

JFK Pre-Referendum Committee

March 1st 2017

JFK Middle School Library

Called to order at 6:31 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: Mark Gahr, Mary Keller, Joseph Muller, Trish Neild-Barry, Carmen Nuccio, Chris Rutledge, Steven Sargalski, Jason Walsh, Vincent Weseliza, Tina LeBlanc, Walter Kruzal, Thomas Arnone, Scott Kaupin, Tim Neville and Jonathan Bilmes.

Absent: Ray Peabody and Mike Szlosek

Approval of Minutes:

A motion to approve meeting minutes from 2/15/2017 was made by Mr. Muller and seconded by Mrs. Neild-Barry.

Ms. Keller indicated 2 issues: A misspelling of “Langan” as “Langdon” on page 7 and “clarification on the 0% fee” should read “clarification on the 10% fee” on page 9.

With corrections, minutes for the 2/15/2017 meeting were approved on a vote of 7-0-1 (Mr. Sargalski abstained; Mr. Walsh was not yet present).

Presentation from Committee Guests:

Following approval of minutes, the Committee welcomed Mr. Nardi from Silver, Petrucelli & Associates.

Mr. Nardi opened with some updates regarding state reimbursement. The Office of Construction Grants is now the Office of Construction Grants and Review and will review all projects coming through the office. A new requirement is a conceptual review of all state school projects before submitting the reimbursement application. The conceptual plan and estimates must be approved before the reimbursement application can be submitted.

The Chair asked how long the conceptual review would take. Mr. Nardi replied that the process is brand new and the timeframe would be unknown at this time.

The Chair asked for recommendations as whether the JFK Project Plan timeline needs to change. Mr. Nardi recommended giving as much time as possible.

The Chair asked if the environmental analysis needs to be completed before the conceptual plan can be submitted. Mr. Nardi said it would need to be completed before the conceptual plan can

be presented but he does not think the timeline for the environmental evaluation would negatively impact the process.

Mr. Nardi said that he would try to find out more information about the process.

Mrs. Neild-Barry asked for clarification as to what was required in the conceptual plan.

Mr. Nardi differentiated between what is included in the reimbursement application vs. the conceptual plan. The reimbursement application is more of a project summary whereas the conceptual plan is more detailed and would include plans and associated costs.

Ms. Keller asked if this new process would be mindful that this is a new process being offered late. Mr. Nardi replied that he believes if we go in with a reasonable plan that isn't far reaching that we should be OK. He also said we would do everything possible to meet all necessary deadlines.

Mr. Nuccio asked for a recommendation as to when we should be ready to present a conceptual plan. Mr. Nardi replied that he had been meeting with Mr. Sargalski and educators to develop the programming aspects of this plan. Once the programming is set, they can go right into building the conceptual designs. And once the conceptual design is approved, they can move into more detail on the cost estimated. Ideally, we would want to be able to submit the conceptual plan by the end of April which would allow for revisions to be made in May and June before submitting for reimbursement.

Mrs. Neild-Barry asked if we may need to meet more often to which Mr. Nardi replied that may be necessary.

Moving onto items relating to reimbursement, Mr. Nardi indicated the existing school (excluding portables) is approximately 167,000 gross square feet. Additionally, projected enrollment based on a recent demographic study (which impacts allowed square footage) shows as 1138 students (which would allow up to 185,000 square feet before reimbursement is reduced). However, Mr. Nardi also indicated that projections based on current enrollment in lower grades would put enrollment at about 1200 students. This additional enrollment would allow for approximately 195,000 square feet.

Mr. Kruzel and Mrs. LeBlanc thought a more recent enrollment study was done. They will check on this and report back. Mr. Nardi also indicated they were soon meeting with Central Office and would check with them as well.

Mr. Sargalski asked if projected numbers based on student population could be used instead of a demographic study. Mr. Nardi said the state requires the numbers to be from a demographic study.

The Chair asked, worst case scenario, how long it would take for a demographic study to be completed. Mr. Neville replied that they know of someone who does them regularly and they do not take that long.

