

Board of Supervisors Special PPL Meeting
(Held at Springfield Fire Department Social Hall, Route 212, Springfield, PA)

MINUTES

February 19, 2008

All Supervisors Present: Karen Bedics, Jim Brownlow, Chuck Halderman, Barbara Lindtner and Rob Zisko.
Also present: Scott MacNair, Solicitor; Sandy Everitt, Secretary/Treasurer; and Rich Schilling, Township Manager.
141 signed attendance roster – Estimated attendance: 175

Jim Brownlow, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. This special meeting was called so that PPL could make a presentation about the proposed route for the new electric lines and substation that will run through Springfield Township. The residents can express their concerns after the PPL presentation and PPL can respond to these concerns. Jim encouraged residents to limit comments to something that was not shared by a prior speaker to ensure that all have an opportunity to speak. He introduced Kathy Frazier from PPL.

Kathy Frazier (Regional Community Relations Director of PPL) introduced Ken Kuhns, Siting Supervisor for PPL; and Paul Wirth, Manager of Public Relations, who will assist her in the presentation.

Kathy stated that the upgrade to electrical facilities is critical. The new transmission line, replacing a single-circuit, 69-kilovolt line that is 80 years old, will be the first part of the project, and will impact 50,000 customers. Without new lines, power outages and power quality problems can occur. PPL has done extensive study and solicited public input over almost 4 years, has selected a preferred route and has recently filed an application with the Public Utility Commission, because they need to approve the path for the line route. She supplied a copy of the application to Jim Brownlow and Bobb Carson. Later, another copy of the application with the document number will be provided so that the township can track this application with the PUC. The public will have opportunity to provide input during the time the application is before the PUC. They anticipate the PUC process will take about a year. PPL would like the new line in operation by May of 2009. The second part of the project will be a substation, and the substation is scheduled to begin operation in 2011.

She spoke about the process PPL followed in choosing the preferred route. 4 years ago, their project team first met and put together a study area where the line could be sited that would have the least amount of environmental impact and cost. Their environmental inventory included things like natural resources, wild life, zoning use, land slope, waterways, historic features, cultural locations and preservation of land. Beyond those considerations, they considered engineering requirements, right-of-ways, etc.

The process involved a public outreach campaign that began in 2004 and included 2 public open houses—one in 2005 and another in 2006—at the Richland Fire and Rescue Company in Richland Township. This period also involved negotiations with property owners, which have mostly occurred over the past year, and environmental assessments.

When filing with the PUC, PPL needed to provide a preferred route and an alternate route. In this case, they submitted two alternate routes. In selecting the preferred route, they needed to balance the community input, look at social factors, engineering concerns, cost, functionality, and where the least amount of impact will occur. Kathy provided copies of an *Impact Assessment* done by PPL in determining the preferred route (appended to these minutes). The preferred route begins at the Coopersburg substation and is 7 miles long, ending at the Quakertown substation. One of the alternative routes is known as the SEPTA Route because a lot of it follows the SEPTA corridor which is not in use at this time. The other alternative route is near Route 309, with part of the line going down Route 309. The route PPL selected is the shortest route. It impacts the fewest number of property owners, has the fewest number of poles, has the least amount of tree clearing and is the least expensive to construct. Another important factor between the route PPL selected and the SEPTA and 309 routes has to do with potential future relocation of the facilities. If either PennDOT or SEPTA would require PPL to move the line in the future, PPL would have to move it and start over again.

Kathy next addressed watershed concerns. PPL realizes that some wetland areas are impacted with the preferred route, as they would be with either of the alternatives. They plan to place poles so that they straddle streams and place access routes to the facilities to have a minimum impact on wetlands and waters. About three miles of the new line are in Springfield Township with approximately 24 poles located in the township. Not all of the poles will require foundations, thus not requiring as much of a footprint in the soil. PPL will comply with all environmental regulations and obtain all permits required. If wetland mitigation and replacement of wetlands are required, they will do that. In their environmental assessment, they found no threatened or endangered species along the preferred route.

