

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY
AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD**

2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 274-5721
FAX (916) 274-5743
Website address www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb



**SUMMARY
PUBLIC MEETING AND BUSINESS MEETING
July 18, 2019
San Diego, California**

I. PUBLIC MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Dave Thomas called the Public Meeting of the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board (Board) to order at 10:00 a.m., July 18, 2019, in Room 358 of the County Administration Center, San Diego, California.

ATTENDANCE

Board Members Present

Dave Thomas
Barbara Burgel
Dave Harrison
Nola Kennedy
Chris Laszcz-Davis
Laura Stock

Board Members Absent

Board Staff

Christina Shupe, Executive Officer
Mike Manieri, Principal Safety Engineer
Peter Healy, Legal Counsel
Lara Paskins, Staff Services Manager
David Kernazitskas, Senior Safety Engineer
Sarah Money, Executive Assistant

Division of Occupational Safety and Health

Eric Berg, Deputy Chief of Health
Amalia Neidhardt, Senior Safety Engineer

Others Present

Michael Musser, CA Teachers Association	Mike Shields, DOSH Elevator Unit
Bruce Wick, CALPASC	Coil Dunn, City of Los Angeles
Nicole Marquez, Worksafe	Juvenal Solano, MICOP
Robert Moutrie, CA Chamber of Commerce	Kevin Thompson, Cal/OSHA Reporter
Jamil Jones, BSI Group	Paul Malinoski, LWD
Jamie Carlile, SCE	James Mackenzie, SCE
Paul Benton	Jesus Ojcela, Keenan & Associates
Brian Heramb, San Diego Gas & Electric	Victoria Esparza
Jon Adams, San Diego County APCD for CAPCON	Mark Stone, Alliance Insurance Services
	Bonnie Burns, So. CA. Gas Co.

Mark Wickens, DOSH Elevator Unit
Pamela Murcell, CA Industrial Hygiene
Council

Whitney Prout, CA News Publishers Assoc.

Dan Leacox, Leacox & Associates

Patrick Pettijohn, CWA Local 9511

Colin Lavin, IBEW 47

Anne Katten, CRLAF

Erika Monterroza, DIR

Greg Dubois, AT&T

Ryan Samiec, AGC of CA

Jessica Martinez, National COSH

Kristin Hamon, SDG&E

Elizabeth Treanor, PRR

Katie Valenzuela, CA. Env. Justice Alliance

Chris Porter, IBEW 47

Ken Smith, University of CA

Maira Martinez, CRLA Coachella

Jesse Cruz

B. OPENING COMMENTS

Mr. Thomas indicated that this portion of the Board's meeting is open to any person who is interested in addressing the Board on any matter concerning occupational safety and health or to propose new or revised standards or the repeal of standards as permitted by Labor Code Section 142.2.

Jon Adams, San Diego County Air Pollution Control District, representing the CA Air Pollution Control Officers Association, stated that his organizations support legislation that protects workers from wildfire smoke, and they would like to work with the Board on this in the future, but they have some concerns about the emergency regulation:

- Use of the Air Quality Index (AQI) could be problematic. The monitors giving the AQI data may be far from where the wildfire smoke is, and it might cause confusion for employers as to whether or not it is ok to continue working in that area.
- Use of non-regulatory monitors may or may not be valid. Global air districts, state, and federal agencies use reference spectrums that have been proven to be accurate to measure particulate matter in the air. Non-regulatory monitors could read high or low.
- Employees using respirators without being medically evaluated or fit tested before using them.

Nicole Marquez, Worksafe, stated that the emergency wildfire smoke standard will give workers the tools that they need to protect themselves while working outside during wildfires, and time is of the essence because wildfire season is here. This proposal will help California lead the way by providing necessary clarity and basic protections for workers who are exposed to wildfire smoke. She said that using the AQI as a measurement is clear and makes sense to employers. It helps employers to understand that when the AQI goes above 150, they must provide protections for their employees, such as respirators for voluntary use or engineering and administrative controls when feasible. This proposal also makes the requirement to identify and evaluate wildfire smoke hazards as clear and straightforward as possible. It simplifies the requirement to determine when protections are needed, rather than relying on the use of an employer's own discretion, and it clarifies what types of controls are needed. She asked the Board to vote "aye" on the emergency wildfire smoke proposal.

