A. Call to Order

Chairman Bauman called the meeting to order at 4:11 pm

B. Pledge of Allegiance

All stood and recited the Pledge.

C. WORKSHOP – ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEADEURES

Please see below.

D. Additions, Deletions or Corrections to the Regular Meeting Agenda
It was the consensus of the Board to move the workshop to the end of the meeting to accommodate the members of the Key Largo Federation of Homeowners who wish to attend their meeting that was scheduled to begin at 7:00 P.M. Commissioner Brooks noted that he was concerned that several items on the agenda that were of interest to the public who had not arrived at the meeting because a workshop was advertised to be held at 4:00 P.M. Chairman Bauman noted the concern and suggested that agenda items not pertaining to the secondary treatment process be considered first.

Chairman Bauman requested that an additional public comment period be added to the agenda prior to the workshop. There were no objections to the change.

Commissioner Brooks stated that after the concerns stated by Commissioner Tobin at the last meeting that there are issues in related to the contract that should be considered prior to the action items. He believes an executive session is necessary. Mr. Dillon stated that with no complaint pending the Board is prohibited from calling an executive session. He noted that an executive session can only be called to discuss a pending claim and it would require a special notice to be advertised and a court reporter present to provide an official transcript.

E. Public Comment

Chairman Bauman asked for public comment. Mr. Dick Morton of Riviera Village addressed the Board. Mr. Morton inquired if the projects were a negotiated contract or if they had been part of a competitive bid. Mr. Sheets stated that the Haskell contract was an awarded as a result of a response to a request for proposals. The process of after the award was to finalize the terms of the contract. Mr. Morton believes that all of these disputes should have been taken up before this time. Mr. Sheets stated that the issue being discussed at present was the secondary treatment process. Mr. Morton asked if the secondary treatment process decision was the Board’s responsibility. Mr. Sheets stated that it is a provision of the contract to permit the Board to issue a purchase order for equipment if they desire and to participate in the treatment process selection. Mr. Morton stated that he is concerned with the controversy over this issue and that the Board continues to question the recommendations.

Mr. Dick Lancaster, President of the Hammer Point Board of Director’s addressed the Board. Mr. Lancaster commended the Board for their progress in the tight time frame they have been up against. Mr. Lancaster stated concern with the Board’s continuing debates over the treatment system issues. Mr. Lancaster believes that the USBF treatment system has a greater potential for problems and because the contractor (Haskell), the engineering company (Brown and Caldwell), board engineer (WEC), the manager and the Monroe County coordinator of wastewater opposes it and with the lack of a guarantee that the process will work he urged the Board to rethink and proceed carefully.

The clerk was requested to reflect for the record that Mr. Nos Espat arrived at 5:10 P.M.

F. Legal Counsel’s Report

1. Response to Commissioner Tobin’s concerns raised at the 1/7/04 meeting

Mr. Dillon reviewed his memorandum in detail. The memorandum is made part of this record as Attachment A.

Mr. Kinsley of the Haskell company commented that the TSC Jacobs Company has worked with Haskell prior and he is confident that they will sign the purchase order and payment terms and would provide payment and performance bonds.
Commissioner Brooks asked about KLWTD purchasing the equipment. Mr. Dillon states that per the contract they could purchase it.

Discussion ensued on the issue of ‘good faith’ in honoring the contract. Mr. Dillon cautioned that the KLWTD must act reasonably and Haskell needs to demonstrate that they are acting reasonably and their request of requesting further information from Fluidyne was done to demonstrate this. Direct purchases were also discussed.

Commissioner Brooks believes that the contract terms are negating the Board’s desires. Commissioner Brooks questioned if Board members could attend the design phase meetings. Discussion ensued on the possible sunshine law implications of members attending the design meetings. Commissioner Wilkinson stated that from past practice the Board had given comments during design discussions, which the engineers have addressed but not always to the Board member’s liking.

Mr. Sheets is confident that the contract has a provision that beyond the monthly status report there is a meeting to be held monthly and these could be held in conjunction with a board meeting, however this may preclude the staff from reviewing information prior to the Board.

