



**DEVILS LAKE WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, 3rd Floor
May, 11, 2012
10:00 P.M.**

BOARD MEMBERS: David Skirvin
Brian Green
Noel Walker
Kip Ward
Randy Weldon

BUDGET COMMITTEE: Douglas Pirie
Alex Ward
Jim Hoover
Jim Park

ABSENT: Don Sell, excused

AUDIENCE: Mitchell Moore

STAFF: Lake Manager Paul Robertson, Seth Lenaerts, Project Manager

MEDIA: None

Skirvin called to order the May 11, 2012 Budget Committee Meeting for the DLWID and asked for introductions.

David Skirvin nominated Brian Green to Budget chair. Randy Weldon seconded. Green was unanimously elected as Chair.

Green asked for nominations for Vice-Chair.

Alex Ward nominated Randy Weldon to be Budget Vice-Chair. Douglas Pirie seconded. Weldon was unanimously elected as Vice-Chair.

Presentation of the Budget by Budget Officer Paul Robertson.

Robertson presented a slide show and noted that the budget committee members were the same as last year. Some highlights follow.

Form LB1 is renewed.

Creation was March to May for the May 11 budget committee meeting.

Public comment will be taken today. The budget committee does not create policy; they make recommendations to the Board for the financial budget.

Mission:

Improve: Water quality; environment for fish, wildlife, and humans; recreational opportunities; safe and efficient navigation, and the economy.

Increase: Public access; public awareness, and public education.

The District extends from Neotsu to Cutler City.

Inside the watershed, residents pay the full rate, while others pay approximately half the rate.

Top 5 Objectives:

-Develop and implement a strategy for aquatic vegetation management and control.

-Complete the septic tank revitalization program.

-Increase District's time spent on the lake to promote communication to property owners while conducting a lakeshore photographic survey. Re-evaluate cyanobacteria postings from the District.

-Determine the source of *E. coli* on Thompson Creek.

-Determine methods we can use and those to collaborate with to sewer the rest of the watershed.

Other program and activities:

Communications

Conferences and Training

Emergency Preparedness

Internship Program

Lake Level Management

Outreach Programs, including the August 4 Revival Festival

Property and Planning Issues

Safety Program

Save our Shoreline

Signage

Total Maximum Daily Load Stakeholder Process

Water Quality Programs

Database Maintenance

General Fund:

Resources collected and spent

Spending on par as to what we are taking in

District's Net Assets:

\$300,000 and now we are at 550,000.

Capital assets

Long Range Forecast:

Steady Funding Measure 5 and 50

Urban Renewal ends; \$26,000 annually for FY 2014-2015

General Fund:
Level Services

Improvement Fund:
Variable Projects

Summary LB-1 (Copy is in the Budget)

This notice is one the legislature created for transparency; it will be printed in the newspaper.

Total of all funds, including net working capital.

Have had a few state and federal grants.

Budgeted 400,000 LY and again this year.

\$36,130 from 2010-11.

Growing 3 and 5 percent per year.

Robertson walked the group through the Summary LB-1 form.

There are two funds. There is one FTE per fund.

The District has not incurred debt. There is an anticipated \$400,000 debt to be incurred that was authorized last year.

Green: What is the point of \$400,000 from bonds and other debt?

Robertson replied that would occur if the DLWID were to purchase the CAFÉ.

Hoover asked how many employees \$125,000 covers and what percentage each received.

Robertson said it was approximately 60/40 for Lake Manager versus Project Manager. The amount includes benefits and cost of employment--\$76,000 and \$48,880.

Robertson said the intern is funded as a consultant. Contractors Services is the facilitator. \$10,000 is allocated for that position and it would equate to about a one-fourth FTE.

Hoover: Could not find the Charter on Page 3. Page 15 said the original Charter is shown on Page 3.

Robertson said it should indicate "Mission Statement" and refer to Page 4.

Hoover said if we have a mission statement we should also include a charter.

Robertson said it is on the website as part of the policy—the first 10 pages of that document.

General Fund: Total of \$352,832 is proposed. Resources are broken up into separate areas of taxes.

Page 11 shows all the areas of net working capital and how it is calculated—it is shown in a pie chart. Requirements are also shown in a pie chart.

General Fund: Material and Services total of \$89,316.

