

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 27, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1. Introduction / Roll Call

Chair Cihacek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. At his request, Public Works Director Culver called the roll.

Present: Chair Brian Cihacek; Vice Chair Joe Wozniak; and Members Nancy Misra, Duane Seigler, Thomas Trainor, and John Heimerl

Absent: Member Kody Thurnau.

Staff Present: Public Works Director Marc Culver, and City Engineer Jesse Freihammer

Chair Cihacek reminded the Commission of the upcoming Ethics Training and encouraged them to attend. He also noted Commissioners are invited to attend the Environmental Commission Conference on April 7 that he previously sent out a link for.

Member Wozniak noted Commissioners also need to fill out a disclosure of financial interest.

2. Public Comments

3. Approval of February 27, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by PWETC commissioners prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions incorporated into the draft presented in meeting materials.

Member Trainor referred to line 607 and noted Member Misra made the motion. He encouraged Members to speak clearly into the microphones as it is sometimes difficult to hear on the recording.

Motion

Member Trainor moved, Member Heimerl seconded, approval of the amended February 27, 2018 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Election of Officers

Member Trainor commented Chair Cihacek and Vice Chair Wozniak have done a good job in these roles.

Motion

Member Trainor moved, and Member Misra seconded, the nomination of Member Cihacek to serve as Chair and Member Wozniak to serve as Vice Chair.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

5. Communications Items

City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated March 27, 2018.

Member Seigler inquired if the lights will be changed on County Road B and Cleveland.

Mr. Freihammer responded the signal lights will be replaced as is, but there will be ADA pedestrian improvements to the intersection.

Mr. Culver explained it is part of the pavement management project on Interstate 35W. The signal timing will be evaluated, but that signal is not coordinated with any other traffic signals.

Member Misra inquired how long repaving will take and if it will involve lane closures.

Mr. Freihammer responded most of the paving will be done at night and the signals will be worked on during the day.

Mr. Culver stated there may be weekend closures of ramps.

Member Wozniak inquired if the late winter is negatively impacting Public Works projects.

Mr. Culver noted it has not affected the proposed projects. This late winter is more typical than it has been in the past. They plan to begin construction projects in May.

Chair Cihacek inquired about salt projections for the year.

Mr. Culver responded his is unsure how many tons they have left, but there is still plenty in stock that will carry into next year. When they order salt, they must take at least 80 percent and up to 120 percent of what they order.

Member Trainor inquired if there is security fencing around the water booster station.

Mr. Culver responded they do not yet have security fencing but have discussed different types of fencings to use when the project is completed.

Mr. Freihammer stated site security will be considered during Phase 3 of the project.

Member Trainor referred to a Ramsey County flyer that included a brochure on recycling in Roseville. He stated it did not indicate that nos. 3 and 6 plastics are restricted for recycling. Under paper products, the paper towel and toilet paper rolls are now approved for recycling. He questioned the accuracy as well as the education on these two items.

Mr. Culver responded he believes the paper towel rolls are accepted as of the City's last contract, which began in January 2017. Regarding the plastics, the County tries to maintain consistency in the information it provides to each City. They may not be focusing on the numbers anymore, but he will get more information on it.

Member Trainor stated it would be nice to see this brochure revised. They will either see items in recycling that do not belong there, or people will not recycle all that they can.

Mr. Culver announced the new Commission members are Michael Joyce, who works for Metro Transit; and, Martin Kors and Michael Kruse who both work for Mn/DOT. These new members will be sworn in at the April meeting and will replace Members Seigler, Heimerl and Thurnau. He thanked the outgoing Members for their service and time with the Commission.

Mr. Freihammer noted there will be some small changes to the new atlases for each Commissioner member and requested they bring in their old atlas to be recycled.

Member Trainor reminded the Commission they need to identify an Ethics Commission Member and volunteered to serve in this role.

Mr. Freihammer stated typically the Chair has served on the Ethics Commission.

Chair Cihacek noted he is happy to serve on the Ethics Commission again, or table it so new members have an opportunity to vote on it. He will remain the delegate unless someone expresses a strong preference otherwise.

Member Trainor stated he would like to be the Ethics Commission delegate.

