

THE REGULAR WORK SESSION OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 23RD DAY OF SEPTEMBER IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND NINE OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 3:00 P.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Thomas W. Evelyn	Present
David M. Sparks	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Stran L. Trout	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

All members were present.

IN RE: FUNDING FOR 4-H AGENT POSITION

Recently retired Cooperative Extension Agent Paul Davis was present to explain a request to restore local funding into the budget of the New Kent Extension Office. He advised that all of Extension's vacant positions had been frozen because of State budget cuts but that internal transfers were being permitted. He pointed out that New Kent no longer had an extension agent nor did it have a 4-H position; however, there might be a 4-H agent who would be willing to transfer to New Kent. Unfortunately, when the position was frozen, the County removed the funding and the State was not willing to advertise the position unless funding was restored. He reported that two-thirds of the cost of the position was funded by the State and New Kent and Charles City each paid one-sixth, and Charles City had already agreed to fund their portion, which would be about \$8,600 from each locality for salary and benefits. He indicated that he did not think that the position would be filled before the beginning of 2010.

There was discussion about whether the requested amount would be sufficient. Interim County Administrator Bill Whitley advised that he felt that the amount would be adequate and could be transferred from the Contingency account, and suggested that the transfer be included on the October 13 Consent Agenda for approval.

IN RE: DUNHAM REZONING APPLICATION

Planner Kelli Le Duc briefed the Board on an application to rezone 131 acres off Tunstall Road from *A-1 Agricultural* to *R-1 Single Family Residential*. She advised that after holding a public hearing, the Planning Commission had tabled its consideration of the application. She reported that there had been a lot of public comment received, mostly concerning traffic impacts, the roads being interconnected with adjacent subdivisions, and the effects on existing septic systems and water supply. She advised that the applicant had presented revised proffers to the Planning Commission just prior to the meeting and staff was anticipating additional revisions.

Board members commented that the cash proffers seemed low in comparison with those from other rezoning cases, and there was discussion about whether the applicant could control where its cash proffers could be spent. County Attorney Jeff Summers advised that

an applicant could proffer against items that were in the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), and it was his feeling that the applicant had increased its proffers before the Planning Commission hearing because it realized they were too low, and after hearing the public comments, would likely add some things to mitigate the perceived impacts.

It was pointed out that the State required that stub roads be extended when constructing adjacent developments, and it was something that people did not understand and hard for them to accept.

Mr. Summers advised that it was apparent that information from the County's Department of Public Utilities had been misunderstood and there were several claims made without the facts to back them up. He also pointed out that the applicant's analysis regarding Watkins Elementary School was in error because they had only taken local funding into consideration. Mr. Burrell added that the applicant was also off on their persons-per-household figure as well as the cost of educating a child.

Ms. Le Duc advised that she expected the applicant to come back to the Planning Commission at its October meeting with some changes.

IN RE: CEDAR HILL REZONING APPLICATION

Ms. Le Duc advised that this application involved a request to rezone three acres (part of a larger parcel) located to the east of the intersection of New Kent Highway and Old River Road from *A-1, Agriculture* to *Business*. She reported that the applicant had requested that the application be tabled so that they could return with some proffers, and were aware that they would be required to pay for the additional advertising costs. She explained that the property had been previously zoned *Business* and the applicant had nine acres (part of the same parcel) on the west side of the intersection that was already zoned *Business*. She advised that it was staff's concern that the applicant had not offered any plans as to what it intended to do with either site.

Mr. Summers advised that the applicant's attorney's comments had been that they might return with a proffer to subdivide the parcel rather than have it split-zoned, and it seemed that the property owner's concern was that the road frontage be rezoned to *Business* and not necessarily the deeper part of the property.

IN RE: ZONING ORDINANCE AND MAP RECONCILIATION

Ms. Le Duc reported that the Planning Commission had held its public hearing on this proposal and had heard objections from a resident on Airport Road whose property was adjacent to the Horsley property being rezoned to *Business*. She advised that the Planning Commission had recommended approval and the matter would come to the Board for a public hearing at its October 13 meeting.

IN RE: COURTHOUSE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Community Development Director George Homewood advised that the request to establish a courthouse development district had been considered by the Planning Commission and forwarded to the Board with a unanimous favorable recommendation. He noted that there had been very little comment on the issues dealing with the regulations and how they would work.

He reported that there was more discussion on how extensively this would apply and what land would be included in the new district. He reviewed maps which illustrated the area recommended by staff, the larger area recommended by the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee (ZORC), and the area reflected as "Village" in the Comprehensive Plan. He pointed out that the ZORC-recommended area included all of the full parcels and followed existing parcel lines.