Kathy spoke briefly about the substation planned as the second part of the project. It is required for liability reasons—to ensure that the lights stay on and that customers have the voltage and power quality needed when and where it is needed. The substation does not go through the PUC process as the line does. PPL purchased 80+ acres of land on Hickon Road, east of Crouthers Road, and will build the substation on a fenced-in 6- to 7-acre portion of that property. To the extent possible, they will put vegetation around it to try to minimize any visual impact. This is the best location for the substation because they need to tie it into the current electrical grid. If the route followed 309 or the SEPTA line, they would have to build out more lines to the substation site. Because of the line route, PPL will not have to do this and the tie-ins will be right on the property that they have purchased on Hickon Road.

Although PPL realizes new power lines can be controversial, they have worked hard to come to agreement with all property owners in the process. They realize that the preferred route will not please everybody, but as a power company, they have an obligation to prevent overload and keep lights on. There are times when public interest and private concerns are at odds, and they realize that is the case with this project. Kathy indicated that the application for the filing to the PUC is on the PPL website, and the public can access the entire document. The website address is: www.PPLnewsroom.com. There is a press release about the line and a direct link within that press release.

Jim Brownlow thanked Ms. Frazier for her presentation. He asked the Township Manager to have the *Impact Assessment* sheet placed on the township website, as there were not enough copies for everyone present. Jim opened the floor for public comments.

Elizabeth Schoenfeld (Haycock Township) – She tried several times to contact PPL by phone, but was unable to get through to an appropriate official. She requested information about who to contact to voice her opposition to the proposed route.

Steve Thompson (691 Rocky Valley Road) – Although Ms. Frazier indicated the new lines would be for 138 KV lines, a PPL representative told him that the lines would be 69 KV. (Ms. Frazier responded that the lines would initially be 69 but are designed to operate at 138.) Mr. Thompson asked why the current power lines along 309 could not be expanded. (Ms. Frazier said they considered doing that on the 309 Route, but they needed more space than was available. The new lines will require steel poles with bigger construction than is currently in place.) PPL approached Mr. Thompson two years ago about how the line would impact his property. Since then, PPL made 3 modifications. He said PPL mainly based their impact assessment for his property on the number of feet the line covered. He thinks the impact will be much greater, especially the market impact.

Bob Allen (760 Povenski Road) – Are you going to use the old Keystone line going into the new substation? (Mr. Kuhns: The source for the new substation will be the 230,000 volt Met-Ed line.) Mr. Allen called PPL with some questions and found them to be polite, helpful and very nice.

Carl Schwartz (3774 Buckwampum Road) – He provided information from a study entitled *High Voltage Power Lines...Do They Affect Residential Property Value?*, published in the Journal of Real Estate Research, which concluded that homes adjacent to or within sight of high voltage power lines sold for about 10 percent less than comparable houses located elsewhere. This affects not only the homeowner, but also the entire region. He concluded with a question about why they chose the preferred route. He said if he was running an electric line through his home, he would use the walls. He would not run it across the living room. (Ms. Frazier: We compensate the property owners we are negotiating with fairly for the use of their land. There is no long-term impact with electrical facilities near homes and residential areas.)

Audience: “Do you live near one?” (Ms. Frazier: I do, in fact! There is a slight temporary dip in the value of homes, but long term, there isn’t an impact on properties.)

Todd Hemmert (320 Hickon Road) – Cost is everything to PPL. That is why they are running it where they are. When properties go down in value, property taxes will go down, and the township will lose money from taxes. Second, how will the Round-Up used under the lines affect everyone's wells? Third, we know that there is a link between EMF waves and childhood leukemia. He concluded with saying PPL is not looking out for the interests of anyone other than their own bottom line and the bottom dollar.

Bruce Whitesell (2011 Route 212) – He does not live near the power line and will not be affected by the sight, sound or smell of it. He will not drink anything PPL might put into the ground. However, it is still a concern to him. Although he heard that there has been public input, to his knowledge, Springfield Township residents have had no opportunity for input before this meeting. This community looks out for each other, even if we are not directly affected, as displayed by the number of people here tonight.

Walter Weaver (636 Rocky Valley Road) – He and his brother own 43 acres of land that PPL is going through. Although they said they worked closely with landowners, they came up with four different plans so far. Because the Weavers did not take any of their offers, they are taking the worst route right through the center. PPL's first offer to them was \$8,000 for four to five and a half acres of land. He does not think it is fair. Columbia Gas already has six acres of his land, and he has had nothing but trouble every time he has had to deal with them.