Chairman Bauman suggested that staff recommend a procedure to the Board. Mr. Castle stated that the contract requires Haskell to provide submittal protocol and once the 30% design is received a recommendation to approve them would be provided. Mr. Kinsley of Haskell stated that he welcomes the participation of the Board. Commissioner Wilkinson asked what the deadline for 30% design approval was. Mr. Kinsley stated that presently there is a two-week time frame in the present schedule.

Commissioner Bauman asked WEC to have a recommended submittal protocol available for the February 4, 2004 meeting.

2. Warranty Form to Nos Espat
   a. Randazza suggested form
   b. Dillon suggested form
3. Fluidyne Warranty

Mr. Dillon presented a revision to items F2a and F2b he addressed items F2 and F3 in his memorandum all of which are made part of the record as Attachment B. The attached warranties were the final versions that were signed by the vendors. Discussion ensued concerning the various warranties.

Discussion ensued on the characteristics of the sewage. Assumptions were made during the RFP process per Dillon and he stated that if they are not realistic they should not be adhered to.

Commissioner Brooks questioned influent characteristics and its possible negation of the warranties. Mr. Dillon had suggested different verbiage to protect the district. Further discussion ensued.

Chairman Bauman objected to the attempts to re-negotiate the warranties during the meeting. He believes that with three signed warranties there should be a decision made immediately. Commissioner Brooks stated that he had a problem with that. Mr. Dillon suggested making a motion on approving the signed documents as presented. Commissioner Brooks stated that he hasn’t had time to review what was sent on the 1-12-04.

Commissioner Tobin asked if the Fluidyne warranty was substantially the same as what had been provided in the agenda book. Mr. Dillon stated all except the two items that he detailed.
Commissioner Brooks stated there is confusion by placing three warranties together. Mr. Dillon stated that Randazza and Purestream had split out the responsibilities listed in the original warranty. Commissioner Tobin stated that he would prefer one warranty with the manufacture and vendor with only one document.

Discussion ensued on the bonding requirements. Mr. Dillon stated that bonds during the initial year are not as important because Haskell holds a bond. He noted that two bonds are not necessary, but that if Haskell is not willing to take responsibility on a process they could not support, there would be no bonding to secure the performance of the person providing the secondary treatment system. Discussion ensued concerning the function of a performance bond and payment bond and the fact that legal counsel reiterated that has never heard of a "process bond". It was noted that the performance bond requirement was struck from the Purestream/Randazza warranty.

5. Haskell Company Purchase Order

Mr. Kinsley answered questions concerning the purchase order and added that vendors he has worked with do provide support and if it is not stated in the warranty it is either stated in the contract or the purchase order.

6. Haskell Design Calculations Request

7. Informational copy of the December 29, 2003 Haskell Company Correspondence

Items F6 and F7 were discussed. Mr. Dillon reviewed the issue of delay. Mr. Dillon had requested Haskell to get information to prove or disprove that USBF would not work. The calculation requested had not provided by Randazza. Commissioner Brooks stated the design calculation had been available since February. Mr. Dillon countered that a statement made in a Randazza’s letter says that the district staff could not verify the cost increase because they don’t have the information. Please see Item G-2 below for further discussion.

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

G. Action Items

1. Pending Payments List

Mr. Sheets stated that the payment list was modified to show what funds the payments come out of as directed by the Board. The GSG time sheets and hourly activity sheets were supplied for informational purposes as per the Board’s request.

Mr. David Miles reported the funds on hand at present were $62,585.66 and that a deposit from FKAA of FEMA Phase 1 money in the amount of $232,108.21. The MSTU money has not been disbursed as previously reported. The amount is approximately $140,000.00. It was noted that the County’s policy is to not pay by wire transfer. Commissioner Wilkinson requested the current cash balance. Mr. Miles stated that it was $294,693.87 the bills payable today will be deducted from the stated balance.
Chairman Bauman asked if there should be a separate capital and administrative funds. Mr. Miles stated that it would be more difficult and is not necessary because it creates an administrative burden to track the accounts.

Commissioner Tobin stated the routine for approval of the bills should be to let the Board review the legal voices, that GSG invoices should include accounting of the time spent on KLWTD activities and that he would not approve the Haskell pay applications until he understands the process. Mr. Sheets stated that he had provided pages of breakdown at item H2. Mr. Tobin stated that the Mull & Associates invoice could be paid if Mr. Miles could explain it. Mr. Miles stated that it was for the hours spent for the annual audit less 10 percent retainage.

