

## Meeting Minutes DRAFT

### Meeting of the California Water Commission

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

State of California, Resources Building

1416 Ninth Street, First Floor Auditorium and Room 340

Sacramento, California 95814

Beginning at 9:30am

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m.

#### 2. Roll Call

Executive Officer Sue Sims called roll. Commission members Andrew Ball, Joseph Byrne, Daniel Curtin, Joe Del Bosque, Kimberley Delfino, Luther Hintz, David Orth, Armando Quintero, and Anthony Saracino were present, constituting a quorum.

#### 3. Approval of November 2014 Meeting Minutes

A motion was made to approve the November 19, 2014 meeting minutes. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

#### 4. Executive Officer's Report

Sue Sims provided the Executive Officer's Report. She began by introducing the Commission to the staff's newest member, Office Technician Beth Perkins. Ms. Sims then noted that California's snowpack was 36% of the average expected amount for mid-January, and stated that reservoir storage was reduced about 800,000 acre feet from the same time last year.

Ms. Sims also mentioned that the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act will be discussed at the Commission's February meeting. Dave Gutierrez, who is managing implementation for Department of Water Resources (DWR), will discuss the program in depth. It may also be useful for one or two members of the Commission to work closely with DWR on implementation. Commissioner Orth pointed out that there are deadlines for two elements of the legislation that involve the Commission. Regulations surrounding for basin boundary adjustment are due January 1, 2016. Broader regulations addressing how Groundwater Sustainability Plans will be assessed for compliance are due June 1, 2016. Chairman Byrne suggested that the Commission decide how to best allocate time and resources for the completion of those regulations at a future meeting.

#### 5. Public Comments

There were no public comments at this time.

**6. Action Item: Election of Commission Chair and Vice-Chair**

Traditionally the election of Commission Chair and Vice-Chair takes place on an annual basis. Commissioner Curtin proposed postponing the election because several Commission members are awaiting confirmation. Commissioner Del Bosque agreed. No action was taken and the item was postponed.

**7. Action Item: Amendment to Existing Delegation of Authority and Designation of Acting Executive Officer**

Ms. Sims will be leaving her position as Executive Officer. The existing Delegation of Authority allows the Executive Officer to handle administrative and staffing issues for the Commission. It does not allow for an Acting Executive Officer to handle those duties. Ms. Sims proposed adding language to the existing Delegation of Authority that would expand the aforementioned duties to the Acting Executive Officer. She then proposed that the Commission designate an Acting Executive Officer to perform administrative duties until the Commission selects a permanent Executive Officer. A motion was made to approve the amendments to the Delegation of Authority. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously. A motion was made to designate Assistant Executive Officer Rachel Ballanti as Acting Executive Officer. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

**8. Action Item: Approval of 2014 Annual Review of the State Water Project**

One of the statutory responsibilities of the Commission is to conduct annual inspections and tours of State Water Project (SWP) facilities and submit a report on the construction and operation of the SWP to the Administration and Legislature. Commission staff drafted the report, which includes information on safety, workforce issues, and overview on construction activities. Ms. Sims proposed approval of the report, with the intention of forwarding it to the Director of DWR and the California Natural Resources Agency for review and submittal. A motion was brought before the Commission and passed unanimously by vote.

**9. Discussion of Proposed Work Plan and Activities for Development of the Water Storage Investment Program (Proposition 1)**

Chairman Byrne read a short official statement emphasizing the Commission's commitment to developing a program through a transparent process to fund water storage projects that provide the largest return on investment and introduced DWR Director Mark Cowin. Director Cowin offered the staff expertise of DWR to the Commission for the development of the Water Storage Investment Program and acknowledged that DWR and the Commission will need to work together for the purposes of advancing water storage in California. Mr. Cowin pledged DWR's commitment in assisting the Commission with the implementation of Proposition 1.

Commissioner Saracino asked if there is funding available for outside consultants to address the issue of integration with the state system. Ms. Sims responded that some expertise exists within DWR and the Commission has resources available to fund consultants.