Nancy Singer (2371 Township Road) – All she knows about any of this is what she has read in the papers. She and her late husband had their property put into preservation because they believe in the future of this beautiful area. She feels sorry for those who are going to have their preserved land impacted. She commented that even though she is using less electric, she is paying more. She does not think PPL is really suffering financially. (Ms. Frazier: PPL is not going through any preserved land, any agricultural preserved properties or preserved open space.)

Bill Dunlap (Slifer Valley Road) – He thinks everyone should be concerned about the potential effect on mankind from doubling the kilovolts from 69 to 138. He asked if there were studies in terms of the impact on lifestyle, appliances, and much more, on human beings—short- and long-term effects. (Ms. Frazier: There have been studies with regard to EMF [electrical magnetic fields] and PPL supports those studies and will continue to do so. PPL designs and constructs the lines to minimize any impact from the EMF. There is scientific evidence that EMF does not harm humans, but PPL will continue to watch it. If it is determined at some point that there is harm, PPL will do what they need to do to protect the health and safety of customers. Mr. Kuhn: The new line will be built to accommodate two lines, although one line will be used initially. Regarding EMF concerns, the new line will allow PPL to string the wires in such a way that the magnetic field will almost cancel itself; it is reduced by the way the wires are arranged on the structure, an arrangement called reverse phasing. With two circuits, when one flows in the same direction, by reverse phasing there is a cancellation of the magnet field. He stated that magnetic fields are generated by the load carried by the transmission line, not the voltage. When they convert from 69,000 volts to 138,000 volts, they will deliver the same amount of product to customers at half the load. So in effect, when the conversion takes place to 138,000 volts, the magnetic field component would actually go down.)

James Nelson – He is a licensed electrician. He asked Mr. Kuhn to explain to the people the load they are looking at and what they anticipate in the future. (Mr. Kuhns: He is not an electrical engineer. He can say that the capacity of the new conductors, which are a larger gauge wire than what exists currently—a 556 ACSR conductor—he believes it is about 1.09 KC mil, but isn't certain. After a lengthy discussion about how the current system operates, he discussed how this would change with the new substation.

Jack Hemmert (320 Hickon Road) – He feels the people of the township should be making the decision about the way the route should run, not PPL. PPL will naturally choose the shortest, easiest and cheapest way. This line will affect the residents the rest of their lives—their properties, their children, everything. He questioned six acres for a substation, feeling that was very large.

Anthony Torlish (475 Kellers Road) – He asked for information about the surveys on the EMF. He said that if he walks under the power lines on his property with a fluorescent light bulb, he can read a paper. That scares him. He also questioned why PPL needs 85 acres for a 6-acre substation. He anticipates they will have 85-acres worth of electric there one day.

Pete Jones (1876 Salem Road) – He referred to Ms. Frazier's opening remark that they met in 2004 with municipal and planning personnel. He is disappointed that this is the first time the residents have had a chance to

get together and look at their proposal. He mentioned the meeting in Shelly, but noted that Shelly is not in Springfield Township. He feels this was either an oversight on PPL's part or a disservice to the residents. Second, although the line does not cross his property, it runs down the entire length of his 45-acre property. A Met-Ed Line runs down that same line. He questioned whether the property owners on Salem Road should be concerned that they have two parallel lines, as far as EMF and other voltage concerns. He has viewed all of PPL's maps and aerial overheads. Although PPL said the poles would straddle streams, one of the poles is right in the middle of the creek that is the headwaters for Tohickon Creek just off his property line. He also noted the PPL's right-of-way overlaps Met-Ed's right-of-way by 25'. Finally, PPL should address the concerns of all residents, not just property owners where the new lines will run. If PPL started this 4 years ago, they didn't have the courtesy to contact the Board of Supervisors of Springfield Township. If it were not for one woman who came to a township meeting and gave a presentation, people still would not know about PPL's plans. There are environmental, aesthetic, and other such concerns that affect all residents. In Europe, everything is underground. Why can't these lines be put underground? If it is only 7 miles, and that would greatly reduce the impact. (Ms. Frazier: PPL did meet with Springfield Township officials, who are no longer with the township. There were 2 public meetings which were announced. PPL has tried to make it an open and transparent process.) Mr. Jones: Is there an EMF issue with the Met-Ed and PPL lines parallel for 8 or 9 properties? (Mr. Kuhns: "It is hard to say without a computer model. We would need to model the load and compare it with what is proposed for our new line to give us the basis that we need to make whatever adjustments we can make to mitigate EMF." The geology of the area (shallow depth to bedrock) would make it very expensive to go underground and would probably cause more environmental damage with the excavation than would occur with installation of overhead lines.)

