

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
BOARD OF MANAGERS
OF THE
NINE MILE CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2017

Call to Order

Chair Kloiber called the meeting of the Board of Managers of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District to order at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, November 15, 2017, at the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Office, 12800 Gerard Drive, Eden Prairie, MN 55346.

Managers Present: Kloiber, Sheely and Peterson

Managers Absent: Hunker and Twele

Advisors Present: Randy Anhorn, Michael Welch, Bob Obermeyer, Janna Kieffer, and Erica Sniegowski

Agenda

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the agenda. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Reading and Approval of Minutes

The Chair called for review of the minutes of the Special Meeting of October 5, 2017. Attorney Welch noted on the second paragraph of page two, PCA should be spelled out as Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. The last sentence, of the second to the last paragraph on page 2, is not substantive and could be removed, "~~He noted that although Ms. Hunker has not been formally sworn in, she should still feel free to contribute to the discussion tonight~~". Chair Kloiber proposed the following change for the eighth paragraph, on page 3, "Chair Kloiber stated that he did not see a lot of benefit to massively expanding the permit program for single-family home projects and would rather see a focus on regional projects that had the most impact, and larger solutions." To the third paragraph, on page 5, it should state, "Attorney Welch used the example of a sport court that was constructed with the known possibility of flooding. He noted that in that case the District issued a variance to allow the property owner construct the project knowing that it may flood to flood their own property." Chair Kloiber noted on page four, the fifth paragraph, it should state, "...there are may be..." Manager Sheely noted on page four, the fourth paragraph, it should state, "Administrator Anhorn stated that staff would support the constructed basins but was having difficulty with expanding floodplain definition to include the inundation areas." On page four, the first paragraph, it should state, "...neighboring Watershed Districts do not included..." On page seven, the first paragraph, it should state, "...proposed

minimum requirements proposed...” On page eight, the third paragraph, it should state, “Chair Kloiber stated that if that planning grant...”

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the minutes with the noted corrections. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

The Chair called for review of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 18, 2017. Attorney Welch noted on page three, under Item A, it should state, “...**approve the variance based on the review of the criteria listed in the Board packet findings set forth in the Engineer’s Report.**” On page three, under Item A, it should state, “...**approve the permit with conditions set forth in the Engineer’s Report.**” On page five, under the roll call vote, an additional “X” should be removed. On page five, under Item B, it should state, “...language: be it further resolved that the NMCWD administrator hereby is authorized to contract for purchase of goods and services or otherwise bind NMCWD in an amount up to \$5,000.”

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the minutes with the noted corrections. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

The Chair called for review of the minutes of the Special Meeting of November 2, 2017.

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the minutes as proposed. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Correspondence

No additional comments.

Public Comment Forum on District’s 2018 Budget and Levy

Administrator Anhorn noted that this is the second opportunity to receive public comments on the 2018 budget and levy.

Chair Kloiber opened the floor for public comments.

Chair Kloiber noted that there are no members of the public present tonight to provide input.

Administrator Anhorn stated that he will certify the final levy.

Hearing and Discussion of Matters of General Public Interest

There were none.

Consent Agenda

- A. **Permit #2017-108: Andy's Truck Storage Parking Lot Reconstruction – 8116 Pillsbury Avenue; Grading and land alteration permit: Bloomington**
- B. **Permit #2017-111: Willow Creek Road Embankment Regrading – 7030 Willow Creek Road; Grading and land alteration permit: Eden Prairie**

Engineer Obermeyer referenced Item A and noted that this site, while not in the identified boundaries of the Bloomington Superfund site, it is located just north of the area. He stated that the information submitted included soil borings and the engineer doing the borings did make notes that there were no visual observations of contamination and no odors, and Engineer Obermeyer has no concerns regarding infiltration.

Engineer Obermeyer stated that the need for a permit was triggered by the volume of materials disturbed. He noted that the site is small at one third of an acre.

Manager Peterson asked if it would make sense to have additional infiltration in these areas near the Superfund site that could handle infiltration.

