

To,

The Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**Re: Chirag Batra v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation Docket No. C-2026-3060946**

Dear Secretary,

Enclosed please find Complainant Chirag Batra's Reply to the Preliminary Objections and Answer of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation in the above-referenced proceeding.

In its Preliminary Objections, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation asserts that it possesses easement rights permitting installation of a utility pole on Complainant's property and further asserts that alternative options, including placement on nearby Township-owned property or underground installation, are impractical or cost-prohibitive.

Complainant respectfully submits that PPL's response acknowledges the existence of reasonable alternatives but declines to adequately pursue them. Specifically, PPL acknowledges the existence of Township-owned property (designated as open space) located across from Complainant's residence and further acknowledges that underground installation is technically feasible, though more costly.

In addition, Complainant has observed that **existing electric poles are already installed immediately before the beginning and immediately after the end of the Township-owned property**. Furthermore, **electric poles and overhead electric lines are also presently installed within the Township-owned property itself**, demonstrating that utility infrastructure already

exists within this corridor and that no new precedent would be created by installing additional poles within Township property.

These existing installations indicate that placement within Township-owned property represents a reasonable and technically feasible alternative and would require only a limited extension of existing infrastructure. However, PPL has not provided sufficient justification for rejecting these alternatives, nor has PPL provided cost transparency regarding the alleged increased cost of underground installation, including the relative cost of underground installation limited to the short segment adjacent to Complainant's property.

Additionally, Complainant respectfully submits that the proposed installation would impose a disproportionate burden on Complainant's property compared to other properties in the neighborhood, where similar installations are not located in prominent front-yard areas, thereby impacting the visual character, usability, and potential value of Complainant's property.

For these reasons, and as explained more fully in the enclosed Reply, Complainant respectfully requests that the Commission deny PPL's Preliminary Objections and allow this matter to proceed.

Copies will be provided as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,



Chirag Batra  
4770 Curly Horse Drive  
Center Valley, PA 18034  
Ph: 978-905-1976  
[batrachirag@gmail.com](mailto:batrachirag@gmail.com)

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true and correct copy of **Complainant's Reply to Preliminary Objections and Answer of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation** upon the following parties in accordance with the requirements of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission:

Kimberly A. Klock (ID # 89716)  
Michael J. Shafer (ID # 205681)  
PPL Services Corporation  
645 Hamilton Street, Suite 700  
Allentown, PA 18101  
Phone: 610-774-2599  
Fax: 610-774-4102  
E-mail: [kklock@pplweb.com](mailto:kklock@pplweb.com)  
[mjshafer@pplweb.com](mailto:mjshafer@pplweb.com)

Devin T. Ryan (ID # 316602)  
Emily S. Grecu (ID # 337777)  
Post & Schell, P.C.  
One Oxford Centre  
301 Grant Street, Suite 3010  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Phone: 717-612-6052  
Fax: 717-731-1985  
E-mail: [dryan@postschell.com](mailto:dryan@postschell.com)  
[egrecu@postschell.com](mailto:egrecu@postschell.com)

Via: Electronic Mail and/or U.S. Mail

I certify that service has been made this 6 day of April, 2026.



Chirag Batra  
4770, Curly Horse Drive  
Center Valley, PA 18034  
Ph: 978-905-1976  
[batrachirag@gmail.com](mailto:batrachirag@gmail.com)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS / REPLY SEQUENCE

1. **Cover Letter** — Page 1 - 2

Overview of the Reply and summary of key arguments.

2. **Certificate of Service** — Page 3

3. **Answer to Preliminary Objections** — Pages 6 - 12

Point-by-point response to PPL's assertions including:

- Township property alternative
- Existing Pole Locations and Infrastructure Corridor
- Underground installation feasibility
- Cost transparency argument
- Disproportionate impact on property
- Easement rights limitation

4. **Exhibit Index / List of Attachments** — Page 13

- **Exhibit A** — Aerial View with marked pole locations (approximate locations) — Page14
- **Exhibit B** — Electric lines and poles inside township property (actual ground pictures) — Page15
- **Exhibit C** — Electric lines and poles just at the beginning of Township Property (actual ground pictures) — Page16
- **Exhibit D** — Electric lines and poles after the Township Property (actual ground pictures) — Page17
- **Exhibit F** — Township Meeting Minutes (August 11, 2025). To prove land is Marked as open space — Page18

# COMPLAINANT'S ANSWER TO PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES' PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS

---

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Complainant respectfully submits this Reply to the Preliminary Objections and Answer filed by PPL Electric Utilities.

