

TOWN OF LINCOLN

LINCOLN TOWN OFFICES
16 LINCOLN ROAD
LINCOLN, MA 01773
781/259-2601



Minutes

Community Center Building Committee

August 16, 2023, 7:30 pm

Hybrid format: Donaldson Room and Zoom Meeting

Attendees

Board Representatives and At-large Members (voting members)

Jonathan Dwyer (Co-Chair), Susan Taylor, Ellen Meyer Shorb, Rob Stringer, Dilla Tingley, Sarah Chester (Chair), Krystal Wood, Alison Taunton-Rigby, Tim Christenfeld

Ex-Officio Members

Abigail Butt, Jessica Downing, Brandon Kelly, Dan Pereira, Tim Higgins

Liaisons

Wendy Kusik, Peter Von Mertens, Andrew Glass, Kim Bodner, Craig Nicholson, Indrani Kharbanda, Owen Beenhouwer, Kathryn Hawkins

ICON Architects

Mark McKevez, Ana Cheng

Minutes Taker

Edwin Tam

Others

Linda Hammett Ory, Buzz Constable, Gary Taylor, J. O'Rourke, Lynne Smith, Andy Wang, Dennis Pickett, Sally Kindleberger, Buckner Creel, Ross Tucker, Terry, Anne Sobol, Alice Waugh, Virginia Rundell, Diana, Ruth-Ann Hendrickson, Sara Mattes, JBH

The meeting started at 7:31 p.m.

1. Welcome & introductions (Sarah Chester)

Sarah C reviewed the agenda and introduced the ICON representatives. For the Open Discussion, when members of the public as well as the Committee members will be able to participate, she reminded everyone of the two-minute speaking limit so all who wish to ask a question or make a comment will have the opportunity to do so.

Jonathan D: Recently (August 2), the CCBC held a working meeting, without ICON, to review the 8 concepts as presented under 100%, 75%, and 50% guidelines from the Town special meeting. The group went through the pros and cons of each concept and the comments that were made. This information was given to ICON and they gave us feedback. The CCBC held another working meeting on August 9, reviewed the feedback, and made further recommendation for the concepts. Because the SOTT, to be held on September 30, asks the CCBC to give four 45-minute presentations, the CCBC needs to organize the presentations and focus our message.

2. Architect's Report / Review of Project Schedule (ICON)

ICON: Three schemes have been forwarded to the cost estimator. Those estimates will be ready for the September 30 SOTT meeting.

3. Review of Concepts (ICON)

ICON presented the three schemes adjusted according to the feedback from CCBC. [See the Lincoln Community Center Schemes posted on the Lincoln Community Center website:

https://lincolncommunitycenter.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/2023-08-16-3-Schemes_Reduced.pdf]

Slide 1: LINCOLN COMMUNITY CENTER - 3 SCHEMES

- Showing frame site on all 3 schemes, side-by-side for comparison.
- Allows a lot of indoor and outdoor accessibility.
- Incorporate all programs.
- Rebuilt LEAP.

Slide 2: 3 Options

Option 1: 100% The Courtyard Scheme.

Option 2: 75% The Compact Scheme

Option 3: 50% The Adaptive Re-use Scheme

Option 2: LEAP presence at the site, the front door is accessible to the turnaround for drop-off.

Two-story concept; accessible walkway to campus.

Option 3: Keep pods and renovate, add circulation around Pod A and Pod B.

All options provide for maintenance area.

Slide 3: Shows proposed pedestrians' walkway (in orange) between the Community Center and the School. Connection runs north from existing pods, LEAP to School. Is there any interest in additional crossing for southern access? We need Committee input.

Dilla T: What is the cost?

ICON: It will be included in the scheme cost. Do we want the south side currently in use? Suggest raising the walks.

Dilla: Is this a pedestrian walkway?

Brandon K: We just built this in May. It will replace some existing sidewalks, especially the eastern side. We need to build it according to DPT standards, and also large enough for a snow blower and large equipment.

Tim C: We may need some solution for the pathways.

ICON: We will take into consideration maintenance and emergency vehicles.

Susan T: Yes, need emergency access.

Brandon: Eliminate what is currently there, and add additional crosswalk for Hartwell to the field.

ICON: This is a choice to consider whether we should include in the cost estimation, continuing to the southern crossing seems unnecessary.

