

NORTH DAKOTA ONE-CALL BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

August 18, 2005

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Bittner at 10:03 am in the boardroom of the North Dakota Association of Telephone/Rural Electric Cooperatives building in Mandan.

Members present: Mark Bittner, Mark Dougherty, Chad Olson, Ron Ness, Jerry Blomeke, Ed Williams, Darrell Wrege, and Perry Oberg.

Others present: Don Nett, Jim Holzer, and Susan Volkman of One-Call Concepts (OCC).

Agenda: Chairman Bittner asked if there were any additions or modifications to the agenda. Perry made a motion that the agenda be accepted as presented. Mark D. seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of previous minutes: Chairman Bittner asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes as presented. Mark D. made a suggestion to change the wording in paragraph 8 to add; after implementation of legislation is finalized. Ron stated that on page 5, paragraph 5, that it should be stated that USDA was asked to contact Attorney General for an option on their issue that tree planting should not be part of the North Dakota One-Call law. Jerry moved, seconded by Ron to approve the minutes as amended. Motion was approved unanimously.

Chad Olson Replacement: Mark B. asked me to give an update on the status of my replacement on the Board. I stated that I visited with my manager and was told to continue on the One-Call Board until a replacement was chosen by David Crothers, Chairman of the North Dakota Association of Telephone Cooperatives.

Mark B. asked if the Board should respond to the Telephone Association. It was agreed by the Board not to intervene with their decision.

Don stated that he had written a reply letter to Jerome Tishmack, Manager of BEK Communications, that it was up to the Telecommunications Association to pick a successor, and he had also contacted David Crothers asking that I remain on the Board at least until the February annual meeting.

Financial Report: Jerry stated that unless there were any questions, he didn't have anything special to report. Mark B. had a question on the public address system that was purchased asking why the cost of \$510 had been entered twice. Jerry stated that the second entry was to enter the address system into the equipment account as an asset.

Ron asked about the legal fees shown on the report. Mark B. stated that these fees were for review of the waivers that had been completed.

Perry made a motion to approve the financial report as presented, seconded by Ron. Motion approved.

Approval of Bills: Don presented two bills to the Board for approval. The first was for his expenses in attending the Common Ground Alliance (CGA) meeting in Nebraska in the amount of \$251.39. The second bill was in the amount of \$11,829.36 for quarterly advertising billing from One-Call Concepts.

Motion by Ron, seconded by Darrell to approve the bills as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Status on Request for Proposals for One Call Legislation: Don stated that Gloria could not attend the meeting because of a medical appointment. Mark B. asked if Jim could give the Board a status report on the consultant issue for the One-Call legislation.

Jim stated that OCC was awarded the consultant contract under Request for Proposal (RFP) prepared by the Public Service Commission. They are working with Jack Dent and have had a couple of phone calls with Gloria on how OCC is going to conduct the study. Jim said that OCC should have no problem in meeting the timeline in the RFP.

As OCC has outlined in their proposal, they are going to use the resources from all of the states in which they provide service to draw on for information. Jim asked if there were any questions.

Mark B. asked Perry of his involvement in the process, because of him being a representative of the Board. Perry stated that being OCC was the only bidder; he received a note from Gloria that OCC was awarded the contract. He had also reviewed OCC's response to the RFP and was impressed with its content.

Mark B. expressed his feeling that the RFP encompassed a two year scope of work. The first year would be the research and development of strategies for legislative changes. The second year would be to sell the plan to the operators and excavators.

Jim stated that it is OCC plan to provide the study of legislation and give the information to the Board and to the PSC. Mark B. agreed with this analogy.

Perry asked Jim if the dollar amount proposed in the RFP would be enough for the study. Jim stated that he didn't know how to answer the question. He said that OCC has a base of 14 states in which to review legislation already in place to draw on for comparative analysis of the provisions that are contained in their law. He felt that with this they would be able to hopefully obtain all of the information for the Board and PSC to make a decision on what legislation to introduce. Jim stated that he felt comfortable with it at this time.

Perry stated that we should get a copy to Mark B. for his review and a copy to the secretary to be attached to the minutes. Jim said he would e-mail a copy of the RFP response to the Board. **(A copy has been attached to these minutes.)**

Ed said that he understands that we have this proposal to look at legislation, but he is questioning if there is federal legislation being proposed that would supersede state legislation. He was at a meeting the other day and there was something mentioned about this happening.

