

**2016 CAPITAL BOND FEASIBILITY & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**OFFICIAL MINUTES**  
**4/29/2015**

**The meeting was called to order at 6:21 p.m.**

**ATTENDANCE**

In attendance: Josh Almy, Connor Applegate, Tricia Barry, Tim Baynes, Paul Bialek, Marta Burnet, Stacy Cho, Kim Clarke, Daniel Crouner, Laura D'Arcy, Amanda Dorey, John Gorow, Lance Gytoku, Kim Hand, Donna Hood, Delaney Huesgen, Doug Jones, Mark Jonson, Jonathan Koshar, Leslie Lederman, Christie Malchow, Andrea McCormick, Jaimi Messmer, Kimberly Montague, Matt Monte, Jason Morse, Jody Mull, Andrew Pedersen, Dawn Peschek, Dana Rundle, Erica Stephens, Susanna Stratford, Mitch Tallman, Drew Terry, Lee Thacker, Alicia Veevaert,

Not in attendance: Martin Buckley, Betsy Cohen, Carla Cohen, Jonathan Grudin, Kerri Jensen, Erik Landahl, Daniel Miller, Ashwani Sirohi, Shawn Skogstad, Madison Willis, Paul Winterstein

**LAND ACQUISITION**

Mr. Kuper called the meeting to order after it was determined a quorum was present. After review, it was moved and seconded to approve the 4/15/15 minutes as presented. By a vote of hands the motion carried.

Mr. Kuper asked the Committee to return to the motion that was tabled at the meeting on 4/15/15. The motion was to accept \$97M for land acquisition in Option 1 and Option 2 of the Springboard Proposal. The motion was tabled at the previous meeting to allow Committee members to study the recommendation and ask further questions before making a decision to proceed on the motion.

**A motion was moved and seconded to “un-table the motion” made at the previous meeting. By a show of hands the motion was approved.**

Mr. Kuper reported that since the last meeting, there was no additional input received from the community, but he had a few questions from Committee members. One Committee member said that her constituents asked why we were not redeveloping our existing properties instead of purchasing new property. In response, Mr. Kuper said the reality is that further expansion to existing properties would in some cases not meet code requirements for impervious and pervious surface. There is only so much building that can be done to existing properties before it becomes necessary to tear down those buildings and shrink their footprint. He noted that the District has redeveloped most of its existing property. As an example, no additional property was acquired for the rebuild of Issaquah MS; buildings have been “swapped” and the parcels are being used as efficiently as possible. Mr. Kuper said that topography, code requirements, wetland delineations and set-backs affect our ability to construct as well as parking requirements. He commented that if a facility gets too large, underground parking would be necessary (an expensive proposition at approximately \$25K per stall according to Mr. Crawford). The IVE/Admin site could possibly be redeveloped, but this would require relocation of the current elementary school which was recently remodeled and the Admin building is a necessity. Mr. Kuper believes we are using our land to our full extent and that is why we are requesting additional property purchases in the Springboard Proposal.

Mr. Kuper asked the Committee if they would like to discuss the motion or had any further questions. He said that he had been contacted by a Committee member with specific questions regarding the property acquisition piece and he has been working to answer his specific concerns. With no further discussion, Mr. Kuper asked the Committee to vote on the motion.

**A motion was made to accept \$97M in the Springboard Proposal to acquire property for 2 additional elementary sites, a middle school site and a high school site. By a vote of hands, the motion was approved unanimously.**

### **PROPOSED EXPANSIONS/REMODELS**

The Committee then moved to discussion on the (2) new elementary buildings and the elementary expansions/remodels recommended in the Springboard Proposal. A set of concept drawings was presented to the Committee showing what these buildings would look like with additions in place. Mr. Kuper reminded the Committee that these were conceptual only and not a final rendering or schematic. Also provided was the 2015 Facility Construction Data report listing dates of construction and remodels at each building, as well as square footage information for the buildings.

