

**UTILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL 8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33301
JUNE 23, 2009 – 6:30-8:30 P.M.**

Cumulative
January 2009 -
December 2009

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Bunney Brenneman, Chair	P	6	0
L. Thomas Chancey	P	4	2
Chris Chiari	P	6	0
Robert Cole	P	4	2
Dr. William Goetz	P	6	0
Don Larson	P	6	0
Terri Murru	P	4	2
Raymond Parker	P	5	1
Frances Smoot	P	5	1
Fred Stresau, Vice Chair	A	4	2
Claire Vickery	P	2	4
Jay Weiss	P	1	0
Dr. Magdalene Lewis	A	0	1

Staff

Peter Partington, City Engineer and Staff Liaison
Bob Dunckel, Assistant City Attorney
John P. Seiler, Mayor of Fort Lauderdale
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Guests

Lynn Shatas, FPL

Communications to City Commission

None at this time.

I. Call to Order

Chair Brenneman called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll was taken and it was confirmed a quorum was present.

III. Self-Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all members, Staff, and guests.

IV. Minutes of May 26, 2009 Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Chiari, seconded by Ms. Murru, to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2009 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

V. New Business

- **Update on City's Green Committee**

Mr. Partington advised that City Commissioner Romney Rogers had been asked to provide a recommendation regarding how to constitute a Green Committee. In turn, Commissioner Rogers has discussed this possibility with Public Works Director Albert Carbon; since that time, Mr. Partington has communicated with Mr. Carbon to learn the Commissioner's intent.

He stated that Commissioner Rogers is aware of the Committee's recent motion related to their role in the formation of a Green Committee. According to Mr. Carbon, there are three options:

- Recommend that the Green Committee is formed from the UAC;
- Recommend that a separate Green Committee is formed, but environmental issues related to energy should come before the UAC;
- Recommend that an entirely separate and new Green Committee be formed, with "nothing to preclude" interested UAC members from participating in the Green Committee as well.

Mr. Partington added it was his understanding this issue will be on the City Commission's Agenda for the July 7, 2009 meeting, and Commissioner Rogers will make his recommendation at that time.

Ms. Murru asked if there have been any discussions, at the City level, regarding budgets and/or budget cuts, as well as "where new committees fit in." Mr. Partington affirmed that there are discussions about the City's budget, but he was unaware of any of the other issues that Ms. Murru had cited, or of the budget's impact on the prospective Green Committee.

Ms. Murru noted that there had been previous discussion of the cost of a City advisory body, and asked if Mr. Partington knew what this cost might be. He

replied that he was unaware of a specific cost. Chair Brenneman stated that she had heard the standard figure to form a board or committee is \$30,000, although she could not elaborate on this.

- **Update from the Tree Subcommittee Meeting**

Chair Brenneman advised that while Vice Chair Stresau is unable to attend tonight's meeting, he had emailed Mr. Partington some of the information from the recent Tree Subcommittee meeting. FPL's Vegetation Management Specialist, Wayne Jollimore, was present at that meeting; it was decided to schedule two subsequent meetings of this Subcommittee.

The next Tree Subcommittee meeting will be Thursday, July 16, 2009, 3:30-4:30 p.m., at the request of Arborist Gene Dempsey; Mr. Jollimore, Ms. Shatas, and the Subcommittee members will work primarily on the two displays.

The following Tree Subcommittee meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, August 13, 2009, also from 3:30-4:30 p.m. The venue has yet to be determined. This meeting will be to work on the prospective identification program for residents who care for their trees. Chair Brenneman added that FPL has offered to "rework" an existing form, including some legal verbiage. FPL representatives will be in attendance, and this meeting will focus on retooling the form to suit this new need.

Ms. Shatas added that FPL is also looking at putting information on the City website so residents can look up when the lines in their area will be cleared. Mr. Partington believed the most recent line clearance is shown on the City website.

- **Recap of Green Expo**

Chair Brenneman stated that a "wrap meeting" had been held, chaired by City Recycling Coordinator Loretta Cronk; all present had come to the conclusion that the Green Expo was "definitely a success." All exhibitors who had brought handouts used their entire supply; the number of exhibitors increased from 45 to over 70.