Chair Kloiber stated that perhaps on such sites with conducive soils that would be large enough to handle additional infiltration, the District could offer to partner with the applicant to construct additional infiltration. He recognized that this site is most likely too small to be conducive.

Engineer Obermeyer referenced Item B and noted that Eden Prairie has submitted a permit for grading a strip along a rural section of Willow Creek Road. He referenced an adjacent wetland, noting that the wetland limits have been delineated and noted that the roadway right-of-way is outside of the wetland limits. He noted that a buffer will be provided within that area because of the slope requirements that were triggered.

Attorney Welch noted that the buffer maintenance should be included for the City of Eden Prairie. He stated that the item could be added as a condition and the agreement could be done through a straightforward letter.

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the Consent Agenda with the condition requiring buffer maintenance on Permit #2017-111. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Hearing of Permit Applications

- A. **Permit #2017-109: Southdale JC Penny's Redevelopment – 200 Southdale Center; Grading and land alteration permit: Edina**

Engineer Obermeyer noted that tonight the Board will consider two projects within the Southdale Center complex. He reviewed past projects that the District has approved, along with the two projects before the Board tonight. He stated that within the District rules, there is a

provision for redevelopment and provided additional details on the requirement. He stated that even though the properties have been purchased from Southdale LLC, there is a certain amount of aggregate disturbance and there has been, and will continue to be, a reduction in imperviousness. He asked the Board to review the developments and keep in mind the aggregate impact of the disturbance of impervious surface.

Attorney Welch provided additional input on the common scheme of development. He stated that you cannot avoid the stormwater rule by selling pieces of a property and dividing up the redevelopment. He stated that someday, someone is going to submit plans for another piece of property that will trigger the 50 percent threshold and require stormwater treatment for the entire site.

Engineer Obermeyer stated that staff has a conference call setup with the Simon Property Group, the owner of Southdale LLC, to discuss that topic and bring that threshold to their attention. He stated that staff has talked with the consultants for Simon but would like to bring this to the direct attention of Simon.

Attorney Welch noted that in this case each project has reduced the impervious and provided treatment for their own site.

Engineer Obermeyer stated that because of the site constraints of the ramp location and footprint of the existing building, there is no area to provide the stormwater treatment and therefore they are proposing to provide the stormwater facilities around the corner on the Southdale LLC property. He stated that under the common scheme of development, this would be allowed because the sites are under common ownership. He stated that the stormwater elements could be sized larger to handle additional treatment and noted that staff is discussing that option with the applicant.

Manager Peterson asked if there would be a better strategy to look at the overall site and be more strategic with planning.

Engineer Obermeyer noted that will be included in the discussion with the Simon Property Group the following day. He noted that some of the sites are under separate ownership, such as the JCPenney site and the Macy's site.

Manager Peterson asked if the city should be involved in the discussions as well.

Engineer Obermeyer noted that the city would review this project as part of their development review process.

Chair Kloiber stated that there is no shortage of treatment areas on this site.

Administrator Anhorn noted that these two projects tonight would result in a reduction of eight pounds of phosphorus per year.

Manager Sheely noted that perhaps this is an opportunity for the District to partner and create a more visible educational treatment aspect.

Attorney Welch noted that if the additional treatment discussion continues to move forward, it could be a collaboration that could include education elements.

Engineer Obermeyer explained the proposed project plans recommended approval of the permit with conditions including financial surety in the amount of \$74,700, necessary maintenance declaration, and receipt of document of legally enforceable dedication to the Southdale re-development LLC property owner from the Southdale Center LLC owner regarding the flowage and management rights for the stormwater facility to be constructed on the Southdale Center LLC property.

Manager Sheely asked if the Board were to approve this tonight, would that negate options for future possibilities of expanded stormwater facilities.

Attorney Welch noted that the Board would need to act on this permit and could not delay action. He confirmed that the Board would still have the opportunity to discuss additional elements with Simon. He noted that all of the projects thus far for this site, even though separate permits, have had the same engineer.