Katie Valenzuela, CA Environmental Justice Alliance, stated that the AQI was created as a health-based measure to inform the public on precautions that should be taken, so using it for workplace safety standards is appropriate. It is also appropriate to require employees to wear

masks during wildfires, and it is important for employers to get them now so that they are prepared when the next wildfire occurs. She also said that there is a lot of work being done to improve the technology for low-cost sensors. She stated that SEFCO has a lab that tests these sensors and publishes the results online, so it is easy to tell which sensors are more accurate than others. This does not replace calibration, but it is a great resource. She asked the Board to vote “aye” on the emergency wildfire smoke proposal.

Juvenal Solano, Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project, stated that for one week during the Thomas fire in 2017, his organization helped to hand out N95 masks to workers. He said that workers were not provided with masks, and some used clothing to protect themselves from inhaling wildfire smoke. He said that ranchers saw them handing out the masks and were in support of the workers having masks. He said that during the Woolsey fire, there continued to be a lack of enforcement and protection for workers against wildfire smoke. He stated that agricultural workers do not make very much money, so they cannot afford to miss work, and as a result, many of them have risked their health by continuing to work in areas where wildfire smoke is present. He asked the Board to vote “aye” on the emergency wildfire smoke proposal.

Jessica Martinez, National Council on Occupational Safety and Health, stated that many workers who do the cleanup after wildfires are given very little information about the technical aspects of how wildfire smoke can impact them and very little information about what protections are available to them, so it is very important that the emergency wildfire smoke proposal is passed.

Robert Moutrie, CA Chamber of Commerce, stated that his organization has some concerns about the emergency wildfire smoke regulation, but they realize that there is not much time for the Board to consider them. He said that his organization hopes that when it comes to the permanent regulation, there will be enough time for the Board to consider it and make possible changes. He stated that the mandate in the emergency regulation has grown significantly from what was requested in the initial petition. The initial petition focused on outdoor occupations that are not considered first responders, but it has now morphed into something that will cover all employees who are working outside for more than one hour per day, including urban employers that don't have employees who fit the mold of the original petition.

Mr. Moutrie stated that there is ambiguity in Section A of the emergency regulation regarding the scope of the regulation, and it could confuse employers about when they must start following the regulation. Prior draft language of this proposal stated that if there is a wildfire smoke advisory and the AQI is greater than 150, and the employer feels that the wildfire smoke may affect their employees, that is when this standard takes effect. He said that when this element was removed from the draft language, a critical reference point was removed. As the proposal is written right now, when an employer sees that the AQI is 150, they won't know what to do. Should they reasonably anticipate that their employees will be exposed to wildfire smoke? Should they go looking for wildfire smoke?

Mr. Moutrie also stated that in previous drafts of the proposal, there were broader definitions for the term “first responders”, but in the current draft, it is now limited to firefighters. He said that this is concerning because there are certain businesses, such as utilities, that must also go to the front line of the fire, to shut down gas and electrical lines to help keep first responders

safe. He stated that the broader definition of “first responders” should be brought back so that those employers can prepare ahead of time and do medical evaluations and fit testing for masks and respirators for their employees.

Mr. Moutrie stated that the current proposal does not allow businesses to rely on air quality monitors that are nearby their worksites. He said that refineries are required to have air quality monitoring on site as per AB 1647, but the emergency wildfire smoke regulation does not allow other businesses to rely on that. It only allows air quality monitoring on site or checking of government websites, which may be further away. He stated that the proposal needs to incorporate closer and more accurate monitors into the business’s obligation.

Mr. Moutrie stated that the training provisions in Appendix B are intended to be helpful, but they are confusing and contain contradictory language. For example, Appendix B contains graphics and directions to shave facial hair, but it does not direct that employees should actually shave their facial hair. This creates confusion because by having it there, it implies that it must be done, but it does not state that it is required. Appendix B also states that employees with facial hair should wear “loose fitting powered air purifying respirators”, which is a big step away from requiring them to wear N95 masks and costs hundreds of dollars to purchase. Appendix B also tells workers to follow manufacturer instructions for masks and respirators, and those manufacturer instructions tell them to get medically evaluated and fit tested. Appendix B also tells them that the manufacturer’s instructions for shaving, medical evaluation, and fit testing should be followed, even though doing so is not required. This could cause confusion and should be clarified.