Motion

Member Trainor moved, and Chair Cihacek seconded, to appoint Member Trainor as the Ethics Commission delegate.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. City Campus Solar Discussion

Mr. Culver reported they have two different solar options to present. He began by highlighting a new program called Solar Possible, which provides collaborative solar purchasing for State agencies, local governments, and schools.

Chair Cihacek stated this program is similar to a previous initiative that Roseville participated in with the Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Culver agreed and stated this is a joint effort between Clean Energy Resource Teams (CERTs), Great Plains Institute (GPI), and the Minnesota Department of Administration, Office of Enterprise Sustainability (OES). Agencies can express interest, but it is not binding. With the previous initiative through the Metropolitan Council, the City submitted a letter of interest and received the proposals, but then decided they were not going to participate due to some risk elements.

Chair Cihacek stated 31 communities have contracted, but not everyone got the offer they would have liked. This new program works the same and after submitting the requested information, they can determine if they want to proceed.

Mr. Culver reported this collaborative procurement will reduce staff time, provide structured technical assistance and education, and deliver better pricing for equipment and financing with more competitive contract terms. However, better pricing is not guaranteed, there is also less ability for customization and individual control, and they may not move as fast as a single actor. Solar Possible is for the installation of solar panels at individual sites. OES helps State government to achieve sustainability goals. The request for proposal (RFP) gives the City better competition and transparency, and it is streamlined. The goal is to prequalify vendors through the RFP process and set price ceilings. Roseville is in the Xcel service territory and the RFP will cover the following three conceptual installations: ground mount; low sloped roof; and, pitched roof. The RFPs will be scored and two vendors per utility service area will be chosen.

Chair Cihacek inquired if vendors will provide proposals on sites submitted by the City.

Mr. Culver confirmed this. He stated Solar Possible participants will be required to provide the following site-specific data: 1) general information such as the site location and orientation, square footage of the space, and solar resource data; 2) ground mount versus roof top data; and, 3) utility data.

Chair Cihacek commented he has several concerns with this proposal. The two vendors per area limitation is going to narrow the pool to only large providers. This is outside the prequalification of vendors and it is not logistically possible. When there are 31 cities submitting up to five or six sites, it is going to be hard to prepare a proposal on all of them and the chances of success are predominantly low. The City and State have two different contracting laws which do not supersede each other. He also does not understand how they can cap the price without knowing the site conditions and other variables. It is a good idea, but to be successful, they need more than two vendors. Also, having one team for a seven-county site will be very difficult. He would also be interested to know who serves on the selection panel. It will be a great deal if it works out because it will not take a lot of staff time and energy.

Mr. Culver commented the next step is to submit an informal communication of interest to CERTS and by the end of April they would submit a non-binding letter of intent. They will provide information on the actual roof sites and solar readiness, which is information they already have. The developer can visit the sites and ask questions of participants. He is unsure if there is a limit on the number of participants. The proposals would then be evaluated, selected, and provided to the participants. At that point, there is a no-consequence, exit opportunity. If they decide to move forward, they will make an agreement with the developer and begin installations.

Chair Cihacek inquired who would do the legal review.

Mr. Culver noted both parties would do this. The RFP will include some minimal terms for legal and operational issues. The City of Roseville would not enter into any agreement with having the City attorney review it.

Chair Cihacek noted he is still unsure how this benefits the City when they have to review the legal terms and provide site specific information.

Mr. Culver responded there would be more options to the City if the system were larger. There would most likely be an opportunity for savings in administration and operational expenses.

Chair Cihacek stated he is skeptical but supports submitting a letter of intent because it commits them to nothing. He does not want to be overly optimistic about

the outcome. He would be more interested in what they are currently doing by working with vendors and addressing the concerns of the City Council.

Member Wozniak inquired if the City would consider partnering with other entities in the City on a Solar Project, such as the school district or large commercial establishments.

Mr. Culver responded it might be an option. The school is going through a facility upgrade and he is unsure when they would be ready to make their rooftops available. They have been patient with solar discussions so far, but the longer they wait, the older the rooftops get.

Member Seigler noted the longer they wait, the less expensive it gets. If they can store and release the energy efficiently, it is worth more than 10 cents per kilowatt.

