

MINUTES OF MEETING  
POINCIANA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Poinciana Community Development District was held on Wednesday, May 19, 2021 at 11:00 a.m. in the Starlite Ballroom, 384 Village Drive, Poinciana, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Lita Epstein	Chair
Michael Luddy	Vice Chairman
Robert Zimbardi ( <i>via Zoom</i> )	Assistant Secretary
Tony Reed	Assistant Secretary
Elizabeth Lambrides	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Jan Carpenter	District Counsel
Kathy Leo	District Engineer
Clayton Smith	Field Manager
Tim Gardner	Clarke
Cherrief Jackson	Clarke
Residents	

*The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the May 19, 2021 Poinciana Community Development District's Board of Supervisors Meeting.*

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order and call the roll. All Supervisors were present with the exception of Ms. Lambrides.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment Period on Agenda Items**

There being none, the next item followed.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Approval of Minutes of the March 17, 2021 Meeting and January 15, 2020 Joint Meeting**

Ms. Epstein presented the minutes of the January 15, 2020 Joint Meeting. There were no corrections.

On MOTION by Mr. Luddy seconded by Mr. Reed with all in favor the minutes of the January 15, 2020 Joint Meeting were approved, as presented.

Ms. Epstein presented the minutes of the March 17, 2021 Meeting. The following corrections were noted:

- On Page 4, Mr. Luddy stated, “\$270,000 for five bare root plants,” should be, “\$270,000 for five bare root plants per linear foot at \$250 per linear foot.” On Page 5, “*buying*” should be “*buried*.”
- On Page 7, Mr. Reed asked if staff determined how much money was needed in the Operating Account for month-to-month expenses and a balance transfer to the money market account. *Ms. Adams verified a fund balance of \$11 on the bond fund.*

On MOTION by Mr. Reed seconded by Mr. Luddy with all in favor the minutes of the March 17, 2020 Joint Meeting were approved, as amended.

*\*Supervisor Lambrides joined the meeting.*

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Consideration of Representative for Central Florida Expressway Project Advisory Group**

Ms. Adams stated in addition to the Central Florida Expressway Project Advisory Group, there was a Polk County Road Construction Project. Ms. Epstein volunteered to represent the Central Florida Expressway Project Advisory Group. Mr. Reed volunteered to monitor the Polk County Road Construction Project and communicate with staff

On MOTION by Mr. Luddy seconded by Mr. Reed with all in favor the appointment of Ms. Lita Epstein to represent the Poinciana CDD for the Central Florida Expressway Project Advisory Group was approved.

On MOTION by Mr. Luddy seconded by Ms. Lambrides with all in favor the appointment of Mr. Tony Reed to monitor the Polk County Roads Projects was approved.

## **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Consideration of Interim Services Agreement with Clarke Environmental Mosquito Management, Inc. for 2021 EMM Program**

Ms. Adams recalled at the March meeting, Clarke presented proposed changes for their Environmental Mosquito Management (EMM) Program. This agreement represents those changes. The Operations Manager, Mr. Smith was monitoring and assessing the results based on the number of concerns and feedback from Clarke and field visits. Mr. Gardner felt it was one of the better ways to treat midges. A huge part of the contract was the inclusion of ponds that were not originally under contract and treatment of the ponds twice per week. Ms. Adams noted the prior agreement was \$12,582.33 per month and this new agreement was \$12,308.33.

On MOTION by Mr. Reed seconded by Mr. Zimbardi with all in favor the Interim Services Agreement with Clarke for the 2021 Environmental Mosquito Management Program in the amount of \$12,308.33 per month was approved.