There was a great deal of interest in going from booth to booth. Attendance increased dramatically, and attendees showed interest in hearing from the Mayor and Vice Mayor in particular. The seminars scheduled during the day, however, did not have great success.

Chair Brenneman thanked all the Board members and their families and associates who had attended the Green Expo: Ms. Murru, Dr. Goetz, Mr. Chiari, Ms. Smoot, and Mr. Chancey.

She felt a particular item that made a difference regarding attendance was the banner at the corner of Broward Boulevard and Andrews Avenue, where it could not be missed. Chair Brenneman noted that several representatives of local green businesses had called to inquire about becoming exhibitors after seeing the sign. The participants at the wrap meeting felt putting up this banner was one of the most effective tools of the Expo.

She added there were several new exhibitors, and the City had been a great help to the event, showing solar parking meters and a hybrid utility truck, which were well received. She noted that Ms. Cronk's car is "wrapped" in the recycling logo and information, and was also shown at the event.

Chair Brenneman concluded that the UAC members' help was "absolutely outstanding," and made a difference in the event. She recognized Vice Chair Stresau's contribution as well.

Because of the potential for a Green Committee, she was unsure of next year's scheduling for the Green Expo. She noted that food vendors had not been a success at the event, mainly because there was not sufficient power for them at Stranahan Park. The planners are tentatively exploring different locations for 2010. The venue visited thus far, the Museum of Discovery and Science, seemed to have an "insurmountable" street crossing near its location.

Mr. Chancey advised that when other events are held at the Museum, the block is usually closed. Some events are held in Esplanade Park and the street itself, with open parking in the garage. He added that the Museum is beginning to "expand their efforts."

Chair Brenneman stated she and Ms. Cronk are still unsure if the Museum would be a usable site, and added perhaps they could discuss this possible location with Mr. Chancey in the future. Should the Museum not serve as a venue, they are again considering Stranahan Park for next year's Green Expo, and a date closer to Earth Day, such as at the end of March 2010. She noted they did not want to compete with a similar event in Miami-Dade.

Another consideration is the need to have a venue approved by fall 2009, so the Committee could focus on publicity for the 2010 Expo. Chair Brenneman added that the Community Greenhouse Foundation had done an excellent job in signing up exhibitors and organizing the event.

- **Other New Business**

Chair Brenneman announced Mr. Partington would share information from the franchise letter from Schef Wright of Power Services, Inc., with which all Committee members have been provided.

Mr. Partington stated the letter refers to “a large part of Phase 1,” which is the only phase regarding the franchise agreement for which a contract has currently been awarded. The letter discusses the scope of services, franchise agreement, and other considerations.

He continued it was his understanding that the individual City Commissioners have also seen the letter, and the City Manager intends Power Services, Inc., and their Attorney, Mr. Wright, to attend the July 7, 2009 City Commission meeting to give a briefing on the letter. They will also provide the City Commission with direction regarding the franchise negotiations.

He concluded that this is the UAC’s opportunity to see Power Services’ “initial thoughts” on the franchise agreement and to discuss them and ask any questions. They may also “give a message” to the City Commission via the Communications section of the minutes.

Chair Brenneman asked if the July 7 meeting will review Mr. Wright’s letter only, or if it will be the “full Power Services presentation” to the City Commission. Mr. Partington replied that the intent is for both Power Services personnel and Mr. Wright to address the City Commission. The scope of work also involves “plans and strategies” to bring about the undergrounding of the City’s electrical infrastructure, he advised, and no draft of this prospective document is in the City’s possession at this time. These presentations would be part of the City Commission’s Conference Agenda.

Chair Brenneman announced she cannot be present at the July 7, 2009 meeting, and stated she would ask Vice Chair Stresau if he could attend. She requested that other UAC members “make themselves available” for the Conference Agenda session as well, noting that it begins at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Parker felt sure Power Services would add more than is stated in Mr. Wright’s letter, which is “only from a legal perspective” and offers comparisons with other franchise agreements.

Having read the letter, he added that there are some sections in it that the Committee would not want to “trespass” into, such as legal or severability clauses. The majority of the letter’s content is “business and legal” material, to which he felt Staff is much better suited than the Committee.

