

1 **PORT OF THE ISLANDS COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**
2 **NAPLES, FLORIDA**

3 Special Public Meeting of the Board of Supervisors
4 January 30, 2026

5 The special public meeting of the Port of the Islands Community Improvement District
6 Board of Supervisors was held on Friday, January 30, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. at the Port of
7 the Islands Resort, Main Dining Room, 25000 E. Tamiami Trail, Naples, Florida 34114.

8 **SUPERVISORS PRESENT**

9 Steve McNamee, Chairman
10 Dan Truckey, Vice Chairman
11 Russell Kish, Supervisor
12 Kevin Baird, Supervisor
13 Anna-Lise Hansen, Supervisor

14 **ALSO PRESENT**

15 Neil Dorrill, Manager, Dorrill Management Group
16 Billy Sparacio, Manager, Dorrill Management Group
17 Zachary Lombardo, District Counsel, Via Zoom
18 Matt Gilinsky, Florida Utility Solutions

19 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

20 The pledge of allegiance was recited in unison.

21 **ROLL CALL/APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

22 All five Supervisors were present in person, establishing a quorum. The meeting was
23 convened at 9:30 a.m. The meeting was also properly noticed. The notice and affidavit
24 are on file with the District Office at 5672 Strand Court, Naples, FL 34110.

25 Mr. Dorrill introduced that this was a project-specific meeting addressing three agenda
26 items discussed at the prior meeting and anticipated to remain on the agenda for
27 periodic updates. These items included the new utility billing rate structure, a contractual
28 issue between the District and the Orchid Cove community related to specialty
29 streetlight poles, and discussion regarding potential retention of a law firm and a

1 hydrologist related to long-range concerns associated with the Everglades restoration
2 program and impacts tied to Hurricane Ian. Mr. Dorrill noted that Mr. Truckey presented
3 on the Everglades restoration issues at the prior meeting, and today's agenda item
4 focused on next steps, including professional services. Any other matters will be
5 addressed at the next regular meeting scheduled for February 20.

6 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

7 No public comments were received at this time.

8 **MANAGER'S REPORT**

9 **A. Utility Rate Follow Up**

10 Mr. Dorrill stated that a memorandum had been sent to the Board following the first
11 billing analysis after adoption of the new rates. Staff has also been working with the
12 Board's liaison, Ms. Hansen, to evaluate the number of units being served by meter
13 size. Mr. Dorrill reported that there are approximately 38 meters larger than one inch in
14 the community, the vast majority of which are irrigation meters. There are a limited
15 number of meters providing potable water service. One one-inch meter provides water
16 service to the fire station, and one four-inch meter provides irrigation water to the hotel
17 only. All remaining two-inch meters were identified in two handouts previously provided
18 to the Board. The two-inch meters classified as residential serve Docks A, B, and C of
19 the condominium, with a separate two-inch meter serving the Stella Maris boat dock
20 facility. There are also two-inch commercial water meters. All remaining meters are
21 irrigation meters.

22 As it pertains to base rates, Mr. Dorrill explained that one two-inch meter serves the
23 Board of County Commissioners marina and dock ship store facility. Another two-inch
24 meter serves the Port of the Islands Marina Condominium. A separate two-inch meter
25 serves the Port of the Islands Resort Hotel Condominium. There is also a potable water
26 meter classified as the south hotel pool, which is water only with no sewer service, and
27 is in the name of A&T Investments, the primary owner of the hotel and part of the
28 condominium.

29 Mr. Truckey asked for clarification regarding the second two-inch meter. Mr. Dorrill
30 clarified that there are two two-inch meters: one serving Docks A, B, and C, and the
31 other serving the Port of the Islands Marina Condominium. Mr. Dorrill noted that he had
32 provided the Board with a separate analysis regarding the total number of units
33 involved.

1 Mr. Dorrill stated that the marina condominium consists of 175 total slips located on
2 Docks A through G, as well as Dock H. On the hotel side, there are a total of 86 hotel
3 room condominium units. Mr. Dorrill noted that over half of those units, estimated at
4 approximately 60 percent, are owned by A&T Investments, with the remainder
5 individually owned.

