WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: **INVASIVE SPECIES SUB-COMMITTEE**

DATE: **FEBRUARY 28, 2014**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:	**OTHERS PRESENT:**
SUPERVISORS DICKINSON	MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY
CONOVER	JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
MONROE	FRANK E. THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER
FRASIER	SUPERVISORS BROCK
BEATY	MCDEVITT
SIMPSON	MERLINO
STROUGH	SEEBER
	TAYLOR
	WESTCOTT
	MICHAEL SWAN, COUNTY TREASURER
	DAVE WICK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE LAKE GEORGE PARK COMMISSION
	RICH NAWROT, EAST SHORE SCHROON LAKE ASSOCIATION
	JANE SMITH, EAST SHORE SCHROON LAKE ASSOCIATION
	BILL MCGHIE, EAST SHORE SCHROON LAKE ASSOCIATION
	ED GRIESMER, PRESIDENT OF THE LOON LAKE PARK DISTRICT ASSOCIATION
	MARILYN DRUSINSKY ABRAMS, DRU ASSOCIATES, INC.
	RON DRUSINSKY, DRU ASSOCIATES, INC.
	KEN MINGES, GLEN LAKE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION
	DOUG PATON, BRANT LAKE ASSOCIATION
	DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
	SARAH MCLENITHAN, SECRETARY TO THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

Mr. Dickinson called the Invasive Species Sub-Committee meeting to order at 11:21 a.m.

Motion was made by Mrs. Frasier, seconded by Mr. Simpson and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the agenda were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Commencing the agenda review, Mr. Dickinson stated the first item on the agenda was a discussion regarding the allocation of the remaining $150,000 budgeted in 2014 for other Lakes within Warren County. Mr. Conover proposed dividing the funds equally between the Towns of Horicon, Chester and Lake Luzerne for invasive species efforts within the Lakes located in the aforementioned municipalities. Mr. Strough questioned whether the proposal made by Mr. Conover included the Town of Queensbury and Mr. Dickinson replied in the negative. Mr. Monroe queried if a determination was rendered with regards to whether the funding could be allocated to lakes that did not provide public access and Mr. Strough replied affirmatively. He explained the County Attorney determined lakes with no public access were ineligible for funding.

Mr. Strough advised a request had been submitted for funding in the amount of $25,000 for Glen Lake, which was located in the Town of Queensbury to assist with the eradication of eurasian milfoil. He said he felt Glen Lake should receive a portion of the funding, as there was public access on the lake and their submission had included a formal plan for eradication.

Mr. Monroe suggested a requirement be enforced that the municipalities provide a portion of

matching funds towards the invasive species effort to be eligible for funding, as he did not think the financial burden should fall solely on Warren County. Mr. Dickinson advised a determination was needed as to how the $150,000 would be allocated. Mr. Simpson questioned whether Glen Lake would be providing matching funds and Mr. Strough replied affirmatively. He advised they would be contributing a local match of $55,000 to $60,000 towards the eradication efforts. He said the $25,000 would be used to further the management program.

Mr. Strough apprised he felt eradication efforts should include whether additional funding requests would be required and a detailed plan summarizing the proposed decrease in invasive species on a yearly basis. He reiterated he would like Glen Lake to be included in the allocation of the $150,000 in funding.

Mr. Dickinson asked how the funding would be applied for prevention efforts in Glen Lake and Mr. Strough replied the $25,000 would be allocated to spot treat nuisance vegetation areas and complete annual lake water quality and aquatic plant surveys. He said the funds were needed to control invasive aquatic species, and in particular the non-native aggressive invasive eurasian water milfoil. He pointed out if no action was taken the cost of future efforts would increase substantially and harm the ecology of the lake. Mr. Dickinson questioned whether the boat launches on Glen Lake were unsecured and Mr. Strough responded the private boat launch was unsecured and the public boat launch was only for car top vessels such as kayaks and canoes; therefore, he said, it did not need to be secure.