Mr. Nardi then went on to talk about programming and provided an initial draft. He noted that the space requirements were based on discussions with educators as to their ideal conditions but understanding that some needs may need to be reduced. A copy of this draft was distributed. The format of the draft was described for clarification purposes. Each classroom, closet, storage room, office, etc... is indicated and the space of said room is indicated (proposed or existing). The columns to the left represent existing space. The columns to the right indicate proposed space. Rooms in black are existing. Rooms in blue are additions. Rooms in red indicate a reduction. Then, on the bottom of page 7 is a total for the entire school.

Mr. Nardi mentioned the team structure. Mr. Sargalski indicated that the number of teams was reduced by one several years ago but they are looking to add said team back. Mr. Nardi said that with the addition of another team could require the addition of classrooms.

Mr. Nardi brought up foreign language looking to increase to one classroom and teacher for every 2 teams.

Mr. Nardi then went through the draft in detail and emphasized the eventual need to make decisions regarding the space.

Mrs. Neild-Barry asked about the structure of keeping the teams and if the teachers wanted to change that. Mr. Sargalski mentioned the team structure would remain similar. One wish would be to have a special education instructor on each team. Mr. Nuccio further indicated that they want to keep the team classrooms near one another.

Mr. Nardi indicated that all classrooms are roughly 760 sq. ft. They would typically aim for 850 to 900 sq. ft. (in a middle school) As an example, the science classrooms were bumped up to 900 sq. ft. to show the space difference (though the likelihood is that the science classrooms would stay at 760).

Mr. Nardi, when talking about the Math department, indicated the addition of an 850 sq. ft. classroom. He also discussed the addition of two math intervention classroom. Mr. Sargalski said in an ideal world, they would like one intervention classroom for each grade level. MR. Nardi then continued that the net change in space for Math was approximately +1000 sq. ft.

Mr. Nuccio asked if shelving space on walls was included in the space measurements. Mr. Nardi replied that the measurements were just the inside space of walls.

Regarding English, Mr. Nardi indicated an addition of one classroom. Regarding storage, Mr. Nardi indicated that closets and storage areas would be inside the classroom. Regarding book storage, Mr. Nardi mentioned that it is currently scattered throughout the building and the plan

would be to have a common book storage room in the library. This is a program being tested right now at the high school and is having positive results. Book storage space numbers would be elsewhere in the specification. In the end, the book storage numbers would likely decrease due to consolidating eight book storage rooms into one main storage room.

Regarding Social Studies, Mr. Nardi drew comparisons to English as one classroom would be added and there would be the loss of one book storage room.

Regarding World Languages, Mr. Nardi said there are currently three classrooms and they are looking to go to six (one for every two teams). This department is also looking to add a world language lab. This is similar to what is present at the high school. This would represent a new addition of approximately 3400 sq. ft.

Some concerns were expressed by Mr. Nuccio, Mr. Sargalski, Mrs. LeBlanc and Mr. Kruzel as to the “wish list”. Mr. Nardi replied to the various concerns and comments by indicating he would be discussion the information with central office and would then again meet with the various coordinators to discuss possible reductions to the initial asks.

Mr. Sargalski took the opportunity to explain the coordinators’ thought processes. For World Language, he said they have three teachers right now and are looking to expand to the sixth grade to help their elective program and scheduling. He also said the class numbers for the existing three classes are very high which is one reason why an extra teacher was requested.

Mr. Weseliza asked how the report will reflect who is making what recommendations for tracking purposes on conceptual changes. (This question was replied to by Mr. Nardi later in the meeting as comments could be included as to who made what suggestions).

Mr. Neville asked about the World Language classrooms listed as 850 sq. ft. and that, initially, it was said that the portable classrooms were not included in the sq. ft. total. Mr. Nardi replied that everyone seemed in agreement that the portable classrooms need to be replaced. Mr. Neville replied that his query was more in relation to whether initial inclusion of the portables in the sq. ft. would skew the numbers. Mr. Nardi replied that for simplicity sake, the final build concept would account for the correct square footage.

Regarding Reading, currently there are nine classrooms and staff members. They would also look to go to 12. Mr. Nardi is still waiting for the final breakdown but it would likely be nine strategic classrooms and three assisted classrooms. The assisted reading classrooms would be smaller due to there being fewer students in those classes. With the added classrooms, there would be an addition of 1800 sq. ft. for reading.