PPL's response confirms several important facts:

1. PPL acknowledges the existence of Township-owned property across the street, that is marked for open space.
2. PPL acknowledges additional permissions may be required but has not pursued them.
3. **Existing electric poles and lines already run through Township Property** (Refer Exhibit B), confirming feasibility of alternative placement. This demonstrates that PPL might already have easement with the Township Property, no other permission should be required.
4. PPL acknowledges underground installation is feasible but rejected due to cost.
5. PPL has not demonstrated that Complainant's property is the only feasible location.
6. PPL relies primarily on easement rights without addressing disproportionate burden.
7. PPL asserts underground installation is "ten times more costly" but has not provided cost transparency or project cost context.

Complainant respectfully submits that PPL selected Complainant's property because it represents the easiest option rather than the least intrusive or most reasonable option.

Complainant provides the following point-by-point response.

---

## II. POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE

---

### 1. PPL CLAIM: Township Property Requires Additional Permission

PPL acknowledges that Township-owned Property, which is marked for open space, exists across the street but asserts that installation would require additional permission or easement rights.

#### Complainant Response

Complainant respectfully submits that this assertion does not reflect the existing conditions at the site.

Upon further inspection of the area, Complainant observed that **existing electric poles and overhead electric lines are already installed within the Township-owned property located directly across from Complainant's residence**. These installations appear to be positioned slightly inside the township property boundary (Refer Exhibit B).

This observation is significant because:

- Utility infrastructure is already present within township property
- PPL already operates infrastructure within Township-owned land
- Placement within Township Property is technically feasible
- No new precedent would be created by installing additional poles within Township Property

Additionally, Complainant observed that **electric poles are located on both sides of the township-owned property** (Refer Exhibit C and D). This suggests that installation of an additional pole along the township property boundary adjacent to the roadway would represent a **minor extension of existing infrastructure**, rather than a new or unusual installation.

Further, Complainant notes that the Township property referenced above was formally identified during an **Upper Saucon Township meeting held on August 11, 2025**, where the **property was**

**designated for open space use (Refer Exhibit F).** This indicates that the land remains undeveloped and available for potential utility placement with appropriate coordination.

Therefore, Complainant respectfully submits:

- Township property remains a viable alternative
- Existing poles confirm technical feasibility
- Utility infrastructure already exists within township property
- Installation on Complainant's property is not necessary
- PPL has not demonstrated that Complainant's property is the only feasible option

Accordingly, Complainant respectfully requests that PPL be directed to evaluate installation within the township-owned property corridor as a less intrusive and reasonable alternative.

---

## **2. PPL CLAIM: Anchor Requirements Near Township Property**

PPL asserts that additional anchor placements would require further easement rights.

### **Complainant Response**

As mentioned prior, **there are existing poles already installed on both sides of the Township-owned Property** (Refer Exhibit C and D). This indicates that utility infrastructure already exists along this corridor.

The presence of these poles suggests that installation within township property is technically feasible and consistent with existing utility placement.

PPL has not adequately explained why installation within Township Property is not feasible given existing poles.

---

## **3. PPL CLAIM: Underground Installation Not Pursued**

PPL indicates underground installation is not being pursued.

### **Complainant Response**

Complainant understands that underground installation is technically feasible but has been rejected primarily due to cost considerations.

Additionally, Complainant spoke with a contractor representative who indicated that underground installation was not being pursued because it is more costly. This further confirms feasibility.