The two areas in the letter in which he felt the Committee could give recommendations to the City Commission, once they have heard what Power Services has to say, regard use of the newest technology and undergrounding. While he felt the rest of the letter could help the Committee narrow its focus, he did not feel it was entirely within their purview.

Chair Brenneman reminded the Committee that Phase 1, which is the only authorized phase of the contract thus far, deals with the possibility of undergrounding. She noted that the letter alludes to this in one section, but does not go into depth on this issue.

Dr. Goetz asked if Power Services and Mr. Wright intended to speak about Phase 2 of the scope of work. Mr. Partington confirmed this, explaining that Phase 1 is the review of the existing franchise agreement with FPL and "task 2" is to examine and recommend strategies for undergrounding the electrical infrastructure. He advised there is "material to come" from Power Services that is more specific to the facilitation of undergrounding.

He identified Mr. Wright as a sub-consultant to Power Services, and "a member of their team."

Dr. Goetz asked if the report on task 2 might be forwarded to the UAC when it becomes available. Mr. Partington stated "with the [City] Manager's agreement" this would be possible.

Chair Brenneman referred Assistant City Attorney Dunckel to p.4 of Mr. Wright's letter, in which she pointed out she was not clear on Mr. Wright's first sentence in a particular section, "City's Right to Purchase FPL's Electric Distribution Facilities." She specified the term "new franchise" as the cause of this uncertainty. Attorney Dunckel identified this as an error, which instead means the conclusion of the existing franchise, not a "new" one. He noted that the existing franchise includes a "favorable" buy-out, which would be eliminated by the proposed new franchise agreement.

Mr. Chiari asked what would happen if the City did not enter into a new franchise agreement at the conclusion of the current one, pointing out that power could not be discontinued as long as the City is "moving forward in good faith." He asked if, during this time, the City might seek out a third provider for its power.

Attorney Dunckel asserted that advocating this particular proposition would be "at variance" with the Florida Supreme Court decision in the Winter Park case, which states the franchise continues to exist during the period in which a new agreement is being negotiated, or attempts are made to purchase the existing assets. This meant the City could not "go out and buy" from a third party.

There is a disagreement, however, between FPL's Counsel and the City's position, Attorney Dunckel noted; the City would state that there is nothing in the case that gives FPL the authority to continue to collect the franchise fee, which would also mean consumers could not be compelled to pay the fee and the City would be "deprived of a significant revenue source."

An alternative argument, he continued, would be that an Order of the Court may allow FPL to continue to collect this fee, and it would be paid into the registry of the Court.

He reiterated that the City does not subscribe to the same theories as FPL's legal counsel, although he declined to go into detail on the theories at this time.

Dr. Goetz asked if the UAC might see a copy of FPL's proposed franchise agreement. Attorney Dunckel stated that this is an item of public record, and agreed to transmit a copy electronically to the members.

Dr. Goetz continued that the Committee had previously been provided with examples of "already concluded" franchise agreements between FPL and other cities, and requested copies of these, which Attorney Dunckel also agreed to provide. Dr. Goetz asked if there were any agreements from "other cities with other power concerns in the State of Florida." Attorney Dunckel advised documents of this nature were not at hand; while he could attempt to procure these, he pointed out that FPL has franchise agreements with approximately 200 municipalities, all of which "had their own business practices."

He added that if Dr. Goetz could provide him with a list of those municipalities into which he should inquire, he would be willing to do this. Attorney Dunckel explained the City had recently sent out letters requesting franchise agreements in cities with populations over 75,000, as well as five counties.

Dr. Goetz felt this might give the City insight into some "common practices outside FPL." Attorney Dunckel noted that while he understood this intent, he has not had success in the past comparing cities.

Dr. Goetz asked if the UAC could be given some idea how these discussions might proceed "from a logistical and technical manner." Attorney Dunckel advised that the first negotiating session will be held on the Friday following the July 7 City Commission Conference Agenda meeting. Mr. Partington confirmed this schedule.

Ms. Murru thanked Dr. Goetz for his research into the franchise agreements of other cities, and noted that the City had retained Power Services to conduct similar research in order to provide a "strong negotiating position" from which the City could work. She proposed that the UAC allow the negotiating team to let the UAC know if there is more information they feel they are lacking in order to move forward with the process.