## **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Consideration of Resolution 2021-05 Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2022 Budget and Setting a Public Hearing**

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2021-05, approving the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2022 and setting the public hearing for July 21, 2021 at 11:00 a.m. at this location. The budget could be changed at any Board Meeting until the budget adoption. The budget starts on October 1, 2021. The bulk of the revenue was from special assessments and Operation and Maintenance (O&M) fees collected on the tax bill from Solivita residents. Ms. Adams highlighted the following:

- On Page 2, staff proposed assessing the golf course their equivalent share of \$184.04 per unit for 13.25 units, which was included in the proposed revenue for Fiscal Year 2022. There were additional steps that the District would need to take in order to assess that property on the tax bill.
- Resident assessments would not increase as this budget was being presented with a level assessment, the same as prior years of \$184.04 per unit.
- Under *Administrative Expenses*, there were some service contract agreement increases.
- For *Field Services*, some service agreements had increases. \$50,000 was added for *Storm Structure Repairs* and \$22,233 for *Contingency*.
- On Page 6, there were service agreements for landscape and aquatic maintenance, which had proposed increases and a contingency.
- The Projected Fund Balance Analysis was on Page 8. At the end of the fiscal year, \$588,266 in *Fund Balance* was projected.
- Under *Fiscal Year 2022 Estimated Reserves*, there will be *Operating Reserves* in the first three months of the fiscal year before revenues were received from the Tax Collector.
- The Debt Service Fund was on Page 9, which was managed by the Trustee. The Bond Series 2012 A-1 and A-2, principal and interest payments were set based on the Amortization Schedule. The special call amount was based on residents who paid their debt in a lump sum.

Discussion ensued and the Board addressed the following:

- Ms. Epstein asked if the tunnels were budgeted. Ms. Leo confirmed no money was budgeted as the only work performed was caulking, which cost less than \$15,000. No replacement costs were budgeted.
  - Mr. Reed suggested budgeting for power washing the tunnels. Mr. Smith estimated the cost was under \$2,500.
  - Ms. Carpenter suggested setting up reserves for unexpected damage to the tunnels. Ms. Epstein identified *Unrestricted Fund Balance* of \$411,000, which could be used for tunnel expenses.

Ms. Carpenter advised if there was an increase in assessments, it should be approved at the next meeting so there could be mailed notices.

- Mr. Luddy questioned the cost to upgrade lighting in the tunnels from incandescent to LEDs and including a motion sensor. Ms. Leo stated the existing lighting was from when the tunnels were originally constructed and lighting upgrades were a possibility. Costs were minimal, \$30 per month. Lighting was important for safety reasons.
- Mr. Luddy asked if the fixtures failed, whether they would be replaced with better technology. Mr. Smith confirmed no failures with the fixtures, but a few bulbs were replaced with LED bulbs. There was Board consensus to replace all fixtures with LEDs.
- Mr. Reed monitors Engineering. He anticipated the Board needing more assistance from Ms. Leo over the next year or two with the transition, road construction, tunnel and structural issues.
  - Ms. Leo clarified the budget did not address any county coordination with the tunnels. If road construction occurs, there would be additional engineering time, but she could not provide an estimate.
  - Mr. Reed did not want to see any surprises based on the hourly rates. Ms. Epstein felt there were sufficient reserves to cover engineering costs. Ms. Adams noted no separate reserve for capital replacement costs, but there were sufficient funds in the operating account, with \$20,000 budgeted for Engineering. Only \$9,000 was spent, but the Board could designate a Board Member to have direct contact with the engineer if additional expenses were incurred. If the Board spent more than what was budgeted by 10%, the Board would need to approve a budget amendment.
- Mr. Reed questioned whether Insurance covered unexpected tunnel damages. Ms. Adams would verify. Mr. Reed understood if the state or county was involved in any modifications that provide any disruption to their tunnels, they would be responsible for the repairs. Ms. Leo explained if modifications were needed for the tunnels caused by the roadway expansion, traditionally it would be at the county's expense. Ms. Carpenter advised if the county or state needed access to

CDD property, the District must provide an easement or license agreement, including indemnities and insurance requirements.

On MOTION by Mr. Reed seconded by Mr. Luddy with all in favor Resolution 2021-05 Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2022 Budget and Setting the Public Hearing for July 21, 2021 at 11:00 a.m., at this location was adopted.

#### **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Consideration of Resolution 2021-06 Approving the Phase 5C Plat Joinder**

Ms. Carpenter stated the resolution was in the same format as prior plats. These were replats of old platted areas that were reviewed by the District Engineer. The joinders are required by state statute.

