**SEU Advisory Board**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, August 14, 2017**

**Welcome New Board Members**

Kirsten Williams is the Vice President of Government Affairs for the Apartment and Office Building Association (AOBA).

Josh Richards is the Sustainability Program Leader from a regional real estate investment trust (First Potomac Realty Trust). He is the environmental group member for this Board.

Sean Skulley is the Manager of Energy Efficiency Programs for Washington Gas’ service area territories in VA and MD.

**I. Call to Order**

Bicky Corman called to order a quorum of the SEU Advisory Board (SEUAB or Board) at 10:15 AM Monday, August 14, 2017, at the Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE), 1200 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC.

**Roll Call**

Roll call was not taken; however, the following people were in attendance:

**SEU Advisory Board:** Bicky Corman, Sandra Mattavous-Frye, Donna Cooper, Leni Berliner, Kirsten Williams, Sean Skulley, Nicole Steele, Josh Richards

**Board members on the phone:** Betty Ann Kane, John Mizroch

**Absent Board members:** Jared Lang, Daniel Wedderburn

**Other attendees:** Tommy Wells, Taresa, Lawrence, Hussain Karim, Lance Loncke, Barbara Burton, Lynora Hall, Leigh Barton, Marshall Duer-Balkind, Patti Boyd, Marc Nielsen, Daniel Conner, Adrienne Henderson, Bernice McIntyre

**Approval of agenda**

The motion to approve the agenda was made by Leni Berliner, seconded by Sandra Mattavous-Frye, and unanimously approved by the Board.

***Board meeting live stream link:*** [***https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4pwjLhQA7Y8***](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4pwjLhQA7Y8)

**II. Official Business**

**SEUAB Chair Corman (0:00 – 7:54)**

The approval of the minutes from the last SEUAB meeting was postponed. Chair Corman had some questions and other members requested additional time to complete their review. She will submit her questions and redlined draft separately to DOEE for review. However, Chair Corman thought the minutes were fabulous and comprehensive.

Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked whether the Board could vote on the Chair’s comments and suggestions. Chair Corman suggested they do so at the next meeting.

There were no other substantive comments about the minutes, but Ms. Williams asked whether the minutes were or could be distributed before the Board meetings. Various members of the Board answered that the minutes were available in Dropbox, but many stated they do not check Dropbox and therefore miss these insertions. Chair Corman stated the Board will postpone approving the June 12th minutes until she has sent her red line version and the Board has had time to read it.

**Dr. Lance Loncke – Updates on Dropbox (5:40 – 10:29)**

Dr. Loncke said that the instructions to access the Dropbox were sent to the government email addresses but he was unsure as to how many Board members had accessed their Dropbox accounts. Some members did while several had not done so as yet. There was also a mixed reception to the use of the Dropbox system as a whole. Dr. Loncke stated there are instructions Board members can follow when they first log into Dropbox. These instructions ask users to reset their password. After the initial set-up, just the user’s email and their newly-created password will be needed to login. Dr. Loncke clarified that these instructions were sent to the Board’s government email addresses and said that he will resend them.

Some Board members noted that they could not access their government email account and Chair Corman clarified and confirmed that some of the newer Board members had not yet received their government email addresses/information. She suggested that Dropbox users use their government emails, not their personal or work email accounts because all information would be subject to FOIA, discovery, *etc*. However, she asked if the Board preferred to use their personal or work email accounts, knowing that all information contained within would be subject to discovery. Mr. Marshall Duer-Balkind and Dr. Loncke affirmed that they could resend the Dropbox invitation and instructions to members’ personal or work emails if they chose to use them – the Board members electing to do this just needed to send him their preferred email address. Several Board members, including Chair Corman and Ms. Mattavous-Frye, stated they would use their work emails.