Commissioner Delfino inquired as to whether the Commission's funding has to go through DWR's budget and the standard state budget process. Ms. Sims answered that staff does plan on working with DWR, but the funds are continuously appropriated for the program, so the budgeting process will be slightly different. Ms. Delfino asked if the appropriations will go through the Department of Finance (DOF). Ms. Sims answered that the approval process is somewhat

different than those that go directly through DOF, and that the issue will be discussed later in the meeting.

Commissioner Curtin pointed out that while the addition of staff and use of outside experts will be needed, it is imperative that the Commission use existing resources as efficiently possible in order to spend as much funding as possible on projects, rather than administrative costs.

Ms. Sims discussed overarching issues and a draft Program Implementation Plan developed by staff. The goal of the document is to provide a high-level breakdown of the program that would be available to the public and which would address questions and concerns about the details of the program. It includes several guiding principles for the Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP). Ms. Sims observed that beyond traditional stakeholders, there are others that the Commission may want to engage such as tribal governments and disadvantaged communities. The Commission will consider projects that leverage other resources and have the greatest statewide benefit. The plan also includes key activities and projects from development of the regulations through project selection. Regarding the issue of the project management team, efficiency will be key; new positions may be needed within the Commission, but staff will strive to use the existing expertise so that there is no redundancy. The team will also engage any short-term contracts and legal support that may be deemed necessary. The Program Implementation Plan includes a timeline that breaks down the schedule which includes up to a year to complete the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) process.

Chairman Byrne asked about deadlines for the process. Ms. Sims said the assumption is that the Commission would submit the regulations to OAL by October 2015. Maureen King, Commission Staff Counsel, explained that the OAL process includes a one year public process to refine the regulations after they are submitted. There are a series of submissions and confirmations that will be executed before the statutory deadline of December 15, 2016. Ms. Delfino and Ms. King clarified that the refinement will occur between OAL and the Commission, not DWR. Mr. Byrne pointed out that even if regulations are adopted early, the Commission cannot allocate funds before December 2016. Ms. Sims added that the idea was to take the existing set of draft regulations and perfect them as much as possible before they are submitted to OAL.

Ms. Delfino stated concerns regarding the ambition of the timeline and the potential additional time needed due to increased interest and input from the public and stakeholders. Commissioner Del Bosque proposed that Commission members actively participate in stakeholder meetings and Ms. Sims agreed that Commission participation would be useful. Mr. Byrne pointed out that the draft regulations have been on the Commission's website for over a year and the public is encouraged to view them. Ms. Sims said staff is considering a stakeholder process similar to processes DWR has used for previous regulations. It is likely that the Commission may need to hold longer meetings in order to accommodate an increased workload. Staff has also worked on a communications plan and materials for Commission members to use for speaking engagements. Staff from the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) and State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) will discuss their involvement at the Commission's February meeting. Staff has also been working on administrative issues, including how to effectively use resources.

Ms. King discussed legal issues pertaining to the water bond. She noted that of all the projects in the water bond, Chapter 8 is the only one that is subject to a formal rulemaking process. She also pointed out that this rulemaking is being done in consultation with three other agencies: DFW,

the State Board, and DWR. The OAL formal rulemaking process is procedural and will include a formal notice of proposed rulemaking, draft regulations, and a statement of reasons explaining why the regulations are necessary. After submitting the notice of proposed rulemaking to OAL, OAL and the Commission have one year to work together to complete the rulemaking process.

Ms. King noted that a new law passed in 2013 requires that regulations with a potential impact in excess of \$50 million be subjected to additional economic analysis. DOF has made a preliminary determination that the Commission's regulations will not have to undergo this process. She also noted that no funding from chapter 8 of the water bond can be spent on a project until draft environmental documents for that project have been submitted. That process is project specific. The Commission will have a role as a responsible agency in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for proposed projects.

Rachel Ballanti, Assistant Executive Officer, briefed the Commission on the draft Project Management Plan and monthly workplan prepared by staff. The purpose of the document is to provide a better understanding of how the project is being managed from a staff level. The Project Management Plan was written for the development of regulations and guidelines. Another will be written for the funding implementation process. Staff has identified over 100 tasks that must be completed over the next two years. Ms. Ballanti provided an overview of the draft monthly workplan for work related to the WSIP. She stated that staff is in the process of redesigning the water bond portion of the Commission website so that it is clear and easily accessible to the public. She also stated that staff wants to publish a scoping survey that is focused on projects that may be eligible for WSIP funding.