Don asked if this was in reference to Pipeline Safety or 811 dialing. Jim stated that as far as 811, there are some things set forth by the FCC for the states to follow for 811 implementation. First, if 811 is being used for other purposes, it must be vacated for abbreviated dialing for One-Call. There are also some questions as to the implementation and the costs associated with this process. Wireless and telephone switching that is not up-to-date and other problems have not yet been addressed. The whole progression of implementing 811 on a national basis is going to be a slow and involved process. In terms of any other broad federal initiative, Jim was not aware of anything.

Susan stated that there is already much disagreement on the funding of 811. There is also the liability question of mistakes in dialing 911 and what to do with these calls. Perry said that it seems that the FCC was quick to implement 811, then after the fact, questioning on how to do it. Jim explained that the CGA has hired a coordinator to write a newsletter to inform the members of the status of 811 and what is happening in the various states. Susan stated that in some states there is a request to the Public Service Commissions to fund 811 in the same way that 911 is being funded today.

Ron asked if CGA was still supporting 811 dialing. Jim stated that CGA was definitely in favor of 811, but the implementation and some of the problems associated with the process is now being realized. Don said that at the CGA meeting in Colorado, 811 was discussed for hours. Jim brought up the question of cellular phones reaching the right call center.

After much discussion on 811, Ron asked the question as to the procedure of the study and the involvement of the Board and the PSC. Mark B. stated that he was somewhat confused. How he envisioned the study proceeding was that the Board would be more involved, but it appears now that the PSC is making all the decisions.

Jim asked how Mark would see it working. He is not opposed changing how things are communicated to the Board, as long as it is not spelled out in the scope of work or in conflict with the RFP contract.

Jim stated that OCC will work with both entities to make sure that the process includes the interests of all concerned.

Collection Issue: Jim discussed the memo which he sent to the Board on Palmer's Mobil Home Park and their refusal to pay the billing because they feel the tickets are out-of-area. The billing is over a year old.

To give the Board some background, Jim explained that previously, Michelle from OCC would review any ticket complaints and handle the disputes. After Michelle left OCC, management reviewed the workflow for handling the credits and determined that in certain cases, she wasn't adhering to the process correctly. For instance, Mr. Palmer would call the office and rant and rave until Michelle credited his account.

After Michelle left OCC, the process was changed to follow the contract with North Dakota One-Call and the One-Call law more closely. OCC sent out a notice to everyone of the change in our procedure. Subsequently, Mr. Palmer quit paying his bills.

In dealing with Mr. Palmer, his position seems to be, that he does not want to pay for any excavation work that does not occur directly over the master meter set that is on his property or the trailer court. Also, Mr. Al Moch from the PSC has advised Mr. Palmer not to pay certain tickets because they are an unlawful bill. Because of these issues, we have brought this to the attention of the Board.

First, from OCC's prospective, this brings up an issue of bad debt. Granted the amount of the billing is small compared to the amount of time spent on its resolution, but it sets a precedent for future billings. The second issue is that there is somebody from the PSC advising people on what an appropriate bill might be. Jim explained that Mr. Mock has moderated his position since visiting with him about Mr. Palmer and explained the tickets for which he was billed.

Don also had conversations with both Mr. Moch and Mr. Palmer. On Monday, August 15, Don visited Mr. Moch at his office and showed him a map and the tickets for which Mr. Palmer was billed. Don explained to Mr. Moch that the caller states that the location is within the boundary of the trailer court. But, Mr. Palmer states that it isn't where his gas line is located.

Mr. Moch stated that he was to meet with Mr. Palmer on Wednesday and that he was going to advise Mr. Palmer to pay his bill. But, Mr. Palmer called Don on Thursday morning the 18th; requesting Don to pass out the letter written to him at the Board meeting and to keep his mouth shut and let the Board make a decision.

The whole issue with Palmer's Mobil Home Park came about when Kevin Alishouse was on the Board and had safety concerns because Mr. Palmer was not responding to ticket requests and that he maintained his own gas line within the trailer court.

Mr. Moch had been asked to attend the Board meeting, but he called telling Mark B. that he had a conflict.

