



City of Cambridge Conservation Commission

147 Hampshire Street
Cambridge, MA 02139
Ph. 617.349.4680

Jennifer Letourneau, Director

jletourneau@cambridgema.gov

Public Meeting – Monday, June 17, 2024, at 7:00 PM Zoom MEETING MINUTES

The following meeting minutes were taken by Lena Frappier and are respectfully submitted.

Present Commission Members: Jennifer Letourneau, Director; Kathryn Hess; John Leo; David Lyons, Chair; Elysse Magnotto-Cleary, Vice Chair; Erum Sattar

Attendees: Lena Frappier, DPW; Kara Falise, DPW; Tess Paganelli MBTA; Christine Lantini MBTA; Alicia Thoms MBTA; Dan Driscoll DCR; Andrea Kendall, LEC Environmental; Richard Azzalina, Stantec; Charles Teague; Libby Shaw; David Bass; Eppa Rixey, James Williamson; Lisa Birk

David Lyons opened the meeting.

7:01 – Informational Presentation

MBTA

Alewife Station Property

Tess Paganelli the Director of Environmental Review and Permitting at the MBTA was in attendance and introduced Christine Lantini, the Manager of Hazardous Materials to present to the commission. Christine stated the property being presented is an undeveloped piece of land owned by the MBTA addressed as 35 Ringe Avenue extension. It's situated in a high foot traffic area and located directly across the street from the MBTA Alewife Station. She described that it's bordered by a bike path to the north and the west with a pedestrian footpath that provides station access from the bike path directly across to the station. That is this area shown. Between this blue curved building and the red outline. Christine stated neighboring properties, MBTA employees and customers have expressed public safety concerns regarding the condition of the property. She presented photos showing the debris in relation to the footpath and stated that at the time of cleanup this was an inactive encampment as there was no activity observed for at least 6 months. The debris identified consisted of biohazard waste, trash, clothing, tents, mattresses. Christine stated there was a high volume of calls to the Cambridge Police, the Transit Police and MBTA's internal systems concerning public safety. She pointed out in the photos that the perimeter fencing was constructed of fallen or dead tree limbs, vines, wooden pallets, two by fours, and it made the interior portions of the encampment hidden, particularly when the foliage was present. She presented photos of the hazardous waste found including needles, drug

paraphernalia and human waste throughout the property. Christine stated the MBTA response action was to contract with New England Trauma Services who sorted through the debris using hand tools, shovels, grabbers, and protective PPE resulting in a total of 7 dumpsters of debris unable to go to a municipal landfill. She stated once that work was completed Northern Tree came in and removed the small diameter trees, overgrown bush, and vines with the goal to open up the area to provide a clear line of sight from one end of the property to the other in all directions. Christine stated that Northern Tree places the wood chips from their cuttings on the ground surface as a sustainable approach to weed control. She summarized the stages of cleanup by presenting progress photos.

Tess stated that the people conducting this work we're not aware of the resources in this area when the work was being conducted, but the priority was public health and safety. She said they were presenting because they were made aware of the resources that were in the area, which include bordering land subject to flooding, 25-foot riverfront, border vegetated wetlands, buffers zone, bank to combined sewer overflow, and a perennial stream. Tess stated they did conduct a site visit with Jennifer Letourneau to evaluate the alterations and the resources. She said they were aware of some press and reporting that indicated a clearing of 70 plus trees. Tess shared that a tree survey was done as a part of this, not that long ago, which would indicate there were 22 trees of various sizes that were on MBTA property, 8 of which were considered desirable and native. Tess stated they tried to retain as many of the large diameter trees in good health as possible so there is still a canopy and shade provided to the stream. She also reiterated that the soil was stabilized by mulch so there isn't any risk of erosion into the stream. Tess expressed to the commission that they feel like the resources are not in imminent danger.

Moving forward Tess stated they plan on having the MBTA transit police routinely monitoring the area, which will be easier and safer now with a clear line of sight. Additionally, she said they will coordinate with Jennifer and with the City of Cambridge Conservation Commission on a planting plan for along the Western property boundary, closest most adjacent to the stream. Tess stated they understand the value of those trees and they want to make sure that the area is safe for commuters, so they look forward to consistently working together for mutually agreed solutions as she also apologized for not coming to the commission sooner.