**Dr. Loncke – Updates on DCSEU FY17 Quarterly Expenditures (10:36 - 44:20)**

At the last meeting, quarterly updates were given for the DCSEU FY17 expenditures from October 1, 2016 through the month of April 2017. Dr. Loncke stated that the DCSEU spent $4,568,188 between April 1 – June 30, 2017. The DCSEU has a $20 million operating budget and has spent a total of approximately $11 million in the first three quarters of the fiscal year, with a little over $9 million reaming to spend in the last quarter (July, August and September). Dr. Loncke stated that DOEE has had several discussions with the DCSEU regarding their spending plans for the remainder of the fiscal year. The DCSEU has provided a robust plan with the intent to execute all projects before the end of the fiscal year. Chair Corman asked for further clarifications on the DCSEU’s total budget for FY17. Dr. Loncke clarified that the total contract value was $20M and the DCSEU’s operating budget was the total ($20M) less the performance incentive of approximately ($820K). As such, the DCSEU had roughly $19.1M to spend throughout the year. As of June 30th, the DCSEU had spent about $11.4M, so they had about $8.6M to spend by the end of September. The DCSEU’s July invoice was expected by the end of the week – invoices usually arrive between the 12th and 15th business day after the close of the month. Dr. Loncke hoped this amount would be $2-3M. For the new SEUAB members, Dr. Loncke noted that it was typical to see significant expenditures for August and September because projects usually close during these two months.

Ms. Berliner asked whether the DCSEU’s robust plan was related to a Strategic Plan (which the Board had not seen). Dr. Loncke answered that the Strategic Plan came in the previous Friday and would be put in Dropbox if it was not already there. Chair Corman asked whether the document in Dropbox was a draft or if it was the final version. Dr. Loncke answered that it was final, but the Board could provide comments for the DCSEU to use in revising the Plan. According to the DCSEU’s contract, they were supposed to have submitted that Plan by August 4th (and they did). It was hard for DOEE to tell if the DCSEU incorporated all comments received from all stakeholder groups because DOEE did not do a line-by-line comparison (between the draft version and the comments received). Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked whether DOEE would accept further recommendations from the Board. Chair Corman asked whether there were comments from other stakeholders because when the Board reviewed the draft, it was so thin that line by line comments were not practical. She continued that with only three months left of the budget, the Board would have to make comments and submit recommendations extremely quickly. Director Wells stated that this was a good clarifying question. He then turned to Dr. Loncke and Mr. Karim and asked how the DCSEU’s new contract – one where they are not required to spend the full $20M in one fiscal year – changed the nature of their work. Dr. Loncke answered that the DCSEU had a little more flexibility in choosing whether they want to start a project this fiscal year or the following year, but also, the Board should keep in mind that there are still annual targets that stimulate performance incentives so they might still be operating under the old mindset of trying to meet the annual targets to receive an annual incentive rather than waiting three or four years out. Ms. Mattavous-Frye clarified that the DCSEU was not required to spend the entire $19.1M. Director Wells added that, in the past, if they did not spend the entire budget, it would go into the SETF Fund Balance and the DCSEU could no longer access those funds. However, the new contract and other District changes would allow the DCSEU to access the unspent funds in the next fiscal year. Mr. Karim inserted that it was subject to appropriation and funding availability. Director Wells agreed that the unspent budget was subject to availability, but asked whether the DCSEU could spend above $20M in one year. Dr. Loncke answered affirmatively and said that, with respect to the benchmarks, spending might impact the number of green jobs that the DCSEU can create because green jobs are tied to expenditures. Director Wells clarified that the DCSEU does not lose access to their unspent fund balance. Dr. Loncke also stated that the DCSEU can be assessed penalties at the end of this fiscal year if the annual targets for some of the benchmarks are not met.

Chair Corman reiterated her earlier question, i.e. whether comments were sent to the DCSEU regarding the Strategic Plan from other stakeholders (besides those sent by the Board)? Dr. Cooper inserted that she submitted comments that were very high level and not overly detailed. For example, one spoke to customer data and privacy. Some were forward thinking, suggesting things that her company was already looking at or implementing. Some comments attempted to maximize coordinating and efficiency. Chair Corman was very appreciative of this information and asked the DCSEU to provide a response when the Board provides additional comments. She stated that if the Strategic Plan was the document that dictated the next three months of spending, the Board needed to know that because they need to understand whether they need to scrutinize it ASAP or whether the next three months of spending were already provided for in prior plans and documents. Dr. Loncke answered that the next three months had already been determined because the Strategic Plan was a five-year document. He also noted that the Board will soon see the DCSEU FY18 Annual Plan. The Strategic Plan is a five-year document, while the Annual Plan comes in every year around the month of August. The Annual Plan outlines what the DCSEU will be doing in FY18 (October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018). DOEE received a draft Annual Plan last Thursday from the DCSEU, but DOEE had not yet had a chance to discuss the draft to make sure the framework covers everything DOEE thinks should be included. Furthermore, similar to the Strategic Plan, the Board will have the opportunity to review and comment on this Annual Plan. Most of the emphasis should be placed on the Annual Plan because it spells out the programs and incentives starting October 1, 2017. Chair Corman agreed that the Board would like to see this Annual Plan and requested that they hear responses to their comments on the Strategic Plan– so they can know whether they have been incorporated or whether other comments have been received. Ms. Berliner asked DOEE to send out an alert when such documents have been received and placed in Dropbox because the Board does not check their Dropbox accounts unless they are alerted to do so. Dr. Loncke said they would.