Robertson proposed that the election expenses be budgeted into two separate years; he would write two separate checks to the County rather than budgeting the total amount one year and nothing the next.

Improvement Fund: Total of \$760,116 is broken down into a pie chart. If we do get a loan, then we have a \$400,000 influx. The loan is not active; just listed as \$400,000. This loan has not been pursued; moneys would come through this fund.

More than half is not actually here yet. Existing funds are the reserve some \$300,000 and a transfer of 56,000, plus from the General Fund. Half would be property acquisition. Half of the chart is in existence.

Vegetation Management:
\$25,000 Aquatic Vegetation Survey
Grass Carp Study \$28,000
Model \$3,500
Topographic survey \$2,500
Economic Study \$10,000
Grass Carp \$100,000
Total of \$169,000

SOS program
\$7,000

The CAFÉ \$400,000 (loan funds)
This would include Exhibits, Aquariums, Audio/Visual

East Devils Lake Road Project
\$5,000

There is some interest from the County. County has funds to do an assessment for fixing the road. Ranges are from \$7 million up to \$31 million. Proposal is for them to partner with the Salmon Creek Watershed Council who will look for available funds. The ultimate goal is for repairing this roadway that bisects the wetlands and presents a serious impact on wildlife. It would be for emergency access, an escape route and residents' access. We would partner with Lincoln County.

Educational DVD
\$3,500 [The Board appropriated \$1,100 this month for this project.]

Categorization:
Material and Services \$84,627
Personnel Services \$48,880
Capital Outlay \$522,700
Debt Service \$0
Reserve \$103,909

This ended the introduction to the budget. Green asked for a short break prior to questions and comments from the Budget Committee.

Hoover: Noticed a number of places where the dam was referred to as the fish control structure. This has other implications. Has it morphed from fish control structure into a dam?
Robertson said that in 1986 it was placed in as a fish control structure for fish. The carp could not go out the structure.
In 1996, the fish control structure was modified to become a dam and it has been a dam since 1997. Robertson said although it is now only a dam, it does control fish, but not like it used to. As part of this process, about 1996, ODFW ruled that we did not need the fish control structure because if the carp left the system, they would perish in the salt water. The metal fence has been abolished.
Hoover: What authorized it to be there now?
Robertson said it was the Water Right that was received in 1996.

Hoover: What I'm afraid of is that if we call it a dam, we start jumping through hoops by calling it a dam.

Robertson: It was originally a fish control structure and now it impounds water like a dam and it serves as a dam. Carp can leave the system through a hole that is about 8 inches wide and 18 inches high.

Green: It is not a fish control structure anymore. It is a dam. It has artificially increased the lake level above where it would naturally be for over ten years.

Green said he likes the general concept that the budget is not a policy making tool, but rather a process by which we try to keep as many of our funding options open as possible based on future possibilities that we might see.

Hoover said when he sees \$400,000 for a possible purchase that hasn't been made at the request of the Board, it feels like the budget committee is approving something that has not been identified as something the Board desires.

Green said whether it is a 1% possibility or a 70% probability is another question. But it is budgeted for in case the Board decides to make the purchase.

Hoover said he still does not understand why the \$400,000 is being placed in the budget because it is not an active discussion.

Green said that two Board members met with the college president about a possible purchase. If it happens at all, we would like to see it pay for itself. There are a lot of possibilities, so the budget process is partly to create a place holder. We don't want to have to go through a supplemental process if we decide to do the project.

Alex Ward said that this is not a new budget item. It was on the budget last year. From what he understands, it has gone through different phases. There have been a lot of public discussions.

Green said that this does not amount to a statement of policy if it is in the budget. There are enough benefits to the project that we do not want to ignore the possibilities.

Hoover continued to voice his concern that the Café item is in the budget. He does not want to include it in the budget if the Board has not decided to do it.

Green said again, "It is a place holder."

Alex Ward asked if Hoover would feel more comfortable if Robertson added some verbiage to that effect in the Budget?

Green said he feels it would be less appropriate to not include the project in the Budget.

Park said he does not know what the intent of the Board is, because the place holder is substantially lower than the selling price that the college is asking for the property; however, he would like to see it left in there in case the Board can get the price reduced.

