

The regular meeting of the Planning Board convened at 6:30 pm in the Chamber Room of the Academy Building.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Ajemian, Ms Sullivan and Mr. MacDonald

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Geller, Associate member; Ms. Burke, CED Director and Alijah, Assistant Director

Mr. Driscoll explained the rules of procedure for these hearings and advised the audience that the meeting is audio and visually recorded.

WALNUT HILL SUBDIVISION PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing convened at 6:30 pm.

The public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise on 3/20 and 3/27 was read into the record by Ms. Guarino. Mr. Gallagher submitted the notification green cards.

Correspondence received and read into the record:

- February 2019 letter from Gallagher Engineering
- Report from Consulting Engineer, HML Associates- dated 3/23/19
- Report from Jonas Kazlauskas, Superintendent Water & Sewer-dated 4/3/19
- Email from Ron Ladue dated 3/5/19
- Recommendations from the ECD dated 3/28/19

Mr. Gallagher presented the plan. It is a 4-lot subdivision on the east side of Walnut Street, south of the intersection of Cherry Street with a 650' feet of roadway and a hammerhead turn-around on 6.4 acres with no wetlands on the property. For the most part, the site is cleared of trees; as you go east, the topography gets much steeper and it is pretty much forested. The roadway is designed under the new rules and regulations that pertain to 1-4 lots and all in compliance with those rules and regulations. Will be bringing in Town Water, but no sewer in this area. He explained how the storm water was being handled. Roadway is crowned, without any berms and it basically flows down into the site from Walnut Street. There is a low point and then it slopes up. The water flows off the roadway into drainage swales that follow along each side of the road and the swales infiltrate the stormwater back into the ground. At a certain point, just as an overflow, they have a piping system that will pick up whatever might overflow from that swale and it travels thru their pipe to a low spot at the northern portion of the site which is where the natural flow goes now. It said it will sit in that spot for a while, but it is sandy soil and will infiltrate into the ground from there.

He said they are pretty well in compliance with all the subdivision rules and regulations with just one exception of the landscape plan and he is asking for a waiver of that. He said it is going to be a private road and will be maintained by a Homeowners Association established just for the 4 homes. "It will never be requested to be accepted as a public way", he said. In lieu of the landscape plan, they would

preserve as many trees as they can beyond the orange line that is shown on sheet 4; it is called their limit of clearing which is to save as many trees as they can on the site. The green stars locate existing trees that were located by their surveyors.

Mr. Driscoll questioned the planting schedule for the street trees? Mr. Gallaher said they are shown on the plan on the profile sheet 5, in green.

Lois Poule-15 Auburndale Heights stated that she never heard about this kind of association and questioned services that might be provided to the Association? Ms. Burke said they would get police and fire protection, but, no maintenance of the roadway...they would be responsible for snowplowing and any repairs.

Mr. Driscoll questioned if the comments received have been addressed yet? Mr. Gallagher said no; he has looked at them and has responses, however, wanted to wait until hearing anything from abutters or the board this evening and then will prepare a revised plan.

On a motion by Ms. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to April 17th at 6:30 pm.

REMAND HEARING-TJ SOLAR-IMHOFF FARM-OFF AUBURN STREET

The public hearing convened at 6:54 pm.

All Planning Board members and Associate in attendance.

There was a stenographer present and it was audio and visually recorded.

The public hearing notice that appeared in the newspaper on 3/20 and 3/27 was read into the record. The green cards for abutter notification were received.

Ms. Burke explained the remand hearing and the mediation process. On November 28, 2017, this Board filed its denial of the current Applicants' request for site plan approval and a special permit. Said denial which was reduced to writing was based upon the proposal of the Applicant at that time. Thereafter, in accordance with the Applicant's rights and applicable zoning law, the Applicant filed an appeal of the Board's decision. That matter was litigated from December 15, 2017 to March 7, 2019. At some point during the course of that litigation, both Parties agreed to participate in mediation. The mediation process involved two nominated planning board members, the town Attorney, three of the Applicant's attorney's, the Applicants engineers, the Applicant, an outside engineer hired by the Town and the Community and Economic Development Director. The mediation process occurred over the course of a couple of months and required several sessions with an experienced mediator. At the conclusion of those many sessions, the Applicant agreed to make edits to the plan (as will be seen tonight) in consideration for this matter being remanded back to the planning Board so that I may continue through a fully transparent public process.

