

Rocky Flats Stewardship Council Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, May 7, 2007, 8:30 – 11:30 AM
Jefferson County Airport, Terminal Building
11755 Airport Way, Broomfield, Colorado

Board members in attendance: Clark Johnson (Alternate, Arvada), Carl Castillo (Alternate, City of Boulder), Matt Jones (Alternate, City of Boulder), Jane Uitti (Alternate, Boulder County), Lori Cox (Director, Broomfield), Mike Bartleson (Alternate, Broomfield), Chuck Baroch (Director, City of Golden), Kate Newman (Alternate, Jefferson County), David Allen (Alternate, Northglenn), Shelley Stanley (Alternate, Northglenn), Karen Imbierowicz (Director, Superior), Tim Purdue (Alternate, Superior), Jo Ann Price (Director, Westminster), Jeannette Hillery (Director, League of Women Voters), Marjory Beal (Alternate, League of Women Voters), Kim Grant (Director, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Ann Lockhart (Alternate, Rocky Flats Cold War Museum), Roman Kohler (Director, Rocky Flats Homesteaders), Ken Foelske (Director).

Stewardship Council staff members and consultants in attendance: David Abelson (Executive Director), Rik Getty (Technical Program Manager), Barb Vander Wall (Seter & Vander Wall, P.C.), Erin Rogers (consultant).

Attendees: Eric Barnes (Wagner, Burke & Barnes Auditing), Todd Neff (Daily Camera), Cathy Shugarts (City of Westminster), Larry Bruskin (CDPHE), Marion Galant (CDPHE), Mark Aguilar (EPA), Larry Kimmel (EPA), Rob Henneke (EPA), Sam Garcia (EPA), Erin Minks (Sen. Salazar), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield/Westminster), Scott Surovchak (DOE-LM), Bob Darr (Stoller/DOE-LM), Linda Kaiser (Stoller), Rick DiSalvo (Stoller), Michelle Hanson (Stoller), Jody Nelson (Stoller), George Squibb (Stoller), Jeremiah McLaughlin (Stoller), David Shelton (Shelton Environmental), Amy Thornburg (USFWS), Sue Vaughan (League of Women Voters), Jennifer Bohn (RFSC accountant), Jeanette Alberg (Sen. Allard).

Convene/Agenda Review

Chair Lori Cox convened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. She asked if there were any suggested changes to the agenda. There were none.

Consent Agenda

Ken Foelske moved to approve the February, 2007 minutes. The motion was seconded by Jo Ann Price. The motion passed 12-0.

Jeanette Hillery moved to approve the checks. The motion was seconded by Roman Kohler. The motion passed 12-0.

Approval of Letter Regarding “The Rocky Flats Special Exposure Cohort Act”

At the January meeting, the Board expressed interest in supporting former Rocky Flats workers in their bid to achieve special cohort status under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness

Program Compensation Act (EEOIPCA). In February, the Board wrote the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health expressing concern about the ongoing delays in implementing the EEOIPCA and in ruling on the workers' petition to seek special exposure cohort status. The Board asked that the Advisory Board not deny the petition if the outstanding issues regarding data reliability are not addressed and if missing records are not uncovered.

The letter being presented to the Board for approval at this meeting is to support "The Rocky Flats Special Exposure Cohort Act" (S. 729; H.R. 904). These bills would accomplish what the workers are seeking to accomplish through the petition process – be designated a special exposure cohort class under the EEOIPCA. Senator Salazar introduced the bill in the Senate; Representatives Udall and Perlmutter in the House. These bills are the same ones the Coalition supported in past years. Previously, former Rep. Beauprez sponsored the House bill with Rep. Udall.

David Abelson began the discussion by noting the recent decision of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health to grant special exposure cohort (SEC) status to a small group of workers at Rocky Flats, not the entire class that petitioned for SEC status. Roman Kohler expressed his confusion about the decision and said he recommends that the Stewardship Council move forward with sending the draft letter from the meeting packet. This draft includes changes Board members requested that David make to an earlier draft.

Erin Minks from Senator Salazar's office circulated copies of a news release and letter from their office. She said the while the recent decision was not comprehensive, it was anticipated that this may happen. The Rocky Flats petition was the largest and most comprehensive that the Advisory Board has reviewed. The period of the 1950's was simply the area for which there was the easiest agreement. She added that a recommendation on the remainder of the petition is not a done deal. She also said that any claims beyond 1970 are really tough, not just here but at other sites as well.