Hoover then asked if the \$5,000 for the East Devils Lake Road project had been discussed by the Board--the partnership of the Salmon Creek Watershed Council.

Robertson replied that the Devils Lake Plan includes the café project. It has been adopted by the Board as a possibility. The \$5,000 came about in May; therefore, the Budget Officer is presenting it to the Budget Committee. When the Budget Officer makes an offering he does so with the knowledge that he is proposing this to the Committee. It might be an item that the Board has not yet fully vetted, but it is a direction and scoping for the upcoming year. If this project were not included in the upcoming year, it would have to be fit in as a contingency item or have some other transfer or there would have to be a supplemental budget created. "So as a Budget Officer, it is my duty to provide future possible contingencies as the Lake Manager and the Budget Officer."

He said that the passive language is intentional as he does not wish the Committee to think this is something that is final.

Chair Green asked for public comment.

Public Comment:

Mitchell Moore: He said he had just two comments. Last night, 60 people came to the meeting. He does not want the Committee to think that the public doesn't care about the Budget. He asked the Committee to consider that decisions they make in June might have a large impact. The dam is a major component of what the District does. He said the Board could consider rolling the staff down to a contractor/single, part-time person. The cyanobacteria program is unique. It is monitored. There is no need for a water district and the SOS program is not necessary. The septic system hasn't been of very much interest to the City. The Budget does not need to be so elaborate. The reserve fund is a nest egg for some of the bigger projects. We have the vegetation management program and expenditures there. The SOS program is nibbling away at funds. You might consider what the gaining factor is. Is the reserve a reserve or not? If a large item is necessary, it could be a supplemental budget. Reserve funds don't seem to be too reserved anymore. What does reserve fund actually mean? Should there be a certain process in place? Possibly voters should approve a restricted reserve fund? This is food for thought. I don't want to attack anybody, he said. The District does do a lot of good. There are just a few hot buttons here. Your final hearing for this is at the June meeting.

Committee Discussion:

Alex Ward said this seems like a discussion for a regular Board meeting. As a member of the city council, he feels the city is turning more attention to the lake. Since the election of Kip Ward to the Board, he has seen more interest in the lake, the D River and the mouth of the lake. He feels the lake is a district-wide resource, although he appreciates that lake front home owners carry some of the tax burden.

He offered a few suggestions: We discussed the possibility of creating funds for the dredging of the mouth of the lake and creating more of a waterway there. I'm a member of several civic groups and I see other government bodies with more of a presence. One thing I feel is missing is that there are no board members present in these groups. It's been a culture that the lake is for lake owners; however, it is also for tourism. The beach isn't the only thing we have to sell to the valley. The lake is an incredible asset and many of you have homes there. I would like to see funds made available for a membership to Rotary or to Kiwanis—both would be valuable.

Green said dredging is a large dollar item. We are back to the flexibility issue. Dredging is something that is kind of on the back burner.

Skirvin said that last thing he remembers was there was a cost of \$50,000 to \$60,000 associated with dredging. In the winter, more sand is going to get deposited there all the time. It would be an ongoing yearly or two-yearly maintenance fee. We have not expressed any desire to take that on as a maintenance fee for the District, although I don't know if it's off the table. If it is something that we want to put in the budget, Paul would indicate that there is an allocation there.

Robertson said that funds could be transferred into the maintenance fund where the contractor is. You can move money between funds in order to make changes. For items that are exceeding more than 15%, you have to have a supplemental budget.

Skirvin asked if there is a budgetary item that would accommodate this project.

Robertson said it could be taken out of the improvement fund.

Park said that in looking at the issue of the upper part of the D River, the Board took a position about a year ago and removed some of the logs. Then more sand built up and now you can still walk across it. That park has been a very popular and well-used area. It could be an asset. You could justify funds transfer to take care of that problem. Is this committee setting policy?

Green said we are keeping the Board's options open.

Robertson said you could create the line item. It doesn't fit into vegetation management or watershed protection. They are all material and services. It could just be identified as a line item for dredging the D River.

Walker said that 20 years ago the lake was dredged. They may have done more than is called for here, but obviously they dredged sand. There will always be more sand waiting to take the place of removed sand. How many years did it take that to fill back up again and it looks like it has never been done. He thinks this should be a project for the city. A tourism opportunity should be handled by the city. It's a big project. The city has more money than the District has.