Mr. Kuper directed the Committee to the concept drawings for Sunset, Cougar Ridge, Endeavour and Discovery all built in the early to mid-90's. Mr. Crawford reminded the Committee that the plans were for concept only and were not final schematics of the proposed remodels:

- Cougar Ridge shows an addition of 6 classrooms with an expanded Commons.
- Sunset which had a 2-story addition in 2002 could be further expanded and increase the number of classrooms on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and expand the Commons area.
- Endeavour is similar to Cougar Ridge with a slightly different configuration due to the corridors, adds 6 classrooms and an expanded Commons.
- Discovery, more similar to Endeavour, adds 6 classrooms and expanded Commons.
- Maple Hills is different with classrooms organized around a Common activity area. The site is fairly confined but there is space to add another 4-6 classrooms.

Mr. Crawford noted that the proposed elementary expansions/remodels are consistent on both Options 1 and 2 of the Springboard Proposal.

A Committee member asked why we do not add 2<sup>nd</sup> floors to the buildings instead of building "outward" as shown in the concept plans. Mr. Crawford responded that when we have a horizontal space to expand, it is a simpler less expensive design; we also save on the costs of stairs and elevators. He added that primary grades must have grade-level access. Regarding the Sunset addition, Mr. Crawford noted that when the initial 2-story addition was made at Sunset there were comments that the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor classrooms seemed isolated. This proposal adds more classrooms to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor providing a more consistent number of classrooms.

A Committee member asked why these particular schools were selected for expansion/remodel; was it due to their age or growth in those areas of the district? Mr. Crawford responded that there was a question as to the age of the buildings and what they may need but primarily it came down to where we see growth and a need for additional classroom space. Mr. Kuper added these buildings are also short of our new preferred baseline of 28-32 classrooms per building.

A Committee member asked if the District were to find additional space for new elementary schools, would this change which buildings to remodel. No, Mr. Kuper replied that if that were the case we would need to re-boundary the areas to

fill in the new capacity. Due to the age of these buildings, rather than just doing cosmetic work and upgrades, the District sees this as an opportunity to add capacity at these buildings.

A Committee member asked if parking could be improved at these buildings during a remodel. Mr. Crawford replied that parking is always a consideration; we try to avoid taking parking and as we expand buildings we try to add spaces.

A Committee member noted that the concept plans show classroom additions, but would there be expansions provided to support other areas (i.e. Library, offices, counseling area). Mr. Crawford said there are expansions of the Commons shown and some additional office space could be considered to support staff. Mr. Kuper added that both Cougar Ridge and Discovery have \$1.5M allocated in the previous bond for office relocations to move those spaces from the core of the building to the exterior. The main office at Sunset was previously remodeled and relocated.

A Committee member asked if money is already allocated for these office remodels, would the work be done at the same time as the additions. Mr. Kuper said there is nothing barring us from “marrying” the two pots of money together. Mr. Crawford added the Cougar Ridge and Discovery projects have some additional security issues that affect the flow of traffic into the building; we may choose to do that work earlier than the additions.

A Committee member asked if this expansion of classrooms would provide full day kindergarten at all elementary schools and address reduced class sizes. Mr. Kuper replied that the goal is to have full day K in all buildings but this set of improvements would not build-out 17:1 at K-3. In his opinion, he does not believe this is a good idea at this time as the state is still “tinkering” with the formulas and it would be a mistake to overbuild. The district’s operational goal, he said, is after new buildings come online, remodels and re-boundary, we would have space for full-day kindergarten at all of our elementary buildings. However, Mr. Kuper said he cannot guarantee this will happen as it depends on growth. He noted an additional 650 residential housing units were being planned in the Highlands according to the *Issaquah Press*. He acknowledged that full day kindergarten is in the front of minds for many parents, but enrollment growth affects our abilities to meet this goal.

For clarification a Committee member asked if an item was in the previous bond is it assumed it will be completed and therefore not be considered now. Mr. Crawford answered that those items will be done but it may make sense to bundle them with other items in this bond. Timing of work is considered, and in some cases, it may make sense to move ahead with the item rather than wait for a future addition. Mr. Kuper added that each item will be completed but they may or may not be combined.

A Committee member asked if there are any plans to reconfigure the Maple Hills parking. There are a large number of stairs from the parking area to the building and the handicapped spaces are a distance away. Mr. Crawford answered that it has not been a topic of discussion. It would be difficult to add handicapped spaces off of the bus loop, but a ramp could be considered from the parking lot he said.

