mr. Gill-Austern. **Motion passed**.

**Public Hearing**

**Notice of Intent:** DEP File # 316-695 (continued from 5/14/2015 meeting)

**Applicant**: KW Development, LLC

**Property** **Location**: 135 Second Avenue

**Project Type**: Demolition of the existing 2-story warehouse building and the construction of a 138-room hotel. Site development includes landscaping, parking lot, stormwater system and utility improvements.

Chair Doyle noted that the Commission did two site visits.

Ryan Bianchetto from Allen and Major, a civil engineering company, submitted an updated plan from recommendations made at the second site visit re: expanding the replication area. Mr. Fowler asked for a summary since she wasn’t at the last meeting. Mr. Bianchetto stated the existing building is a shoe manufacturer. The existing pavement is at the front. Currently, from a stormwater perspective, the stormwater flows unmitigated surface into the wetlands. There is no treatment at all under the existing condition’s perspective. Proposal is for a 138-room hotel, 6-stories tall. Existing wetland is primarily untouched except for an approximately 135 sq. ft. disturbance. There are two stormwater perspectives for two infiltration systems to take the roof water and parking lot and flow into a bio-retention area.

Applicant has agreed to recommended changes from the site visit: total of 130 sq. ft. of disturbance with a replication up to 780 sq. ft. Total replication ratio is 6:1. Chair Doyle stated that he and Mr. Gill-Austern were at the second site visit. He noted it was an opportunity to get a 6:1 replication rather than a 2 ½:1. He wanted to clarify that they weren’t pushing for it, it just made a lot of sense to do it. Mr. Aftandilian stated that they agree that it’s very logical. What they saw on site was a mound of sand and gravel that had been pushed there over the years. The replication area takes that out and creates a nice, clean line between the impervious developed site and brings the rest of it back.

Chair Doyle stated it will vastly improve it. Suggested they send DEP an update of the 6:1.

Mr. Baker noted that when the Commission was out there they thought it would be a good educational opportunity to add interpretive signage and a big piece of granite people can stand on, looking out over the wetlands. This could be also one of the first sites to put a GIS chip into the brand-new trees that are being planted to begin documenting the trees in Waltham. Mr. Bianchetto stated you’re way ahead of the curve here and asked what would the GIS show – location and species? Mr. Baker replied if you have a chip there, you can pull up an app on your phone and it would tell you all about the tree. Chair Doyle feels the Commission should look into determining whether or not it’s for trees just on public property. He does like the idea of interpretive signing. There are no town standards at this time.

Mr. Aftandilian stated they have adopted a pretty green program. They recycle throughout the hotel and have recycle containers in all of the guest rooms, they try to use low-impact toilets and faucets, laundry systems minimize water and they do save money.

Mr. Moser thinks these are great ideas, but he feels there shouldn’t be any conditions put on the project.

Chair Doyle opened up the discussion to the public. No comments.

Motion to close the public hearing made by Mr. Moser, seconded by Mr. Dufromont. **Motion passed**.

Motion to issue a positive order of conditions made by Mr. Moser, seconded by Mr. Baker.

**Motion passed**.

**Public Hearing**

**Notice of Intent:** DEP File # (not yet assigned)

**Applicant**: SMC Trust

**Property** **Location**: 154 (BEF) River Street

**Project Type:** Demolition of an existing railroad trestle bridge spanning the Charles River. Work includes restoration of Bordering Vegetated Wetland; Bank and Land Under Waterway resource areas.

Mary Trudeau represented the applicant. SMC Realty Trust owns this bridge. They bought it from the railroad company 10 -15 years ago. DCR removed a similar bridge a couple of years ago. The bridge is approximately 340 ft. long. It consists of 32 bents and the first 7 are above the bank of the river on the east and west sides of the river. The remaining 18 are in the waterway. On the eastern bank, DCR has a foot path. There are abutments on either side that are a combination of bits of concrete, rock, treated wood, and various other things. It is currently growing trees on its surface. On the north side there is bordering vegetated wetlands between bents 5 and 7. On the southern and eastern banks there are small areas of vegetated wetlands. The western bank is resource area. It’s pretty littered. The proposal to take down the bridge consists of several steps. The first involves installing a silt curtain. The purpose of it is if anything falls off the bridge, it would get caught in the curtain. They decided to use the same strategy that DCR used to take down the other trestle bridge. They’ve talked with the contractor who took down the trestle. They would build a temporary bridge out of deadmen (large concrete blocks, 3’ x 3’ x 3’) and crane mats to create a stable surface. They would dismantle the bridge and take the pieces to an awaiting dump truck. They would not store anything on the site. It will be hauled away. When they get to the water, they will start using a crane, depositing material into trucks. Another device they would use to control the debris is using a mat. In terms of the filing, they had heard that there would be a new type of permit process. They have filed this as an Environmental Restoration Project. They request the Commission considers this a limited project. When they take out the bridge, they are increasing 700 sq. ft. of vegetated wetlands. The riverfront area is also being restored to a more naturalized condition. On the eastern bank, DCR has asked them to do the landscaping in accordance with DCR’s plan. Environmental Restoration Project requires they put a notice in The Environmental Monitor. The only response they received was from the MWRA asking if they had a water line easement.