Attorney John McClusky, representing the applicant, also explained the process. He stated that when they first went thru the process the Conservation process was still pending. Since then, they have issued an Order of Conditions for this project in a larger scale than what you are going to see tonight. The project is now smaller than originally proposed which came about during the mediation process. He referenced the documentation entitled "TJA Solar documents for remand hearing" that had been submitted describing what changes had been made during the mediation process. He said that "of course, any other issues that come up during this special permit process, we are more than happy to address those." He said the items mentioned were the ones that were of particular concern of the parties. He referenced a separate Inverter plan showing the location of the proposed inverters. He explained why it was not part of the plan itself; the plan you see tonight, was agreed upon by the parties, so they didn't want to modify that plan, so it is an overlay plan. It was tweaked this past weekend concerning some minor calculations issues and was sent via email to Ms. Burke

He then introduced Christopher King, a design engineer from Atlantic who explained the plan and what engineering changes that have taken place as a result of the mediation.

- The overall project has been reduced in size and is shown in the area outlined in pink. It equates to just shy of 3,000 panels which reduces it by 16% or about 4 acres. The resulting reduction increases along the property lines, particularly on the westerly side which increases the vegetated area by 100' and the Auburn Street area to 200'.
- Even though the project has been reduced, the decommissioning bond has remained the same which includes a 2% cost of living over a 20-year period. They feel that is adequate and it has been reviewed.
- They have submitted revised noise information which considers site specific information and equipment. He mentioned the inverter location plan. Per the Town requirements, they are located in excess of 220 feet from the property lines. The plan erroneously showed one of the setbacks at 100 feet; the setback of the inverters is still over the 220 feet. The noise study concludes that the 76 inverters that you see on the revised inverter plan demonstrates that the noise far less than the State mandated 10 decibels at the property line and does not create a pure tone condition. (a constant humming)
- They have submitted an updated solar glare study. There were two observations performed at either end of Old Farm Road. They identified a very low potential for glare, and it was only during a very short period of time, a one-hour window which was early in the morning and it was not throughout the year; it was different based upon observation points. They also did an analysis from the second story height and the results did not change. He said it was important to point out that the glare study did not take into account the existing vegetation during May or the proposed vegetation. The vegetation plan went thru may illations under the guidance of the landscape engineer from BETA Group. The plan shows very detailed planting areas and they were designed location specific. There are 4-foot berms located along the westerly side with aggressively growing arborvitaes along with conifers which will provide all year screening. Along Auburn Street, there is a visual barrier between the adjacent properties, the right of way and their project. There are close to 600 plants (10 species) and were recommended by BETA

Group as being deer resistant and should thrive and provide immediate screening. They have agreed to provide this protection up front before the construction of the solar array starts to provided that visual wall, so the neighbors won't be looking down on a construction project. In addition, they have offered a \$25,000 bond and suggested that, if approved, a condition be that the landscaping be re-evaluated during the first non-foliage season, when the existing vegetation is at its weakest from a visual screening point; go out there with a representative from the Town and take a look to see if there are any obvious holes that might need filling in. He commented that the drone video will show that with the berms and plantings provides instantaneous visual barrier for the project.

- They submitted an ANR plan separating the residential lot from this project; so, this is now a one-use project, he said.
- He mentioned some benefits for the project: Added revenue of about 60-80 thousand dollars on an annual basis. This is a use that will not require Town services or infrastructure; traffic generation is much less than a residential subdivision; being a green community, this will bolster the Town's Clean energy portfolio enabling them to obtain grant money that is geared to clean energy solutions which can save the town money long term.

Mr. King commented that he feels they have addressed all the issues and concerns of the neighbors. He feels the reduction helps it to fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. Driscoll questioned where the amount of \$25,000 landscape bond came from? Mr. King said they have worked on multiple projects where they have offered a landscape bond based upon the number of plantings and the species; he said if the Town has a better mechanism or a different way they would like it calculated, then they would certainly be amenable to that and come to an amount that both sides would be comfortable with. He noted that the documentation of the decommissioning bond refers to Blackstone, MA and asked if this document was correct? Mr. King said no, it must be a Scribner's error; it was a lot of information put together in a short period of time and must have fallen thru the cracks; the information is intended for the Town of Bridgewater. Mr. Driscoll noted that the glare study still says 2017; wasn't it updated showing all the new inverters, he asked? Mr. King said yes, it should state March 18, 2019.