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Kuhns if they planned to cut the trees down in the combined MetEd/PPL right of way near the stream behind his home. (Mr. Kuhns: Some, but they plan to leave the lower growing tree species in place. They will not be clear cutting or removing all vegetation. They keep the root systems intact for the low growing vegetation to help prevent soil erosion.

Amy Humphrys (2138 Salem Road) – She is a neighbor to Pete Jones. They have the same power lines behind and in front of their property that Pete Jones has. When Met-Ed comes to maintain their lines, they damage their property. She has been calling for 6 years from the last time they came in with their large truck doing all kinds of damage to the yard and driveway. They promise to come back and make repairs but do not. When they trim under the lines, they leave everything lay—in the creek, in the pond, everywhere. It looks like a tornado hit. They have a quarter-mile long blacktopped driveway. Met-Ed damages the driveway with their big trucks, but they do not fix it. There is a pipe that is collapsing from the big trucks driving over it. (Ms. Frazier: PPL does not work by that standard. If they cause damage, they will come back and fix it. She asked to talk with Ms. Humphrys after the meeting. Regarding the tree trimmings being left all over, PPL does not work that way.)

Charles Mease (2143 California Road) - Why can't you use the right-of-way you already own on Route 309—put arms on the poles, replace the wires, whatever—and utilize them? In 1958 I came home from work to tell a PPL representative where I wanted a pole on my property. Three weeks later I came home and they were digging a hole about 60' from where I wanted it—right in the middle of my parking lot! When I called them about moving it to where I wanted it, it would have cost me \$2,400 to move it. Why did I meet this guy if they were going to do what they wanted to anyway?

Hans Reimann (2915 Springtown Hill Road) – He has an ongoing problem with PPL right-of-way easements that encroached onto his property which is still unresolved. He also expressed concern about invasive plant corridors created by electric lines. He asked what PPL does when they have to cross another line. [Mr. Kuhns: Usually, higher voltage lines go on top, lower voltage underneath. However, this is decided on a case-by-case basis.)

Carl Schwartz (3774 Buckwampum Road) – Feels PPL should focus on the alternative route where wires already exist—the 309 corridor. Asked for input about PennDOT and the so-called objection they made to using the 309 line.

Dave Smith (Berks County) – Asked if this project had something to do with water. Water will be like gold in the future. Might you want to turn into a water company too? And, then you'll have the land for peanuts.

Carol Bolster (3069 Church Street) – She questioned how this line will affect the water quality. She also questioned how the new, more energy efficient appliances and the new light bulbs that require less energy are going to require more electric. And, she doesn't understand why PPL can't use the 309 corridor where it is more

industrial. (Ms. Frazier: The lines will not affect water quality at all. PPL abides by all environmental regulations and acquires all permits needed. Although newer appliances need less energy, people have more appliances in their homes. We considered 309 before as an option, but it is not the best route.)

Maria Weick (3492 School Road) – You have given us a lot of assurances, but not much information. Can you tell us why you cannot use the 309 corridor—not just tell us you cannot use it? Why can't you use steel towers on the 309 route. Why should “your” preferred route be “our” preferred route? Give us a list of believable reasons and convince us! Why has the 309 corridor worked for the past 85 years and now it is not good enough? (Ms. Frazier: All the details are in the filing. The *Impact Assessment* does detail all the different alternatives. Five or six reasons: Cost, shortest route, impacts the fewest people, least tree clearing, wouldn't have to relocate the line later if PennDOT or SEPTA required it.)

Rich Baumbach (320 Hickon Road) – Why do you need 85 acres when you are going to put in a 6-acre substation? I live next to the substation property; how will this affect my well? The line you chose is best for you because it is cheap. What about our option? As the lady before said, give us some real proof that you need this route. It is your bottom line. What about ours? (Ms. Frazier: The increased cost of moving the line will be paid by everybody in this room. It is paid by the rate payers.)