Chair Cihacek stated the more the utility rates increase, the more value solar has for them. There are benefits to waiting and benefits to action and they need to determine the best plan for them.

Mr. Culver stated there are a lot of incentive programs out there and they do not know how long they will last. Solar panels may also become more efficient over time and that will make it more attractive in the future.

He invited Mr. Patrick Weir? from IPS Solar to present the second option to the Commission.

Mr. Weir from IPS Solar highlighted information related about their company and reported they are located in Roseville and are NAPCEP certified. They offer full service solar development and focus mainly on community and commercial solar gardens. They partner with New Energy Equity and WGL Energy. They develop and construct the solar site and then partner with a stable utility company, who becomes the long-term owner.

Chair Cihacek inquired if there is a relationship with the partners from the beginning or if they are reassigned when the project is completed.

Mr. Weir responded they are reassigned. The buyers want a group of projects that they have subscribers to and sites.

He continued his presentation and reported they have done 75 megawatts in community solar so far in Minnesota. He explained community solar gardens have an offsite garden, solar is tracked by Xcel energy and they issue bill credits to the consumer at the rate of \$0.1033 per kilowatts per hour (kWh). The consumer then pays back the developer \$0.0983 per kWh and this presents a guaranteed five percent savings the first year. He provided a list of current community solar subscribers and pictures of community solar gardens they have done in Minnesota.

He provided a rendering of Roseville City Hall with solar panels on the rooftop. When roof repairs are needed, they can take the panels off, stack them near the corners of the buildings to allow them to get at most of the roof.

Chair Cihacek inquired when the City will need to replace the roof.

Mr. Culver responded the roof on City Hall was refurbished in 2014 and they are on a 20-year life cycle before major repair is needed. With solar panels on the roof, there is less wear. If they had 25-year panels on the roof, they would try to delay it as much as possible. If they did not have panels on the roof, it would be redone in about 2036.

Member Wozniak inquired what the proposed size of this installation would be.

Mr. Weir responded the installation on City Hall would be about 204 kilowatts, on Public Works it would be 299 kilowatts, and on the Skating Center it would be 230 kilowatts. The total for all three buildings would be about 735 kilowatts.

Mr. Culver stated the Public Works roof is a little more complicated because it consists of three different roof ages. The largest roof in the middle was redone in 2014 and the oldest part is scheduled for major reconstruction next year. The remaining part is scheduled to be redone in about 10 years.

Chair Cihacek inquired how they do roof maintenance.

Mr. Culver responded they do annual patching as needed. When it is replaced, they remove all the rock, replace the liner, and reset everything. If there are solar panels on the roof, they would have to be removed and then replaced after the work is done. It usually takes one to two weeks to replace the roof but could possibly be done in a more compressed time if needed.

Chair Cihacek inquired what the financial loss would be for the two weeks the solar panels would be down and if it is possible to put them in ground applications during that time.

Mr. Weir responded they have in their contract that for 72 hours there would be no financial loss. After that they would factor in an average daily production lost. They would not be able to install them on the ground that quickly and it would be cost prohibitive to build something to hold the solar panel on the ground.

He continued his presentation and provided two offers to the City for a community solar garden. One option would not involve any installed solar panels (off site Community Solar Garden) and the other option would involve installing a Community Solar Garden on the various rooftops with an added lease payment. Xcel looks at the last two years bills and averages kilowatt usage hours and allows

the City to sign up for Community Solar Garden shares at 120 percent of that average annual consumption. The City has about 3,400,000 kWh annually.

Member Seigler inquired what size solar installation would be required for 3,400,000 kWh.

Mr. Weir responded it would be about a 2.5 megawatt system. The benefit is in the savings to the City, not the size of the solar garden.

Mr. Culver clarified they would only be able to put about 700 kWh on the rooftop, but they could subscribe to any other community solar garden system in the surrounding area up to 3.4 megawatts.

Member Seigler stated if they had 100 percent of their electricity that was allocated towards solar, the savings would be \$17,000 the first year.

Mr. Weir confirmed this and noted the credits no longer fluctuate with Xcel and will increase at 2.3 percent each year. The PPA rate is what is paid back to the developer. IPS offers to escalate at two percent each year and the savings grow slowly over time.