Chair Doyle stated there is a City of Waltham water easement that runs through there. He asked Ms. Trudeau if she information about it. Ms. Trudeau did not have the information, but she will research it. She noted they do not have a DEP file number yet and asks to continue this hearing until they receive DEP’s comments. They were hoping tonight to initiate a discussion with the Commission. They feel it’s a benefit to the City of Waltham, and to her client it makes the property transferrable at some point. The bridge was built in 1915 and renovated in 1930. The work that they will continue to discuss with the Commission is removal of 192 pilings that go through riverfront, bordering vegetated wetlands, land under waterway, and bank resource areas across the Charles River. Chair Doyle stated a limited project is new to the Commission in this regard. Typically, it allows for maintenance and operation of major municipal beneficial infrastructures, however it sounds like they have expanded this to restoration work.

Ms. Trudeau noted these projects are beneficial to environmental resources.

Chair Doyle stated that there’s no question taking out the bridge is the right idea. Did ask how far back the project goes in terms of grading, particularly on the east side. Ms. Trudeau replied it’s just the abutment. They want to get rid of the bridge so that the property is marketable.

Chair Doyle would like to see who the property owners are, who has the property rights, is there a pipe going under the river (what is the easement)? He made a call to Alex Green of the Historical Commission to ask if there is any historical significance to this project. He noted that the Commission will defer to the project that was done to take down the River St. trestle. We will continue tonight, and we’ll schedule a site visit.

Mr. Dufromont asked if they will check the foot bridge. Ms. Trudeau noted the mats they are using to collect debris will protect it. She assumes if there is any damage, the contractor will repair it.

Mr. Dufromont asked if there are any plans to do repair work to the foot bridge. Mrs. Fowler stated that the 4H Club will be repairing it as a project.

Mr. Moser would like to get the plans to show the extent of the embankment that will be removed. He noted that there are a lot of logs that have washed up against the bridge and wanted to know if they can be removed. Ms. Trudeau stated they will.

Mr. Gill-Austern asked about the DCR plans showing the bents being cut above the water line. Ms. Trudeau stated it would impede boats if they were cut under the water line. It would be very dangerous.

Mort Isaacson of the Historical Commission asked Ms. Trudeau if her client contacted the Historical Commission. Ms. Trudeau stated they haven’t, but now they will.

Mr. Isaacson noted his trestle may have been built in 1915, but it replaces trestles from 1845. It was extremely important in the City’s history and for interpreting that history. He knows there are plaques for the dam that used to be there. Will there be some sort of historical interpretation of the site? They were very surprised when DCR removed the other trestle without coming before the Historical Commission. They would like to discuss this new project. Mr. Isaacson stated he misses the trestle that was taken down, and he will miss this one, too. Ms. Trudeau said they will meet with the Historical Commission to get them some type of mitigation or photographic record.

Site visit scheduled for Wed., June 10th at 5:00 p.m., 154 River St. (behind Shaw’s).

Mr. Moser commented that he hopes the landscape plan doesn’t include installing park benches. The benches attract the homeless, which generates most of the trash we pick up.

Mrs. Fowler asked if the Commission can get a site plan of the property. Ms. Trudeau stated they do not have one. Chair Doyle replied that getting a full-blown survey of the land would be onerous, but it may be warranted. Ms. Trudeau suggested they look at things at the site visit first. Chair Doyle stated that the Commission needs to look at the river, 200 feet outside of it, and if it is an improvement. Mr. Moser asked if the goal to do this is in August/September. Mrs. Trudeau stated ideally, yes, otherwise it will get delayed a year. Mrs. Fowler noted that DCR has no formal plan yet. She would like DCR to have one so that within 12 months, this is done. Ms. Trudeau stated the work would be done at the same time.

Motion to continue to the next meeting made by Mrs. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Dufromont.

**Motion passed**.

Motion to recess for 2 minutes made by Mr. Keleher, seconded by Mrs. Fowler. **Motion passed**.

Motion to resume by Mr. Gill-Austern, seconded by Mr. Moser. **Motion passed**.

**Public Hearing**

**Notice of Intent:** DEP File # (not yet assigned)

**Applicant**: Boston Properties

**Property** **Location**: 170 Tracer Lane

**Project Type:** Reconfigure parking areas and building access

Phil Moser and Tali Gill-Austern recused themselves due to potential conflicts of interest.

Phil McCourt asked the Commission if they feel a separate NOI needs to be filed for 1601 Trapelo Road where a small amount of the work is being done. It is not included in the 170 Tracer Lane NOI, where the majority of the work will be done. Boston Properties owns both properties. None of the mitigation work will occur on 1601 Trapelo Road, only the movement of existing impervious surfaces. The road will swing slightly to the west and come down.

Guiliana DiMambro stated that Tracer Lane curves down by the highway (I-95) into a cul-de-sac. They are proposing to realign the road a little to the west so it goes right up to the building. It pulls the road and the impervious surface away from the wetlands. They are proposing a bio-retention area as part of the work.