Kip Ward said that we are in a transition stage. We are doing community based projects and struggling with a static budget in trying to address a fluid process. In the end, the lake is dying and until we address that problem, we are shuffling chairs on the Titanic. During upcoming years, we are going to have to change our way of thinking. We are addressing issues for over the next year.

Walker said that the man who spoke at the regular meeting has no history. Dredging was looked at and 10 to 11 million dollars would be needed for whole lake dredging. There is no way we can pay for that. We are looking for band-aid measures and it is impossible when you have this many houses around the lake.

Kip Ward said that we do have some challenges ahead. He said: I was here during that time, also. All I'm saying is that we have a fluid process and we are trying to address a fluid document.

Hoover said he would still like to make the Charter the original intent. He said he went back and took the five priorities of 2010 on Page 5. He does not see the CAFE listed as one of the five priorities.

Robertson said the budget process is incumbent on the budget officer to have a sense of the District and where it is going. A discussion about the budget is prohibited until the budget committee meets. The budget officer collects information throughout the year and determines whether projects should be continued.

Hoover asked if the Board could indicate what the budget officer can include in the budget.

Robertson said that always happens through a goal-setting process. The goal-setting process has been done every two to three years. It could be done every year; however, there is a lot of work that goes into the process. The Board decided to cap the priorities at five. The CAFE was put into the budget last year as an opportunity. The decision making process of the committee last year was that although it wasn't in the top five, there was an opportunity and the District brought it far enough up that the committee and the budget officer thought it warranted inclusion.

Green said to Hoover: All of the information is available in Minutes and Managers Reports on the website every month. You want to make a list of priorities and keep things fluid.

Hoover: If we are going to have a list of the top 5 priorities and there are 22 items, I'm choosing one of the other 17 to be included with the five because this unique opportunity exists. If I include the other 17, I don't doubt that I can research it.

Park said that perhaps it might be useful to explain within the introduction of the budget that the monies to be spent can only exist if the monies are made available. The \$400,000 set up for the

CAFE is not a direction for expenditure unless the money is there. It takes additional action by the Board to obtain the money before it can be spent. It all depends on the availability of the money. Over the years this budget has been in existence, the Board cannot expend this money unless it is available. We are not directing the Board to spend the money unless it is available.

Green said it is not even a direction.

Park said the Board is going to make the decisions; they have to have the money before it can be spent.

Pirie said he provided the Board a one-page summary of a number of motions that he wanted considered that are in the policy area. However, he now doesn't know what he is doing here other than making minor adjustments.

Green said that citizen involvement in the budget committee is where citizens can have input into what the District is doing. Are you making these motions? You are a member of the committee and you can make any motion you want to make.

Pirie read his motion: Whereas the CAFE proposal is felt to be a distraction and not necessary to provide the mission of the DLWID to provide safe lake water at a pool level appropriate for multi-use recreation and free of navigation hindering aquatic vegetation, therefore, it is proposed that all Budget Officer allocations or comments concerning the CAFÉ be eliminated. Specifically, at a minimum, eliminate SB-30 line 10 and Line 26, LB-line 17 and LB-31 line 6.

Hoover seconded the motion.

Hoover said he believes that if the Board is borrowing money, we should put in a line item to borrow money for sewerage and dredging the lake.

Green said another option would be to move to add a line item for anything you wish to add.

Hoover asked why we are limiting it to the CAFÉ.

Walker said he is not a fan of the CAFE at a higher cost, but he is not opposed to it at a lower cost. He sees no problem with leaving it in as a line item. A supplemental budget would be more time consuming.

Green said that supposing the college said they would sell the building for \$100,000; instead of saying yes, we would have to go through a hearing process and a supplemental budget process.

Park said that he noticed in an e-mail there is an issue regarding the lease on existing office space and the District is being recognized as a non-profit. We are paying rent on office space and one of the real reasons for the CAFE is that it would provide a facility for office space and offset the rental of office space. He is in favor of saving the line item to take advantage of the opportunity in case it is available.

Weldon said a lot of discussion has occurred over the last few years and if we could get some place that would be advantageous at \$400,000, the Board would be prudent to look at it.