On MOTION by Ms. Lambrides seconded by Mr. Luddy with all in favor Resolution 2021-06 Approving the Phase 5C Plat Joinder was adopted.

#### **NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Consideration of Resolution 2021-07 Scheduling Hearing to Assess O&M Fees to Golf Course**

Ms. Adams reported this is a resolution to assess golf course property for a share of the O&M assessments, since they benefit from the stormwater system. Imposing an O&M assessment requires specific notice to the landowner as well as a public hearing. Ms. Carpenter presented a resolution declaring the assessments, the methodology, number of units and the amount. The cost to maintain the District's assets was shown in the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2021-2022, which would benefit golf course properties in the attached legal descriptions and Assessment Roll, identifying 13.25 units. It also declares the public hearing and directs the advertisement, which was the same date as the budget hearing.

Ms. Reed asked if it would be retroactive for all of these years. Ms. Carpenter replied no because this was the first time the District was going through this process. Mr. Luddy asked if the golf course was aware of this impending action. Ms. Carpenter notified Taylor Morrison (TM) that there was a resolution on the agenda. According to the budget, the assessment would be less than \$3,000. If it passed, they would be sent a formal detailed letter laying out all of the

statutory requirements. Mr. Zimbardi requested a copy of the letter, which Ms. Carpenter would email to him. A resident questioned how the 13.25 units was determined. Ms. Adams stated it was typically based on square footage and shown in the Assessment Methodology Report.

On MOTION by Mr. Reed seconded by Mr. Luddy with all in favor Resolution 2021-07 Scheduling the Public Hearing to Assess O&M Fees to the Golf Course for July 21, 2021 at 11:00 a.m., at this location, was adopted.

## **TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Discussion of Tunnel Rule**

Ms. Adams explained staff was recently notified that a vehicle traveled through a tunnel and the Board will be considering different ways to deter that as the tunnels would only allow for pedestrian, bicycle and golf cart access. The original rule was approved in 2016. Ms. Epstein noted residents living near the tunnels, see vehicles driving through the tunnels every week.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Zimbardi requested “*neighborhood electric vehicles*” and “*low speed vehicles*” in Section 1A be changed to “*NEV*” and “*LSV*”. He did not want to specify vehicles that are not capable of exceeding 25 miles-per-hour (mph). If anyone had a golf cart faster than 25 mph, they could not use the tunnel. Ms. Adams noted the rule could not be modified as the original rules were adopted at an official rule hearing. Ms. Carpenter suggested sending the rules to all Supervisors to provide any proposed changes and set a public hearing next month. Ms. Lambrides asked if there was any benefit to changing the rule since it was not being enforced. Mr. Zimbardi disagreed. Ms. Epstein requested this item be placed on the next agenda.

## **ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Staff Reports**

#### **A. Attorney**

There being none, the next item followed.

#### **B. Engineer**

Ms. Leo addressed the following:

- Littoral Plantings: As requested at the last meeting, photos were provided of littoral plantings in Baldwin Park along the pond edge.
- Tunnel Inspections: Performed bi-annually. The north or south tunnels were inspected by in-house Structural Engineers and were in good condition, but

caulking was recommended for the north tunnel. Ms. Leo and Mr. Smith would obtain quotes.

- Annual Ponds: Inspections were performed at the beginning of May.
- Generally, everything was in working order with the minor concrete repairs, structures needing to be cleaned out and eroding pond edges. The littoral plantings were a good solution versus re-grading. Mr. Smith would report on the worst ponds. The budget was sufficient.
- Pond Map: Based on what the Polk County Property Appraiser was showing and included future ponds in the northwest. Ms. Leo would work with District Counsel in completing any necessary paperwork.