7:12 – Public Comment

Jennifer Letourneau stated there were 3 attendees with 3 minutes each to speak and the MBTA could respond if they wanted to. She stated this was an informational presentation and there is no action being voted on by the commission.

David Lyons and Christine discussed the orientation of the photos presented to better understand the work area.

Erum Sattar also wanted to clarify the approximate size of this area. The MBTA could not present the actual size of the location, but Tess stated that the entire project was within the 50-foot buffers, so it is a very small area.

Charles Teague, a resident of North Cambridge and director at Cambridge for Trees, stated he sent an email requesting the MBTA commit to the Cambridge urban forest master plan. Charles

asked folks not to be defensive, but to move forward in a positive way. He stated that he knows the city does not have authority over the MBTA and they are not required to do certain things where these actions were obviously necessary for clean up, but he thinks they got carried away. He invited people to see the location with him to point out the larger trees that were removed. Charles stated it was overwhelming because they were unaware of who was doing the work and described that it was a larger area worked on near a drum tower. He expressed that they should be more sensitive going forward.

Kathryn Hess wanted to clarify the area of concern from Charles and asked if that was within our jurisdiction. Jennifer stated that she referenced her files on the resource area delineation and the location presented by the MBTA is the only wet resource area. Kathryn pointed out that the Conservation Commission we need to keep within our jurisdiction. Charles explained the area he was referencing was the little bridge within feet of Alewife Brook.

James Williamson stated that the presentation confirms his suspicion that this had to do with the homeless encampment and that he was aware of this throughout the entire pandemic. James stated this was a technical fix to a social problem and there should be a social based community-based solution. He mentioned finding alternative housing and policing the situation better because it's just disappointing that the people reach for the easy solution. James described another example of people lighting fires in trash barrels and seeing those removed lead to trash everywhere. He stated that he understands there are different regulations on what they are allowed to do but questioned if they were responsible and in contact with the correct agencies.

David Bass, a resident nearby who passes the area frequently, stated he was in attendance to learn more about the situation. He said he is encouraged to see Cambridge is caring for every square foot for the city and its inhabitants.

Eppa Rixey stated they were in attendance for the same reason as David and requested a copy of the presentation.

Libby Shaw, a resident of Watertown and President of Trees for Watertown stated she was in attendance after hearing of the removal of these trees. Libby said she understands there are a couple other situations in Cambridge where trees are at risk and wanted to emphasize how important it is to try to preserve existing trees wherever possible because in the kinds of heat situations that we're looking at towards the end of this week, existing trees are going to do much better handling that kind of heat than small new trees and we really need the shade and all the other services that bigger existing trees provide. Libby stated that the MBTA folks who are here seem environmentally aware, but we really should be doing everything we can to preserve existing trees wherever possible.

Erum Sattar thanked everyone for the presentation and thought it was very helpful to see. She directed a question towards Christina, asking if so many complaints were coming in for such a long time, did they go in earlier to try and figure out the degradation that was happening.

Christine stated that the environmental department became aware of the issue around fall of 2023 before they started the response actions in March identifying a funding source and contractors.

Kathryn Hess pointed a question towards Tess asking about actions to prevent the degradation of the property from occurring in the future as opposed to remediating the situation. Tess responded that keeping areas open and visible is important for the safety department and where the MBTA is in the business of transporting people and not social reform they don't always have all the answers, they look forward to dialogue and collaboration to learn more. Kathryn stated as they move forward with a management plan, she hopes to see that they identify all the resource areas at the Alewife property. Tess mentioned they are familiarizing themselves more with the area and conversations they need to have to get ahead of things. Kathryn welcomed the opportunity of another site walk to help develop plans.

Jennifer welcomed Dan Driscoll, previous project manager of Alewife for DCR for 20 years, to weigh in. He stated that these encampments have been out there for the duration of that and mentioned they are difficult to navigate. Dan said he did a bike ride of Alewife, the Greenway, the Mystic, and the Charles, a 25-mile loop, and counted 7 encampments along the rivers where most of them are in buffer zone or touching resource areas. He stated that he didn't know what the T's policy is, but they cannot allow Rangers to deal with this because sometimes there's drugs present, so they typically approach this with the environmental police. He also said they try to get services involved to help these people as a lot of times there's mental illness with the 5 state hospitals closed and the state not having a great plan of what to do with those folks besides medicate them. Dan summed up that they try to involve social services with their help being refused most times by the homeless, and involving the environmental police to make sure that regular officers or rangers aren't exposed to things that could be taking place out there. He stated that he appreciates what the MBTA is doing, and it is not easy so thank you.