Mr. Moutrie stated that his organization is grateful that the AQI for PM 2.5 has been raised to 500 on an emergency basis because it will allow places like Sacramento, which are not the focus of this emergency regulation, to continue to function at a different level. This needs to be considered when the permanent regulation is developed. He said that in November 2018, the AQI in Sacramento got above 300, and if the emergency regulation takes effect, and the AQI goes above 300 again, every business in Sacramento will have to stockpile N95 masks for all of their employees, and get their employees medically evaluated and fit tested, to comply with the standard. He stated that this is a considerable cost for employers who are not the focus of this regulation, and if they choose not to do that, they will have to shut down their businesses until the AQI goes down.

Mr. Moutrie also stated that the emergency regulation appears to exempt businesses with closed doors and windows, but it is not clear what “closed” means. For example, drive thru workers frequently open and close the drive thru window throughout the day, and bus drivers frequently open and close bus doors throughout the day. It is unclear whether businesses in those types of situations would fall under this regulation, and how they will know if they do fall under it.

Elizabeth Treanor, Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable, stated that when the Board adopted the decision for Petition 573 in March to develop the emergency regulation pertaining to wildfire smoke, it only covered outdoor workers, but it has stretched since then to also cover indoor workers. Her organization feels that only outdoor workers should be covered by this regulation. She asked the Division to look at its enforcement policy and ensure that in this case, attendance rosters and trainer credentials are not included in the enforcement because emergencies are a different situation than the average training.

Ms. Treanor stated that Section (f)(4)(a) is very confusing because it states that the employee training must include how to clean, store, and maintain respirators. She said that disposable respirators cannot be cleaned and reused, and they should be thrown away at the end of the employee's shift or when they have become soiled. Cleaning and reusing them is a significant safety hazard, and keeping this requirement in the regulation will be confusing for employers who don't have respiratory protection programs. She stated that Appendix B is also confusing, and in some places, contradictory. There are certain things that the regulation says are not required, but then the regulation refers the reader to the manufacturer's instructions, and the manufacturer's instructions do require it. Also, the manufacturer's instructions may not be available, or may be difficult to find, in an emergency situation.

Ms. Treanor also stated that there is a provision in the emergency wildfire regulation that will expose employees to another potential hazard called arc flash, which is fatal. She said that there are no respirators available that are arc flash-rated, so electrical workers who are going in to de-energize power lines in AQI areas over 500 will have to follow the regulation and be exposed to arc flash, or violate the regulation and be protected from exposure to arc flash. She stated that this issue needs more attention, and her organization is glad to see that an advisory committee meeting has been scheduled to begin discussing the permanent regulation for wildfire smoke exposure. She asked the Division to include a lot more dialogue in the upcoming advisory committee meeting so that all concerns that are raised can be addressed.

Ms. Laszcz-Davis asked Ms. Treanor to explain the dilemma and the challenge regarding arc flash. **Ms. Treanor** stated that with the emergency wildfire smoke standard, if the AQI reaches 500 or greater, which it does because the crews are very close to the fire, using respirators will be mandatory. Under the present standard, when they go into the same situation, they do not wear respirators because of the possibility of being exposed to arc flash. She said that there are currently no respirators available that are arc flash-proof, so they could be exposed to arc flash when they are wearing them, which can seriously injure or kill them. With the emergency regulation and its mandatory requirement to wear respirators when the AQI reaches 500 or greater, employers will be stuck in a situation where they will have to have their employees wear respirators and be exposed to arc flash, or have their employees not wear respirators and be in violation of the rule. **Mr. Berg** stated that the Division did research on this issue and determined that it is not a problem. **Mr. Healy** advised Mr. Berg to wait and further address Ms. Treanor's comments about this in his briefing on the proposal during the Business Meeting. **Ms. Treanor** stated that it would've been nice if the Division would've discussed this issue with stakeholders during the advisory committee meeting.

Mr. Thomas stated that this is an emergency regulation, so it will not be perfect. He said that an effort was made on all parts to give employers guidelines to protect their employees from wildfire smoke, and it was not easy to come to a consensus. He said that he hopes the permanent regulation will be closer to perfection.