6 Mr. Dorrill reported that the initial bi-monthly billing last month totaled approximately
7 \$249,000. As of the Monday prior to the meeting, approximately \$238,000 had been
8 paid. Some accounts are on auto-pay and pay a flat rate in advance. In addition, there
9 were approximately \$8,000 in credits representing advance payments not reflected in
10 cash billings since the bills were mailed. Door hangers were issued the prior week for
11 shutoff notices. Mr. Dorrill noted one account just over the threshold, believed to be the
12 Stella Maris boat dock, and advised Mr. Truckey to follow up with the property manager
13 to confirm payment status. Another account related to the hotel condominium was still
14 billed to the former property manager, Resort Management. The new property manager
15 is Sandcastle, and there were a few open items related to that transition. That
16 outstanding balance was less than \$300 and dates back nearly one year. With those
17 two exceptions, all other final notices and door hangers were issued earlier in the week.
18 Mr. Dorrill noted that since the boat docks do not have a front door, no hanger could be
19 issued. Those two accounts will be addressed separately.

20 Mr. Dorrill stated that Ms. Hansen has served as the Board's liaison in reviewing
21 incomplete historical utility records. He noted that some additional standard three-
22 quarter-inch meters also appear under the A&T Investments account. His understanding
23 is that those meters pay a single base rate and are not subject to additional base rates.
24 At the final adoption hearing, rates were adopted based on either meter equivalency or
25 the actual number of units being served. This approach was tied to the removal of the
26 non-ad valorem utility assessment, which resulted in tax relief of approximately \$1,200
27 per owner. As a result, all owners, regardless of property type, are required to pay a
28 base rate.

29 Mr. McNamee commented that not all properties received the same reduction because
30 condominium reductions were prorated. Mr. Dorrill agreed and clarified that on an
31 equivalent residential unit basis, everyone paid the same rate or a prorated fraction
32 based on their prior utility assessment.

33 Mr. Dorrill reported that he recently followed up with the hotel condominium property
34 manager and held a teleconference with her, her partner, and a Board member. He
35 explained that improved source documentation shows that the number of base rates

1 tied to the main two-inch meter will increase to reflect the actual number of units rather
2 than an industry standard assumption. Mr. Dorrill requested identification of the
3 appropriate point of contact for the Marina Condominium to discuss similar adjustments
4 prior to the next billing cycle. Mr. Truckey indicated he could contact the dock master
5 and noted that Sandcastle is the responsible management firm. Mr. Dorrill stated that
6 the individual he spoke with at Sandcastle, Yolanda, was unable to identify the
7 appropriate owner or property manager contact, noting the size of the company. No
8 representative from the Marina Condominium was present to assist.

9 Mr. Dorrill stated that overall payment trends related to the new rates are positive. Staff
10 has continued working with Ms. Hansen to refine unit counts and conducted a physical
11 count of 81 hotel condominium units across multiple buildings. Additional units may be
12 tied to three-quarter-inch meters under the A&T Investments account, but overall
13 documentation has significantly improved. Mr. Dorrill affirmed the Board's position that
14 all 175 boat dock units will be charged a water base rate to offset the elimination of the
15 non-ad valorem assessment. Mr. McNamee noted that the dock ERCs were previously
16 assessed at 0.25 and 0.5 ERUs, resulting in a relatively small reduction, and expressed
17 concern with that outcome. Mr. Dorrill acknowledged that Mr. McNamee also brought up
18 that concern at the prior meeting and stated he was providing updates on unresolved
19 items.

20 Mr. Dorrill stated that evaluation of irrigation charges is scheduled for mid-year. There is
21 no irrigation base rate. Historically, irrigation rates were tiered for conservation
22 purposes, but the Board adopted a flat rate after deliberation. Irrigation revenues will be
23 reviewed at the April meeting in advance of the May budget workshop. Ms. Hansen
24 asked whether the numbers would be skewed by dry season usage. Mr. McNamee
25 stated that historical records can be used for comparison.

26 Mr. Dorrill concluded that significantly improved source documentation is now available
27 for unit totals. He noted that questions remain regarding how 86 hotel units may be
28 served by a single two-inch meter and that several three-quarter-inch meters may serve
29 other uses such as kitchens or other facilities. Further adjustments may be necessary
30 pending follow-up with the hotel condominium. Mr. Dorrill thanked Ms. Hansen for her
31 assistance and Mr. Truckey for identifying the location of the two-inch meter near
32 Building F.

