**SEU Advisory Board**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, June 12, 2017**

**I. Call to Order**

Director Tommy Wells called to order a quorum of the SEU Advisory Board (SEUAB) at 10:08 AM Monday, June 12, 2017, at the Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE), 1200 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC.

Director Wells asked the Board for permission to facilitate this meeting in Ms. Corman’s absence. The Board approved his request unanimously.

**Roll Call**

**SEU Advisory Board:** Sandra Mattavous-Frye, Dan Wedderburn, Donna Cooper, John Mizroch

**Board members on the phone:** Betty Ann Kane, Nicole Steele, Leni Berliner

**Absent Board members:** Bicky Corman, Jared Lang

**Other attendees:** Tommy Wells, Hussain Karim, Lance Loncke, Ted Trabue, Barbara Burton, Kristie Rupper, Mohamed Ali, Lakeisha Lockwood, Lynora Hall, Alex Lopez, Rich Hasselman, Pierre van der Merwe, Ricky Gratz, Alex Lopez, Leigh S. Barton

**Approval of agenda**

The agenda was introduced by Director Wells with a note that some agenda items may need to be spread out over several meetings. Director Wells called for a review of the agenda and input on how it might be shortened. Ms. Berliner suggested that Tetra Tech focus on primary findings and conclusions only. There was a brief discussion between Dr. Loncke and Ms. Mattavous-Frye concerning this issue. Director Wells ended the discussion by saying that since Tetra Tech was present at the meeting, the Tetra Tech representative should give a brief overview, as requested, but that we should also be able to ask any questions and take advantage of Tetra Tech’s presence.

**II. Official Business (0:00-1:43:07)**

**Director Wells – Minutes (0:00-0:20)**

Director Wells asked if the Board would like to approve the minutes. Ms. Mattavous-Frye moved to approve and Mr. Wedderburn seconded. The Board approved the minutes.

**Dr. Loncke – Quarterly Expenditures (0:25-8:09)**

**Update on the data requests from Ms. Corman (0:35-4:10)**

Data were requested and sent out to the Board members by Ms. Hall. This included the FY16 financial audit. A draft of the EM&V report was also circulated. A breakdown of DCSEU’s expenditures was sent out – including total expenditures for FY16 as well as expenditures to date (for the first two-quarters in ’17 and the month of April). All presentations and Board reports were posted, going back to FY13, on the DOEE website. DOEE also provided the figure for total incentives paid to third parties (as requested by Ms. Corman). This figure is also provided in the annual audit report, which the Board has, regarding the total amount of funds spent by the DCSEU. DOEE wanted to make sure that the Board members received this information and Dr. Loncke suggested that the Board create a Dropbox account in which to store this information to reduce the email load. (**Discussion of the Dropbox suggestion – 2:33-4:10**) Director Wells clarified the request and asked what Board members would need to do to access the Dropbox. Dr. Loncke responded that Dropbox is an online storage system that Board members would be able to access from anywhere. Furthermore, DOEE (Ms. Hall) will provide instructions on how to access and use Dropbox. Finally, Director Wells and Dr. Loncke clarified that Ms. Hall is the point-person for any issues with Dropbox.

**Questions Regarding the Dropbox Request** (**4:10-7:25**)

Director Wells called for questions regarding the use of a Dropbox storage account. Ms. Berliner liked the idea, but also requested a link to the DOEE website, directing Board members to the exact location of the data and reports provided by DOEE. DOEE agreed to this request, saying DOEE will email a direct link to the annual and quarterly reports page. Ms. Kane also agreed with the idea but added that the Dropbox account needs to be secure. Mr. Wedderburn noted that he often has technical problems accessing email attachments. Director Wells answered that the IT team can take care of Mr. Wedderburn’s issue and again emphasized that Lynora and Dr. Loncke would be available for Dropbox access issues.

**Rich Hasselman – Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification (EM&V) Presentation from Tetra Tech (8:20-1:19:00)**

Mr. Hasselman introduced himself as a representative of Tetra Tech from Madison, WI. Tetra Tech has been the evaluator for the DCSEU for the past several years. This year Tetra Tech evaluated the FY16 results.