Mr. Chiari noted that as no public officials would be in attendance, the negotiating sessions would not be subject to the Sunshine Law; he asked, however, if

Committee members would be able to attend. Attorney Dunckel advised that the meeting would not be open to the public; in addition, it is not known how many negotiating sessions will be necessary at this point, so it is not yet possible to determine at what point the public might be able to comment or participate in the process.

Dr. Goetz inquired as to who would be present at the negotiations. Mr. Partington advised that there will be, "at least," representatives of the following: the City Manager's Office, City Attorney's Office, Public Works, and the Finance Department. These were the only offices he could definitively state at this point, he added, and the attendees could vary from one session to the next.

Dr. Goetz asked if the UAC would have any leverage in the negotiations. Attorney Dunckel replied that while this is the case, he did not wish to discuss it as a matter of public record at this time.

Mr. Larson felt the City Commissioners could extract "good information" for negotiating purposes from the letter provided. He encouraged them to attempt to reach a 20- or 25-year agreement rather than a 30-year contract, and felt the City should leave its options open to the greatest possible extent.

Ms. Murru asserted it is "critical" that the UAC remain neutral on some of the prospective agreement's specific details. She asked if the Committee might remain in the background as a "resource" for Attorney Dunckel, in a capacity of providing him with more information, bringing other parties to the negotiations, or other uses.

Attorney Dunckel agreed that if there are additional resources the UAC might be able to provide, he would make them aware of this. He added that he would be willing to have individual discussions on the subject with "one or more" of the Committee members if they wished.

Dr. Goetz asked why the negotiating sessions would not be made public. Attorney Dunckel explained that contracts are not typically negotiated in a public manner. Dr. Goetz noted that he felt this meant the City would be negotiating "from a very weak position," and that one aspect of the discussion that might be in the City's favor would be public opinion.

Mr. Chiari pointed out, however, that once the negotiations were concluded and the prospective franchise agreement came before the City Commission for a vote, the Committee would be able to speak publicly on any aspects with which they are not in agreement.

He also disagreed with the previous characterization of the City's position, asserting that they were "actually in a strong position," with a "good new team" of

elected officials to move the negotiations along. The City's current contract with FPL, he pointed out, had concessions that other municipalities have not seen, which strengthened their position yet further.

Chair Brenneman agreed with this, noting that in the letter from Mr. Wright, there are provisions in the existing franchise agreement about which he was "very complimentary." She felt Mr. Wright also brought a good deal of research to bear on the issue.

She added had recently requested to see the franchise agreements between FPL and West Palm Beach and Riviera Beach, both of which were mentioned in Mr. Wright's letter and which she "thought would be helpful." Mr. Partington offered to distribute copies of these if the members wished, and did so at the Chair's request.

Dr. Goetz did not believe there is "any relationship" between the present franchise agreement and a prospective one, and did not feel, from Mr. Wright's letter, that FPL felt this was the case either. He expressed concern that the City would not be able to "use the past franchise" as any form of leverage in the negotiations.

Attorney Dunckel advised that he did not wish to "read too much" into any possible thought processes that would go into the upcoming negotiations, although he agreed that the existing franchise agreement did not necessarily hold value as a precedent for any possible forthcoming one. He assured the members, however, that it will be "woven into the fabric of the negotiations."

Ms. Murru again thanked the UAC and Staff for contributing to the City's ability to negotiate from "a position of strength," and reaffirmed that they would be of help in the future if necessary. She agreed that discussing any strategy in detail would not serve any of the participants well at this point.

Mr. Chiari asked Ms. Shatas if there have been any recent franchise agreements to which FPL has brought "some flexibility" regarding what they are willing to bring online with a municipality, or what they might allow a third party to bring on board, such as alternative energy strategies.

Ms. Shatas replied that she could not speak to whether these had been addressed in franchise agreements, as these are "a new area." She stated, however, that FPL is working on alternative forms of energy.

Mr. Chiari asked if perhaps other FPL representatives might be able to address the Committee about alternative forms of energy, noting that he hoped Fort Lauderdale might have the opportunity to "blaze new trails" in this area. Ms. Shatas agreed that these could be discussed along with other "renewables."