33 Mr. Truckey stated that he does not believe the information regarding the meters is fully
34 accurate. He noted the presence of a two-inch meter in front of the building and another
35 two-inch meter across the street that was recently repaired. He stated that additional

1 work is needed to identify meters by building and does not believe all 86 units are
2 served by a single meter. Mr. Dorrill asked where the additional meter was located. Mr.
3 Truckey stated it is across the driveway and indicated he would show it to Mr. Dorrill
4 following the meeting.

5 Mr. McNamee expressed support for developing a comprehensive map of meter
6 locations, noting the lack of infrastructure mapping within the District. Mr. Dorrill
7 suggested looking into CAD mapping and overlaying it with property appraiser base
8 maps to identify streetlights, meters, and other infrastructure. He noted that no complete
9 records currently exist.

10 Mr. Dorrill stated that District records currently identify only six potable water two-inch
11 meters. If additional meters exist, staff needs to identify their locations and determine
12 why they were not previously classified as residential or commercial. All remaining
13 meters are identified as irrigation meters.

14 **B. Orchid Cove Private Streetlights**

15 Mr. Dorrill stated that he has been in contact with Mr. Gunther, who is currently out of
16 state, and that Mr. Truckey has also communicated with him. Mr. Gunther provided Mr.
17 Truckey a pricing schedule that aligns closely with Mr. Truckey's estimates. This will be
18 worked out between them by the February 20 meeting.

19 Mr. Dorrill provided background on a prior agreement with Orchid Cove related to an
20 alleged overcharge for irrigation. He stated that the current Board appears to want the
21 matter resolved, as reimbursement for the asserted overcharge appears to have been
22 satisfied. Additional issues remain regarding specialty poles, fixtures, and LED lighting
23 billed at higher rates. Mr. Dorrill expressed uncertainty that a negotiated rate below the
24 tariff adopted by the Florida Public Service Commission is achievable. Mr. Truckey
25 reiterated his belief that the issue could be resolved by February 20.

26 Mr. McNamee stated that the priority is determining whether the agreement has been
27 satisfied and, if not, a check should be written to close the matter. He noted that no
28 payment was issued previously because the CID lacked available funds at that time. Mr.
29 Truckey stated he would provide Mr. Gunther's email with his recommended pricing to
30 Mr. Dorrill.

1 **ATTORNEY’S REPORT**

2 **A. Further Consideration of Special Counsel, Lewis Longman and Walker**

3 At the prior meeting, Mr. Lombardo and Mr. Dorrill identified a preferred law firm and
4 recommended using a local hydrologist to assist with potential evaluation of long-range
5 impacts to the community following the Picayune Strand phase of the Everglades
6 restoration program. Mr. Dorrill stated that, since the last meeting, staff held a
7 teleconference with a senior partner of the identified law firm in advance of this meeting.

8 Mr. Lombardo reported that he and Mr. Dorrill met with Michelle Diffenderfer of Lewis,
9 Longman & Walker, who has extensive experience with the Comprehensive Everglades
10 Restoration Program. He stated that she provided an overview of the current status of
11 the program and explained that much of the work has already been completed. Her
12 recommendation was that the District enter an initial due diligence phase to support and
13 organize the data that Mr. Truckey has been compiling, in a manner that can be
14 effectively presented to state and federal agencies to pursue potential relief for Port of
15 the Islands. She noted that while it may be too late to significantly alter the program,
16 there are still potential mitigation options.

17 Mr. Lombardo stated that Ms. Diffenderfer provided a preliminary estimate of
18 approximately \$20,000 for her firm’s services. He further noted that she recommended
19 engaging two consultants: one with a biological focus to address ecosystem and
20 species impacts, and a hydrologist to analyze water table conditions in a format suitable
21 for review by federal agencies. Mr. Dorrill requested Board direction on whether Lewis,
22 Longman & Walker should be asked to assemble a formal proposal for consideration at
23 the next meeting noting that they are the preeminent firm in this space. Given how far
24 this program is along, it’s important that the District has a firm that’s deeply embedded
25 in this area and understands how to move efficiently through the process. Mr. Lombardo
26 added that Ms. Diffenderfer has experience working with both the Seminole and
27 Miccosukee tribes, who face similar challenges related to Everglades restoration
28 impacts as major landholders in the region. Mr. Lombardo stated that he was impressed
29 with the discussion and requested consensus to obtain an engagement letter and full
30 proposal for Board review at the next meeting.