Discussion ensued and the Board addressed the following:

- Ms. Epstein requested a long-range plan for the littoral plantings. Ms. Leo would work with Mr. Smith on evaluating the ponds from an erosion standpoint.
- Ms. Lambrides liked the idea of plantings along the pond and asked what happened with the plantings when the water was down 5 feet and were no longer in the water. Ms. Leo explained the plants had a depth of water that they could take. The plants only had problems when it freezes, but would eventually come back.
- Mr. Reed felt that residents living around the ponds should decide and not the Board. Mr. Zimbardi concurred.
- Ms. Lambrides asked if planting littorals were feasible. Mr. Luddy had pictures showing how difficult it was to manage the plants. Ms. Epstein voiced concern about areas where the pond slope was eroding as it was more expensive to re-grade the side slopes.
- Mr. Reed requested a copy of the requirements and permits to understand the District's responsibilities. He wanted resident input because residents around the ponds would oppose it. There were ponds that looked terrible with growth around the edges. If residents paid for a view and did not want it changed, the Board had no right to disturb their pond and ponds should be considered on a case-by-case basis.



- Ms. Epstein questioned the legal aspect. Ms. Carpenter explained the ponds were owned by the CDD and the Board had an obligation and responsibility to ensure they were properly maintained. Documents that were very detailed, referring to the Clean Water Act. Mr. Reed questioned whether the ponds were maintained properly in the past.
- Ms. Epstein deferred to the District Engineer to provide recommendations on each pond. Ms. Adams recommended in advance of planting littoral shelves, educating residents on the benefits of littoral shelves on ponds through consultation with the District Engineer and HOA. Plantings that flower were better received. Ms. Epstein voiced concern about the water table in Central Florida and development of 5,000 houses across the street affecting their ponds. Ms. Leo stated it was difficult to say if additional water would have a direct effect on stormwater ponds.
- Mr. Reed noted the cost was prohibitive and littorals should only be planted where residents wanted it.
- Mr. Luddy asked if the District was in good shape with the drainage for the upcoming hurricane season. Ms. Leo confirmed the structures were in good shape, but there was some cracked concrete, which would not affect the drainage. Plants were blocking drains, but field staff would remove them. The report would be used as a punchlist.

*Mr. Zimbardi left the meeting.*

### **C. District Manager**

Ms. Adams asked whether the Board wanted to continue with Zoom hybrid meetings, with a physical quorum of three Board Members at the meeting location and staff and public participation via Zoom, since vaccinations were now widespread. Ms. Adams commended the Solivita team for assisting with audio and video connectivity. Ms. Epstein preferred continuing with Zoom hybrid meetings, but disliked the set up. Ms. Adams would reconfigure the camera with the Board facing the audience.

#### **i. Action Items List**

Ms. Adams reported on the following action items:

1. Pond Turnover from Taylor Morrison: The District Engineer and Field Manager are communicating with TM. A punchlist of items to be resolved prior to turnover was presented to TM.
2. Review Golf Course O&M Assessments: This item is scheduled for an assessment hearing.
3. PCDD Workshop with Polk County: Discussed earlier in the meeting.
4. Estimates for Littoral Shelves: Discussed earlier in the meeting.

**ii. Approval of Check Register**

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from March 10, 2021 through May 11, 2021 in the amount of \$175,633.83. Ms. Lambrides asked why Mr. Reed only received \$84.70. Ms. Adams stated it was due to withholding.

On MOTION by Mr. Reed seconded by Ms. Lambrides with all in favor the March 10, 2021 through May 11, 2021 Check Register was approved.

Mr. Luddy requested the Open Items List on the ponds. Ms. Leo was waiting for a date closer to turnover to make sure that everything was completed.

**iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

Ms. Epstein presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through March 31, 2021. Ms. Lambrides questioned what percentage of residents in Solivita paid off their CDD fee. Ms. Adams would investigate. This item was for informational purposes.

**iv. Presentation of Number of Registered Voters – 4,872**

Ms. Adams presented a letter from Polk County Supervisor of Elections reporting the number of registered voters as of April 15, 2021, which was were 4,872. Ms. Epstein questioned the change from last year. Ms. Adams would verify. No action was required by the Board.