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the permit subject to the noted conditions. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

B. Permit #2017-110: Southdale Shake Shack – S.E. Corner of West 66th Street and France Avenue; Grading and land alteration permit: Edina

Engineer Obermeyer presented the permit request and proposed plans. He noted that this site would remain under the ownership of Southdale Center LLC. He noted that the infiltration calculations were based on soil borings in other areas of the parking lot and therefore verification of that is being requested. He recommended approval of the permit contingent on the conditions of financial surety in the amount of \$29,900, verification of the soil borings, and necessary maintenance agreement.

Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to approve the permit subject to the noted conditions. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Treasurer's Report

The Treasurer submitted the report. Administrator Anhorn provided clarification on certain items included in the revised report.

Engineer Obermeyer presented a pay request from Sunram in the amount of \$127,981.13 and recommended approval. He clarified the work that has been completed in the Edina Creek project and which work is still being completed.

Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to approve the pay request to Sunram in the amount of \$127,981.13. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to approve the Treasurer's Report and pay the bills. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Education & Outreach Program Report

The Chair called for the report of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

A. General Updates

Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski stated that staff is working on more promotional materials for the adopt a drain program. She noted that people have started to report the amount of debris that is being removed. She stated that it is exciting to see the project move along. She noted that people within the Normandale Lake pilot area are receiving their signs and the next batch will receive signs, stating that they protect Nine Mile Creek, which will be delivered in the spring.

Manager Peterson noted that she has noticed that perhaps the street sweepers have been by about once a week to clean-up the leaves.

Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski stated that she has not notice the sweepers in her neighborhood and would follow-up to determine the sweeping pattern. She stated that the buckthorn bust took place on October 28th and was a success. She thanked Barr Engineering for their participation and for providing lunch for the event.

B. Watershed Sandbox Exhibit

Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski stated that there is not a great name for this exhibit and played a YouTube video that provided additional details. She stated that people have different learning styles, and this is a great option for people to learn more about watersheds. She stated that the important element is that this would need to be portable to be used in different locations. She stated that this will be a great learning tool that will bring people in and it is interactive. She noted that drawing people into the District booth will allow staff to talk to them about other elements. She stated that she has given specific information on size limitations and mobility to the consultants that designed the pop-up cart. She stated that Riley Purgatory Creek Watershed also wants to partner on the exhibit. She stated that the proposed budget for the exhibit would be \$13,090.38 and with the partner cost-share the District's portion would be half (\$6,545.19). She provided information on the proposed dimensions. She confirmed that you need to scoop the sand out to move the exhibit. She noted that staff would propose to use kinetic sand.

Manager Sheely noted that if the boxes had handles, it could help to make it more movable. She noted that a second base could help to make it higher as well.

The Board provided input on elements in the design which could make it easier to move.

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve a budget of \$6,545.19 expenditure for the exhibit and authorize staff to enter into the necessary contracts. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

C. Discovery Point Landscape Restoration Change Order

Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski presented change order #2 for the Discovery Point landscape restoration project. She stated that this would continue the buckthorn and tree removal on the southwestern portion of the property. She provided additional input on the ash trees that are on the property and the city of Eden Prairie's policy to remove ash trees. She noted that the necessary approvals have been obtained for the tree removal. She stated that the original contract unit prices and the unit prices for change order #2 were included for comparison purposes. She stated that a letter was recently sent to 122 neighbors and a public meeting was held prior to this meeting, noting that about seven neighbors attended. She stated that she received phone calls thanking the District for sharing the information as well. She noted that the information is also posted on the District's website and would be shared on Nextdoor. She stated that one ash tree will be saved for educational purposes to show how a ash tree can be treated/protected against emerald ash borer.

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to authorize the administrator to execute change order #2 for the Discovery Point Landscape Restoration Phase I in an amount not to exceed \$26,400. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Unfinished Business

A. Rules

Administrator Anhorn stated that the rules were discussed at the November 2nd special meeting, along with comments that were received.

