

1 _____X
 2 BOARD MEETING OF THE WATER AUTHORITY
 3 OF GREAT NECK NORTH
 4 _____X

5
 6 50 Watermill Lane
 7 Great Neck, New York
 8 Held via Zoom
 April 12, 2021
 6:04 P.M.

9
 10 **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

11
 12 A P P E A R A N C E S:

13
 14 Michael C. Kalnick, Chairperson, Village of Kings Point
 15 Carol Frank, Director, Town of North Hempstead
 16 Jay Johnneas, Director, Village of Great Neck
 17 Dan Levy, Director, Village of Saddle Rock
 18 Susan Lopatkin, Director, Village of Kensington
 19 Michael Smiley, Director, Village of Great Neck Estates
 20 Steven Weinberg, Director, Village of Thomaston
 21 _____

22 ¹ The regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Water Authority of Great Neck
 23 North was held on April 12, 2021, at 6:04 P.M. in accordance with Governor Cuomo's March 13,
 24 2020 Executive Order No. 202.1, extended by Executive Order No. 202.101 which permitted public
 25 meetings to be held remotely by conference call. The agenda for the meeting was posted on the
 Authority's website. In accordance with said Order, the public was given the ability to listen
 to such proceeding at the Authority's office and this transcript was made of the public portion
 of the meeting.

1 ALSO PRESENT:

2

3 From the **Water Authority of Great Neck North:**

4 Ralph J. Kreitzman, Vice-Chairperson

5 Robert Graziano, Deputy Chairperson

6

7 Greg Graziano, Superintendent

8 Michael Rispoli, Assistant Superintendent

9 Sue Huang, Civil Engineer

10 Adam Solow, Supervisor of Water Plant Operations

11 Judith Flynn, Treasurer

12 Debra Ray, Secretary

13

14 Stephen, Limmer, Counsel, McLaughlin & Stern, LLP

15 Keith Kelly, Senior Vice President/Partner, CDM Smith,

16 Consulting Engineers

17 Gary Stuart, Associate, CDM Smith, Consulting Engineers

18

19 NOT PRESENT:

20 Gerald Schneiderman, Director, Village of Great Neck Plaza

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Approval of the draft
2 minutes of March 15? [Res. #21-04-01]

3 MEMBER LOPATKIN: I have one question:
4 On page five on the top it says "no necessary
5 disclosure" but I think it should say "no
6 unusual disclosure." It just didn't make sense,
7 "no necessary disclosure."

8 Unless anyone has any other comments?

9 MR. LIMMER: Well it's your statement so you
10 can correct it.

11 MEMBER LOPATKIN: That's what I am doing.

12 MS. RAY: I got it. I'll fix it.

13 MEMBER LOPATKIN: Okay. Thanks.

14 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: As amended.

15 Motion to approve?

16 MEMBER LOPATKIN: So moved.

17 MEMBER SMILEY: I second. Smiley.

18 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

19 (Whereupon all members responded in the
20 affirmative.)

21 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Approval of the Abstract
24 of Claims? [Res. #21-04-02]

25 MEMBER LEVY: I so move.

1 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Seconded?

2 MEMBER WEINBERG: Steve Weinberg.

3 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

4 (Whereupon all members responded in the

5 affirmative.)

6 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Treasurer's Monthly

9 Report. [Res. #21-04-03]

10 Anything unusual? We all reviewed it.

11 MS. FLYNN: Nothing unusual to report.

12 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Very good.

13 Revenue and Expenses Quarterly Report.

14 [Res. #21-04-04]

15 MS. RAY: Can we get a motion?

16 MR. LIMMER: Motion to accept.

17 MS. RAY: Yes, please.

18 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Okay. Who moved?

19 MEMBER SMILEY: Smiley.

20 MEMBER LEVY: I have a couple of questions

21 with regard to the Revenue Report. Did we get

22 to it?

23 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Not yet.

24 I need a second on the Treasurer's Monthly

25 Report.

1 MEMBER WEINBERG: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

3 (Whereupon all members responded in the
4 affirmative.)

5 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Okay, Dan. Revenue
8 Expense Report.

9 MEMBER LEVY: Okay. Couple of questions:

10 The first page, the interest income. We are
11 minus \$11,000 plus. How were we so far off
12 between the projected and what we got -- and
13 before you answer that, the second question is
14 Lockheed Martin on Community Drive. The plan
15 was receiving \$87,000, we only got 45. Are they
16 delinquent or we just miscalculated how much
17 they owe us?