There was a drone video shown of the site with an audio presentation. Attorney McClusky asked everyone to keep in mind that the project is much smaller than was originally intended and reflected in the video. This was done prior to the mediation process. Mr. Driscoll, for clarification, commented that the video stated that there were 12 acres of panels. Mr. King stated that had been reduced to 8 acres. Mr. Driscoll said he was confused because in the technical summary it refers to a 13-acre development. Mr. King felt he misspoke....the drone video had updated figures in the narrative, but the array that you say was the old array. Mr. Driscoll questioned "so how many acres are there now". Mr. King said there were 13 acres. Mr. Driscoll said that he was just trying to determine the size of it. Mr. King said that the 12 acres probably doesn't represent the storm water facilities and possibly the entrance drive; it may have just included the array itself which is 12 acres and the fenced area is 13 acres. Mr. Driscoll questioned how big was it before? He was told 16. Mr. Driscoll said he was just trying to figure out the

math. Mr. King referenced the decision that was made back in 2017 where it references an 18 acre solar farm. Mr. King said he will get a clarification on that for the Board.

Mr. Ajemian questioned "how many panels are we talking about?" He was told currently they have approximately 14,000 panels; there were roughly 17,000. He asked how they were going to secure the service road? Mr. King said they have provided a clear distance between the 7' fence and the panels and that is deemed adequate for the maintenance activities. They have a access secure gate provided with a Knox box for emergencies. Mr. Ajemian asked if they submitted an erosion and sedimentation plan? He was told yes. Mr. Ajemian questioned whether there will be lighting? He was told that no lighting was proposed. Mr. Ajemian asked them to confirm that there were no hazardous materials in the panels. He was told that there are no hazardous materials, it is clean energy, but that if the Board feels strongly, that panel specifications be provided or that a condition of approval would be that the panels contain no hazardous materials and they would be amenable to that. Mr. Ajemian questioned their ability to get so many trees and asked if they had considered that? Mr. Kings noted that they are not all the same; the contractors faced with this are aware of the challenge and will find a way to meet the requirements. Mr. Ajemian said he would want a landscape arborist to supervise the installation of the plants.

Attorney McCluskey noted that the plans have not been revised since the mediation; they will update the plans once all the changes are decided.

Ms. Sullivan said she wanted the numbers tightened up; the acreage, the number of panels, the amount of the bond, the form of surety for the decommissioning and the report needs to be corrected. The noise study didn't account for the non-reflective panels or the vegetation. She expressed concern if the vegetation and trees were not watered and questioned if the bond should be reviewed to see if appropriate.

Attorney McCluskey said that they are expecting that the Town would want them to walk the property with them and demonstrate if there are any gaps in the drainage and make sure it was complete and what was intended.

Mr. King said he would get a clarification on the acreage and inverter discrepancy. The would be certainly amenable to having someone from the Town review the bond amount and come to an agreement on that. As far as the form of the surety, they have used several ways....a bond, money in escrow...it is really up to what the town would recommend as the vehicle. He said he just received clarification that the project was originally 18 acres and has been reduced to 12 acres and that includes the isles between the panels...that is the size of the solar array itself.

The hearing was then opened up for public comment.

Paula Lehtola-640 Auburn Street-direct neighbor across the street made comments on somethings that she has not heard addressed at any of the hearings she has attended:

- Wanted the Board to know that the arborvitae will be eaten by the deer, as far as they can reach. so, there will be open spaces. They will also eat all the Rhododendrons and holly.
- Read from a decision from the Town of Rochester that she suggested this Board should be concerned with them:
 1. Visual screening is required for the life of the project and shall be maintained in good condition to the satisfaction of the Planning Board until such time as the decommissioning of the solar farm is complete in accordance with this special permit.
 2. The use of chemical cleaners, solvents on panels and equipment is not permitted.
 3. The use of chemical herbicides, chemical pesticides, chemical or sludge-based fertilizers are not permitted.
- They have a wooden fence and shrubbery all around the project. She showed the members pictures.

