

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE  
**Ordinances & Administration**  
**Monday, June 18, 2012 – 6:00 p.m.**  
**1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Conference Rm. – City Hall**  
**-Minutes-**

**Present: Chair, Councilor Sefatia Theken; Vice Chair, Councilor Robert Whynott; Councilor Steven LeBlanc, Jr.**

**Absent: None.**

**Also Attending: Councilor Verga; Councilor Ciolino; Councilor Cox; Linda T. Lowe; Jim Duggan; Mike Hale**

**The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Items were taken out of order. There was a quorum of the City Council.**

**1. Continued Business:**

- A) Report of Ad Hoc Committee regarding possible amending of the Gloucester Code of Ordinances, Chapter 2, Article V, Sec. 2-471 to 2-476 re: Tourism Commission as relates to CC2012-015 (Hardy/Cox)

**Councilor Theken** acknowledging the members present from the Ad Hoc Committee, and referred to the report submitted by them for recommendations to amend the Gloucester Tourism Commission ordinance which was received by the Committee on May 9<sup>th</sup>. She thanked the Committee for taking the time to assist the O&A Committee to begin their review of this Commission's ordinance.

**Linn Parisi**, Seaport Gloucester DMO and coordinator for the Ad Hoc Committee thanked all the members of the Ad Hoc Committee: John Orlando; Kay Ellis; Tracy Muller; Paul Frontierro; Bob Ryan; Pauline Bresnahan; Karen Scola; Denise Foley; Mona Faherty; Dr. Nicole Andrade; and Peter Webber. She stated that the Gloucester Tourism Commission deserves recognition; that the community needs to invest in the tourism sector; and the Tourism Commission needs to be reinvigorated to help generate more tax dollars on an on-going basis for the City. The rewriting of the ordinance, she said, will help propel tourism forward more quickly. The Ad Hoc Committee hopes the O&A Committee will consider their recommendations carefully. The Ad Hoc Committee concluded via their recommendations that this was the way to move the Tourism Commission forward. Ms. Parisi then reviewed the Ad Hoc Committee's report (on file):

**Composition:** The Commission should be not less than 7 and no more than 11 members. The Chair would be elected from within the Commission. Representation could cover not only the sectors of tourism but adjunct sectors also that contribute to the visitor-based economy. It is suggested members be recruited with staggered terms: 2 from restaurants, 2 from accommodations; 2 from attractions; 2 from retailers – 1 from downtown, 1 not; two members from Arts/Culture/Wellness sector; an At-Large member, and four ex-officio members, one each representing the Chamber of Commerce, Discover Gloucester, PR for Gloucester, and from the City Council.

**Planning:** The Ad Hoc Committee felt planning was important to empower the Tourism Commission to devise an overall umbrella plan for Gloucester tourism to increase year round visitation; and therefore, tax collection. This planning should include communication to develop and maintain a tourism database for use by the Commission for communications with all Gloucester tourism based businesses, etc.; to create a separate interactive micro-site for the Tourism Commission to communicate with tourism businesses and to recruit new members when needed; develop and maintain a permission-based consumer database; generate a quarterly report to the Mayor and City Council.

**Councilor Whynott** commented that 11 members may be too large, asking what would constitute a quorum; it could be less than six members. **Ms. Parisi** noted they did discuss that at length, and determined it is the choice of the O&A Committee. All these folks are business owners who have a great interest in this success; and felt the "bar could be raised" and why they included it as low as a seven member Commission. **Councilor Theken** asked about the ex-officio members. **Ms. Parisi** stated they're heavy on tourism business owners. It would be difficult to eliminate people because of it. **Councilor Theken** expressed concern there may be conflicts of interest with ex-officio members. **Ms. Parisi** pointed out that the ex-officio members have no vote. They spoke about what if there was a conflict; and it is up to the Chair to address it quickly. On inquiry by **Councilor LeBlanc**, **Ms. Parisi** stated that the micro-site would be somewhere they could let it be known a seat is open on the Commission. The Ad Hoc Committee clarified for Councilor Ciolino that the Chamber of Commerce member could be any paid staff member and could be their Executive Director. **Ed Collard**, a Chamber of Commerce Executive Board member felt

concessions would be made along the way, and they can work together on it. A board member would not necessarily be the best choice as they are not involved in the day-to-day issues of the Chamber. With the Chamber's current staff, he expressed his belief there would be good representation. PR Gloucester was described as a private partnership with the Chamber of Commerce for the promotion of the tourist-based business economy.