Jennifer thanked Dan for his thoughts and said that Tess and Christine were both responsive and receptive as soon as everyone was made aware of the situation.

David Lyons echoed Jennifer in her comments and thanks to Tess and Christine. He also agreed with Dan as it is not an easy problem. David stated as the Conservation Commission we have a particular lens on this but there is a lot more going on here than just our concern of the resource area. He ended with thanking the representatives for their presentation and agreeing with Kathy's comments about a second look including work at neighboring properties like the bike path connectors coming from the redevelopment.

Erum also expressed her thanks and found Dan's context helpful to historicize the situation. She also asked if there would be another presentation of a proactive plan. Tess responded that they will be back as they are aware of the resources now and they will be stewards protecting the resources on their properties statewide. Tess also thanked everyone for their comments.

7:37 – Request for Determination of Applicability

MBTA

Red and Green Lines Vegetation Management (Charles River)

Alicia Thoms of the MBTA thanked the previous presenters for their work and introduced their Arborist Calvin Layton to explain the vegetation management plan for the right of way system.

Calvin stated they are in attendance concerning the Wetlands Protection Act and, CMR, 2, 3, 11, 53 C 11 the regulation for vegetation management plans for rights of way in the state of Massachusetts. He said this regulation is related to the Red and Green Line areas above ground and they are required to write a 5-year vegetation management plan, which they have done and submitted and has been approved by MDAR and is in effect now. Calvin stated they are in front of the commission to verify their wetland boundaries and limits. The two areas identified are the Longfellow Bridge area and the north side of the bridge where it comes into Cambridge with the distinct granite wall. He stated according to regulation they cannot apply herbicides within 10 feet of that wetland and out of the 10-foot zone they are limited to applying once a year. Calvin said both the buffers typically do not have vegetation on them or a lot of vegetation and if there's no vegetation, they will not treat anything. He stated their application is selective and they only treat targeted plants unless it is very thick growth. Both areas do not see a ton of seed source and the delineations were done by BSC group in June of 2022.

David Lyons asked Jennifer if there was a city review for this and she stated that over the last 20 years we see this fairly frequently. She also reminded Calvin that they are looking for a negative determination which agrees with you, but also allows that you do not have to file a notice of intent and meets the exemption.

Calvin stated in the DEP guideline they did say that a negative determination wasn't necessary. Jennifer agreed that it is consistent with right of way vegetation management. She also stated that they have gone back and forth on the submittal and many questions were already answered including the licenses of the applicators, so this is a hundred percent complete submittal and consistent with all previous submittals and what has been done. Jennifer also mentioned she has conducted field visits to the treatment areas and affirms the ability to conduct the vegetation management plan with no adverse effects in these areas.

Erum Sattar said she found it helpful to hear that there are regular inspections concerning application and elimination.

7:47 – Public Comment – no public comment

7:47 – Public Comment Closed

5 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 0 – Abstained

7:48– The commission unanimously approved a negative determination.

5 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 0 – Abstained

7:49 - Notice of Intent

DEP File #123-324

Department of Conservation and Recreation – Memorial Dr. Phase 3

Dan Driscoll, the Director for Green Transportation for the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) was present, he stated that will be an abbreviated presentation to answer more of the technical issues that need to be resolved. Dan outlined that he would address his remarks, resource area impacts, the revised form three, surface material impacts, the alternatives analysis, and then the revised NOI plans for the commission. He restated the area limits go from the

