**SEU Advisory Board**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, October 16, 2017**

**I. Call to Order**

Bicky Corman called to order a quorum of the SEU Advisory Board (SEUAB or Board) at 10:15 AM Monday, October 16, 2017, at the Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE), 1200 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC.

**Roll Call**

Roll call was taken and the following people were in attendance:

**Board Members -** Bicky Corman, John Mizroch, Kirsten Williams, Dan Wedderburn

**Board Members on the Phone -** Donna Cooper, Betty Ann Kane, Sandra Mattavous-Frye,

Leni Berliner, Sean Skulley

**Absent Board Members -** Nicole Steele, Jared Lang, Josh Richards

**Other Attendees:** Millie Knowlton (SEUAB Member, *pending confirmation*); Tommy Wells (Director, DOEE); Taresa Lawrence (Deputy Director, DOEE); Lance Loncke (Associate Director, DOEE); Hussain Karim (Assistant General Counsel, DOEE); Lynora Hall (Staff Assistant, DOEE); Marshall Duer-Balkind (Program Analyst, DOEE); Patti Boyd (Senior technology Strategist, DCSEU); Adrienne Henderson (Assistant People’s Counsel, OPC); Ted Trabue (Managing Director, DCSEU); Marcus Walker (Director of Operations, DCSEU); Sheryl Dove (Strategy Manager, DCSEU); LaKeisha Lockwood (Energy Program Specialist, DOEE); Angela Johnson (Director of Finance, DCSEU); Bob Jose (Agency Fiscal Officer, DOEE); Tamara Boyd (Financial Planning and Analysis Manager, DCSEU); and Patrice Brooks (Project Intake Supervisor, DCSEU), and Dan Cleverdon (Public Service Commission),

***Board meeting live stream link:***

[***https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aem28JcZiOc&t=213s***](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aem28JcZiOc&t=213s)

**Approval of Agenda (0:03 – 11:21)**

The motion to approve the agenda was made by Mr. John Mizroch, seconded by Ms. Kirsten Williams and unanimously approved by the Board.

**Opening Discussion**

Chair Corman introduced Ms. Millie Knowlton who will soon join the Board as a representative of the Building Construction Industry. Ms. Knowlton stated that she currently works for Tesla on the Commercial Energy Solar Storage Project and looks forward to serving on the Board. Chair Corman stated that another draft of the annual report was circulated to the Board. The Board was granted a one week extension for submittal of their annual report which was originally due on October 14, 2017. Chair Corman noted that it may be beneficial for the Board to have a closed executive session to facilitate a frank discussion about the contents of the draft. Ms. Mattavous-Frye said that she definitely supports Chair Corman’s suggestion given that she had some questions that would be better discussed at an executive meeting. Mr. John Mizroch noted that he echoed similar sentiments during his previous discussions with Chair Corman before the start of the meeting. He noted that this is just a draft and the Board should be able to speak frankly with each other as opposed to having others who are not on the Board looking over their shoulders. Director Wells stated that Mr. Hussain Karim will provide the Board with the necessary criteria for holding a closed executive session should the Board decide to move forward with it. Chair Corman also asked Mr. Karim to provide the Board with the criteria for a closed executive session Chair Corman asked Mr. Karim if the Board would be permitted to discuss confidential documents during an executive closed session? Mr. Karim stated that the Board cannot discuss confidential documents in public session and may be permitted to do so during a closed session. Mr. Karim stated that he will review a memo previously provided by the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability (BEGA) that outlined the permissible reasons for holding a closed session. Director Wells stated that the Board would need to come up with a permissible reason to hold a closed executive session. He also asked the Board if they were seeking to move the current meeting to an executive closed session. Ms. Mattavous-Frye mentioned that the Board would need to get the criteria from Mr. Karim prior to going into the discussion. Director Wells stated if it is the Boards desire to move to a closed session later in the agenda, Mr. Karim could help develop a rationale for moving to an executive session. Chair Corman stated it would be beneficial to review the Open Meetings Act and the previous memo from BEGA before the Board can decide whether or not it will move to a closed session today or in the near future. Mr. Mizroch noted that given the nature of the Board, it would be shocking that the Board does not have the right to hold an off-the-record conversation among members Director Wells said that Mr. Karim will provide the specifics regarding permissible closed sessions.

