

**South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Stewardship Task Force
Minutes of Task Force Members Meeting
January 26, 2009**

A meeting of the members of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir (SFRR) Stewardship Task Force was held on Monday, January 26, 2009, at 6:00 p.m. in Conference Room A of the County Office Building ó 5th Street, Charlottesville, VA.

SFRR Stewardship Task Force Members Present: Mr. Mark Fletcher ó citizen from University of Virginia (UVA) representing recreational interests on the SFRR, Mr. Thomas Jones ó citizen representing property owners along SFRR, Ms. Karen Joyner ó Ivy Creek Foundation, Mr. Chris Lee ó Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce, Mr. John Martin ó Rivanna River Basin Commission, Ms. Wren Olivier ó Sierra Club, Dr. Liz Palmer ó Albemarle County Service Authority Board of Directors, Mr. Dennis Rooker ó Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, Mr. Ridge Schuyler ó The Nature Conservancy, Ms. Dede Smith ó Citizens for Sustainable Water Supply, Ms. Holly Edwards ó Charlottesville City Council, Mr. Michael Gaffney ó Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Board of Directors, and Ms. Sally Thomas ó Chair, member of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and representing the League of Women Voters.

Also Present: Ms. Tamara Ambler ó RWSA Water Resources Manager, Mr. Tom Frederick ó RWSA Executive Director, members of the public, and media representatives.

Ms. Thomas commented that she would like to leave tonight with a document that Task Force members agree to, and suggested that rather than reviewing the draft line by line, group members cite the òmajor issuesö they have with the report. She asked Task Force members to make a motion for suggested changes and items for inclusion.

Dr. Palmer thanked Ms. Thomas for her work on this.

Ms. Smith said that as the Citizens for a Sustainable Water Plan cannot support the report in its current form. òIt's not even sort of close to what we can support,ö she said, because the group feels it does not answer the questions posed by the city and county as reflected in their respective resolutions. Ms. Smith also commented that the concerns of the public were òtotally dismissedö in this report, and cost comparisons as requested from the city are also not included in light of the escalating price of implementing the water supply plan.

Ms. Thomas responded that the cost comparisons were not requested from the city.

Ms. Smith said that the city asked for òapples to applesö comparisons, and this report reflects òlimited collection of data.ö She indicated that the group would like the report to include a recommendation, as indicated in the email she distributed, for a more comprehensive study of the reservoir as they feel was requested through the resolution by the City on June 3rd and the resolution by the County on June 11th, voted on by the RWSA on June 23rd. òOur group feels that we should respect the wishes of the city and county and anything short of that will not fulfill the intent.ö

Ms. Olivier said that she would support Ms. Smith's comments in an effort to provide "all the range of dredging possibilities" as the public expected, and indicated that the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club has a statement that they would like to attach to the final report.

Ms. Smith noted that last statement Dave Norris and Ken Boyd made to the Task Force at their October 27th public hearing asked the group "to more closely analyze the key components of the adopted and alternative plans, to ensure that the path chosen to meet the goals of the water supply plan was the most economically and environmentally responsible one," and she does not feel the scope of what is being recommended in the study will address those words.

Mr. Rooker asked her to point out the language she is referencing, because the board chairs specifically asked the Task Force to focus efforts on building a well-rounded case as to how the reservoir benefits the community, what measures would be most effective in maintaining those benefits, what is likely to happen to the reservoir if no such measures are undertaken, and what the next steps would be to move those measures forward. "The charge made it clear that the water supply plan was a given, to this Task Force." "I haven't seen any charge by the city or the county to undertake a study of dredging, to do cost comparisons of various kinds of dredging. I don't see any of that." He added that the lead sentence says it's outside the scope of this committee's charge,

Ms. Smith responded that Mr. Rooker's comment is different than saying one cannot factor in what follows, which is a thorough assessment of the cost and feasibility of the various components, "especially in light of the escalating costs."

Mr. Rooker said that at the four-board chair meeting it was specifically brought up that a cost analysis was being pursued through an RFP to be issued by the RWSA.

Ms. Smith stated that in the November 23rd city council resolution, one of the cost comparisons includes a comprehensive dredging study.

Mr. Rooker said that an RFP would need to be issued to achieve that, and this committee is not charged with doing the RFP.