Voting in favor of Pirie's motion: Pirie and Hoover

Voting in opposition: Walker, Park, Alex Ward, Weldon, Skirvin, Green and Kip Ward.

The motion failed.

Hoover moved to include \$100,000 as a place holder for dredging the lake to provide more awareness of the lake, financed as a loan by the District.

Skirvin seconded the motion.

Robertson said a bond is revenue. If you are using existing funds, you would budget for a requirement and you would basically reduce your items reserved for other projects.

Walker said he does not believe the District should be paying for that project.

Hoover said we are just listing it as a place holder.

Robertson said if it were to come to fruition, you would need some method for debt service.

Discussion on the debt service and a means of paying for the loan.

Robertson said debt service for the CAFE would come through the general fund. If an item is legitimate, it should be included in the budget. If you only want to have \$30,000 for debt service, then you should probably limit your loan activities to \$400,000. Or put more money into it. You would want to take it from the general fund. Borrowing more now is more difficult than it would be in the future. Discussion on the \$30,000 debt service and reduction of the general fund.

Skirvin: Which item in the budget would the down payment come from?

Robertson: We could finance that amount.

Hoover: How much cash assets does the District have?

Robertson: Cash assets of \$345,000 approximately. LB 11-Item 4, working capital, plus transfer from the general fund and a little interest.

Park said he would not be in favor of the logic of borrowing money for a recurring expense for dredging.

Hoover: withdrew his motion and Skirvin withdrew his second.

Hoover then moved to have the committee allow the debt service that is capped at \$30,000 be available for three purposes, sewerage, dredging and/or CAFE by discretion of the Board, to be possible by a resolution of the Board at the time it is needed and that there be placed in the budget a line item in the improvement fund for capital outlay for sewer of \$1 with a subsequent reduction elsewhere in that fund. Hoover added that his motion to include sewerage the lake, and dredging along with the CAFE building could be funded by acquiring debt. Pirie seconded.

Skirvin said he agreed with Hoover that these funds should be available with one line item.

Robertson said they could transfer funds within a fund the total of the fund to other parts, as long as there were at least a \$1 place holder. By resolution it can be accomplished anyway.

You might just want a note. There has been a discussion about having access to funds and if the Board wanted to use those funds, they could transfer them to the material and services portion.

Park asked about the issue of sewerage being a city issue rather than a District issue.

Hoover said that a bond, a cost estimate, and a feasibility study put out to contract would not be within the scope of the city.

Hoover withdrew his motion and Pirie, his second.

Skirvin moved to allow debt service to be used for consulting services related to sewerage and for contracts related to dredging in the improvement fund. Hoover seconded.

Walker opposed. Alex Ward, Kip Ward, Park, Skirvin, Green, Weldon, Hoover and Pirie voted Yes. Motion passed.

Green called for a one-half hour lunch break.

Pirie asked about LB 11, Line 26 Capital outlay for the Café, a total of \$401,000—what is the \$1,000?

Robertson said the \$1,000 was for a matching grant item that the city had requested for an OWEB grant. They were not awarded the grant; however, they could reapply.

Pirie made another motion: Whereas there is concern about the future size and purpose of a District and we would like to see the District get back to fundamentals, Pirie moved to delete the funds in LB 11-Line 22 of \$48,800 for the project manager.

Hoover seconded the motion.

Alex Ward said that Pirie assumed that the septic inspections had been deleted because the city is no longer interested in participating in the project. As a city councilor, Ward said, he can attest that the city is interested in pursuing this project and wants to get the job done. The county is involved and there are many issues that the city is working on, including Roads End annexation. There will be hurdles because the city is a large entity of bureaucracy and these things take time. The city councilors are eager to get through the process. There is a lot on the city manager's plate right now; however, if you remove the project manager from the process, the project might just go away. Alex Ward said he is also curious about the SOS project; he was under the impression that it is an ongoing project. He was not aware that there was an end to it.

Robertson said that the SOS project is an ongoing project. It will be part and parcel of the services costs that are in the budget.

Alex Ward said that having addressed those issues, Seth should be commended for his hard work. Alex said he would vote against this motion.

