

Reading Municipal Light Board of Commissioners

Regular Session

230 Ash Street
Reading, MA 01867

May 7, 2003

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MASS.

2003 AUG -7 P 1:33

Start Time of Regular Session: 7:35 p.m.
End Time of Regular Session: 9:34 p.m.

Attendees:

Commissioners: Pacino, Hughes, Herlihy, Soli, and Ensminger

RMLD Staff: Messrs. Cameron, Blomley, Butler, Fournier, and Kazanjian
Mses. Antonio and O'Leary

CAB: Mr. Carakatsane

Guests: Mr. Cummings, Reading Board of Selectmen
Mr. Dick Nelson, Nelson Adam & Dickson, P.C.
Mr. Kevin McConnell, Nelson Adam & Dickson, P.C.

This meeting of the Reading Municipal Light Department (RMLD) Board of Commissioners 7 May 2003 is not being broadcast live this evening. Videotapes will be available for distribution to the community television stations in North Reading, Wilmington and Lynnfield.

Chairman Pacino called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Action Item(s)

Mr. Cameron introduced Messrs. Dick Nelson and Kevin McConnell of Nelson, Adam & Dickson, P.C., and noted their attendance at this evening's meeting to give a brief presentation of the RMLD's 2002 Financial Statements and the 2002 Retirement Trust.

Mr. Pacino noted the RMLD Board of Commissioners Audit Sub-Committee met with Nelson, Adam and Dickson last Monday evening, May 5, 2003 to discuss the finalities of the 2002 Audit.

2002 Employees' Retirement Trust Statements

Mr. Nelson began the presentation by addressing the question asked by the Audit Sub-Committee relative to the Retirement Trust Funding progress noting that information is not available in the actuarial report because it is not a required disclosure. Mr. Nelson stated the Audit Sub-Committee asked what the funding status of the trust is in relation to the obligations and what the assets are in the trust. Mr. Nelson stated he understands another report will be issued shortly and if the Audit Sub-Committee wants such a disclosure made in a subsequent year, the Sub-Committee will have to speak with the Actuary to get the information arranged in order to make such a disclosure. Mr. Nelson then noted the Retirement Trust on page three a statement of changes in net assets shows the funding that came in during the current year. The changes consist of a contribution from the Light Department of \$181,165, investment income of \$418,286 and the assets appreciated in value due to a decline in interest rates during the 2001 and 2002 years. The deduction that occurred during the year were contributions made to the Town Retirement system and those expenses exceeded the current year additions therefore you have assets available for benefits of \$8,356,521 at the end of 2001 and \$8,305,474 at the end of 2002. On page two, Mr. Nelson explained this page shows the component of the asset which made up that \$8,305,474 which consists of cash of \$34,712; investments with a market value of \$8,349,018; accrued interest receivable of \$64,166, and monies due to the RMLD of \$190,252. The latter amount was funding that was due to the Department that had not yet been made as of December 31, 2002 and there was a liability that RMLD had not paid as of December 31, 2002 which is its share of expenses attributed to the non-contributory retirement payment of \$18,574. As he continued, Mr. Nelson stated on page four there is a statement included of cash flow which basically show changes in the investment during the course of the year that is self-explanatory. Lastly, Mr. Nelson pointed out the series of disclosures in the footnotes included on pages five, six and seven. The supplementary footnote has to do with the disclosures that were discussed at the Sub-Committee meeting which are the required disclosures with respect to the aggregate funding method that is being used by the actuary. Mr. Nelson noted these disclosures show the amount of annual contributions over the last six years and the required contributions.

Mr. Hughes questioned why an amount due to the Town of Reading on page seven in the amount of \$18,574 for the 2002 non-contributory Retirement Pensions is outstanding.

Action Item(s)

2002 Employees' Retirement Trust Statements

Mr. Fournier explained there was no definitive reason why the amount was not paid, it just did not get paid by the end of the year. Mr. Fournier also explained that every autumn the Town of Reading submits their invoice to the Light Department, the contributory and non-contributory portion of the Pension Trust expenses. The contributory portion of \$825,000 was made, however, the \$18,574 was made subsequently in January of 2003 because the \$18,574 was simply omitted from the transfer in 2002.

Brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Ensminger questioned on page five under Membership it indicates the membership of the Light Department as of January 1, 2001 and gave its last actuarial valuation, has there been any other evaluation since then?

Mr. Nelson's evaluations are compiled bi-annually and there is one being worked on currently so that is the most current data we have.

Mr. Pacino noted the evaluations have always been done every other year.

Mr. Ensminger questioned whether these numbers have shifted significantly and if there is preliminary data on that?

Mr. Fournier stated he would have to go back and look.

Mr. Pacino suggested Mr. Fournier check with Ms. Klepeis at the Reading Treasurers' office and get the answer back to Mr. Ensminger.

Mr. Ensminger then asked what is the timeframe of the vesting policy?

Mr. Cameron replied it is 10 years for employees.

Mr. Pacino stated the Audit Sub-Committee reviewed the reports and recommended the RMLD Board accept this. Mr. Pacino reminded the Board if they accept this, it would be accepting it as Trustees of the Pension Trust and that is a different category than accepting it as a member of the Board. Mr. Pacino stated these investments had an increase in value and also noted the question that was asked relative to the monies owed to the Town of Reading that was commented on the Management Report. The Sub-Committee is meeting with the Accounting Chief in order to review and discuss. Mr. Pacino stated the Sub-Committee consists of Commissioners Soli and Ensminger. Mr. Pacino then asked for a motion to accept the Financial Statements as presented.

Motion

Mr. Soli made a motion seconded by Mr. Hughes to move that the 2002 Employees' Retirement Trust Statements from Nelson, Adam & Dickson, P.C., be accepted on the recommendation of the RMLD Board of Commissioners Audit Sub-Committee.

Motion carried: 5:0:0.

2002 Audited Financial Statements

Mr. McConnell began his presentation of the 2002 Audited Financial Statements on page 20, the last page of the report, Schedules of Operating Revenues. Mr. McConnell noted the total operating revenues was down by \$10,205,249 with a portion due to \$6.6 million in Rate Stabilization refunds; the next highest change was in the Commercial and Industrial Sales, which showed a decrease of \$3,089,453. The \$3,089,453 decrease was caused by a decrease in kilowatt-hour sales due to industry cutbacks and companies leaving the system. Also reflected in that is the PPA adjustment for the second half of the year of 2002. Mr. McConnell referred to page three which is the Statement of Income and Analysis of Surplus, noting at the top of the page the Operating Revenues and the \$10,205,249 decrease in revenues previously reviewed. Further on that page the Operating Expenses are seen to decrease by about \$7.7 million; this consists of a decrease in the base purchase power about \$4.4 million and a decrease in the fuel expenses of about \$3.6 million which totals about \$8 million. Mr. McConnell stated there were some smaller increases, the largest of those were a property insurance increase by \$200,000; benefits increase by about \$300,000 and outside services that include legal fees increased by \$140,000.

Action Item(s)

2002 Audited Financial Statements

Mr. McConnell explained further down the page, on Interest and Dividend Income there was a decrease of \$322,695 consisting in part of changes of earned interest on the depreciation fund and the Rate Stabilization fund. The depreciation interest decreased by \$168,000 and the Rate Stabilization interest decreased from the prior year of about \$126,000. The next major item Mr. McConnell reviewed was under Miscellaneous Income Deduction. The major change in that item was a one time litigation settlement this year of \$432,119.

Mr. Pacino pointed out under Other Income and Miscellaneous Deductions there is an item for Contract Work and Streetlights and stated that was the outside business where the Department lost \$200,000 during the first year, however, this past year that number was reduced to \$30,000 due to new management. The litigation settlement was the major law case that has now been settled.

Mr. McConnell resumed his presentation explaining the balance sheet on page two noting the item of Current and Accrued Assets there is a shift in Operating Marketable Securities of about \$3 million while Customer Accounts Receivables decreased by about \$923,194. As Mr. McConnell noted, the Prepayments had major decrease of \$825,046 and that constituted a decrease in the Prepaid Insurance and a negative of \$700,000 change in prepaid for this year. Mr. McConnell pointed out under Current and Accrued Liabilities the accounts payable decreased by about \$1,960,496 and the main item responsible for that decrease was purchased power which decreased by \$1.9 million. Mr. McConnell continued, stating that "Other Accrued Expenses" increased by about \$635,000, due to the Pension Trust (\$182,000), an increase in the accrued payroll (\$21,000), and the litigation settlement accrued at the end of the year (\$432,000). The final item Mr. McConnell reviewed on the balance sheet was the Other Deferred Credits, which showed a decrease by \$1.5 million for deferred fuel credit.