Mr. Byrne inquired as to whether the WSIP guidelines need to be approved by OAL. Ms. King clarified that the Commission would approve the guidelines and will receive guidance from DWR. Ms. Ballanti added that the bond includes an approval process for guidelines that is less extensive than the OAL process.

Ms. Ballanti provided a flow chart to the Commission with a timeline of the process, emphasizing that changes to the guidelines will be done throughout the process with cooperation and feedback from OAL. It was stressed by Ms. King that the department was aware that OAL assistance will be needed as soon as possible and that they have already made preliminary inquiries and will look into it further. The guideline process is shorter than the regulation process and would occur after final regulations are adopted because corresponding changes may need to be made as the regulations go through the OAL process. Ms. Delfino suggested that staff verify with OAL that the guidelines do not need to go through the rulemaking process.

Ms. Ballanti said that in February, DWR staff will present an example of a groundwater project that could qualify for funding. This will be part of three meetings which will focus on groundwater storage, reservoir reoperation and conjunctive use, and surface storage. These meetings will address outstanding issues through the lens of specific project types. In February, staff would also like to discuss potential funding for environmental permitting. Ms. Delfino asked for the Commission to be advised further on the stakeholder process and financial issues.

Mr. Curtin suggested a subcommittee to examine how funds are being spent, including administrative costs. He stated that there is no information on how \$6.1 million is being spent. Ms. Ballanti said the \$6.1 million is bond funding and will be put towards the budget for

administration of bond-related issues between January 2015 and December 2016. She offered to provide Mr. Curtin with further details. The Commissioners all agreed that tasking a subcommittee for the purpose of reviewing the administrative budget would be prudent.

In May, staff is planning for the Commission to discuss process related issues that will be informed by the scoping survey. By June the project team anticipates having stakeholder recommendations and environmental priorities from DFW and the State Board for further discussion. The project team anticipates submitting the regulations to OAL by October 20. Ms. Delfino repeated her concerns regarding the aggressive speed of the schedule. The team again acknowledged the ambition of the timeline and Ms. Ballanti said staff can consider how to adjust the schedule.

Commissioner Hintz inquired about how stakeholders will be recruited and what the criteria are for participation. Ms. Ballanti stated that the project team is working with the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) and seeking their expertise for the stakeholder process. This issue will be discussed in further detail by Ajay Goyal.

Commissioner Saracino said the schedule did not include specific decisions that must be made by the Commission. That would be helpful in informing what decisions need to be made by the State Board and DFW. Ms. Ballanti said Mr. Goyal will also address outstanding issues.

Ajay Goyal, Chief of DWR's Statewide Infrastructure Investigations Branch, discussed outstanding issues and the stakeholder process for the WSIP program. In the last three years, the Commission has made significant progress. DFW has developed a list of ecosystem priorities, the State Board has developed water quality priorities, and the Commission has developed a document that lists various economic metrics and tools which could be used to value the various public benefits. The Commission has also developed a working draft of regulations, a working draft of the guidelines for the application review process, and a working draft of the initial statement of reasons that Ms. King covered in her presentation. The draft priorities from DFW and the State Board are very broad and the project team has to work with DFW to refine those priorities. The legislation also requires that the regulations contain relative environmental values from DFW and the State Board.

Funding will be awarded on competitive basis based on expected return on public investment and measurable improvements to the Delta ecosystem. The Commission should provide applicants with assumptions to use to evaluate the performance of potential projects. Baseline assumptions that are shared by applicants will work to ensure there is fair competition when projects are compared. Another proposed method for ensuring fair competition is to develop economic values for the public benefits, so the applicants can all be considered fairly and evenly. The Commission must also develop methods for monitoring public benefits.