He explained that staff's recommendation was to include only the government-owned and school- owned property plus Preservation Office Park, Maidstone, and the Post Office site, at the present time in order to provide an opportunity for a "proof of concept" and it would allow the developer of Preservation Office Park and Maidstone to continue with those projects. He added that it would also give the Board an opportunity to decide how much additional land it wanted to include in the district. He indicated that ZORC wanted to include the two undeveloped parcels owned by Mr. Poe on the south side of Route 249, as well as vacant land on the north side. He confirmed that the Planning Commission, by unanimous vote, recommended staff's proposal, but at the same time had asked that the Board consider an initiating resolution to rezone the parcels recommended by ZORC, including the Poe property.

He explained that the Planning Commission was philosophically committed to the village development concept and felt that under the staff proposal there was not a whole lot of land that could be developed. He clarified that staff agreed that, over time, the other parcels should be made a part of the district, but wanted to make sure that the concept worked before additional parcels were added. He indicated that staff's recommendation had been reviewed with several members of the now defunct ZORC and although there were some members who did not agree, there were some who did. He confirmed that once the zoning classification was created, then any of the property owners could apply for rezoning.

Mr. Homewood advised that there was a plan to eventually install a roundabout at the intersection of Cumberland Road and Route 249 that would connect to an extension of Egypt Road.

Former ZORC Chairman Julian Lipscomb advised that ZORC had worked hard on the Courthouse Village District and felt that property on both the north and south sides should be included. He pointed out that it was the only area in New Kent that would qualify as an Urban Development Area as required by the State to accommodate up to 20 years' worth of growth, and the undeveloped areas should be included because the rest was owned by the County.

Mr. Homewood explained that it was the Board's decision whether or not to add additional property, and that issue was separate and apart from the pending matters to establish the district.

Mr. Summers clarified that the Board would have three issues to decide at its upcoming meeting: the text amendments establishing the district and its regulations; the designation of the parcels to be a part of the district; and whether it wanted to have an initiating directive back to the Planning Commission to expand the area.

IN RE: PARKS & RECREATION UPDATE

Parks and Recreation Manager Kim Turner and Parks & Facilities Coordinator Matt Spruill were present to update the Board. Ms. Turner expressed her appreciation of the Board's

continued support of staff training and described the education and networking opportunities at a recent conference.

She reported on a Youth Scholarship Program that was available to residents that provided program assistance based on household income and size. She pointed out that this program was funded with donations and was not a cost to the taxpayers. She encouraged Board members to refer any interested residents to her office.

She advised that staff was in the process of updating its policies and procedures to conform to the Parks & Recreation Facilities ordinance previously adopted by the Board. She indicated that they were trying to streamline all policies and procedures to make better use of staff time.

There was discussion regarding the requirement to have an ABC license and insurance for certain events held at the Quinton Community Center. Mr. Summers explained that the County insured the facility and would not want to use its policy to cover the negligence of a private party, but would want any renter to name the County as an additional insured on their personal policy. It was reported that the rental fees were less than those charged for other community centers in the County, were in line with those charged in neighboring communities, and supported the operating costs. Staff advised that non-resident fees had been mistakenly omitted from the Fee Schedule and the Board would be asked to consider adding those the next time that the Fee Schedule was amended. Mr. Summers suggested that the County build a record to show there was a rational basis to charge non-residents a higher fee, at which time Ms. Turner pointed out that non-residents also paid higher program fees based on the premise that they did not live and pay taxes in New Kent.

Ms. Turner advised that the Before- and After-School programs were doing well, with about 60 elementary school students (kindergarten through fifth grade) in both the morning and afternoon sessions. She reported that the program was staffed by the Youth Programmer and some part-time staff, many of whom worked at day care centers in the County. She indicated that the morning session started at 7 a.m. and the afternoon session ended at 6 p.m. and that extending the hours would require the County get a State license, which was not something that was being recommended. She explained the fees and the fact that some financial assistance was available through the Social Services Department. She advised that they had been asked to consider something for 12 and 13 year olds and were in the process of researching initiatives for such program.

Mr. Spruill reported that participation was up in all youth programs and he felt that the struggling economy had resulted in many families choosing to participate in programs within the County rather than in adjacent communities.

Mr. Burrell advised that parks and recreation programs were a recognized deterrent to youth gang activities and resulted in lower incarceration costs.