Jeanette Alberg with Senator Allard's office said that the Board met again on Friday and decided to postpone writing its language until June 11-12. She explained that workers who were exposed to neutron radiation between the years 1952-1958 were approved for SEC status. The Board is still looking for additional information on other classes of workers to see if they can enlarge that group. The Colorado Congressional delegation urged them at Friday's meeting to enlarge the SEC to include more workers, so they decided to postpone their decision.

Jane Uitti asked what rationale was used to select the years that were approved. Erin Minks explained that workers in the 1950's were monitored for neutron exposure. Roman said that after 1958, NIOSH has more confidence in their monitoring results. Jeanette Alberg added that NIOSH is advising the Board on scientific issues and there is also an auditor that reviews the data and provides independent oversight. She said there seemed to be a general scientific agreement that there was no way to reconstruct doses for the 1952-1958 time period. The Advisory Board will make a recommendation to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who will make the final decision.

Jo Ann Price asked if there are 12 people on the board. Erin Minks said the number can be up to 18, but she was not sure how many were present in Denver. She noted that there were some conflict of interest issues that came into play.

Ken Foelske asked what the compensation limits are for the SEC. Jeanette Alberg said that if the worker is diagnosed with one of 22 listed cancers, there is a \$150,000 lump sum, plus medical benefits. This can also be a survivor benefit.

Lori Cox pointed out that the Stewardship Council has already taken an overall position of support for the Rocky Flats SEC petition, and that she does not think there is much purpose in adding anything other than support for “The Rocky Flats Special Exposure Cohort Act.”

Matt Jones noted that David Abelson said in his opening remarks that this first cut appeared to be policy-driven rather than scientific and that it was not consistent with the Advisory Board’s other decisions. He said this issue should be included in the letter.

Karen Imbierowicz said that she was in support of revised letter. She also asked if it would make sense to send a letter to the Advisory Board asking them to increase the extent of the SEC at their June meeting.

Jeanette Alberg noted that there is a precedent for the Advisory Board taking a comprehensive petition for SEC status and carving out smaller groups for approval.

Lori Cox asked if there were other opinions among Stewardship Council members. Jeanette Hillery said she was in favor of sending another letter because the more the Advisory Board knows that another group is watching their work the better their decisions may be. She is also in favor of the changes David suggested to the letter.

Lori asked if there were any questions on the draft letter for approval. Kim Grant asked if they could just add a statement to this letter that would address those issues being discussed for a possible second letter. David Abelson said that those statements do not match the audience or intent of the letter being discussed.

Karen Imbierowicz moved to approve the letter with one change of the word ‘to’ to ‘for’. The motion was seconded by Jo Ann Price. The motion passed 12-0.

David Abelson will develop a second letter to be sent to the Advisory Board and will solicit comments from the Board. There will not be time to officially approve prior to it being sent, but it will work.

Jane Uitti suggested that since the Stewardship Council has already approved new sections in the letter they just approved, David could start with that since it has already been discussed by the group. David agreed, and added that it will emphasize that the Stewardship Council supports the congressional delegation.

Lori Cox pointed out that the message of the letter is that the Stewardship Council is still watching the Advisory Board, we would like for them to approve the remaining workers, and that this group is disappointed in the actions so far. She asked the other members to provide direction to staff when a draft is submitted.

Executive Director's Report

David began by formally welcoming new Stewardship Council members Tim Purdue (Superior) and Ann Lockhart (Rocky Flats Cold War Museum). Jane Uitti is retiring from her position with Boulder County, so this meeting will be her last.

In a recent email, David updated the Board on mineral rights acquisition at Rocky Flats. He said to let him know if there are any questions.

David asked Mark Aguilar (EPA) for a brief update on Rocky Flats' deletion from the National Priorities List. Mark said that after EPA published the Notice of Intent to Delete, there was a 30-day public comment period. They received and responded to three sets of comments. EPA sent a letter on Friday, which included the responsiveness summary. These materials will go into the public docket, and copies will be sent to the Board. EPA will publish the Notice of Deletion in the Federal Register this week.