**II. Official Business**

**Review and Adoption of September 5, 2017 and September 22, 2017 Minutes (11:38 - 28:55)**

Chair Corman asked Board members if they had a chance to review the September 5 and September 22, 2017 minutes. Mr. Mizroch motioned to approve the September 5, 2017 minutes, which was seconded by Ms. Kirsten Williams and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chair Corman noted that she did not have any major issues with the September 22, 2017 minutes but felt that they were a bit parsed and not accurately capture all of the main items discussed during the meeting. Chair Corman stated that one of the reasons she requested to receive the minutes in advance of approving a draft agenda is because it would be a helpful reminder of what was discussed at the last meeting so that the Board can follow through on at the next meeting. Chair Corman noted that although her main concern was reflected on the current agenda, the condensed draft of the minutes did not accurately reflect that is was Chair Corman that requested the item be placed on the agenda for today’s meeting. For example, there was a discussion about the Board’s involvement in the development of the upcoming EM&V contract, the criteria used by the EM&V contractor to evaluate the DCSEU’s performance, contract modifications that lead to changes in the minimum and maximum benchmarks, and DOEE’s processes for changing performance targets and/or other contract terms and conditions that were not reflected in the September 22 minutes.

Director Wells asked Chair Corman if she wishes to have the minutes amended before the Board motions to approve the minutes. Chair Corman stated she was not asking for an amendment to the minutes because the main items she wanted to discuss were included on the current agenda. Ms. Mattavous-Frye stated that she had some concerns about the accuracy of the minutes and emphasized that DOEE should make additional efforts to ensure that certain important discussions/items are not inadvertently omitted from the minutes. Director Wells stated that the agency is taking additional steps to improve the accuracy of the minutes and asked the Board to become more intentional about the items they would like to see reflected in the minutes. He noted that the Board is not a corporate board and in his opinion, the minutes should be used to help draft the annual report each year. The minutes should clearly reflect the issues and concerns addressed during the year and the manner in which they were addressed by the Board. Ms. Mattavous-Frye stated that the minutes should also reflect the origins of the agenda items/requests and the work that was completed by the Board that resulted in subsequent changes that are appropriate.

Chair Corman subsequently made a motion to amend the September 22 minutes to reflect the fact that she requested a discussion be included on the agenda for the October 16, 2017 meeting to discuss the Board’s ability to provide input on the next EM&V contract, DOEE’s processes for making changes to the DCSEU contract, and the Board’s involvement in the contract modification processes under the prior and current DCSEU contract. The motion to amend the September 22 minutes was seconded by Mr. Mizroch and unanimously approved by the Board.

Director reiterated that it is burdensome to provide verbatim transcription of the discussions held during Board meetings, so the folks tasked with drafting the minutes must exercise some judgement and try to highlight the important issues discussed by the Board. However, the agency will work at improving the accuracy of the minutes so that the Board is comfortable with the final draft produced. Chair Corman stated that in fairness, there are videos and recordings of the meetings so there’s no need for a verbatim transcription of the discussions held in order to draft the next annual report. However, the minutes should reflect ongoing issues raised during meetings so that they can be addressed at future meetings. Dr. Loncke suggested that the Board specifically identify important issues that they would like to include on future agendas. Chair Corman repeated her request to get the minutes before the draft agenda. Mr. Mizroch mentioned that the Board would like to receive the minutes at least three days before the next meeting. Corman stated that in fairness to DOEE the Board has had more frequent meetings over a shorter timespan in an effort to complete the annual report, so some credit should be given to DOEE for completing the minutes prior to each meeting.

**Review of FY17 Multi-Year Contract Modifications; Prior DCSEU Contract Modifications; DCSEU Expenditure Report and EM&V Contract (29:01 – 1:06:07)**

Dr. Loncke stated that the full copy of the DCSEU multi-year contract is available via Drop Box for Board members to review the entire contract. The most recent modifications to the current contract were executed on September 28, 2017. Dr. Loncke explained each of the three modifications to the current contract, and the process by which contract modifications were completed. A properly executed contract modification requires signatures from VEIC/DCSEU and the District’s designated Contracting Officer, Jacque McDonald.