Mr. Herlihy questioned under Current and Accrued Liabilities, did the audit reveal any reduction in accounts payable that wasn't contributed to purchase power?

Mr. McConnell replied he did not have the details with him but stated the major portion of the change was due to the purchase power.

Mr. Pacino asked Mr. Fournier to get a breakdown of the accounts payable between purchase power and any other major category that may be appropriate, showing the 2002 and 2001 figures for the Board in addition to the breakdown of those numbers on page three of the Operating Expense as requested by the Audit Sub-Committee.

Mr. Fournier stated the internal RMLD Statement is in the back of the room and they can be picked up on the way out of the meeting.

Mr. Ensminger asked how the value of the transmission and distribution plant, or general plant, was determined and how are the fluctuations assessed from year to year? Mr. McConnell replied the valuation of plant is at cost so all the assets are carried at cost and the DTE approves the depreciation rate which is a standard 3% depreciation although the past few years it has been 5% depreciation.

Mr. McConnell then explained the question raised by the Audit Sub-Committee about the footnotes that are included on page seventeen relative to disclosing activity with RCTV and noted the second footnote question from the Audit Sub-Committee was relative to the disclosure on the Pension Trust that Mr. Dickson already reviewed. The last change reviewed by the Audit Sub-Committee was an addition on page nine, second paragraph from the last note "B" regarding a withdrawal from Energy New England.

Mr. Pacino stated there is an investment balance that is a worthless investment right now and asked Mr. Cameron to elaborate.

Mr. Cameron noted he received the ENE financials on Monday and stated he didn't plan to discuss this subject until the next Board meeting because he has not actually discussed this with ENE as yet, however, by reviewing the ENE financials it appears the formula ENE uses values the equity and liabilities and as of the end of December the liability portion of ENE is much larger than our equity position. Therefore, the ENE Auditors determine ENE owes us nothing.

Action Item(s)

2002 Audited Financial Statements

Mr. Herlihy questioned if that meant the RMLD lost \$500,000?

Mr. Cameron stated that is what he interprets by reviewing the financials although, as he stated, he still needs to discuss this with ENE and obtain further information. Mr. Cameron will return to the Board with the information once received.

Mr. Pacino then asked for a motion to accept the 2002 Audited Financial Statements.

Motion:

Mr. Soli made a motion seconded by Mr. Hughes to move that 2002 Audited Financial Statements from Nelson, Adam & Dickson, P.C., be accepted on the recommendation of the RMLD Board of Commissioner's Audit Sub-Committee.

Motion carried: 5:0:0.

Nelson, Adam, and Dickson, P.C.

Mr. Pacino thanked Nelson, Adam, and Dickson, P.C. for their presentation for the past three years of service. Mr. Pacino explained this is the third year of Nelson, Adam, and Dickson's contract and stated the RMLD is in a state of transition concerning auditors and not sure where that will lead.

Mr. Cummings then asked Mr. Pacino to read the paragraph relative to ENE for the audience.

Mr. Pacino read, "In December of 2002 the Department gave notice of withdrawal from Energy New England, LLC, the termination becomes effective in December 2003, how much of the Department's equity in ENE that will be recovered will be determined by a formula in December of 2003. As a result the Department's equity position in ENE on the effective date of the withdrawal is at risk."

Minutes of March 18, 2003

Mr. Soli made a motion seconded by Mr. Herlihy to approve the minutes of March 18, 2003 as presented.

Motion carried by a show of hands: 4:0:1. Mr. Ensminger abstained as he was not in attendance at the meeting.

Minutes of April 3, 2003

Mr. Soli noted two changes needed on pages six and nine. On page six, last paragraph, seventh line down, the last word should be "service at" not "service is" and two lines down a hyphen needs to be added on de-seasonalize. Mr. Soli also noted on page nine, first paragraph, last line, "not" should be added between the words "should and out."

Mr. Herlihy made a motion seconded by Mr. Hughes to approve the minutes of April 3, 2003 with changes presented by Mr. Soli.