Chair Corman noted that it was helpful to see the breakdown of the DCSEU’s expenditures included in the Dropbox because it answered her June questions about administrative expenditures and third-parties. However, some Board members noted they did not bring a copy of the document to this meeting. The Board thought it would be helpful to be able to be responsive to the effectiveness of the DCSEU’s spending and this document enables them to do so. Chair Corman recapped for the new Board members that the Board was trying to understand the DCSEU’s spending habits to ensure effectiveness. The document was circulated among members and the Chair asserted that $600K out of about $1.3M that was expended during the month of April 2017 was external, suggesting that the bulk of April spending was internal (or on administrative expenditures). Chair woman Corman wanted to know what the breakdown looked like now and requested to see this breakdown at every meeting. Director Wells noted that just because the breakdown indicates that funds were spent internally does not necessarily mean that they were administrative expenditures. Chair Corman inserted that it would be good for the Board to have a conversation about why the breakdown is the way it is. Dr. Cooper added that one of the items the EM&V report addressed was looking at the programs and comparing expenditures and benefits received and considering whether or not they were cost-effective. She understood that this was different, but, from an administrative perspective, this took into account the execution of the programs. Tetra Tech noted the efficiencies with dollars spent and being realized with the outcomes of residents and customers being referenced. She did not see any red flags in their report.

**Discussion on Comparisons of the DCSEU’s Performance with that of other States (*i.e.*, MD) – (32:05 - 42:04**)

Chair Corman noted there was a question on the acquisition costs posed at the last meeting and there were comparisons with other states. Dr. Cooper stated that MD and PA were both looked at out of curiosity over what other states were doing and because Director Wells had heard of positive things happening in MD. Chair Corman reiterated the question about the point of comparison with MD and PA from the minutes. Dr. Cooper stated that she was looking at MD and noted unique features of their program because the programs are implemented by MD utilities. In sum, MD programs were very cost-effective and efficient. She had provided Director Wells with some high-level information about programs in MD. Chair Corman asked whether the Board could look at this information as well. Director Wells inserted that the DCSEU has subcontractors that operate in DC and Maryland, and noted that some subcontractors (or one in particular) would like a strict rebate program and so he wanted to know more about a rebate-type program. Ms. Berliner noted that MD had a very peculiar program because incentives were half their budget. Director Wells could not affirm this but noted that this was why the EM&V report was so important. He also did not see any red flags in the report but noted that the DCSEU’s goals were different, including social goals, compared to the goals of Empower MD, so the comparison between these two programs was not exact (not “apples to apples”). Chair Corman asked whether Empower MD uses a straight rebate program. The Board answered no, not entirely. Mr. Skulley added that MD had a mix of programs and depended on the utility and their proposed program design. He also noted there were custom programs and that most of these programs were winding down for the year.

Chair Corman asked the Board to describe DC’s payment/incentive mechanism. Dr. Cooper answered that the Board would need to have a deeper discussion in order to answer this question because the information presented in the last meeting was just a high-level overview of the suite of programs available. Mr. Skulley added that, in his experience, programs could always make themselves run more smoothly and efficiently. Chair Corman asked whether this was what the Board referred to as “acquisition costs.” The Board answered negatively. Mr. Skulley inserted that “acquisition costs” were just the overall cost per kilowatt-hour and these costs could be benchmarked against those of other states. Dr. Cooper added that these were provided in the Tetra Tech report. Ms. Mattavous-Frye inserted that she had originally raised the question of why the MD costs were so high and the explanation was that there was no straight comparison of the two programs.