31 Mr. Truckey reiterated background information regarding the Everglades restoration
32 project. The project began in the late 1990s and included efforts to block canals that
33 previously conveyed freshwater through the area. He stated that the area from U.S. 41
34 to State Road 951 and north toward I-75 had previously been planned for additional

1 development, and that the State later acquired land and proceeded with restoration to
2 return the area to Everglades conditions. Beginning in 2015, the project involved closing
3 what are commonly referred to as step canals, and that the closures were completed in
4 July of the prior year. He stated that the closures eliminated freshwater flow through the
5 Port of the Islands canal system.

6 Previously, during wet season events, the system would flush, helping keep canal water
7 brackish with relatively low salinity. Since the closures, the community has become a
8 dead-end saltwater estuary and salinity has increased. The stagnation and increased
9 salinity have changed the ecosystem, including fish and vegetation, and manatees and
10 alligators have largely left the area. Current salt levels are approximately 30 parts per
11 million, compared to approximately 35 parts per million in the Gulf.

12 Sheet flow through the land contributed to flooding impacts during Hurricane Ian. There
13 was approximately two feet of water over well field infrastructure two days before the
14 hurricane. Hurricane Ian expanded those conditions and resulted in damage including
15 washouts, impacts to diesel generators and electrical equipment, and damage to the
16 water pipe to the well field from trucks driving over it to get to the plant to restore power.
17 This caused leaks in the pipe to the well field. Pipe replacement alone is estimated at
18 approximately \$1.1 million, generator replacement at approximately \$80,000, and costs
19 to rewire and raise wellheads to meet current requirements at approximately \$500,000.

20 Mr. Truckey stated that saltwater intrusion has also increased because freshwater no
21 longer flows down the canals during high tides. Saltwater now moves over the weir and
22 into the freshwater system north of the weir. He explained that the District previously
23 relied on canal withdrawals for both a fire pump system and an irrigation pump system,
24 and that those systems are now pumping saltwater and have been shut down. Fire flow
25 must meet required criteria to ensure adequate water can be delivered through hydrants
26 during an emergency. He stated that irrigation water is also necessary and that
27 saltwater cannot be used for irrigation or fire suppression systems without causing
28 damage. He explained that the primary options are desalination or expansion of the well
29 field to increase freshwater supply.

30 Mr. Truckey stated that the restoration project has created numerous issues that place
31 significant funding demands on the District, estimating that without even addressing
32 saltwater intrusion, the impacts could represent approximately \$3 million in costs. Mr.
33 McNamee discussed the concept of expanding a pond or using a freshwater source as
34 a tank for fire protection, including the possibility of a filtration and pump system. Mr.
35 Truckey referenced that the tomato farms received approximately \$26 million to address

1 impacts from the project. He also noted that the Miccosukee Tribe has permits related
2 to the District's well field held up due to concerns about water conditions affecting
3 reservation lands.

4 Mr. Truckey stated that the Corps of Engineers has not accepted responsibility for these
5 impacts. He explained that the restoration project, which was estimated at
6 approximately \$15 billion, spans from central Florida through Lake Okeechobee and
7 south through the Everglades, with Port of the Islands affected by higher water flows
8 during wet seasons. He stated that the Corps currently does not want to take
9 responsibility for mitigation and that the District is receiving little attention. Efforts to
10 obtain assistance from Commissioner LoCastro at the County level have not resulted in
11 support. Meetings have been held with South Florida Water Management District and
12 the Corps, but meaningful action has not occurred. South Florida Water Management
13 District ultimately defers to the Corps, which controls the project.

14 Mr. Lombardo clarified that Lewis, Longman & Walker emphasized the need for
15 substantial data collection before determining the appropriate course of action. He
16 stated that this would likely be addressed through negotiation rather than immediate
17 litigation, but litigation was not ruled out. Because data collection requires investment,
18 the matter was brought back before the Board following the prior meeting.