Motion carried by a show of hands: 5:0:0.

Landscaping Bid

Mr. Cameron stated this Landscaping Bid was sent to many companies and only received one bid in return.

Mr. Blomley explained this bid was advertised and sent to 37 firms; the first group of firms was obtained by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the remaining firms were those who expressed interest in the past. The bid was also advertised in the local newspaper and two site visits were held prior to the bid opening, however, only one firm attended the site visit, that is the firm who actually bid. This new bid was proposed for three years, 2003, 2004, and 2005 and the only exclusion in the year 2003 was the spring cleanup because that is complete. The one bid was got was received from David Linehan & Son (Linehan Landscaping and Fuel). The bid was reviewed, analyzed and evaluated by the General Manager and the RMLD staff. The cost was year 2003 - \$28,200; year 2004 - \$37,200; year 2005 - \$41,700.

Mr. Cameron made a point stating the RMLD requires \$5,000,000 for insurance coverage and that is one of the reasons not as many firms responded. Mr. Cameron stated two years ago one of the landscape contractors was severely injured on the RMLD property and that is the reason for the insurance requirement.

Mr. Pacino stated this is the first bid the Board has needed to review since the extensive discussion of 30B and questioned how 30B would have affected this particular bid?

Action Item(s)

Landscaping Bid

Mr. Cameron stated 30B would not have affected this bid because it is over the \$25,000 threshold.

Extensive discussion ensued.

Mr. Soli made a motion seconded by Mr. Hughes to move that Bid 2003-7, for Groundskeeping/Landscaping Services be awarded to David Linehan & Son as the lowest qualified bidder for a total of, Year 2003 - \$28,200; Year 2004 - \$37,200; Year 2005 - \$41,700; Labor Hour Rate \$37.50; Seed cost - \$.75 per square foot; Sod cost - \$9.00 per 9 square feet on the recommendation of the General Manager and RMLD staff. The Operating Budget for this item for year 2003 is \$37,200. The budget includes general maintenance and also accident, environmental and lawn damage repairs.

Motion carried: 4:1:0. Mr. Herlihy voted against this motion.

Report of the Chairman of the Board

Mr. Pacino noted the presentation on Article 7 was made at Reading Town Meeting and Town Meeting did vote to go forward with the action that the Ad Hoc Committee has recommended. Mr. Pacino stated he found it interesting that when the RMLD Board received their legal opinion they shared it with the Reading Board of Selectmen immediately, however, the Reading Board of Selectmen has yet to send their legal opinion to the Board.

Mr. Pacino also stated that technically the RMLD is owned by the Town of Reading, although it is extremely important to remember who the RMLD customers are. Mr. Pacino also stated he met with the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen after the Town Meeting and they decided to schedule a meeting of the two Boards in an attempt to improve the communication between the RMLD Board and the Reading Board of Selectmen.

Discussion then ensued relative to the RMLD presentation to the Town Meeting.

As CAB member, Mr. Carakatsane commented the approval of Article 7, which has been changed several times from what was originally proposed, was not unexpected. Mr. Carakatsane stated the CAB is still very interested in pursuing special legislation so the majority of the proposals can be legally adopted. From the CAB standpoint is that offer has been ignored by the Town of Reading and the Reading Board of Selectmen attempted to meet with the area Boards of Selectmen prior to Town Meeting and the feedback he received was not positive at all from at least two of the other Towns. As a Lynnfield representative, Mr. Carakatsane noted that Lynnfield is still interested in the majority of the proposed changes in one form or another being legally adopted, however, it will require various people legitimately and respectfully communicating and unfortunately, that has not happened.

Mr. Cameron noted the Article has not been sent to the Attorney General, as yet. Mr. Cameron also noted he will come back to the Board once he knows what has been sent to the Attorney General.

Mr. Carakatsane stated the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen has made it widely known that they will be forming a legal opinion.

Mr. Pacino asked Mr. Carakatsane, if this had gone through a Special Legislation would you, as representative of Lynnfield, recommend to the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen to support this without change?

Mr. Carakatsane stated the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen support everything except the designation of 30B, however, it is their opinion the only way it can be adopted is by Special Legislation. Mr. Carakatsane stated it is fully expected the Attorney General will reject it very quickly.