Chair Corman asked whether MD’s savings were better or worse than DC’s. Dr. Cooper stated that she would have to take a deeper look because these were different programs operated by different utilities. Chair Corman clarified that she was asking about this because she was getting ready for the next report and was looking at the ACEEE rating. She thought that DC’s rating went down. Someone noted that the ranking had only dropped one position, from 14 to 15, for energy efficiency. Chair Corman thought that it had dropped by three places. The Board answered that she was referring to the city scorecard. Ms. Berliner inserted that MD invested in utility scale generation and that the cost structures and rebates to the generator were very different. While it had an effect on the cost to the consumer, this calculation was very complex. Director Wells noted that the Board needed to understand what it meant to ask the DCSEU to go “bigger and deeper.” Because the DCSEU was required to measure outcomes annually, instead of a multi-year basis, DOEE had dis-incentivized doing deeper, bigger retrofits because the bigger programs would continue longer than a year. As such, it was a matter of understanding what other states were doing, but at the same time, realizing that the Board was asking the DCSEU to do something different.

Chair Corman re-emphasized that it would be helpful for the Board to understand what expenditures looked like in May, June, and July. She requested a discussion to better understand whether this was the right split. Director Wells added that this was a good way to learn more about the DCSEU and how they work.

**Chair Corman – Update on Drafting SEUAB FY16 Annual Budget (44:20-1:45:48)**

Chair Corman asked when the Annual Report was due. The Board had a brief discussion about the due date. Mr. Karim said it was due 90 days after the EM&V Report was issued. The final draft was sent to the Board on July 11th, so it was due 90 days after July 11th. Chair Corman inserted that she had asked this question to emphasize that it would be helpful for the Board to understand what happened in May, June, and July. She asked that this information be made available to the Board and that they review it at the next meeting. Dr. Loncke noted that this meeting was the last one on the schedule, so the Board would need to set up some dates for the next meeting as well as for the new fiscal year. Director Wells affirmed an agenda item to review quarterly expenditures (broken down by month).

**Discussion on the DCSEU FY16 Financial Audit and Request for Auditor to answer Questions – (48:00 - 58:54**).

Ms. Berliner asked that the auditor (the person who prepared the financial audit) be present at one of the meetings before the October deadline so the Board can query him. Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked what Ms. Berliner would like to query him on. Ms. Berliner answered that she would like his explanation for what he reported so the Board can incorporate his reasoning in the new report (*e.g.*, on progress on the new contract, performance, etc.). She thinks the Board’s (and the Council’s) understanding of the report would be greatly enhanced by a deeper understanding of the auditor’s report. Ms. Kane stated that there was a difference between what an auditor looked at versus what a program evaluator looked at. The auditor might be able to tell the Board how he arrived at the numbers in the report, but he could not really evaluate the programs behind the numbers. Director Wells agreed that a traditional audit was a balance-book and noted that he wanted to clarify what the Board was looking for so that they can get the answers they want and need. Mr. Mizroch noted that it seemed like the Board had a lot of prep work to do before they knew what they wanted to say in the Annual Report. Ms. Mattavous-Frye agreed that the auditor would be helpful as long as the Board’s questions were specific and focused. Mr. Skulley agreed that it may be helpful to understand what was considered in reaching a particular number (*e.g.*, expenditures for low-income programs).

Ms. Berliner suggested that the Board bring questions to the next meeting, figure out what they want to ask and how, and then bring the auditor to the following meeting. Director Wells affirmed that DOEE will provide whatever the Board requested. Dr. Cooper asked how much time the Board would need to allocate to have the auditor respond to the questions. Ms. Berliner clarified that the Board would simply ask the questions in person and the auditor answer in real time or they could send him the questions in advance of the second meeting in September to give him time to prepare answers. Director Wells suggested that the DCSEU’s Chief Operating Officer be present to help answer some of these questions because there are some things that the auditor may not understand. Dr. Loncke noted that Marcus Walker is the Director of Operations and Ted Trabue is the Managing Director and that they could be available to answer questions. He also pointed out that the DCSEU Audit Report for FY16 contained one finding from the auditor (the DCSEU could not provide proof of income verification for two of the low-income projects at the time of the audit, but they have since been able to produce those documents). Director Wells affirmed that the Board would probably need Marcus to answer whatever the auditor could not. Dr. Cooper added that there also seemed to be some questions that were within Tetra Tech’s purview. She suggested looking back at their report and seeing if the Board had further questions to be answered by Tetra Tech. Chair Corman agreed.