The discussion moved to the maximization of existing sites. Mr. Crawford noted that the core projects are an area where we have maximized available space. Issaquah HS was made 3-story to reduce the footprint of the building. The rebuild of Issaquah MS was originally planned as 2-story; it has been redesigned as a 3-story which shortens up the footprint area and allows for additional classrooms if needed. Additional space has been preserved on the north side of the IHS performing arts building for future expansion. The potential to expand both IHS and IMS has been preserved which is in Option 2 of Springboard Proposal. There is also potential to add 24 classrooms at both Skyline and Issaquah

High School and 14 additional classrooms at the middle schools. Returning to the concept plans the expansions (as proposed in Option #2 of the Springboard Proposal) are shown as follows:

- Skyline HS shows a 3-story addition of 24 classrooms. The Commons was expanded in the previous addition. An additional expansion to the Commons on the eastside of the building.
- A rebuild of Pine Lake MS shows the new facility constructed in the upper ball fields, outside the existing campus so it can remain in session. The footprint of the new building matches the new IMS. It preserves the entrance from the signal off of Issaquah Pine Lake Rd. Mr. Crawford noted that space is preserved in the rebuild, but it would not be enough to construct another school facility. We are trying to be efficient with our properties.
- Pacific Cascade shows expansion of the Commons on the west side and additional classrooms off of the north and south wings as space allows.
- Beaver Lake MS would expand to the west with an expansion of the Commons to the northwest. Science classrooms are located on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and more could be added in the expansion.

A Committee member commented that the Pine Lake site looked like it would have enough extra land for 2 schools. Mr. Crawford answered that even with the new building sited as far east as possible there would not be enough space for 2 school facilities due to parking and access constraints. However, the space could be used for facilities or centers to support school programs. Regarding entry to the school there would potentially still be 2 points of entry into the school (one off of Issaquah Pine Lake Road and the other off of 228<sup>th</sup>); a third entrance would be provided for staff parking and buses.

A Committee member commented that forecasting growth is complicated and expensive. How much capacity is built in this plan if growth looks like what it has been? The forecast from 2011 was forecasted at 5.9% actual was 14% thru today. You are forecasting 6% but it feels like today there is more development than 4-5 years ago. If that manifests and you have growth like we have would you do what you are doing and do more, or would you not do this and do something completely different?

Mr. Crawford responded that this is a good lead-in to the question on the size of high schools and middle schools. There is a real difference in how these buildings can support increased rates of growth in the future. If we do the proposed additions only, we take care of near-term growth but there is not a lot of reserve capacity at those sites. If we build an additional high school and middle school, the population of the remaining schools will come down, leaving space for growth at each facility which equates to a large number of students across the district. There is a difference in the 2 options to address growth. In his opinion, we are seeing pent up demand in construction that cannot continue at this rate; but as long as economy remains good we can expect growth to continue. Mr. Kuper added that if we go thru Option 1 and build out in 6 years, the board knows we would come forward and ask for more expansion; if facilities are needed at that time. Option 2 will provide us capacity with the additions and expansions, but adding new facilities in Option 1 allows us to add even more capacity in the long term.

A Committee member asked if a building can go thru multiple expansions. Mr. Kuper answered that it depends on the site. Some work is made to core facilities during remodels but these spaces are taxed; PE is held on the stage or “brunch” is served at 10:30. He said the district wants students to have the same experiences across all buildings. As an example the overcrowding at Grand Ridge affected the students’ experience until the kindergarteners were moved to other sites. Mr. Kuper stated the district wants to avoid overcrowded buildings that affect our core facilities and students’ experience.

A Committee member asked how much we can expand core facilities during remodels. Mr. Kuper responded that an elementary school with 32 classrooms is not build to house 1000 students. Elementary schools average 550-575 in our district; some districts run up to 900 which is considered very large for an elementary school. This is not ideal when a building is not constructed to house that many students initially.

A Committee member asked about the cost per classroom on the 2 different options for a new high school vs. additions. Option 2 shows that it would cost \$28M for a 24 classroom addition while a new building on Option 1 is \$120M. Mr. Crawford answered that costs are different for a new standalone building vs. adding onto an existing building; costs tend to go up when adding into a building and interfacing with existing construction. In regards to elementary schools, the early 90's buildings need additional work. Mr. Crawford said a new comprehensive high school (with 50 classrooms) includes many other costs such as site infrastructure, utilities, clearing and grading, and all the costs of building on a new piece of property rather than just adding onto a site where the infrastructure is already in place. Mr. Kuper commented that a new high school would also include the cost of a stadium as all district high schools have their own stadium. Mr. Kuper added that inflation has been built into the cost of the new high school as we are looking at building 48 months out and inflation would escalate costs on a project that size.