Mr. Hasselman reviewed the timeline of the evaluation. The final report would be issued no later than June 28th. This year Tetra Tech focused on the Performance Benchmarks. They did not conduct a separate impact evaluation as they had done in previous years. Tetra Tech leveraged the results from past years and applied them to the FY16 data. Originally, there were six Performance Benchmarks; however, two had shifted to tracking goals, meaning that they were no longer tied to an incentive. The new tracking goals are Reduce Growth of Peak Demand in the District and Reduce the Growth of Energy Demand for the District’s Largest Energy Users. Tetra Tech conducted both benefit-cost and acquisition cost modeling. Tetra Tech also conducted savings analysis by program tract level (i.e., DSEU residential programs that supported the installation of energy efficient appliances and lighting) However, these tracks do not actually affect the benchmark results.

**Evaluation Methods**

In past years, realization rates were calculated from the impact evaluation. Mr. Hasselman explained a table on the PowerPoint slide, highlighting energy units for natural gas. Realization rates are the saving achieved compared to what the program/DCSEU reported to Tetra Tech. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked why there would be a difference in these two values. Mr. Hasselman answered that, among other things, custom projects can account for these differences. Dr. Cooper asked whether Tetra Tech is engaging the DCSEU in the process to understand the data that has been set forth. Mr. Hasselman answered affirmatively, and stated that tracking systems can also account for the difference: The DCSEU relied on a technical reference manual for savings. Data entry errors could have occurred. The TRM is a living document. All these factors can lead to disparity – it is not uncommon. In fact, it is rare to find no variance due to the sheer amount of data being pulled together. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked whether some realization rate is standard or is within a zone of reasonableness. Mr. Hasselman answered affirmatively and emphasized that the current rates are not concerning (until they drop below 0.9). The only unusual rate was last year’s kW, which was high. Custom projects tend to be higher risk because there is more judgment going into them.

This year, the policy decision was to use the lowest realization rate from the three metrics in the table from the past three evaluation cycles. This was a substitute for conducting an FY16 impact evaluation. This was conservative – in no one year was the lowest actually hit across all three program types. Thus, this was a worst case scenario – a conservative look at the savings.

Tetra Tech then looked at other tracks/benchmarks, low-income spending levels, and made a minor adjustment based on FY15 findings. Tetra Tech also used other tracking data from DOEE and DCSEU for green jobs information and incentive-level spending.

**Results of FY16 DCSEU Evaluation (19:05)**

The Results were broken up into two groups of benchmarks: Compensated Performance Benchmarks and Tracking Benchmarks.

***Compensated Performance Benchmarks:***

For the Reducing Electricity Consumption, Natural Gas, Reducing the Cost of Renewable Energy, and Low-Income Spending benchmarks, DCSEU was somewhere in between the minimum and maximum targets as set by the contract. The Green Jobs benchmark well exceeded the maximum target. Those jobs were based on two components: direct jobs that were tracked based on invoices to DOEE and a component based on incentive spending.

Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked whether a green job was one job in the District or at the DCSEU. Mr. Hasselman answered that it was jobs in the District. Director Wells clarified the question, asking Mr. Trabue to describe the green jobs calculation. Mr. Trabue answered that the green jobs calculation was an accumulation of both jobs created within DCSEU and jobs created by subcontractors. The vast majority of green jobs were outside the DCSEU office. Director Wells then asked about the criteria to claim credit for jobs completed outside the organization. Mr. Trabue answered that there were four factors Tetra Tech considered: the person (1) worked as a DC resident, (2) earned at least a living wage (~$14), (3) were on a certified payroll, and (4) worked in support of a DCSEU program. A green job was 1,950 hours of work for one individual, and the DCSEU achieved 104.5 FTEs in FY 2016. The headcount, over the years, floated at around 400 District residents. Alternatively, one green job was $200K worth of incentives paid towards a project. The $200K figure was derived from economic analyses conducted by the Obama Administration at the time of the stimulus money. At that time, it was estimated that it took about $200K to create a green job.

Dr. Cooper asked whether DCSEU also tracked green job retention. Mr. Trabue responded that the answer is mixed: jobs created in the office were tracked, but once someone left, they were no longer tracked or counted. However, the Office also has a Workforce Development Program run by Sheryl Dove. In that instance, retention will be tracked. The people who go through training programs were tracked.