Collaboration: Work with and liaise between Gloucester municipal departments and civic tourism based organizations to nurture the mission. Attend adjunct meetings as necessary; partner with existing local groups that attract visitors to the City.

Identity: Execute a branding study to identify and define Gloucester's visitor based identity to produce a branding program to promote the brand.

Infrastructure: Work with City departments and civic groups and organizations to identify potential attractions. Advocate for infrastructure improvement within the City owned attractions; like the Boulevard; beautification.

Education: Seek out opportunities for seminars, workshops certifications, etc. relating to growth in the tourism community; host periodic informational and networking meetings for the tourism community to discuss relevant issues.

Visitor Welcoming: Assess and develop a plan for visitor welcoming that includes budgeting of resources; coordination and training of volunteers and staff; data collection; etc.; facilitate with downtown retailers for servicing cruise ship arrivals. Cruise ships last year brought in about 8,000 people. It was pointed out that the cruise terminal is privately owned. Four whale watch companies are privately owned bringing in 200,000 people annually. They don't run down to the boats and see those people off or supply information to them. They are private businesses. The visitors center is where this information is and available. **John Orlando** pointed out these private businesses gain from these visitors. What the owner wants to do on that property is at the owner's discretion. The Tourism Commission can assist in welcoming cruise ship passengers to the City; but there have been questions as to why the Tourism Commission assisting Cruiseport itself. **Councilor Ciolino** stated volunteers are burned out; what they're saying is Ms. DeLorenzo needs to take more responsibility for the greeting of the cruise ship passengers. **Tracey Muller** also commented about the situation with volunteers for the welcoming of cruise ship passengers and the issues faced by the other businesses in the associated tourism-based economy. **Mr. Orlando** stated they're suggesting the Cruiseport take more responsibility to get the word out to the volunteers. The cruise ship passenger can't store their luggage or use the internet there. They have to go outside. The Ad Hoc Committee stated once those visitors are out front they can then give them information. **Councilor Theken** asked that the City Clerk forward the original Special Council Permit for Cruiseport to the P&D Committee to examine what was in the conditions versus what happens how when a cruise ship comes in now.

Distribute leads: Familiarization tours.

Advertising: Recommend and coordinate efforts for print; web based; multi-media, cooperative.

Web based: Oversee, coordinate and maintain the City's tourism website; develop and distribute a consumer e-newsletter; recommend and coordinate City funded printed materials as necessary that may include producing and distribution of a visitor guide, maps, brochures, rack cards, businesses cards, etc.; a public relations contract with a public relations firm.

Grant Program: Implement a grant program to provide money for Gloucester non-profit and government organizations looking to develop festivals, events, etc. both new and existing.

How to execute the new plan: Make an annual investment in Gloucester tourism of 50% of the previous fiscal year's collected hotel and restaurant tax which will allow the Tourism Commission to execute the Gloucester tourism plan, either entirely or in selected segments of the plan via an RFP process to an entity or entities that will report directly to the Tourism Commission.

#### DISCUSSION:

**Dr. Nicole Andrade** noted research was compiled in order to create a model for the Tourism Commission, and was not developed by the Ad Hoc Committee in a vacuum. **Councilor Theken** expressed she was pleased to see such diversity in the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee and as a result they were able to reach consensus with their recommendations. The Committee had presented a good model to O&A. **Ms. Parisi** and **Councilor Theken** discussed the number of meetings a member of the Commission should attend. **Ms. Lowe** commented how many meetings a member should attend would not be appropriate for ordinance language. **Mona Faherty** stated asked about the definition of "resident" if that is a requirement to be a member of the Commission. Ms. Mullen was put on the Tourism Commission by the Mayor but was asked to step down as she was not a resident. However, she owns one of the largest tourism businesses in the City, but can't be on the Commission. In a seasonal business, members will go away for several months; but they can participate remotely. **Councilor Theken** wished to have membership clarified and wished to see any further appointments to the Commission held in abeyance until the ordinance is amended. **Ms. Mullen** stated the Tourism Commission ordinance just says resident; she is not a