Reorganization of the RMLD Board of Commissioners GM Contract Committee/Sub-Committee

Mr. Pacino noted during reorganization of the RMLD Board of Commissioners Sub-Committees, no formal vote was taken relative to the GM Contract Sub-Committee and stated the individuals on that Committee is Mr. Soli and himself. Mr. Pacino stated they are scheduled to meet with the General Manager relative to his contact this Thursday, May 8, 2003 at 9:00 a.m., and will return to the Board with an update.

Mr. Hughes suggested a formal vote should be made relative to the GM Contract Sub-Committee, however, when asked the Board for input it was unanimously agreed the Sub-Committee remain as currently staffed.

Selectmen Liaison and Customer Comments

Mr. Carakatsane stated the CAB is happy that the Board adopted the various refunds and rate changes.

General Manager's Report

2003 Annual Northeast Public Power Association (NEPPA) Conference

Mr. Cameron noted the information enclosed in the Board book relative to the NEPPA Conference that will take place in Groton, CT at the Mystic Marriott Hotel from August 17 to August 20, 2003 and ask the Commissioners if they were interested in attending. Mr. Cameron stated reservations need to be made by July 19 to avoid late registration charges. Mr. Cameron noted guests are welcome although they need to be paid for personally. The RMLD will pay for the Commissioners to attend the conference, their hotel room, meals, mileage and other related expenses, however, the Commissioners will need to pay for their guests' meals, tours, etc., on their own. Mr. Cameron noted the golf tournament is also separate and any Commissioner wishing to play in the tournament would need to pay their own way as well.

Commissioners Pacino, Hughes, Soli, and Ensminger expressed their interest in attending.

Mr. Hughes asked if the CAB has any interest in attending this conference.

Mr. Cameron told him Ms. O'Leary is currently coordinating with the CAB members on this issue.

Nominations for NEPPA Annual Awards

Mr. Cameron noted the Director of NEPPA, Mr. Pat Hyland, told him that his research found that Allan Ames has never received a NEPPA Service Award.

Mr. Hughes made a motion seconded by Mr. Soli to move that Allan Ames receive the NEPPA Commissioner Service Award.

Motion carried: 5:0:0.

Mr. Cameron confirmed with Mr. Hyland, Director of NEPPA, that there would be no charge for Mr. Ames' to attend the NEPPA Annual Conference for one night in order to receive his award. Mr. Cameron noted the only cost would be for the hotel room and mileage.

It was the sense of the RMLD Board of Commissioners that given 28 years of volunteer service on the RMLD Board of Commissioners, the RMLD should pay for Mr. Ames hotel room and mileage to attend in order to receive this award.

Mr. Hughes asked when Mr. Ames will be awarded with his meter lamp?

Mr. Cameron stated Mr. Ames has been contacted and are awaiting his availability in order to schedule the meter lamp presentation at a RMLD Board meeting.

Board Discussion

Presentations (Ten Minute) at RMLD Board Meetings (Vice Chair Hughes)

Mr. Hughes stated he was concerned with the atmosphere that was projected at Town Meeting, in particular toward the Department by the members of the audience. Mr. Hughes stated he was also quite concerned about a previous Board Meeting that was conducted while he was still Chairman by one member of the CAB. Mr. Hughes wanted to go on record by saying he was concerned about the Chairman's recent statement that presentations at the RMLD Board be limited to one per meeting and not to exceed 10 minutes. Mr. Hughes suggested that all presentations should be submitted to the General Manager and the Chairman of the Board for approval and inclusion on the agenda by Wednesday prior to the meeting. This includes the RMLD Board members, CAB Board members, Task Force members, Ad Hoc Committee members and Selectmen Liaison members. Mr. Hughes stated this is similar to the rules set out for the Board and is included in Agenda Item 7a. Mr. Hughes noted presentations are submitted by Wednesday prior to the meeting, it will give the Department and the Chairman time to review the presentation and prepare any necessary responses to it, this also prevents the Board from being blindsided. If more than one presentation is received by the RMLD for a Board meeting the presentations will be scheduled on a first come, first serve basis.