Mr. Wedderburn asked about the Reduce the Cost of Renewable Energy benchmark with respect to reducing the cost of solar panels. Mr. Hasselman answered affirmatively. There is approximately a 10% decrease, but the delivery of the program was also more efficient. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked whether there were scale synergies because there were more solar installations (i.e., why is solar getting cheaper?). Mr. Hasselman answered that both hard equipment costs and soft costs (e.g., permitting, the electrical work, industry skill set) decreased. Mr. Mizroch inserted that the cost of the solar panels decreased due to Chinese over-manufacturing.

***Tracking Benchmarks*** *(****32:30****)*

To a degree, the minimum and maximum targets do not matter anymore, but Tetra Tech still tracked them, and they were solidly in the middle range of the historical benchmark. One of the reasons for making Peak Demand a tracking goal was because these savings were accounted for through the electricity savings anyway. However, Peak Demand is still important to track for PJM market eligibility.

The Largest Energy Users tracking goal well exceeded the maximum targets. This goal tracked unique buildings greater than 200,000 ft2 in the District not only because they were the largest energy consumers, but also because they were where the program could help get lower acquisition cost projects completed. Director Wells asked Mr. Trabue why this benchmark has nearly tripled its maximum target. Mr. Trabue answered that the DCSEU has focused its energies on the largest energy users over the last five years. Director Wells asked Mr. Trabue to mention some of the buildings the DCSEU has focused on. Mr. Trabue named the White House, the old Executive Office Building, some of the Smithsonian Museums, large multi-family buildings, all universities in the city except Trinity University, and hospitals. These buildings operate 24/7, so they are highly energy-intensive, and as such, the biggest impacts can be achieved from them.

Director Wells then asked how the target would change in the new contract. Mr. Trabue answered that the target remains a tracking target in the new contract. Dr. Loncke inserted that there is no minimum and maximum in the new contract, the savings would just be tracked through the Electricity and Natural Gas benchmarks. Director Wells asked whether there was still a tracking goal for the Largest Energy Users. Dr. Loncke answered affirmatively. Ms. Kane asked whether there was still a legislative requirement to focus on the largest energy users. Mr. Karim answered negatively – it was no longer required. Ms. Kane then clarified that it still made sense to track the largest energy users because they lead to much savings. Dr. Cooper asked for more specificity of the categories (e.g., the federal government, GSA). Mr. Trabue answered that DCSEU has worked with federal office buildings, private office buildings, DC Water, Metro, etc. When the contract was set up, the largest energy users were not defined. Afterward, DCSEU and DOEE came to an agreement to define it as a building that was at least 200,000 ft2. This was aligned with Department of Energy work. DCSEU did not have consumption data for individual buildings; instead, DCSEU used the square footage metric. Dr. Loncke added that DOEE provided building energy benchmarking data to the DCSEU on an ongoing basis.

***Acquisition Costs (40:20)***

***Electricity:***

Acquisition costs are the cost to get the first year energy savings. Tetra Tech compared DC’s costs to those of Maryland and Pennsylvania (regional programs). Mr. Hasselman noted that Tetra Tech removed the effect of renewable energy because those programs did not cover renewable energy. The data showed that the DCSEU was following a traditional pathway: the first year was the most expensive year (e.g., startup costs) and then it decreased and began to plateau.

Comparing this data to MD and PA, Tetra Tech saw that DC’s changes in expenditure (acquisition costs) follow PA. This was interesting because unlike PA’s “commodity program,” DCSEU also had policy goals to meet. Director Wells asked whether this data considered administrative overhead. Mr. Hasselman answered affirmatively. Director Wells asked if and how the Board could counter community criticisms about high overhead using the chart shown on the PowerPoint. Mr. Hasselman answered affirmatively, but with less certainty. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked if any other jurisdictions were examined for comparison purposes (aside from PA and MD). Mr. Hasselman answered that they just looked at MD and PA because they were regional and had similar climate and demographic profiles. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked about a national comparison. Mr. Hasselman was unsure but had no reason to believe that these numbers were not within a reasonable bound. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked Mr. Trabue if he knew why the MD costs are so high. Mr. Trabue and Mr. Hasselman were both unsure. Director Wells asked whether MD’s program was primarily operated by the utility and was answered affirmatively. He then asked whether the utility program was mostly focused on rebates. Mr. Hasselman was unsure; Tetra Tech simply relied on the annual reports published. Director Wells then turned the question to Dr. Cooper. Dr. Cooper answered affirmatively but said she wanted to look for more specificity. As such, she would look for more details on this issue. Ms. Kane inserted that MD included a substantial amount of taxpayer money in their program and their funding was structured differently. Dr. Cooper reiterated that she would get the additional details requested by Director Wells.