Mr. Merlino stated he had originally assumed the $300,000 earmarked for invasive species would be subject to some type of application process; however, he continued, he was concerned the funds allocated to Lake George were not subject to any such process. He pointed out the minimum amount of funding required by Lake Luzerne to prevent the lake from being overtaken by the invasive species this year was $100,000. Mr. Dickinson advised that while he was sympathetic to Mr. Merlino's concerns he felt the $150,000 awarded to Lake George was appropriate and noted he anticipated additional requests for funding for Lake George would be forthcoming this year. Mr. Merlino stated he had assumed the $300,000 would be distributed evenly to the six lakes discussed during the October 2013 Budget Committee meetings. Mr. Dickinson reiterated he felt the $150,000 awarded to Lake George was suitable, as it was the largest Lake in Warren County and had a significant economic impact on the area.

Mr. Strough restated he felt Glen Lake should be included in the allocation of the additional $150,000, as it was one of the lakes mentioned during the October 2013 Budget Committee meetings. Mr. Dickinson advised Glen Lake was being considered for funding and noted a determination was required as to how the $150,000 would be disbursed.

Mr. Westcott apprised he supported the request for Glen Lake to be included in the disbursement of the $150,000. Mr. Dickinson stated the lakes being considered for a portion of the $150,000 in funding were Glen Lake, Schroon Lake, Brant Lake, Loon Lake and Lake Luzerne. Mr. Taylor advised invasive species was a County-wide problem that needed to be addressed. Mr. Monroe said he felt the funding was for both prevention and control of invasive species and noted additional funding would be required for the County-wide initiative for boat washing stations.

Mr. Beaty suggested parameters be developed for next year to assist in determining who was eligible for funding to ensure the funds were being utilized efficiently. Mr. Dickinson said the discussion on the $150,000 allocation could be tabled until an outline was developed on how the funds would be disbursed; however, he aid, this would delay the disbursement of the funds. He said he felt it would be more prudent to make a determination on the allocation at this meeting and then

develop a procedure for awarding future funding at a forthcoming meeting.

Mr. Monroe advised he felt the key to prevention was in enforcing mandatory inspections and boat washing. He said he was concerned if the entire $150,000 was allocated an additional source for funding for the County-wide prevention program would be required. Mr. Simpson agreed with Mr. Monroe that a County-wide initiative requiring mandatory boat inspections and boat washing at stations would play a significant role in preventing the spread of invasive species from lake to lake.

Martin Auffredou, County Attorney, advised the ideal situation moving forward would be to develop criteria with a deadline for an application to be presented to the County which would provide the funding needs of each municipality and their justification as to why they required the funding. He said the Committee could use the information presented in the applications to determine how much funding should be earmarked in the Warren County budget to combat invasive species and then conclude how the funds would be allocated based upon the expressed needs of the applicants. Mr. Dickinson stated the agenda for the next meeting would contain discussion on developing criteria to determine how future funding should be awarded.

Discussion ensued.

Pursuant to the discussion, motion was made by Mr. Conover, seconded by Mrs. Frasier and carried unanimously to allocate the funding earmarked for combating invasive species in other lakes located within Warren County in the 2014 County Budget to the Town of Chester in the amount of $41,666.67, the Town of Lake Luzerne in the amount of $41,666.67, the Town of Horicon in the amount of $41,666.67 and the Town of Queensbury for Glen Lake in the amount of $25,000. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. McDevitt suggested the Committee contact Dr. Daniel Molloy, a biologist who had been featured in a recent New York Times article because of his work at a laboratory in Cambridge, New York discovering a bacterium that killed zebra muscles but appeared to have little or no effect on other organisms. He said he thought Dr. Molloy would be a good resource to utilize in developing a plan to eradicate invasive species utilizing a natural solution. Dave Wick, Executive Director of the Lake George Park Commission, added that he felt Dr. Molloy would be a useful resource to utilize if his schedule permitted to assist with the efforts to combat invasive species.

With regards to Agenda Item 2, Mr. Dickinson advised Mr. Monroe would be making a power point presentation regarding the Loon Lake Milfoil Program. Mr. Monroe reviewed the power point presentation in detail; *a copy of which is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Monroe apprised the presentation detailed the management of the eurasian watermilfoil in Loon Lake using the aquatic herbicide Renovate On Target Flakes (OTF). He noted Loon Lake was the second lake in the Adirondacks to be granted permission to use Renovate OTF to manage eurasian watermilfoil. He said the eradication efforts on Loon Lake commenced in 2000 and the expenses had steadily increased each year.

