

**MINUTES OF MEETING
SUNSHINE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT**

A Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Water Control District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Wednesday, May 12, 2010 at 6:30 p.m.**, in the **Commission Chambers, Coral Springs City Hall, 9551 West Sample Road, Coral Springs, Florida 33065.**

Present at the meeting were:

David Hulett	President
Emily Heafy	Vice President
Joe Morera	Secretary

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Doug Paton	Client Services Manager
Matt Kozak	Wrathell, Hunt & Associates
Terry Lewis	District Counsel
Cory Selchan	Field Superintendent
Rhon Ernest-Jones	District Engineer
Tom Donahue	District Engineer
John McKune	McKune & Associates
Paul E. Brewer	Paul E. Brewer & Associates, Inc.
Brian DeGirolmo	DeGirolmo & Associates
Dennis Mele	Ruden McClosky
Rick Kolb	The Weitz Company
Jonathan Sharon	The Weitz Company
John Mills	Resident
Mr. Vignola	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Hulett called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Mr. Wrathell called the roll, noting, for the record, that Supervisors Hulett, Heafy and Morera were present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Correspondence from Division of
Emergency Management Regarding Sub-
application Number PDMC-PJ-04-FL-
2010-033**

Mr. Donahue spoke of two (2) grant applications submitted to FEMA in a national competitive grant program and advised both were denied. He stated other funding mechanisms, through different organizations, will be researched. Mr. Ernest-Jones expressed his disappointment in this decision. Mr. Hulett asked if this was a state or federally sponsored program. Mr. Donahue advised it is a federal program through FEMA and the Florida Division of Emergency Management is the state administrator.

Mr. Morera asked if all of the documentation that FEMA requested, with regard to the Pump Station 1 & 2 replacement request, was submitted. Mr. Donahue advised FEMA requested additional documentation and calculations in November and they were only given a few days to respond, noting they provided what they could in the timeframe allotted. Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated FEMA is viewing this as a restoration project, rather than an enhancement project.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Copy of Letter to Michael Levinson, City of Coral Springs (for informational purposes)

Mr. Wrathell stated, at the Board’s direction, the letter to Mr. Levinson was prepared and sent about a week-and-a-half ago. He indicated he received an email from Mr. Michaud, inviting them to set up a meeting. He expressed his desire to have Mr. Ernest-Jones, Mr. Donahue, Mr. Selchan, Mr. McKune and Mr. Lewis attend, noting he would try to set up the meeting in the next few weeks and report back to the Board with the results. Mr. Ernest-Jones commended Mr. Wrathell on the quality of the letter. Mr. Hulett expressed his interest in participating, as well.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration/Discussion of Permits/Applications/Letters of No Objection

- **2501 NW 114th Avenue, Luis D. Leon, Installation of Fence in Drainage Easement**
- **4121 Coral Hills Drive, Borsellino, Installation of Fence in Drainage Easement**

Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated he and Mr. Donahue decided to take an aggressive position, on the part of the District, with regard to these permit applications, noting they are looking to the Board for policy discussion.

Mr. Donahue first referred to the property located on Coral Hills Drive and indicated the property line is in the middle of the canal. He explained that, from the property line and in, there

is a 45-foot drainage easement and the property owner is proposing to place a fence along the top of the slope. Mr. Donahue showed GIS photos of the area and expressed the concern that, although this is not District property, it is an easement for the District to maintain; putting up a fence would restrict future access and maintenance by the District's crew. He stated in their recommendation, they require that a gate be placed along the fence to allow access and, as a condition of the permit, the homeowner will clean out all of the vegetation along the bank, down to the water's edge; noting if the homeowner chooses not to do so, he should place the fence along the easement line, to allow full access to the bank.

With regard to the property on 114th Avenue, Mr. Donahue indicated the homeowner is proposing to replace the existing four (4)-foot high chain link fence with a six (6)-foot aluminum fence in a 15-foot wide drainage easement along the east side of the property. He stated a permit condition is that the homeowner removes all vegetation within the drainage easement and right-of-way, to the water's edge. Should they choose not to do so, they should put the fence 15 feet into the property, at the end of the easement.