Ms. Smith responded that there is a difference between being charged with an RFP and saying "you can't do that," adding that the city and county were looking for a "full menu of options."

Mr. Schuyler emphasized that he is here to follow the charge the Task Force was asked to do "what the city, county, other two board chairs asked the Task Force to do. He said that they specifically told the Task Force that they were not charged with responsibility of reassessing the fundamentals of water supply plan, stating "in our opinion that is outside your purview."

Ms. Smith said that that does not preclude a comprehensive study to look at all of the options for the reservoir provides.

Mr. Schuyler responded that this task force was asked to look at all of the benefits that the reservoir provides to the community beyond the water supply.

Task Force members disagreed.

Mr. Jones said that the Task Force was not asked to disregard the benefits relating to water supply, and the Task Force has acknowledged the benefits of the reservoir to the water supply ó which is a different thing from storage ó although the language is clear that the group is not charged with reassessing the water supply plan.

Mr. Schuyler emphasized that the Task Force was specifically asked not to reassess those fundamentals, and that follows the June 2nd resolution from City Council, which asked the group to òundertake a study of the reservoir and the viability and merits of maintenance dredging, siltation prevention, and any other appropriate initiatives that could maintain and enhance the aquatic health and water quality of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir.ö He added that the Task Force has done that with this report.

Ms. Olivier said that is not respecting what the public has wanted and expected this committee to do.

Mr. Schuyler responded that the group is supposed to respond to what the board chairs specifically asked for, not go around them and respond to other issues.

Ms. Smith stated that the City is fully expecting a menu of options.

Mr. Schuyler replied that the report does that, by providing options other than those related to the water supply plan.

Ms. Smith said that approaching it as Mr. Schuyler has suggested is misconstruing the charge by saying water supply canø be considered, as one of the benefits of the reservoir is its role in water supply. òYou just canø have it both ways.ö

Mr. Rooker asked if she was advocating spending \$50 million to dredge the reservoir, or \$125 to \$150 million on the high end. He said that he is on this committee to represent the Board of Supervisorsø views as opposed to his personal views, and both the Board and City Council have been clear in their resolutions what they wanted this committee to do, and it was not to make recommendations that in effect would supplant or replace the water supply plan.

Ms. Smith asked if he felt it is fiscally responsible to say that changing the water supply plan would not even be discussed.

Dr. Palmer said that this group has never been asked to provide information that would come from professional consultants and engineers for a greater analysis of different components of water supply plan.

Ms. Smith asked where the feasibility of dredging the reservoir fits into this, as it's been cited in the resolutions and the request of the four board chairs.

Dr. Palmer stated that the possible reasons to dredge ó long-term, rowing, short-term ó are to be considered, but the main storage component is not a reason to dredge as that's not part of the water supply plan.

She also said that people feel strongly that there is an ethical obligation to maintain the reservoir, and this committee is finally going to say what's going to happen to the reservoir ó but that's not part of the water supply plan.

Ms. Smith said, "I just think that's irresponsible."

Ms. Thomas asked if she had a motion to make.

MOTION: Ms. Smith moved that the Task Force's recommendation include a comprehensive professional study of dredging to get a baseline evaluation of the reservoir condition with defining physical and geophysical information, including bathymetric measurements, side scans, geotechnical [data], to identify potential dewatering and disposal sites (per Gahagan & Bryant and what the task force discussed), to identify potential commercial uses for sediment, work with the community and the Army Corps of Engineers to establish an integrated resource management plan for the reservoir, analysis of new sandbar/wetlands and potential for removal, assess the impact of dredging on the control of hydrilla, prevention of future sedimentation: i.e. forebays, cost estimates for a menu of dredging options, and evaluate permitting conditions.

She commented that many of the tasks in her motion are within the limited scope of the draft proposed report of the Task Force, but her motion gives a wider range of dredging options. "I do not feel that the cost of such a study is going to be really much different at all" and the money is available."

Ms. Smith also presented a written version of this statement.

Ms. Olivier seconded the motion.

Dr. Palmer said she would feel very irresponsible in asking the ratepayers to pay for that study, as the \$300,000 could be used for other things. Dr. Palmer noted that the water resources manager position with the county is frozen, and this money could go to other erosion control operations.

Ms. Smith mentioned that Mr. Frederick put forward recommendations as to how to use that money.