Hoover said he realizes that there is a need to have someone out doing projects. His concern is that he hasn't observed a clear goal that has been stated or a cost related to the goals that are set or what we are receiving for the \$50,000. He said if we are talking about septic systems around the lake reducing nutrients by "x" amount, then this salaried position is a good use of money. We are paying a salary to someone and we do not know whether the septic systems are contributing to 5 or 10 percent of the problem. What are we getting in return for this expenditure? Is there a measurable return that justifies \$50,000 or is that on a list of 22 projects? It's about what that position actually accomplishes. Regarding the inspection program that Mr. Ward referred to, at the last meeting, it seemed that the city was hesitant to be involved in this project because of liability and they did not wish to proceed with the project.

Walker said that Lenaerts is extremely capable; however, Walker doubts that Lenaerts wants this job to be his entire future. Walker would like to see this position end after some of these important projects have been completed—sometime in the future, but perhaps not this year.

Skirvin said goals and targets are important. This is a decision for the Board to make. We don't know what the Board will decide this upcoming month; but these are Board decisions. He trusts the Board to make the decision and to establish goals that Lenaerts would be able to attain.

Pirie said he would like to see some time-lines and asked how long is this temporary position going to continue?

Pirie withdrew his motion. Hoover withdrew his second.

Pirie moved to convert the reserve fund of \$760,000 to a restricted reserve fund with the maximum possible percentage being accessible. Hoover seconded the motion.

Discussion continued on the question of whether all \$760,000 was accessible.

Robertson said that current access is laid out in last year's budget—whatever the appropriations were laid out in that budget are available through June 30 of this year.

Skirvin said the District has a solid history of being very frugal with its money; we've built up a reserve fund by being thrifty. He does not understand why the District cannot appropriate the available funds. Is it because someone is not getting everything they want out of the Board?

In his opinion, there is no evidence that the Board has wasted any money over the years.

Pirie said this would be to keep the Board from taking advantage of fliers, such as the CAFE. When the amount is something that large, it's an expenditure that you may need for dredging or other emergencies. It should not be spent on a flier.

Hoover said that his response would be that if the makeup of the Board changes over the next few years and the Board decided to put in 100-foot dock for skiing competitions for people, that might not be the intent of the taxing District and it would give the voters more opportunity to be involved. Kip Ward said he finds this motion to be punitive, frivolous and unhelpful. He questions the intent. Walker said he thinks the intent is good; however, he does not think the issue of timeliness came up. If the college wanted to sell the building for a good price and we can get it for \$300,000, how long would that take? I think the Board would like to have more control. He would not be in favor of the motion.

Skirvin asked what it would take to get the money out of a fund. Robertson responded it would take a supplemental budget.

Vote: Pirie, Yes.

Alex Ward, Kip Ward, Walker, Park, Weldon, Green voted No.

Skirvin was absent.

The motion failed.

Hoover asked if there were any staff pay increases in the budget.

Discussion on whether or not the Board had the option to give an increase in pay.

Robertson said that the current contract is below what was budgeted last year. The Board can allow an increase in salary if they wish—it would be within the current budget. The amount available is 104 percent of the current contract. The last two full cycles there has been a 4 percent opportunity for the Board to change the contract and they have not done so.

Kip Ward asked if that means that the Board is limited to 4 percent.

Robertson said within the fund, you can move an amount through resolution.

Hoover asked if the project manager's salary can be increased as well.

Robertson said this budget allows a 3 or 4 percent increase above last year's budget.

Hoover said he is concerned that the \$5,000 for the Drift Creek Watershed Council item was glossed over. He asked if we are funding labor for studies. Why is it \$5,000? What are we gaining?

Robertson said we would be offering \$5,000 as a partnership with the Salmon Drift Creek Watershed Council during the current year to support a grant that is also partnered by the County who may provide \$25,000. The total would cost about \$30,000.

Park said that this is an appropriation item for the Board.

Green said it is potentially a great opportunity for the cost.

Green moved that the Budget Committee recommend to the District Board adoption of the Budget for the DLWID, Version 2012-2013, as amended by motions at this meeting.

Alex Ward seconded the motion.

Robertson will include the original Charter.

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

Robertson requested a motion relative to setting the tax assessments for the year.

Skirvin moved that the Committee adopt the tax rates in the LB50 attachments of .2499/1000 inside the watershed and .128/1000 outside the watershed.

Green seconded the motion.

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

Skirvin signed the Resolution.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Burt