18 So that's for the first page.

19 MEMBER WEINBERG: Dan, were you also
20 going to talk about the expense side or just the
21 revenue side?

22 MEMBER LEVY: I am on the first page. I am
23 going to move on.

24 MEMBER WEINBERG: Because I noticed there
25 were huge variances that really, we haven't seen

1 before compared to actual and projected on the
2 expense side as well. Just seemed very unusual
3 that there should be that great a difference in
4 so many line items on the budget.

5 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Judy, take
6 the first one, please.

7 MS. FLYNN: So on the interest income
8 side we had budgeted, and we knew interest was
9 going down last year. We had about \$120,000 in
10 interest income. Not knowing what the rates
11 were going to be we had budgeted 50% of interest
12 income and at this point the banks are not
13 paying -- I think they are only paying about five to
14 seven basis points which is much less than
15 what we had budgeted.

16 In addition, the T-bills are much less than
17 we had expected. I think the T-bills are all at
18 about ten basis points. So it's just that the
19 interest rates are lower than we had
20 anticipated.

21 With regard to the Lockheed/Community
22 Drive --

23 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: So when
24 the budget is put together it's done in August
25 of last year, given to the public in September,

1 so there is a huge lag when the budget is
2 actually approved, sent to the state until now,
3 and the rates have only gone
4 down and that's the issue --
5 what we thought we could invest at
6 in August and September
7 of last year has gone down dramatically; hence
8 the drop in the interest rate.

9 Next. Sorry, Judy.

10 MS. FLYNN: The Lockheed/Community Drive,
11 \$87,000 would be a normal amount, it's not
12 because they are delinquent. I think it's
13 because -- Greg, are we not using that Well as
14 much as we would have?

15 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO:
16 For the last six weeks or so that has been
17 offline due to SCADA improvements. It had to
18 be taken offline. So the power is down, the
19 chemicals are down, et cetera. The Well site
20 hasn't run in about six weeks.

21 MEMBER LEVY: So basically they paid
22 what they were supposed to pay us, only just
23 didn't use it as much?

24 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: We have been
25 talking about that in Executive Session, I think

1 last month which you may have missed, Dan.

2 I have to be careful how I say it -- there is

3 ongoing --

4 MR. LIMMER: Greg, let me just interrupt you.

5 Dan, there is litigation with regard to

6 Lockheed Martin paying monies we believe are due

7 to the Authority so I would rather discuss that

8 in Executive Session.

9 MEMBER LEVY: Okay. Okay, that's fine.

10 The same question goes to the third page with

11 regard to bond issuance costs. We anticipate

12 \$7,000, we ended up spending \$100,000 in just

13 the first quarter.

14 MS. FLYNN: Yes.

15 MEMBER LEVY: So what happened there?

16 MS. FLYNN: That relates to the loan

17 facility that we are applying for from the EPA.

18 There was a \$100,000 application fee that we

19 paid in February so that was not budgeted. We

20 only found out about that funding, that possible

21 funding, after the budget was finalized.

22 MEMBER LEVY: Okay. That satisfies my

23 questions. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Steve, you had a

25 question on expenses?

1 MEMBER WEINBERG: Unfortunately, it's
2 more general. I mean there seems to me to be a
3 number of line items where the expenses -- and
4 maybe I'm just not remembering this correctly --
5 but the expenses are under-budgeted. If that could
6 be addressed, or it was under-budgeted by more
7 than 15%?

8 We could address this privately if you
9 prefer.

10 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: So Steve,
11 the plan to date for expenses was \$2,225,546,
12 actual is \$2,079,061, so we are actually to
13 budget, under budget, for expenses by \$146,000
14 overall.

15 So there may be, unless you want to go
16 through item-by-item, there may be some items
17 over what we budgeted but nominally must be
18 under what we budgeted because we're \$146,000
19 under expenses.

20 MEMBER WEINBERG: I agree with you
21 so it's not worth taking the time now, but I
22 thought the variances were pretty wide and it
23 seemed to me there shouldn't be that many
24 individual line items where it's pretty wide all
25 over the place.

1 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: I'm looking
2 through it real quick. I see the bond issuance
3 cost is one big one; maintenance of vehicles is
4 another one for about \$7,000.

5 Judy, do you see any off the top of your head
6 any that we are off?

7 MS. FLYNN: I think Steve is also addressing
8 the under-budget items; so auditing as an
9 example. The internal auditors haven't come in
10 yet, they are a new firm so we haven't received
11 their bill. Typically they would have been in
12 already.