Mr. Ernest-Jones stated, in both cases, the desired fence line is the top of the canal bank, which may exacerbate the difficulty of accessing the canal. Mr. Lewis explained the legalities of an easement and stated, while it is the homeowner's property, his property is subject to the District's right to maintain and operate the water control system. Ms. Heafy indicated she could not, in good conscience, vote for a fence when they are trying to keep the easements free to clear the banks and noted the Board is setting a precedent with this decision. Further discussion ensued and Mr. Ernest-Jones expressed his concern over the District's ability to maintain the canal with land-based equipment.

Mr. Selchan indicated the installation of the fence would not preclude any maintenance, as the permit will stipulate that if the District requires access, the fence will be removed, at the homeowner's expense. He stressed that he was not reversing his stance; however, he articulated that it would benefit the District to work with the homeowners and have them remove the vegetation, advising it is a win-win situation for the District. Mr. Hulett advised Mr. Lewis that, if this permit is approved, he would like the permit to stipulate that the gate be a specific size, as well as indicate that this condition be passed on to the next property owner. Mr. Lewis suggested that if they wish to make the permit run with the land, it should be issued in a recordable form.

Mr. Hulett was in favor of denying the application, as presented. Mr. Ernest-Jones expressed that the policy being set will affect the future. Mr. Wrathell clarified that denial of this application by the Board does not preclude the homeowner from submitting a revised application.

On MOTION by Ms. Heafy and seconded by Mr. Morera, with all in favor, the Permit Application for the Installation of a Fence in the Drainage Easement at 4121 Coral Hills Drive, was denied.

With regard to the property located at 2501 NW 114th Avenue, Mr. Donahue reiterated there is an existing fence on the property line, a 15-foot drainage easement inside the property and a District right-of-way outside of the fence.

On MOTION by Mr. Morera and seconded by Ms. Heafy, with all in favor, the Permit Application for the Installation of a Fence in the Drainage Easement at 2501 NW 114th Avenue, was denied.

- **EFFCU – Castlewood Branch Permit Modification 2007-11**

Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated this property is at the tail end of a drainage system. He stated Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc., answered all of his questions, noting the solution they are proposing will improve their flooding situation. He suggested approving this permit modification.

On MOTION by Ms. Heafy and seconded by Mr. Morera, with all in favor, the EFFCU – Castlewood Branch Permit Modification 2007-11, was approved.

- **PERMIT/APPLICATION LOG**

Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated the Permit Log will be amended accordingly.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Discussion: Broken Woods/Spring Lake
Access & Culvert Issues**

Mr. Ernest-Jones stated this item is a request for a “no objection” ruling for access from University Drive. He indicated the applicants proposed to culvert a piece of canal, within the District’s culvert, with the possibility of there being a driveway over the culverted piece of canal, into the property behind. Currently, the access into Broken Woods is compromised and he advised he is looking at it from a functionality standpoint.

Mr. Ernest-Jones stated approval is recommended, with several conditions. The perpetual maintenance obligation of the culvert itself would be from the applicant; the applicants provide additional calculations, noting that, due to the complexity of the application, he feels it would be appropriate to have some cost recovery on their end, for its review; and that the flow would not be compromised. He also mentioned the issue of the retention area represented by the piece that will be culverted over. Mr. Hulett pointed out that the applicants are asking for access from the east side of the property, as well. Mr. Ernest-Jones stated the same conditions and recommendations will apply to that also; stressing, this is an accompanying document to their Land Use Plan Application and not a permit application.

Mr. Wrathell expressed that Mr. Donahue and Mr. Ernest-Jones did an excellent job of addressing this topic in their letter. He stated the applicants were looking for an ingress/egress point and wanted to discuss this with some private property owners; with that would come a potential purchase of that ingress/egress point or purchase of an easement. He explained if the District is going to fill in a canal and culvert it, the District is creating a drive for them, which has some degree of value; the District needs to be careful, as a governmental entity, about giving away property, without some level of compensation. He indicated, from a drainage perspective, if they meet all of the engineering criteria and the drainage is not affected in a negative way but may potentially enhance it, the issue would be its value as an ingress/egress point. Mr. Ernest-Jones stated, if granted, this would be a permissive right, rather than a transfer of title, noting his assumption that the District would continue to hold title to the property.