Anderson Bridge to the Elliott Bridge, about a mile in length, and includes both sides of Memorial Drive to the back edge of the sidewalk on the north and all the way to the river on the southern edge of the project. Dan said the first two phases from the Longfellow Bridge to the BU bridge were successful with a lane diet out there and did all kinds of park improvements and landscape improvements. He stated they made a real effort to protect the London plane tree alley as well as strengthen it with new plantings even though they need to remove 7 or 8 that have been severely compromised. Dan said they are expanding parkland by over an acre, and they are preserving historic features wherever possible. He stated they will be taking out all the guardrails, and there will be no guardrail along this mile of Memorial Drive, which National studies show does slow people down, but it's also just going to read much more like a park in a parkway. Dan stated they have some significant storm water treatment improvements, and the project has had extensive public engagement. He said the core of the project is an effort to try to make this centerpiece park of the DCR system safe for pedestrians and by providing an 11-foot shared use path as well as a 5-foot stabilized aggregate path that will be for pedestrians only. Dan stated they are also going to restore the sidewalk on the north side of the parkway with porous pavement that will benefit all the larger London plane trees by providing better air and water to them. He pointed out a photo of what he believes is the most dangerous section of pathway in the entire DCR system, given the numbers of users out here, 6 feet wide, non-ADA compliant, cracked with edges where runners and walkers can break ankles. Dan said he was out here leading a walk a week and a half ago with the secretary Tepper and Commissioner Arrigo and a cyclist went off the edge and wiped out 10 feet from them. He said they thought he staged it and said, no, you could probably stand out there every day and see something bad happen to people. Dan also explained they will be adding 3 new pedestrian activated signal crossings which will make a massive difference from what it is now with people jaywalking across 4 lanes down to 3 appropriate crossings across 2 lanes.

Dan introduced Andrea Kendall with the LEC to provide updates concerning the wetland resource area impacts and buffer zone. Andrea mentioned there were a lot of resubmittals of information to the city working with Jennifer and Kara to make sure that we've addressed everything as it relates to stormwater and compliance. She described a diagram that identifies the work in in flood plain and that is largely associated with the path improvements down by the Elliot Bridge and then to a minor extent the helical support piles at each of the overlooks and there are elevation by elevation to the 2 to foot 3-foot elevation and then the 3-to-4-foot elevation. Andrea said the next column in green is the proposed cut that's the compensatory flood storage and they are achieving our, no net loss of flood storage. She stated the first update to the NOI form page three is the bank they anticipate to the extent that there is vegetation at the overlook areas, there will be cutting of vegetation, so they've accounted for 60 linear feet of cutting, but there is no physical alteration of banks proposed. And then the bordering land subject to flooding, the compensatory flood storage and impacts have been updated and then finally down at the riverfront area, the numbers have changed ever so slightly. Andrea said Stantec also prepared a table identifying existing and proposed pervious and impervious areas and area net change identifies how much increase or decrease in impervious area there is for each of the resource areas and buffer zone. She pointed out the BLSF there's a slight decrease in pervious surface because of the addition between the sidewalk area, expansion and bench in the concrete footprint of the bench.

Richard Azzalina addressed the fact that the WPA form indicated an alternative analysis had been completed and the comment indicated that a copy of that analysis or some discussion of that analysis would be helpful. He stated they did submit the ENF, the Environmental Notification Form that was filed mentioning 12 design alternatives and in our response to the comment we provided an analysis of those 12 alternatives which included cross-sectional graphics. Richard pointed out a summary table with descriptions, pros and cons. For comparison evaluation within the riverfront area. He explained as required by the Secretary Certificate they were scoped to analyze and evaluate two additional alternatives in the draft EIR. One alternative he mentioned was where they were required to increase the buffer size of the buffer between the paths and the river to allow for storm water treatment and hopefully have less impervious area closer to the river. He said the second alternative that they evaluated in the draft EIR, was an alternative that minimized tree removal throughout the entire corridor. Richard stated what they came to learn when they looked at these two alternatives was that they're really opposites. One impacts trees more than the other and the other impacts the river front or the bordering land subject to flooding area more than the other. He stated they were able to develop a preferred alternative that's essentially a combination of those two. Richard addressed an area by the Elliott Bridge as the area where they have impact to bordering land subject to flooding between elevations 3 and 4 and the note at the top of the drawing indicates that impact as well as the impact to that same elevation interval on the next couple of drawings.

Dan stated that some of the other changes that they've made to the to the design stem from comments at the last public hearing with the commission.

Richard returned to say another change made was the stabilized aggregate path in the vicinity of the rest area. On the NOI plans that stabilized path kind terminates into the shared use path which is combating wheeled vehicles, or bicycles, or what have you. He stated they had a concern about potential conflicts between bicycles and pedestrians travelling in opposing directions so they continued the stabilized aggregate path all the way to the rest area and that's where the pedestrian path would terminate.