Whitney Crowell, CA News Publishers Association, stated that her organization would like to participate in the advisory committee process for the permanent rulemaking regarding protection from wildfire smoke. She said that her organization sees some workability challenges in the emergency standard. She stated that it is not clear in the emergency standard what training is considered to be effective, and there are several concerns regarding Appendix B that need to be reconciled. She also said that the monitoring requirement in the regulation requires the employer to monitor the AQI at the worksite where the employee is working. This

is challenging for news reporters who are covering things at many different locations throughout the day. News media employers and employees don't always know where they will be at a given moment, so how do they monitor the AQI at each location before the workday, and then periodically afterward? She recommended that the Division look at the scope of employees.

Ms. Crowell stated that it will be difficult to do medical evaluations and fit testing for all news media employees when the AQI reaches 500 because it is unknown when the next wildfire will happen, and the news media sends out the reporters and crew that are the closest to where it is happening. She also said that there is legislation that was recently passed that gives the news media a pass to enter into wildfire areas where first responders may not go. News media employees help inform the public of what's going on, and if the public needs to evacuate from certain areas, so the news must be obtained by reporters and dispersed quickly to the public. She said that with this emergency regulation, if the closest news media employee does not have a recent medical evaluation and fit test for a respirator, or if those were done for a different kind of respirator than the ones that may be provided closest to the scene, then they will be in violation of the rule.

Chris Porter, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 47, stated that N95 masks do fit under a full face shield and can be used on a temporary basis to protect workers. However, electrical wires above most wildfires are in transmission distribution (sub-transmission, transmission 115 or 220, or greater than 500 volts, which is a 60 calorie count), and this becomes a greater hazard. He said that the few respirators that are available and can guard against this are cost prohibitive for some employers, especially contractors and employers with small crews, and they are not rated as non-conductive. It is also not dielectrically feasible to introduce them into an energized environment. The emergency wildfire smoke standard nullifies an existing regulation that protects electrical workers from this type of harm.

Anne Katten, CA Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, asked the Board to adopt the emergency wildfire smoke regulation as drafted. She said that outdoor workers need access to N95 respirators and straightforward, short, simple training on how to use the respirators, as well as how to recognize the symptoms of smoke exposure. She stated that masks and training cost money, but the cost in terms of health risks to people from inhaling the small particles in wildfire smoke is much greater. Wildfire smoke can exacerbate preexisting conditions such as asthma, cardiac problems, and respiratory problems, and the costs associated with treating these conditions are huge, especially for low income outdoor workers who have limited access to medical care. She said that her organization is looking forward to working on the permanent regulation, and she hopes that in the permanent regulation, the threshold for mandatory use of respirators is reduced to the threshold for hazardous air levels, which is 301 AQI for PM 2.5. At that level, it is important that the fit of a respirator has been checked. She said it will also be important to fine tune Appendix B in the permanent rule to be as clear as possible for employers.

Maria Martinez, CA Rural Legal Assistance, stated that the emergency wildfire smoke regulation will bring about a good change for California workers. For the past 7 years, at night during the winter, ranchers have been burning stacks of hay to keep frost from forming on their crops. Though the fires are extinguished in the morning, these fires leave fog and smoke in the area, and workers are exposed to this secondhand wildfire smoke. Because of the

smoke, many people have developed fungus in their lungs.

Samantha Marine, resident of Northshore for 25 years, stated that many retired farmworkers have developed asthma and breathing problems, or have had their preexisting conditions exacerbated, due to exposure to smoke from the hay fires, and have had to move away from the area as a result. She said that this emergency wildfire smoke regulation will help prevent these types of problems from occurring again in the future, and it is desperately needed to protect California's farmworker communities.

Marisa Zamora, Riverside County Office of Education, stated that she and her family have worked in the fields for many years and been exposed to the hazards of wildfire smoke. She said that in 2018, the smoke from the wildfires was suffocating, but everyone continued to work and did not complain. These workers have to continue working, despite the dangerous conditions, because they need to provide for their families. She stated that over 70% of these workers do not have health insurance, and therefore, cannot afford to pay for medical care when they become sick from exposure to wildfire smoke. She said that she is looking forward to the day when she can do her work in the fields and not have to worry about risking her health to do so.