In reference to the permit, Mr. Monroe advised the application was submitted in 2012 and approval was granted in March of 2013. He stated the use of Renovate OTF in Loon Lake began in May of 2013. He apprised one of the consultants who had worked on the project speculated that the native plant species in the lake had decreased from 31 in 2005 to 28 in 2012 because the eurasian water milfoil was "choking them out". He stated in 2012 there was eurasian water milfoil discovered at 32% of the survey sites and 41% of the surface area within the littoral zone which is where the eurasian water milfoil can grow.

Mr. Monroe apprised the majority of the work completed from 2000-2005 was hand harvesting conducted by the volunteer scuba divers. He said since the infestation increased steadily they worked with a consultant to hand harvest and use benthic barriers; however, he stated, the infestation continued to expand. He summarized the number of sites mapped and cleared from 2010-2012.

Mr. Monroe stated, the consultant recommended in 2012 that Renovate OTF be used to treat the eurasian water milfoil; therefore, he said, they contacted the Adirondack Park Agency (APA). He apprised the APA informed them before consideration was given that a lake-wide tier three survey was required. He advised the lake-wide survey of all of the aquatic plants was completed at the end of 2012 and the application to use Renovate OTF in 2013 on Loon Lake was submitted to the APA.

Page 7 of the presentation, Mr. Monroe advised, listed the results of the lake-wide survey. He pointed out about three acres of very dense beds of infestation was depicted on the lower right hand corner of the map. He said the treatment consisted of 14.9 acres utilizing 1,207 pounds of Renovate OTF at an actual cost of $55,574, which was substantially more than what was projected. He explained the measures taken to limit the non-target impacts consisted of utilizing a sequestration curtain to allow for a lower application rate, commencing treatment in the spring when the eurasian water milfoil emerges and postponing treatment when there were sizable rain storms.

Mr. Monroe apprised the goal was to reduce the infestation coverage of the eurasian water milfoil within the treatment area and achieve control of currently uncontrolled areas. He stated the benefits projected were restoring the value and function of a deep water marsh which consisted of the shallow south end of the lake, reducing infestation in the area of high boat traffic, enhance recreational opportunities and aesthetics and reduce long-term management costs for control.

Mr. Monroe stated an issue occurred when the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) determined the scope of individuals who were notified about the project was insufficient. He said the range was increased to include individuals in the Towns of Bolton, Horicon and Warrensburg.

With regards to the quantity of Renovate OTF utilized, Mr. Monroe advised because the lake level and flow were lowered by the dam, the amount of Renovate OTF required was significantly less than projected. He stated the actual cost of $55,574 did not include the contributions from the Town of Chester Department of Public Works and the volunteers.

Mr. Monroe apprised a windy weather event occurred shortly after the installation of the sequestration curtain resulting in several partial tears in the curtain which required repairs. He said the APA evaluated the results by examining the triclopyr concentrations, the effects the Renovate OTF had on the eurasian water milfoil, changes to native species composition and other observable non-target impacts. He stated the actual triclopyr concentrations progressed slower than what had been projected.

In reference to the percentages of reoccurrence in the sites surveyed, Mr. Monroe advised there was a significant reduction and he noted there was no reoccurrence in the dense area referenced earlier. He pointed out the number of native species had increased since the treatment, which the consultant felt was directly related to the reduction in the eurasian water milfoil.

Mr. Monroe stated educational material was posted at the Loon Lake boat launch/wash station to assist in making boaters more aware of aquatic invasive species. He said the boat washing station was open twelve hours a day and was gated after hours.

Mr. Dickinson apprised he was impressed with the presentation and applauded Mr. Monroe for his due diligence and time spent on combating the eurasian watermilfoil in Loon Lake. Mr. Monroe interjected that he would like to commend the efforts of the members of the Loon Lake Association, as they played a major role in the project.

Mr. Conover questioned whether there was any record available in reference to the stewards identifying eurasian water milfoil and Mr. Monroe deferred to Ed Griesmer, President of the Loon Lake Park District Associaiton. Mr. Griesmer advised because mandatory boat inspection were required they had been able to complete thorough inspections of every vessel and ensure the invasive species were washed off the vessels before entering the lake. He said another inspection was completed when the vessel exited the lake to certify the invasive species would not spread to any other bodies of water the vessels may enter.

