



Members

James Tillotson, Chair
Fred Krampits, Vice Chair
Derek Dobosz
Gary Labrie
Jerry Roy

APPROVED 9-12-2023

MINUTES
August 8, 2023

The following are the minutes of a public hearing held Tuesday, August 8, 2023 at 6:30 PM in the City Council Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall, 274 Front Street, Chicopee, MA 01013.

Members Present: Tillotson (zoom), Krampits, Labrie, Dobosz

Member Absent: Roy

Also Present: Councilor Laflamme, Councilor Pniak-Costello, Mike Pise (Chief of Staff), Tim Reilly (Associate City Solicitor), Councilor López, Doug Ellis (City Engineer), Elizabette Batista (DPW Superintendent), Stephen Zajchowski (Chief of Human Resources)

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM by the Vice Chair.

In compliance with the open meeting laws the Vice Chair asked if anyone in the audience was recording the meeting. Hearing none the meeting continued.

Some of the audio is inaudible.

Councilor motion to close public input – Councilor 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					X
Krampits	X				
Dobosz	X				
Labrie	X				
Roy			X		

Motion passed.

ITEM #1

MEETINGHOUSE ROAD - Odd side – from the intersection of Chicopee Street & Meetinghouse Road – all the way to the beginning of the driveway of Stefanik School – Directly across from the intersection of Elcon Drive & Meetinghouse Road. - PARKING PROHIBITED

Elizabette Batista stated I think that for item number one, it should actually say “parking prohibited” from Chicopee Street all the way to Meadow Street because item two only talks about no stopping or standing. So we should be extending the no parking all the way to Meadow Street from the outside of meetinghouse road, from the intersection of Chicopee Street to the intersection of Meadow Street, and then item two will address the no stopping and standing.

Doug Ellis stated that just having the entire street, since the item two only deals with the no stopping or standing. So we have the no parking item on being from Chicopee Street to Meadow Street, then that should cover it.

Elizabette Batista stated that the signs would still work. The signs within that ordinance will just say all three. It'll say, “No parking, No Stopping, No Standing”.

Councilor López stated that it will still just be one sign.

Elizabette Batista stated Yes, not multiple signs. If you read the item number one, it's referencing the driveway to Stefanik School across from Elcon Drive. Elcon Drive is kind of like in the middle of where you wanted those signs. I don't think that's an accurate distance anymore. I would just reference the no stopping, no standing up to the address, 139 - 145.

Councilor López stated that the biggest issue was from the driveway down to Meadow Street. If we want to do them along the field, just to keep it on both sides of the school, that's fine by me as well. What I was saying was I wanted more coverage. I wanted more coverage on that side. But I wasn't necessarily saying that I needed no stopping or standing on that side, because parents could line up on that side now that we have signs on the other. So it actually might make more sense.

Doug Ellis stated that the 540 would just increase to 920 feet and that would bring it all the way to 139 and 145.

Councilor Dobosz motion to close public input – Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Dobosz motion to amend – Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				

Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Dobosz motion to approve the amended version– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

AMENDED VERSION TO READ AS:

MEETING HOUSE ROAD

PARKING PROHIBITED

Odd side of Meeting House Road – Entire length – Parking Prohibited

ITEM #2

MEETINGHOUSE ROAD - South (Odd) side – From Meadow Street to a point 540 feet westerly thereof- NO STOPPING OR STANDING

Councilor Dobosz motion to close public input – Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Dobosz motion to amend – Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Dobosz motion to approve the amended version– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					X
Krampits	X				
Dobosz	X				
Labrie	X				
Roy			X		

Motion passed.

AMENDED VERSION TO READ AS:

MEETINGHOUSE ROAD - South (Odd) side – From Meadow Street to a point 540 feet westerly thereof- NO STOPPING OR STANDING

ITEM #7

Delete Chapter 275-66 A in its entirety

And insert in place thereof
275-66 A Burnett Road

- A. No further business, commercial or industrial development shall occur on Burnet Road from the Ludlow/Chicopee line to the intersection of New Lombard Road and Burnett Road and any appurtenant street for a period of one year commencing on April 1, 2023, and terminating on April 1, 2024, except by special permit.