Regarding the guidelines, Mr. Goyal said the Commission must decide upon the structure of the independent review panel that would assist in the review of applications. The Commission must also decide upon the ranking criteria for proposed projects. To accomplish these tasks, Mr. Goyal recommended a stakeholder advisory process with a stakeholder advisory committee that would contain, among other things, specialists, staff from various agencies administering the public benefits, and staff from agencies that have projects in mind that they wish to be funded. Regarding the more highly technical areas such as those economic benefits and relative

environmental value, Mr. Goyal advised the creation of subcommittees. In order to develop all of these components, it was advised that a stakeholder advisory committee would meet three to four times between January and August 2015, while the subcommittees would meet once a month. There should be around four subcommittees. All of these meetings will be public and attendance from non-participants will be welcome. State Board, DFW, and Commission staff would meet every second week. The project team is also developing a task order for CCP to assist in the stakeholder process. The technical aspects that need to be developed will benefit from consultant support.

Commissioner Saracino spoke with regard to the schedule of the stakeholder process and asked if a facilitator will be used in order to keep the timeline at its most efficient. Mr. Goyal replied that staff has met with CCP regarding the issue. Mr. Saracino said that one piece of feedback from DWR's Agricultural Water Measurement Regulation stakeholder process was that there were no clearly articulated objectives. Another was that the technical information, data, facts and figures was not completed in advance. Mr. Goyal stated that once CCP is on contract, they will develop charters for the committee and subcommittees. Consultants and staff will provide all the pertinent materials to the committee members in advance of the meetings. Ms. Delfino expressed concern that the subcommittees outlined may not capture all of the outstanding issues. She asked for more detailed information on the stakeholder process so the Commission can provide feedback. Mr. Goyal said the economic consultants would assist in the development of common assumptions and values for the public benefits.

Commissioner Orth agreed that clarity is necessary and stated that it would be helpful for the Commission to see the stakeholder group charter ahead of time. He also asked how stakeholders will be recruited and what the process for outreach will be. Mr. Goyal welcomed Commission feedback on the group charter. He also said the details of stakeholder recruitment are still being worked out, but the idea was the formation of a Commission-approved advisory committee, consisting of about 30 people such as staff from the water agencies, DFW, State Board, and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). The scoping survey results will also help form a better idea of who the project proponents will be, and staff from those agencies may participate in the committees. Staff plans to develop a list of stakeholders for Commission feedback. The developed stakeholder plan will be on the agenda for the February Commission meeting.

Commissioner Ball asked about the financial impact of these activities. Mr. Goyal said that, some staff and consulting support will be needed, but the project team is aware of the need to be conservative regarding the hiring of new staff as the process is implemented.

Gail Chong, DWR's Deputy Assistant for Bond Accountability, discussed bond accountability requirements. As of January 2015, DWR is monitoring over \$16 billion from ten bonds, including Proposition 1. DWR will oversee all the financial elements of Proposition 1. She discussed the process of fund appropriation, clarifying the concept of continuous appropriation. Funds are appropriated without regard to fiscal year, and can be used year to year without further legislative action. The only constraint is that bond sales only occur twice per year. DWR must provide DOF with cash flow projections on which to base bond sales and revenues. DWR has a database to track bond expenditures. DWR acts a liaison between the Treasurer's Office, the State Controller's Office, DOF, the Legislature, and the California Natural Resources Agency in the management of bond funds. Continuous appropriation gives the Commission flexibility in its budget.

Tracie Billington, Chief of DWR's Financial Assistance Branch (FAB), discussed the support her branch will be providing to the WSIP program. The FAB currently manages integrated regional management funding and groundwater planning and project grant funding. Her team is providing assistance to the Commission with developing the guidelines and evaluation criteria. She briefly discussed the development of regulations and guidelines and what information should be contained in each document. She stated that development of both documents can take place concurrently, but the approval process is different. Next, Ms. Billington reviewed a flow chart outlining the process and decision points.

Ms. Billington also discussed the development of a scoping survey. Information collected in the survey will help inform the Commission as it makes decisions on issues such as maximum funding for any one project, funding available to different project types, and when funding should be made available. Ms. Billington pointed out a draft survey in the member's packets and asked for approval to move forward with the survey.

Speaker #1: Barry Nelson of Western Water Strategies

Mr. Nelson provided a prepared informational document to the Commission containing recommendations with regards to drought management. He also directed the audience to the published online document called *Wetter or Not: Actions to Ease the Current Drought and Prepare for the Next*.