---

### **4. PPL COST CLAIM: "TEN TIMES MORE COSTLY"**

PPL asserts that underground installation would be approximately ten times more costly than overhead installation.

### **Complainant Response**

While PPL asserts that underground installation is “ten times more costly,” PPL has not provided:

- Total project cost
- Cost of overhead installation
- Cost of underground installation limited to approximately 50-meter section affecting Complainant’s property
- Percentage impact of underground installation relative to total project cost

Without this information, the “ten times more costly” assertion lacks meaningful context.

For example, underground installation may be ten times more costly for a small segment yet still represent a small percentage of the total project cost.

Complainant respectfully requests that PPL provide:

1. Total project cost
2. Cost of overhead installation
3. Cost of underground installation limited to Complainant's frontage
4. Percentage difference relative to total project cost

This information is necessary to evaluate whether PPL's decision is reasonable.

---

## **5. DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT**

The proposed pole location uniquely impacts Complainant's property.

To Complainant's knowledge, no other homes in his neighborhood have poles installed in comparable prominent front-yard locations.

This may negatively affect:

- Property value
- Aesthetic character
- Curb appeal
- Usability of yard space

As the property owner, Complainant has a legitimate interest in maintaining the value and character of the property.

---

## **6. PPL CLAIM: Easement Rights Allow Installation**

PPL asserts that it possesses easement rights permitting installation on Complainant's property.

### **Complainant Response**

Complainant acknowledges that easement rights were granted during development of the neighborhood. However, easements do not grant unlimited authority to place infrastructure without regard to reasonable alternatives or disproportionate impact.

Utilities are expected to exercise easement rights reasonably and minimize unnecessary burden on individual property owners.

To Complainant's knowledge, no other homes in the neighborhood have poles installed in prominent front-yard locations. In limited instances where poles exist, they are located in rear wooded portions of properties with minimal impact.

By contrast, the proposed installation would place a pole in a prominent and visible portion of Complainant's yard, resulting in disproportionate impact.

---

## **7. COMPLAINANT HAS RIGHT TO FILE**

PPL suggests that Complainant lacks standing due to easement rights. However, Complainant remains the property owner and retains a legitimate interest in minimizing unnecessary impact.

The existence of an easement does not eliminate Complainant's right to request reasonable placement or Commission review.

---

## **III. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Complainant respectfully requests that the Commission:

1. Deny PPL's Preliminary Objections
2. Require evaluation of township property
3. Require evaluation of underground installation

4. Require cost transparency and comparison
  5. Require avoidance of disproportionate burden
  6. Grant additional relief as deemed appropriate
- 

Respectfully Submitted



Chirag Batra  
4770 Curly Horse Drive  
Center Valley, PA 18034  
Ph: 978-905-1976  
[batrachirag@gmail.com](mailto:batrachirag@gmail.com)  
Date: 04-05-2026

### **Exhibit Index / List of Attachments**

- **Exhibit A** — Aerial View with marked pole locations.
- **Exhibit B** — Electric lines and poles inside township property.
- **Exhibit C** — Electric lines and poles just at the beginning of Township Property.
- **Exhibit D** — Electric lines and poles after the Township Property.
- **Exhibit F** — Township Meeting Minutes (August 11, 2025). To prove land is marked as open space.

## Exhibit A — Aerial View with marked pole locations

(Approximate Locations)

● Disputed location

● Current Approximate Location of  
Already Existing Electric Poles

● Complainant suggested location  
across the street



**Exhibit B — Electric lines and poles inside township property**



This is Township Property, poles and electric lines already exist inside it.

- **Exhibit C — Electric lines and poles just at the beginning of Township Property.**



Start of Township Property,  
electric poles and lines just  
before.

**Exhibit D — Electric lines and poles after the Township Property.**



Township Property ends. Electric poles and lines just after it.