A Committee member asked if the \$28M allocated for the 24 classroom high school addition (in Option 2) provides funding for additional office spaces that would be needed for administration or counselors. Mr. Crawford replied that each high school operates differently; Skyline would have offices for teachers incorporated into classroom spaces. We would need to work with the high schools to identify other available space in their buildings for administration spaces.

A Committee member asked if an addition to a high school makes a crowded situation worse by putting more stress on the core facility. Mr. Kuper replied that running a high school with 2600 student is not the district's preferred option. Mr. Crawford acknowledged that while a high school addition may include some interior modifications it would not include a new gym or library. He added a higher student load with higher building use is a less than ideal situation.

A Committee member asked if there would be enough science rooms with the expansion of the high schools. Mr. Kuper responded that with recent changes in grad requirements, potentially some of the 24 rooms will be science classrooms. Mr. Crawford said there is a consideration that more science labs would be necessary in both the high school and middle school additions, adding a science lab is much more expensive than a traditional classroom.

A Committee member commented that if Option 1 is not preferred, the group would need to revamp Option 2 based on the issues regarding the additions. In her opinion, she would rather see fewer things done right than come back in just a few years to ask for a great deal of money; Option 2 seems to extend the problems at a great expense. Mr. Crawford responded that the expansion projects would become more costly and complex if additional core facilities were necessary as those areas are often buried in in the facility. Mr. Kuper added that given the "angst and the controversy" of adding a 4<sup>th</sup> high school, it is important for the Committee to discuss both options fully. He said that data may show what we ought to do, but without discussion on the drawbacks of adding classrooms without core facilities we would not be doing the process justice; though not a preferred solution it could be where we end up. Adding a 4<sup>th</sup> comprehensive high school is a major decision that the Committee must address. The Committee is formed to wrestle with these issues and not just state our preferred solution.

A Committee member asked if the extra space at Pine Lake MS would be large enough for a plateau community stadium. Mr. Crawford answered that it is not big enough for a football field but possibly another baseball or youth soccer field. To provide a larger community stadium facility we would need the existing Pine Lake field, which was recently updated

with new turf. Mr. Kuper added a single district sports complex would require a large piece of property given the extra parking requirements.

A motion was made that the Committee approve the funding for Elementary 16 and Elementary 17 and the expansion/remodels of the elementary schools which include Discovery, Endeavour, Cougar Ridge, Sunset and Maple Hills on Option 1. Mr. Kuper asked the Committee to discuss the motion at their tables. Mr. Burton recommended the table-groups complete the following statement: "Because if we don't . . ." He said while an agreement may seem apparent, the Committee should be able to message to the community why this is an affirmative need with factual findings relative to the motion not the "lack of a better option". Mr. Kuper noted that this represents a \$150M value in the bond.

Mr. Kuper reconvened the meeting and asked for comments from the Committee. A Committee member felt that the proposed new elementary schools (E16 and E17) should be a separate discussion from the remodel/expansions of current facilities. Another Committee member felt that had been addressed during the discussion of land purchase for the new elementary schools. Mr. Kuper reminded the Committee that they can always change, amend or bring back items before it makes its final recommendation to the Superintendent.

A Committee member asked if there was a consideration for a 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> elementary school rather than all of the expansion projects. Mr. Kuper replied that finding 10 acre parcels of property is hugely difficult; based on district research conducted in the last 24 months when growth management policies changed, it has been difficult to find 2 good elementary school parcels. Finding a third would be more difficult. He added that since these buildings need work due to their age, administration felt it would be a good use of taxpayer money for expansions without the additional expense of property acquisition at the same time. Mr. Kuper also said the expansions provide capacity broadly all over the system rather than in a single location especially as it relates to full day kindergarten and there is less disruption in the re-boundary process.