**D. Field Manager**

**i. Field Manager's Report**

Mr. Smith reviewed the Field Manager's Report, a copy of which was included in the agenda package. The tunnels were pressure washed and looked great. For pond conveyances, the entity comes to the District to turn over ponds. Staff was taking a different approach to

hydrilla treatments, which was yielding better results than last year. He agreed with Ms. Leo that the tunnels needed painting and caulking, but did not see any vehicles. Mr. Smith presented the following quotes:

- Tunnel Signage & Bollards: The Hunter Green sign with dark gold lettering was hard to see and recommended a “*Golf Cart Only*” sign and smaller bollards.

Mr. Reed questioned the District’s liability if someone hit a bollard. *Ms. Leo explained bollards were typically used to prevent unauthorized access. They were lightweight and designed not to cause significant damage. Ms. Carpenter stated there was always going to be liability, but the Board was preventing improper use that would damage the tunnels.*

On MOTION by Mr. Reed seconded by Mr. Luddy with all in favor  
GMS Estimate #060 for eight “*Golf Cart Only*” signs, four posts  
and four bollards in the amount of \$1,753.76 was approved.

- Littoral Plantings: Clarke provided a proposal for littoral plantings with maintenance for Pond A-11, which was problematic for fish kills and Pond C-20, which had algae issues.

Ms. Epstein commented that it will look gorgeous. Mr. Gardner of Clarke stated it will shore up the shoreline to make it look natural. It was good for wildlife and water quality. Ms. Epstein questioned the best time of year to do the plantings. Mr. Gardner stated there was enough time to still plant them this year.

Mr. Gardner explained to a resident who wanted Pickerelweed removed from behind their house that Clarke left beneficiaries. Ms. Epstein recommended an eblast for residents before the planting starts so it did not surprise residents. Ms. Leo suggested including the University of Florida article explaining Florida-friendly plants for stormwater pond shorelines. Mr. Gardner noted over time as these ponds continued to erode, they must be dredged or plantings installed. He did not recommend dredging as it caused tremendous access issues. Ms. Epstein stressed the need for educating the community prior to proceeding. Mr. Reed proposed planting the littorals on the two ponds as a test to obtain data. Mr. Luddy assumed the Board would review the ponds next Fall, obtain feedback and discuss. Ms. Epstein hoped to have a five-year plan for all ponds and include in future budgets.

Ms. Adams presented the proposal with Clarke for littoral plantings in the total amount of \$14,325; \$6,458.33 for Pond A-12 and \$2,916.67 for Pond C-20 and \$4,950 for a maintenance

program to guarantee short-term success of the littoral shelves. There was \$30,000 in contingency funds. Ms. Lambrides questioned the maintenance. Mr. Gardner explained Clarke maintains the littorals for 30, 60 and 90 days and treats for undesirable plants. Mr. Reed noted undesirables were supposed to be hand pulled and voiced concern about replacing the plants at \$2,000 to \$6,000 each. The Board agreed there would be a large amount of money to establish plants in the long term for 100 ponds. The initial planting was a one-time cost. Mr. Gardner stated plant maintenance was on a pond-by-pond basis, but their routine services covered it. Ms. Epstein preferred Clarke maintain the initial plantings until they were established, since the proposal included up to 80% of plant replacements. Mr. Reed was in favor of gathering data for final decisions, but if they were looking at a test case with a long-term outcome of doing many more ponds, that expense was beyond what they intended to do. Ms. Lambrides agreed unless someone was on staff full-time.

On MOTION by Mr. Reed seconded by Ms. Lambrides with all in favor the Proposal with Clarke for littoral shelf plantings and maintenance on Ponds A-12 and C-20 in the amount of \$14,325 as a test and communicating with residents was approved.
---

Mr. Smith met with Clarke to discuss the cost for fountains and aerators in select ponds and provided proposals, which included power and maintenance, for ponds B-1, C-10, D-1 and F-5 to improve water quality. Ms. Epstein asked about solar options. Mr. Gardner did not recommend solar. Ms. Epstein was not in favor of the fountains and aerators, due to the cost and access issues. Ms. Lambrides felt an argument could be made for having fountains at the entrances and questioned whether owners around the pond could subsidize the fountains. Ms. Carpenter advised the CDD looked at the assets as benefiting everyone the same way, but the District could special assess residents through a rule, but it was a lengthy process. Ms. Lambrides asked about residents petitioning the Board for a fountain in a specific pond. Ms. Carpenter stated it would be up to the Board to accept the donation and set assessments to allocate the maintenance costs; however, if the residents did not maintain it, the CDD would be stuck with a broken fountain.