Member Seigler inquired if they would ever own anything and what would happen if a storm wiped out the system.

Mr. Weir noted the City would not own any of it and there is no risk to the City. It is not on their property and they are just a subscriber to a community solar garden. They are trying to get a developer to offer the City a PPA for using the City's rooftop. It could be a win-win situation.

He highlighted the rooftop option with the added lease payment benefit to the City. The roof lease payments begin at \$10,000 annually and go up slowly over time. The City needs to evaluate the risk and parameters and determine if the added value is worth the risk of having the panels on the roof.

Mr. Culver stated they will continue to look at the cost-risk to it. They would be getting an annual lease payment and the major roof maintenance would come one time during the 25 years. If it costs \$6,000 to manage the solar panels during the roof maintenance, this will affect their savings. There is risk, and the risk of losing money goes down the further into it they get.

Member Seigler commented they could buy into the community solar garden and put solar panels on the roof after that.

Chair Cihacek noted they would already have their energy needs met with the 120 percent solar. The lowest risk option would be to lease the space and then put a system up.

Member Seigler inquired what would happen if the panels are damaged on the roof top at the fault of the City.

Mr. Weir responded the equipment is owned by them, it is usually on them, but if it was caused by negligence by the City, that may be different.

Chair Cihacek stated it would be included in the cost analysis and they could look at purchasing additional liability insurance. They still need to do some risk scenarios based on the size of the design to determine what the risk is.

Mr. Culver stated the size of the system they are considering includes panels on the Skating Center and they would need to bring that roof up to code. This needs to be considered when preparing the cost scenarios.

Chair Cihacek noted there is also a potential benefit of heating and cooling costs decreasing by the solar panels shading the roof.

Member Trainor inquired if there is capacity available in existing solar gardens for the City to buy into.

Mr. Weir responded there is some capacity available and they are always looking for more hosts. They could sign a letter of intent for 3,400,000 kWh which would serve as a reservation for the City to participate. Once they determine where the City is allotted into the different solar gardens, an addendum would be added that indicates the wattage coming to the City from each location.

Member Seigler inquired who the owners of the gardens are and if the investors get a tax credit.

Mr. Weir explained the owners do get a tax credit. They typically come from WGL Energy, but they recently did a contract with Xcel Energy as well.

Chair Cihacek clarified they will be using private equity to build. They will have a private financier who is a private equity partner and getting a tax credit for the equity contribution. The completed garden will then be sold to the utility company.

Mr. Weir agreed with Chair Cihacek and noted sometimes the tax credits will go to the owner and other times they go to the developer, depending upon how long it takes.

Member Seigler inquired if the solar panels secure the debt and if bankruptcy affects anything.

Mr. Weir responded if they are putting panels on the roof, they would be past the development period and would have a financial partner by then. All of the solar gardens in Minnesota are owned by utility companies and they get the tax credits.

Mr. Culver inquired what the typical life cycle of a solar panel was.

Mr. Weir responded they are under warranty for 25 years but will produce for 30 to 40 years. NASA has panels that are over 40 years old. They degrade 0.25 percent per year and that is why the kilowatt hours go down each year.

Mr. Culver stated at the end of 25 years, they might possibly have an option to purchase them and produce energy for another 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Weir noted they could also negotiate a contract and get a payment from Xcel.

Member Misra inquired if the projects done in 1991 are all original panels.

Mr. Weir stated they are all original panels and mostly residential, and they are still producing. However, the efficiency and size of the panels have changed over time.

Chair Cihacek inquired about next steps.

Mr. Weir explained they could provide a subscription agreement with them which can then be shared with the City Attorney for review. They are willing to do more evaluation to help decide what makes the most sense.

Member Wozniak inquired if other rooftop locations had been considered, such as the gas canopy, the salt storage structure or the property across Woodhill that was recently purchased. He also inquired how rooftop solar costs compare with other installations.

Mr. Culver responded the Fire Station is the only other location that has been talked about.

Mr. Weir stated carports add about 25 or 30 percent to the cost because a structure needs to be built to hold it. This is typically done in warm climates where energy is expensive and there is a limitation on land. Ground and roof mounts are similar in cost.