**Exhibit F — Township Meeting Minutes (August 11, 2025).**

- See scanned copies below.
- Minutes can also be found here: <https://www.uppersaucon.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/BOS-Minutes-8-11-25-signed.pdf>

## MINUTES

Upper Saucon Township Board of Supervisors  
Regular Meeting  
Monday, August 11, 2025 – 6:30 P.M.  
Township Municipal Building

Members Present: John G. Inglis, III, Chairman  
Philip W. Spaeth, Vice Chairman  
Stephen Wagner  
Brian J. Farrell  
Timothy Foley

Staff Attending: Thomas F. Beil, Township Manager  
Joseph Geib, Assistant Township Manager  
Patrick Leonard, Director of General Services  
Patricia Lang, Director of Community Development  
Thomas Nicoletti, Chief of Police  
Dane Carroll, Police Sergeant  
Thomas Dinkelacker, Township Solicitor  
Charles Unangst, P.E., Township Engineer

### CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Inglis called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., in the Public Meeting Room of the Upper Saucon Township Municipal Building, 5500 Camp Meeting Road, Upper Saucon Township, Lehigh County, PA.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Inglis asked all in attendance to stand and recite the “Pledge of Allegiance.”

### NOTIFICATION

Chairman Inglis announced that all public sessions of the Upper Saucon Township Board of Supervisors are electronically recorded. The recordings are maintained as part of the record of the meeting until the minutes are transcribed and approved by the Board.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Lowell Lindy of 4113 Dillingersville Road, Zionsville spoke regarding the property at 4732 West Hopewell Road. He stated that the structures at the subject property are historic, and that they should not be demolished. He provided Lower Milford Township’s Historic Property Ordinance, and stated that according to their rules, an historic property cannot be modified or destroyed, and suggested that Upper Saucon Township pass similar regulations.

2987

Millie Schuck and Tammy Wheitsel of 4942 Route 309 (Lot 360) spoke about flooding concerns from the recent heavy rainfall on July 14. They had concerns regarding the amount of floodwaters that came into the trailer park from several properties upstream from them, and that the flooding prevented Upper Saucon Ambulance Corps from servicing a call for another neighbor during the storm. They requested that the stormwater be redirected, and stated that flooding to this extent has not happened before, and that their landlord seems to be unwilling to assist them. Chairman Inglis replied that some of the flooding concerns will be addressed when the new warehouse project gets built, as the project will build additional stormwater infrastructure capable of alleviating some of these flooding concerns along Chestnut Drive.

Julie Gudz of 3856 E. Hopewell Road spoke about flooding concerns from the recent heavy rainfall on July 14. She returned home to find her block basement wall had caved in due to flood damage, leaving her home uninhabitable. She inquired if there were any plans in the future to alleviate flooding in the area of East Hopewell and East Valley Roads, especially with 72 homes planned for the Saucon Parke project. Mr. Beil replied that the Township Engineer is looking into the flooding issues in the area, and has yet to issue a final report on the matter. Mr. Beil asserted that there were no stormwater controls when many of the existing homes were built many years ago.

Peggy Gudz of 3817 Bittersweet Road spoke in support of her daughter, Julie Gudz. She was upset that many homes were damaged during the flooding on July 14, and that more homes are being proposed before the existing flooding problems are solved.

Nathan Dubbs of 2905 Stonewall Drive inquired about the agenda items for release of funds for Estates at Saucon Valley. He requested the Engineer's report that the release of funds is based on, so he can know what the community is accepting with the release. Mr. Beil agreed that he will provide the Engineer's report in the coming days. Mr. Unangst informed the resident that the developer requested release on a considerable amount of items that were not yet installed – including trees – and that the Township is still holding security for those items.

#### **TOWNSHIP ACQUISITION OF OPEN SPACE PROPERTY INTEREST – 4732 WEST HOPEWELL ROAD**

##### Public Hearing on Possible Fee Simple Acquisition of 10.3 Acres at 4732 West Hopewell Road

Chairman Inglis opened the hearing and asked Solicitor Dinkelacker to handle the proceedings.

Solicitor Dinkelacker said the purpose of the hearing is to accept public comment and input relative to the Possible Fee Simple Acquisition of 10.3 Acres at 4732 West Hopewell Road.