Attorney Dunckel emphasized that there is a need for the UAC to respect the fact that there are some areas of the negotiations that the City and FPL wish to accomplish which, for business or other reasons, might lie outside the boundaries of the franchise agreement; they could, however, become the subject of another agreement outside the franchise agreement.

Mr. Cole asked for a status update regarding net metering with FPL – for instance, if a customer with solar power might be able to “put power back into the network.” Ms. Shatas advised that this would be one of the renewable strategies she would bring back to the Committee for later discussion, adding that Miami-Dade is presently working with “smart meters” related to this issue.

Chair Brenneman stated she would like to bring up an additional item, and stated that FPL has recently filed for a \$1.2 billion rate increase. Five hearings on this topic are scheduled for South Florida, the closest of which will be held at the Main Library at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, June 25, 2009. She advised that she plans to attend, and has also formally requested of City Administration that their lobbyist intervene on behalf of Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Chancey asked if Ms. Shatas could make any comments regarding the need for this increase.

Ms. Shatas explained that the increase is for the “rate base,” which is approximately 37% of a customer’s bill, and has not increased since 1985. A typical 1000-kilowatt residential customer’s bill is roughly \$38, she noted; the rate increase would raise this by \$12. She added that an unrelated portion of the bill, the fuel adjustment, will not be affected and is expected to decrease the following year. She described this as a technology/efficiency-based rate increase.

Mr. Chancey recalled that at an earlier meeting, a misstatement regarding hurricane cleanup had referred to “over a billion” dollars reimbursed to FPL for its efforts. He asked if the increase might have some relation to an event such as this, in which case it would be less of an expense than a loan. He asked what the increase might cover – for instance, an unforeseen event such as a hurricane.

Ms. Shatas advised that the government does not reimburse FPL, which must be self-insured out of necessity. She continued that in a single 15-month period in 2004-05, there were seven major storms, which necessitated bringing in teams from across the country to assist in cleanup. Regarding the details to which Mr. Chancey had referred, Ms. Shatas indicated she would have to “go back and check” what was discussed in a particular meeting.

Mr. Chancey stated it had been his impression that the extra funds had been necessary for storm cleanup, and asked if FPL had had to absorb this loss, or if

money to cover the expense had come from sources other than rate increases or insurance. He concluded he simply wished to understand where these funds had gone.

Ms. Shatas asserted FPL does not get “money from the government,” and believed this expense was “part of what’s covered” in the rate base. They do not, for example, receive FEMA funds for cleanup purposes, and had to rely on claims to FPL’s insurance carrier to cover repairs incurred during the 2004-05 storms.

She reminded the Committee that after these storms, FPL had appealed to the Public Service Commission for additional funds at that time; they had also applied for the rate base increase at that time, which the Public Service Commission had not allowed for four years, or until 2009. She did not recall the specifics of where FPL’s funds came from, but stated she would be able to research this issue for an answer to how much money came from the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Chiari asked what the total cost of damage to FPL’s systems was after the 2004-05 storms, how much they received from the Public Service Commission, and how much was received from FPL’s insurance carrier. Ms. Shatas reiterated that she would need to research these specific amounts, and would be glad to provide the Committee with these figures.

Dr. Goetz felt a study of FPL’s “bottom line” would give the Committee an idea of the extent to which they were reimbursed. He cited their profits as \$1.6 billion in net income with an annual average of 25% return, including all costs incurred to repair infrastructure and monies from other sources, as evidence that they are “getting more of a return... than almost any other sector” or industry in the U.S. He requested an estimate of non-infrastructure-related costs by the utility.

Ms. Shatas and Attorney Dunckel both stated they did not have this information at hand.

Dr. Goetz stated he had read these were estimated to be approximately \$110-120 “per person per day of an outage,” or roughly \$180 million per day in non-infrastructure costs. He believed these costs had been “essentially hidden,” as there had not, until recently, been a reliable means of estimating them; however, he asserted these were “part of the true cost” to the customer, in addition to their rates.

Mr. Chiari added that a recent *Sun-Sentinel* article stated FPL is currently earning 10.61% on its asset base, with a projected goal, after the prospective rate increase, of a 12.5% return.