Regarding Visual Arts, Mr. Nardi commented that at present there are three art classrooms (one in each of the academic wings) and three teachers. Art is looking to add one additional room as a studio for ceramics with a kiln room and mud room attached. There was also a conversation

about moving art out of the three wings and into a place in the building where they would be adjacent to one another and perhaps adjacent to technical education. The net additional sq. ft. for Visual Arts would be 2400.

Regarding Family & Consumer Science, Mr. Nardi said the status quo include two food labs and one sewing lab. He sees this department consolidating with a reduction of one food lab and eliminating the sewing lab. There is a hope in the future to add a business or computer component to this area. The space change for this department would be a loss of about 1500 sq. ft. Mr. Sargalski indicating they have a retirement this year that will leave them with only one teacher in this department and the area colleges aren't producing graduates in this area of education. In the future, they may be looking to add a teacher for computing or personal finance.

Off topic, Mrs. LeBlanc said she received a message from Mr. Drezek and it indicated that the most recent enrollment study was done last year.

Regarding Music, at present there are four dedicated classrooms and the band room is the auditorium. The request is to add one more general music classroom and a dedicated band room for 150 to 200 band students (which would be roughly the same size as at the high school). There would be increased storage requirements due to the total number of band students at the middle school (approximately 480). One practice room was also requested to be attached to the chorus, orchestra and band rooms (three practice rooms). An office was also requested off each of the three aforementioned rooms. Music would represent an addition of 8300 sq. ft.

Ms. Neild-Barry asked when we would be discussion the auditorium. Mr. Nardi replied that he still needs to discuss the auditorium with central office. Ms. Neild-Barry asked if the drama department could be consulted on the auditorium and Mr. Nardi said they could.

Mr. Nardi said that Physical Education and Health are still being discussed. Though, he did discuss the gymnasiums (the main gym, the basketball court and the specialized gym for rock climbing and other activities). A request had been made to turn the auxiliary gym (currently housing rock climbing and adventure activities) into another basketball court. To save space, the elimination of the auxiliary gym may need to be a sq. ft. saving measure. Additionally, there are no dedicated Health classrooms and a request was made to add three classrooms for that purpose.

Mr. Sargalski mentioned that the current Health program is taught out of Family & Consumer Science.

Mr. Nardi continued discussion cardio fitness and the pool. Regarding the pool, he mentioned that the educators do not use it but the town does. It still goes towards the school's total square feet even though it is not used for education. He recommended having a discussion on this matter. Ms. Keller mentioned that the Fermi pool is used by the high school swim team and the Dolphin team because it is set up as a competition pool. She mentioned the JFK pool is a bit smaller and is used more for swim lessons and summer camp by Parks & Recreation. If there

was only one pool, then swim lessons and other activities may have to be limited during swim team season. Mr. Nuccio mentioned that we would be keeping something open that isn't open 85% of the time. Ms. Keller indicated that if we get rid of the pool that it would have an impact on town activities. Mr. Walsh asked if there was any educational value to the pool. Mr. Sargalski said that some time ago it was a teaching station. But due to staff numbers and the number of students, including the losses of some PE teachers, using the pool as a teaching station has not been feasible. Ms. Keller replied from a recreation and a community standpoint, people seem to want the pool. Mr. Weseliza concurred and added that if we closed this pool but down the line decided we wanted another indoor pool, the costs may be prohibitive. Mr. Sargalski asked for reimbursement numbers on a pool. Mrs. LeBlanc added towards the community aspect that getting rid of the JFK pool may cause people to not vote for the JFK referendum. Mr. Gahr also commented that public works gets questions about pools and agrees with Ms. Keller. He brought up that there is a lot of after school activity in the schools and thinks that the pool should be kept.

The Chair asked, in relation to the pool and other items, when the committee will start seeing costs associated with various items. Mr. Nardi said in general, the cost is \$420 / sq. ft. The Chair continued that it would be nice to see, for example, the costs associated with adding a classroom in the draft proposal. Mr. Nardi said that the dollars won't come into play until the conceptual plans are developed due to the nature of design activities.

At this point, Mrs. LeBlanc received a follow-up from Mr. Drezek on enrollment projections. He indicated they were on the town website. Based on the study data available, the projected enrollment showed 403 for sixth grade, 387 for seventh and 436 for eighth for a total of 1226 for 2018-19. For 2017, the projections are 380 for sixth, 436 for seventh and 448 for eighth for a total of 1264. Based on these numbers, Mr. Nardi said JFK could go up to 215,000 sq. ft. without reducing the reimbursement rate.