Brandon: Sidewalks cut through green space, maintenance hug around building in existing Hartwell.

Dilla: Seems unnecessary.

Brandon: Eliminate it, not including it in the cost estimation.

Susan: We are missing pedestrian walks.

Slide 4: Shows a brief outline of the 3 options (100%, 75%, and 50%)

Slide 5: Site Development

- Site development cost is \$3.5M for each of the 3 options
- Option 3 (50%) will not have site conservation or restorative landscape, raised crosswalk at Ballfield Road, pedestrian bridge, or Strat's playground.

Slide 6: New Community Center Square Footage

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Notes
Stories	1	2	1	
New Construction SF	20,500	13,400	6,185	Corridor additions at lower cost
Renovation SF		4,965 (Pod C)	9,885	Pods A, B
Total GSF	20,500	18,365	16,000	Based on reduced program SF

Tim H: The administrative group has had a productive meeting with the new superintendent to catch him up on the CCBC.

Dilla: We need information on actual sites on the pros and cons.

Peter V: Why Strat's place? This is part of MG and why do we fund it?

Tim C: This is to remove the old playground, but we are not required to do it.

Brandon: MG wants to remove the playground now; it is not safe to use it anymore.

Sarah C: This is the playground behind Pod B.

Brandon: This is a wood structure, not safe. Lori (MG Director) wants it to be removed.

Jonathan: This is part of the project cleaning up Strat's Place. We can have an add-on estimate on the new playground.

Dan P: Site estimate will have an add-on cost; it will benefit the whole site, but is it best to use that amount of dollars?

Jonathan: Proposal includes Strat's Place and Playground.

Dan: Strat's Place is part of the site works for clean-up.

Alison T-R: Only cleaning it up.

Jonathan: We will have an estimate of the Strat's cost.

Dan: We are not building a playground, just addressing the landscape. The goal is to try to improve it, not planning to build MG a new playground space. The current playground is protected, but there is a number associated with it.

Jonathan: Clean-up related.

Krystal W: Move playground space, site swap?

Dan: Need to talk to the School Committee.

Tim C: For clean-up, it is reasonable.

Peter: Concrete parking in front of the LEAP building spoils play space. Can we extend parking further north if we remove the maintenance pod?

ICON: The playground will be replaced.

Slide 7: Maintenance

All 3 options reflect the possibility of moving the Maintenance to Hartwell Main, renovating 1,000 SQ FT of space there.

Slide 8: LEAP and POD renovation or demolition for all 3 options

Slide 9: Sustainable Design Strategies.

A summary of which options have the following: PV ready, photovoltaic, all-electric, passive house envelop, daylight harvesting, self-fading façades, building reuse, healthy materials choices, increased ventilation, and filtration.

Susan : PV ready is not for option 3.

ICON: Option 3 needs a new roof, not renovate Pod C, only Pod A & B.

Tim C: Nothing precludes us from adding a canopy.

Andrew G: Is there enough space for a PV panel?

ICON: 10,000 SQ FT will get us there. All the options will have it.

Tim C: Have to sign a separate agreement on Pod C, need a larger-scale project.

Andrew: 50% of Pod C is not renovated; the issue is should we renovate later?

ICON: It is challenging taking on this for the Option 3 (50%).

Slide 10: Table showing the projected cost of all 3 options.

	<u>Option 1</u>	<u>Option 2</u>	<u>Option 3</u>
New Construction	\$23.6M	\$15.4M	\$5.75M
Renovation	--	\$3M	\$6M
Maintenance			
to Hartwell	-\$850K	\$0.3M	\$0.3M
Total	\$22.75M	\$18.7M	\$12.05M
Up to cost	\$25M	\$18.75M	\$12.5M

Sarah C: To clarify, Option 1 total is \$22.75M, and up to cost is \$25M. Option 2 both numbers are about the same, \$18.7M, with the up to cost of \$18.75M. And Option 3 is \$12.05M, with up to cost of \$12.5M.

Susan: Option 2 Pod C renovation, will it bring up to code?

Dilla: The current Maintenance space in Pod B, could this become activity space?

ICON: Maintenance is in a state of flux now; let's see how it plays out, easier to see when we get there.

Slide 11: Summary slide

Susan: Easier to see everything from this summary slide

ICON: There is an update since the last distribution over the weekend.