Dr. Palmer said that "our charge was to figure out if we were going to dredge what we were going to dredge for," and Gahagan & Bryant emphasized the importance of that determination. She added that the cost of a feasibility study for the purposes in the report is probably less than \$300,000, and it's not up to this group to determine those costs.

Mr. Rooker disagreed with the characterization by Ms. Smith that this is disrespectful to the City and County, and only about 1/3 of the public that commented in the survey mentioned dredging. He noted that many of the items in her statement are already in the report, but she includes an expanded study. Mr. Rooker asked Mr. Frederick to explain the cost differences between a smaller study and a comprehensive study.

Mr. Frederick responded that he does not have a perfectly quantifiable answer, but he can provide some guesses based on his past experience. He said that a bathymetric survey if limited to a smaller area of the reservoir could be cheaper than a study of full reservoir, then added that Rivanna will be accountable to the DEQ under the new Ragged Mountain permit for doing full surveys periodically, and since one hasn't done one in seven years, Rivanna may choose to broaden the task force's recommendations to go ahead and perform the full survey. Mr. Frederick noted that if sediment sampling on just a portion of the reservoir, the sampling costs would likely be less, but the engineering labor required to generate a report would likely be similar without respect to the size of the sampling.

Mr. Rooker noted that in one of the original reports that was done for VHB, it was recommended that a bathymetric study of the reservoir be done every five years, and it's been six years since the last one was done. He asked if the RWSA would be doing a bathymetric study of the entire reservoir sometime soon, if this committee were not in existence.

Mr. Frederick responded that it is due sometime in the near future.

Mr. Rooker commented that it seems a bit odd that this group would be considering evaluating slices of the reservoir when a larger study would be done every five years anyway, and it seems to be "money well spent" to go ahead and do an entire study.

Dr. Palmer asked Mr. Frederick if the bathymetric studies were less expensive, based on kinds they've done in the past.

He said that he did not have those exact figures available.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there was anything in the budget right now to allow for that study this year or next year.

Mr. Frederick responded that the RWSA operating budget does not include an allocation for that at this time, adding that what was mentioned last summer is money in the watershed fund if the Board chooses to "advance" toward a dredging study but no final appropriation has been made.

Dr. Palmer commented that what's recommended in the proposed task force report is the right way to proceed and could save the public a considerable amount of money.

Mr. Lee said that looking at the charge by the Mayor on October 28th, the references in the resolution from the City and the County talk about a study for the viability and merits of dredging for siltation prevention and any other appropriate initiatives that could maintain and

advance the aquatic health and water quality. He asked Ms. Smith how her recommendations address the aquatic health and water quality.

Ms. Smith replied that there is no way to answer those questions without doing a study of the reservoir, and it hasn't been done since 2002 ó when only some of those parameters were included. She said that she is proposing a feasibility study as defined by Gahagan & Bryant and enhanced by items that the Task Force deemed appropriate, such as wetlands.

Mr. Martin commented that the Task Force is 35 minutes into this discussion, and it's time to vote.

Mr. Schuyler said that he would like to know what the feasibility study suggested by Ms. Smith would intend to address.

Ms. Smith replied that it would be to look at the current condition of the reservoir, to provide a menu of options that would range no dredging to restorative dredging.

Mr. Schuyler asked what the ultimate objective of that would be.

Ms. Smith said the study would provide cost estimates related to a range of options.

Mr. Schuyler asked what purpose the dredging would intend to achieve, beyond what's included in this report.

Ms. Smith replied that the intent would be restoring the reservoir to its original condition for the variety of benefits identified in this report that range from recreational to water supply uses.

Mr. Schuyler said that rowing, paddling, fishing, aesthetic value, biota, etc. have been identified in this report, and asked her which of these is not addressed to her satisfaction. "Where does this not go far enough."

Ms. Smith responded it does not offer the city and county decision-makers the information they've asked for to maintain, preserve, and possibly restore the reservoir, as the board chairs have clearly asked for that information, and this report does not go far enough. "I think this committee should respect what the City and County have asked for [to] make sound decisionsí particularly in light of the escalating costs."

Mr. Schuyler asked how this squares with the Mayor's statement that the charge of this group is not to reassess the fundamentals of the water supply plan.