Engineer Kieffer discussed the benefits of water retention and how size plays a factor. She noted that information provides details on volume and then discussed the role that rate control plays. She displayed scenarios in how water would be treated from a storm with the different volume retention systems. She provided similar information for water quality, noting the larger the basin, the more pollutants that would be removed. She reviewed alternatives that could be beneficial as well. She stated that the preferred stormwater best management practices (BMPs) to meet volume retention and water quality needs is infiltration, but if there are site constraints (bad soils or soil contamination), it is hard to reach the same on-site levels of benefit with other options. She stated these are the scenarios where the District is attempting to find the best approach. She provided information on the different soil types and the corresponding drawdown rates. She presented a possible site scenario where for most soils, the footprint of the BMP would range from four to ten percent of the site, with the exception of D type soils which could take up as around 28 percent of the site. She reviewed the District's rules and alternatives available for those sites that because of various constraints, cannot meet the District's current

one-inch retention requirement. She stated that providing the full one-inch treatment offsite, through the purchase of credits, would not provide a water quality benefit to the immediately downstream region. She reviewed some of the alternatives that focus on providing the treatment onsite.

Attorney Welch noted that the approach where, because of site constraints, an applicant would have a reduced on-site volume retention requirement, but would still need to meet the full water quality requirement on-site, would provide water quality treatment to the immediate receiving water resource.

Engineer Kieffer reviewed on-site compliance alternatives. She provided flexible sequencing that is used by other metro watershed districts where they require volume retention on-site to the maximum extent possible.

Chair Kloiber noted that the question would then be how you define the maximum extent possible.

Engineer Kieffer stated that in talking with staff from other watersheds there are pros and cons to that as it provides flexibility to ask for more but also puts judgement decisions upon the engineer.

Attorney Welch explained that he does not like the “maximum extent possible” because it causes a negotiation with the engineer and applicant. He stated that the 0.55-inch minimum requirement is a meaningful checkpoint.

Chair Kloiber stated that perhaps for D type soils, you would say that the applicant would at a minimum need to retain 0.55-inch on-site, and that is it. It was noted that there are very few cases that are not able to meet that mark.

Administrator Anhorn asked if getting the water quality treatment near the project site is important, and if so, how do they get that requirement into the rules.

Chair Kloiber noted that as written currently, the payment into the stormwater fund would provide that treatment but in a different location in the watershed.

Administrator Anhorn noted that single-family homes are still required to meet the water quality requirements, even if they cannot meet the full one-inch on-site. It was noted that the private banks being created are being kept by the creator for their future projects rather than becoming available to purchase.

Attorney Welch noted that what he does not like about payment into the stormwater fund is that it places the burden back on the District.

Engineer Kieffer provided another sequencing approach used by other watershed districts. She provided an example of how the different approaches would apply to a previously

approved project. She highlighted some of the pros and cons of the different sequencing approaches.

Administrator Anhorn stated that the question would be whether the rules are appropriate as currently written or whether there needs to be an element for reduced volume retention requirements for site constraints, while still requiring the water quality treatment on site.

Manager Peterson stated that she does not see that infiltration on-site for these types of soils as being advantageous because there is the potential for the BMP to fail.

Engineer Kieffer noted that BMPs on D type soils are more likely to not function long-term compared to BMPs on other soils.

Manager Peterson stated that the payment into the stormwater fund seems to provide the District with additional funds to use on a regional treatment element rather than focusing on the smaller pieces that may fail, however this approach results in the downstream waterbody(ies) losing the water quality benefit.

Chair Kloiber stated that if the language is kept as originally proposed, the District would continue to gain funds that could be used for a regional treatment option but noted that the funds the District is collecting is nominal. He noted that the District would be able to levy for the funds needed for a regional treatment option.

Manager Peterson stated that she would also prefer not causing staff to use a lot of their time on adding the water quality element to these nominal projects.

Attorney Welch noted that the threshold for a few of the other metro watershed districts is one-acre and therefore they are only permitting larger projects. He stated that this District is reviewing projects on much, much smaller sites and it would be hard to justify staff spending a large amount of time. He recommended against the District getting involved in a design negotiation with applicants.

