

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: May 13, 2020

### Attendees

Sara Nomellini, Chair, County 2  
Kurt Wiesenberger, Vice Chair, Charlotte  
Phillip Gussman, City 1  
Priscilla Johnson, City 4  
Bobbi Almond, City 5  
Sherry Washington, County 4  
John Garrett, County 5  
Mark Loflin, County 6  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Bob Cameron, Davidson  
Sam Stowe, Gaston  
Bob Lemon, Huntersville  
Walter Ballard, Lincoln  
Kim Hardee, Matthews  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Theresa Brunner, Pineville

Kevin Vesely, York  
Haley Gentry, CLT Chief Business and Innovation Officer  
Jose Colon, FAA Community Engagement Officer (Southern Region)  
Reggie Davis, FAA Community Engagement Officer (New England Region)  
Tracy Montross, American Airlines  
Melissa Treadaway, CLT Public Affairs Manager  
Mark Wiebke, CLT Planning Director  
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)  
Dan Gardon, CLT  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)  
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

### Summary Minutes

#### ❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:05 PM
- **CLT Welcome – Stuart Hair, Director of Economic & Community Affairs, CLT**
  - Hair: Thanks, everyone, for attending tonight. *Talked about the features of WebEx.* Encourage folks to mute if not talking. Dan sent out Agenda. You can use the chat feature. We will be recording the meeting, and the chats will be part of that. You can raise your hand as a participant. If you do that, someone will acknowledge you.
- **Describe Meeting Approach – Ed Gagnon, Facilitator**
  - Gagnon: Thanks to all for being on the call. I'm sure you have a lot going on personally/professionally, so we appreciate you being a part of this today. In addition to what Stuart addressed, please say your name before you talk. Dan may mute the panel. If so, use the hand raising option. *Went over the documents/handouts.* If you are on the phone, this is the PDF that was sent out yesterday. I will reference the page numbers at the top of pages; disregard page numbers at bottom.
    - *Went through meeting Agenda;* Approaches to community engagement and submission timelines, both on page 3; FAA submittal checklist - we will briefly review at the end, and then some additional documents that we will review at the end. In terms of our time together, we are in the opening section. In a second we will have Sara handle the approval of the minutes, and then the vast majority of our meeting will be addressing the current situation with CLT, having a good discussion about potential community engagement approaches, discussing submittal timelines, and then ending the meeting with next steps.
- **Approve Agenda/Minutes for January/February – Sara Nomellini, ACR Chair**

- Nomellini: *Described how to deal with approving minutes via WebEx.* Mark Loflin moved to approve the minutes. All in favor. Minutes approved.

❖ **Discuss Current Situation and the Plan Forward – CLT Staff**

➤ **Share Current State of CLT and the Funding Situation**

- Hair: Charlotte Douglas International Airport remains open. We are open for traffic. We continue to see traffic coming in and out of the airport as usual. The numbers of passengers are dramatically down, though. We are down to about 90% less passenger traffic than we normally would be handling in May. The bookings and flights are holding relatively steady with normal average amount of flights. Passenger growth is primarily driven by connecting passengers. The number of connecting passengers has grown over April numbers where local passengers remains pretty low. We are seeing some changes in our normal patterns, due to a lot more connecting passengers, but the number of flights does remain relatively steady to our normal April.
  - We had about 100 fewer flights than normal today as expected. So, that puts us at about 300 arrivals and departures. We were at 400 arrival/departures this time last year. Passenger volume is dramatically down, and total flights are down but not as dramatically. For the airport, we are a self-funding enterprise of the City of Charlotte. Revenues are generated from charges to the airlines as well as revenues produced by non-aeronautical activity – such as parking, picking up the soda at the retail store, buying the book, souvenir, buying the meals. That is what we operate on. With passenger counts dramatically down, so are revenues. Airports have been hit hard, and that is why as part of the CARES bailout, there was money included for airports. We are still working through plan of finances where we are going to program that money. We aggressively responded when we saw numbers begin to decrease and identified cost savings internally and long-term. We have delayed projects but have had no layoffs and don't anticipate having layoffs. We are beginning to look at a return to work program. So, it's time to bring the ACR back together. So, this evening we are trying to begin to come back to a more normal situation. Doing virtual working meetings, I do not see us in-person for a couple of months. We do want to continue the work of the ACR and not lose the momentum that was really building up. Any questions or conversations that you have?
- Wiesenberger: Can you mention how much you received from the government – from the stimulus package?
- Hair: 135 million included.
- Wiesenberger: Does that represent some percentage of your revenue?
- Hair: There was complicated math. I did not completely understand it. I do know that some larger hub airports received more, and some received less. How they came up with that number, I don't really know.
- Garrett: How many operations are we running a day now, roughly?
- Hair: This morning at about 7 am, we had about 287 flights on the schedule for the day. That is arrival and departure, so you would multiply it by 2 to get total number of operations.
- Garrett: That would compare to 700-800 normal operations?
- Hair: There would have been 400 flights – 800 operations.
- Gardon: To clarify, it would be 1,600 total flights this time last year - 800 arrivals, 800 departures. So, down more than 50% of our operations.
- Vesely: Is the FAA fully operational and hasn't had any disruptions?
- Hair: Air traffic control is fully operational; they have decreased some staffing, but that is because of fewer flights that are in effect. They have stopped training that is non-essential. That goes into what we will talk about next.