Ms. Smith replied that Mr. Schuyler is "corrupting [the Mayor's] intent," as the Mayor has consistently said there are implications with any level of dredging. She emphasized that the City and County want as much information as possible, and that was the whole point of the November 3rd resolution of the City that prompted the four-board meeting.

Ms. Thomas said that the four board chairs have set in motion the need for professional assessments relating to associated costs, but that was not part of the direction to this Task Force.

Ms. Smith responded that the feasibility study was "part of that."

Regarding the escalating costs, Mr. Lee noted that a letter from the Mayor says the RWSA should take advantage of the pause to evaluate the key components of the water supply plan to ensure the path chosen to meet goals is truly the most economically and environmentally responsible. "They put that to a body, but not to this body."

Dr. Palmer added, "They're paying somebody else to do that."

Ms. Smith asked who's going to do it, if it's not done within context of this study, and suggested expanding Task Force recommendations to accommodate their goals.

Mr. Schuyler said if the City wants to do something broader, they are not bound by what the Task Force recommends, and the Task Force charge shouldn't be artificially expanded to advance an agenda if that's not what was asked.

Mr. Rooker commented that he may ultimately support an expanded study, and it is within the purview of the RWSA and the governing bodies to proceed with that. He added that if one accepts the water supply plan, then this Task Force shouldn't recommend a broad study to dredge the entire reservoir to create a storage area that would go "way beyond" what's called for in the 50-year plan.

Mr. Fletcher said that this group essentially has one arm tied behind its back, but there is not anything in the report that doesn't supply the information requested by the four board chairs to move forward with recommendations. "It's not going to be our decision as to how people spend their money, but we've surely given some folks options as to how they can spend dollars if they choose to do that." He acknowledged that there is "a bigger issue out there."

Ms. Edwards asked if there would be another formal motion to include what Ms. Olivier offered.

Ms. Thomas responded that could be decided by consensus, but it is not part of this motion.

Ms. Thomas called for the question.

The motion failed 10-3, with Ms. Olivier, Ms. Smith, and Ms. Edwards voting in favor of it, and Ms. Joyner, Mr. Martin, Dr. Palmer, Mr. Schuyler, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Gaffney, Mr. Jones, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Lee and Ms. Thomas voting against it.

Ms. Thomas asked if there were other major issues with the report.

Ms. Smith commented that she formally objects to the discussion of public input, and felt that there was much more discussion than what's reflected in the report.

Mr. Jones said that it's inherent that public comment of this type is non-scientific, and many people spent much time to respond to the survey, so it's unnecessary to include the disclaimers in the report. "The questionnaire spoke for itself."

Ms. Thomas stated that people are trying to get conclusions from the public comment, and somewhere it needs to be said that the survey is not scientific, so perhaps using the term "questionnaire" instead would cover that.

Mr. Rooker suggested leaving out the footnote, and adding language that states the responses to the questionnaire were not intended to be considered scientific data.

Mr. Martin said that he feels very strongly that it should all be left in, adding that it will ensure that the survey will not be "misused in the future debate in this community as to its significance." He added, "You cannot use it to demonstrate what the public attitude is, but it's very likely that's how it's going to be used." Mr. Martin commented that the survey had very little value in determining what public opinion is.

Dr. Palmer agreed, adding that this is just a "normal disclosure" used in public opinion surveys.

Mr. Fletcher said that he has mixed feelings about this, and he is accepting of the disclaimer, but it gives the impression that there is no value to the public comment. "I don't think we want to discount every single person that answered this survey."

Mr. Martin replied that it acknowledges the people who answered the survey, and the whole point is to what judgments can be made as to the feelings of the entire population.

Mr. Gaffney said that he liked Mr. Rooker's suggested inclusion of "not intended to be"

MOTION: Mr. Rooker moved to end line 220 after the words "Appendix E" and delete the remaining two sentences, noting that the survey itself includes the disclaimer that the questionnaire is not scientific; the motion also included elimination of Footnote #3, which states the same disclaimer.

Mr. Gaffney seconded the motion.

The motion passed 12-1, with Mr. Martin dissenting.

Dr. Palmer suggested changing the word "survey" to "questionnaire" throughout the document.