Dan clarified that there is no bicycle path, but a shared use path that's 11 feet and paved and pedestrians and bikes can use it and then there's a 5-foot stabilized path that only pedestrians can use. But the other path you'll see a lot of runners and pedestrians on as well.

Richard said that they did do additional traffic counts on Memorial Drive post pandemic and in fact, the traffic volumes have dropped about 7% compared to the traffic counts that were taken in 2019.

Kara Falise referenced her memo and stated Stantec replied with a very thorough and complete response package on April 29th and her review of that memo is what was summarized in this May 23rd document. She said Stantec's resubmission of materials addressed all the technical questions in our comment letter except for their bordering lands subject to flooding table and an alternatives analysis for the riverfront area. Subsequent to our issuing of this letter and which both topics they covered very clearly and concisely this evening, documentation was submitted to the commission on those two identified deficiencies. Kara stated with respect to it being a complete application for the commission to make a determination on, she thinks we're at that point. She highlighted the table that Andrea went through this evening wasn't a technical

requirement but thinks sort of a lot of the language in the initial submission was talking only about the reduction in impervious area and this table helps to define where various types of cover land to your jurisdiction of the resource areas. Kara mentioned there was a comment in our initial review that talked about the condition of some of the existing infrastructure that was attended for reuse. She said the DCR indicated that they're generally on top of their outfalls, but they are now proposing to replace all of the old brick structures in the curb-to-curb area with new catch basins that will have sumps and hoods so that's a huge improvement because those are standard and typical water quality features in a stormwater system that are lacking on some of the older structures. Kara also pointed out that the planting plan had changed as a result of some comments to the commission and that some trees were removed to improve that view shed but have been relocated in other places in the corridor for maintaining and establishing a tree canopy. She stated another important aspect to understand is the stabilized slope detail that they provide with staked logs would be on the bank of the river because that changes how people experience the river. They did indicate specific locations where that detail would exist, and it was about 100 linear feet of bank that will require that type of stabilization because of the changes in grade. Kara did also state that Dan reminded us a lot of it is under the purview of his contractor's means and methods and how this work gets completed, but we would advise or recommend that the commission consider a condition on their final construction plans and specifications, their SWIP and their logistics plan be submitted to Jennifer for an administrative review at which time if it was significantly different than the understanding that was presented in the notice of intent, which we don't anticipate it would be, Jennifer take action or indicate that they were okay to proceed at that time.

8:12 – Public Comment Opened

Jennifer stated there was one attendee.

James Williamson said he appreciates the work that DCR has done on this and Dan's comments earlier in this meeting and his previous presentations, especially paying attention to the balance between pedestrian safety and bicycle amenities. He stated a question not to go down the road of operations but there has been an ongoing debate and even controversy over what's called Riverbend Park and whether it should be opened or closed to automobile traffic on Saturdays, as well as on Sundays. It was closed during the pandemic on Saturdays as well as on Sundays and what I'm wondering is from the DCR's point of view, would it be open or not to automobile traffic on Saturday have any impact one way or the other on your plans?

Dan thanked James for the comments and the support and stated that's an ongoing discussion with the commissioner and some of the delegation. I certainly have talked to my commissioner. He said there's no issue for their plans relative to having a Saturday closure and once their plan is built, once you have 16 feet of additional cross-section and independent pedestrian path or restored sidewalk, the closure would still be nice, but I don't think as critical as it is today.

Jennifer stated to the commission there are no other attendees present tonight.

8:16 – Public Comment Closed

5 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 0 – Abstained

David stated Kara's comments were helpful but had questions specifically about the stabilization method and asked if we have a map showing where those 100 feet is.

Richard stated if you look at these overlook areas on the diagram, the line that runs parallel to the aggregate path represents a wood rail fence that starts about 25 to 30 feet in advance of the overlook, and it also extends another 25 to 30 feet or 40 feet in some cases beyond the overlook and then it would wrap around the overlook as well. He said that is the slope stabilization because the side slopes in that area are steeper than one and half to one.