Councilor Dobosz motion to Item #7 out of order– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					X
Krampits	X				
Dobosz	X				
Labrie	X				
Roy			X		

Motion passed.

Councilor Dobosz stated that this just gives the City Council an additional tool. Having resident input in development on Burnett Road has allowed us to negotiate as a dealership. They did work with us like they have the size of their original proposal. So this is important because it doesn't stop development of the road, but it does allow the City Council to consider the developer and make sure that there's a smart development in the neighborhood.

Public Input

Susan Laplante, 71 Angela Drive I've lived there in the Burnett Road area since 1965. My parents bought a home there. I bought a home there. My son and his family have a home there. It's a great area to grow up in. I am completely against them taking away the moratorium from Burnett Road. It's very important. We have a huge traffic issue that no one has dealt with in 24 years. Why isn't something being done to help the traffic, that moratorium should stay. It's an issue for the people who live in that area and have to travel that road every day. I love that area. I don't want to leave that area, but I don't want the traffic getting any worse. We haven't been against businesses coming up. We work with Telsa. We work with the condo company. We worked with Williams Truck Stop, a different story that had nothing to do with the moratorium. I'm not against businesses. People aren't against businesses. We just want a safe area to stay in. I'm hoping you reconsider and do not change this moratorium. Please keep it in place for the area residents of Burnet Road.

David Amo 72 Fairway Drive. I'm all in favor of having this moratorium in place for another year. It's very obvious that Lee Pouliot and the Planning Department do not want us to have a moratorium. They have made it very clear. We're doing this year by year. So for the City Planner to come to you people and say, we have a permanent moratorium, he's all wet. This moratorium is just for a year. I've checked with leaders down in Boston, and we are definitely within our right as long as we do a moratorium for a year or two years. If you did a permanent moratorium that's one thing, but year to year, there's nothing wrong with that. The City Planner doesn't want us to have a moratorium, guess what, he doesn't live up there and he doesn't even pay taxes in this city. We've come to meeting after meeting and have told you people, we want this moratorium. So we please ask you your consideration and renewing this moratorium for another year. Thank you.

Glen LaPlante 71. Angela, everyone on that Ordinance Committee is a City Councilor, and your job as a City Councilor is to represent the people in your ward. Those are the people that elected you. Our City Councilor, Derek Dobosz is basically behind this moratorium as the people that live here. So I believe that's very important. It's not as important what a Planning Board person says about a moratorium. First of all, the moratorium protects not only the city, but its residents. So you, as City Councilors, know that if you were representing that area and dealing with the same problems that you would be for a moratorium in your ward, too, I'm sure of it. It's only for one year. If it comes up next year and it has to be voted on again next year, we'll deal with it next year. I believe the moratorium is there for a reason. I believe back when the moratorium was put in place, there was specific wording in that, It's duly said that until the city takes correction of the traffic problems on Burnett Road, well, guess what, In 20 something years it hasn't happened. They've relied upon McDonald's coming into the area for anybody that wanted to build. Anything to do with any type of traffic resolutions up here, the city has done nothing. So based on that alone, that moratorium should still stay in effect until something is done. So I would like to see the moratorium stay in effect. Thank you.

Planning Department Comments

Massachusetts zoning allows municipalities to develop zoning ordinances that are termed zoning moratoriums. They are meant to be temporary pauses in development so that communities can address emergency situations with new regulations in a specified period of time. He explained that the Planning Staff and Planning Board are not opposed to the use of more tools. They are opposed to a permanent ban. The Burnett Road moratorium is specific to addressing the negative impact of increasing traffic. This moratorium has been in place for 24 years. He stated that the City cannot have a permanent ban on development of by right uses. He presented the committee with the map below showing the parcels effected by this proposed ordinance. There are 460 parcels that either front on Burnett Road or connect to Burnett Road. If the residential parcels are deleted than there are 42 parcels impacted by this ordinance. Majority of those parcels are already developed or are not

developable. Lee stated that if the issue is traffic, then money should be spent on enforcement and street design versus adding this extra question in a by right use.