- Reindel: What I have heard from FAA headquarters and from regional offices - they are not fully staffed in ATC facilities. They staff those facilities based on flight numbers. Staffing is down because flights are down.
- Hair: The chat box brought up: The City Council of Charlotte has created community recovery task forces, and there is one that is focused on the airport. They meet on Thursday morning at 10a. Tracy did a great presentation last Thursday. We have had previous presentations from Brent and our concessioners. Tomorrow will be a wide-ranging conversation. Encourage you to look at that information.
- Wright: This may be a question for Tracy. What we see on the media is that flights may be scheduled, but they are being cancelled. So, when you said 200 flights or 400, were those flights that actually flew, or were they cancelled for whatever reason?
- Montross: I included on the WebEx a link for our presentation that was delivered to City Council just last week (see the “Airport Task Force Group” at [https://charlottenc.gov/CityCouncil/Committees/Pages/Community\\_Recovery\\_Task\\_Force.aspx](https://charlottenc.gov/CityCouncil/Committees/Pages/Community_Recovery_Task_Force.aspx)), and you will see on slide 7, a slide that shows our scheduled flights. We used to have 702 flights scheduled on a peak day; 274 are the actual flights that are in the schedule, but there are additional cancellations that are made at the point of departure based on how many passengers are confirmed for that flight. We are cancelling throughout the day. On an average peak scheduled day, we are flying just over 270 scheduled trips.
- Johnson: When the flights are being cancelled, are they being cancelled in advance or when passengers arrive and you see how many passengers are actually going to be on the flight?
- Montross: Combination of both. To the extent that we have enough notice, we are sharing that information with passengers ahead of time and giving them the option to rebook their flights. If we fly to a place multiple times a day, we will cancel some. That way we can save the cost of flying empty aircraft and still get the passengers to their destination.
- Gagnon: Anything else for Stuart? *No.*

➤ **Address Potential Approaches to Community Engagement and Submittal Timelines**

- Gagnon: As we talk about Community Engagement, I will take the screen and bring up page 3 in the handout.
- Hair: As you remember, when we started talking about what we needed to do before submitting to the FAA, we determined that we needed to have some level of community engagement so that folks could understand the effects on what is happening in their area. In light of what has happened, we are looking at non-traditional ways to have meetings. The options that we have identified are: Option 1: Virtual public meetings (something like this). Option 2: Prerecorded videos – do the whole presentation and where we could have questions and answer them in a timely manner. Option 3: Go forward without any additional public meetings. All of the meetings have been public; this one is public. Based off of conversations with FAA staff, if they go to implement any changes from the recommendations, there would have to be outreach through the environmental process so the public would have a chance to be involved in that stage. Those are the 3 ideas we have had regarding community meetings. I will ask Gene to talk about another roundtable that he has been involved in and the milestones that they brought forward.
- Reindel: What Stuart is alluding to is called the South San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force. This task force was set up to handle the specific problem of airplane noise resulting from airplanes departing from 2 airports – the Hollywood Burbank airport and the Van Nuys airport, which are located a mile or two from each other in the southern San Fernando Valley of California, which is just north of LA. It actually affects Los Angeles as well. This roundtable or task force had a direct expected outcome in their bylaws which was to submit recommendations to the FAA aimed at solving the reported airplane noise problems. At their outset they had envisioned a temporary task force to do this in 6 meetings. It just ended last week. It went to 7 meetings because people were not prepared to provide input for one of