13 The electric as an example is under by 62%,
14 but again, that has to do partially with some of
15 the Wells being offline due to construction; and
16 then a lot of the maintenance wells and
17 pumps and the maintenance of hydrants and the
18 maintenance of mains and services, those are all
19 things that the line items don't
20 necessarily match the plan because it all
21 depends on the weather or if other things happen
22 such as a main break or something else
23 breaks and then we will be under or over
24 budget depending on what month of the year it
25 is.

1 MEMBER WEINBERG: Okay. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any other questions?

3 MS. FLYNN: If you have any questions when

4 you're not driving and you want to talk about

5 them, you can give me a call.

6 MEMBER WEINBERG: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Motion to accept the

8 Revenue and Expense Quarterly Report?

9 MEMBER LEVY: I so move.

10 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Seconded?

11 MEMBER WEINBERG: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

13 (Whereupon all members responded in the

14 affirmative.)

15 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Capital Improvement

18 Projects Report. [Res. #21-04-05]

19 Questions?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Motion to accept?

22 MEMBER JOHNEAS: Motion.

23 MEMBER LEVY: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Dan seconded.

25 All in favor?

1 (Whereupon all members responded in the
2 affirmative.)

3 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

4 (No response.)

5 Steve (Limmer), what
6 do you think about items 1.6-1.8? Do we
7 we need someone to speak on those and do we
8 needs motions to accept?

9 MS. FLYNN: These are just the final copies
10 that I was providing to everybody.

11 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Okay. Fine. So we
12 have already accepted it so it's done. Not
13 necessary, right, Steve?

14 MR. LIMMER: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: That also applies to
16 the final audit statements, 1.8, we accepted them,
17 correct?

18 MEMBER LOPATKIN: We did it last month,
19 I thought.

20 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Exactly. Just want to
21 make sure not to do it again.

22 Moving ton to the Engineering Status Report.

23 MR. STUART: Hi, everybody. This is Gary.

24 The report was included in the board packet,

25 Exhibit 2.1. I guess most things are

1 self-explanatory.

2 I'm happy to answer any questions on that. Just
3 one update: The last project, Greenway Terrace,
4 we did get confirmation from the developer that
5 they are ready so that project is scheduled to
6 start April 26th.

7 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Very good.

8 MR. STUART: It should be done in a week.

9 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Thank you.

10 Greg, 2.1 a, the change order, do you want to go over
11 that?

12 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Keith is
13 going to go over that. Keith is on the line
14 from CDM.

15 MR. KELLY: Good evening, everyone.

16 So the change order is related to Well 6
17 construction and the AOP process. We should all
18 understand that this AOP process is a new
19 process. It's new to the DOH and it's new to other
20 regulatory agencies so we get a lot of comments.
21 We submitted this for approval in the
22 beginning of 2020. We finalized comments with
23 DOH in February and March of this year. It's
24 gone back and forth. COVID has impacted them and
25 some of those changes, well,

1 almost all of the changes are what this change
 2 order is about. We have some DOH issues, some
 3 piping changes from the contractor, things that they
 4 have incorporated that were not in the original
 5 design, but as these systems continue to be constructed on Long
 6 Island, there have been numerous findings with
 7 contractors and that the DOH has required other people
 8 to make changes, but the biggest thing was that we moved the
 9 tank--the peroxide tank--outdoors for safety and
 10 operation issues and that is probably 95% of
 11 this cost. It's just something we
 12 learned as we went along. Anyone have any
 13 specific questions about any of the items?

14 I am more than happy to address any questions.

15 MEMBER FRANK: I was just going to ask
 16 about the Old Mill Road project where DOH
 17 is asking them to move their sewer line. What's
 18 the story on that?

19 MR. STUART: This is Gary. I can answer
 20 that.

21 We haven't heard back from the
 22 developer yet but the Department of Health which
 23 is kind of weird, this is the first time they
 24 have ever done it, they were concerned about the
 25 sewer and, you know, obviously the Authority

1 doesn't control where the sewer goes. So they
2 have asked the developer to relocate it and the
3 developer has not responded yet.

4 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Gary, we
5 designed it as ten feet of separation, correct?

6 MR. STUART: Yes, correct.

7 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: The Health
8 Department is kind of overstepping their bounds
9 because the state standards and sanitary code
10 says ten feet of separation which we are,
11 but for some reason the Health
12 Department wants it even further away.

13 MEMBER FRANK: Does it have to do with the
14 terrain in that area?

15 MR. RISPOLI: No. It's just how the
16 developer had routed the sewer lines or sewer
17 course mains throughout the development and they
18 had it entering a manhole on the east side of
19 our proposed connection and they are just
20 stating, you know, wouldn't it be better for
21 everybody if the connection to the sewer was on
22 the west side of the development and wouldn't
23 have to cross our water main at all.