Rik Getty announced an upcoming technical meeting, which will take place at the DOE office at 11025 Dover St. (108th and Wadsworth) on May 10th.

David also referenced the Stewardship Council's quarterly financial report, which was sent to Board members in the last couple of weeks. More information will be available in the monthly staff update by the end of the week.

Jo Ann Price commented that there was a problem with the Stewardship Council's website. David said she was probably using the wrong address, and noted that the correct one is on the letterhead.

Public Comment

Erin Minks spoke about the issue of National Wildlife Refuge funding. There is projected to be a nearly \$2.5 billion budget shortfall for the Refuge system nationwide. Senator Salazar signed a letter to recommending that Congress approve an increase to the funding. Related bills will be coming out within the next month

Receive Stewardship Council 2006 Financial Audit

Eric Barnes (Wagner Burke and Barnes) began by noting that this was his first year working with the Stewardship Council. In general, no material problems were found and the Stewardship Council was found to be in compliance with all applicable law and regulations. Mr. Barnes then reviewed what was included in the audit report. Page 1 is the only content that belongs to their

firm, and it is their opinion, which he said was 'clean'. He then walked the Board through the audit, pointing out revenue and expenditures.

Jo Ann Price asked about a figure of \$186,000 on the audit. David Abelson explained that it is the amount that has been expended. Not all of the Stewardship Council's available funding has been requested yet. This is done on quarterly basis based on what the group projects it will need. The most recent number can be found in the quarterly financial report.

Mr. Barnes spoke about page 8 (Notes to Financial Statement). He said this section will be beefed up in the final report. They will add that the Stewardship Council is exempt from the provisions of TABOR, due to Enterprise status as advised by Barb Vander Wall. Most of this is boilerplate language. He noted that they are still looking at a money market fund held by the Stewardship Council, which is an investment. It is disclosed on page 12. There is also a TABOR emergency reserve, which will be removed and rolled into the total net assets.

The Stewardship Council is not required to have audit under state statute. David explained that a decision was made by Executive Committee to have the audit to make sure things were being managed properly. In order to save money, they decided to request a less-intensive audit.

Karen Imbierowicz moved to approve the audit as amended (Barb Vander Wall's changes). The motion was seconded by Jeannette Hillery. The motion passed 12-0.

Host Legacy Management Quarterly Meeting

DOE briefed the Stewardship Council on site activities for calendar year 2006. DOE has posted the report on their website.

Scott Surovchak started off by sharing that last year was a good opportunity for Legacy Management to learn about operating a closed Rocky Flats in low precipitation conditions. They are not seeing the water flows that existed during operations and closure. The area is very slow in responding, and there are delays before they are seeing water flows after precipitation events. The remedies and revegetation are working quite well. There was a lot of snow over the winter, which led to compaction, sliding, subsidence, and geology in action.

Surface Water Monitoring and Operations

George Squibb provided an update on surface and ground water monitoring and operations for calendar year 2006. During the year, site personnel collected 139 samples, including 70 composites comprised of 2,829 grabs. There were no pond discharges during the calendar year.

Water quality at all Points of Compliance and Points of Evaluation (except GS10) were below applicable standards. At GS10, reportable values for total uranium were likely caused by groundwater contributions of naturally-occurring uranium to S. Walnut Creek. George added that these values are currently going down, and that the March sampling report will be available soon.

Surface water quality results supporting both the Original and Present Landfills indicate that these remedies are functioning properly. The regulators were consulted on elevated levels for boron, arsenic and manganese. The contact record is available on the Rocky Flats website.

Groundwater Monitoring and Operations

Groundwater activities during the calendar year included routine and special monitoring; replacement of media in the Mound treatment system; repair of the Solar Ponds treatment system; installation of instrumentation at the Mound and East Trenches systems; initiation of a treatability study at the Solar Ponds treatment system; and observation and tracking of the development of a slump south of former Building 991.

The site found that groundwater quality is generally consistent with previous years' data and indicate that the overall remedy is functioning properly. Also, following repairs and media replacement, treatment systems performed as designed through the end of 2006. At the Original Landfill, uranium concentrations in one of the downgradient wells are statistically higher than in the upgradient well. This difference will be evaluated in 2007 to determine if these results are natural or anthropogenic.