Matt Holmes-80 Old Farm Road-Had a flash drive and made a presentation showing the elevations and views from the homes on Old Farm Road noting that the subdivision is higher in elevation than the solar farm. He commented that at eye level height, it is 20' over what they are planning for the screening. He asked the Board to keep in mind that this is at level one off the deck. He reiterated that what they are proposing will not screen much of anything. He felt if they added another 20 feet, it would cast shadows on their panels. He mentioned the overhead wiring and poles on the plan and asked if they were going to every panel? That was a question they would like to know because it would be a problem in their opinion. He recommended that this application be denied again. Ms. Sullivan questioned his profession and he told her he was an architect. Mr. Driscoll suggested that our design review engineer review the information presented.

Lynnette Delano-Chase-60 Old Farm Road Commented that the very first meeting held at the police station, Attorney McCluskey stated that there are no houses visible from that field, yet today, 2 1/2 years later, we are discussing screening. She stated that it will be impossible to screen this project from the neighborhoods and she hopes that the Board has the fortitude to deny it. She invited anyone interested to come see the view from her property. She said he whole neighborhood and Town will be destroyed, and they will gain nothing.

Dan Zani-20 Old Farm Road- He would like the plan to be studied very carefully because the engineering that was required to get this past Conservation requires a huge amount of fill. He believes it is one million cubic feet of fill needed to accomplish this task. He referred to the back-page grading area, the fill goes up to 7 feet and the plan indicates only minor regrading of total site is less than 25%. The berms require a lot of fill and a calculation of that seems to be way out of proportion and is exactly what makes it not a perfect site. It is totally against the bylaw, he said. He said it came up at a conservation meeting that the existing bog should have had a notice of intent. The applicant says they don't know why the owners didn't get one, but they feel that the passage of time has resolved this issue. That was in the Conservation minutes, he said. He asked how the board felt about that and does that make full compliance with the bylaws. He questioned if that is now the natural condition of the field. He said he asked that because the decommissioning paper work says to restore the site to its natural condition. If they put the million feet of soil in there, do they then have to remove it in the decommissioning? He

questioned the overhead wires. He said their representation of the heights are real; they will see the wires now and the panels. Another thing to notice, is that they take no measurements from the Clapp house that is surrounded by panels of glare; one big reason, he said, is because it gets huge glare. It states that the Clapp's will be getting a new underground electrical service...are they forced to get one he asked? It is all on this plan that you haven't seen before. Must be denied...doesn't meet the 22-6K and will never meet that.

Julia Valiukenas 32 Plumfield Lane-read a statement. Excerpts from: statement: She was concerned about the zoning issue. Why put this in a residential neighborhood? This is a special permit; what are the extenuating circumstances that would persuade a reasonable body of people to conclude that an exception should be made in this case? Potential impact really not known as far as house values; no one can tell us for sure that this is not harmful to our health and that of our children from being exposed to all that concentrated electric magnetic intensity that they will be undergoing 24/7.

Mrs. Holmes-80 Old Farm Road- commented that this is the wrong location; they have demonstrated that cannot be screened; the board should protect their rights as this is life altering to their neighborhood.