***Natural gas: (49:53)***

There were no comparison states for natural gas. The programs in MD and PA were structured around electric utilities. However, there was a reference range published by ACEEE in 2012 for natural gas acquisition costs. Mr. Mizroch asked for clarification on these numbers. Mr. Hasselman answered that ACEEE looked across programs in the US at their natural gas and acquisition costs. It found a range from $19/BTU to $59/BTU with an average of $37/BTU. Mr. Mizroch clarified that the number was the amount to acquire savings, not the cost of the gas. Dr. Loncke and Mr. Hasselman answered affirmatively; the number was the cost of efficiency. Mr. Hasselman explained acquisition cost trends over the past few years.

Programs around the country faced challenges due to the lower costs of natural gas in the market. This lowered the economic motivation for people to save gas, forcing agencies, like DCSEU, to work harder to get savings. Ms. Berliner asked about making the manufacturing of natural gas more efficient. Mr. Hasselman answered that higher capital cost equipment was needed to try to get natural gas savings (e.g., replacing furnaces and boilers). Most savings come from massive manufacturers. Ms. Berliner asked about the Clean Energy Plan, opportunities for expanded use of natural gas in the transportation industry, and DCSEU’s ability to encourage the installation of the most efficient energy operations. She also stated that the degree to which the City made microgrids based upon cogen plants and the efficiency of the new plants would be a real game changer. Director Wells was unsure. He said the District was working to transition to electricity for transportation. For example, Capital Crossing will generate power within the building (BCHP). Mr. Mizroch added a plug for hydrogen for fuel cells (currently being used in CA) because they can be operated using a natural gas line. California installed fueling systems based on their natural gas infrastructure.

Director Wells asked whether the DCSEU did anything related to transportation. Mr. Trabue answered that the DCSEU worked extensively with Metro, but it did not work on the cars or the fuel choices directly. Dr. Loncke agreed. Director Wells asked whether any District universities still generate their own power. Multiple people, including Mr. Mizroch and Ms. Mattavous-Frye, answered Georgetown. Ms. Kane provided more details about the Georgetown program but said she did not know how much of that came from interaction with DCSEU. Mr. Trabue answered that DCSEU worked extensively with Georgetown and Howard, especially on their steam facilities. He continued that DCSEU helped most of the larger universities with their electricity consumption. Ms. Mattavous-Frye clarified that she was referring to the plant Georgetown built two decades ago and since expanded and enhanced.

***Cost Effectiveness Test (59:28)***

Cost effectiveness of the DCSEU portfolio of programs was calculated by dividing dollars gained by dollars spent. The dollars gained was a reflection of the lifetime of benefits going out multiple years from the present time. The dollars spent was the cost of the program (most of which were in the first year). The benefit-cost test of the DCSEU was done using the societal benefit test. Mr. Hasselman believed that the District’s approach to the societal test was one of the more comprehensive ones in the country. The gross portfolio, which looked at the savings with no adjustment, was about 3½. The full costs, which included the evaluation costs, did not change this year. Realization rates dropped it down to 3.3 benefit costs. Program free-ridership looked at how much the programs actually influenced someone to do something. In FY14, Tetra Tech conducted gross research, applied the findings, and arrived at 2.7. Thus, the DCSEU portfolio of programs remained cost effective.

***Recommendations (01:01:53)***

Tetra Tech did not conduct the full process evaluation so the recommendations were fewer than in the past.

The first recommendation was to watch the cost effectiveness going forward, especially in the face of a new contract. A lot of sustainable programs that have been operating for a number of years have begun to plateau in terms of progress and there was no reason to assume DCSEU would be any different. This was particularly important because of the benchmarks DCSEU must meet.