Mr. Jones mentioned that he would like it to be stated explicitly that Greg Harper's photographic comparison of loss of area by photographs could not, and was not intended to be able to, measure the depth of the water. He noted that this reference was between line 300 and 310, and noted that surface area loss in the future could be more sudden. Mr. Jones suggested adding the language: "Mr. Harper emphasized that because his technique is based on photographs, it cannot determine changes in water depth. These projections simply extrapolate the past loss of surface area into the future."

Mr. Martin asked if Mr. Harper had actually said this.

Mr. Jones confirmed that he had.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker moved for inclusion of the statement: "Mr. Harper emphasized that because his technique is based on aerial photographs, it cannot determine changes in water depth; these projections simply extrapolate the past loss of surface area into the future," as suggested by Mr. Jones, who agreed to provide exact wording to Ms. Thomas for the final report.

Mr. Rooker suggested adding the word "aerial" before photographs.

Mr. Jones suggested putting that statement after Footnote #22, on line 309 in the text. He seconded the motion.

Ms. Smith stated objection as to how much space this analysis was given, as it is not a valid scientific method.

Ms. Thomas said that her conversations with Mr. Harper determined that this was a valid mathematical method.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Schuyler if this was the method that The Nature Conservancy used.

Mr. Schuyler responded that the Conservancy uses a more thorough method, and if this were to be done more specifically it would need to consider hydrology, hydraulics, and sediment transport costs, noting that Mr. Harper said that this was a "back of the envelope" method.

Mr. Jones said that one way to handle this would be to include predictions as to how much surface area would be lost in the next 30 years, as the hydrology is far more complicated. He commented that if there are concerns about people misusing data, he would delete the sentence related to amount of surface area Mr. Harper predicts would be lost if there is no intervention.

Dr. Palmer responded that it's helpful in determining what would happen if nothing was done. "I do think it's helpful for people to visualize what would happen."

Mr. Jones clarified that the change would be on line 302, to add "if the loss of surface area continues at the same rate," replacing sedimentation.

Mr. Gaffney said that it's a given that loss of surface area would continue if nothing is done.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker move acceptance of Mr. Jones's language into the report. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker moved to approve the report as amended tonight. Dr. Palmer seconded the motion.

Ms. Olivier asked to include a statement from the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club:

“A stated purpose of the South Fork Rivanna Stewardship Task Force is to assess the benefits of the Reservoir and to recommend measures to preserve its benefits to the community. The Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club notes that since this Reservoir was constructed over forty years ago, the primary benefit has been the provision of water to the Albemarle-Charlottesville urban community. This benefit will be lost without capacity-restoring dredging.

The Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club recommends a study of the costs and feasibility of dredging the Rivanna Reservoir to restore its original water storage capacity be conducted. Possibly excessive estimates of the cost of dredging provided during development of the current water plan may have led to the mistaken rejection of dredging of the Rivanna Reservoir as the primary means of providing long term water supply.

The adopted water plan, which does not include capacity-restoring dredging, has significant environmental and economic costs. Many members of the public and our organization believe that the adopted water plan should be reconsidered. The Task Force should recommend such a study of capacity-restoring so that decision-makers involved in long term water planning can make informed choices that would serve the public interest.

The Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club rejects the notion that stewardship of the Rivanna Reservoir should be based on the assumption that the reservoir will function primarily as a “water park” or some other form of cultural asset.”

MOTION: Ms. Smith moved that the statement from the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club be included as an attachment to the Task Force’s final report.

Ms. Olivier seconded the motion.

Ms. Thomas stated that the motion by Mr. Rooker and seconded by Dr. Palmer would be set aside for discussion of Ms. Olivier’s proposal to include the statement from the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club.

Ms. Thomas asked if the Sierra Club was suggesting that this report suggests reservoir use for a water park.

Ms. Olivier responded that the group was considering maintaining it for fishing, rowing, paddling, etc.

Dr. Palmer said that she used the phrase “water park,” and perhaps that was taken out of context.

Mr. Rooker stated that this report contains the primary benefit of the reservoir as the provision of drinking water to the Charlottesville/Albemarle community.

Ms. Olivier noted that the next draft of the statement excluded water storage.

Mr. Schuyler commented that he is not certain how to proceed with inclusion of the Sierra Club's statement.

Mr. Rooker said that he doesn't think the report should include statements from third party groups, noting that he doesn't agree with every word in the report but the intention was committee consensus. He added that the Sierra Club could certainly issue a press release on their own.