This will streamline the process and it belongs in the License Committee.

all Special Permits in Chicopee expire if not utilized in one year from the date granted. State law allows a minimum of one year and a maximum of 3 years life span. The Council has seen numerous projects permitted through Mill Conversion Overlay District for renewals in the past few years. The renewals are necessary because of the competitiveness of financing programs. The developers need to be permitted at the local level to be able to compete for funding programs. This ordinance would allow the developer to concentrate on the funding instead of worrying about coming before the Council every year to renew the Special Permit.

Councilor Dobosz motion to close public input– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor López stated I just would like to say on the record that I fully support this moratorium, as we call it. It's not actually a moratorium. It's just another mechanism for the council to be able to oversee the development that happens. It only affects a couple of parts of the plan. This is not like we're asking for the entire city to go through jump through another hoop. It's very necessary in this area. I've spoken to a lot of the residents of that area, and they all have supported it. So we should absolutely do what the residents of that area are asking. It's been in place for years and it's worth it. It was the only mechanism that actually allowed us to negotiate with Tesla the way we did. If you ask Tesla, they're actually very happy that the mechanism was there. I've spoken to some of them. Tesla is actually able to be good neighbors in that neighborhood and communicate with the residents. So as councilors, we should definitely support this, and I fully support it. Thank you.

Councilor Pniak-Costello stated she appreciates the resident's perseverance for constantly coming down here in regard to one issue or another. The traffic is a legitimate issue, and they have legitimate concerns not only in Ward Six, but in my ward as well. Traffic is a problem. You can't ignore it and say, okay, we can minimize traffic because traffic is always there. No, we fix it, but before we fix it, you can't put more strain on the taxpayer and the residents. Time to put residents before anything else. Thank you.

Councilor Dobosz motion to approve– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				

Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

ITEM #3

DOROTHY STREET - Intersection of Dorothy Avenue and Prospect Street - ISOLATED STOP SIGN

Councilor Pniak-Costello stated some residents have indicated to me that at one point there was a stop sign at the intersection of Dorothy Avenue and Prospect Street. Like it says in the agenda, it's an isolated stop sign. So basically what I'm looking for is to put it back up. Prospect Street is a busy street. There's a lot of traffic in the sense that it's used as a cut through from James Street to Memorial Drive, and it's also used as a traffic flow from James Street to go into Memorial Drive to go into CVS. So there's traffic. That's an issue. It's primarily a residential area. New families are moving in. They're younger. They have children. Many residents have indicated that we have to start looking at stop signs because of the increase of traffic. So I can turn it over now, I guess, through the chair to Doug and have him explain what the engineering perspective is.

Doug Ellis stated that this is at the end, the south end to Dorothy Avenue, turn on to Prospect Street. It should have a stop sign. So it suggests in the revised wording just to be consistent with how we usually do them.

Councilor Labrie motion to close public input– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Labrie motion to amend - Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					x
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Dobosz motion to approve - Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson					X
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

AMENDED VERSION TO READ AS;

DOROTHY STREET

Traveling South – At the Intersection of Prospect.

ISOLATED STOP SIGN

ITEM #4

CHAPEL STREET - Travelling west (even side) 25 feet from the intersection of York Street in both directions - PARKING PROHIBITED HERE TO CORNER

Councilor Labrie stated he would like to amend it to read, north, even side.

This is for a dangerous corner that's used quite often by the church. Three residents happened to call me within 5 minutes of each other because there's a three family in the area and the third-floor tenant has four vehicles. So it really clogged up that intersection. So I've got to spread it out a little bit so there's not a tragic accident there.

Councilor Dobosz motion to close public input– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Labrie motion to amend - Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Labrie motion to approve - Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

AMENDED VERSION TO READ AS:

CHAPEL STREET - North (even side) 25 feet from the intersection of York Street in both directions - PARKING PROHIBITED HERE TO CORNER

ITEM #5

CHAPTER 7

HUMAN RESOURCES (GROUP 2)

ADD

BENEFITS COORDINATOR #2 \$52,388.72 (GRADE 8)

SAID ORDINANCE TO BE EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2023

Steve H.R. Director I'm also here with Karen Gay, Benefits Coordinator. We're dealing with over 4100 participants in our benefits plan between retirees, dependents and city employees with school and city side. It is a lot of work for one person to have to handle. So we're asking for a second Benefits Coordinator to help us better manage that process and be able to get that process happening.