A Committee member asked if it was an option to build a new building behind some of these elementary buildings (similar to Briarwood) rather than doing an expansion which may tax a building to its limit. Mr. Kuper said a "build behind" would still cost about the same as a new facility (\$36M). Mr. Crawford answered that the sites are too small to add another school building. He noted that the IVE/Admin site allows the opportunity to build another school which would be multistory and share play fields and core facilities with IVE. Mr. Kuper said that those buildings haven't reached their generational limit such as Clark; the Community has an issue with rebuilding a building constructed in the 90's. If the building was built in the 70's there is more reason to justify replacing that building (like PLMS).

Mr. Kuper then returned to the motion on the floor to approve funding for E16 and E17 and the expansion/remodels of elementary buildings. A Committee member seconded that motion. A question was asked as to the rationale of breaking Elementary 16 and 17 from the expansion projects. Some Committee members questioned if additional elementary schools (beyond 16 and 17) were still an option. Mr. Kuper reminded the Committee that there are both political and economic reasons related to feasibility.

Mr. Crawford reminded the Committee that moderate projections for 2019-20 elementary enrollment show 10,000 students. With 15 elementary schools that would be an average enrollment of 670 students per building; adding 2 elementary schools would bring enrollment to 588. Mr. Kuper added that the District preference is a 500-600 average for elementary schools from an operational standpoint as well as providing an equitable student experience. It is not

always possible to have uniform enrollment numbers due to neighborhood needs, unanticipated growth and geography but the goal in a re-boundary is to be as uniform as possible. Mr. Kuper called for a vote on the motion.

**A motion was made to approve funding for Elementary 16 and Elementary 17 and the remodel/expansion of Cougar Ridge, Discovery, Endeavour, Maple Hills and Sunset for a total of \$115.5M. By a vote of hands the motion was approved unanimously.**

### **MIDDLE SCHOOL PROPOSALS**

Mr. Kuper asked the Committee to look at the Middle School recommendations in Option 1 of the Springboard Proposal. He reminded them that the PLMS rebuild was pushed from the 2012 Bond as the district was sensitive to the amount of the tax rate due to uncertain assessed valuation and economic growth. PLMS was built in 1974 and is a prime candidate for a full re-build. The other items include funding for a new 6<sup>th</sup> middle school and remodel of BLMS which was opened in 1994. Mr. Kuper noted the BLMS work (in Option #1) is mostly upgrades, updating and HVAC work – not an expansion. He asked the Committee to meet separately to discuss the recommendations.

After the committee reconvened, Mr. Kuper addressed the question as to how we ensure that new construction will handle future remodels and additions. He cited the Issaquah MS project as an example. When the City of Issaquah adopted its redevelopment plan the District was forced to go back to drawing board on IMS. The original design showed a 2-story plan but it was determined this would not allow as much expansion as we would need for the future. IMS was then redesigned as a 3-story building on a smaller footprint which allows for future expansion. The same planning was done for Issaquah HS where we have the ability to add an addition to the Performing Arts building. Remodel projects are trickier due to the impact on core facilities; however Maywood is an example of forward planning. A basement was included in the remodel at Maywood; this summer we will be framing the walls and finishing the area to add 6 classrooms (accommodates 180 students). He noted that sometimes a site is too confined for an addition, but it is part of our near term and long term construction plans.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the funding to rebuild Pine Lake MS, build a new Middle School #6 and remodel/upgrade Beaver Lake Middle School. Mr. Kuper noted that the property acquisition for a middle school site had already been approved; the location of a new MS#6 is dependent on property acquisition. The work for Beaver Lake would include cosmetic upgrades, façade work, and HVAC improvements. As there was no further discussion he called for a vote on the motion.

**A motion was made to fund \$153.5M for the rebuild of Pine Lake Middle School, construct a new Middle School #6, and a remodel/upgrade of Beaver Lake Middle School. By a vote of hands the motion was approved unanimously.**

### **REMAINING SPRINGBOARD PROPOSAL ITEMS**

Mr. Kuper noted the remaining items on Option 1 include: Land for Transportation (\$1M), Portable Classrooms (\$6M), Central Administration Expansion (\$7.5M), Project Management (\$6M), and Contingency (\$12M). A Committee member asked about the use of a contingency fund. Mr. Kuper answered that a contingency fund offers an inflationary hedge for the cost of new construction and funding for unforeseen conditions or failures. For example during the construction of Newcastle ES, a boulder on-site required unforeseen costs in blasting. Recently, the IMS gym roof experienced unforeseen failure requiring emergency repair. Moving to the option of a 4<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive High School, Mr. Kuper asked the Committee to hold discussion on that item.