Back to the pool, Mr. Sargalski said that if the pool was kept, he would be interested in determining the costs of turning it back into a teaching station so swimming could be added to the curriculum. Mr. Neville said that when it was shut down it was due to a budget issue. But he also said he thinks that children need swimming lessons. During his time, Mr. Neville said they contracted with Springfield College to have an adequate number of lifeguards available. There is also the issue, though, of children not wanting to take swimming (often due to the types of bathing suits). But, Mr. Neville does think there is value to having swimming in the curriculum as long as the social issues are taken into the account. Mrs. Neild-Barry also thinks that children should be taught to swim. But, she also understood the social and body image reservations involved. Mr. Kruzel then commented on the reimbursement aspect and wondered if it would be reimbursable since it was not being used for education at present. Mrs. Neild-Barry mentioned that some students are using the pool for a special program and that perhaps such use could be considered educational. Mr. Nardi replied that some percentage basis would likely be applied as the town uses the pool as well.

Regarding the locker rooms, Mr. Nardi said these were being examined in depth. The locker room space may be reduced in terms of shower space. This may be contingent upon talks with the town about the JFK building being used as a shelter. There are additional requirements if a building is used as a shelter including the ability to heat and cool spaces, having sufficient generator capacity, having adequate showering and eating spaces and structural considerations. Mrs. Neild-Barry and Mr. Arnone brought up the possibility of looking into changing the shelter location to another building such as Fermi. Mr. Nardi asked to confirm if JFK was the town's dedicated shelter. Mr. Kruzel confirmed that it was. Mrs. Keller and Mr. Sargalski brought up Enfield High being used as an overflow shelter. Mr. Walsh brought up the possibility of getting federal grants if Enfield wanted to turn another building into a shelter. Mr. Gahr mentioned that if another building were to be used, it would need to be large as JFK has been filled to capacity as a shelter in the past. Mr. Nardi followed by saying that the pool and shelter aspects of the building are going to be tough decisions requiring substantive thought and discussions.

Mr. Nardi mentioned that further meetings were going to take place with staff, coordinators and administrators and that the draft should be completed by the next meeting. Mr. Nardi mentioned that if something is in the draft initially, it won't be removed but there will be an indication that the item is not being moved forward. This will aid in tracking suggestions and decisions. Regarding the "provided" column of the sheet, Mr. Nardi said they will leave the requested numbers as is and use the "provided" column to show what is actually being provided in the conceptual plan. Ms. Keller asked whether other organizations could be included in the meetings to discuss space and programming needs. Mr. Nardi said the focus is on educational use but he would look into the possibility. Mr. Neville agreed that Parks and Recreation should be included in these discussions as given their use of and association with the town and buildings they may have valid suggestions. Mr. Kruzel and Mr. Sargalski clarified Mr. Nardi's point that such groups wouldn't be excluded, but with a focus on education, such groups would wind up using the renovated building as they do now with perhaps some adaptations. Mr. Nardi reiterated that they would meet with any departments deemed necessary.

Mrs. Neild-Barry asked Mr. Nardi if, when talking with central office, he could determine if Fermi could be used as a shelter. Mr. Gahr replied that one issue is with the generator as it is only sufficient to run a boiler. Mr. Arnone said that a new generator would cost a few hundred thousand dollars and that many generator grants had dried up.

Sensing no other comments on the presentation, the Chair thanked Mr. Nardi for his time. The Chair also requested Mr. Nardi's presence as the Environmental Consulting Firms were discussed and Mr. Nardi agreed.

Motion: A motion was made to modify the agenda to immediately address the Environmental Consultant Selection. Motioned by Mr. Neild-Barry and seconded by Mr. Sargalski. Motion approved 9-0-0.

Old Business:

Item 6A: Selection of an Environmental Consulting Firm

Motion: A motion was made to open discussion on the selection of an Environmental Consulting Firm. Motioned by Mrs. Neild-Barry and seconded by Ms. Keller. Motion approved with no objection.

Mrs. Neild-Barry confirmed that we have \$30,000 available, minus Silver, Petrucelli & Associate's 10%. She also mentioned that whomever we select needs to stay under that amount with an appropriate sample size.