**Discussion on Board meeting dates during the month of September 2017 – (58:54 - 1:14:06**).

Ms. Kane asked whether the Board has a date for the September meeting. The Board answered negatively. Chair Corman answered that she would not be available until the third week of September. Ms. Berliner suggested that the Board do a round-robin of drafts of their report, but that the Board needed to start writing in order to determine what further information they needed. Ms. Kane emphasized the importance of meeting the October deadline for submission of the Board’s annual report to the DC Council. Chair Corman suggested meeting the first week of September. Director Wells noted that the September 4th is a holiday, so the meeting would need to be the 5th, 6th, or 7th. Additionally, he noted that if the Board needed to fly the Tetra Tech representative back to DC for an in-person discussion, DOEE would need to determine the cost (as well as timing). Ms. Berliner emphasized that the auditor and the evaluator would not be needed at the first meeting, but rather at the second. Dr. Cooper suggested that the Board first determine whether the evaluator (Tetra Tech representative) needed to be flown out or whether the Board could simply ask the questions over Skype or telephone. Chair Corman clarified that the first September meeting would simply be for the Board to share their questions and drafts, to determine whether they needed the Tetra Tech representative, and to prepare the list of questions for the auditor and Marcus (to be asked at the second meeting in September). Ms. Mattavous-Frye further clarified that the Board could send the questions to the auditor and/or Tetra Tech representative after the first meeting so that they would have time to prepare their answers. Ms. Williams clarified that the auditor’s and Tetra Tech’s reports were separate documents and asked that both reports be placed in Dropbox. The Board agreed upon the afternoon of September 5, 2017 at 2 PM for the first meeting and on the morning of the September 22, 2017 at 10 AM for the second meeting. Director Wells noted that if the Board needed to question the authors of the Tetra Tech report, it would probably need to be via phone. Ms. Williams asked for previous Annual Reports (*e.g.*, last year’s) to be put in Dropbox. Dr. Loncke agreed to do so. He then asked whether Chair Corman would like the Board members to send their questions for the auditor/Tetra Tech to DOEE for consolidation before the first September meeting. Ms. Kane suggested that people send in their questions as they think of them.

**Discussion of who should write selected sections of the Board’s Annual Report – (1:14:06 -1:45:48**)

Ms. Williams asked whether the Board had assigned sections for the Annual Report. Chair Corman answered somewhat negatively. She had sent Lynora a version of the outline, but she sent the wrong version (one without names). The names of people writing each section had not changed, but she had changed Section II’s title to “Implementation of the New DCSEU Contract” and added more information about the new contract. An electronic copy of the outline was not in the Dropbox, but Lynora had forwarded it in a July 24th email. John Mizroch was assigned Section I, the Executive Summary, and Chair Corman had added a note about the heightened importance of the Board’s role as a check on the DCSEU’s activities given the increased magnitude of the contract amount and its extended time span. Section II was assigned to Chair Corman, but she noted that she had added her name by default and new people were welcome to contribute where they would like. Chair Corman also noted, for the new people, that the outline format followed the formatting of previous years. She will send her updated version again.

Ms. Kane noted that this Annual Report was for FY16, but the implementation of the new contract took place in FY17, so she was unsure as to whether it should be included in the FY16 report. The 2016 Report should cover the creation of the new contract, not its implementation. Chair Corman agreed that this was a valid point. Mr. Mizroch asked what was appropriate for the Board to mention in this Annual Report. Ms. Kane agreed that this was an important question because the contract impacts a significant portion of ratepayer money. She continued that this would be a good place to mention where the Board fits in with the District’s other goals and programs. Chair Corman re-emphasized that she had put these notes into Mr. Mizroch’s section of the outline because the new the DCSEU contract gave the Board a heightened role. Dr. Cooper commented that this discussion should also be in a separate section of the Report, not just in the Executive Summary (because the Executive Summary should be a summary of the larger document). Chair Corman asked whether people want to assign themselves to these sections that were discussed in the Executive Summary but not in later sections. Ms. Mattavous-Frye suggested that the Board work on this section collaboratively and she volunteered to work on it with Dr. Cooper. Mr. Skulley suggested that these sections go under Section V, Subsection B because some of the programs did not exist in FY16. The Board thought this was a great point. Ms. Kane offered to help Mr. Mizroch with information about the individual programs.