Tim H: Shows the best tradeoff, very clear on it.

Sarah C: We will make this into a pdf and post it online.

Tim H: This slide gave us the project size, site development, budget cost, parking, playground, etc., all wrapped into 1 slide.

Alison: Option 2 shows Pod C renovation is \$3M.

ICON: This is the current estimate.

Krystal: Current dollar of \$3M.

Dan: Filling out some additional dollar value.

ICON: Some.

Dilla: Strat's Place will have a dollar value.

ICON: It will be in the clean-up level; sounds like the Committee wants a number, and we can have it.

Susan: Currently Strat's Place is not safe; we need to make it safe, cannot have kids playing on it now.

Jonathan: Need to change the wording.

Susan: The north side needs to break it down a little more.

ICON: The play court is already there, we will replace it.

Susan: MG asked to take it down, we are not replacing it.

Tim C: No longer CC project to include Strat's Place; need people to understand beyond CC.

ICON: A holistic approach.

Tim C: Remove the orange dot. Need bike path, raise walkway bridge, bridge will go away, bridge to parking lot stays.

Susan: Safety is an issue, need to make the center a safer place, now may not be as safe.

Sarah C: We need to make sure the whole area is accessible to everyone, of all ages and abilities.

ICON: Possible with wider walk path.

Jonathan: Option 3 vs. Option 2, renovation is \$3M more.

ICON: Chapter 34 makes renovation of a public building by 30% in 5 years, over that, everything needs to be up to code.

Sarah C: The roof was done 1 year ago. Is 30% accumulative?

Jonathan: Pod C assessment value is \$1.64M

Slide 12: Program Table, Net SF and Gross SF

	<u>Option 1</u>		<u>Option 2</u>		<u>Option 3</u>	
	<u>Target</u>	<u>Scheme</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Scheme</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Scheme</u>
Total NSF	15,880	16,695	15,880	14,530	10,060	10,350
Total GSF	19,048	20,500	19,048	18,365	11,144	16,000

ICON: Option 3, NSF dropped, limited by existing structures.

Dilla: Is LEAP space available to us (COA&HS)?

Andy W: There is furniture there, lots of stuff, may not be practical.

Alison: They are not empty spaces.

Dilla: We cannot count on it.

Sarah C: They are also used for summer camp.

Alison: Pods A, B, and C all are used for summer camp.

Slide 13: Model shows LEAP entrance, Maintenance entrance, building entrance, and path connecting to North of campus. Also, it shows the 13,400 SQ FT roof for PV panels.

Tim C: Like the turn-around and drop-off entrance.

ICON: It makes sense to have it.

Slide 14: Shows locations of the room and functions.

Andrew: This is the 75%, right?

Sarah C: Could have potential outdoor space behind the building.

ICON: Potential space and LEAP can tie into it.

Alison: COA&HS entrance comes in the Lincoln Community Room or lobby.

Andrew: Big gathering space, responding to ideas.

ICON: Hang-out space, not disruptive to other programs.

Sarah C: Accessible to the courtyard.

Susan: Next to the Multi-purpose Room.

ICON: Plan to have a movable divider for the Multi-purpose Room and Lincoln Community Room.

Krystal: Are there any COA&HS programs in the summer?

Abby: Yes, it's reduced, lean staff, and our volunteers are normally in and out for the summer. Short answer: Summer is lighter.

Krystal: Summer all 3 pods are used by summer camp.

Dilla: Tim C suggested moving maintenance to the left.

ICON: Unless there is cost saving, a separate building requires a separate foundation and separate exterior wall.

Dilla: So two separate buildings.

ICON: Separate building added cost.

Slide 15: Option 1 shows CC drop-off and pickup, MG drop-off, pedestrian crosswalk, pedestrian bridge, and pedestrian and bike path connections.

Brandon: Where is the sidewalk for MG?

ICON: Building the southern wall is the current path.

Sarah C: The building shifts down to the south wall area.

ICON: New septic for site + utility.

Craig N: For the pedestrian bridge, children will ride bikes through.

ICON: We will grade the CC, potentially a new path tied to Lincoln Rd to that area; or south of the Start's Place.

Craig N: How do they go in front of LEAP? May go through MG.

ICON: Path is north to south.