Mr. Lewis explained the difficulty of assigning a value to an easement. His suggestion was that District Staff be able to recapture all of their costs in time and charges.

Mr. Hulett asked the applicant to address this petition, advising that it was denied by the project zoning board and is being restructured. Mr. Dennis Mele introduced himself and

indicated he was there on behalf of the applicants. He advised the plans are significantly different than what was originally presented. He explained he previously came before the Board because the city asked them to obtain a letter from the District consenting to their filing the application. He indicated the city is requesting that they obtain a new letter for the new application, which says the same as the one completed in January.

Mr. Mele explained that the old plan had 817 units, plus six (6) acres of commercial property, adjacent to Sample Road. He stated there are now 424 units, noting more than 50% of the units are single-family and the rental apartments were completely eliminated.

Mr. Mele indicated the city requested, if they were proposing to use the two (2) crossing points as access, the applicants should come to the District for a conceptual review and then come back for the formal permit. He expressed there is no interest in obtaining the real estate where the two (2) crossing points are; however, they would, if that was the District's preference.

Mr. Mele indicated they are prepared to make significant improvements; they would maintain it, pay for the maintenance and post the security for the work done to the right-of-way. In addition, whatever agreement they reach would be recorded in the public records. He advised, after the property is developed, there will be a master homeowners association, that will provide some of the common area maintenance. He stated water taken out of the canals will be replaced and all of the water they put in will meet the District's current standards for slopes, depths, widths and pretreatment. He noted the commercial property will be limited to two (2) stories.

Mr. Mele stated the applicants are requesting a letter similar to the one written in January and that the Engineer be allowed to send the letter that was included in their Agenda packages. He advised that they will be filing the Land Use Plan Amendment next month, so they are trying to get everything necessary for the application put in place.

Mr. Hulett expressed no issues with providing a Letter of No Objection, as they were neither approving nor opposing the application, but indicating their understanding that the property can be rezoned. He asked what the District was committing to. Mr. Lewis referred to the April 26th letter, advising it states that, while in concept, the project is potentially permissible and is subject to final plan review and processing of a permit application; the project will rise and fall on its merits. Mr. Hulett confirmed that all they are doing is re-dating the letter that was previously sent to the city. Mr. Ernest-Jones stated in their letter, they tried to use the same

caveat language and clarified there are two (2) letters, the first being the updated Letter of No Objection and the other letter specifically addressing the potential permissible nature of culverts.

On MOTION by Ms. Heafy and seconded by Mr. Morera, with all in favor, re-issuing the Letter of No Objection dated May 4, 2010, as well as the April 26, 2010 letter from Rhon Ernest-Jones/IBI to DeGirolmo & Associates, was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Approval of Minutes of April 14, 2010
Regular Meeting**

Mr. Hulett presented the April 14, 2010 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, corrections or deletions.

The following change was made:

Line 335: delete “when” and “not”

On MOTION by Ms. Heafy and seconded by Mr. Morera, with all in favor, the April 14, 2010 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Citizens Requests

Mr. Hulett asked if there were any Citizens Requests.

Mr. John Mills, a resident, indicated he spoke to Mr. Selchan earlier in the week regarding the canal along 97th Lane and stated it was very overgrown. Mr. Selchan advised him it was sprayed the previous day. Mr. Hulett stated the clearing of the easement property is the homeowner’s responsibility, from the property line to the edge of the water. He advised part of the problem is that many of the homeowners do not realize that they are responsible for maintenance of the canal bank. Mr. Selchan explained that Mr. Mills did not have any overgrowth problems on the canal bank. The amount of rainfall they had this spring created a problem with algae. He stated this canal has very shallow areas and, in those areas, the problem is worse. He noted the difficulty with algae is that the chemicals used to maintain it need to be applied a little at a time and it is a long process to remove it.

Mr. Hulett stated what the District is doing is a major reclamation of the entire system. He spoke of a major culvert cleaning process, culvert repair and reclamation and further dredging of the canals, so that they meet the hydrologic needs for proper flow of water to the pump stations. He noted several “hot spots” were identified where further work will be done to bring the canals to the proper depth. He stated, once this project is complete, they feel confident that the system will prevent flooding in the area.