IN RE: SHARED USE AGREEMENT FOR THE HISTORIC SCHOOL PROPERTY

Ms. Turner requested the Board's feedback on a draft Use Agreement with the School Board. She advised that in 2007, the County's Park and Recreation Division assumed management of all school facilities during non-instructional times, and with the County taking ownership of the historic school property, it was suggested that a formalized agreement, adopted by both the School Board and the Board of Supervisors, be put into place in order to set expectations and provide accountability. She indicated that the proposed Agreement had been reviewed by Administration and the County Attorney, and

would be reviewed by School Board staff the following week. She clarified that the document had not yet been presented to the School Board as she wanted to obtain the Board's comments first, and perhaps wait until after the Deed to the Historic School had been signed and accepted.

Mr. Summers reported that the proposed deed had been sent to the attorney for the School Board in August and he would follow up on its status. He advised that the School Board had already declared the property as surplus.

Ms. Turner advised that under the proposed agreement, Parks & Recreation would maintain the master schedule for the facilities, which would hopefully avoid some of the conflicts and misunderstandings that had occurred in the past.

There was discussion regarding the new high school. Ms. Turner advised that requests for uses of any of the facilities at the high school had to be cleared through the School Principal and/or the County Administrator.

Staff reported that the new custodial arrangements at the schools had worked out better for Parks and Recreation because the custodians were at the elementary schools later at night.

Ms. Turner advised that for the time being, the historic school was the only property that Parks and Recreation would be operating at all times, but others could eventually be added to Attachment A. She confirmed that Parks & Recreation was using only the gymnasium, a classroom and the restrooms in the historic school. She related some problems with securing the building, noting that a big problem was that many people still had keys and staff was hesitant to spend the \$12,000 quoted to have the doors rekeyed.

She advised that they were considering a reorganization of her division and she felt that having the proposed Agreement in place would make it easier for everyone and would hold both the Schools and the County accountable to find alternate locations when a conflict developed. She clarified that the Agreement would have to be approved by both the School Board and the Board of Supervisors before it became effective, but she wanted the Board's blessing before it was sent to the School Board for consideration.

There were no suggestions for changes from the Board.

IN RE: RECLAIMED WATER LINE PROJECT

Present to review bids for the Reclaimed Water Line project were Interim County Administrator Bill Whitley, Malcolm Pirnie Engineer Kris Edelman, Financial Advisor Ted Cole, and Public Utilities Director Larry Dame.

Mr. Whitley explained that the project had been bid in two separate components -- one for the line work and the other for some modifications for storage at the Chickahominy plant. He reported that the lowest of the fourteen bids for the line work had been received from Godsey & Son for the sum of \$2,837,945.75. He advised that for the second component - work at the Chickahominy - the lowest bidder had been Enviroscape from Mechanicsville at \$1,145,500. He indicated that the bids had been reviewed by Mr. Edelman who, along with staff, was recommending that the contracts be awarded to the lowest bidders. He pointed out that there were two separate resolutions for consideration -- one for each component of the project.

Mr. Whitley reminded that New Kent had applied for and been approved for funding for the project through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (federal stimulus funding) in an amount of up to \$6.7 million which would be paid through the State Water Control Board. He confirmed that the County would not be able to collect the difference between the total project cost of \$3,983,445.75 and the \$6.7 million award to use for other projects in the County. In addition, he reported that the cost of \$147,000 to extend the reclaimed water line to the Royal New Kent golf course could not be covered under the stimulus funding because there was a requirement banning certain facilities, including golf courses, from receiving funding. He advised that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) had been asked to challenge that but staff was not hopeful that it would be covered. He suggested that amount could be added to the planned utility borrowing in 2010.

He also advised that the stimulus funds would not cover any change orders that might occur on the project, nor would it cover any contingency. Mr. Sparks expressed his concern about the risks to the County, especially in light of the wide range of bids. It was reported that there could be some unanticipated sub-surface problems that might develop because the reclaimed water lines would be installed along the side of Route 33 instead of in the median with the sewer lines. Mr. Dame assured the Board that the County would have one of its inspectors with the contractor at all times to make sure that any claims for change orders were legitimate. Mr. Whitley added that the Board would be asked to approve all change orders and that they would be paid from the Utility fund.

Mr. Dame commented that he did not think that the bids were really that far apart, with six of them being within \$1 million of each other, and that there were plans to take the waterline under Good Hope Road rather than bore again under the interstate. Mr. Edelman pointed out that the bid was based on unit pricing and there may be some savings there.

Mr. Sparks questioned whether staff had been aware that stimulus funding would not cover change orders or contingencies. Staff explained that all information had been received through DEQ and very little had been in writing.

Mr. Trout asked what would happen if the project were not completed. Mr. Whitley reviewed that the County would be executing an agreement for what was being called a principal forgiveness loan (which would not be considered a debt of the locality) and if the County failed to comply by not completing the project, then it would have to pay back the funding.