Ms. Thomas noted that the appendix could certainly include public comment.

Ms. Smith said that a minority report would likely be forthcoming.

Mr. Jones stated that this seems to be a special case, and the minutes could certainly reflect a "minority opinion."

Ms. Smith commented that there wasn't an avenue for public opinion, and perhaps public comment should be included.

Mr. Rooker said that the Sierra Club statement should be included in an appendix of public comments, along with other emails addressed to the committee and comments made in public hearings.

Ms. Joyner noted that the responses from the RWSA should be included as well.

Mr. Rooker agreed.

Ms. Smith said that she would invite the Sierra Club to be part of a minority report. She asked to read a statement to be included in the minutes.

Mr. Lee stated that he would like to handle the motion on the floor.

Ms. Thomas noted that the RWSA did not receive and could not retrieve individual emails, because what was set up was a list serve. She suggested that Ms. Ambler could perhaps collect those for inclusion.

Ms. Thomas called for the question on the motion for inclusion of Ms. Olivier's statement from the Sierra Club.

The motion failed 10-3, with Ms. Olivier, Ms. Smith, and Ms. Edwards voting in favor, and Ms. Joyner, Mr. Martin, Dr. Palmer, Mr. Schuyler, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Gaffney, Mr. Jones, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Lee, and Ms. Thomas voting against it.

The Task Force reconsidered Mr. Rooker's motion to adopt the report.

Ms. Smith read a statement for inclusion in the report: The Citizens for a Sustainable Water Plan appreciate the effort that went into creating the SFRR Stewardship Task Force report. However,

we feel that the task force report has fallen short of its charge and therefore we cannot sign on to it.

It is our opinion that the report failed to honor the intent of the governing bodies that authorized the task force, as reflected in the statement by Dave Norris and Ken Boyd at the October 27 meeting of the task force, when they stated that "we believe RWSA should take advantage of this pause in the implementation process to more closely analyze the key components of the adopted and alternative plans to ensure that the path we choose for meeting our community water supply goals truly is the most economically-and environmentally-responsible one."

Good decisions require good data. Knowledge of existing conditions is essential in determining the best way to move forward. To recommend a "collection of data" under limiting conditions will not provide the City and County with the "apples-to-apples" cost comparisons they have called for.

We feel that in addition to the failure to adequately address the intent of the City and County, the task force report fails to acknowledge or honor the overwhelming support that the public has conveyed for dredging the SFRR for our water supply.

She said that they do plan on creating a minority report.

Mr. Schuyler commented that the record should reflect that this report recognizes that the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir will continue to provide 96% of the water this community will use now and in the future. He also said that the statement that this resource will be lost without dredging is simply not true, adding that restorative dredging was not selected not just because of cost, but because restoring it to its original capacity at \$30 million would only meet 21% of water storage needs, and the Ragged Mountain solution is a 100% solution. Mr. Schuyler added that spending \$30 million to dredge the reservoir the dam height could be reduced by five feet, restoring 360 million gallons of capacity and preserving 13 acres of trees around Ragged Mountain.

Ms. Smith asked how much dam height would be saved by restoring and maintaining the reservoir at its original capacity of 1.2 billion gallons.

Mr. Schuyler responded that with spending more than \$30 million the dam height could be reduced from 45 to 30 feet, but it would be substantially more than \$30 million; it would cost \$70 million more to create storage by dredging than to create the Ragged Mountain Dam.

Mr. Rooker commented that that's the best price he has heard.

Ms. Edwards commented that she doesn't agree with the entire report, but the entire piece has such great information she can support it. She emphasized the importance of the process and journey the Task Force experienced to get to this point, and it's important to bring that to a close.

The Task Force voted to approve the motion by Mr. Rooker to adopt the report presented and amended tonight. The motion passed 11-2, with Ms. Joyner, Mr. Martin, Dr. Palmer, Mr. Schuyler, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Gaffney, Mr. Jones, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Lee, Ms. Edwards and Ms. Thomas voting in favor, with Ms. Smith and Ms. Olivier dissenting.

The Task Force agreed by consensus to allow Ms. Thomas to make any necessary non-substantive grammar and typographical changes.

The Task Force applauded Ms. Thomas for her work.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.