19 Mr. Truckey stated that the Board must decide whether to spend approximately \$45,000
20 to initiate the process. Addressing matters involving South Florida Water Management
21 District and the Corps requires experienced attorneys and hydrologists. Limited
22 historical data exists for Port of the Islands. Prior quarterly data submissions were
23 rejected by the Corps as inadequate, with monthly data required instead. Hydrologists
24 and drainage experts will need to conduct studies comparing conditions before and after
25 the restoration project. Those efforts will require funding.

26 Mr. Kish asked what desalination would cost. Mr. Truckey stated that the District
27 Engineer is reviewing desalination compared to expansion of the well field, as well as
28 the feasibility of constructing a reservoir.

29 Mr. McNamee added that sufficient freshwater must be reserved for fire flow in the
30 event of a major fire. That reserve has effectively been lost due to saltwater intrusion
31 following canal closures. He also noted that peak irrigation demand may exceed
32 available freshwater supply, requiring additional sources.

1 Mr. McNamee discussed the possibility of utilizing an existing five-acre pond located
2 approximately 400 yards from the plant on property owned by Lindsey Case. If access
3 could be obtained for emergency use, a portable pump and collapsible piping could
4 convey water to the plant on an interim basis. The pond could also receive runoff from
5 approximately 50 acres, allowing overflow to return to the canal system. Using an
6 existing feature would likely be more cost effective than excavating a new facility. The
7 first step would be determining whether Mr. Case is willing to cooperate. If not, eminent
8 domain could be considered. The pond would be used only during emergencies or
9 when irrigation supply is insufficient and could help manage rising groundwater caused
10 by sheet flow.

11 Mr. Truckey added that a new 250,000-gallon storage tank project has cleared FEMA
12 due diligence and is awaiting funding. FEMA activity has recently increased, and
13 funding is anticipated. The tank would allow off-peak filling and high-demand use to
14 better manage supply.

15 Mr. Truckey stated that restoration documents dating back to the 1990s contain savings
16 clauses requiring mitigation if flood protection is diminished. The canals historically
17 protected this area from flooding. With the canals closed, water now moves through the
18 land, increasing flood risk and sheet flow. Those savings clauses provide a basis for
19 seeking mitigation.

20 Recent mapping related to challenges raised by the Miccosukee Tribe shows proposals
21 to redirect water under U.S. 41 and back into the land. The Corps has blocked canal
22 flow and constructed levees and dams to prevent water from returning to the canal
23 system. A similar approach was used at the tomato farms, where approximately \$26
24 million in levee and culvert work was completed to route water around thousands of
25 acres and disperse it back into the land. Similar solutions could potentially be explored
26 for Port of the Islands.

27 Mr. Lombardo stated that his understanding of the motion would be to request that
28 Lewis, Longman & Walker provide a full proposal, including recommended experts, for
29 Board review and potential approval at the February meeting.

30 **Ms. Hansen made a MOTION not to exceed \$50,000. Mr. McNamee made the**
31 **second, and all were in favor.** The proposal will be presented at the February 20
32 meeting.

1 **SUPERVISORS' REQUEST**

2 **A. Rear Yard Drainage Easement**

3 Mr. Lombardo reported that he, Ms. Hansen, and the District Engineer identified a
4 property that appears to be constructing within a District drainage easement. Mr.
5 Lombardo stated that a draft letter had been prepared to notify the property owner and
6 Collier County that the District's swales are not to be damaged. He brought the matter
7 to the Board prior to taking action to confirm the Board's direction. Mr. Lombardo
8 clarified that the letter would not constitute code enforcement. The District holds a
9 drainage easement as shown on the plat, and pursuant to that easement, the District
10 maintains a South Florida Water Management District-permitted swale. Any removal or
11 alteration of the swale constitutes damage to a permitted stormwater facility. The District
12 is not assuming county enforcement authority but is asserting its property rights and
13 maintenance responsibilities.

14 Mr. McNamee asked how similar situations would be handled for other properties where
15 construction has occurred within swales without prior enforcement. Mr. Lombardo stated
16 that this was the broader issue prompting the discussion, and that it may require
17 sending letters to all property owners who have encroached upon District drainage
18 easements requesting restoration.