the meetings. I want to describe that process. The task force included the City of Burbank, the City of Glendale, City of Pasadena, four council members from the City of LA, and also four Congress members – Adam Schiff, Brad Sherman, Tony Cardenas, and Ted Lieu. Also, Senators Dianne Feinstein and Kamala Harris. They also had advisors to the task force: I was one of the advisors and the facilitator. Also Hollywood Burbank airport had an advisor, Van Nuys airport had a representative, FAA had a representative, and sometimes they sent as many as 4 or 5 people...The meetings were all public. The public attendance at these meetings ranged from 100 to 400. The last meeting was done virtually – where we received almost 500 comments and at any point in time there was at least 150 people on the call and at most, 400 on the call. Clearly a lot of interest from the public.

- Here you're dealing with a lot of different neighborhoods and a lot of different areas, while there it was really just a particular area that was affected. Both of those airports had their planes departing and heading further south than they used to before turning north. Almost all their destinations are north, as a Southern airport. They were trying to solve this problem; however, during these meetings, they came up with 6 community noise concerns. What occurred prior to the final meeting was the members submitted recommendations based on what they had heard. They had had 8 or 9 community groups present during the first 4 or 5 meetings. They addressed what they felt the problems were and possible solutions might be. We also had HMMH present on technical data as you have seen us do here. They also had FAA and Southwest airlines present. The last couple of meetings we focused on solving the problems and coming up with recommendations. They came up with over 100 recommendations. I first brought it down to 19 recommendations, and then through a 4-hour vote, they approved 16 recommendations. *Gene discussed which entities would review and implement those recommendations.*
- Hair: Thanks for that summary. I think it provides a precedent for us to look at in Charlotte regarding community engagement. How does the ACR want to proceed?
- Gagnon: In terms of these options, you could potentially do Options 1 **and** 2 - hold a public meeting and record it – publicize it and leave it out for a while. Option 3 - You could move forward without public meetings. Want to hear from ACR members regarding this.
- Loflin: In January, we had 3 options, at that point I was seeing value in moving ahead. I am more comfortable with moving on.
- Garrett: We are a representative public group, and these meetings are public. If you were asking me to vote, I'd say no public meetings.
- Vesely: Speaking from SC, there has not been any advertising down here. It is hard for me to digest that you don't want to have anybody involved except for this committee as there are only myself and another SC representative. No one knows about these meetings in SC.
- Garrett: My question is: Is the Slate going to change with public meetings? If not, there's no reason to do this. We have been doing this for 2 years.
- Vesely: But the Slate has not been finalized, right?
- Gagnon: At the very end of the process, you will finalize what recommendations are sent to the FAA. Right now you are considering 10, but you can decide whether to submit that full number or a subset to the FAA.
- Vesely: The FAA was going to help us decide and be collaborative with us. I haven't seen any of that. How do we know if a Slate recommendation is worth going forward other than the casual statement of things that they would like to pursue or not to pursue?
- Gagnon: To briefly address that, when the FAA suggested doing non-starters, they had committed to doing a review of what the ACR had done to that point and letting the ACR know what the non-starters are; they committed to do the full review when the submittal occurs. However, their commitment when O'Harra came was to basically note the non-starters. For the sake of time, I don't want to get into a detailed discussion of the level of feedback received in

the non-starter discussion. What I hope we can decide is whether you want to have these community meetings, what the value would be in the process moving forward, and looking to CLT to give some guidance regarding that.