Bruce Wick, CALPASC, stated that his organization is happy that a regulation is being passed to protect outdoor workers during wildfires, but his organization is sad that it is written as it is because it requires employers to choose between compliance and safety. **James Mackenzie, Southern California Edison**, echoed this comment. Mr. Wick said that a regulation is best when it is developed in collaboration with labor, management, and occupational safety and health professionals all working together, and in the end, labor folks feel safe with it, management folks feel they can implement it and comply with it, and everyone can easily understand it. The proposed regulation does not accomplish this, and he hopes that the Division will focus on doing that when it comes time to work on the permanent regulation. He said that employers do not oppose the idea of handing out N95 masks to workers or suspending the confusing requirement regarding voluntary respirator use when there is wildfire smoke in the work area. He stated that this temporary regulation will take effect soon, so translations of Appendix B will be very important in order for employers to properly implement this regulation. However, it will be hard for them to do because Appendix B contains a lot of conflicting information. He feels that the temporary regulation is a good form of protection to put in place for employees for this fire season, but as work begins on the permanent regulation, there needs to be a focus on safety where compliance and safety are the same, and the Division needs to take the time needed to get it right.

Dan Leacox, Leacox & Associates, stated that he is concerned about moving forward and working on the permanent regulation to address employee exposure to wildfire smoke. He said that many folks voiced their concerns during the development of the temporary regulation, and there was an opportunity early in the process for the Division to address those concerns, but the Division did not. He stated that going forward with the advisory committee process to develop the permanent regulation, there should be more dialogue with stakeholders. He said that with the temporary rule, employers have to have medical evaluations and fit testing done preemptively on all of their employees in order for them to be able to use N95 respirators when wildfire smoke is present. He stated that he spoke with someone who does medical evaluations and fit testing on employees for these types of masks, and that person is only able to do about 10 of these in a day, and each one costs \$125 to do. This can create a

significant cost for the employer, and it can take a very long time to get all of the employees medically evaluated and fit tested. He said that this leaves employers with only two options: shut down on days where wildfire smoke is present in the work area or preemptively do medical evaluations and fit testing on speculation that a fire will occur in the work area. He feels that as a result of this, almost every employer will fall under the scope of this regulation, requiring nearly half of the workers in California to be medically evaluated and fit tested for N95 masks. He stated that when a regulation makes an employer choose whether or not to comply, or it is unreasonable or doesn't make sense, it puts employers in a tough spot, and some good and ethical employers who usually comply will opt out. He said that the concerns of these employers should be taken into consideration as the permanent rule is developed so that they will continue to comply.

James Mackenzie, Southern California Edison, stated that the emergency wildfire smoke proposal has several administrative complexities in it that make it difficult for workers and employers to understand why they are doing it. He said that his organization agrees with the concerns regarding removing the language pertaining to wildfire smoke advisories because other agencies are already monitoring the wildfire situation, and they are able to communicate these advisories to employers, instead of the employer having to monitor the situation themselves, allowing employers to focus on protecting their workers from exposure to wildfire smoke. Removing this from the proposal puts the burden on employers of monitoring the situation, in addition to protecting their employees, and it is difficult to explain to employers and employees why they must do that. He stated that he is looking forward to the advisory committee process to develop the permanent regulation, and he hopes that there will be a lot of real time dialogue so that a good permanent standard can be developed that will be easy to follow, and employers and employees will be able to understand why they must do things a certain way.

Victor Esparza, member of the general public, stated that it is important to make clear in this emergency standard what the trigger is that makes it mandatory for employers to follow these regulations. He said that some companies and businesses will not comply unless they know exactly what trigger to look for.

Nancy Zuniga, IDEPSCA, stated that it is very important that employers train their workers on how to use N95 masks. She said that after the Woolsey fire, many workers informed her organization that they were not feeling well. Her organization was able to train 200 workers in 30 minutes about how to protect themselves while working in conditions where wildfire smoke is present. In that training, her organization provided instructions on how to put on the masks, why they are useful, the risks associated with wildfire smoke exposure, and other information contained in Appendix B. She stated that this proposal is very much needed because many of these workers are immigrants who assist in cleanup efforts after the fires, and they deserve to be protected.