The informational document outlined eight strategies, three of which he emphasized: 1) cost effectiveness; 2) working to develop a storage strategy, and 3) recommending development of a rigorous method to ensure environmental benefits are credible, significant, and assured. Mr. Nelson closed by urging the Commission's opportunity and responsibility to open a rigorous debate about water storage at the policy level to assure progress while protecting and improving both the California economy and environment.

Speaker #2: Tim Stroshane, policy analyst with the Environmental Water Caucus / Restore the Delta

Mr. Stroshane directed the Commission to a letter that he sent dated January 5. In his letter and his presentation, he expressed concerns that Chapter 8 of the 2014 Water Bond is being interpreted too narrowly when it comes to project eligibility. He also urged the Commission to avoid worsening the appropriation of water rights by prioritizing water storage projects that depend on new water rights.

Mr. Stroshane stated that the San Fernando groundwater basin storage can be expanded using recycled water and storm water. Moving toward more groundwater basin storage can result in increased independence, and investing in them can result in less reliance on imported water from the Delta. Mr. Stroshane requested that the Commission avoid costly storage investments that produce poor yields, and that they maintain openness and transparency through their decision-making process. When asked to provide studies that provided quantities of water that would back up his documentation, Mr. Stroshane agreed to provide these items to the Commission.

Speaker #3: Daniel Heagerty, a California citizen

Mr. Heagerty began by commending the language of the mission statement. He described an effort called Public Trust Water aimed to engage the youthful demographic of the state and get

them more engaged in water issues. It is a citizens' campaign to help develop a public language with which citizens can engage.

Mr. Heagerty then expressed his concern that the public trust was mentioned only once in the Commission's draft documents. He stated that the Commission has a trustee responsibility for the water resources of the state. The public has the legal right to expect the Commission to steward this public trust assets through their development of regulations and bond funding guidelines, and oversight of projects. He asked the Commission to consider four points: 1) the public right to clean and accessible water; 2) the Commission's duty to future generations; 3) an admonition against waste and harm and 4) needs of nature to sustain itself. He stated that groundwater projects must prove substantive and sustainable net gains for the public trust.

Speaker #4: Steve Rothert of American Rivers, Regional Director of California Operations

Mr. Rothert encouraged the Commission to develop a shared information base that is integrated, systematic, and standardized. He had three specific recommendations/questions: 1) Whether funds from Proposition 1 can go to and support environmental mitigation and compliance; 2) In determining net public benefit, certain definitions could be expanded (for example, "without project conditions" is the type of nonspecific language that may require clarification); 3) The hydrologic period is defined as historic hydrology, but Mr. Rothert suggested the Commission consider climate change in its deliberations.

This is the end of the public testimony period.

**10. Briefing by Association of California Water Agencies on Water Storage Policy Task Force**

Tim Quinn, Executive Director of the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) briefed the Commission on the activities of their water storage policy task force. In the past few years, ACWA has convened task forces on issues such as finance, the statewide water action plan, and a Groundwater Sustainability Task Force, which provided recommendations for legislation in 2014.

In upcoming months, ACWA will develop a report on water storage policy. The membership includes experts on water management and storage from around the state. Storage is essential for water management in the State. The report will take a broad approach, explaining differing needs and opportunities across regions. Mr. Quinn's presented seven pieces of advice to the Commission.

1. Create a vision. Don't work project-by-project; have a grand plan first.
2. Encourage integration of new projects into other projects, existing infrastructure, and groundwater basins.
3. Leverage your dollars. Be financially conservative; ask applicants requesting Bond Funds to request less than the highest possible allocation amounts.
4. Provide financial support to CALFED Projects.
5. Provide financial support for other types of projects.
6. Reserve your authority. You will need expert advice, but the Commission needs to make the difficult decisions.
7. Maintain an open and transparent process.

ACWA will not recommend specific projects, but will provide what their members collectively believe is good policy.

Mr. Saracino asked for Mr. Quinn's recommendations regarding integration. He said that ACWA would provide recommendations regarding integration. He suggested that integration becomes more important the closer a project is located to the "hub" of the system. Mr. Saracino stated that the Commission will need to invest in studies on system integration as they develop the program.

Mr. Del Bosque asked for insight on the legislature's vision for this chapter of the bond. Mr. Quinn said that while he cannot speak for the legislature, he believes the vision was for a set of integrated projects, and include surface storage projects that have been difficult to build.