19 Mr. McNamee raised concerns regarding vehicles parking on District-owned boulevards
20 and grassy areas between sidewalks and streets, resulting in damage to turf, irrigation
21 heads, and infrastructure. He asked whether the District has the ability to ticket, fine, or
22 otherwise address this issue, or whether informational notices could be distributed. Mr.
23 Lombardo responded that if vehicles are parking within District easements, the Board
24 could consider adopting rules to address the issue. He explained that construction
25 within swales is a property rights issue rather than a rule violation, and that enforcement
26 through the court system is inefficient and costly. Addressing parking concerns would
27 require a separate rulemaking process.

28 Mr. McNamee expressed concern that construction within the drainage easement could
29 proceed before the District has the ability to stop it. Mr. Lombardo stated that the intent
30 of sending the letter to both the property owner and Collier County is to prompt the
31 County to place a hold on the building permit, though that outcome cannot be
32 guaranteed.

1 **Ms. Hansen made a MOTION to demand removal of any impediment to the**
2 **District's drainage easement at 172 Venus Cay. Mr. Truckey made the second,**
3 **and all were in favor.**

4 Mr. McNamee requested that a Board representative attempt to speak with the property
5 owner directly before further escalation. Ms. Hansen stated that once documentation is
6 received from the engineer, she would visit the property.

7 **B. Cays/Newport Wingwall Signage/Electric Service**

8 Mr. Baird reported on proposed entry enhancements related to lettering for the large
9 concrete walls at the Cays Drive and Newport entrances. He shared proposals with the
10 Board.

11 Mr. Truckey reported that at the Newport entrance, Lot 41, a meter base that had been
12 non-operational since Hurricane Ian was reactivated, a meter installed, and plans were
13 underway to run power beneath the roadway to the sign area near the former real
14 estate building. The improvements will provide permanent power for lighting and holiday
15 displays, eliminate the use of extension cords across roadways, and include irrigation
16 improvements. Underground direct burial will be used for the electrical installation.

17 Mr. Dorrill requested that all proposals and invoices be submitted to Mr. Sparacio for
18 coding and inclusion in the pre-audit file. Mr. McNamee asked whether the \$4,500 cost
19 for acrylic signs applied to both entrances. Mr. Baird stated that the total cost for the
20 work was under \$10,000.

21 **Ms. Hansen made a MOTION to approve the acrylic sign proposals. Mr. Kish made**
22 **the second, and all were in favor.**

23 The work requires a permit and is expected to be completed in the coming months. The
24 mock-up image provided by Mr. Baird will be uploaded to the website with the February
25 20 agenda.

26 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

27 Deborah Jansen - Sunrise Cay - Ms. Jansen asked whether raising the weir would stop
28 saltwater intrusion. Ms. Hansen responded that doing so could create flooding
29 concerns.

30 Rheta Bradke - Orchid Cove Board – Ms. Bradke requested clarification for the record
31 regarding Mr. Gunther's submissions, noting that he has previously stated he was

1 acting in his individual capacity and not as a Board liaison. She requested that
2 contractual matters be communicated to the full Orchid Cove Board. Mr. McNamee
3 asked whether she preferred direct communication with the Board, and she confirmed
4 that preference.

5 Mr. Kish asked whether the canals are under federal or District jurisdiction. Mr. Truckey
6 responded that they are under South Florida Water Management District jurisdiction.
7 Mr. Kish expressed concerns regarding net fishing activity within the canals and
8 requested assistance in identifying appropriate enforcement contacts.

9 Mr. Dorrill stated that a teleconference with Florida Rural Water is scheduled for
10 February 9.

11 Mr. Baird asked for an update on the rate consultant. Mr. Dorrill stated that he has been
12 in contact with the senior manager or partner at the firm that acquired Mr. Weyer's
13 practice. Mr. Weyer contacted Mr. Dorrill on Monday to apologize for providing what he
14 had offered. The firm, PFM, is based in Orlando and provides econometric and district
15 management services. Mr. Dorrill stated that he anticipates presenting a contract for
16 that work at the February meeting and noted that Mr. Weyer is now employed by that
17 firm and remains the likely consultant due to his familiarity with the community.

18 Mr. McNamee stated that he had posted information in the room addressing public
19 questions regarding utility rate comparisons and encouraged residents to review the
20 materials. It was requested that they be posted on the website.

21 **ADJOURNMENT**

22 The next meeting will be on February 20, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. **On a MOTION by Ms.**
23 **Hansen and a second by Mr. McNamee, with all in favor, the meeting was**
24 **adjourned at 10:46 a.m.**