The second recommendation was to monitor the DCSEU’s acquisition costs. A multiyear contract is going to be beneficial because projects that can take a year or two to come to fruition can be completed and deeper savings can be achieved. For example, lighting standards (CFLs are being replaced by LEDs and new standards are going to reflect this change).

The third recommendation was to keep an eye on the overall costs and use of natural gas in the District because it will become tougher for the DCSEU to achieve more natural gas energy savings in the future. The manufacturing base and the ongoing low prices of natural gas will detract from potential savings and economic motivation.

Ms. Kane asked about CHP and whether it cut against the goal of reducing natural gas. Mr. Hasselman answered that CHP was a good opportunity to get overall system improvements; 70% efficiency for electricity and heating looks good on paper, but the challenge was getting the right balance between meeting power demand and getting enough heat. A California program heavily incentivized CHP and ended up biasing the market towards making electricity, thus diminishing the need for natural gas. However, they ended up with less than optimal systems – they just created electricity, like a power plant, or worse. Ms. Kane asked about the role of DCSEU in these CHP projects. Director Wells answered that whatever the source, there will always be a role for energy efficiency to reduce consumption, but one of the goals of reducing energy consumption is to reduce District greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. If the District only produced energy for the growing market for natural gas, it begged the question: as to what degree was the District increasing GHG load through power plants versus that same thing happening just outside of the District (or some distance away). Ms. Kane inserted that there were negotiations for CHP at Walter Reid, a DC government project.

Ms. Kane said that the other potential issue was electric vehicles: The switch from a gas-powered vehicle to an electric vehicle doubled the electricity use of the household. Ms. Berliner inserted that the DCSEU should take a second look at what constitutes energy performance and redefine it as necessary. Natural gas is not the only fuel for CHP. Vermont has a renewable heat standard and the DCSEU should learn about the impacts of renewable heat in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. Thus, there is a range of fuel sources that are lower in GHG emissions than natural gas. She continued that over the course of the ten-year contract, there will have to be review and revision of what constitutes performance standards. Director Wells clarified that all agency initiatives are guided by the Clean Energy Plan. The District views the Clean Energy Plan as an organic document that can adjust for technology and investments. The Clean Energy Plan is the overall controlling policy for the agency. Ms. Berliner suggested Mr. Hasselman look for areas where redefinition may become necessary. Mr. Hasselman answered that Tetra Tech had not been forward looking, but he would follow up and look into this with DCSEU and DOEE. Ms. Berliner inserted that it would be helpful for the Board to have a forward looking view. Mr. Mizroch added an overview of DCSEU’s progress, emphasizing that the Clean Energy Plan is the current toolkit. It reflects the major changes in energy source and price, DDOE becoming DOEE, and changing DC demographics. Ms. Berliner added that there was serious interest in building microgrid(s) in the city and a role for DCSEU could be carved out. Ideally, this should be done as a modification to the existing contract. Mr. Mizroch disagreed with Ms. Kane’s earlier electric vehicle comment. He said that he has an electric vehicle and has not seen much of any increase in his electric bills, much less a doubling. Ms. Kane inserted that this might be because the technologies for energy production are themselves more efficient, which would help keep costs down.

Dr. Loncke added that the DCSEU is currently developing their five-year strategic plan and that this might be the best place to address the issues discussed at this meeting.

The Board thanked Mr. Hasselman for his presentation.

**Director Wells – General Updates (1:19:25 – 1:42:00)**

**Upcoming Hearings (REDF Sweep; Green Bank)**

Director Wells stated that anytime the government sweeps SETF or REDF funds for energy efficiency (SETF) or renewables for solar (REDF) and converts them into general tax dollar funds, it is bad for a number of reasons: (a) it hurts the District’s relationship with ratepayers, (b) it is not good governance, and (c) when there is a budget crisis, a deficit, there is a public policy to look at all resources. When the new administration came in, the District ran a deficit and used $1.5M of the SETF money for the LIHEAP program. Later, both the District and the Mayor’s people agreed that that was a mistake. Previous administrations had tapped into SETF funds because it took a while for the DCSEU to get going, so there was a balance. The transfers in the past triggered an audit. The auditor agreed that the fund sweeping was a bad idea. The SETF funds are now being drawn down at the predicted rate. The REDF funds have had some balances, mostly because it is very difficult to predict how much money will be needed. The process for a project like ground-mount solar takes a while and involves multiple exchanges of money between the District and DOEE.