Chair Corman asked what criterion did DOEE and/or the DCSEU used to determine when a contract modification is needed for general housekeeping purposes as opposed to substantive changes to the contract, and whether or not the proposed changes should be discussed with the Board given the Board’s strategic role of regarding the contract. Dr. Loncke explained that most of the previous contract modifications require mutual agreement between DOEE and the DCSEU, unless there were mandatory District and/or federal government laws or contract requirements that were required to be incorporated into the contract. In those instances, the Contracting Officer can make unilateral modifications to the contract. He also explained that the Board has not historically participated in the contract modification discussions regarding changes to the performance benchmarks targets.

Director Wells noted that the Board should be involved in the modification process, or be notified of discussions between DOEE and the DCSEU regarding substantive changes to the contract that may affect the DCSEU’s performance which the Board has to monitor. Mr. Karim stated that he thinks it’s a good idea for the Board to be involved in the contract modification process unless there are contract-related matters that have to be done urgently and DOEE could not provide prior notification to the Board. Director Wells further clarified Mr. Karim’s statement by stating that he agreed that the Board should receive prior notification of proposed contract modifications and be given an opportunity to weigh in. However, he noted that there may be certain contract issues (e.g. changes to the required levels of insurance coverage for DCSEU subcontractors) that may need to be urgently amended and should not be delayed until the Board has had an opportunity to provide comments/feedback on the proposed changes. Director Wells noted that although the Board serves in an advisory capacity to both DOEE and the DCSEU, receiving prior notification of substantive changes to the contract seems highly appropriate especially in light of the fact that the Board helped shape the contract, and the Board reviewed and provided input on the current performance measures detailed in the contract. Both Chair Corman and Ms. Mattavous-Frye said that informing the Board of general housekeeping contractual changes during meetings would be sufficient, but the Board should be given an opportunity as early as possible whenever a change is being contemplated that affects the performance benchmarks or targets specified in the DCSEU contract.

Many Board members and Director Wells also expressed concerns about the recent modification to the energy savings targets for the benchmark for improving the energy efficiency and renewable energy generating capacity of low-income housing, shelters, clinics, or other buildings serving low-income residents in the District. Some could not easily grasp the inherent conflict between a sliding energy savings target for the low-income benchmark and the overall energy savings targets for annual reductions in electricity and natural gas consumption. Mr. Trabue, Mr. Karim and Dr. Loncke explained that one of the main reasons the DCSEU wanted to modify the previous low-income energy savings target (which DOEE agreed to after careful research and analysis), was to remove the inherent disincentive for the DCSEU to pursue greater than expected overall energy savings because they were unable to find a compensating amount of low-income energy savings. For example, the previous low-income energy savings target was set at 10% of the overall energy savings achieved by the DCSEU in a given fiscal year (e.g. FY17 target for reduction in electricity consumption is 86,473 megawatt hours (MWh)). This meant that the DCSEU must ensure that at least 8,647 MWh of energy savings were derived from programs that served low-income residents, in order to meet the maximum electricity energy savings goal for the low-income benchmark. Therefore, for every 1 MWh of savings above 86,473 MWh, the DCSEU must achieve an additional 0.1 MWh of low-income energy savings. Under this scenario, the DCSEU would be reluctant to pursue additional savings (especially in non-low-income sectors) above the specified goal if they were unable to complete a low-income project that provided the required amount of energy savings need to account for 10% of their overall energy savings.

In order to remove this disincentive for the DCSEU, the low-income energy savings target was converted to a fixed number, instead of moving target. This change also prevented the DCSEU from earning a performance bonus for achieving lower amount of low-income energy savings. For example, under the original construct the DCSEU could have earned at least 50% of the at-risk performance bonus for deriving 5% of the overall energy savings from low-income programs. If overall energy savings was 60,878 MWh, the amount needed to meet the 5% target for low-income energy savings would be 3,044 MWh, which is a lower than the amount needed (4,324 MWh) under a the new fixed low-income energy savings target.

Ms. Mattavous-Frye asked if the 10% low-income energy savings target was a reasonable reflection of the historical savings achieved based on the EM&V analysis. Dr. Loncke stated that it is a reasonable amount, which becomes even harder in the out years once the low hanging energy savings opportunities have been exhausted in the low-income space. Mr. Sean Skulley asked if there was a similar target for natural gas. Dr. Loncke answered yes. The low-income energy savings target is measured in MMBtus, which is based on the combined amount of electricity and natural gas energy savings achieved. Dr. Loncke also explained that the DCSEU must achieve the specified energy savings target and the required amount of annual low-income expenditures in order to qualify for the at-risk performance bonus for the low-income benchmark.