Commissioner Brooks question the Board’s payroll checks being process prior to the payments pending list being approved. Mr. Miles stated that by resolution of the Board he has the authority to disburse up to $2,500.00 and that the payroll is being paid under that authority. Also the payroll and federal taxes have been paid.

Commissioner Brooks stated that legal fees for two months in the amount of approximately $16,000 concerns him and that if the cost of on issue is over $5,000 there should be an accounting. Mr. Dillon stated that the contract states that his invoice is to be submitted in detail and forwarded to the manager. Mr. Sheets stated that his had been done in the past, however at the transition of Mr. Dillon to legal counsel it was assumed that it was no longer necessary this can be changed. Mr. Sheets asked the Board if it were requesting copies of all the invoices listed on the pending payments list. Discussion ensued. Mr. Sheets requested direction to provide backup on all pending payments. Commissioner Brooks and Commissioner Tobin would like to see a dollar threshold. Discussion ensued. Commissioner Beaty would like Commissioner Tobin to review all legal bills. Chairman Bauman asked the other service providers if they had difficulty providing detailed invoices. It was noted that consideration must be given to the prompt pay act because when the Board has money the prompt pay act comes into play so a specific procedure should be enacted.

MOTION TO APPROVE ALL BUT ITEMS NO. 3, 4, 5, 6, (DILLON’S, GSG’S AND HASKELL’S) AND TO PAY THE BALANCE OF THE PAYMENT PENDING LIST WAS MADE BY COMMISSION TOBIN. Discussion ensued. Commissioner Tobin stated that Haskell might be approved at the end of the meeting after the pay application process was reviewed. Commissioner Beaty seconded the motion. Chairman Bauman requested a roll call vote as follows:

  Commissioner Beaty    Yes
  Commissioner Brooks   Yes
  Commissioner Tobin    Yes
  Commissioner Wilkinson Yes
  Chairman Bauman       Yes

All were in favor and the motion was unanimously approved.

Commissioner Tobin requested an item be added to the agenda. The item was to reconvene the meeting after the workshop to approve payment of the Haskell pay application if it were in order. The Board gave its consensus.

2. Resolution of Haskell Contract Concerns
   RE: Secondary Treatment Selection
   a. Resolve to Mediate with the Haskell Company
   b. Resolve to Relieve Haskell from AWT Warranty
Mr. Dillon concluded his presentation on the letter from Haskell and stated that staff had examined the other information provided by Randazza and Purestream and continues to conclude that the USBF process would not work. Mr. Kinsley and Mr. Hortenstine summarized that from the design calculations at were evaluated and after consulting with Purestream's engineers that none of the information received had changed their position. Mr. Hortenstine gave specific details of the process used in analyzing the addition information, which included speaking with Dr. John Smith with Smith Environmental of Cincinnati Ohio. A modeling scenario was run with the information but it didn’t address the bio kinetics. Dr. Bratby of Brown and Caldwell also spoke with Mr. Smith and are in agreement with Mr. Hortenstine’s deductions. Dr. Bratby used Biowind to module and couldn’t achieve 3.0. Mr. John Smith provided information from a plant in long Island, NY and on from Italy to demonstrate that 3.0 could be achieved however, out of 3-5 months of data provided only several days reached 3.0 the consistent numbers were from 5 to 8. Mr. Kinsley and Mr. Hortenstine Concluded that they did not find out anything that changed their opinion.

Chairman Bauman asked Mr. Dillon for his opinion on the issue. Mr. Dillon stated that the short answer is that neither Haskell or Brown & Caldwell, nor Weiler believes that USBF can meet the standards and Haskell cannot go forward without resolution to the problem. Mr. Castle has received the same information and he stated that it did not include the kinetic values to achieve the levels required. Mr. Castle purchased a different process model program from the EECS Group and he couldn't achieve the required nitrate level. Discussion ensued. It was noted that a program was not sent just the input information. Mr. Castle of WEC concluded that no significant information to change his mind was provided and the fact that he used an independent model and obtaining the same results aided his conclusion.

Commissioner Tobin asked if the process calculations were first received on the 10th January. Mr. Castle stated that the first useable information was received on January 10, 2004.