Air Quality

George reported that routine analysis of air monitoring filters at three stations was conducted through September 2006. Since October, samples at S-136 and S-138 have been archived pending need for analysis. These samples will be held for six months and then discarded.

During the calendar year, measured isotopes (except for uranium) were generally below detection limits and not measurable. Airborne radionuclides were dominated by uranium isotopes of natural origin. Without any large-scale soil disturbances, potential air emissions are expected to remain at or below detection limits. One of the members asked about high wind events and George said that high winds would fall under routine scenarios.

Ecological Monitoring

George showed photos depicting areas onsite in three conditions: (1) prior to demolition, (2) just after demolition, and (3) during 2006. He then reviewed weed mapping results, which were lower than normal. 401 acres at the site were treated with herbicides in during 2006. The boreal chorus frog vocalization survey, conducted each spring, found an increase in the frog population in 2006.

Site Surveillance and Maintenance

Jeremiah McLaughlin reported on 2006 Site Operations. At both the Present and Original Landfills, quarterly inspections were performed for the first and second quarters and monthly inspections were performed for the third and fourth quarters. The vegetative covers were inspected monthly from July through the end of the growing season. The site followed the prescribed checklist in the Monitoring and Maintenance Plan of May 2006.

There are no significant concerns at the Present Landfill. Nine settlement monuments were installed in September 2006 across the top of the landfill and 6 on the east face. All were surveyed in December.

At the Original Landfill, the site has been monitoring seeps and slumps. At Seep #7, there was an investigation of the 'burrito drain'. After being unearthed, it was found to be functioning fine. However, there was insufficient compaction. At Seep #4, a shallow trench was dug to the West Perimeter Ditch. Jeremiah showed some photographs of the slump areas, and also some berm repairs.

Routine site inspections include annual inspections; special inspections (precipitation, seismic, and human activity); erosion controls, ponds and stormwater management structures; monitoring locations; groundwater treatment systems; vegetation; and fences and postings.

At the West Access gate, improved signage has reduced vehicle damage. At the East property boundary, frequent maintenance has been necessary due to heavy snow and freezing conditions. Wackenhut continues to hold the surveillance subcontract at the site. Site road upgrades were completed in August and September, 2006. These upgrades allow for better all-weather access for surveillance and maintenance work.

Jane Uitti asked about the insufficient compaction at the landfill. Jeremiah explained that on the east side of the original landfill there is some differential settlement, where the soil is settling out. It is not technically a slump. Scott Surovchak clarified that this was normal since this was the first really wet period for the new landfill.

David Allen asked what caused the need for berm repairs. The repairs were done to get the water to flow off the landfill correctly again. If not repaired, water would have infiltrated the cracks. Large amounts of snow, followed by 60 degree days, caused the problem. This was a saturated area, and not much vegetation was growing there yet.

Ken Foelske asked if there was a similar increase in deer movement as there was for frogs. Scott said the deer population is pretty steady, and that there has not been a large increase.

Matt Jones asked how the air monitors work, how often they are sampled and why they removed the west monitor. Scott replied the monitors are continuous flow, and are sampled monthly. The west monitor was removed because there was good baseline. Matt asked about what would happen if there is a fire when winds are blowing to the west. Scott said that there are no legal or technical reasons to keep them. Also, based on the results of a site study, there are no significant concerns in terms of doses to firefighters either.

Jeannette Hillery agreed that there has not been a history of anything being detected in the monitors, but added that she thinks the responders need better education. Rik Getty said he did an analysis after the fire in April, and will forward it. Carl Castillo asked what the additional cost would be to maintain west monitor and was told it was about \$3,000 per year. He asked Scott if the Stewardship Council could successfully advocate for that. Scott reiterated that he

sees no need for this monitoring because they had repeatedly been seeing less than 1% of any standard in the samplers. He advised that the community should get used to not having them.

DOE Briefing on CERCLA Five-Year Review

Rick DiSalvo (Stoller) presented this update. DOE, EPA and CDPHE are in the early stages of preparing a CERCLA Five-Year Review for the DOE-retained lands. These parties will prepare the draft for EPA to approve.