Director Wells stated that the discussions on the changes to the low-income energy savings targets showed that substantive changes to the performance benchmarks may require additional policy considerations, and such changes should definitely be presented to the Board for advice before they are incorporated into the contract. Chair Corman and Ms. Mattavous-Frye agreed with Director Wells.

**Discussion on BEGA Rules for a Closed Executive Board Meeting (1:06:11-1:19:27)**

As noted above, the Board discussed the mitigating circumstances that required the next meeting to be held as a closed session for Board members only, pending the outcome of a written opinion from BEGA. Mr. Mizroch made a motion for the next meeting to be an executive closed session once BEGA requirements were satisfied. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wedderburn and unanimously approved the Board. Mr. Mizroch asked if the executive sessions could be held via a conference call. Chair Corman asked that DOEE send around a Doodle Poll to determine the best date and time for the next meeting. She also requested that DOEE seek another extension from the DC Council to allow the Board additional time to complete the annual report. Dr. Lawrence indicated that she will work with DOEE’s legislative director to request that the annual report be submitted to the Council on or before November 30, 2017.

**Discussion on Modifications Minimum and Maximum Performance benchmarks Under the Previous DCSEU Contract (1:19:31 – 1:56:43)**

Chair Corman asked Dr. Loncke to explain the origins of the terms “minimum performance benchmark” and “maximum performance benchmarks.” Ms. Mattavous-Frye also requested that the explanations be provided in writing and included in the meeting minutes. Dr. Loncke, Mr. Karim and Dr. Lawrence collectively provided oral explanations of the origins of the terms minimum and maximum performance benchmarks. Both Director Wells and Chair Corman subsequently asked Board members that have been serving on the Board since 2011 if they recall the discussions and explanations provided by his staff. Dr. Cooper noted that she recalled the discussions. Ms. Mattavous-Frye also stated that she recalled the extensive discussion held regarding the performance targets for each benchmark. The following explanation was subsequently provided:

***Origins of the term Minimum Performance Benchmark***

The term “minimum performance benchmark” was an interpretation of the language used in the original DCSEU RFP and Contract to describe the numeric targets for each of the benchmarks that were used to measure the Contractor’s/VEIC’s performance on an annual basis. The origins of this interpretation dates back to the original drafting of the DCSEU RFP, which was done through a public process led by the SEU Advisory Board in collaboration with experienced energy consultants that were retained to assist the Board with the development and quantification of the minimum performance requirements specified in the CAEA. At that time, Board meetings were held bi-weekly at the Wilson Building and several public stakeholders attended and participated in the discussions. The Board spent several weeks deliberating the best ways to accurately measure the DCSEU’s performance and wanted to ensure that the final draft of the performance benchmarks did not result in an “All or Nothing” approach to assessing the actual achievements of the DCSEU. The All or Nothing approach meant that the DCSEU Contractor/VEIC would earn all of the at-risk compensation for achieving 100% of the target for a particular benchmark, but would not receive an incentive payment if the DCSEU fell short of the performance target, regardless of the magnitude of the shortfall. As argued at the time, the All or Nothing approach would serve as a disincentive for the DCSEU develop a wide array of programs that were capable of achieving certain performance targets each year, and the Board and/or DOEE would have had significant difficulty characterizing the performance of a newly established entity that needed a few years to reach full maturity. Hence the Board instructed the energy consultants to develop performance targets and incentive payments that were based on a “Sliding Scale” to reward some level of success by allowing the DCSEU to earn incremental portions of the at-risk compensation available for each benchmark if the DCSEU met certain performance thresholds/minimum performance benchmarks, until the ultimate/maximum/highest level of performance was achieved.