Dan said what they've found in the upper Charles is a lot like that above Watertown, but also the Boston side, by providing good connectivity opportunities to the river with an overlook of this type tends to keep people from trampling the rest of the river. He stated when you don't control it, they fight to get to the water for fishing and whatever they want to do like watching wildlife. The landscape team will look at where they can reduce mode areas between the pathways and the river and might be able to do more tall grasses, habitat, ecologically appropriate plantings to strengthen this project and make it better for habitat and wildlife. Dan said allowing the public to have these connectivity spots that they can get out on that overlook and not worry about a bike racing up behind them are important recipes for people, especially the elderly who might use this 5-foot walking path or people with young children. He said the city of Cambridge is doing a project in the project limits and put in a pathway of sorts that is not in the plan and they're not sure if they're going to keep it or naturalize the area.

Jennifer stated that's the Willard Street outfall for commission members.

Kathryn appreciated the alternative analyses and said by looking at these different alternatives you came up with what seems like a win-win.

Elyse also thanked Richard for the presentation and Jennifer for mentioning the Willard Street outfall. She also said living in this area she knows there were some neighbors unable to attend the meeting and would like to hear more about the outreach to specifically the apartment buildings on Memorial Drive.

Dan stated historically this project had two big phases and it started with AECOM, a different consultant team. They had four public meetings with the community and led two walks on the project. He said they plan to have another public meeting possibly this summer, but sometimes summer is not a great public meeting time, so they might push it to after Labor Day. Dan also stated once it goes out to bid for construction, they will do a subsequent public meeting and it'll be a construction meeting, not a meeting for feedback from the public but to provide information about staging, closures, and schedules. He said they can check on the website to learn about all the different pieces of construction that are happening at any given time. Dan gave an example of it on Hammond Pond Parkway in Newton, another significant parkway where they're taking two lanes out of that parkway and it's been going on for about six months and we've it's been flawless as far as community input, people being on board, and understanding detours. He stated the parkway will always stay open at least one lane in each direction except for when binder and top course are being put down.

Erum Sattar stated she also appreciated the alternatives analysis but her impression looking at the comments received from the last meeting was concern about the increase of the slope into the river and wondering if that was also something that was looked at.

Richard said as part of the alternatives analysis there was a set of parameters and project objectives that they were seeking. One was to minimize the impact of the London plane tree alley and the other project goal is to minimize the riverfront area impacts. He said sometimes they were competing interests so as they went through the alternatives analysis, they really came to understand that it's a fine balance of those achievements that resulted in the preferred alternative and they ended up with an alternative that minimized the encroachment towards the river. Richard states there was no way they could construct a stable one and a half to one or one to one slope without putting in some rip rap and that wouldn't look so great. They thought the overlook was a better approach and it provides an opportunity for the public to get to the river, the river's edge. He said there's also plantings that go along with those in between the rows of coil logs so that over time it's going to look like a vegetated embankment and be more stable. Richard stated of the 12 alternatives, 7 of those utilized a parkway width of 30 feet which is something that AECOM had done previously under their initial assessment, but they looked at trying to reduce the width of the parkway to keep it to maximize the amount of parkland and concluded that they could reduce it to 26 feet.

Dan added that as significant as these improvements are that they're proposing, it's not the end of improvements out here. They understand that the riverbank itself, whether it's additional strengthening of bioengineering in some areas or battling invasives, continuing to implement our vegetation management plan that this commission has sanctioned is an ongoing process. He stated they can't fix it all as part of this but they're doing what they can in making improvements including planting upwards of 80 trees and low shrubs for habitat. Dan said they will revisit a couple of years if they need more trees down by the Anderson or on the new island by Gerry's Landing Road.

David asked Jennifer if there are particular conditions to discuss.

Jennifer stated with our construction mitigation standard conditions and addition items of care, we will have everything fully incorporated.

David said overall the improvements to the pathways for all users, storm water and pervious areas will be big improvements.

8:34 – The commission unanimously approved to issue the order of conditions.
5 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 0 – Abstained

8:35 – Administrative Topics

Meeting Minutes Approved upon spelling correction– March 25, 2024
5 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 0 – Abstained

Jennifer stated the vacancies have been posted on the city website.

8:41- David Lyons elected as new chair.
4 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 1 – Abstained

8:43- Elysse Magnotto-Cleary elected as new vice chair.
4 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 1 – Abstained

8:44 – Meeting Adjourned
5 – In Favor, 2 – Vacant, 0 – Abstained