**ii. Customer Complaint Log**

Mr. Smith stated there were several service calls for Ponds B-1 and B-16, which were treated.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Supervisor's Requests**

Mr. Reed had a PowerPoint presentation on ponds to be turned over to the CDD. Ms. Carpenter suggested placing this item on an upcoming agenda for public comments. Ms. Leo noted the ponds Mr. Reed was referring to were not yet turned over and would work with Mr. Reed to resolve any issues. When the ponds were ready for turnover, they would come back to the Board for acceptance. Ms. Epstein preferred Mr. Reed meet with the District Engineer offline, only come to the Board if there was a critical issue that wasn't dealt with properly and have it come back to the Board when TM was ready to turn over the ponds at a workshop.

Mr. Luddy suggested inviting the Neighborhood Captains Executive Committee to attend CDD Board meetings to facilitate communication with residents. Ms. Carpenter noted no legal issues. Janet, the head of the Neighborhood Captains Executive Committee, thanked Mr. Luddy for the suggestion. Many Neighborhood Captains have a separate system to communicate with residents in an education role. Mr. Luddy was in favor of asking the Neighborhood Captains Executive Committee to contribute to the Board and attend CDD meetings.

Mr. Luddy recalled last month, the Board talked about the new Central Florida Expressway project. Residents want to see a tunnel from outside of Solivita to the hospital across the street and sound barriers. Ms. Epstein agreed with the sound barriers, but the county did not intend to build sound barriers. The most affected residents should encourage TM to build a wall along Marigold Avenue because once the tree line was cut down, there was going to be nothing between the expressway and the houses.

**THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Other Business**

There being none, the next item followed.

**FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****General Audience Comments**

Residents addressed the following:

- Mr. Steve Mizel recalled at the last meeting, Supervisor LaRue was against merging because of the fiduciary relationship to his residents and not committing them to replace the tunnels. A cost analysis of \$700,000 to replace each tunnel,

would cause a budget shortfall of \$1.4 million. There was nothing wrong with the tunnels. He asked who was responsible for repairing damage to the tunnels during construction of the Central Florida Expressway and whether they would be sufficient to handle the widening of Marigold Avenue.

- Ms. Leo stated the County Engineer was doing an analysis and design to ensure the tunnels were wide enough to support what they were proposing. Any damage would be the responsibility of the county. Ms. Epstein recalled the county saying when they presented before the CDD Boards that the design of the road would take into consideration the tunnels and would reinforce if necessary.
- Mr. Dennis Glass stated from 2010 until 2018, he was fishing in rowboat in a pond between his house on Glendora Road North and did not understand why no more boating was allowed.
  - Ms. Carpenter would research whether a policy or a rule was enacted. Ms. Adams stated typically, most Districts did not allow boating in stormwater ponds. Ms. Epstein recalled there were certain non-CDD ponds where boating was allowed, but no boating was allowed on CDD ponds.
- Mr. George Horton recalled at a meeting held in 2018 that boating was allowed in CDD ponds. According to their By-Laws, all Solivita waterways allowed boating. The Board was concerned with residents building docks and liability issues.
  - Ms. Epstein stated District Counsel would review the rules and the District Manager would look at the liability.
- Mr. Dennis Glass voiced concern about the littoral plants and whether they would resolve the erosion issue. Since his pond was not a problem, he wanted permission to put his boat in the water. Realtors were telling clients they could put their boats on Solivita ponds.
  - Ms. Epstein noted the ponds they were looking at had erosion issues. Staff would look at the existing rule and engineering issues. She requested this item be placed on the next agenda.

**SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

On MOTION by Ms. Lambrides seconded by Mr. Luddy with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/Vice Chairman