Francine Schmitt (Richland Township) – I was approached by PPL on March 8, 2007. They wanted to go through my property. I have been researching this for about a year. I can answer many of the questions people here are asking. (She shared a great deal of information verbally and referred people to information on several tables she had set up to display information). She also question why the route could not run along Route 309. She is concerned about regular flooding that occurs in areas very near where the substation is planned.

Chris Lerch (2704 Richlandtown Pike) – Why is PPL putting a substation in a residential area instead of an industrial area? With the strictness of zoning in the township, he does not see how they can meet the code and still be able to do that. He also wondered if this might be a move to permit Quakertown to buy their electricity from PPL instead of purchasing it from Ohio.

Supervisors Comments

Jim Brownlow – Asked if the substation was going to be used for other transmission lines yet to be built. (Mr. Kuhns: Only looking at the next 20 years at this time.)

Barbara Lindtner – She is concerned because this is the first time PPL met with the Board of Supervisors and residents of Springfield Township. She is also concerned about the impact on property owners, the environment, the impact of EMFs created by the power lines. She does not understand why PPL cannot expand the existing lines to accommodate larger structures. The current route would be easier to access with their vehicles to maintain. They already have easements along 309, people are used to the power lines there, and it is a commercial district designed for their purpose. She asked PPL to tell her how much more it would cost the residents to run the line up Route 309. (Mr. Kuhns could not give a cost.)

Rob Zisko – Rob asked about how wide a right-of-way PPL had along Route 309, how tall the poles currently were and what they were proposing for the new towers cross-country. (Mr. Kuhns: Don't have defined right-of-ways; current line was built by a predecessor company. Line is 80 years old and so are right-of-way agreements. In some cases, they have only tree rights—no rights to rebuild, no rights to reconstruct. They would need to acquire all new rights. New poles would probably average 85' high.) Rob asked for back up for the cost figures given for the alternative routes. (Mr. Kuhns: SEPTA expense comes from the fact they would need to accommodate a future electrified overhead rail catenary. This would require poles closer together and much taller. The 309 route would require taller structures spaced closer together, all the rights-of-ways would need to be re-negotiated along the entire route. PennDOT will not permit steel poles inside their right-of-way and the line runs in their right-of-way for about 4,000 feet. There would be significant traffic stoppage along 309 for the year it would take to install the line.)

Barbara Lindtner – Why purchase land in a Resource Protection Area instead of in the Industrial Area for a substation? (Mr. Kuhns: The location of the substation was chosen because it is where the source transmission line and the preferred line route cross. To tie in the new substation to the electric grid requires six line connections at

230,000 volts and four at 69,000 volts. By siting the substation where these lines cross, we do not have to build additional transmission facilities to tie the substation into the grid. If we built a half mile away, we would need to take the source transmission line and build connections down to the substation and potentially the same thing with the lower voltage line. Siting of the substation and the selection of a preferred alternative went hand-in-hand. It impacts less land in the community by siting both of them together.

Karen Bedics – How far away will customers be served from the electricity in our township. (Ms. Frazier: Townships of Richland, West Rockhill, Upper Saucon, Bethlehem, Springfield, Lower Saucon and Salisbury; Boroughs of Perkasie, Coopersburg and Quakertown) Is there potential in the future for this need to be extended to other states, other areas, that might warrant more power lines being run into this area? (Ms. Frazier: No plans for that in next 10 – 20 years.) Karen asked how much care PPL had given to following the Environmental Inventory Guidelines listed in Appendix A on the PPL website—linear features. (Ms. Frazier: They took it very seriously and did look at the linear functions of all three routes carefully.) Karen asked how much actual negotiation had taken place between PPL, PennDOT and SEPTA as far as trying to work out using one of those routes instead of the one PPL chose. She asked for documentation as to the types of negotiations that took place with these two entities. (Ms. Frazier: More with SEPTA than with PennDOT. Senator Wonderling also talked with SEPTA.)