Michael Musser, CA Teachers Association, stated that his organization hopes the Board adopts the emergency regulation for wildfire smoke protection, and his organization is looking forward to participating in the advisory committee process to develop the permanent regulation. He hopes that there will be good discussion and more involvement allowed in that advisory committee process to come up with a strong permanent standard.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Thomas adjourned the public meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Mr. Thomas called for a break and reconvened the meeting at 11:33 a.m.

II. **BUSINESS MEETING**

Mr. Thomas called the Business Meeting of the Board to order at 11:33 a.m., July 18, 2019, in Room 358 of the County Administration Center, San Diego, California.

A. PROPOSED EMERGENCY SAFETY ORDERS FOR ADOPTION
(GOVERNMENT CODE 11462.1)

1. TITLE 8: **GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS**
Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, New Section 5141.1
Protection from Wildfire Smoke

Mr. Berg summarized the history and purpose of the proposal and indicated that the proposal is now ready for the Board's adoption.

Mr. Harrison stated that this regulation isn't perfect, but it's a good avenue to get there. He said that he would like to see the Division do something along the lines of what it did with the heat illness prevention standard by providing wide-sweeping education on this standard, which will help employers to comply. He also stated that while this regulation is in the emergency phase, the Division should be mindful and reasonable when it comes to enforcement. He said that he participated in the advisory committee process, and as the process moves forward for the permanent regulation, he would like to see more dialogue occur so that all voices can be heard and concerns can be vetted to come up with a permanent standard that's as close to perfect as possible. **Ms. Stock** echoed Mr. Harrison's comments.

Ms. Stock stated that she hopes this emergency regulation will be adopted today. She said that she understands the concerns regarding training in an emergency setting, but it is not necessary to wait to train employees for these types of situations until the emergency happens. The training can be done now so that they are prepared. She also stated that she understands the concerns regarding taking the time to get employees medically evaluated and fit tested for masks and respirators, but there is no other alternative to this. It needs to be done because wildfire smoke is a serious hazards that can cause long term health effects. She said that this proposal has some logistical problems, but in the end, it is important to provide protection for employee who may be exposed to wildfire smoke.

Ms. Burgel stated that she supports measuring the air using the AQI, and she feels that using the AQI as measurement in the permanent standard is a good idea. She said that the AQI isn't perfect because there are only 41 monitoring stations, but additional stations can be brought in during wildfires. She also stated that she would like to see the trigger level for mandatory use of respirators lowered to 300 or greater, but in the case of this emergency regulation, she supports the proposal.

Ms. Laszcz-Davis stated that everyone who commented today seems to agree that the best course of action to take is to adopt the emergency standard that is before the Board today to get protections put in place for workers, and then get to work quickly on a final regulation that will adequately address everyone's concerns.

Mr. Thomas stated that he is glad to see that this issue is being addressed. He said that it isn't perfect, but it is a good first step. He stated that the permanent regulation will be better, and he also encouraged the Division to allow more give and take during the advisory committee process to develop the permanent standard.

MOTION

A motion was made by Ms. Stock and seconded by Ms. Laszcz-Davis that the Board adopt the proposal.

A roll call was taken, and all members present voted "aye." The motion passed.

B. PROPOSED VARIANCE DECISIONS FOR ADOPTION

1. Consent Calendar

Mr. Healy stated he is aware of no unresolved procedural issues regarding items A-Q on the consent calendar, and he believes that those items are ready for the Board's decision on the question of adoption.

MOTION

A motion was made by Mr. Harrison and seconded by Ms. Laszcz-Davis to adopt the consent calendar.

A roll call was taken, and all members present voted "aye." The motion passed.

C. OTHER

1. Legislative Update

Mr. Healy provided an update on legislative activity and status, in the past month, of the following bills:

- AB 203
- AB 1124
- AB 457
- AB 1158
- SB 1

- AB 1400

2. Executive Officer's Report

Ms. Shupe stated that the rulemaking pertaining to firefighter personal protective equipment is in the final stages of review by the Department of Finance, and she is hopeful that the proposal will be brought before the Board for a public hearing before the end of this year.

3. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were mentioned.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Thomas adjourned the Business Meeting at 11:05 a.m.