- Loflin: I would like to have Dan and Stuart talk about the CLT relationships with the community in the past.
- Gardon: We generally have good relationships with the public. These are not normal circumstances or times. Having public meetings like this might not be ideal. At best the meetings would be like this meeting. Both having meetings and not having meetings, both have positive and negative benefits and disbenefits. To John's point, if any of these are good with the FAA, they will have to go through public meetings before implementing. These public meetings that they will go through will be similar to what they went through with the implementation of Metroplex, which many in this group felt were not good enough. So, there is really no easy answer - not an easy process.
- Johnson: Do you think we have that kind of interest that would generate a decent input from our community that would attend a virtual or recorded meeting? Are 1 and 2 more beneficial than 3? If we're not going to have any changes to recommendations, then I would say let's not have the virtual meetings or the pre-recorded meetings.
- Wiesenberger: I would be in favor of Option 2a. I would also put a twist on 2a and giving the public options to comment somehow by email if they have strong objections or different ideas. That is my preference.
- Washington: I agree with Kurt, and Option 2 is good where they could provide feedback.
- Cameron: I basically agree with those 2 comments. If we did this, could we have a series of briefings given - One to say - Hello we are the ACR, another to say - Here is what we have done, and then in a 3rd, here is our Slate. We could then have an idea of the interest. I hate to slow down the process because of the community meetings. I think it would be good to put something on the website to bring anyone with an interest up to speed.
- Wright: I agree. The ACR has been meeting, and they are public meetings. I do have a concern about the 30 day time limit. I do think the pre-recorded information is preferable, with the ability of those to send in comments.
- Johnson: Will someone maintain the website to respond to the comments and questions?
- Gardon: CLT would cover that.
- Gagnon: Any other comments or opinions about doing this online, staged rollout with comment options? And doing that while you are in the process of finalizing the submittal documents?
- Brown: I agree with Bob. We have hashed over this for 2 years, and we have come up with a Slate that we think is appropriate for everyone. Kevin came in later in the process, and we tried to work his concerns for the south of Charlotte into our options. When people come in later we can go over and over. I'd like to move forward as quickly as possible. I think we have some good options to send to the FAA. The 30 days, is it going to change our Slate of recommendations? I don't think so.
- Gagnon: [Pause in Discussion] With the pause, let's look at: Submission timelines (page 3 at the bottom of page): the first bullet point states - in the event that public meetings for the Slate submission are not conducted - which is Option 3 - submittal documents can be drafted relatively quickly. CLT feels that they can have submittal documents completed quickly. If Options 1 or 2 are done, assuming they are not done concurrently with the development of submittal documents, it could potentially add time - Dan said months. Based on how this conversation is going, if we were going to go with 2a v. doing nothing community engagement, what would our timeline be?
- Hair: I don't want to guess a hard deadline. Maybe in a month timeframe.
- Johnson: I want to get to a point where we DO have a definitive plan. I chose #3 because, of what it says at the bottom of the document on page 3. If public meetings are conducted this

adds time to the submission. If we did Option 3 and we had communities that had questions, we could have virtual questions. We need a definitive plan that says we have made some gain. I am like Sayle, we have been doing this a long time. When I came in I thought we were ready to submit something, and it keeps getting pushed back. I understand that everyone is trying to keep their communities satisfied. Kevin, have you put out any information in your community?