Solicitor Dinkelacker introduced the following exhibits into the record:

- T-1 Copy of Resolution No. 2023-10 establishing procedures for reviewing open space property interests considered for acquisition by the Township.
- T-2 Copy of public notice which was submitted to The Morning Call newspaper on July 15, 2025 with instructions for publication.
- T-3 Copy of actual public notice that appeared in the legal notices section of The Morning Call newspaper on July 28, 2025.
- T-4 Page 78 of the Comprehensive Recreation and Open Space Plan which identifies the property at 4732 West Hopewell Road as a priority for preservation by the Township.
- T-5 Component 3 of the Official Map which identifies the property at 4732 West Hopewell Road as being considered for acquisition by the Township for recreation purposes.
- T-6 Open space suitability rating for property at 4732 West Hopewell Road as noted in Appendix to the Comprehensive Recreation and Open Space Plan.
- T-7 Lehigh County on-line assessment records for property at 4732 West Hopewell Road.

Solicitor Dinkelacker noted that Exhibits T-1 through T-7 will become part of the official record of the hearing.

Solicitor Dinkelacker reviewed the proposed acquisition with the Board.

Solicitor Dinkelacker asked if anyone from the public wanted to comment on the proposed Acquisition.

Cathleen Deschu of 4804 Bowood Street spoke regarding the acquisition and reuse of the subject property. She implored the Township to purchase the property and save the buildings, as she stated that she has heard rumors that the owner intends to level the building to make way for 10 houses should the Township not purchase the property. She stated that the area is losing so many older and historic properties, and wished more would be done to preserve them. Some ideas she suggested for reuse include a meeting hall, a dance hall, and an educational heritage farm.

Christopher Deschu of 4804 Bowood Street spoke regarding the acquisition and reuse of the subject property. He suggested that the barn could be renovated and reused, and that the concrete silos could be restored to working order. He also suggested returning the property to a working farm to attract visitors from the area, and use the barn for horses.

Tony Bucha of 4520 Calvert Street inquired if the approval for preservation of the subject property still needs the approval of County and State offices. Solicitor Dinkelacker stated that

it does not, as the Township enacted a tax for the sole purpose of using municipal funds for the preservation of open space.

Supervisor Foley inquired if the Township has had the buildings on the property evaluated for potential value. Mr. Beil replied that such an evaluation has not yet been done yet, and the Engineer will evaluate the buildings once the Supervisors approve the acquisition of the property.

Chairman Inglis closed the public hearing.

Authorize Acquisition of Open Space Property Interest – 4732 West Hopewell Road  
Motion made by Supervisor Wagner and seconded by Supervisor Spaeth to authorize the Township's acquisition of a fee simple open space property interest in real property located at 4732 West Hopewell Road, Center Valley, Pennsylvania 18034 (Parcel Identification Number 641445583945 1) for the purpose of protecting and conserving the site's natural and scenic resources, and for the purpose of providing Township residents with open space benefits, all in accordance with testimony presented during the hearing concerning the Township's acquisition of the afore-described open space property interest held on August 11, 2025.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

#### **SUBDIVISIONS & LAND DEVELOPMENTS**

Brookhill Estates Subdivision (a/k/a Yamnicky) – Preliminary / Final Subdivision Plan – Resolution No. 2025-18

Motion made by Supervisor Farrell and seconded by Supervisor Wagner to adopt Resolution No. 2025-18 conditionally approving the Preliminary / Final Subdivision Plan of Churchill Acquisitions, LP to subdivide the 30.8 acre property at 6155 Beverly Hills Road into 9 residential building lots.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Strawberry Hill Subdivision – Preliminary / Final Subdivision Plan – Resolution No. 2025-19

Motion made by Supervisor Farrell and seconded by Supervisor Spaeth to adopt Resolution No. 2025-19 conditionally approving the Preliminary / Final Subdivision Plan of Winchester Acquisitions, LP to subdivide the 11.89 acre property at 6807 Blue Church Road South into 20 residential building lots.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

## MINUTES

### Regular Meeting of July 14, 2025

Motion made by Supervisor Foley and seconded by Supervisor Wagner to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of July 14, 2025.