Mr. Whitley indicated that staff had not anticipated that change orders wouldn't be covered and confirmed that no one had asked that question. He added that staff was confident that the project would be completed and there was little danger that the County would have to repay the funds. He stated that the Board would be notified of any problems with change orders, and would receive recommendations on how to pay for them, either out of the Utility fund or added to the utility borrowing anticipated for 2010. He advised that although problems were not anticipated, in construction sometimes "bad things happened".

Mr. Davis commented that this was high-profile project and he felt that everyone would go out of their way to make sure it succeeded and he did not expect there to be any problems.

Mr. Burrell stated that he felt that the project would put New Kent in good favor with the State.

Mr. Sparks noted that the County was already \$147,000 "in the hole" and was at risk with no contingency and no way to be covered for change orders, and he would not vote to approve the project.

Mr. Trout disagreed with Mr. Sparks, stating that he felt that things would work out and the County stood to make a profit once the project was completed and would be better off than it was before. He added that there was a presumption in the industry that there would be change orders on a project.

Mr. Davis agreed with Mr. Trout, referring to the ability to sell discharge credits because the County would not be discharging to the waterways. Mr. Dame concurred, stating that the County would make money in the long run with the sale of credits, but could not project what that revenue would be. He added that he could not tell the Board there would be no change orders, which was one of the reasons why a County inspector would be on the project site at all times.

There was discussion regarding the sale of reclaimed water. Mr. Dame advised that the reclaimed water would be sold at \$1.25 per 1,000 gallons and, based on a usage of 80 million gallons between the three proposed customers, the County would collect about \$100,000 per year. He advised that the County may not be able to provide 80 million gallons of reclaimed water in the beginning but should have no problem once flows to the plant increased. He indicated that using reclaimed water would become more acceptable in the State and would be a good selling point for prospective businesses in the Route 33 industrial corridor.

Staff advised that there were no formal agreements yet with the proposed reclaimed water customers, but the two golf courses had agreed "in principal" and knew that they would not be able to use groundwater for irrigation after 2012. Mr. Dame advised that if Colonial Downs did not take advantage of the ability to purchase reclaimed water for irrigation, the State might allow them to continue to use groundwater but that amount would be deducted from the permit for Kentland and would affect the ability to complete build out of that development.

Ted Cole advised that a utility borrowing had been planned for the amount needed to complete the expansion of the Parham Landing plant and a couple of other utility projects, and adding in the \$147,000 to cover the line work not eligible for federal funding, that amount would be a little over \$3.2 million, which he felt fit in well with the financial projections of the utility system in terms of continuing to be self-supporting. He reminded that there was a time when the borrowing was expected to be \$15 – \$20 million. While he recognized that did not eliminate the concern about change orders, he assured the Board that it should be fairly comfortable that it had sufficient debt capacity to handle additional debt service in this amount and more, and still have the system support itself and not have to use general fund monies, as long as the rates continued to be adjusted as outlined in the *pro forma*.

Mr. Sparks stated that he was disappointed that staff "hadn't asked the right questions up front". He commented that although there might not be a problem, \$4 million was a lot of money and he wanted to make sure all bases were covered and he felt that these were basic questions to be asked in any negotiation.

Other Board members disagreed, reminding that there had been a short time frame within which to apply and there had been little published information and no one to answer questions.

Mr. Burrell moved to adopt Resolution R-52-09 awarding the contract on the Parham Force Main contract to Godsey & Son. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Nay
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Trout moved to adopt Resolution R-53-09 awarding the Chickahominy modifications project to Enviroscape. The members were polled:

David M. Sparks	Nay
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: GROUNDWATER WITHDRAWAL PERMITS

Present to review the status of the groundwater withdrawal permits and County water systems were Assistant Public Utilities Director Mike Lang, Malcolm Pirnie Engineer Kris Edelman, and Public Utilities Director Larry Dame.

Mr. Lang reported that out of the six permits outstanding last year, four had been issued by DEQ – Farms of New Kent, Bottoms Bridge, The Colonies and the Courthouse. He indicated that the two outstanding were Route 33 which was in modeling, and Colonial Downs which was pending the reclaimed water issue.

He noted that the Farms of New Kent permit was effective June 1, 2009, and required that all 14 – 16 private wells be taken out of service and abandoned by June 1, 2010. He advised that the required observation well nest would be sited at the Old Telegraph Road transfer station and would be paid for by the developers. He indicated that the permit would be reviewed in five years and if the project was not built out and/or consumption had not reached what was predicted, it could be cut. He added that the permit also required an investigation for a water source other than groundwater. He reiterated that the Farms of New Kent had agreed to pay for the costs of all of the conditions, which was estimated to be about \$250,000. He pointed out that the developer did have a pending application for irrigation that might be successful, which would be a network of shallow wells that would draw from the water table aquifer, which was not as protected as it was recharged through rainfall, but they would be required to have a mitigation plan in place to address any impact on surrounding shallow wells.