Ms. Berliner added that she had a write up on Green Jobs to add to Section V, Subsection A that Ms. Steele would help with. Ms. Williams asked to be assigned the Subsections of Section IV, Subsection E. Chair Corman asked how much of this section should be retained given that it contained information from both 2014 and 2015 (and that some of the 2015 information overlapped with or invalidated some of the 2014 information). She suggested that Section IV be changed to include both 2014 and 2015 in the title and that those 2014 recommendations that were not rendered obsolete by the 2015 recommendations be included. The Board had no objections over Section III.

Chair Corman asked about the status of the vacancies (for Section IV). Daniel Conner reported that only one seat was still open – the Building Construction seat. Chair Corman noted that she had forwarded a recommendation to the Board, but not for that seat in particular. Director Wells noted that her recommendation may not have been appropriate for that particular slot. Ms. Berliner suggested tapping the Green Building Council. Director Wells and Daniel both pointed out that the Green Building Council did recommend someone, but that person was rejected by MOTA because they were not a DC resident. Ms. Steele added that she has a couple partners whom she could recommend, at least one of whom was a DC resident. Chair Corman noted that PJM is still an issue the Board should be talking about.

Chair Corman asked for a volunteer to head up Section IV. Ms. Mattavous-Frye noted that OPC had already started doing 2015. The Board emphasized that the 2014 recommendations should only be included if they had not been fulfilled or captured by the 2015 recommendations. Chair Corman added that the Board wanted to see a report on the revenues for the PJM market. Ms. Berliner suggested that the Board consider whether it was useful to provide context about the ISO in the northeast because prices were so low that there was a problem for generators. Ms. Kane added that the demand-response market was uncertain. Ms. Mattavous-Frye agreed that the Board needed information on its status. Chair Corman assigned this section to Ms. Kane and noted that some of this context was already known. She added that there was still a question about transparency. In an aside, Chair Corman noted that Ted Trabue and Lance Loncke should send their section to Ms. Kane.

Ms. Berliner suggested dividing Section V, Subsection A by market (*i.e.*, low-income, multi-family; commercial and industrial; and residential). Chair Corman suggested diving by both market and performance benchmark. Ms. Kane asked whether the Tetra Tech report did this already. Ms. Berliner answered that the Tetra Tech report examined some of this and that the Board should quote from it. Ms. Kane emphasized that the Board should look at the Tetra Tech report while writing this report. She also suggested that the Board organize the report as the Tetra Tech report was organized: by program. Dr. Cooper agreed with this suggestion. She also asked whether the Board wanted to cite back to a certain viewpoint to look at prior performance. The Board agreed that they should do this. Ms. Mattavous-Frye noted that OPC was willing to be the contact person for Section V, with input from the rest of the Board (*e.g.*, Ms. Steele, Mr. Skulley, and Dr. Cooper). Ms. Mattavous-Frye clarified that they will look at the programs looking forward.

**Director Wells – General Updates (1:45:48-1:49:20)**

Director Wells stated that DOEE notified the recipients to whom they intend to award the $13.2M in grants and they will sign them today. The Board clapped. He further clarified that this was the REDF money. Ms. Kane asked him to recap for the Board what the Council did with the REDF money. Director Wells answered that the Council repurposed about $2.5M and substituted local funds with REDF money, which was inappropriate. He did not know if the Council’s actions could be fixed, but they definitely took $2.5M and repurposed it. However, the advocacy community was terrific in response to this issue. As a result, the Council put some money back and he learned from Councilmember Alan that it was the number 1 issue coming into his office. Ms. Steele noted that the $2.5M was how much the Council put back, not the total amount they took. Director Wells added that they were looking to give money to sister agencies for solar and DOEE is trying to install a 1MW ground mount solar system and redistribute the credit to the low-income community.

**Adjournment**

Chair Corman adjourned the meeting at 11:59 am.

Minutes prepared by: Lynora Hall