Jerry asked if in any of the conversations with Al Moch, has the discussion come around to the fact that he really shouldn't be advising these people about whether or not they should be paying a bill and that this is not within his jurisdiction. No one stated that Mr. Moch was advised of this.

Don stated that Mr. Palmer has written a letter dated June 19, 2005 to Don and copied Mr. Kevin Kramer of PSC. Don said that the PSC had asked that he attend one of their meetings, but he felt that he would go with the Board, but did not feel he should attend on his own.

Mark D. explained that there are two issues before the Board. The first issue is a collection issue that should follow the procedures that OCC has in place. The other issue is with the PSC and specifically Al Moch and him advising operators on their billing.

Mark B. felt that a letter should be sent to Al Moch explaining the out-of-area locates and that the Board approves of the way OCC is implementing the review and billing. If Mr. Moch has an issue with the way it is being implemented, he needs to contact the Board directly, but not make recommendations to individual operators.

Ed asked if the contract spells out the size of the block that he has to report. Jim explained that the out-of-area definition that exists in the contract is determined essentially that the Call Center maps it properly based in the information that the caller gives us and based on what is contained in the base map. If the Center makes a mistake when we draw the excavation polygon, then credit is given. The base map notification area is completely customizable by the operator.

Susan stated that the Call Center was told by the callers of these tickets that the location is within Palmer's Mobil Home Park. She said that the Center has to rely on the information given by the caller.

Jerry asked if Mr. Palmer has paid anything to date. Jim stated that he has paid one ticket that he called in himself. Don said that the total bill is \$21.06 for Palmer's Mobil Home Park, but he did pay \$1.17 in April.

Jerry inquired where OCC was at in relationship to getting the updated mapping for new developments in Fargo. Jim explained that the information for all of Cass County has been loaded into the Call Center and they are taking a look at it to see if it is something they want to move to. There are several issues to review, such as, are we at the same level of features on the base map. The initial feedback is that the data looks good in the Fargo area, but there is really nothing additional to use in the more rural areas.

Ron stated that after speaking with Randy in Orlando that he thought this information was going to be used as a secondary source of data. Jim said that there are a couple of alternatives; one is to discard the existing data that we have and replace it totally with the new data. The second method is to display the existing base map layer and overlay the new data in a different color as Randy has suggested. The third option would be to take

the overlay data and make some determinations about what we would manually add to the Call Center data. For instance, make the new layer a different color than the existing data.

After much discussion, Mark B. stated that if we ask operators what the number one issue that we face, it is probably out-of-area locates. We know we have a problem, but right now we have two operators (Chance Trailer Court and Palmer's Mobil Home Park), that we are having a billing problem with for under \$50.00.

Mark B. would like to deal directly with Al Moch and explain what the out-of-area locate policy is, explain the problems associated with getting updated maps, and explain the problems with excavators not knowing exactly where they are at when they are calling in locate requests.

Jerry said that he agreed with all of Mark B's statement, but the Board needs to communicate to Al this issue about collecting the bill is one that the Board is responsible for, and to ask him not to be telling people that they don't have to pay their bill. Chad stated that if Al had a problem with billing that he should be advised to contact someone on the Board first.

Mark D. made a motion for Mark B. to contact Al Moch and visit with him about the out-of-area and billing issues. Jerry seconded. Motion carried.

The other issue was with the letter that Mr. Palmer wrote to Don about his billing. Don said that Mr. Palmer asked to have a letter from the Board stating our position. Jim stated that all of the tickets that he is being billed for have been checked and are not out-of-area tickets. We will indicate to Mr. Palmer that OCC followed approved procedures and meets the criteria of the Board.

Mark D. made a motion to write a letter to Mr. Palmer to indicate that OCC followed approved procedures and their billing meets the criteria of the Board. Ed seconded. Motion passed.

Don showed a 30-second TV ad for the Board's review and comment.

The Board recessed for lunch at 11:56 am.

The Board reconvened at 12:40 pm.

Place Name Blocking: Jim explained that he became aware of Place Name Blocking when a company from Grand Forks Water contacted them after they had made some adjustments to their data base and began to receiving locate requests for an adjacent municipality. They wanted to know why this was happening. Apparently, we had for some members instituted what we called Place Name Blocking.