Mr. Mills explained how the canal behind his home became disfigured and shallow. Mr. Selchan indicated the canal is not scheduled to be dredged, as it is not a main drain. He stated it is an aesthetic issue and creates algae problems. Mr. Hulett advised, prior to the June meeting, he and Mr. Selchan would inspect the area. Mr. Vignola, a resident, confirmed that the canal has very high and very low points.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors’ Requests

Mr. Morera congratulated Mr. Hulett on being a finalist and a very strong candidate for the city commission seat. He then expressed appreciation to District Counsel for giving the District a gracious discount. Lastly, he noted that many of the backup pages in the Agenda package are now double-sided and indicated this is a positive step in the green initiative.

Mr. Hulett asked Mr. McKune if he contacted the NRCS. Mr. McKune reported he met with representatives in the local office in West Palm Beach and was advised it was too much of a restoration maintenance function. He indicated he will go to Gainesville in a month and will meet with a state NRCS representative to see if there is another portion of the NRCS program they can participate in.

Mr. Hulett reminded Mr. Wrathell that the District will be bringing its human resource functions in-house. Mr. Wrathell indicated will be discussed at the June meeting, when the proposed budget is presented.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

a. Attorney

With regard to drainage easements in the Coral Springs Research and Development Park, Mr. Lewis indicated he read the City of Coral Springs’ Attorney’s opinion on the issue of who

has maintenance responsibility for these particular easements and, after reviewing the original plats, which were originally filed in '67 and '68, his conclusion is that there is some dual responsibility for keeping those rights-of-way clean. He stated the District has a fundamental obligation to maintain its water control system. If it is critical to the system to maintain the upland rights-of-way, or clear them of obstructions; that is a primary obligation of the District. He further noted that the city, through its adoption of its comprehensive plan, its land development regulations, enforcement code, etc., has an obligation as well. He advised the plats indicate that the dedication for the maintenance of the facilities goes clearly to the District; however, the second sentence says the rights-of-way are dedicated to the general public for their use, as well. Mr. Ernest-Jones stated there is a separate dedication specifically to the Sunshine Water Control District, then the Sunshine Drainage District, of the canals, but the easements were dedicated to the public. Mr. Lewis stated the strategy of engaging the city to see if this can become a dual responsibility makes sense because they have some land use regulatory obligations of their own over these properties but they do not stem from the plat dedication.

Mr. Lewis stated the landowners are obligated to maintain and keep the property clear within an easement that is upland of the waterway itself. Mr. Ernest-Jones clarified the area they are discussing is an easement within a swale. He stated the plat language does not dedicate the swale to Sunshine Water Control District, noting it is dedicated to the public. He explained that it is used as a means of draining a city street and the public street would not reach their canal without the swale, which is why they are getting a lot of flooding. He concluded, because the plat does not specifically indicate that it was dedicated to the District, there is at least a 50/50 responsibility. Mr. Lewis stated, at some point, if the city and the property owners were not going to maintain the easements, the District should have been collecting assessments for the additional maintenance.

Mr. Hulett asked if there have been any further discussions with the property owners over the last few months about agreeing to clean up the swales, since they are the ones with the problem. Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated the city sent a letter notifying each property owner of their obligation to keep the swale clear. He advised that one (1) property owner, Mr. Merrick, volunteered to take the lead in getting a contractor to clean it out and collect assessments from the adjacent properties. Mr. Hulett requested that Mr. Ernest-Jones follow up with Mr. Merrick and report back, at the June meeting, regarding where he is in the process.

Mr. Lewis reported a small change to Chapter 298. He stated 298.66 is an enforcement section that makes it a criminal penalty to obstruct or damage a waterway and advised that the section was strengthened to make it clear that if a special district owns, operates or maintains a facility, the enforcement provisions apply to all of those facilities.

Mr. Lewis also spoke of a change affecting all local governments with regard to tort liability. He advised the Sovereign Immunity statute waived tort liability for amounts up to \$100,000 in damages for a single event and \$200,000 if multiple damages occurred out of the same event. He stated the waiver was doubled and the governor signed that bill into law.