Chairman Bauman asked for comments from Mr. Espat of Randazza. Mr. Espat noted that he was not on the call with Brown and Caldwell and the Purestream representatives so he could not dispute what was said. Mr. Espat believes there are two issues, one why the process name had changed, because four major competitors had claimed rights to their patent. Mr. Espat noted that there was no change to the process. Mr. Espat noted that John Smith was not only the consultant, but is the co-owner of the patent. Mr. Espat addressed Mr. Dillon on the warranty and clarified that when design is discussed the only reason we say ‘actual’ is because we must have some parameter of where you are starting. It is Mr. Espat’s opinion that no one will guarantee from a specific starting point. Mr. Espat stated that it was clear when Boyle sent out the RFP criteria that there would not be 250 B.O.D. you would have a food distribution supplement to provide the nitrogen results. Mr. Espat stated that as far as consequential damages, the warranty is signed by both owners of the Purestream Company and Randazza provided an additional warranty. Mr. Espat stated that in the disclaimer where Mr. Dillon addressed the issue was contradictory.

Mr. Espat stated that concerning bonding that if Haskell is providing the opportunity for Fluidyne to bond through them so he should be given the same opportunity. Mr. Espat believes that Fluidyne can’t get one on their own either, he is not sure of this but he should be given the same opportunity. If he needs to have one he would like to add it to his proposal. The cost of the bond should be included in the original bid he would buy it if it were made available to him. Mr. Espat stated that concerning process or performance bonds it is important that the District clarify what performance means and he believes as far as performance bonding it should be clearly stated as what it includes if it is a process warranty it has to be defined so that you are protected for 5531. Mr. Espat thanked the Board.
Chairman Bauman asked for further Board comment. Commissioner Brooks requested to read information into the record. Commissioner Tobin requested to question Mr. Espat. The Chair granted the request.

Commissioner Tobin asked Mr. Espat to please tell the Board why the information that was asked for months ago had only been provided last week and why according to both engineers it was not sufficient data. Mr. Espat stated that he had arranged the discussion with Mr. Smith and that the calculations and all the required information had been on record in the District and was issued by CPH Engineering and he had spent 5 hours going over the information with Mr. Stu Oppenheim in February. Mr. Espat stated that he had difficulty defining whom he should be in contact with and that he had answered Mr. Kinsley's requests but Mr. Oppenheim requests were extensive and costly. Commissioner Tobin stated that the information received from Randazza hasn't established 3.0. Mr. Espat stated that the USBF BESST technology is patented and they cannot divulge the essence of their process with the calculations that others could copy their process. Discussion ensued on the patent process and the information divulged and if it is public record. Commissioner Brooks stated that on patents some are never divulged Polaroid had hundreds on film process and Coca Cola's ingredients. Mr. Espat stated that there are portions of the information, which were not disclosed to WEC and Brown and Caldwell. Commissioner Tobin stated that without this information the Board cannot prudently spend 8 million dollars on something they cannot see or have proven them. Mr. Espat stated that there is no engineering that can present SBR has produced 5531.

Commissioner Brooks contacted John Smith of Smith Environmental Engineering. He responded with a letter dated January 13, 2004, which is made part of this record as Attachment C. Commissioner Brooks noted a point made in the letter that as the consultant for Purestream's USBF BESST system that the KLWTD project had been reviewed in detail by him and the current design will meet the requirements of 3.0 per liter of total nitrogen. It further explains that Mr. Smith had discussed with Ted Hortenstine and emptied to describe that the process is unique and combines the internal recycle and doesn't fit the mold and doesn't fit standards. It also notes that during Mr. Smith's tenure at the EPA he was part of a pilot program that operated many plants in various places. Commissioner Brooks also noted that he had talked with David Refling of Boyle Engineering who claims USBF BESST could meet the requirements and so stated in the PDR that a chemical feed and possibly a denitrifying filter on the end would be required for the other process. Mr. Refling provided an email verifying his opinion, which is made part of this record as Attachment D. Commissioner Brooks also referred to a letter from Osvaldo Ojito who worked with Gartek (Attachment E) and a letter from Gartek (Attachment F) stating that both processes have been used and they believe both systems could meet 5531. In total Commissioner Brooks had four engineers that claim it would reach 5531.