Mr. Walsh continued with some research. Regarding federal and state statutes, he mentioned they are broad and open to interpretation and a variety of methods for determining where to test and the number of tests to be completed. Mr. Walsh would like to have a better understanding of how to determine an appropriate number of samples.

Mr. Nardi replied that he was not familiar with the meter-grid method. Mr. Nardi recommended, as there are not statutory requirements to test for PCBs, that we test areas most likely to be contaminated. Mr. Walsh continued with a list of items most likely to be contaminated which involved various items and areas where caulking was used (including around windows, wall joints, spaces between brick and concrete, fireproofing, etc...). Given the various areas where contamination could exist, Mr. Walsh asked how the firm would narrow that down. Mr. Nardi replied that they would go through the building and look at the era of the materials. As an example, a school like JFK may be on the lower side for window caulking samples since the windows (aside from those in the Library addition) as the windows are all original. Whereas, in another school, there may be some original windows but some replaced and other new additions. In the latter, there are likely to be more types of caulking to test. Mr. Nardi also mentioned that the environmental teams had not yet walked to building to narrow down the sample size which could be one reason for the discrepancy in the number of samples between the three estimates. Mr. Nardi also said he asked Fuss & O'Neill why they had over 200 samples listed to which they replied that a project with a similar size (compared to JFK) required that many samples. Though, Mr. Nardi believes less samples will be needed. Mr. Nardi recommended looking at the unit price for the samples (amongst the three estimates) and re-estimate each with the same number of samples to determine which is the most economical. Then, this number can be compared to the town council approved \$30,000 and advise the selected firm that they cannot exceed a certain number of samples.

The Chair then asked for a description of services provided by Silver, Petrucelli & Associates for their 10% fee. Mr. Nardi said that he environmental firm would sign a contract with and would be managed by Silver, Petrucelli & Associates. Mr. Kaupin also confirmed that we took this approach to save time from having to go through a standard bid process as certain critical deadlines have to be met.

The Chair then asked about Silver, Petrucelli & Associate's relationship with all three possible firms and asked if there were any issues related to the quality of the three organizations. Mr. Nardi said he has not experienced any such issues.

The Chair then asked for a recommendation as to which of the three firms would most likely be able to keep their cost under the \$30,000 mark. Mrs. Neild-Barry replied that would be dependent upon the number of samples. Mr. Nardi further replied that, after normalizing sample counts, whichever firm has the lowest apples-to-apples cost estimate would be most likely to stay under the \$30,000 mark.

Mr. Arnone asked a question related to liability if, for example, something is missed or not enough samples are taken. Mr. Nardi replied that it would be the liability of the Environmental Consulting Firm but also of Silver, Petrucelli & Associates given how the contract is set up. Mr. Arnone commented that doing it this way was better for Enfield taxpayers since it reduces town liability.

The Chair stated that in regards to the unit pricing suggestion made by Mr. Nardi, Fuss & O'Neill shows a unit price of \$75 / sample, Langan shows \$85 / sample and Mystic shows \$125 / sample. Mrs. Neild-Barry then commented we are not looking strictly at the estimates but rather through which firm we could get the most samples for the cost. The Chair then replied that Fuss & O'Neill would be able to provide more samples for the same amount.

Mr. Weseliza advised having an attorney review the contract to determine and allocate potential liability. Mr. Arnone agreed this would be important. Mr. Nardi replied that if the choice is made, in part, by unit price and if with Silver, Petrucelli & Associates managing the process, they would advise to which ever firm is selected that the firm do a walk-through of the school before any contact is signed.

Mr. Sargalski asked about testing of fields. Mr. Nardi replied that the estimates do not include testing of the fields. The only outdoor testing would be the areas near and beneath the windows. Mr. Kaupin said the understanding was that the fields were tested several years ago.

Mr. Walsh commented that one area could be tested and if positive for PCBs then other areas with the same materials could be considered to have the same results and abated.

Mr. Nardi believes that each firm's initial proposal was given with a minimal outlook. Then, when Fuss & O'Neill was asked to provide costs associated with testing and PCB samples that they may have taken a similar project and used those numbers for their estimate.

Mr. Arnone asked what process was followed at Enfield High School and Mr. Nardi replied that the testing was done.