Chairman Inglis inquired about the outcome of the Hedges appeal that went before the Zoning Hearing Board at their August 5 meeting. Solicitor Dinkelacker informed the Chairman that the Zoning Hearing Board denied the applicant's request, based on the Township's position that the applicant was seeking the wrong type of relief.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

## ORDINANCES

None

## RESOLUTIONS

### Resolution No. 2025-20 – PennDOT Winter Maintenance Services Agreement

Motion made by Supervisor Wagner and seconded by Supervisor Spaeth to adopt Resolution No. 2025-20 authorizing and directing the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to execute the Winter Maintenance Services Agreement with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT).

Mr. Beil informed the Board that the Winter Services Agreement with PennDOT comes up for renewal every five years. For the past five years, the Township has been performing snow removal work on Vera Cruz Road. The Township requested that PennDOT address some drainage concerns along the road, including the clearing of 15 or so cross pipes which cause flooding and icing conditions on the road. When PennDOT refused to address these concerns, the Township opted to remove Vera Cruz Road from the Winter Services Agreement moving forward. Mr. Beil stated that should PennDOT agree to address the problems on Vera Cruz Road, the Township would be willing to sign a revised agreement.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

### Resolution No. 2025-21 – Accepting Flint Hill Road Waterline Extension

Motion made by Supervisor Wagner and seconded by Supervisor Farrell to adopt Resolution No. 2025-21 conditionally accepting the Bill of Sale for the Flint Hill Road waterline extension constructed in connection with the Estates at Saucon Valley Subdivision.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**MOTIONS**

Release of Funds - Estates at Saucon Valley Subdivision – Security Release Request 18  
Motion made by Supervisor Spaeth and seconded by Supervisor Farrell to authorize the release of construction security in the amount of \$491,078.50 for the Estates at Saucon Valley Subdivision in accordance with the Township Engineer’s recommendation made by letter dated August 6, 2025.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Request For Payment – Preston Lane Pedestrian Bridge (Contract 1 – Site Work and Bridge Installation) – Certifications #7 and #8  
Motion made by Supervisor Farrell and seconded by Supervisor Foley to authorize payment in the amount of \$39,152.20 to Flyway Excavating for work completed on the Preston Lane Pedestrian Bridge Project.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**CORRESPONDENCE & INFORMATION ITEMS**

None

**DIRECTION / DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Cancellation of Board of Supervisors meeting scheduled for August 25, 2025 due to lack of agenda items

It was the consensus of the Board to cancel the meeting originally scheduled for August 25, 2025.

**BILLS, PAYROLL, AND COMMISSIONS**

Prepaid Invoice List Dated August 8, 2025 for Check Issue Dates: 7/15/2025 – 8/8/2025 and Warrant Detail Invoice List dated August 8, 2025 for Report Dates: 7/15/2025 – 8/11/2025

- Prepaid Invoice List ..... \$547,405.13
- Warrant Detail Invoice List..... \$284,924.37

Motion made by Supervisor Farrell and seconded by Supervisor Foley to authorize payment of the Prepaid Invoice List and Warrant Detail Invoice List both dated August 8, 2025.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

Supervisor Spaeth inquired about the status of the stormwater basins on the Traditions of America (TOA) – Saucon Valley project. Mr. Beil noted that there was recent correspondence from the Lehigh County Conservation District, and that they will be issuing a violation to the developer. The violation will then be handled by the Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP).

**COURTESY OF THE FLOOR**

None

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

At approximately 7:33 p.m., the Board met in Executive Session to discuss the following issues:

- a) Purchase of real property or acquisition of an interest in real property.
- b) Legal issues related to the use or lease of Township-owned property which, if conducted in public, would violate the Attorney/Client privilege and lead to the disclosure of information or confidentiality protected by law.

At approximately 8:42 p.m., the Board returned from Executive Session. No decisions were made.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion made by Supervisor Farrell and seconded by Supervisor Foley to adjourn the meeting.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:43 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Secretary