Member Misra inquired if modifications would be required on the existing structures.

Mr. Weir stated modifications would not be needed, but they would want a structural engineer to look at the Skating Center more in depth. Some additional bracing may need to be added to the bracing inside.

Chair Cihacek stated he would be interested to see a subscriber agreement and other information that considers risk factors, what the City needs to do to mitigate the risk, how it impacts the financial payout, and other scenarios with both leased and non-leased options. They could then have the City Attorney look at it and consider a revised option to adjust for risk.

Member Seigler inquired if the City's flat roofs would be considered small, medium, or large, and if large would be the most efficient.

Mr. Weir responded the City's roofs are considered medium and a large roof is the most efficient. Typically, a high school's roof is large and can handle 1 megawatt.

Chair Cihacek noted the leases correlate with the rate size. If they reduce the rate size by 10 percent, the lease payment decreases. He also requested a scenario of five to 10 percent less than what is designed so they have the capacity to move panels.

Mr. Weir agreed that 10 percent less than the currently designed scenario would be appropriate.

Member Misra stated she would also like to know what other rooftops have encountered in terms of liability and other issues.

Mr. Culver commented Maplewood has existing rooftop panels and just went through an analysis. He will reach out to them for additional feedback.

Mr. Weir agreed to collect the information requested.

Member Misra inquired if they use the same type of panel regardless of climate.

Mr. Weir commented it is the same panel. After 10 to 15 years, the inverters need replacement. Other than that, not much typically goes wrong. They can withstand a 100 mile per hour hailstorm.

7. Ordinance Updates

Chair Cihacek requested a report on the changes made from last month to this month on the ordinance updates.

Chapter 405 – Noise Control.

Mr. Freihammer reported the change to this ordinance included an exemption for City-led projects. The City Council had some concerns regarding whether this should be included in the policy or the ordinance. Staff decided to take the entire policy and include it in the ordinance and put a two-day exemption limit on projects. The ordinance also defines sewer lining projects, water main or valve work, and high traffic areas.

Member Seigler referred to the two-day limit and inquired if it was consecutive days.

Mr. Freihammer responded they just said two days per project area and did not further define it.

Chair Cihacek noted the project area is ambiguous and they may not need to further define it.

Member Trainor referred to Section 405.04, item A. He noted the last sentence should be changed to "...regarding Noise Control if the following conditions apply..."

Member Wozniak referred to Section 405.04, item A(1), and stated the examples listed are the only areas this policy will apply.

Mr. Freihammer noted the Council's intent was to define the projects and he will change the language to indicate that these are the projects the policy would apply to.

Member Misra referred to Section 405.02, item J. She suggested they update the word "churches" to "religious institutions."

Chair Cihacek noted this is a good comment for the City Council and suggested they send these types of comments to the City Council.

Mr. Culver explained when the Comprehensive Plan is completed, there will be an extensive effort to update the zoning ordinance and language. He would rather do it with the entire ordinance versus plucking it out in specific spots.

Chapter 707 – Right of Way Management.

Mr. Freihammer reported language was added to indicate they will review all right of way permits along with language regarding small cell. They updated the format and cross-referenced some items.

Member Wozniak inquired about the spelling of "collocate."

Mr. Culver responded they pulled that word out of the State law and will confirm the correct spelling of it.

Chapter 802 – Sewer Use and Regulations.

Mr. Freihammer reported this chapter was not reviewed by the City Council and changes were made based on previous Commission discussion. The definitions were refined and the need to submit inspection reports was eliminated.

Member Trainor commented on the restriction with discharging waste temperatures greater than 140 degrees and inquired how hot a typical commercial dishwashing unit runs.

Mr. Culver stated he believes it is 160 degrees for sanitizing.

Member Trainor noted the scope of changes are significant and it would be good to poll a couple of the affected users for feedback.

Chair Cihacek agreed that stakeholder feedback would be good and requested they obtain this prior to bringing it to the Council.

Chapter 803 – Storm Water Drainage.