Chairman Bauman stated the issue is not whether he believes it or could find engineers to certify the process the issue is Brown and Caldwell doesn't believe it and the Board needs to decide if we need to get new engineer, or begin dispute resolution or consider a new vendor. It is a legal issue at this point; Haskell has a contract with Brown and Caldwell.

COMMISSIONER WILKINSON MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE ISAM FLUDIYNE PROCESS. CHAIRMAN BAUMAN RULED THE MOTION OUT OF ORDER UNTIL DISCUSSION IS CONCLUDED. Commissioner Tobin interjected with several more questions. Commissioner Brooks stated that concerning parliamentary procedure if the Board wants to take this up the Board may need to motion to reconsider the previous motion and for it to come forth it must come from one of the yes votes for the USBF system.
Commissioner Tobin inquired that if Boyle is comfortable with USBF and with three board members vacillating he thought that with cooperation with Nos they might come to some determination. Commissioner Tobin asked for Haskell’s opinion of Dave Refling’s email stated that both technologies have the potential and his recommendation for the KLWTD to hold a performance bond. Commissioner Brooks added the Mr. Refling had spent about 30 minutes on the phone with him and stated that both can achieve 5531 and for this size plant the USBF would be best for this application and would produce a saving. Mr. Kinsley stated that he knows, likes and respects Mr. Refling along with Mr. Betancourt of Gartek, however, they have not been privileged to all the information and exchange of information nor had the benefit of the study and at the end of the project neither Gartek nor Boyle will stamp the drawings Brown & Caldwell is going to stamp them. The Haskell Company is not swayed by the comments versus the study. Mr. Kinsley concluded that the Board’s engineer Ed Castle of WEC is also getting the same numbers with all the same information.

Chairman Bauman closed the legal report and asked the Board members for any final comments. Commissioner Tobin asked Mr. Dillon that in light of the recent memos what his opinion was of the legal issues the Board might face. Mr. Dillon stated the main question is who will take the risk for performance. If we demand that Haskell take USBF and install it, Haskell would be justified in invoking the dispute resolution process, and that it is not reasonable to ask someone to build a plant after so much detailed study showing that the technology won’t work. We would be unreasonable if we demand that they do so. Commissioner Tobin asked if they had signed a contract saying we can choose a process and could they find remedy by getting out of the contract. Mr. Dillon stated that not only could they seek a remedy they can declare KLWTD in breach and demand payment for the time they spent and without a clause in the contract covering termination the District could be liable. This is not the type of contract where the Board can demand performance that is not objectively reasonable. If the Board does so, the District will lose time and money.

CHAIRMAN BAUMAN BROUGHT ITEM G-2 RESOLUTION OF THE HASKELL CONTRACT ONCE AGAIN TO THE FLOOR FOR CONSIDERATION. THE THREE OPTIONS PROVIDED WERE: A. RESOLVE TO MEDIATE; B. RESOLVE TO RELIEVE HASKELL FROM AWT WARRANTY; OR C. SELECT MODIFIED SBR TECHNOLOGY. COMMISSIONER WILKINSON MOTION TO SELECT 2C TO SELECT MODIFIED SBR TECHNOLOGY. Brooks states he is out of order. Mr. Dillon noted that a motion to reconsider applies on the day of the vote only. Mr. Dillon’s professional opinion is that Commissioner Wilkinson is in order. CHAIRMAN BAUMAN ASKED TO WAIVE THE RULES TO MAKE A SECOND AND SECONDED. Chairman Bauman asked for further discussion. Commissioner Beaty asked what the exposure would be if we relieve them of the warranty. Mr. Dillon stated that the exposure would be to give up the 8 million dollar performance bond the benefit of the engineer selected to design and seal the project and to give up the performance warranty that Haskell provides and substitute it with an engineer that KLWTD did not choose. Also Purestream would be without a performance bond and there would be a conflict from the obligations of Haskell to complete the work and we would lose the meat of the contract. Mr. Dillon concluded that the team was selected by the Board and the District would lose the benefit of the team and that replacing it with an engineer to be named later and an un-bonded technology would not be prudent. Commissioner Brooks stated that he has low confidence with fluidyne due to the information distributed and the form of reports from various plants, for example the Bartow plant being identified as an AWT plant. He questioned who generated the reports and the internet claims that Bartow is an AWT plant. Commissioner Brooks stated that he could not support the motion. Commissioner Tobin stated that he is glad the board takes the time to hammer out the issues and glad the public is interested. He feels trapped because the lawyer advises voting a certain way, which is a lesson that the legal counsel is the sixth Commissioner. He continued that the KLWTD is lucky they have an experienced, ethical attorney, but Commissioner Tobin is not happy to be in the present position. Commissioner Tobin stated that the Board has done all it can to support the original decision but he is disappointed that Mr. Espat continues to be the loner trying to make the point for the company that the
USBF system has a lower cost but with the little amount of information given late in the game there is not much else that can be done and we may regret Mr. Espat not being there and there may be problems in the future but we are trapped with no choice. Commissioner Wilkinson stated the public should have been permitted to speak prior to the vote and the solicited letters presented this evening were no proof. The public needs some proven system and the Haskell warranty system is best and he supports SBR and the technology committee has recommended SBR. Commissioner Wilkinson stated that he was sorry it is this way but a selection must be made and the board was elected to make the tough decisions. He thanked all involved for their exceptionally hard work after we continue to slap them and say they don’t know what they are talking about. WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION CHAIRMAN BAUMAN REQUESTED A ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Beaty</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Brooks</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tobin</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Wilkinson</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Bauman</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED BY A VOTE OF THREE IN FAVOR AND TWO NOT IN FAVOR.