For example, the Compensation Scheme for the Performance Benchmark for Reductions in Electricity Consumption stated that “The Contractor shall receive 25% of the compensation at risk allocated for this benchmark in Table 1 for a reduction in electricity consumption ***equivalent to 0.5% annual reduction*** in the weather-normalized total electricity consumption in the District for 2009.  For every 0.25% reduction beyond the initial 0.5% reduction in electricity consumption, the Contractor shall receive an additional 12.5% of the incentive allocated to this benchmark.” Likewise, the Compensation Scheme for the Performance Benchmark for Improving the Efficiency of Low-Income Housing states that “The Contractor shall receive 50% of the compensation at risk allocated for this benchmark in Table 1 for annual expenditures, for programs targeted toward low-income residents in the District, that are the ***equivalent of 20% of the SEU’s annual budget from the SETF***. For every 5% in expenditures beyond 20% of the SEU’s budget, the Contractor shall receive an additional 25% of the compensation at risk allocated for this benchmark in Table 1” (*see pages 54 and 57 of the DCSEU FY 2011-2016 Contract available in DropBox*).

Therefore, the DCSEU, and subsequently the SEUAB, Tetra Tech and DOEE, interpreted the term “***equivalent to***” as the minimum performance benchmark/numeric target which marked partial achievement of the established numerical targets for each benchmark and the point at which the DCSEU began earning bonus/performance incentive payments from DOEE for meeting and/or exceeding established performance targets. The DCSEU was the first to officially use the term minimum performance benchmark in their FY 2012 Annual Report that was completed in October 2012 (*see page 8 of the DCSEU 2012 Annual Report available in DropBox*). It is also important to note that the original DCSEU Contract did not provide numeric values for overall performance targets for a 1% annual reduction in electricity consumption nor the requirement that a minimum of 30% of the SETF expenditures be dedicated to improving the energy efficiency of low-income housing. Hence, the DCSEU and Tetra Tech’s EM&V reports were the two most prominent documents that quantified the minimum performance levels that the DCSEU was expected to achieve on an annual basis.

The term was also used in the SEUAB Annual report that was subsequently completed in November 2012 following the submission of the DCSEU’s Annual Report to DOEE and the Board (*see page 2 of the FY 2012 SEUAB Annual Report of the SEUAB available in DropBox*). However, as noted in the Board’s report the authors relied on information provided by the DCSEU to draft their report which described the Board’s assessment of the DCSEU’s performance during FY 2012. Hence, I would not hold the Board accountable for adopting the use of the term minimum performance benchmark.

In March 2013, Tetra Tech’s first report on the Annual Performance Benchmarks Evaluation also used the term minimum benchmark specifically to summarize the numeric levels of energy savings and other performance metrics verified by Tetra Tech (see pages 1-2 and 1-3 of the

DCSEU FY12 Annual Performance Benchmarks Evaluation Report *available in DropBox*). At that time, both DOEE and Tetra Tech felt that the term was consistent with the original performance benchmark language specified in the DCSEU Contract.

***Origins of the term Maximum Performance Benchmark***

The terms “maximum performance benchmark” was first used in Tetra Tech’s FY 2014 Annual Evaluation Report for the Performance Benchmarks in response to a direct recommendation from the Advisory Board that the EM&V reports include numeric targets that facilitated numeric comparisons of the DCSEU’s actual performance against established maximum performance targets/benchmarks. This recommendation was made following Tetra Tech’s presentation of the DCSEU’s FY 2013 results which was held at the Wilson Building. During the presentation, some Board members expressed difficulty in truly understanding the levels of the DCSEU’s attainment of the performance benchmarks because the 2013 report did not include maximum performance targets/benchmarks. Hence, Tetra Tech, and subsequently the DCSEU, began including the terms minimum and maximum performance benchmarks in the report to allow independent readers to easily interpret and compare the DCSEU’s performance year over year.

However, neither the original DCSEU Contract nor the “new” DCSEU Multiyear Contract included the terms “minimum performance benchmark” or “maximum performance benchmark” in the executed original or any of the subsequent modifications to both contracts.

**Status of the EM&V RFP and New Contract (1:19:31 – 1:56:43)**

Chair Corman inquired about the status of the EM&V RFP and new contract. She noted that the two big criteria - acquisition cost and realization rates - used by Tetra Tech in the FY16 EM&V Report were not really transparent and did not provide much information on accuracy of the DCSEU’s performance. Chair Corman also reiterated her comments from the September 22 meeting where she raised concerns about the Board’s ability to provide input on the scope of work for the new EM&V contract to ensure that the reports produced are helpful to Board members. Ms. Mattavous-Frye agreed with Chair Corman’s statements and stated that there are a number of Board members that would like to see more simplified EM&V reports that can be easily understood, especially since the Board has several new members that may not be very familiar with most of the EM&V jargon used in the previous reports. Dr. Cooper noted that Pepco previously raised some concerns about the methodology used by Tetra Tech to measure DCSEU energy savings, and was uncertain if the methodology accurately accounted for other energy savings efforts occurring in the District so as to not overstate or understate the DCSEU’s impact on the overall decrease in energy usage that has occurred in the District.