A motion was made to approve funding for Land for Transportation (\$1M), Portable Classrooms (\$6M), Central Administration Expansion (\$7.5M), Project Management (\$6M), and Contingency (\$12M). In further discussion, a Committee member asked where portable classrooms are placed. Mr. Kuper replied the portables go as needed to bridge growth. Mr. Crawford added that portables would be sited to support growth between the potential approval of the bond and the time when additions come online. Mr. Kuper noted that there will be 9 new portables placed this summer (18 classrooms) at a cost of \$2M. He added that while \$6M sounds like a lot of money, portables can easily run \$3M in one year; it costs \$200K alone for site work even if we have a pad and utilities for the portable. He said the \$6M allocated for portables include moving or repurposing existing portables.

In response to the question, the life-span of a portable is approximately 15-20 years; sometimes re-decking, re-siding or re-roofing is necessary and that work comes from the portable budget. Mr. Crawford said the frame of a portable is similar to a residential house but mechanical systems have a shorter life and need upgrades and replacements. A Committee member asked if there was enough funding in the reserve contingency. Mr. Kuper answered that an inflationary hedge is built into each project budget. He acknowledged that although the contingency as a percentage of the total is small but significant number to explain to the taxpayer.

A Committee member noted that the 2012 bond included several smaller projects (carpet and flooring, HVAC improvements for example); do those items need to be included here? Mr. Kuper replied that given the size and scope of this proposal and the fact that there may be a Critical Repair Levy run in the interim (2018-19), it was decided to not add these items in this Bond. If anything was missed in this bond, it could be addressed in a later levy. In response to the question, he said that there was \$6M in the 2012 bond for contingency. In comparison, \$12M in this bond is not as much. He added that there are other means to battle the unknowns of capital projects; the district earns interest on its money until it is expended. For example, once we sell \$100M in bonds, we earn interest for 24 months until we spend the money. We may glean an additional \$4M-\$6M in investment earnings which can help offset inflationary costs. This is not something to count on to fund new construction but the additional revenue can be used for contingency.

A Committee member asked how much contingency is left from the previous bonds. Mr. Kuper said that there is none left from the 2006 bond and approximately \$4M remaining from the 2012 bond. He noted that as a percentage of the bond we are asking for about the same amount in this proposal. Another Committee member asked if there were "greener" options available in portables. Mr. Kuper answered that there are some questions regarding the "seed" portables which are significantly more expensive. That wouldn't bar us from buying fewer nicer portables or pilot a "seed" portable, but it is driven by enrollment needs. Mr. Crawford said that these portables cost quite a bit more and there are less expensive, more efficient ways to conserve energy; there is a tipping point between the need for space and how nice do you need to make the portable.

Concerning the funding for Project Management, Mr. Crawford noted that this was the cost for Capital Projects which is funded out of the bond and not general fund. Mr. Kuper said that additional support staff or project management could be added, but it roughly costs \$1M per year for the team that is currently in place. Mr. Crawford noted that the district has a long process of construction of projects with an experienced staff that is totally focused on the district. In his opinion, consultants may be focused more on their own commission or company needs. Mr. Kuper added that there is a lot of pride in knowing that he, Mr. Crawford and Capital Projects staff represent the district as the Owner in construction projects rather than outsourcing this management to outside consultants.

The motion before the Committee was seconded. As there was no further discussion, Mr. Kuper asked the Committee to vote on the motion:

**A motion was made to approve funding for Land for Transportation (\$1M), Portable Classrooms (\$6M), Central Administration Expansion (\$7.5M), Project Management (\$6M), and Contingency (\$12M). By a vote of hands the motion passed unanimously.**

At this point, Mr. Kuper asked the Committee to wait until the next meeting to discuss the proposal to construct a 4<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive High School. While the enrollment numbers support the need, changes to boundaries can cause concern for families. It will require a thoughtful amount of time for discussion at the next Committee meeting. He noted that dinner would be served at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.