- Vesely: No, we cannot put out any information unless it passes through the committee first.
- Johnson: I put some information in 2 newspapers. I think a few others did as well. I assumed that you did as well. That was my impression was to get out information to our area – to the public. It sounds like we are going back to that again. I feel like we are going around and around.
- Vesely: Maybe I misunderstood. FAA is going to have to vet all the submissions. I don't recall any public meetings when the last change was made. I have a problem with saying we are doing something without letting the public know.
- Gagnon: Dan, do you want to comment on submission timelines and how that relates to options?
- Gardon: Realistically, it will take about a month to get submission documents out and ready. If the committee decides to do Option 2a, while that video is being shared with the community, CLT could be working on submission documents and then getting them out there. If we do Option 1, live meetings, we would have to wait until those meetings were over before drafting the submission documents. If we do Option 3, no meetings, it would likely still be a month.
- Gagnon: We are going to talk about next steps, and those include seeing all the recommendations on the expanded grid that HMMH has created – you have all been sent that, also looking at a summary document that HMMH has put together that is a concept that Sara and Kurt put together where on 2 or 3 pages, you can see the highlights of all the recommendations - looking at those 2 items potentially in June. So from what I am hearing from Dan and Stuart, it sounds like depending on which options are selected, whether it is no meetings or 2a, we would need to review this information – the expanded grid results – in June. In terms of timing, it looks like July would be the earliest date by which the submittal documents would be ready to vote on full Slate. Is that correct?
- Hair and Gardon: Yes, I think that is reasonable.
- Gagnon: One more question, if it was Option 2a, would Dan and Stuart foresee bringing the Slate and submittal documents to the ACR for approval in July, or would that delay it an additional month?
- Johnson: If we are going to get this to the public, I would think it would delay a couple of months. We would have to publicize it, correct?
- Nomellini: Couple of thoughts. What we send the FAA is not what we are going to get back, right? *Correct.* I am assuming that they are going to make some changes, tell us we cannot do this or that. Part of me thinks that if we do this informational session now, some of this becomes moot. What we focus on now is who we are, what we are doing, and this is our plan going forward. If you're interested, get involved; start showing up at our meetings. Reach out to your representatives. If no one knows what we are doing, let's give them the opportunity.
- Gagnon: That sounds a little like what Priscilla suggested. Move forward now without public meetings now, but there is still a communication plan to engage people, particularly when the FAA comes back with their input, and at that time the ACR would reach out for more robust input.
- Nomellini: I am assuming it won't be an option at that point. If the FAA comes back with proposed solutions, I think we will have to go to the public because of the NEPA process.
- Gagnon: I noticed on the chat, Mark Loflin wants to make a motion.
- Loflin: I'd like to make a motion that, at this time, we move ahead with Option 3 as we have discussed on the submission of the timeline and with the continuation that the community

engagement committee would continue moving forward in preparing anything that would come up in the interim maybe with the understanding that when we make our submittal we will be presenting that to the public.

- Gagnon: So the Motion is to **Adopt Option 3 with the understanding that the Community Engagement Project Team will move forward to address any interim community engagement needs regarding the Slate.** Is that correct?
- Loflin: Yes, and preparing for any information that we would want to present when we do our final Slate.
- Wiesenberger: I second that motion.
- Gagnon: We need discussion before the vote.
- Vesely: My question would be, as Sara pointed out, that we put out information that we are the ACR and not exactly what we are putting out because we really don't know. Is that correct?
- Loflin: I would say, keeping in mind that we are preparing a Slate. At that point, to be prepared to discuss what we have asked the FAA to do regarding our recommendations. Not a lot of technical details.
- Vesely: I agree.
- Brown: So, basically we are going to prepare the Slate, and in the meantime, we'll put out something for the public like an informational video or website; it will note that the ACR is trying to improve the noise pollution in the area, and these are some of the recommendations going to the FAA. The FAA can accept or deny. Is that what we are doing?
- Johnson: Yes, and on the website, we could have a paragraph about who we are and what we are doing. I used that paragraph in the articles that I wrote. I got a lot of feedback on the online article that I wrote.
- Gagnon: Sayle, the only addition I would make to clarify your summary was Mark Loflin specifically said that community engagement team is a group that is charged with working on that communication plan with CLT.
- Loflin: I was not necessarily requiring that we have a video or website.
- Gagnon: The details would be determined later.
- Loflin: Yes, the main point was to not delay us getting the Slate.
- Brown: I agree with you, Mark. For Gene: Did the one in the San Fernando Valley, did it go a lot quicker than ours has?
- Reindel: The task force had 7 meetings over nearly 9 months. They were dealing with a single issue that they were trying to resolve. I don't want people to think that you could have done what you are trying to do in 9 months. It was a specific problem versus you trying to look at the entire Metroplex and trying to come up with solutions on many levels.
- Brown: Do you think the political pull made a difference; gave an advantage?
- Johnson: I think it made a big difference.
- Reindel: What made the difference, it was just the way they set up the task force. They were accountable to the public in every way. Even taking 9 months, the public was not happy. The fact that the elected officials were the task force members, that did play a factor.
- Brown: With our Slate, do you think that we have addressed most of the concerns of our community? Do you think that there is anything that we could have done to improve it – going forward to submit to the FAA?
- Reindel: I don't think that I can answer that succinctly. I know most of the issues that you are dealing with, it looked at most everything we could have looked at. I think you have done a really exhaustive job. Whether you got everything, I cannot answer that.
- Brown: I agree with Mark. Let's go ahead with our Slate and do an informational thing with the public. That is my opinion.