Craig: No sidewalk on Ballfield Road?

Susan: Do we need to revisit the northern route?

Craig: Need to tie in the pedestrian path.

Sarah C: What is the crosswalk like?

Andrew: Kids come from Lincoln Road.

Brandon: Most come from Pod B.

Craig: Young kids go through the lower area; older kids go through the north side.

Susan: Need a sidewalk to come out of Ballfield Road, also need a sidewalk to the parking.

ICON: We will add that connection.

Susan: What about the Tennis Court parking area?

Sarah C: Need good safety to Ballfield Road.

Krystal: Are we losing a playable area?

ICON: Not necessarily.

Slide 16: Option 1 shows potential future expansion area.

Slide 17: Option 1 shows all function rooms, size, and all the entrances.

ICON: Next to the Lincoln Community Room, there is an open courtyard, about 65' x 50', not too big and not too small. Roof slope to maximize daylight. The Community Room is accessible to the outside courtyard. There are movable partitions between the multi-purpose room and the Lincoln Community Room. Behind the Kitchen, there is storage. The Fitness Room is at the northern end and is accessible to the outdoor courtyard. There is a separate entrance for LEAP. PRD and Activity Room are on the Lower West side. There is no single-use toilet, including staff.

Tim C: Storage is important for tables and chairs; COA&HS needs to store equipment.

Tim C: No such thing as too much storage.

Alison: Storage will be in the room.

Susan: Storage space is expensive.

ICON: Plan for it, like office space.

Abby: Storage is important; space needs to be flexible for usage, and a folding partition is needed for the Multi-purpose Rooms A & B; also, the Fitness Room with a partition so we can have 2 classes concurrently.

ICON: It would be for a smaller class, maybe 16-20 people, like yoga, with less movement.

Abby: Needs partition for Fitness Room, exercise class is approximately 15 people plus instructor. We need to be able to divide up the space.

Slide 18: Option 1 front view shows the architect's perspective of what the building looks like.

Susan : This really feels like a CC. The white building looks like a brick building.

Tim C: What materials?

ICON: Cover masonry, wood, and premium products.

Andrew: The school project is a brick façade, a concrete block at the back. Need explanation this is just the schematic drawing, not the actual one; transparency is important.

Tim C: From the value survey, the lowest interest received.

Andrew: The Historical Commission will have a design review. It is a public process, intended to see how the design fits the campus. Something simple that blends with nature and historical design is important.

Slide 19: Another angle shows Option 1.

Slide 20: Option 2 aerial view shows the path to MG, entrance to CC, and lower path connection to north of campus.

ICON: PRD is on the first floor. There is an accessible sloped walk to MG. Parking is straightforward, in front of the building. There is a lower path connection to the North campus. Also, 10,000 SQ FT roof for PV panels.

Slide 21: Shows the first floor function Rooms and the separate LEAP Building.

ICON: PRD is on the first floor for easy in and out. LEAP is on the side. Maintenance and mechanical are at the rear tucked into the slope. A large area for COA&HS.

Slide 22: Option 2 Second floor.

ICON: Stairs to the second floor. The Kitchen is next to the Multi-purpose Room, potential to go down to the porch area. The Fitness Room is at the opposite end.

Slide 23: Option 2 site view shows Community Center drop off and MG drop off. Also, a pedestrian bridge and crosswalk to the North campus. We can create a circular around the parking area.

Krystal: Are we losing MG playground in the front?

ICON: Yes.

Slide 24: Option 2 shows expansion space.

Slide 25: Option 2 Shows a circular area and entrance, with the LEAP location.

Peter: Can some parking go to the north?

ICON: May be limited, only 3 or 4 spaces, not a lot for the bucks.

Peter: It may get congested in that circular area.

ICON: Limit parking in the circular area.

ICON: Maintenance and Mechanical are at the southern end of the building

Susan: Where is the Maintenance dumpster?

Peter: Aim to have a 1 to 1&1/2 story building.

ICON: The circular drive gives LEAP a front entrance door.

Slide 26: Option 2 - The second floor shows open to the Lincoln Community Room, Multipurpose Room, Fitness Room, and Kitchen.

Dilla: The Kitchen is not adjacent to the Lincoln Community Room. The Kitchen is at the other end of the second floor.