Very simply, what it allows OCC to do for a member in place name A is to prevent them from getting all of the tickets in place name B even if the polygon crosses into both areas. So, for example, in Minneapolis-St. Paul, the city of Minneapolis would not get a ticket that was identified as the city of St. Paul, even if the excavation polygon crossed over into both areas.

Richard Schultz entered the meeting at 12:45 pm.

Jim explained that the Board needs to decide if they want to offer Place Name Blocking to the members, and if so, then a release would have to be drafted for liability purposes. Perry asked how many of these are out there. Susan stated she didn't know of any others. Jerry stated that he had talked with Randy at Grand Forks Trail Water Users that asked for Place Name Blocking. Jerry said that if base maps are updated on a timely basis, some of these requests would go away.

Perry made a motion the North Dakota One-Call not offer Place Name Blocking. Ron seconded. All voting in favor of the motion except Jerry. Motion carried.

Center Operations: Don reported that incoming tickets are up 3.9%, outgoing tickets are up 5%, and the ratio is still at 5:1. Ron asked if the other call volume is unusual because of I-Tic. After some discussion, it appears that home-owners, calling into the Center, were the reason for the rise in other call volumes.

Don stated that average hold times is well within the 60 seconds. Ron asked why the week of July 8th, the average hold time was over 4 minutes. Susan reviewed the report and explained she didn't know why, but that they would look into the problem.

Don said that the total advertising budget was \$42,750 and to date we have spent \$27,730.40. In the TV and radio advertising budget there are \$3,701.95 remaining. Don recommended transferring \$500 from Directory Listings budget, \$1000 from the Magazine and Other Print budget and \$882.95 remaining from the Excavator Handbooks budget, along with the \$3701.95 in TV and Radio Ad budget to provide a fall TV campaign.

Jerry made a motion to follow Don's recommendation of using this \$6084.90 on a fall TV campaign. Mark D. seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Don presented a list of past meetings held during 2005. He also discussed I-Tic and reported that 518 have attended training sessions, 327 have qualified for privis, and 19% are using I-Tic on a regular basis. Don also announced the I-Tic contest winners for the past quarter.

At 1:05 pm, Steve Synhorst and Gary Puppe entered the meeting.

Don and Jim explained to the Board that there have been some problems with I-Tic for members that don't use it consistently. But, those companies that use it on a day to day

basis and learn what is expected from the Center on using I-Tic have become very good at using I-Tic and are very happy with it.

Design and Survey Locates: Steve Synhorst with Ulteg Engineers representing North Dakota Council of Consulting Engineers met with the Board to explain that he would be the liaison between the ND Council of Consulting Engineers and the Association of General Contractors (AGC). Steve stated that he really didn't have an update, but he was here to introduce himself and get to know the faces of the Board.

Mark B. explained the survey that each of the Board conducted with their constituents and the concept of design locates. Steve said that he would like a copy of the survey results if possible.

Ron asked Steve's perspective on whether he would like to see design and survey locates come through the One-Call Center. Steve explained that they would definitely like to see it go through these channels and his feeling is that the engineers would be willing to pay for this service. Steve stated that was all he needed to discuss with the Board at this time.

Richard Schultz from Excel Energy talked with the Board about his concerns with design locates. He said that Department of Transportation (DOT) locates have not been a problem to date, but their company is noticing issues with re-financing companies asking for design and survey locates. Richard said that his company is handing out maps of the proposed area and asked Steve if these were sufficient to give these companies. Steve stated that he would have to check with engineers that do this on a day to day basis, if this information would suffice.

Richard also stated that these finance companies did want to use the Call Center. But, they wanted to know if the Call Center would provide a list of the utilities involved in the design area, so they could contact each utility separately. This seemed to result from the fact the some of the utilities were charging to do these design locates. So, the finance companies would check to see if they were charging before they asked for the locate to be done.

Mark D. asked Steve if he felt the engineers would have any problem in extending the timeframe for the design locates from 10 to 15 days. Steve didn't see that this would be an issue with the engineers.

Ed stated that from the conversation that transpired that design and survey requests should be separate from the routine and emergency tickets. The Board seemed to agree that this issue and the number of days should be reviewed.

Steve left the meeting at 1:40 pm.

Richard asked Jim about the search area on the web site by district number. Jim stated that this function should be implemented shortly.