Chuck Halderman – Thanked Francine Schmitt for bringing this to Township's attention last year. He clarified the timeline of PPL's interaction with former township personnel on two separate occasions, two times in 2004 and once in 2006. However, the supervisors were not made aware of any of this until July 21, 2006, when they received a memo from the former zoning officer, which did not tell us the impact their plans would have in the township. Chuck questioned why, when there are no electric towers in New York City, they could not be run underground here? He also questioned why it could not be buried along the SEPTA route out of the right-of-way area, providing conduit for future electric or other utilities to use. Chuck is also concerned about a state law that allows PPL to have 500' on each side of the centerline of transmission lines. That is 1,000 feet by state law—what is to say you will not ask for more right-of-way once it is built? (Mr. Kuhns: The right-of-way for post-transmission lines is 100' wide. For that transmission line, that is all it will ever be. That is what was negotiated with the property owners who were signed up and that is what is recorded in the county court house.) Chuck: State law allows you 500' and the ability to condemn land. What is to prevent you from taking an additional 400' on each side of that easement?

Jim Brownlow turned the meeting over to Scott MacNair, township co-solicitor to review the process.

Scott MacNair – An application was filed with the PUC and copies provided to the township and to other municipalities that are required to have copies.

The PUC will issue a hearing date, and will supply the date to the township(s). Public notice regarding that hearing must be published in the newspaper two times at least 45 days prior to the public hearing. The property owners where PPL has right-of-ways across them are required to receive this information as well as the township(s). Information will be placed on the township's website as it becomes available.

Once the hearing is set, there is a procedure for intervening called entering an intervening notice. The township is permitted to do that. Individuals can also be intervenors in such an action. Individuals can appear before an entity, can appear before the PUC and present evidence of their own, cross examine the evidence that's presented by PPL.

The PUC regulations delineate what PPL has to establish at the hearing. Scott gave some examples:

1. Present and future necessity of the proposed line.
2. Safety of the proposed line. The impact and the efforts they have made to minimize the impacts on the following different areas: Land use, soil and sedimentation, plant and wild life habitat, the terrain, hydrology, landscape, archeological areas, geological areas, historic areas, scenic areas, wilderness areas, scenic rivers.
3. Availability of reasonable alternative routes.

After PPL presents, they will also hear evidence from the township if it decides to intervene and possibly other individuals who decide to intervene. They may also hear cross-examination on the different issues listed above.

Scott asked PPL several questions to get clarification on what he felt were vague aspects to their filed application. PPL lists the purpose for the new line as system reinforcement for unplanned events. What is an unplanned event?

With respect to that same question, how many times in the past, whether it be 5 or 10 years, has one of these unplanned events occurred that has led to a problem with the current line, such that power outage has occurred and service has not been able to be provided?

Mr. Kuhns: Unplanned events are: equipment failures, transformer problems, problems with the existing transmission line. Ultimately, it is not going to be just for contingency outage or equipment failure. The present facilities are just going to overload, which will knock the line out of service and cause a power outage. Mr. Kuhn did not have figures on how many times an unplanned event occurred in the last 5 – 10 years with him.

Scott asked if provisions in the Township's Zoning Ordinance regarding performance standards and natural resources were considered. He understands that the MPC does exempt utilities to a certain extent. He asked if PPL reviewed Springfield Township's provisions regarding performance standards and whether or not the Comprehensive Plan was considered? Additionally, he asked if the right-of-way easements that have been worked out with landowners have been recorded yet or if they are just agreements that will be recorded based upon this application being filed and/or approved.

Mr. Kuhns: We reviewed the MPC and the zoning regulations. Ultimately, what governs the decisions that we make are the regulations that we are required to follow. In the case of the transmission line and the substation, NPDES permits for E&S Control and Army Corps permits for stream crossings and wetland impacts. We did not look at the Township's Comprehensive Plan. The majority of the easements that we have acquired have been recorded.

Scott asked when the bog turtle study will be completed and what will be done to "resolve the situation" if bog turtles are found. Do you plan to go around them? If you don't know at this point whether they are there, how do you know the problem can be resolved?

Mr. Kuhns: We have had a bog turtle specialist investigate the wetlands along the line route. It is his opinion that none of the wetlands are bog turtle habitat.

Jim Brownlow thanked the PPL representatives for their time and for responding to the many questions and concerns.

Kathy Frazier agreed to leave cards with contact information in case people had further questions.

Adjournment

At 10:30 p.m., Rob Zisko moved to adjourn the meeting. Barbara Lindtner seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt
Secretary/Treasurer

Next meeting: February 26, 2008

Approved: March 25, 2008