The off-site and refuge lands are not part of the review as they are currently being deleted from the CERCLA National Priorities List and thus are no longer subject to CERCLA. The remedy in place for DOE-retained lands (or Central OU) addresses hazardous substances remaining on site by institutional and physical controls, incorporating monitoring and maintenance. The purpose of the review is to make sure that the cleanup remains protective of human health and the environment. The last CERCLA review was conducted in 2002; this review must be completed by September 2007.

The Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement (RFLMA) provides for implementing the regulatory framework for the CAD/ROD so the remedy will remain protective. DOE, as the CERCLA federal lead agency under Executive Order 12580, is conducting the review. DOE, Stoller, CDPHE and EPA staff comprise the review team. To complete this review, the team is using EPA's *Comprehensive Five-Year Review Guidance*, June 2001.

The team will review the technical performance of the remedy, including monitoring data, system performance, and operation and maintenance. They will then determine whether physical and institutional controls are in place and are successfully preventing exposure.

Next, the team will evaluate whether the Comprehensive Risk Assessment underlying exposure scenarios and parameters remain valid; consider any changes that have occurred in reference doses or slope factors, or ARARs; and consider if RAOs (Remedial Action Objectives) remain valid. Finally, the team will consider new information not addressed or anticipated in the CAD/ROD that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy. Remedy selection decisions are not reopened, but are evaluated against any new requirements.

The review conclusions will include: (1) protectiveness statement, which is a determination of whether the remedy is, or is expected to be, protective of human health and the environment; (2) identification of any issues; and (3) recommendations and follow-up actions. Rick pointed out that the remedy may still be protective even though further actions are recommended.

If there are any issues identified, possible review results are:

- Remedy is still protective;
- Remedy will be protective once the remedy is completed;
- Remedy will be protective in the short-term, but follow-up actions are needed to ensure long-term effectiveness;
- Remedy is not protective, unless action(s) identified in the review are taken in order to ensure protectiveness; or,

- Protectiveness cannot be determined until further information is obtained.

The remedy is considered not protective if unacceptable risk to human health or the environment is present due to:

- An immediate threat
- Migration of contaminants is uncontrolled
- Potential or actual exposure outside assumed scenario is evident, or
- The remedy cannot meet a new cleanup level (e.g. new or changed standard or ARAR) and the previously acceptable level is now outside the risk range.

The Review report may include a Explanation of Significant Differences, which are actions to be taken that do not change the selected remedy but implement a new requirement (for example, adding requirements to ensure a changed standard or new ARAR is met).

A recommendation to modify the CAD/ROD to change the selected remedy would be separate from the report. Any proposed modification is subject to public review and comment prior to approval.

The first Five Year Review was performed when cleanup and closure activities were being conducted under RFCA. The Sep 2002 review concluded that the OU1 and OU3 remedies and completed RFCA accelerated actions were protective; DOE custody and control of the site adequately controlled the risks; and completion of cleanup and closure under RFCA would result in a final CAD/ROD.

Several issues were identified to be considered as the Site proceeded with final cleanup:

- Areas requiring access restrictions
- Ecological risk
- Land transfer and management
- Post-closure management
- Funding for long-term activities
- Trench 1 waste disposition
- Plume barrier and treatment system operations

The current Five-Year Review will report on the status and disposition of these issues.

In terms of community involvement, a formal notice that the review was underway was published March 11, 2007. A fact sheet was also posted on the Rocky Flats website. The public will be notified when the review is completed. The draft report will be submitted to EPA for approval and CDPHE for concurrence and posted on the Rocky Flats website by August 1, 2007.

Document review as part of this study will include RI/FS report (including the Comprehensive Risk Assessment); Proposed Plan; CAD/ROD; surveillance, monitoring and maintenance reports; RFLMA requirements; and ARARs and toxicity and slope factors.

The monitoring data set consists of validated data from January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2006. The data set for the July 2006 RI/FS was validated data ending July 31, 2005. Data for

monitoring locations specified in the RFLMA will be used. Operation and maintenance cost data will be evaluated.

The RFLMA specifies periodic inspections and monitoring of remedy components. The Five-Year Review is focusing on whether these inspections are being conducted and reported, and whether changes to the inspection frequencies should be recommended. Inspections of the OLF and PLF are being conducted in accordance with the Landfill Monitoring and Maintenance Plans.