Chris Wagner, VHB noted the resource areas on site: the wetlands are located at the toe of the slope from the base of the existing building. There’s a fairly conservative menial water line. There wasn’t a clear demarcation of a channel pass where the stream comes out from the highway.

Chris Lovett, VHB stated the entryway improvements have added improvements to the drainage system. Improvements include relocation of roadway and grading changes to improve the entranceway to make it ADA accessible. They have provided stormwater improvements that address the 170 Tracer Lane site.

There is a 25 ft. setback from the vegetated wetland line. 1200 sq. ft. of pavement has been removed. Chair Doyle asked what can/cannot be done within the riverfront. Mr. Lovett noted that the information is located in Items A, B, C, D and E of their stormwater report. Chair Doyle pointed out the language states “an *improvement* over existing conditions”. Mr. Lovett stated there are three elements to this: the storage, the water quality, and the habitat elements. Chair Doyle is concerned mainly about the ecological element. Is what was there before better than what is proposed now? Ms. DiMambro noted they are planning on planting substantially all around the site.

Chair Doyle asked what happens in the event 170 Tracer Lane gets sold, how does this get maintained, since the underground system serves both 170 Tracer Lane and 1601 Trapelo Road?

Jim Ward from Nutter stated that in the sale documents, there would be easements and retaining rights to go over and maintain it. The Order of Conditions will have that condition on it and it will be a perpetual requirement.

Chair Doyle asked if there is data on the gauging station and if it has flooded to the point that it would back flood into the pond. Mr. Lovett stated they can look it up.

Chair Doyle wants to make sure the detention basin is high enough and that it functions independently. Asked if it ever flooded up to 182. If that’s the case, it would back-flood. He also noted that they should not plant proposed trees under the power lines. Anything over 6 feet will be cut down.

Would like to plan a site visit.

Mr. Gill-Austern asked Atty. Ward if he works closely with his father. Wanted to know if he has any reason to recuse himself from this hearing. Atty. Ward stated that out of abundance of caution, he should recuse himself.

Site visit scheduled for Thursday, June 4th at 9:00 a.m. Mrs. Fowler will meet them at 8:00 a.m.

Motion to continue public hearing to next meeting made by Mrs. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Keleher.

**Motion** **passed**.

**Informational Update**

42 Felton Street: DEP File # 316-685

Mrs. Fowler noted that construction has begun, however the first item of the Order of Conditions states you need to notify us when you start the work. There is also no DEP # posted.

Chair Doyle asked for a briefing on where the project is.

Dan LeBlanc stated that Jim Curtis is the environmentalist we hired to do the clean-up, RAM and all of the specifications required by DEP. Mr. Curtis, President of Cooperstown Environmental LSP, mentioned that Mr. LeBlanc bought the property in 2014. He hired EBI from Burlington to do testing and found a number of contaminated episodes in the soil and ground water. He brought in Cooperstown Environmental and there was 7,025 tons of soil they removed from the site. Last night, Mr. Curtis submitted the RAM completion report to DEP. Talked about moving around soil, but it was nasty and they removed it to contamination site in Maine. Water has been tested before and after. Removing the source will remove the ground water condition. We want to do quarterly samples on the ground water. We’ve taken it down to the level that meets residential standards.

Chair Doyle stated they are looking to close this out. Mr. Curtis noted they haven’t tested the ground water yet, but they are close. Mr. Gill-Austern asked if the Commission will get a copy of the reports.

Mr. Curtis stated the reports are all online on the DEP website.

Chair Doyle asked what is the next step to get Mr. LeBlanc to start building. Mr. Curtis noted they are doing a focus risk assessment on where the building is. From the soil data they have right now, it should pass the risk assessment which will allow them to start building.

Chair Doyle stated that they have a hole in the ground with erosion controls. Mrs. Fowler asked if there are erosion controls in place. Mr. LeBlanc stated there are, but they moved them around during the winter. They are waiting for the building permit before they can start building. Chair Doyle read the site specific conditions from the Order of Conditions.

**Commission Business**

* Approval of meeting minutes 5/14/2015
* Approval of Trust Fund meeting minutes 5/14/2015
* Approval of meeting minutes 11/20/2014

Minutes approved by Mr. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Dufromont. **Motion passed**.

**Correspondence**

* Arrigo Farm Purchase – Mr. Dufromont forwarded the request to CPC.
* Bishop’s Forest – spray-washing

**Old Business**

**Mrs. Fowler**

* 145 Crescent Street – building permit records were pulled and the Building Department approved the replacement of the existing siding and deck in April 2014. Conservation will contact Bill Forte requesting that Conservation be notified whenever something is being built within 200 ft. of water.

**New Business**

* Absolute Auto Detail: Mrs. Fowler stated it’s illegal to wash cars on property that water leads to City stormwater. Mr. Gill-Austern asked if they can use biodegradable soap. Mrs. Fowler stated they can’t. Chair Doyle suggested this gets tabled to the next meeting.

Motion to table the rest of the items on the agenda made by Mrs. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Keleher. **Motion passed**.

Motion to adjourn made by Mrs. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Dufromont. **Motion** **passed**.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.