Mr. Lewis advised he would not be present at the next meeting, as he will be attending the Florida Association of Special Districts Annual Conference in St. Petersburg. He invited everyone to attend this meeting. Mr. Hulett indicated Mr. Ernest-Jones had been trying to persuade the Board to have some affiliation with the association and they are considering at least an associate membership. He asked Mr. Wrathell to address membership details at the June meeting.

Mr. Ernest-Jones inquired about changing the June meeting date so that he could attend the FASD meeting. Mr. Hulett suggested moving the meeting to June 16th. Mr. Wrathell asked Mr. Lewis if there was a requirement, under Chapter 298, to present a proposed budget prior to June 15th. Mr. Lewis advised there was no such requirement under Chapter 298.

On MOTION by Ms. Heafy and seconded by Mr. Morera, with all in favor, rescheduling the June meeting from June 9th to June 16th, pending availability of the meeting location, was approved.

b. Engineer

i. Update: Pump Station 1 & 2 Replacement

*****This item, previously item b.iii., was presented out of order.*****

Mr. Ernest-Jones introduced Mr. Rick Kolb and Mr. Jonathan Sharon, from Weitz Construction. He advised they are now working off 75% design plans, which were submitted to Weitz approximately three (3) weeks ago. He stated Weitz responded with updated cost estimates and some good pricing information. He indicated Weitz provided some possible

engineering opportunities, which they reviewed, noting some were accepted and others were rejected.

For Pump Station 1, Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated the updated cost estimate is close to \$3 million and for Pump Station 2, the estimate is approximately \$3.2 million, bringing the total to \$6 million, versus their original estimate of \$5 million. He advised they elected not to take advantage of some of the offered savings because of functional disadvantages.

Mr. Kolb reviewed the four (4) items that put them over budget.

Mr. Ernest-Jones stated, at one time, they were recommending partial demolition for the existing stations; however, they are now recommending full demolition within the sheet pile confines. He discussed additional cost estimates and noted all of the items are open for review. Discussion ensued regarding the formation of a subcommittee to assist in negotiations. Mr. Hulett expressed his confidence in the team of professionals to handle the negotiations and bring back the numbers. Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated any negotiations will be on the basis of recommendation, the Board's evaluation of their recommendations and will be done in an open forum. He indicated the next step is to orient towards a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP), which will be appropriate as the plans are fully completed.

ii. Monthly Engineer's Report – 04/06/10 to 05/03/10

******This item, previously item b.i., was presented out of order.******

Mr. Ernest-Jones reported, with regard to the East-West Basin Interconnect, the engineering work has commenced. He stated the interlocal agreement for the Integrated Water Resource Plan Grant for Water Resource Feasibility and Design Projects will be heard either May 25th or June 8th at the Broward County Commission Meeting. Upon execution, the city will execute a separate interlocal agreement for cost sharing between the city and the Sunshine Water Control District.

Mr. Ernest-Jones recalled that the Board approved employing FishTec, Inc., for the culvert cleaning project. He reported the final contract was fully executed and the work is scheduled to be completed in July and August, 2010. Mr. Morera advised he was glad to see that the E-Verify language was added to the contract and that it will be added to all future SWCD bid documents and construction contracts, as he requested. He inquired about the consequences to a contractor who signs an agreement using E-Verify but does not adhere to it. Mr. Lewis advised

it would be a breach of the contract and they could give the contractor notice and remove him from the job. Mr. Ernest-Jones indicated they will request evidence of compliance.

Mr. Ernest-Jones suggested putting the Culvert Replacement/Repair and Canal Restoration Phase 2 projects out to bid. He indicated they can work into the bid package the requirement that the contractor provide prices for a certain period of time, because it will take awhile to bid it. That way, they can feel confident of the numbers on Pump Stations 1 & 2. He advised they are currently basing their estimate on a per-linear-foot basis. Mr. Hulett agreed, noting they will then be in a position to make a good decision on whether or not to proceed with the bond issue.