Mr. Conover stated Lake George was dependent upon the success of the smaller lakes in their prevention and combating efforts, as the boats generally traveled to the different waterways throughout the County. He said the expectation was for the Loon Lake site to become a regional wash station to tag vessels that would be honored at any of the other lakes within the County.

Mr. Monroe added the boat inspectors and attendants found there was a great deal of traffic between Schroon Lake, Loon Lake, Brant Lake, Lake George and Lake Luzerne. He said the SAVE Group was attempting to develop a regional plan to move the wash stations away from the water bodies to avoid congestion.

Mr. Monroe voiced his concern with the bid specification requirements that the contracted divers be paid the prevailing wage rate of $55 an hour for industrial divers, which was not relevant to the actual work being completed. He suggested referring the concern to the Legislative Committee for further discussion and the Committee concurred.

With regards to pending items, Mr. Dickinson advised Pending Item 1 could be deleted, as the County Attorney had prepared a list of questions for the candidates regarding the consulting services for SEQRA/EIS documentation preparation. Pending Item 2, Mr. Dickinson said would be addressed at a later date.

Mr. Auffredou apprised the lowest responsible bidder had been identified in reference to the boat washing stations; however, he said, they were $13,893 above the $100,000 that was budgeted. He stated that the SAVE Group had indicated they would provide the additional funding required as a contribution to the County to keep the process moving forward. He advised he felt this was an indication of a continued partnership on the project and he had no legal concerns with regards to the contribution. He suggested moving forward with the acceptance of the funds at the same time the bid was awarded. He noted he would ensure, through an agreement with the SAVE Group, that they recognized they had no ownership of the Counties property. As an alternative, he stated, the additional funds could be advanced and reimbursed through the grant; however, he recommended utilizing the funds offered by the SAVE Group. Mr. Monroe added that the SAVE Group requested that he meet with Mr. Auffredou to discuss how the funds would be allocated from the County to the Lake George Park Commission. Mr. Auffredou advised he could develop a master agreement that depicted how the funds would be managed.

Mr. Dickinson suggested a short recess prior to commencing the interview with a consultant for SEQRA/EIS (StateEnvironmental Quality Review Act/Environmental Impact Statement) document preparation. The Committee recessed from 12:27 p.m to 12:34 p.m.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Dickinson introduced Marilyn Abrams and her husband Ron Drusinsky of the Dru Associates, Inc, who were one of the respondents to the request for proposal (RFP) for consulting services for SEQRA/EIS document preparation. He stated they would begin by asking the questions prepared by Mr. Auffredou, followed by any additional questions the Committee members may have.

Mr. Dickinson requested a summary of the relevant background and experience of Dru Associates, Inc. which qualified them to undertake the project on behalf of the County.Ms. Abrams replied she had started Dru Associates, Inc. 28 years ago and had been in business ever since. She said they considered themselves scientists but noted they were consultants. She stated they had worked on a wide range of projects that included invasive species, wetlands, permitting, wetland construction, etc. She apprised they advertised very little, as most of their contracts were from the same clients they had worked with for a number of years. She advised they were currently working on an invasive species project in the Village of Hewlett Harbor, New York. She explained they completed a management plan for them last year, worked on permitting and NYSDEC monitoring, and she advised their contract was just renewed for another year to do a whole year study in conjunction with the NYSDEC.

Mr. Drusinsky added his previous work experience was with the NYSDEC as a supervisor of fish and wildlife. He stated the company was founded because they recognized the need for independent scientists to assist landowners, developers and entities such as the County in providing scientific analysis. He apprised their work focused on waterfront endangered species, wetlands, natural resource management and water quality and he noted most of the work completed was encompassed under New York State's Environmental Conservation Law.