domiciled resident. She understood the ordinance should not be changed for her specific circumstances; but they need to have the best qualified people on the Commission. **Ms. Lowe**, commented on the term “resident”, stated it is used throughout the Code of Ordinances, but not defined. The most clear cut way to demonstrate what is a resident is as registered voter of the City which is the most widely accepted way to do it. **Mr. Orlando** asked if all boards and commissions have to have a residency requirement. **Ms. Lowe** stated she looked at them all. The differences were dramatic; using a variety of language. The overriding factor is stated in the charter, which takes precedence, that when people must leave a board or commission it is termed “remove” from the City and the flip side is when you “reside”. **Mr. Orlando** also expressed he took issue with the definition regarding residency. Many who might be qualified to be on the Commission own a business but don’t own the building they have their business in. **Councilor Whynott** didn’t agree that residency is the end all. It is a stakeholder that is important in many situations like this. **Councilor Theken** expressed concern for boards like the Capital Improvement Advisory Board, the Waterways Board, the Licensing Commission, etc., due to their major impact on the City and stated residency has to be across the spectrum of City boards, committees and commissions. **Councilor Ciolino** pointed out one solution is that ex-officio members of the Commission would not have to be residents of the City. They would be participating and part of the discussion, and do not have a vote. **Ms. Parisi** also offered to the O&A Committee that should they need them to review any further information, the Ad Hoc Committee is willing to step forward to assist them at any time. **Councilor Theken** pointed out that Councilor Hardy and Councilor Cox did bring this matter forward. **Councilor Cox** expressed her thanks to the Ad Hoc Committee for their hard work. **Councilor Whynott** stated he was pleased to see so much positive input from the group. **Ms. Lowe** stated now the Committee would look into the recommendations to form their amendments to the Code of Ordinances and then break out the goals with several members from the Ad Hoc Committee meeting with her. **Councilor Theken** suggested Ms. Parisi, Ms. Muller, Ms. Bresnahan, and Ms. Faherty to work with Ms. Lowe. **Councilor Ciolino** stated there is also a need for a policy manual.

**This matter is continued to July 2, 2012.**

B) Addendum to Mayor’s Report for the May 22, 2012 City Council Meeting re: Mayor’s decision to allow remote participation by the City Council and the City Council Standing Committees (Cont’d from 6/4/12)

**Linda T. Lowe**, City Clerk stated an ad hoc committee had been named: Councilor Paul McGeary and John Blanchard, IT Director and herself. They are now in the throws of setting up the technology to allow for remote participation at City Council and Standing Committee meetings. **Councilor Verga** expressed his concern regarding the five permissible reasons why they can permit remote participation. Only geographic distance seemed vague to him and open for possible abuse, commenting that a Councilor could be sworn in and never show up for a meeting. He expressed the need for limits on the reasons for remote participation, and how many times a Councilor can get permission to remotely participate. As an elected body, he stated his belief the public expects them to be present. Personal illness, disability, emergencies, however, is clearer. **Councilor Theken** also expressed her concern regarding the limits. **Ms. Lowe** suggested the Council has to define what constitutes an emergency and disability. **Councilors Theken** and **Whynott** agreed the rules didn’t allow for unlimited use for remote participation. **Councilor Whynott** stated a Councilor should not be able to remote participate for their entire two-year term. **Councilor Verga** commented they also have to look at the technology as well to decide what happens when technical difficulties occur when a Councilor is cut off who is participating remotely; and the parameters for continued participation at a meeting when this happens. **Ms. Lowe** stated the rules are included in the Open Meeting Law; if the technology fails, they must try to reconnect, making an effort over a reasonable length of time. If after that length of time they cannot reconnect with the Councilor, then it is the same as if the Councilor left the meeting. There will need to be parameters for such cases. She added remote participation can be done by video or audio conferencing and everyone involved must be able to be heard. There was a discussion of the Mullin Act issue as well. **Councilor Verga** asked about a six vote requirement, giving the example if there are five people present and one person remotely, and the rest not participating, the quorum is still there. **Ms. Lowe** confirmed that to be the case. **Councilor Whynott** suggested they should all look at the law memo from the State’s Attorney General’s office and ask the Council to review the five permissible reasons for remote participation in order to get their ideas on limits of how many times remote participation can be utilized by an individual Councilor under each of the permissible provisions; a recess period for, say, 15 minutes for a technical retry for connection. If it is not possible to resolve the technical difficulty in that timeframe then that Councilor would be considered having left the meeting. The Council will be asked to forward their responses to Ms. Lowe.