Mr. Wrathell expressed concern that, if they go out to bid, they may not have enough time to go through the public hearing process and the other steps required prior to issuing bonds. He feels the bond buyers will look for validation in Circuit Court. He advised that once Mr. Ernest-Jones has the final numbers, it will take six (6) to nine (9) months to go through the entire process, stressing they want to have an additional three (3) months on top of what they will need if everything goes smoothly.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if it would be possible to go forward with the engineer's estimate now and then use the bid as a refinement and confirmation. Mr. Wrathell advised him if he is confident that, when the bids come back, they are at, or below, the number estimated in the updated drainage plan and the number they have is at least 10% higher than they think it will be, it should be okay. He stressed that regardless of the policy regarding clearing the rights-of-way, the issue is to get the clearing done when they have a mobilized contractor, regardless of whether they have to send a bill to the individual property owner or decide to consider it a cost of business. He stated that must be incorporated because when they begin the hearing process, they cannot go above the number they have. Mr. Hulett requested revised assessment numbers.

Further discussion ensued regarding the bond validation and the bidding process, noting the District only bonds 90% of whatever the raw number is for the estimated cost of the project. Mr. Wrathell stated having a contingency, on top of what Mr. Ernest-Jones thinks is a safe number, is a reasonable approach. Ms. Heafy indicated she is now in favor of having the District pay for clearing the canal banks. Mr. Morera was against this. Mr. Wrathell stressed that they must decide soon whether they should budget for clearing the canal banks because the District will have to pay the contractor to clear them. He stated that initial assessment will be billed to all

of the property owners. Mr. Hulett stated the bottom line is they will have a better idea of the direction they should go once they have had a few meetings with the city on this topic.

Ms. Heafy asked if there was a change in the water quality. Mr. Lewis stated the EPA extended the time period they can comment on the criteria for nutrients. He advised he feels they will get a different rule than what they originally proposed. He stated he will have an update on numeric nutrient standards at the FASD conference.

iii. Coral Springs Corporate Park

*****This item was formerly item b.ii.*****

This item was discussed previously.

c. Field Supervisor

Mr. Selchan reported that a large rain event occurred on April 26th, where the east basin station ran for nine (9) hours and the west basin station ran close to 24 hours. He advised the pumping event ran smoothly, with no issues. He indicated the only other issue was with algae. He stated the problem exists throughout the city and he has had quite a few complaints. He explained it takes awhile to treat and it comes from the nutrients in the water that wash in from everyone's yard.

d. Manager

i. Unaudited Financial Statements as of March 31, 2010

Mr. Wrathell presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of March 31, 2010. He referred to the unreconciled cash balance sheet, as of May 11th, which he distributed to the Board earlier. He stated, unless otherwise directed, the CDARS account that is maturing the following day will be deposited in a NOW account with Community Bank of Broward. He suggested moving the three (3) money market accounts into the NOW account as well, leaving enough money in the money markets to keep them open. Mr. Hulett requested moving all of the money into the NOW account and closing the money market accounts.

Mr. Wrathell explained the FDIC program for Mr. Lewis.

On MOTION by Mr. Morera and seconded by Ms. Heafy, with all in favor, moving all of the District's funds from the maturing CDARS account and the Evergreen, Federated and Fidelity accounts into a NOW Account with Community Bank of Broward, was approved.

Mr. Wrathell referred back to the Unaudited Financial Statements. With regard to revenues, he pointed out, through March, they are at 85%, with \$1.82 million collected in relation to \$2.151 million budgeted. He stated many residents probably paid in March and that revenue should be received in April or May. In addition, revenue collections will continue to come in through June and July from tax certificate sales. He also noted the updated amortization schedule on Page 4, which represents the principal reduction.

On MOTION by Ms. Heafy and seconded by Mr. Morera, with all in favor, the Unaudited Financial Statements as of March 31, 2010, were approved.

ii. March 2010 Check Register

Mr. Wrathell presented the March 2010 check register.

iii. March 2010 Invoices

Mr. Wrathell presented the March 2010 invoices.

iv. NEXT MEETING DATE: June 9, 2010 at 6:30 P.M.

Mr. Wrathell indicated this item was discussed earlier and the meeting date was changed to June 16, 2010 at 6:30 p.m., pending room availability.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



President/Vice President