Dr. Loncke stated that the RFP closed at the end of September 2017 and the Office of Contracting and Procurement has assembled a technical evaluation panel to review the proposals submitted by eligible entities. He also assured the Board that they will have an opportunity to review the EM&V contract and provide input on the SOW and the types of performance measures the evaluator should focus on while conducting their analysis of the DCSEU’s overall performance. Chair Corman asked when would be the best time for the Board to provide their “wish list of evaluation items” to the EM&V contractor. Dr. Loncke stated that the Board could meet with the selected contract immediately after the EM&V kickoff meeting between DOEE and the contractor, and at other designated times during the EM&V engagement to ensure the final report fully reflects the input provided by the Board.

Chair Corman asked if the Board has the capacity to effectively make recommendations on areas for improvements in the EM&V reports given that EM&V principles and approaches are totally outside her area of expertise. She noted that the Board has an annual budget of $9,000 and suggested that those funds could be used to hire an experienced private consultant (even though she doesn’t think that the $9,000 will go very far) to assist the Board with identifying relevant performance measures that are typically captured in EM&V reports that could provide a clearer understand of the DCSEU’s performance and impact on the District. Chair Corman also asked if anyone knew how EM&V reports are done in other programs/jurisdictions such as Energy Efficiency in Massachusetts. Are they done using the same criteria? Chair Corman noted that the Board can take this up at the next meeting but they would need more information before proceeding further. Director Wells said that he and Dr. Lawrence would reach out to NASEO to find out if they have consultants that could provide some perspectives on how other states conduct their EM&V analyses and reports. Ms. Mattavous-Frye suggested that, as an alternative, one or two members of the Board could review and compile EM&V information from various states and place them in the Dropbox. However, she was not sure if the members would be able to critically analyze the information contained in other EM&V reports. Mr. Trabue stated the DCSEU would be happy to assist with the research endeavor if the Board did not view the DCSEU’s involvement as a potential conflict of interest. Mr. Cleverdon also noted that Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory has a whole series of EM&V related reports and analyses that are publicly available. Chair Corman stated that she agreed with Ms. Mattavous-Frye that a small group of Board members should be assembled to focus on this issue and requested volunteers. Mr. Wedderburn stated that he would be happy to volunteer since he has some relevant experience. Ms. Mattavous-Frye volunteered a few OPC staff to participate in the group.

**Discussion on the Schedule for Upcoming Board Meetings**

Chair Corman asked if the schedule for other meetings was determined. Dr. Loncke stated that no meeting dates have been determined except for the possibility of holding a closed session within two weeks. Chair Corman stated that the Board should set the next set of meeting dates and arrange the topics/discussion issues in advance. She noted that the Board still has to schedule a deep dive on the DCSEU’s internal vs. external expenditures which should occur after the Board has completed its annual report. The Board also needed to schedule a meeting to discuss EM&V issues and the small group of Board members should begin working on their EM&V deliverables. The small group will consist of Mr. Wedderburn, OCP, and any others who are willing to participate. Director Wells and Dr. Lawrence will reach out to NASEO for assistance. Chair Corman asked Mr. Cleverdon if he was willing to research the information from LBNL and send it around to members or place them in the Dropbox. Mr. Cleverdon stated that he will make an effort to pull some information together. Chair Corman asked DOEE to set up a doodle poll for dates for the executive session and requested that DOEE seek an extension on the due date to submit the annual report to Council. Dr. Loncke stated that DOEE would send out two doodle polls, one for the executive session and one for the regular Board meeting. Dr. Loncke asked Chair Coran if she would like to hold the regular meeting a week after the executive session. Chair Corman stated that the week of November 20, 2017 would be best.

**Next Meeting**

TBD pending the results of the doodle polls.

**Adjournment**

Chair Corman adjourned the meeting at 11:59 am.

*Minutes prepared by: Lynora Hall.*