Mr. Lang advised that the Bottoms Bridge permit became effective on July 1, 2009, for 180 million gallons per year, and required discontinued use of the New Kent Crossing well by January 1, 2010, which was serving the Food Lion and other businesses in the shopping center but not the outparcels. He indicated that the owners of those businesses had been contacted several times and plans had been approved for their connection to the public

system and the ordinance required that they be connected by March 1, 2010. He reported that the Bottoms Bridge permit also required an observation well nest but no site had been located yet. He stated that possible sites had been identified and correspondence mailed to the owners who did not live in the County, with no response. He described that construction of the well nest would require about one-half acre of property and once constructed, would only need about a quarter of an acre. It was reported that this permit would also be reviewed in five years to determine if consumption was what had been predicted. Mr. Lang added that DEQ wanted a condition that the area would be connected to an outside water supply by 2019 but the County would not agree to that condition and DEQ allowed it to be removed. He indicated that there were five facilities that needed to be abandoned by July 1, 2011, and there were several businesses in the service area that still needed to connect to the public system.

He reported that the permit for The Colonies was issued on August 1, 2009, for 17.5 million gallons which would cover the build-out of the area at 208 gallons per residence per day. He pointed out that current use was low, at about 185. He noted that the well at The Colonies drew from the Piney Point aquifer, one of the more protected ones, but the permit was issued during a period where there was less scrutiny. He stated that he expected to receive information on the fire flow model in the near future and the estimate for upgrades was around \$750,000.

Mr. Lang reported that the Colonial Downs permit had expired on February 1, 2008, and it was anticipated that it would be issued for 220 million gallons per year. He indicated that the application submitted assumed that the reclaimed water project would be approved. He reported that water use for irrigation continued to remain high in the Brickshire subdivision, accounting for more than half of the water use, and he reminded that DEQ would not allow groundwater for irrigation after 2012. He indicated that could affect the build-out of the development.

He indicated that the permit for the Courthouse was effective August 1, 2009, for 57 million gallons per year, and that all parcels on the north side of Route 249 were in the service area but were not connected to the system.

He advised that the Route 33 permit had expired on April 1, 2009 and although administratively approved, it was still in modeling. He spoke about water quality problems which might require the sending of notices, which wouldn't affect anyone except Henrico Jail East.

He commented that irrigation demands were going to limit building in Bottoms Bridge, Colonial Downs and Farms of New Kent, and efforts needed to continue to address that issue.

Mr. Sparks thanked the Public Utilities staff, commenting that without their hard work and expertise, he did not expect that the permits would have been this far along. There were comments regarding an improved relationship with DEQ.

There was additional discussion regarding the fire flows in various neighborhoods. Mr. Lang reminded that the preliminary engineering work for the system in The Colonies was funded by a grant but it was highly unlikely that grant funds would be available for construction. Mr. Dame advised that staff would continue to look for grants for similar work in other neighborhoods with the same problems. Mr. Trout expressed his concern that it would not be fair to the taxpayers to use general fund monies to pay for improvements in selected neighborhoods and in those instances a local tax district would work well.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Sparks moved to appoint Martha Eagle as District Two's representative to the Clean County Committee to complete a term ending December 31, 2011.

Mr. Sparks moved to appoint Thomas Richart as a District Two representative to the Transportation Safety Commission to serve a term ending December 31, 2011.

The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motions carried.

IN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE

The Chairman announced that the Board of Supervisors would hold its next regular meeting on Tuesday, October 13, 2009, at 6 p.m. in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building, and would hold a special meeting on October 1, 2009, at 6:00 p.m. for a closed session to continue review of applications for the County Administrator position.

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Burrell moved to go into Closed Session for a personnel matter pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.1 of the Code of Virginia to review applications for the County Administrator position. The members were polled:

Stran L. Trout	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session.

Mr. Sparks moved to return to open session. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Evelyn made the following certification:

Whereas, the New Kent County Board of Supervisors has convened in a closed session on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

Whereas, Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed session was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

Now there be it resolved that the Board hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open session requirements by Virginia law were discussed in closed session to which this certification resolution applies and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered by the Board.

The Chairman inquired whether there was any member who believed that there was a departure from the motion. Hearing none, the members were polled on the certification:

David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Sparks moved to adjourn the meeting. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 7 p.m.