H. General Manager’s Report

1. Transition Committee Status Report No. 2

Mr. Sheets stated that this item would be covered during the workshop or postponed to a later date.

2. Presentation of GSG Time Sheets and Hourly Activity Descriptions

3. Sheets stated that this information was provided at the direction of the Board and would be provided with each invoice. Commissioner Wilkinson commented on the time sheets and breakdowns submitted by GSG and asked if it is necessary to have this information with every invoice. He believes it is not necessary for a fixed fee contract.

4. Discussion with FEMA concerning the EA

Mr. Sheets reviewed the information provided which included an email log forwarded from Science Kilner. Mr. Sheets stated that he would be meeting with Miles Anderson on Monday the 19th.

I. Engineer’s Report

1. Conceptual Review of the Impacts of Connection of the Calusa Camp Resort to the KLWTD (Please see the enclosed report)

Mr. Castle offered to postpone the presentation due to the late hour. Commissioner Tobin requested a summary of the Calusa report that had been provided. Mr. Castle stated that several synopses were provided. The first deals with quality of influent and the system that is in place. The wastewater will be strong and greasy but with no toxic effects however, there is a great deal of infiltration but once the system is rehabilitated it could be accepted. Discussion ensued on the age of the system and financing the connection from the Calusa Campground to the KLWTD system. Mr. Castle notes that the positive aspects are that the KLWTD system picks up flow and adds 350 customers and pointed out that on page 4 of the report was a summary of how much income could potentially be generated.
J. Commissioner's Items

1. Discussion of Strategic Planning and Consulting Strategic Planning Firm
   -- Chairman Bauman
2. Discussion of near shore water testing – Chairman Bauman

It was the consensus of the Board to table the Commissioner's Items until the February 4, 2004 meeting.

K. Meeting Adjournment

Mr. Sheets introduced Ms. Marguerite McCauley who was present to conduct the Administrative Procedures Workshop. Mr. Sheets stated that the Administrative Procedure should be scheduled as a separate meeting if it is to get undivided attention. He added that the document would take many meetings to become a working document on how to address issues facing the KLWTD. The Board gave its consensus to hold the Administrative Procedure Workshop at a future meeting. Ms. McCauley offered to provide a brief overview of the information provided. Chairman Bauman declined but thanked Ms. McCauley for her attendance and invited her back to present the manual at a future meeting. Ms. McCauley would advise the Board of her availability.

Mr. Sheets stated that the Transition Plan was to be discussed as part of the workshop but could be postponed to discuss the Haskell pay application. It was the consensus of the Board to postpone the discussion of the Transition Plan until a future agenda.

The chairman adjourned the regular meeting at 8:50 pm to begin the workshop.
The chairman reconvened the regular meeting at 9:17 p.m. Commissioner Brooks made a motion to approve the Haskell Company's pay application NO. 1. Commissioner Tobin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion was unanimously approved.

All were in favor of a motion to adjourn at 9:18 p.m.