Chair Kloiber stated that he would lean towards using a tiered approach to providing water quality on site because there has not been much action on the funds generated from the stormwater fund. He stated that with this option being discussed the District will see the treatment provided now at the cost to the applicant.

Engineer Obermeyer stated that the Board should remember that when the original rules were drafted, it was before the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's Minimal Impact Design Standards (MIDS) were developed, and now the other districts have based their rules off the MIDS. He stated that the District set the tone and asked if the District wants to tweak their rules now.

Manager Sheely stated that two Managers are absent tonight and missing this important discussion. She stated that there are four watersheds in Minnetonka and asked if there is value in being similar to the other watershed districts.

Chair Kloiber stated that he would agree that it would be courteous to have some type of consistency for the member cities, but noted that his first focus is protection of the water resource.

Manager Sheely stated that the Board is trying to make it better for themselves but also for the entities that they permit for and the cities in District.

Manager Peterson asked if this change would be a real improvement or just a tweak.

Attorney Welch noted that the change would be that the water quality treatment would be provided on-site. He explained the perspective of a member city staff member and how their rules must match each of the watersheds they belong to. He stated that if a member city wants to take over control of certain elements, they do not need to match the exact verbiage of each watershed district but simply provide an ordinance that would provide equivalent or better water resource protection.

Chair Kloiber stated that because there are two Managers absent, perhaps they could give a general sense of where the Managers present sit on the issue.

Engineer Kieffer stated that if the consensus is to move in this direction, that would be a change to the rules as drafted.

Administrator Anhorn stated that the intent was to present something at the December regular meeting that the Board could approve, and the rules could then be released for a 45-day review period. He asked for input on the presentation that will be given to the remaining Managers to expedite the discussion.

Chair Kloiber stated that he would be open to the idea of a tiered approach, as he believes it to make sense. He stated that he would like to see more from the menu of equivalent treatments offered by Minnehaha Creek Watershed District. He stated that if there was a short presentation and discussion, he could support voting on the matter at the December meeting.

Engineer Obermeyer asked if the Board wants to give up volume retention in favor of water quality. He stated that there would also be an option to require some level of volume retention and the water quality.

Chair Kloiber stated that he would be willing to give up some volume retention in favor of gaining the full water quality on-site. He stated that he would like to have the volume retention provided to the extent possible.

Manager Sheely suggesting the slides as presented to the Managers that were absent tonight as that will provide them with a sufficient baseline of information to go into the December meeting with. She stated that she would like to understand how the three items are different: the current District rule, the Riley Purgatory rule, and the Minnehaha rule.

New Business

A. MAWD Annual Meeting Delegation and Resolutions

Administrator Anhorn noted that two delegates and an alternate are needed for the MAWD annual meeting. He reviewed the voting duties of the delegates.

Chair Kloiber stated that delegates would need to be present at the MAWD meeting on Saturday morning. He stated that he will be at the meeting.

Manager Peterson stated that she would need to leave the meeting fairly early and could possibly be the alternate.

Manager Sheely stated that she does have plans for Saturday morning but could cancel those plans to attend on Saturday morning.

Administrator Anhorn stated that he is not sure but believed that Manager Hunker would be leaving Friday night.

Manager Peterson stated that she and Manager Twele were planning to travel together.

It was the consensus of the Board to appoint Chair Kloiber and Manager Sheely as the delegates and Manager Twele as the alternate for the MAWD annual meeting.

B. Education/Outreach Program Manager Annual Review

Administrator Anhorn confirmed that Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski was comfortable with this discussion occurring in open session. He stated that this is more than just a performance review as staff and the managers have previously discussed potential organizational changes to do more with the limited staff available. He commended Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski for going above and beyond and for being of great assistance in the time since he has joined the District staff. He stated that through her performance review, the rankings for each of her review areas were either "outstanding" or "exceeds requirement". He stated that using the salary and review table from the District's employee policy manual, this rating would equate to a recommended five percent salary increase. He stated that in addition to the suggested merit increase, to address organizational needs, he and Erica had been working on a revised job description that would change her position from Education and Outreach Manager to a broader Program and Project Manager position and presented that new position description to the board. He noted that she has already taken the lead on certain projects. He stated that this would also open the door for Gael to become the Education and Outreach Coordinator rather than Specialist which would help to transfer some of Erica's current Education and Outreach job duties to Gael. He stated that he felt that the change in job description and work load for Erica would equate to another half-step salary increase, which would bring the total recommended salary increase to ten percent.