Mr. Freihammer reported they now included the grading ordinance as part of this and will also include Stormwater Facility Management and Maintenance. The grading ordinance would be removed from the zoning code. This will simplify the ordinance by including it in one area and it will become part of the erosion control permit. With the stormwater facility, they are talking about private BMPs and what property owners are required to do. The frequency of inspections was reduced from monthly to quarterly, and they did not require the records to be submitted annually.

Chair Cihacek referred to Section 803.05, item A(1)(a)(i) and inquired if the phrase “when granted by the community” is standard language or if it should read “when granted by the City.”

Mr. Freihammer responded he will change it to “when granted by the City.”

Chair Cihacek referred to Section 803.05, item A(1)(b)(ii) and inquired about “qualified individual [LS2].”

Mr. Freihammer responded the [LS2] is a comment made by staff. They did not want to define what determines who is a qualified individual. It was left subjective and staff would be determining if a person is qualified to sign off on it. It could create a potential issue and they could try to define who that is.

Chair Cihacek stated they may not have to define it if they include a remedy to the process if there is a dispute as to whether a person is qualified or not. This could be through an appeal process or preapproval process.

Mr. Freihammer commented anyone with experience in dealing with stormwater BMPs would be qualified. They also have checklists and inspection forms they can share with businesses and property owners.

Member Trainor inquired if this would be addressed in the required maintenance plan. The owners must submit a plan, and have it approved by the City and this approval includes who will conduct the maintenance. If they changed the person

conducting the maintenance without coordination with the City, they would be liable for anything the City wanted to do.

Mr. Freihammer noted they are trying to make sure businesses have someone in charge.

Member Seigler stated if it is clean and nice and passes inspection, it should not matter.

Mr. Culver explained the quarterly inspections could be done by any maintenance staff on site. The annual inspection and certification needs to come from a more technically qualified individual. They need to certify that it is operating as designed.

Chair Cihacek stated this would need to be someone with an engineering background or something beyond maintenance.

Mr. Culver agreed and stated it could be a technician or a landscape contractor with prior experience on this.

Member Misra inquired if the maintenance plan would cover the inspections and suggested they include language that indicates approval of who would conduct the inspections.

Chair Cihacek agreed with Member Misra.

Mr. Culver suggested the wording be changed to “an annual inspection certification by an approved individual as indicated in the maintenance plan.”

Mr. Culver noted they will look at possible options.

Chair Cihacek commented they can submit it as is knowing there is a potential risk for problems during the first year of implementation. Based upon feedback, they can make an adjustment the following year.

Mr. Freihammer noted they will incorporate the Commission’s comments and share it with the City Council.

Member Seigler referred to Agenda item No. 6 regarding the Solar discussion. He stated he would not do the government option. It seems like everything is still up in the air and they should give them a year to see how it all works out.

Mr. Culver inquired if they should still submit an email of interest to them.

Chair Cihacek stated they have sufficient information from what was offered by IPS Solar.

8. Items for Next Meeting – April 24, 2018

Discussion ensued regarding the April PWETC agenda:

- New Member Orientation
- Maintenance Facility Study
- Update on Solar – this item will be added if there is additional information from IPS
- Snow Event Parking Regulations – this item may be postponed to a later meeting

Mr. Culver stated a member of the Council requested they look at the parking regulations during a snow event. If there is a snow fall of two or more inches, no parking is allowed on the street until it is cleared. They may go back to the Council and request additional feedback on whether this is something they want them to address.

Mr. Culver stated the May meeting is full with the MS4 Annual meeting and the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed has also requested some time at this meeting.

Chair Cihacek inquired how organics is doing.

Mr. Culver responded they will be asking a series of questions regarding organics recycling as part of the community survey that will take place in April.

Chair Cihacek inquired if Eureka has provided an annual report and if it could be programmed into an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Culver responded they have not received one yet and he would prefer to include it when Ryan is present.

Member Siegler recalled someone that had an issue with the stoplights going a full cycle at three in the morning when no one is around. He suggested they consider going to just blinking since it is a nuisance.

Mr. Culver stated there are safety issues and the complication is that all the signals in Roseville are operated by Ramsey County or Mn/DOT. They cannot dictate policy to them but will check in with the County to see what options there may be.

9. Adjourn

Motion

Member Seigler moved, Member Heimerl seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:29 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0
Motion carried.