Mike Pise stated the Mayor's office was strongly in favor of adding the second position.

Councilor Labrie motion to close public input– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz					x
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Laflamme stated I think it's important that we get the resources needed, especially for benefits. The state and federal requirements consistent changing of employees that come through this city and new employees. So I'm in favor of this to give them the tools to work with the resources they need from staffing.

Councilor Pniak-Costello stated I think the insurance has to be improved of how we handle it. Getting another resource as far as an employee will help, especially in regard to a controversial issue to the insurance and

reconciliation. So this is definitely long overdue. Probably should have been done before now, but at least it's starting now, and it can help in the situation that we're in. Thank you.
 Councilor Labrie stated this is a much-needed position in that office.

Councilor Tillotson motion to approve– Councilor Dobosz 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

ITEM #6

Chapter 275-9

Add to the end of § 275-9 (F)

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, a special permit granted under Chapter 275 Section 67 (Mill Conversion and Commercial Center Overlay District) shall lapse in a period of one to three years as determined by the City Council, including such time required to pursue or wait termination of any appeal from the grant, if a substantial use has not sooner commenced, except for good cause or, in the case of a permit for construction, if construction has not begun by such date, except for good cause. Following such lapse, the rights for the special permit may be reestablished only after a notice and a new hearing, as specified in § 275-10, have been undertaken.

Councilor Krampits stated this had gone through the zoning committee because at the time the special permit was only good for one year and many applicants needed more than one year to get financing to go forward with their projects. There was a discussion back and forth between various councilors, splitting it down the middle, doing two years, and a consensus was reached basically for it to be a period of 1 to 3 years with that time frame being voted on or selected by the City Council, whether they wanted one, two or three years as part of the condition of the special permit.

Councilor Labrie stated I definitely agree with this. Being on zoning, we have so many applicants coming back to renew it. I would like to see two, but there is three there. I don't know why we would grant it if somebody came in for a special permit and wanted to build something and they need three years, I would be a little leery if they know right off the bat that they're not going to get the financing within three years. He stated it's our option, It's not the applicant's option.

Councilor Pniak-Costello stated It makes sense. It gives the council some say in regard to time limits. We didn't have that kind of input before. So I think this is a step in the right direction.

Councilor Tillotson stated that we can't hold up the property beyond the three years so that if they can't generate the money in that time period, then their permit will be invalid, and someone else will have an opportunity to purchase the property and move forward with the project. So I think it's a good idea.

Councilor Labrie motion to close public input– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Dobosz motion to approve– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz	x				
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

ITEM #8

Ordinance Amendment to delete Sections 275-41 Home Occupation, 275-52(B)(11), 275-53(B)(12) and 275-54 (B)(1)(i) and insert section 188-22 Home Occupation License.

DELETE: § 275-41 Home occupation.
 § 275-52(B)(11)
 § 275-53 (B)(12)
 § 275-54 (B)(1)(i)

INSERT: § 188-22 HOME OCCUPATION LICENSE.

- (1) A special license from the City Council is required for a home occupation. Special license requests require immediate abutter notification, legal advertisement, a public hearing, a fee as set by the City Council¹ and yearly renewal. Applications may be obtained and filed in the City Clerk's office.
- (2) The procedure for obtaining a home occupation special license is as follows:
 - (a) Obtain an application from the City Clerk's office.