Fred Chase-60 Old Farm Road-is Councilman for District 4 where this proposal would be located. His comments tonight are strictly as an abutter. He remains adamantly opposed because this is entirely inappropriate for this parcel. He said that the first plan was actually first drafted back in May of 2016, so we are weeks away from the third anniversary of the history of this project. He spent two hours today in the CED office reviewing the latest plans. What was especially dismaying to him tonight, was to learn from Attorney McCluskey, that in fact, a new plan has been submitted electronically today. So, after spending two hours today, he still doesn't know what is being presented before the Board this evening. He suggested that any new plans be given to at least one abutter, not necessarily him for comparative purposes. One point he does have concerns about is with respect to- the inverters. He said there are 76 rows of solar panels and each row, under this string inverter mechanism, must have its own inverter. It is concerning to him that the shaded area of the plans, shows an area of overhead wires, which is roughly consistent with the pink area to the left of the field on the westerly side. He stated that he believes that the reduction in the size of the solar array wasn't necessarily intended to be an offering to assuage the abutters, but it was a consequence of the fact that this version of inverters require electrification on the entire western border. What he wants to know of the consequence of these string inverters is exactly how many wires are overhead and what will be the support mechanism for those wires because they will be at an elevated height and he thinks that will exceed the height of any vegetated buffer. Another issue he had, was about underground utilities. The Conservation Commission had strongly expressed preference that there be no underground utilities; however, this Board has previously expressed a preference for underground utilities, if possible. This is a very direct conflict, he said, and we need to know if there is a resolution to this. This conflict tells him that this site is totally inappropriate for this purpose. Another issue that is related to this, is there had been a change in the location of the driveway for the existing Imhoff residence at the far southern end of the site. It will now be located to the west of the Clapp residence which has been proven to be an area of environmental sensitivity. That, along with the underground issue, seems to him that an update should

be provided to the Conservation Commission and may, in fact, require a new Notice of Intent. He said that the remand order that came from the Superior Court specifically does require that all regulations, bylaws, ordinances of the Town be observed. He said that the Conservation Commission has previously that no trees can be cut in connection with this project. There is a stand of mature trees, maybe 8-10 in number, and possibly 50 feet in height, that are at the east of his residence at 60 Old Farm Rd. Given the movement of the residential driveway, that will necessitate the removal of that strand of trees.

Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. King about the overhead wires that are shown on the latest plan that were not there during the mediation. Mr. King stated that those are existing overhead wires that are not associated with this project; All of the wires associated with our project are underground. There are no new poles being installed.

Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. King about the fill and grading. He asked what percentage of the site this would encompass the grading and how many yards of fill would be expected to be brought in? Mr. King referred the question to Frank Gallagher. Mr. Gallagher said he doesn't have the quantity this evening. He can get that information to the Board. He said the fill is generally in the bog area which is shown outlined in red. Mr. Driscoll said he would like the answers to those questions including the area of the panels. Mr. Gallagher said he would get that information for him. Mr. King said generally speaking, the site itself is 30 acres and their panel area is 12 acres, just graphically visually looking at it, to be 25% of the 30, that would mean that bog would need to take up more than 50% of the solar array which it clearly doesn't. Mr. Holmes from Old Farm Road said he would like to give the Board some numbers and came up to the podium. He said his takeoff on the bog is roughly 66,000 sq. ft and the solar field is somewhere around 755,00 sq.ft, so therefore 25% of 755,000 is around 188,000 sq. ft and the bog is 66,000....so his question would be how long is the berm; if it is 20' wide by 4' tall, that is 80 sq.ft per foot ...if the berm is 800 feet long, that is another 80,000 sq. ft...if you add that all up, it is over the 25% of the site. He said that one of his colleagues mentioned that you have to add 7' at the back of the south east corner and that isn't even be counted.

Mike Berolini-129 Old Farm Road-commented that he is all for solar, but, this is the wrong area for a commercial project; expressed concern about the safety of the children in the neighborhood; Concerned about possible cancer risk; concerned with the noise; concerned that the bond was too low; concerned that the height dimensions won't allow sufficient screening; concerned about the value of their homes going down.

James Heffernan-50 Old Farm Road-expressed concern about the constant humming; asked the Board to vote it down.

Lois Poole-15 Auburndale Heights-expressed full support for her neighbors whose homes abut this land. To put this solar farm in the neighborhood is to devalue their property and seems unfair. The Massachusetts Environmental Protection Agency is very clear on where these projects should be located in three areas: Brownfields, along highways, Industrial Parks. Exposure to magnetic fields in these areas is occasional, but if you put this in a neighborhood the exposure is 24/7. She has found in her

research that no health agency or scientific Association has said that this exposure is safe. The research is in progress and the only statement they have made it to put it on highways and Industrial parks.

Kelly Trombley -123 Old Farm Road-spoke about all the animals that will be displaced. She asked the Board to think about what would happen if a fire broke out. She felt that their neighborhood would be taken over by the fire very quickly because of all the fences keeping it secure from the children, how quickly would the fire department be able to get in there to extinguish that fire. She urged the Board to consider this very carefully.