24 So, thinking about the comment,
25 yes it would be ideal, but again, like Gary

1 said, we can't control the way the developer has
2 their design and we base our design
3 on a survey and a design that we are given. And
4 then the Health Department has their own review
5 of the subdivision plans and everything else,
6 and we spoke with the reviewer from the Health
7 Department stating that, if they have
8 comments to the design of the development, that
9 they should make those comments during
10 the review of the development plans.

11 But we are still waiting on
12 the developer to give us a response. It's been
13 about three weeks and I sent about three e-mails
14 over to them.

15 MR. STUART: But our design complies
16 With regulations. I guess they are
17 putting on their perfect world hat and thinking
18 the sewers on one side, ours on the other, but,
19 they do cross and we are in
20 compliance with the regulations.

21 MEMBER FRANK: Okay.

22 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Back to
23 the change order.

24 Any questions on the change order?

25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: There was a lot of work by
2 our staff on that, Greg and Bob.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON GRAZIANO: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Steve, do we need an
5 approval on the change order?

6 MR. LIMMER: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Motion to approve?

8 MEMBER WEINBERG: So moved. [Res. #21-04-06]

9 MEMBER SMILEY: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

11 (Whereupon all members responded in the
12 affirmative.)

13 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All right. Greg.

16 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: First item,

17 I have is laboratory testing services are up for

18 renewal. Pace Analytical Services is

19 willing to hold their price on every item other

20 than IOC, inorganic contaminants. They are

21 looking for a \$25 increase per sample.

22 I based on what we did last year, it's a rough

23 increase of \$500 plus or minus, depending on how

24 many IOC samples we take this year. Based on

25 our relationship and them holding the pricing on

1 all the other items, especially coliform
2 bacteria, et cetera, that we do a lot more
3 sampling of, I recommend the Board renew with
4 Pace Analytical. [Res. #21-04-07]

5 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: So moved?

6 MEMBER LOPATKIN: So moved.

7 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Second?

8 MEMBER LEVY: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

10 (Whereupon all members responded in the
11 affirmative.)

12 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

13 (No response.)

14 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Next item is the
15 spring newsletter. This is the final version.

16 I don't believe it has gone to print yet, right?

17

18 MS. RAY: No, it hasn't gone yet. It will go
19 tomorrow.

20 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Barring any
21 last-minute concerns, I think we covered
22 everything and we got in what Carol was
23 looking for as well.

24 MEMBER FRANK: Thank you. That's great. I
25 thought it was very good.

1 MEMBER LEVY: I have a small comment.
2 I notice that the letter was very detailed.
3 I don't know that we -- whether that was done on
4 purpose or not but we didn't go into detail about why
5 we are increasing the fees on homeowners.
6 The rates were increased and I assume it's
7 because of the treatment fees, but it doesn't get into
8 that, it just talks about us having to spend
9 money but it doesn't say this is what's going to
10 happen per household or per line.
11 MEMBER LOPATKIN: It does.
12 MEMBER LEVY: I missed it. I read it twice.
13 MS. RAY: The third paragraph. It's right in
14 the front.
15 MEMBER LEVY: Okay. I was looking at the
16 financial overview. I missed that. It's good.
17 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: This was
18 approved by the attorneys who are handling the
19 1, 4 dioxane case to make sure we didn't put
20 anything out there that could jeopardize the
21 case.
22 MEMBER LEVY: Should we get the money
23 from the case, are we going to have a
24 reimbursement to the residents or credit or
25 something or we just going to go into the

1 General Fund?

2 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: That's
3 something that we can discuss but this fee is
4 not enough. I don't want to go into it now.

5 MEMBER LEVY: I know.

6 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Not even
7 enough to cover what we are looking at.

8 MEMBER LEVY: I know that.

9 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: So we would
10 have to discuss it if and when we get the money and
11 how much money we get, when we get it.

12 MEMBER FRANK: If we have a surplus, let's do
13 that.

14 MEMBER LEVY: Okay.

15 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: So Sher
16 Edling was on last month in Executive
17 Session and explained timelines and so forth.

18 So everything is good with the newsletter?

19 MEMBER WEINBERG: My comment is just
20 that I thought that it was excellent, very well
21 written and very well done.

22 MEMBER FRANK: I thought it was really filled
23 with very pertinent information.

24 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Perfect.