**This matter is continued to August 6, 2012.**

**3. CC2012-029 (Verga/Ciolino) Resolution re: Equitable treatment of residents who are City water users, customers and water rate payers and Amend GCO Sec. 23-58 to reflect the requirement of equitable treatment of all customers (Amended CC2012-023)**

**Councilor Verga** explained that with the City Clerk's help language was clarified for this Council Order to address concerns raised at a City Council meeting when this matter first came forward; words italicized in the revised Council Order 2012-029 show the language changes in the final paragraph: "...served by *water lines in their streets...*"; ...sec. 23-58, "*Disposition of money paid into treasury on account of waterworks*". This relates to water main lines in the road and not to lateral lines to homes, which is the property owner's responsibility. The addition of "*in their streets*" clarifies this point. **Councilor Theken** asked about the Ward 5 Becker Lane area where there was a fire, and that originally a draft ordinance that came through which did not gain Council support. **Councilor Verga**, on inquiry by Councilor Theken, commented that it still made a distinction of people on private roads and those on public roads. However, these are all water rate payers who subsidize all the other water projects throughout the City. **Councilor Theken** asked what this would cost the City, and how do they overcome the DPW going onto private roads and property. **Councilor Verga** stated as to the costs that might be incurred the vision is that the City would treat private street XYZ the same as public street ABC. They need to have these water lines fixed because there is something wrong with it. If a public road is fixed, they are subsidized by the private road also. The purpose of this resolution is to show there is no distinction between the designation of private or public. A rate payer is responsible for the water line from the property line of the home/business to the street now. They won't know costs until a master water plan is developed by the DPW Director to alleviate water distribution problems in certain areas of the city, like Rust Island that has nothing at all. His vision is not to point to one particular road that may have raised the issue jumps to the top of the list. It is saying that if a list is created, they should only be looking at what the priorities are and not making the distinction in those priorities based on whether the area is a private way or public way.

**Mike Hale**, DPW Director stated his department has never had a contention with managing water on private roads. Most of the water on private roads was installed by the City at one time. They regularly maintain them. The Council voted to appropriate the funding for Way Road and Page Street a number of years ago which was for publicly installed water mains and services on those private roads. The City has ordinances that separate out ownership of private sewers. They don't own or maintain or service them. If a sewer failed on High Popples Road, for instance, they would make sure it was shut off to prevent pollution of any abutting roads and wetlands, but it would not be the City's responsibility to maintain that or fix that private sewer failure. Ordinance and regulations state that. There is an ordinance devoted to private road paving. They don't automatically pave a private road because the owners pay taxes, unless the Council tells them to. He expressed there is a distinction between what is installed privately and what is a private street or not. The Becker Lane/Circle area is one of a few areas in the City that is very complicated. There are other water systems that have been installed privately that the City does not maintain. Whether a subdivision or not, the City doesn't automatically own the utilities when they are installed, but these are rate payers. He pointed to Lupine Lane, one of the most recent subdivisions in the City. The City doesn't own anything on that way, nor do the residents want the City to own anything on that way. With a Form J under subdivision control regulations for the City you can convey those utilities to the City for ownership and maintenance if that option is chosen. He expressed he wished to be cautious. He recognized these are rate payers; water has to get to their house. They are paying for the water main to go by for the conveyance of water to them. It is treating water; it is managing resources from the reservoirs, to dams, paying for water work on the Boulevard that services the entire City; main transmission lines – all the rate payers are sharing in those costs. It is difficult to separate this out through this language. He expressed his understanding of why it is being asked for. However, Becker Lane/Becker Circle can install water [upgrades] at a fraction of what it would cost the City. He stated he was not opposed to treating people equitably; the City does that very well. If they start separating out these "anomalies" it opens the City up to much more. Why would he not then be responsible for maintaining the High Popples Road sewer – privately installed, but yet those residents pay a sewer bill which contributes to the sewer everywhere else in the City. **Councilor Whynott** stated these roads can convey their pipelines to the City; but what if they didn't wish to accept them; would the City be obligated to accept them. **Mr. Hale** stated he was referring to subdivision controls. The City wouldn't want to accept a system that was failing. Earlier he was referring to subdivisions such as Castle View for another subdivision process. They can convey the utility to the City through the Form J. The City does have the right, however, to say no. It is like roads. They don't have to accept a way that is in terrible