Ms. Shatas stated that FPL is “not guaranteed a profit.” Mr. Chiari asked how this is possible, as FPL is guaranteed reimbursement of 100% of the cost of fuel. He added that they did not have to be “as efficient in [their] operations,” noting that the Public Service Commission is expected to add an element of market pressure on corporations that have “natural monopolies” by the nature of their product. While the issue may not be inefficiency, he felt there was a “lack of market incentive.”

Ms. Shatas felt FPL is quite efficient, and has a large number of alternative forms of energy operating in 26 states. She added that a number of cities and counties wish to work with FPL on stimulus package activities, as well as net metering and other activities.

Regarding finances, she reiterated that she would need to verify the figures cited in order to ensure information is accurate.

Dr. Goetz commented that it is his understanding that outages are increasing nationwide at a 10-12% rate annually, and that Florida as a whole has the third highest rate of outages nationally. He did not feel this was indicative of efficiency.

Ms. Shatas asked where this information came from, as she did not believe it was accurate. She reminded the Committee of a recent presentation regarding outages, which pointed out that they were one of the more efficient providers nationwide.

Dr. Goetz stated he would send his information to Ms. Shatas.

Mr. Chancey felt communication is key on this issue to prevent misinformation on either side and ensure that “everyone has got the same goal.” He suggested that providing examples of FPL’s green initiatives, and how they have helped provide cost savings, might help convince the public that a rate increase “makes sense.”

He added that the Committee hopes to see positive initiatives of this nature, such as wind generators, and noted that some newer examples of this technology have smaller blades and are less unsightly.

VI. Unfinished Business

Ms. Shatas distributed a report on 3rd Quarter line clearance to the members. Mr. Chiari noted he would attempt to find the information on the City’s website, as previously mentioned.

VII. For the Good of the Committee

Mr. Larson stated that at the previous night's Better Meetings Academy, the subject of "Communications to the City Commission" had been raised, and it was noted that there would be "some adjustments" to how this is done in the future. In order to pass along this information, in bullet point form, to the City Commissioners as quickly as possible, it is being discussed that the Recording Secretary be authorized to send the Communications directly rather than waiting for them to appear in the meeting's minutes. He added that the final process has not yet been determined.

Chair Brenneman advised she had attended the previous month's Academy, and to the best of her knowledge, the Communications are sent from the Recording Secretary, at the Chair's direction, to the Staff Liaison, who then passes the information on to the City Clerk and City Manager.

Mr. Partington confirmed that the City Clerk is looking into this issue. In the past, she has waited for the Boards or Committees to approve their minutes before placing the Communications on the City Commission's Agenda; he advised she is now seeking input as to what the Commissioners wish to do.

Mr. Parker noted that in the last meeting's minutes, the recent power outages in the Coral Ridge area were referenced as being caused by an "underground failure." He asked Ms. Shatas if she could clarify this further. She did not have any further information at this time, noting that it could have been an equipment failure, as underground equipment needs replacement more often than overhead lines; it could also have been that someone "dug into" the line.

Mr. Chancey distributed information to the Committee members, citing Listerine as a non-pesticide mosquito repellent. He was not aware of its effectiveness at this point, but felt this might be a way to "stay green."

Chair Brenneman advised that two sign-in sheets, one each for the Tree and Infrastructure Subcommittees, are being circulated. She requested that all members sign "one or both."

She explained the nature of the two Subcommittees to Mr. Weiss, and pointed out that these groups "only meet when there is business to discuss." The Infrastructure Subcommittee takes up matters such as the siting of substations, lines, poles, and similar concerns; the Tree Subcommittee is busier, and deals with the UAC's two displays regarding homeowners and trees, as well as the correct methods of pruning trees specific to Fort Lauderdale.

The Subcommittees typically meet on Thursdays, and are often in the range of 3:00-4:00, intended to end by 5:00 p.m. Chair Brenneman pointed out that UAC members are not obligated to participate in Subcommittees if their work schedules do not allow for the time.

VIII. Announcements

The Committee's upcoming schedule is as follows:

- Tree Subcommittee Meeting, Thursday, July 16, 2009, 3:30-4:30 p.m.
- UAC Next Regular Meeting, Tuesday, July 28, 2009, 6:30 p.m.
- Tree Subcommittee Meeting, Thursday, August 13, 2009, 3:30-4:30 p.m.

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]