Chair Kloiber stated that the Board is happy to have her here as she has, and continues to do, great things for the District. He believed that she deserves the full ten percent salary increase and looks forward to the great things she will continue to do.

It was the consensus of the Board to recommend the ten percent salary increase and job description for Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski as described and retroactive to November 2, 2017.

Administrator Anhorn stated that staff will continue discussions with Eden Prairie staff to increase the allowed number of full-time staff members.

Manager Sheely commended Education and Outreach Program Manager Sniegowski for her strong leadership abilities and for the excellent job she does for the District.

Engineer's Report

- A. Bush Lake Outlet Project: Status Report**
- B. Eden Prairie Lakes Water Quality Improvement Project: Status Report**
- C. Edina Creek Stabilization Project: Status Report**
- D. Normandale Lake Water Quality Improvement Project: Status Report**
- E. Pentagon Park Stormwater Management**
- F. Discovery Point Site Restoration**
- G. Status of Construction Projects**

Engineer Obermeyer provided photographs of 5225 Baker Road. He stated that he received a call from the property owner's son who stated that he had difficulty mowing and pulled, by hand, the blanket the District put down. It was noted that this was City property in County right-of-way. He stated that the material was too heavy for the property owner to pick-up and noted that the blanket that was installed would have deteriorated by spring. He stated that he spoke with Blackstone Contracting and they stated that they could pick-up the material for a cost of \$500. He recommended that the Board authorize the activity and noted that there could then be discussion as to who would be responsible for that \$500 charge.

Attorney Welch noted that this is too small of a charge to spend much time on and recommended that the Board authorize the administrator to send a letter to the property owner stating that he would owe the \$500. He stated that if the property owner pays the funds, he pays and if he doesn't pay then the District would not spend a lot of staff time chasing this amount. He noted that the party did call the District.

Manager Peterson stated that perhaps this is a situation that can be used as an educational opportunity.

Manager Sheely asked the role of the city.

Chair Kloiber stated that although this was City property, the initial culvert repair was done a part of repair/maintenance of the District's Minnetonka Lakes Water Quality Project. He stated that he would be open to sending the letter.

Manager Sheely stated that she would agree with sending a letter showing the amount that it costs to clean up what he did and asking him to stay off the project area but not requesting payment.

Manager Peterson agreed.

Engineer Obermeyer noted that the property owner was very accommodating during the project and therefore he would support that action.

Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to authorize an expenditure of \$500 for the pick-up of material at Baker Road. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

With respect to phase one of the Nine Mile Creek Stabilization Project, Engineer Obermeyer stated that the District is continuing with Sunram and there is a potential issue of reconnecting the channels that have been excavated and filling in the old channel. He stated that the contractor has finished the channel bypasses and restored those but there is no germination, which means that come spring there could be potential erosion without the germination. He stated that staff has discussed this with the contractor and discussed the dates and possibility of liquidated damages. He stated that the contractor has not decided whether he will route the water into the new channel this fall.

Attorney's Report

Attorney Welch stated that when the Board comes back to start the 45-day comment period before adoption of the rules, staff will start a plan amendment at the same time as the District must amend the rules into the plan. He stated that the District was voluntarily dismissed from the condemnation process with the Metropolitan Council, as planned.

Administrator's Report

Administrator Anhorn had nothing further to report.

Managers' Report

The Chair called for reports.


Task Summary Report & Manager's Calendar

The Managers reviewed and updated the task report.

Adjournment

It was moved by Manager Peterson, seconded by Manager Sheely, to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 p.m. Upon a vote, the motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,



Grace Sheely, Secretary

ATTACHMENTS:
Treasurer's Report