25 Thank you. Thank you, Deb and thank you, Kathy

1 Ryan, et cetera, and the rest of the staff that
2 contributed their pieces to it.

3 Next item: Proposal from Hawkins Delafield
4 and Wood. They are our current bond counsel who
5 handled our last three or four bond offerings,
6 et cetera.

7 This proposal is for the new WIFIA/EPA loan
8 we are going for. We are going to try to
9 complete this ourselves. In a bond offering you typically
10 have a financial adviser and bond
11 counsel. We are going to attempt to do this
12 in-house with Judy, Sue and I and not have a
13 financial adviser. We don't feel at this time
14 it's necessary to have a financial adviser which
15 is a \$40- to \$50,000 cost usually. From what we
16 are gathering, it's pretty cut and dry, this
17 type of loan, the terms are the terms, pretty
18 much. But we do need bond counsel because there
19 is a lot of -- [Res. #21-04-08]

20 MEMBER KREITZMAN: They have to give an
21 opinion.

22 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: They
23 have to give an opinion, they have to develop
24 multiple
25 resolutions, they have to make sure that we

1 are satisfying the EPA, that our debt is going
2 to be on par with the rest of the debt, so there
3 is quite a bit that Bill Jackson and his firm
4 have to do.

5 Probably a little bit less than a typical
6 bond, it's fractionally less, that's why if you
7 see on Exhibit A, his pricing is not to exceed
8 \$40,000 which is a little bit less than what he
9 normally charges and it's also inclusive of
10 disbursements and all incidental expenses
11 also. Usually, in the past it's roughly \$50,000
12 and there is extra charges for incidentals.
13 This is now including all incidentals and not to
14 exceed a fee of \$40,000.

15 I find Bill and his firm to be absolutely
16 fabulous. The EPA was actually going to use his
17 firm for our closing until they found out that
18 we were using them and they were upset by the
19 fact that they were losing Hawkins on their
20 side.

21 MEMBER KREITZMAN: Greg, am I
22 correct in assuming we don't have to rate this
23 bond since it's done with the EPA?

24 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Sometimes
25 they do require rating, but they will

1 allow the rating within a certain period of time
2 which we are falling right on the cusp of
3 because in the 2019 bond we had the S & P
4 rating, so they are accepting that one. They
5 are not going to require us to go out and pay
6 for another rating.

7 MEMBER KREITZMAN: Great. Because
8 that's a big expense.

9 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: Yes. They
10 are working with us. I think it's within the
11 year, Judy, right, within the year?

12 Judy, we can't hear you.

13 MS. FLYNN: Yes, you're correct.

14 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: So this is
15 going to be just outside of the year, the EPA is
16 not going to make us go out and get another
17 rating, so we are going to use that rating.

18 So I recommend the Board approve Hawkins,
19 Delafield & Wood to perform this work for the
20 previously mentioned fee.

21 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: So moved?

22 MEMBER LOPATKIN: I move.

23 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Seconded?

24 MEMBER WEINBERG: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

1 (Whereupon all members responded in the
2 affirmative.)

3 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?
4 (No response.)

5 SUPERINTENDENT GRAZIANO: For the next couple
6 of items, Michael, we are going to go into
7 Executive Session, correct?

8 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Correct.

9 (Whereupon there was a discussion held off
10 the record.)

11 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Can I have a motion
12 to go into Executive Session? [Res. #21-04-09]

13 All in favor?

14 MEMBER WEINBERG: Motion.

15 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Second?

16 MEMBER LOPATKIN: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: All in favor?

18 (Whereupon all members responded in the
19 affirmative.)

20 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?
21 (No response.)

22 (Whereupon the Board went into executive
23 session from 6:29 P.M. to 7:20 P.M.)

24 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Motion to adjourn?

25 MEMBER LEVY: I so move.

1 MR. LIMMER: Wait, wait, wait.

2 Is Gail on for the minutes?

3 THE REPORTER: I am.

4 MR. LIMMER: So we need
5 a motion, then a second, to notify everyone
6 who has an outstanding bill for more than 180
7 days, to give them 30 days' notice and if they
8 don't bring their account up to date, that their
9 water will be turned off. [Res. #21-04-10]

10 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Steve, I saw Gail
11 was on. I thought she was taking down what you
12 were saying throughout.

13 MEMBER LOPATKIN: So
14 moved.

15 MEMBER WEINBERG: I second.

16 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: A vote?

17 All in favor?

18 (Whereupon all members responded in the
19 affirmative.)

20 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Any abstentions?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. LIMMER: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN KALNICK: Good night, all.

24 (Time noted: 7:24 P.M.)

25