Inspections of the surface water monitoring stations, ground water monitoring wells and treatment systems are routinely performed as part of each sampling and maintenance event. An annual inspection of the Central OU surface was conducted on March 19, 2007. No evidence of violation of institutional controls was found. Several areas had evidence of minor erosion, slumps, sink holes or slides. Many small pieces of debris were also noted.

Interviews may provide additional information about Rocky Flats and/or help identify remedy implementation issues. Feedback is requested from the Stewardship Council. Other interviews may be conducted, such as with the USFWS.

RFLMA also specifies certain evaluations be done as part of the CERCLA periodic reviews. Besides the protectiveness questions, the scope will include:

- Review whether new technologies may reduce the need to rely on institutional controls and recommend any follow-up
- Recommend continuing, discontinuing, or changing any remedy component; and
- Recommend any changes to landfill inspection and monitoring frequencies.

Chuck Baroch asked how long the Five-Year Reviews will continue. Rick said they will continue to take place for the foreseeable future.

Lori Cox asked if the Five-Year Review will also consider monitoring and maintenance components and if the review will look at air monitoring. Rick replied that the remedy does not currently require air monitoring. He added that if people have questions or concerns, they may be submitted through the website to be considered.

Jo Ann Price asked if 'issues' would include changes to water standards. Rick said it would. She also asked about new technologies. Rick said they would look at whether any new treatment systems could improve or accelerate treatment. He also said there is nothing really new for soils. However, if something came along, they would look at.

Chuck Baroch asked if DOE will still do Five-Year Reviews when the title is transferred to the USFWS. Rick explained that the Peripheral OU, which will comprise the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge, is being deleted from CERCLA; DOE will retain the Central OU, which will continue to require Five-Year Reviews.

Jo Ann Price referenced the pond status report, which indicated that Pond C2 is currently 23% full, and asked if there are any plans for a discharge. Scott said there are no plans to discharge. Discharge levels are dictated by dam safety, and they are nowhere near these levels.

David Abelson noted that there is no formal public comment period as part of the Five-Year Review. The Stewardship Council will be briefed on the draft report, and there will be an opportunity for the Board to engage the agencies on any issues. Therefore, while there is no official process, there will in fact be an unofficial public involvement process.

Rocky Flats Reading Room Status

Bob Darr updated the group on the status of the Rocky Flats Reading Room. The Reading Room holds unclassified documents pertaining to the history, cleanup and environmental monitoring at Rocky Flats, as well as the establishment of the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge. The collection contained 2,932 document titles as of December 31, 2006. This included 2,376 titles pertaining to RFETS and 556 for other DOE sites.

The Rocky Flats documents include technical reports, videos, Rocky Flats Reports (RFPs), CDPHE Health Advisory Panel reports, newsletters, serials, contracts, environmental monitoring reports, beryllium reports, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board documents and videos, updates to contracts, newspaper clippings, shift superintendent daily reports, and updates to controlled documents. The print documents consist of approximately 501 linear feet of Rocky Flats documents, and 110 linear feet of documents for sites other than Rocky Flats. In addition, there are two filing cabinets of microfiche copies of the Administrative Records.

Bob presented a chart reflecting 2005 and 2006 Reading Room usage statistics. DOE tracked the number of visitors, number of phone requests, and number of email and mail requests each month. There were less than 200 visitors each year, with fewer phone, email and mail requests. In 2006, 48% of the users were citizens, 42% were government employees or contractors, and 10% were legal staff.

DOE is now considering whether it is worth the effort and expense to maintain the Reading Room. It costs about \$60,000 per year to maintain the facility. If DOE decides to close the Reading Room, it probably would not keep the materials but could donate them to an appropriate facility. They are currently looking for input from the public. The existing contract expires in December, 2007.

Public Comment

There was none.

Updates/Big Picture Review

David Abelson announced that the Stewardship Council will require two meetings for its internal budget review, so an October meeting has been added to the schedule. They also plan to incorporate new member interviews during this timeframe, as the Stewardship Council will be

soliciting additional applicants toward the end of the year. David would also like to take some time to look at how things are working for the Board in general at this time (meetings, communications, etc.).

Next Meetings:

- August 6, 2007
- October 1, 2007
- November 5, 2007

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Rogers.