- Gagnon: Any other discussion? Move on with the vote. Reminder: The Motion is to move on with Option number 3 - understanding that the Community Engagement Project Team is going to work on the interim community engagement needs regarding the Slate with CLT.
- Nomellini: All in favor? *Many voices in favor.*
  - Any opposed? *None.*
  - *Wright abstained.* Motion approved.

❖ **Note Plan for Future Progress**

➤ **Determine ACR Member Meeting Logistics and Communication Preferences Moving Forward**

- Gagnon: Next, I would like to talk about future plans for the ACR. On Agenda, item 3a - in Agenda planning call, we had talked about - until something changes - to continue the meetings on 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of the month at 6pm. Any changes to that for the near term? *None suggested.* After the Slate is submitted there may be adjustments to schedule.

➤ **Note the Focus of Upcoming Meetings – Refresh on Overall FAA Submittal Checklist**

- Gardon: Looking at the checklist, we have made very good progress. Pretty much everything has been waiting for the public meetings. Now that this last motion was approved, I will start working on submittal documentation. We still need to receive the full analysis of the expanded grid, but I think Gene has that and we will be transmitting it to the group shortly, and that's the last hurdle before submitting to the FAA. Everything that we have been through - we have received the non-starters from the FAA and reviewed the collective analysis.

➤ **Note the Focus of Upcoming Meetings – Possible Future Agenda Items**

- Gagnon: Thanks Dan. HMMH had sent out this collective expanded grid on 9 of the recommendations at this point. I will take it from there. I am going to talk about future and upcoming meetings. This will change slightly because of the motion just passed. Under item 3b, the tentative plan is in June to look at the expanded grid view of ACR recommendations. HMMH has already provided the PowerPoint and also provided the KML files, so you can look at each recommendation on Google Earth. They have also created a Recommendation Evaluation Table that we will share with Sara and Kurt to get their review before the next meeting, and then we will share with you all as well. Thelma had asked about when the KML files were sent. They were sent a couple of months ago in preparation for March meeting. We will resend the hyperlinks to everybody.
  - Item 3b, number iii - Decide on recommendations to present to community. I think the main focus of that conversation will be around the 2 non-starters that were identified by the FAA and whether you all want to include those in the submittal package. You may want to submit all 10 recommendations or a subset.
  - We'll get an update on community engagement as well as on development of the submittal documents.
  - We may have the FAA come back and tell us about the EPAYE and CAATT Waypoints. When we thought we were going to be meeting in March, the FAA was to share what that process was like when they changed the thinking of addressing altitudes at the Waypoint. If you all decide you want to know about that, we will check with the FAA to see if they can share that.
  - Then Alan Sauber, who I don't believe is on the call, wanted to spend a few minutes chatting about a point relating to the January collective analysis.
  - So, June meeting, expanded grid, evaluation table, maybe deciding on whether you want to eliminate any of the Slate recommendations before submittal documentation is finalized. Possibly some of these other items as well. Any questions about immediate next steps?
- Vesely: I was hoping to sit down with HMMH, and maybe Mr. Brown, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Muckenfuss because some of the assumptions made to the FAA on the 6K proposal - to keep the planes at 6K at all times - had a negative impact and that could be what their sticking point

was to that. Rather than bore the whole committee with that detail, is there some way to see what the issue was?

- Gardon: We can facilitate that and schedule that.
- Vesely: Thank you. It should not affect anything we are doing here.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

- Gagnon: Here the main items are some of the additional handouts in the PDF. On page 5, the February 2020 meeting notes. You all provided some different input on collective group 16. You all really liked the HMMH approach of Comfort/Concern/No-Go paths into their review of that collective. You had some suggestions on sample talking points if there were to be public meetings.
- **Written updates documents on pages 6 and 7**
  - Gagnon: This is based on feedback we solicited prior to the March meeting. Between March and May we did not go back to these parties for updates, but we will ask for updates on these for June. Airlines related updates. Last page in handout is one page out of the Requests/Motions Database. That is the full handout for you to review.
  - Is there any new business? *None*.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Nomellini: A motion to adjourn?
- Brown motioned to adjourn. Vesely seconded; all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:25 pm