condition. They've accepted private ways that have been improved. **Councilor Whynott** expressed they couldn't compare paving roads that is inconvenient for someone to travel versus water conveyance. **Councilor Theken** stated Becker Lane area has water conveyed to them. Their issue is low water pressure. If they do what is proposed in this resolution, she expressed they could be opening up issues they may not wish to that could have far reaching ramifications. She discussed different situations where there was no water or some water and low water pressure. If there was no access to water, that would be a different issue altogether. **Councilor Whynott** expressed his disagreement with Councilor Theken as to possible ramifications by passage of the resolution. **Mr. Hale** stated in 1999/2000 there was a new 10-inch water main installed on Concord Street where the Fire Department would use to fight a fire in the Becker Lane/Circle area. They fight fires from where the biggest main that is nearby. The Lorraine Fire was fought from Main Street which is where the largest main was. **Councilor Ciolino** stated the Council has a fiduciary responsibility. This resolution gives the Council an ability to organize and focus a water project. There are no guarantees to do anything, but he expressed his opinion that they "owe it to these folks." It is like any other project the City does when it comes to funding. **Councilor Theken** asked who decides who gets these things done first. Rust Island has no water at all. If they say they'll do this, where does Becker Lane go on the list? She did not wish to give false hope to folks. **Mr. Hale** stated they are developing a water master plan right now which will be available in the fall. Based on the size of the main available to them, that they have water to the lines, Becker Lane could be at bottom of the list now under development. **Councilor LeBlanc** stated these residents pay a water bill; then what is the responsibility of the City if this resolution passes to fix those lines; that is if someone goes in and does shoddy work, now time has passed, the situation deteriorates, or an undersized line was installed, what is the City's responsibility? **Mr. Hale** stated that would not be the City's responsibility to pay for someone's poor work. **Councilor LeBlanc** agreed that the City should not be responsible for shoddy work. **Mr. Hale** stated the question is where does the responsibility begin and end. No one is trying to not be responsible to the water users. There are a few cases in the City where it is not the City's responsibility to fix someone's poor water. He likened it to being no different than replacing water to one's home when it was laid twenty years ago. **Councilor LeBlanc** expressed agreement with Mr. Hale that if shoddy work was done on behalf of the homeowner, it should not be the responsibility of the City to ameliorate the situation. **Mr. Hale** pointed out there is an opportunity for the residents of Becker Lane/Circle to replace or improve service from a main from an adequately sized main on Concord Street for that whole development. **Councilor Theken** expressed how do you tell one part of the City, here we'll do it, and to another part of the City that they won't. Furthermore, she wanted to know what something like this is going to cost the City first. If there was no water access at all, it would be a different conversation. **Councilor Verga** stated without this ordinance, what if the top ten of the list are private roads, and they're not getting their roads fixed because they're private; it is not equitable. **Councilor Theken** stated she wanted a master list first. **Councilor Verga** envisioned that when the list is compiled that the City will not distinguish between public and private ways. His water rates pay for all the water infrastructure work going on around the City. It is about being equitable. **Mr. Hale** asked how they distinguish between private sewer users if this resolution is passed. Would these private sewer users then want the City to take care of their sewer, meaning a privately constructed sewer in a public way or a private way? **Councilor Verga** reiterated this is only a resolution regarding water usage and water rate [payers] only. **Councilor Ciolino** stated in the past the City should have stayed on top of this. For whatever the reason, now they need to make it right. It is like any other project. An estimate is made, and then it is determined how to pay for it. **Councilor Theken** asked about a water connection fee. **Mr. Hale** stated there is already an entry fee for water. **Councilor Verga** stated in general if you would replace a water line on, say, Perkins Street what would be the typical bill to the resident. **Mr. Hale** stated to maintain a City pipe, there would be no charge to the homeowner. **Councilor Verga** agreed that it would be the private homeowner's responsibility to take that corrected water line to their home at their own expense. **Mr. Hale** stated this situation they are speaking of is a minor exception to the majority of situations in the City; that they are making a resolution to amend the ordinance for an exception. **Councilor Whynott** stated the Becker Lane residents are asking the City for help; and if they have to spend a little more money in the near future, then that help should be given. **Councilor Theken** asked why they didn't have water. **Mr. Hale** stated the way the land is divided there is no requirement for them to update their water system. It was done through the A&R process which is a subsection of the subdivision control laws. The Planning Board has no authority to say no because of inadequate utilities. It is not the City's fault; it is how the statute was set up. **Councilor Theken** asked that this resolution be sent to the Legal Department for a written opinion as soon as possible. **Ms. Lowe** stated she worked with Councilor Verga to make sure the revised resolution included private streets. There was further discussion of the resolution language with Ms. Lowe and the Committee. **Councilor Verga** stated when reading the resolution it is important to read it as a whole. **Councilor Theken** expressed her concern with the language and how it is constructed. **Ms. Lowe** responded "in their street" was included to be more specific. The resolution is the explanation of the ordinance amendment and then contains the ordinance amendment