Mr. Curtin discussed the issues of flexibility, integration, reliability, and natural infrastructure. He also said that the idea of ranking projects caused him concern. Mr. Quinn suggested that in lieu of ranking, the Commission compare projects against its vision. Mr. Saracino clarified that some sort of prioritization will still be necessary.

*The Commission meeting adjourned for lunch from 12:00-1:00pm.*

## **11. Workshop: Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act Issues**

The Commission meeting reconvened at 1:00 pm. Maureen King introduced Ted Prim, Deputy Attorney General, who provided the Commission with an overview on the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act ("Bagley-Keene").

When Bagley-Keene was designed, its authors were striving for a consensus-building approach. The idea was that it could facilitate a group of people with different backgrounds to get together, debate, deliberate, and come to a decision over time, while providing a seat at the table for the public. This was done by attending meetings, receiving notice, being able to testify, etc.

### WHAT IS A MEETING:

Bagley-Keene starts with the notion that meetings with state bodies are open. The general rule is when the majority of a body takes action under the body's jurisdiction, the meeting must be open, accessible, and available to the public.

*Serial meetings* are prohibited, defined as: any meeting or series of communications between a majority of members "to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter of the state agency" that has not been made public and transparent per the guidelines set forth in the act.

Also prohibited are "*chain*" meetings. An example is if one member has a private conversation with another, who passes the information to a third. This, and any type of communications between members that are not done with transparency, are in violation of the act.

### WHAT IS NOT A MEETING:

- Commission members talking to the public
- One-on-one meetings amongst Commission members that do not fit the definition for a serial meeting

- Exceptions for events in which a quorum is present but issues under the Commission's purview are not discussed
- One-way legal memoranda

NOTICE REQUIREMENTS:

Ten calendar days' notice are required prior to a meeting. Notice is usually provided via the internet, although written copies must be available on request as well. All notices must include an agenda that is descriptive but brief within reason. The agenda can be on any matter, not just action matters. The brief general description must contain the purpose, the parties, and the dollar amounts that will be discussed. (Action items are tricky; the best practice is to avoid limiting words. For example, do not say "discussion" if there is no discussion. Make use of disclaimers and avoid discussion of topics that were not explicitly mentioned in the published agenda.) These agendas must also be available alternate formats to accommodate for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) needs.

TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS:

Teleconferences must be take place within an ADA-compliant building to ensure that all participants and attending citizens are accommodated. The Attorney General's office is still working on some logistical details such as the procedures involved when a caller is participating from out the state/country.

RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC:

- The public has the right to anonymity if they so desire, and do not have to provide identification in order to be heard. (This rule applies only to the meeting itself, and not to the building in which the meeting is held. For example, the security desk might need a name, but they are not obligated to share that name with the Commission).
- The public can participate in a respectful and orderly fashion.
- The public can record the hearings as long as the act of recording is not disruptive to the meeting itself.
- The public can testify before or during consideration of an item.
- The public, like the Commissioners, are bound by time limits, but will still be afforded a reasonable amount of time.

CLOSED SESSIONS:

- In the rare circumstances, there are exceptions for which a board, agency, or Commission can hold a closed session. These include:
  - Personnel issues such as employment evaluation, discipline, or dismissal. The purpose of the exemption is to protect the privacy of the employee during times of review. 24-hour notice to the employee is required, during which time that employee has the option to request the hearing be done in an open session. Closed session deliberations consisting of essential-only personnel are still an option after an open-session hearing.
  - Pending litigation defined as an existing case in which one is a party, considering becoming a party, or exposed to litigation based on existing facts.

Other guidelines for Closed Sessions:

- A public announcement is still required, even if the meeting is closed.

- Once in closed session, all participants must remain on-topic and only speak to the published agenda items.
- Minutes are required but need not be disclosed to the public unless mandated by a court.
- There are criminal and injunctive penalties if these rules are violated.

After Mr. Prim concluded his presentation, Ms. King inquired as to the logistics involved regarding site visits, such as construction locations that may not be deemed safe, or that are not open to the public. Mr. Prim stated that specifics such as that in the example are still being worked on and will be addressed when a resolution is made by the authoring body.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.