Richard stated that Excel had a ticket that was called in correctly, but the caller used an address that went outside their service area in Minot by 18 blocks. This was a highway signing project. Because of the wrong intersecting address, Excel did not get the ticket. He didn't feel that it was anyone's fault, but he wanted to tell the Board and OCC of the occurrence.

Richard left the meeting at 1:42 pm.

Don introduced Gary Puppe from the ND Association of Soil Conservation Districts. He explained that he is an associate of a state-wide membership of Soil Conservation District supervisors. They own and operate two tree and shrub nurseries called Lincoln-Oakes Nurseries and one is south of Bismarck. They have a water pipeline which they use to irrigate the nursery that is 3 ½ miles long.

The reason he is attending the meeting is the frustration with locate requests that their organization receives which he feels are out-of-area. He displayed to the Board a map which showed the pipeline and the surrounding area. On the map, he attached dots indicating the location of the excavation in reference to the pipeline. He explained that Lincoln-Oakes became a member of the One-Call system in 2005 and since April has received over 90 locate requests.

Gary asked how they could get the corridor narrowed down to alleviate some of these locate requests. Susan explained that the information that the caller provides the Center is the basis on how the excavation polygon is drawn. Susan described that the Center does not have up-to-date maps of these new sub-divisions and construction sites.

Jim asked Gary how he receives his tickets. Gary said that they are called. Jim explained that if they were faxed the tickets, they could review the ticket requests to see if they would be affected, and in turn, would not have to spend time on the phone for each ticket they received.

Susan explained that OCC does not produce the base maps. They buy commercially available maps and the majority of the time; they are outdated by the time they are input into the system. Mark B. described to Gary the difficulty North Dakota One-Call and the Center have in getting and updating our existing mapping system. The Board is talking about ways in which we can improve our mapping, so when new sub-divisions come on board, the Center will know where the address is located.

Jerry described to Gary that he works for a rural water system in Cass County. They have lines that adjoin both the cities of Fargo and West Fargo. They receive, at least, 30 to 40 of these tickets per day that fall into the category that he is explaining. Jerry stated that they have come to the realization that for them to be a part of the One-Call system, they are going to receive these types of tickets. But, for the safety of their faculties and for the safety of the excavators, that they are willing to pay that cost.

Don said that he would meet later with Gary and explain how to receive his tickets by fax or e-mail and the procedure to request out-of-area credit. Gary thanked the Board for their time.

Gary left the meeting at 2:15 pm.

Don asked Mark B. if there was anything further that the Board needed to discuss with Jim and Susan, because they would have to leave. Mark B. asked that we talk about the contract before they departed.

New Business: Mark B. discussed the Operation Center contract renewal that Ron had reviewed and made recommended changes and additions. Mark B. asked for the list of issues that the Board would negotiate. The list is as follows:

1. Re-write agricultural definition.
2. Re-write gardening and landscaping description.
3. Expand the definition of “Instate Representative.
4. Include DOT into One-Call system.
5. Re-write or revise “Out-of Area.”
6. Review storage capabilities of the contractor.
7. Specify guidelines of response and hold times of the contractor.
8. Review ticket information required on the One-Call Center.
9. Ensure development of reliability of One-Call Center redundancy.
10. Attendance of quarterly Board meetings by a representative of the contractor.
11. Timely mapping updates.

Mark B. asked if the Board had any questions or comments of Ron’s changes and comments. Mark B. suggested taking No Locate Required (NLR) out of the contract.

Jerry left the meeting at 2:17 pm.

Mark D. stated that some of the definitions are part of the One-Call law and can not be changed without legislation. Ron said that those would be reviewed and revised as required.

Ron discussed the “Out-of-Area” definition. He stated that as an operator he has no way of knowing when he could receive an out-of-area credit, because he has no way of knowing what the caller said when they called in the ticket. He feels this is one of the main frustrations when people try to obtain credit. He feels that we should remove the out-of area completely from the contract.

Ron asked what safeguards are in place at the Center so that CSR’s wouldn’t extend the size of the polygon. Susan assured the Board that there are many ways to research how the CSR’s and the Center itself is performing their work. OCC has five employees that do nothing but review tickets that are taken that have no complaints attached to them. If they come across a ticket that the polygon is too big or even too small, they are reviewed

and action is taken to clear up this process. Susan stated that OCC has these safeguards in place to protect their reputation, which is very important to them.