Mr. Monroe questioned whatthe elements of the SEQRA process were and what experience they had relative to this process. Ms. Abrams replied they prepared a large number of SEQRA reviews and noted they were fully familiar with all aspects of the SEQRA process. Mr. Drusinsky added over the 28 years they had been in operationthey had either been the lead consultant for many EIS's or they were a team member depending on the client and the circumstances. He stated he thought the majority of the EIS information would originate from research through public interaction, literature and field research. He said although he did not foresee any issues, should something be unearthed during their research they could include it in the EIS. As an example he advised they were the lead environmental consultants for the work completed at the Saratoga National Gold Club which had required an extensive SEQRA process that would take a number of years to design, permit and implement. Ms. Abrams added that NYSDEC used this particular case as training ground for their staff because the results were so significant.

Mr. Auffredou queried whether Dru Associates, Inc. had prepared a strategic plan of action for the EIS, as he felt it was a key to the success of the project, and they replied affirmatively. He asked if they could elaborate on the work performed for the Fund for Lake George in 2009 and in what way that work qualified them for the project, as well as provide details in how that work could assist them with completing this project. Mr. Drusinsky explained any relevant literature from the review completed in 2009 for the Fund for Lake George project could be used in conjunction with further literature reviewed from 2009 to present for this particular project. He said the project for the Fund for Lake George included a report and an annotated bibliography of which they had PDF versions available in their files; however, he stated, he was unsure whether the report was ever published or distributed.

Mr. Dickinson advised the County worked closely with the Fund for Lake George, as they were members of the SAVE Group and he queried whether Dru Associates, Inc. had any issues with him

inquiring about their work history with the Fund and Mr. Drusinsky responded he would encourage that he do so. Ms. Abrams added a copy of the report and the annotated bibliography could be supplied for their review.

Mr. Auffredou questioned if the cost of their proposal would have been significantly higher had they not performed the literature review in 2009 and Ms. Abrams replied she felt the literature review they completed went above and beyond that of what was considered a normal literature review to include an entire historical perspective. Mr. Drusinsky further explained he would be reviewing the data collected from the 2009 report from a different perspective, which was why the literature review encompassed such a large portion of the proposal costs.

Mr. Monroe asked whether the Dru Associates, Inc. would be able to provide the cost of the a no action alternative, as he felt it was important for the public to understand, and they replied affirmatively. Mr. Drusinsky advised the central value of natural resources had become a significant subject over the last few years in scientific literature. He stated a number of his colleagues around the world had become aware of how important it was to associate natural resources with the gross domestic product (GDP) because there were real costs linked to them. He said a great deal of scientists had published papers questioning what the environment represented in dollars and he felt a dollar amount could be included in their report relative to no action being taken. Mr. Monroe apprised the economy of the Adirondacks had been mostly dependent upon the timber and mining industries. He continued, since these industries were in a decline, tourism was now a major contributing economic factor, which was why he felt it was so imperative to show the cost of no action was significantly greater than undertaking an action plan.

With regards to the economic impact of the Oswego River /Salmon River Project they worked on, Mr. Auffredou advised he sensed they were projecting similar results with the County project. Mr. Drusinsky stated the Salmon River had over 55,000 fisherman during September and October. He said in the economic development portion of their work, Ms. Abrams had suggested considering zoning and land use protection along the river front, to which the public responded negatively. He apprised they had been astounded to find no land use regulations on an area so dependent upon natural resources. He continued, the economics, the local interests and how individuals determined to conduct themselves were all vital elements.

Mr. Dickinson queried whether they were aware of the comprehensive plan completed by the Lake George Park Commission on boat washing and inspection on Lake George and they responded they were aware of the plan but had not reviewed it.

Mr. Conover asked whether they had any thoughts on the type of strategy to combat invasive species in all bodies of water and Mr. Drusinsky replied he anticipated this project in many circumstances would parallel the Hewlett Harbor case. He explained Hewlett Harbor wanted to treat the duckweed issue with chemicals; however, he said, the NYSDEC would not allow them to do so until they developed a formal plan. He explained that he had to consider both public interest and the procedures at NYSDEC. He stated he dealt with various divisions of the NYSDEC such as fisheries, pesticides, habitat which referred to freshwater wetlands, tidal wetlands, as well as County Department of Public Works. He advised this case provided verification that he had experience with navigating with the different entities involved.