During DC’s annual audit (Sept. 30), the District saw the $3M in the fund and thought it was a balance. One of the challenges was that the agency certifies how much money it has by May 1st, but it has to expend the money by Sept. 30th or the Council will want to sweep it. The agency has to plan ahead, but that is hard when it does not know how much money it will get. This time, the agency asked a community of stakeholders how the money should be spent. DOEE issued an RFA, request for grants for the remaining $13M, and received over 40 proposals. DOEE should be able to make an announcement by the end of the month for at least $13M in grants. But, when giving someone a grant, it is done through cost-reimbursement, so the money will be spent over the next 18 months. Again, this caused the Council to see a balance and want to sweep it. The Council justified the sweep by booking the next year’s money, forcing agencies to find ways so the funds do not appear as an unspent balance in an audit and also to the Council

Currently, the Council threatened to take $7.5M of the $13M grant money. The agency thought they may take the money as “local funds” for LIHEAP. Another problem was that the Council wanted to use about $5M to fund a project to put LED lights in streetlights. They justified the sweep by saying that the funds would still be used for energy efficiency purposes. Sierra Club, DC Environmental Network, and a number of other groups went to the Chair and argued that this was not the intent of the law.

Ms. Kane inserted that this was a vicious problem because the customers ended up paying twice. The REDF money is for solar projects. It comes from the alternative compliance fees that retail suppliers have to pay because there are not enough solar recs for them to buy. Therefore, if the money is not used to create more solar, then there will not be enough solar recs for retailers to buy, and they will have to keep paying these compliance fees. Ms. Kane urged everyone to contact the Council and their Councilmember about this. The fund was set up to combat this problem, not exacerbate it. Ms. Kane stated that customers pay 10% more for electricity in the District because of the REDF money. Ms. Mattavous-Frye stated that OPC also had funds that were swept due to the audit (~$200K). OPC filed a complaint in opposition and will address the sweep. Dr. Cooper clarified that the Council has a plan for use of the solar dollars, but that they will be used for energy efficiency-type measures, not specifically solar. Director Wells affirmed. Mr. Mizroch noted that this could cause a lawsuit. Director Wells inserted that the District needed to be very careful because it was not allowed to tax the federal government. So if the District took the compliance fees and converted them into general funds, they would essentially be taxing the federal government. Thus, the Council’s plan is irresponsible. It would be different if the District was not running surpluses and if the District were in a crisis. Mr. Wedderburn noted that his real concern was that the funds are just going into the general funds, not specified funds. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked about the views of individual Councilmembers. Director Wells stated that Councilmember Cheh was against it, but “found money” put the Councilmembers in a difficult political position. Mr. Mizroch emphasized that this is not “found money.” The other board members agreed. Director Wells stated that Ms. Kane explained the situation very well. Booking future revenues against current measures is bad governance and puts the residents in an awkward position. However, within the limits of the law, the agency was looking for creative financings to prevent Council from seeing a fund balance. The agency was working with other DC agencies to look for solar projects. He noted that the solar funds need to accrue to low-income residents. They need to create a public-private partnership so that a private entity can deploy those funds for low-income residents. UDC has a number of roofs. If they can put together a program to deploy on their roofs and then reduce the tuition for their low income students, the department could creatively assign the benefits of the solar generation to low income residents. The agency has more projects than money but needs to deploy the money lawfully. Finally, he noted that the department is moving the money quickly for a government agency.

**Director Wells – Status of Vacancies and Nominations (1:42:00-1:43:07)**

Director Wells noted that Daniel Conner, Director for External Affairs, was supposed to be at this meeting. Mr. Conner was working to fill the vacancies in the SEUAB. He asked Mr. Karim for an update on this endeavor. Mr. Karim answered that he was unsure about Mr. Conner’s progress, but had heard that things were moving forward with Ms. Corman’s candidate. Director Wells noted that names were moving forward and the department asked the Mayor to move this forward. Ms. Mattavous-Fry asked about Jared Lang, but Mr. Karim was unsure as to his availability to attend Board meetings.

**Adjournment**

Director Wells adjourned the meeting at 11:56 am.

Minutes prepared by: Leigh S. Barton