Board Discussion

Presentations (Ten Minute) at RMLD Board Meetings (Vice Chair Hughes)

Mr. Pacino stated if someone wants to make a presentation on the overhead projector that it will be limited to 10 minutes and he will allow that. Mr. Pacino stated it is difficult to ask somebody outside to actually get their presentation to the GM in advance, however, it will need to be given to the him at the start of the meeting so he may determine if it is appropriate

Rate Comparisons - April, 2003

Mr. Cameron informed the Board the April 2003 rate comparisons are not too different from March, 2003. Mr. Cameron stated Peabody and Middleton residential time of use rate are still below the RMLD, however, Middleton is below RMLD on the Commercial and Commercial Time of Use Rate. RMLD was the lowest on the Commercial and Commercial Time of Use Rate however since the RMLD fuel charge went up to 4 cents per kWh although for May the fuel charge has gone down to 3.5 cents per kWh and the fuel charge will probably stabilized around 4 cents until the end of the year.

Mr. Pacino asked if this is before the rate decrease has been put into effect and asked what the status of that is as of now and if it has been filed with the DTE?

Mr. Cameron replied it has been filed with the DTE as of April 1, 2003 and he has a stamped copy of what has been filed and is waiting until June 1.

**The FERC Standard Market Design White Paper (Commissioner Herlihy)
RMLD Fleet Vehicle Update (Commissioner Herlihy)**

Mr. Herlihy noted while at the Reading Town Meeting there was some interest concerning the whole Standard Market Design (SMD) issue. Mr. Herlihy stated he asked the General Manager to update us on this issue.

The FERC Standard Market Design White Paper

Mr. Cameron stated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has reviewed the Standard Market Design (SMD) for the whole United States. Mr. Cameron informed the Commission that New England operates under a SMD and has the rules in place regarding pricing, congestion management, and transmission issues. The rules are not unlike what is going on in Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, etc. Mr. Cameron noted the FERC is trying to put a set of rules together that could apply to all the different parts of the United States. Different areas have different rules relative to the power supply going over control area borders. Mr. Cameron also stated he reviewed the white paper that FERC has distributed and it is a 30,000 foot level of SMD and there is not a lot of specifics. Mr. Cameron will update the Board further as it progresses.

RMLD Fleet Vehicle Update

Mr. Herlihy stated at the Reading Town Meeting the role of the Board under the charter was reviewed and one of the items that interest him was that the Board is ultimately responsible for equipment and supplies of the Department. Mr. Herlihy stated that if that is the case then the Board should have an annual update on those items especially on vehicles and is quite pleased to have received the report in such a timely fashion.

Mr. Soli questioned who monitors the employee safety requirements.

Mr. Blomley replied there is a National Electric Safety Code as far as the personnel and equipment are concerned. Mr. Blomley stated the balance of that is on the manufacturer's recommendation on their equipment.

Mr. Cameron noted last week he met with the Town Manager, the DPW Director, Mike de Brigard from DPW, and Jim Blomley. Mr. Cameron noted the possibility of joint maintenance of the DPW and RMLD vehicles was discussed and the possibility is being studied.

Letter from Ratepayer, John Ronayne

Mr. Cameron said that a letter was received from John Ronayne, a ratepayer, thanking the RMLD for taking care of a dangerous situation where wires were hanging over some trees in the area.

Mr. Pacino reminded Mr. Cameron to follow-up with scheduling a meeting for the RMLD Board of Commissioners to meet with the Finance Committee in order to make a presentation of the RMLD Budget.

Board Discussion

Letter from Ratepayer, John Ronayne

Mr. Pacino noted the next meeting dates are Wednesday, May 29 and Wednesday, June 11.

Mr. Hughes asked the Chairman if the Commission could meet one meeting per month during the summer.

Mr. Pacino stated he will check the schedule and return for discussion.

Mr. Ensminger suggested meeting every third week as a compromise.

Motion to Adjourn

At 9:34 p.m. Mr. Ensminger made a motion seconded by Mr. Herlihy to adjourn the regular session.

Motion carried by a show of hands 5:0:0.

Mr. Pacino called for a poll of the vote:

Mr. Soli Aye; Mr. Herlihy Aye; Mr. Hughes Aye; and Mr. Ensminger Aye; Mr. Pacino Aye.

A true copy of the RMLD Board of Commissioners minutes as approved by a majority of the Commission.

Daniel A. Ensminger, Secretary
RMLD Board of Commissioners