The Chair commented that his examination of the numbers, taking into account the unit price concept, and given no quality concerns with either of the three possible firms, and emphasizing

his comments to be strictly from a cost perspective, Fuss & O'Neill seemed to be the firm most likely to stay under budget. Mr. Nardi concurred that Fuss & O'Neill seemed to offer the lowest price. The Chair further commented on the importance of doing the right thing and displaying such an appearance, but expressed a certain weariness of having to go back to the town council for addition funds for this aspect of the project.

Motion: A motion to close discussion was made by Mrs. Neild-Barry and seconded by Mr. Walsh. The motion was approved 8-0-1 (Mr. Muller abstained by absence).

Motion: A motion was made to select Fuss & O'Neill EnviroScience LLC as the Environmental Consulting Firm by Mrs. Neild-Barry and seconded by Mr. Sargalski.

In discussion, Mr. Walsh commented that if done strategically that Fuss and O'Neill could keep to within the cost parameters.

During the vote, Mr. Muller returned. The Chair made a point to clarify for Mr. Muller what the vote was for.

The motion was approved by a vote of 9-0-0.

The Chair then stated that Fuss & O'Neill was selected as the Environmental Consulting Firm. He further confirmed that the funds were approved and advised Mr. Nardi to engage the Firm from a contractual perspective.

Mr. Nardi confirmed that they would contact Fuss & O'Neill to schedule the building walk through and revise the sampling estimate as appropriate.

Mr. Gahr asked for clarification on attorney review. The Chair replied that the contract would be between Silver, Petrucelli & Associates and Fuss & O'Neill but that it would be a good idea to have the attorney review. Mr. Nardi stated that Silver, Petrucelli & Associates would have the interaction with Fuss & O'Neill and that any committee interaction would be through Silver, Petrucelli & Associates. Mr. Arnone then asked if the original contract between Silver, Petrucelli & Associates and the Town of Enfield would cover the liability items to which Mr. Nardi said it would.

Public Communications:

The Chair opened the floor to public comments. No public comments were offered.

New Business:

Item 7A: Approval of 2017 Meeting Calendar

Motion: A motion to approve the 2017 Meeting Calendar was made by Mrs. Neild-Barry and seconded by Mr. Muller.

Mr. Muller and Mrs. Neild-Barry asked about the possibility of increasing the number of meetings if necessary in lieu of the new State approval requirements. The Chair replied that, if necessary, we could add additional dates. This is something that the committee could approve on an as-needed basis.

The motion was approved 9-0-0.

Item 7B: Agenda Items for the 3/15/2017 Meeting

Agenda items to include further updates from Silver, Petrucelli & Associates which could also include updates on the Environmental Testing.

There will also be FOIA & Parliamentary Procedure training on the next agenda. This item was communicated to the Chair by the Town Manager's office.

Committee Communications:

The Chair confirmed the next Town Council and Board of Education meetings and presentations that would be made.

Mr. Kruzel and Mr. Kaupin said the Hale-Use item would not need to be brought up as some discussions are already taking place.

Mr. Gahr commented on the potential Hale-Use and that Hale doesn't have any athletic fields but Fermi does. Mrs. Neild-Barry stated the logistics might be better with using Hale. She further commented that such discussions are down the road and Mr. Kruzel said that the item would be something that would be considered by the Building Committee.

Mr. Weseliza commented on some emails regarding the amount to be requested from the Town Council for the environmental testing and that there needs to be a better way of communicating should the need for decision arise. The Chair replied that such emails were for the sole purpose of communication intention as revised estimates were received one business day before the Town Council meeting and there was no time to call a meeting. The Chair agreed that under normal circumstances it would have been best to get everyone together but it is not always feasible nor would it be within guidelines. Mr. Weseliza said he wasn't comfortable changing the number requested after a different number was approved by the committee. The Chair reiterated that it would not have been possible to call a meeting in the time following the new numbers being received.

Ms. Keller indicated that if the committee had voted to request the \$30,000 number that we would have to stick with that in a presentation. The Chair clarified that if a number had been voted on and approved then that number would have been needed to be the one presented. However, there was no vote and rather just a discussion as to what the number should be. Mrs. Neild-Barry concurred. Mr. Kruzel replied that it was under the discretion of the Chair to change the number requested in the presentation given new information.

Adjournment:

Motion: A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Muller and seconded by Mr. Weseliza. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 PM

■ EMR