Abby: I struggled with this design. I like the Kitchen next to the porch area, prefer the Multi-purpose Room and Kitchen together. If not possible together, then prefer the Kitchen and the Lincoln Community Room adjacent to each other.

Dilla: The Kitchen needs to be near the Multipurpose Room because of the luncheon.

ICON: For other projects, the kitchen is an active space, from 7:00 am to 2 or 3 pm. Typical to have countertops so people can put food on them; it is the center of the facility, and some have the kitchen next to the lobby.

Abby: Need a coffee bar for coffee and pastry, prefer coffee bar next to the kitchen

Dilla: Meals on Wheels pick up on the second floor; it may be a long way to the elevator.

Slide 27: Option 2 Architect's view of the CC Building.

ICON: Slope accessible to MG. No hard rail and no rail assistance are needed.

Slide 28: Option 2, another architect's view of the CC building from another angle.

ICON: Challenging because having a long building needs space to be efficient.

Slide 29: Option 3 aerial view shows the roof for PV and slope path to MG.

ICON: Keep 2 pods for renovation. Accessible slope walk to MG, requires some side walk. Parking from the front and continues to the side.

Slide 30: Option 3 shows all the functions in each room.

ICON: Maintenance is at the southern end of the building. The building's entrance comes directly to the Community Room. COA&HS and Multi-purpose A & B Room are at the north end of the building. This building is also connected to LEAP. Fitness Room is on the southern end.

Susan: Where are LEAP and MG pickup?

ICON: LEAP pickup in the semicircle in the parking lot area.

Slide 31: Option 3 aerial view shows MG and LEAP pickup and drop off. Also roof for PV panel and pedestrian bridge and crosswalk.

Slide 32: Option 3 Site plan for future expansion.

Slide 33: Option 3 shows the functions of all the rooms.

ICON: Due to the net SQ Ft and shortage in some space, there may be a decrease in programming in the new CC building. So the bumped programs will need to be held elsewhere. The Multi-purpose Room needs to be divided. PRD and COA&HS will have storage space. The Kitchen will be close to the entrance for meals and wheel pickup.

Dilla : How does PRD connect to the toilet?

ICON: There is a small corridor connecting them together.

Buck C: This looks the same as the old-school project.

Slide 34: Option 3 architect's drawing of the CC Building front.

Slide 35: Option 3 architect's drawing on the CC Building side.

Slide 36: Option 3 architect's drawing on the CC Building side view facing LEAP.

Slide 37: Summary slide for COA&HS and PRD on shared space and each room SQ FT.

Comments

ICON: Try to limit additional work on the roof, especially structural work for the building for the roof.

Krystal: Are we decreasing in parking space?

ICON: About the same. The east side will be regraded.

Tim C: With equipment on the roof, we may not have 10,000 SQ FT FOR PV.

ICON: Good point; equipment may need to go somewhere.

Andrew: Mechanical takes up a lot of roof space, so is there sufficient room for all-electric buildings?

Susan: We may need the north bridge.

ICON: For the drawing, blue is glazing/glass, corridor is indoor space, we will add doors.

ICON: We would like permission to move forward on these 3 options.

Susan: I am not convinced the pedestrian and parking area is good for the plow; also, it is a long walk from the retaining wall.

ICON: We need the retaining wall, this is challenging to remove or add green space, we will look at it.

Alison: For the wetland setback, we want it but may not be able to have it.

Sarah C: This change will add cost significantly.

ICON: Need for the storm management system.

Susan: This feels like a CC; it also answers a lot of the safety questions, and makes me happy.

Dilla: Let's do the 100%, 75%, and 50%, the like and don't like.

Dennis P: Program language is important. The Committee needs to go through the number and raise the question, do we need all this space? This is very important to communicate to the Town. If they don't have the conference room, what does it mean? For option 3, is there a reduction in programs? Where and what that is. For some of the staff office, can it go somewhere?

Alison: For the programs, it is still there, just the size of the room reduced.

ICON: Option 3, Fitness Room is still full-size SQ FT. For the community room, show timeline and overlap; for the Multi-purpose Room, the ability to sub-divide the room.

Alison: Careful language is important.

Andrew: Reducing what?

ICON: Reduce functionality.

Andrew: Reducing size of the room makes it difficult to use.

Alison: It is clear on how to label it.

Dan: For example?