Mr. Driscoll asked Ms. Burke and Mr. Romulus to have the Design Review Engineer review the abutters presentation, confirm that all the utilities are underground and that the poles already exist, look at the grading and fill calculations, look into the glare situation and determine whether it is only one hour a day and if that is acceptable and confirm the size of the project of what it was and is now. Ms. Burke questioned who the glare question should be addressed to? He asked her to review or the design engineer.

Attorney McCluskey commented that no chemicals, fertilizers or herbicides would be used and that is made clear in the six -page operations and maintenance plan that was previously submitted. He said visual screening was addressed in operations plan. He said he would give Mr. Chase a copy of the latest plan. The inverter plan that he saw has not changed dimensionally at all, but there were a couple of notations that said 100 where it should have been 200. He submitted that to the Board as soon as he received it on Saturday, he sent it. The square footage of the fill of one million square feet was for the bog that has to be leveled out somewhat. As far as the decommissioning plan and taking away any dirt that is really not what the language of the decommissioning plan speaks to; it speaks to the decommissioning of the materials of the panels and the structures that holds them. The Form A plan is not part of the application and they don't believe that it needs a separate Order of Conditions or Notice of Intent.

Ms. Burke wanted to check on a couple of things that the Board was looking for:

1. Decommissioning estimate and the incorrect language (Black stone vs. Bridgewater) resubmitted to the Board
2. Both bonds to be submitted to review team for review
3. Issue Lisa brought up about the timing of the decommissioning? Lisa noted that it was in the last paragraph.

Ms. Sullivan questioned the issue of the Conservation Commission. Ms. Burke said that one of the standard conditions of a special permit is that if there are any changes to the plan that would affect the previous decision of another Board in Town that they would have to go back before them; she will confirm that.

Mrs. Holmes questioned the % of grading relative to the site; she questioned "what is the site"...in her opinion it should be the limit of work for the project in which case, they are absolutely doing major regrading in more than 25% ; she recommend that be clarified and the peer review engineer can verify

it. She said in the back corner the elevation goes all the way down to 30 and they are filling it all the way up to 49. You can't really see it on the plan because they have the solar panels shown, so she recommended that a grading plan be provided for review. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. King if he could provide that and Mr. King said yes. Mr. King said they are confident in their analysis; it based upon real photographic information and an actual CAD file that was brought in compilation with that. He feels they have presented accurate information on what it is going to look like. He stated that they are amenable to any bond review. He wanted impress upon the Board that they went thru a long mediation process and the Board's review engineer, who has a fiduciary responsibility to the town to review their design was the one who recommended the plantings which are deer tolerant, heights, elevations and various schemes throughout depending on the proximity to the residents and their relative elevations. He feels that the information presented this evening demonstrates that the project will be screened and effective and gives the Board a mechanism to way it and supplement it if required. They would be willing to negotiate that amount, he said. He spoke about bring in fill to make the earthen berm, but that is in part with the screening that was recommended by the consultant. He spoke about the inverters being 3000, but to be conservative they modeled 3500 transformers.

Mrs. Poole commented that one of the things missing on this plan is the Great River Preserve one of the assets of the Town and also missing is the Taunton River Watershed. She spoke about wildlife migrating to this area. She said locating this project here is counterproductive to all the work that that Town has done for the Taunton River shed. She said she found out from the American bird Conservancy and the Audubon Society that they don't want us to put solar panels in migrating areas. The reason is that migrating birds mistake solar panels for water and the birds are injured or incinerated.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to May 15, 2019 at 6:30 pm.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Ms. Sullivan, it was voted by members present, Mr. Ajemian had left, to approve the minutes of 3/20/19.

Ms. Burke gave an update on happenings:

May 1st the ZBA needs the chamber room for the public hearing on the McElwain School project; so, the Planning Board meeting has been changed to room 201A for one item to be addressed.

June 5th is the next public forum on the comprehensive Master Plan. She took the liberty of cancelling the Planning Board meeting scheduled that night due to the fact that the Master Plan is under the jurisdiction of the Planning Board. The meeting will be held at the Senior Center from 4:30-8:30.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, the meeting was adjourned at 8:54 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: _____