itself. **Councilor Whynott** understood about the private road paving is done 50% by the private way owners. **Mr. Hale** stated they've done only two in his 13 years with the City. His office has the discretion to do the work; but the Council has the discretion to fund it. **Councilor LeBlanc** gave the example of a private electrical contractor that is hired for work on a house, and it is found the work was done improperly. National Grid wouldn't come in and fix that problem. He stated this is the same thing. **Councilor Theken** commented with a private road, no one knows what's underneath it, and wondered if the City now is financially responsible to fix it according to the resolution. The pipes are no good and now they have to do \$1 million of work because the owners didn't maintain it. She wanted this all laid out, reiterating areas such as Rust Island and Crafts Road has no water at all. **Councilor Verga** agreed they have to get a list of roads prioritized. **Councilors Verga** and **Theken** wanted it be sure that the resolution was moved forward cleanly. To that end they would ask the City Solicitor to provide an opinion by June 27<sup>th</sup> and the matter is continued to July 2<sup>nd</sup>. They also will ask Ms. Egan to be present at that meeting.

**This matter is continued to July 2, 2012.**

4. *CC2012-030 (LeBlanc/Whynott) Amend GCO Sec. 22-287 re: handicapped parking in front of Cleveland St. #20 (TBC 07/02/12)*

**This matter is continued to July 2, 2012.**

5. *CC2012-031 (Hardy/Ciolino/Theken/Tobey) Amend GCO Chapter 1, Article IV, Division 4 "Department of Veterans Services" Sec. 2-291 re: Veteran's Director*

**Councilor Theken** stated that given recent events with regard to the Memorial Day ceremonies, the resignation of the Veterans' Services Director, and the start of a search for a replacement, this was an appropriate time to restore this position to that of a department head, and as such should have Council reappointment every year, like many other department heads. Therefore she asked the Committee to endorse the amending of the Gloucester Code of Ordinances for this purpose. After discussion by the Committee, it was determined that a two year reappointment period would better serve this position.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the City Council voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed the Ordinances & Administration Committee recommends to the City Council to AMEND GCO Chapter 1, Article IV, Division 4, "Department of Veterans' Services" Sec. 2-291 "Appointment qualifications and general powers and duties of director" by ADDING after "approved by the city council" "for a term of two (2) years" AND TO ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING.**

6. *CC2012-032 (Whynott) City Council request to State for permission to allow 30 minute parking in front of WWII Memorial*

**Councilor Whynott** explained that this is for 30 minute parking right in front of the WWII memorial without park and beach visitors taking up the spaces. There is no signage that says you can't park there either. There is no legal parking around the Memorial. The Committee discussed the matter of the parking in this immediate area of Western Avenue; where there was legitimate parking and no parking. **Councilor Verga** suggested the Traffic Commission could make a recommendation about parking in this area for the Committee to consider in order to make a request to the State Department of Transportation for parking and signage as this is state highway.

**This matter is referred to the Traffic Commission. The matter will return to the agenda upon receipt of a Traffic Commission recommendation.**

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Dana C. Jorgenson  
Clerk of Committees**

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING: None.**