Alison: Fine print and color, programs language on existing programs.

Dilla: That may not be true.

Dan: We can look at it.

Dilla: Reduced functionality may reduce participation.

Dan: Reduced due to space constraints.

Lynne S: Hard to see numbers, size, etc., request to post this online. The 50% option is appealing, but some may have pushback. The 50% option looks as good as you can. Solar PV should not drive everything; we do what we can in renovation and energy efficiency.

Andrew: We are not backing off on the green energy, energy-efficient buildings, or all-electric buildings. We need the information to make an informed decision.

Linda H: As for the SOTT meeting, are there sufficient programming needs? PRD information is helpful on how space is used but still needs to be clear, like the number of people in each room, and how many people it can accommodate. Option 3, Room A & B (Multi-purpose), cut down the size of the room. What about connectivity to LEAP, it cannot access LEAP. Bathroom access, why just for COA&HS? What about Boy Scouts? Where can they use the restroom? The 2-story building is treacherous for Meals on Wheels during winter; and needs an elevator to access to second floor. The sloped pathway seems treacherous, and we still need a handrail.

Jonathan: Thanks for the feedback.

Sara M: Impressed with the work that has been done so far. At the first public meeting, ICON expressed the concept of "remodel, repurpose and reuse." These comments coincide with the lesser cost option. Our driving concern is cost and green to effectively achieve the goal. The code required us to have a visible railing for the bathroom, pathway, building, and parking will have cover for green energy. At the annual meeting, the stakeholders will address the options and costs. Linda's comment on language related to program reduction, and program compromise, suggests not using this language. There are facilities owned by the Town that can have these programs. The existing attendance should drive the size of SQ FT. We can support these activities elsewhere in town.

Buck: I looked closely at the site diagram, access in the east side of Hartwell; how do trucks access it? Do we need to remove some trees? Conservation and School are quite strict on this; once the building is up, how do you renovate Pod C later? As for the Hartwell renovation, this is a small project, same for Strat's Place, just clean up. Solar panels, air handlers, HVAC, and equipment, all take up space.

RuthAnn H: Overall an integrated program involves PRD, COA&HS, and School; not just COA&HS cost, but other costs are needed here. From the design, too many windows on the west side; we will lose heat, need to look at that.

Owen B: The reality is how projects like this progress. The architect does an amazing job with tradeoffs. We have to remember the mathematics: 100%, 75%, and 50% (cost). This is a multiple of \$25M; this is a functional building and some of the stuff we cannot easily change. The Committee needs to go with the 3 options, 100%, 75%, and 50%. Maybe 50% is out of reach, we may want to try the 60%

Motion: Jonathan D moved that **The Committee authorizes ICON to proceed with the 3 options (up to 100%, up to 75%, and up to 50% cost) with LEAP renovation.**

Krystal: Second.

Aye votes: Susan Taylor, Ellen Meyer Shorb, Sarah Chester, Dilla Tingley, Rob Stringer, Krystal Wood, Alison Taunton-Rigby, Jonathan Dwyer, Krystal Wood, Tim Christenfeld.

Concur votes: Tim Higgins, Dan Pereira, Abby Butt, Brandon Kelly, Peter Von Mertens, Craig Nicholson, Andrew Glass, Owen Beenhouwer, Jessica Downing, Edwin Tam.

Motion passed.

4. CCBC Administration (Sarah Chester).

Sarah C: For the project timeline, we need a working meeting before the Sept 12 forum, either Sept 5 or 6. All agreed to hold the working meeting on Wednesday, Sept 6.

Communication Sub-Committee meeting next Wednesday, 8/23, at 2 p.m.

Jonathan: There is a lot of work, does the Sub-committee need help?

Tim C: Yes, who can help?

Jonathan: Who can pitch in? Q & A needs to take a lot of thinking, especially for the SOTT.

Susan: The School Committee meeting is coming up also.

4.1 Decision: Approve minutes for the July 26 CCBC meeting

Sarah C asked for a motion to **approve the minutes for the July 26 CCBC meeting pending any edits sent to her by Friday, August 18, at 5 pm.**

Alison moved, Krystal seconded. All approved by show of hands.

Motion passed.

5. Adjourn

Motion: Sarah Chester asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting by a voice vote. Tim C moved and Krystal W seconded.

The vote passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 pm.