- (b) Submit the completed application together with the required fee and a copy of the Assessor's Map to the City Clerk's office.
 - (c) A hearing will be held by the License Committee of the City Council on the application for the special license in accordance with this chapter.
 - (d) The City Council will thereafter upon approval of the License Committee's action vote to issue the special license.
 - (e) Once this special license is granted, a certificate of occupancy must be obtained from the Building Inspection Department and a copy forwarded to the Board of Assessors.
 - (f) All home occupation special licenses shall expire on April 30th of each year, unless revoked. Any applications for renewal of the home occupation special license may be made in the month of April and shall take effect on May 1 next ensuing.
 - (g) If a nonowner of the property is the applicant, permission must be obtained, in writing, and submitted with the application.
 - (h) The City Council may in its discretion grant a waiver to allow one employee who is not a member of the family if there is a specific finding by the City Council that the waiver will not cause any undue hardship to the neighborhood nor disrupt the residential nature of the residence.
- (3) Records. The Building Commissioner shall be responsible for maintaining records of home occupations. If a special license for a home occupation has expired and the holder of such license has not received a renewal of the license from the City Council, the Building Commissioner shall forthwith notify the license holder that the license has expired, and the operation of the home occupation must cease within five days, and the holder must renew his license through the License Committee of the City Council.
- (4) Performance Standards. A special license for home occupation may be granted only if all of the following performance standards are met:
 - (a) No alteration of the principal building shall be made which changes the character as a dwelling. In no way shall the appearance of the structure be altered or the occupation within the residence be conducted in a manner which would cause the premises to differ from its residential character, either by the use of colors, materials, construction, lighting, signs or the emission of sounds, noises or vibrations.
 - (b) No use shall create noise, dust, vibration, odor, smoke, glare, electrical interference, health hazard or any other hazard or nuisance to any greater or more frequent extent than that usually experienced in an average residential dwelling.
 - (c) Only one nameplate shall be allowed. It may display the name of the occupant and/or the name of the home occupation. It shall not exceed two square feet in area, shall be nonilluminated and attached flat to the main structure, visible through a window or posted in front of the

building with a maximum height of four feet. The limitation to one nameplate is intended to apply to all lots, including corner lots.

(d) No traffic shall be generated in greater volume than would normally be expected in a residential neighborhood. The activity involved shall not assume a commercial or public character or constitute a health or safety hazard to the neighborhood.

(e) The use shall be clearly incidental and secondary to the dwelling and dwelling purposes and shall not change the character of use as a dwelling.

(f) There shall be no exterior storage on the premises of material or equipment used as a part of the home occupation.

(g) The total area used for the home occupation shall not exceed 1/2 the floor area of the user's living unit.

(h) A home occupation, including studios or rooms for instruction, shall provide off-street parking area adequate to accommodate needs created by the home occupation.

(i) Any other conditions which the Council shall impose relating to the health, safety and welfare of abutting property owners.

(5) Special Conditions. The City Council may impose special conditions upon a home occupation to ensure that the business is conducted in a manner which is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Such conditions may include but shall not be limited to the following:

(a) A requirement for fencing and/or screening of the subject property from neighboring residences.

(b) A limitation on the number of vehicles related to the occupation which may be stored on the premises or parked on an adjacent right-of-way.

(c) A restriction on the hours of operation for the home occupation.

(d) A requirement that the permit be renewed after a designated period of time.

(e) Any other conditions which the City Council shall impose relating to the health, safety and welfare of abutting property owners.

- (6) Grounds for Revocation. Failure to meet the definition in this Section and/or any of the performance standards outlined in this Section or any condition imposed by the City Council in accordance with the Section shall be grounds for denial of a special license for home occupation or for revoking such a special license if one has already been granted.
- (7) Enforcement The City Building Inspector shall have the authority and responsibility to investigate and enforce issues of unlicensed home occupations. The Building Inspector, given a question as to whether a hobby or a home occupation is involved, will make the initial determination and will notify the parties. If a home occupation is determined, the party involved will be given 60 days to obtain a license or to cease and desist. The determination by the Building Inspector may be appealed as provided for herein. A “hobby” is normally a pastime that is engaged in for pleasure as opposed to profit. Any individual found to be in violation of the Home Occupation Ordinance will be subject to fines up to \$25 per day for each violation after a determination has been made.

Councilor Labrie motion to close public input– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz			x		
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Councilor Labrie motion to approve– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz			x		
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

ITEM #9

Minutes – July 11, 2023

Councilor Labrie motion to approve– Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz			x		
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

ITEM #10

Adjournment

Councilor Labrie motion to adjourn – Councilor Krampits 2nd the motion.

Councilor	Yes	No	Absent	Abstained	Out of Chair
Tillotson	x				
Krampits	x				
Dobosz			x		
Labrie	x				
Roy			x		

Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 7:36 PM