Mr. Drusinsky projected the NYSDEC would require them to provide a listing of all the species in the lakes before they could present their ideas to deal with the invasive species issue. He apprised their management plan for Hewlett Harbor consisted of the different scenarios they felt could deal with the duckweed issue. He pointed out all parties involved realized the process would be lengthy. Ms.

Abrams added they were able to receive the permits for pesticide application despite being told it would never happen because they had provided respectable scientific and monitoring data. She pointed out a way to generate a good working relationship with the NYSDEC was to provide them with reliable scientific information. Mr. Drusinsky added he had an advantage over others, as he sustained communication with his former colleagues at the NYSDEC who were still there today.

Mr. Conover advised he felt they would not be able to move forward with the project if the County did not receive the support of the NYSDEC and Mr. Drusinsky concurred. Ms. Abrams stated she felt they forged a respectable professional relationship with the NYSDEC and used the Saratoga National Gold Club project as an example of a successful joint venture.

Mr. Conover stated he felt the work completed on the Warren County project would be utilized as a model for the State; however, he added, he felt strong political influence would be required to complete the project. He asked Dru Associates, Inc. to elaborate on invasive species that posed a significant threat of emerging within the water bodies of Warren County. Mr. Drusinsky explained an appropriate example was his experience in New Zealand, where visitors were notified before entering the Country that if they intend to go fishing their equipment would be subjected to inspection. He apprised this level of concentrated action presented challenges politically, economically and socially; however, he said, it had been executed in some locations.

Mr. Drusinsky advised there were a number of minor details that needed to be included in the project which were relevant to boats that he felt the NYSDEC would find useful. With regards to the Hewlett Harbor project, he stated that his contact at the NYSDEC had confided he was unsure if he could rely upon the Municipalities to execute the efforts necessary for the prevention and control of invasive species. He apprised he demonstrated the Municipalities were serious about their efforts so the NYSDEC officials could be assured the project would not be a failure and reflect poorly upon them. He said he felt he would be successful in convincing the NYSDEC to support Warren Couny's project.

In reference to other water bodies in the County that were not accessible to power boats, Mr. Auffredou questioned whether these water bodies should be considered in the project, as well. Mr. Drusinsky apprised if they were selected to work on the project they would attempt to visit every water body in Warren County that was accessible by roadway. He said that although the request for proposal stated kayaks and canoes were not necessary to be considered, he felt they should not be ignored as they played a role in the spread of invasive species. He said that since all water bodies in Warren County could not be regulated, education would be a key component to prevention.

Mr. Monroe asked whether they would consider reducing the cost of their proposal if some of the work could be completed internally and they replied affirmatively. Mr. Drusinsky pointed out the contract at the Saratoga National Golf Club was budgeted at $750,000; however, he said, the actual project cost was $600,000.

Mr. Conover advised he felt the success or failure of the project would be dependent upon how the County determined to expend the first $75,000. Mr. Drusinsky stated they would focus on whatever the County desired and added if they were selected for the project this would be the main contract they worked on this spring. With regards to outreach, Mr. Conover apprised he felt the outreach aspect of the project was a major component, as the public needed to be educated on the severity of invasive species.

Mr. Drusinsky advised if they were selected he would require contact information for all interested parties, such as those at the NYSEDEC, the Planning Department's GIS Unit and third party affiliates.

Ms. Abrams added it would be helpful to know if there were any individuals who had been particularly unsupportive of the County efforts and Mr. Monroe replied they had been unable to receive the support of the Warren County Conservation Council because of their concerns with restricting the time allowed to launch boats so they could fish. He said they had indicated they were considerate of the issues but were concerned they would be unable to launch their boats to go fishing at 3:00 a.m. if they so desired. He apprised he felt education would be key in convincing them it would be beneficial for them to cooperate.

Ms. Abrams asked if there was a time frame for when a final decision would be rendered on which consultant was selected and Mr. Dickinson replied a decision would be made shortly after the interviews concluded on March 6, 2014. He noted he would keep them apprised throughout the process. Mr. Monroe added that a determination as to what would be budgeted to the project had not been made as of yet.

As there was no further business to come before the Invasive Species Sub-Committee, on motion made by Mr. Conover and seconded by Mr. Simpson, Mr. Dickinson adjourned the meeting at 1:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah McLenithan, Secretary to the Clerk of the Board