After much discussion, the Board consensus was to review the policy that Minnesota had established for out-of-area locates, before a making a decision.

Mark B. talked about page 8 of the contract that referred to routine and emergency locates. He expressed that the Board should consider adding design and survey locates to the language of the contract.

Jim and Susan left the meeting at 2:52 pm.

Ron asked Don about cost and updates to the web-site. Don explained that he would try to update the site on a more timely basis. The cost of the web-site is \$2400 per year. Ron felt for that cost, the Board is not getting a lot. Don said that if there are changes to be made, let him know and it will be done.

Mark B. said that the Board could finalize the contract language at the November 17th meeting and have OCC review and return the contract for the February 16th meeting. Our current contract runs through February 27, 2006.

The Board discussed Call Center hold times and if we want to change the way it is written on page 13 and 14 of the contract. The language will be changed to reflect that the caller will not be on hold for more than 180 second maximum per half hour.

Mark B. asked if the language for the In-State Representative needed to be re-written. The Board discussed with Don their interpretation of his duties and interaction with the Board and OCC. Because of some the changes that have evolved with Don's representation with the Board, no change is being made at this time.

The Board discussed having a representative from OCC at the quarterly meetings. After some discussion, it was decided to request, someone other than Don, if the situation warranted. This could also be handled by a conference call if needed.

Mark B. asked about the base map update on page 18 of the contract, if we wanted to change any of this language. Perry asked if there is any cost added to the contract. Mark B. replied this is figured on a cost basis. Ron stated that if the maps are not updated annually, the Board is to receive a credit. It was decided to leave it as written for now.

Also, on page 18, there is a contractual specification on insurance requirements. Mark D. will have the attorney review these to insure these specs are sufficient and review the "hold harmless" section of the contract.

The Board discussed the definitions of agriculture and landscaping and decided that this is more of a legislative issue.

Mark B. asked me about the expansion of storage requirements talked about on the list of contract items. On page 7 of the contract, in items 7 and 12, it discusses the storage capability for records. Mark B. will review this and make sure this is part of the contract.

The cost proposal form will need to be reviewed, which is Attachment 1 of the contract. Mark B. wondered if Member Updates of Facility Location, Remote Ticket Entry, and NLR should be removed. It was agreed leave the form as it is now.

Mark B. will review the contract and make revisions, then recirculate it with the Board.

Center Operations continued: Don discussed the meeting he attended in Golden, Colorado. There were 55 people in attendance representing 45 states. They had some very good discussions and he felt it was well worth the time.

Don asked for the Board's input on choosing a give-away for the meetings and Contractor's dinner. Darrell had some items that were passed around the table for the Board to assess. The Board decided to let Don make the final decision on the choice.

Don relayed to the Board that the Locator's Association Meeting will be held January 4th and 5th at the Ramkota Inn in Bismarck. The Board is being asked to have an open question and answer session on January 4th at 3:00 pm.

Don thought that the Board should consider a change in the One-Call law in the next legislative session. He stated he receives many complaints when, for instance, there is a water main break in a town and the operator feels they should be able to call in the emergency locate. He feels that this is happening now and the operators are using the name of the excavator. He said that in emergency situations, like the water main break, that in most instances, the excavator is not involved initially and the law should change so that operators could call the Center under these circumstances.

Don stated that they have had another instance of conflict in Jamestown. The locators went out and marked the facilities, and then the city came along and covered the marks. The excavator came out to perform the job and found no marks, so they asked for a re-mark of the facilities. The locators refused to re-mark the facilities. They wanted them to call in another ticket and wait for 48 hours. Don did talk to the locating contractor and they finally re-marked the locate. Don also felt that in this situation the excavator should never have to wait 48 hours for a re-mark of facilities.

Don asked if all of the Board has a copy the best practice handbook. They are going to review the first three chapters at the next Common Ground Alliance (CGA) meeting.

Don handed out the Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) field form. The CGA is pushing this damage information to become mandatory for all One-Call members.

Ron is going to the technology meetings in October.

The next meeting will be held at 10:00 am on November 17, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 pm.

Submitted by Chad Olson, Secretary

Chairman, Mark Bittner

Signature

Signature

Date

Date