

J.T. LANE: Good morning everyone. We've had some audio, visual issues in the room over the past week, so we sort of have a makeshift solution, right Sheree? So everybody has mics. We've got these sort of spaced out. Whenever you are speaking, if you can just turn it on and turn it off when you're done so we don't have feedback issues with the camera in the back. Thanks everybody for coming out. I think we'll start with role call.

SHEREE TAILLON: Dirk Barrios, Vern Breland, Ben Bridges, Robert Brou, Jeffrey Duplantis, Greg Gordon, Jimmy Guidry, Jimmy Hagan, Randy Hollis, Pat Kerr, J.T. Lane, Rick Nowlin, Rusty Reeves, Chris Richard, Keith Shackelford, Cheryl Slavant, Delos Williams. We do have a quorum.

J.T. LANE: Welcome again. I had wanted to get started with something I know that we've all been reading a lot about in the news and hearing about, and that was the issue in St. Bernard public health. The department is very involved in the response and working with the parish and our federal partners on that issue in the parish. And I thought that before we got started today it might be a good idea that if any of you had questions or comments that you wanted to share, or get answered by me, or Dr. Guidry, or Jake. But, also, I've invited Senator Morrell to offer his comments on what he's hearing from the community and the response thus far and share with us his prospective as sort of I think a timely reminder of how important the work that we're doing the next year is going to be for all of us. With that, I'll turn it over to the Senator to make a few remarks.

JEAN-PAUL MORRELL: In my district, I represent half of St. Bernard Parish. I'm sure as you've been made aware, because of the national attention, an amoeba, a parasitic amoeba that is brain eating was found in the parish water supply. And the response by DHH, in particular by OPH, has been tremendous in trying to provide resources to people in St. Bernard. We had a meeting this past Monday and it made a visible difference in the way people in St. Bernard felt about water safety. Let me clarify. In early September when this story broke and this amoeba was found in the water supply, obviously there was a tremendous amount of panic by people. Because, as you all know, the idea if you get water up your nose in the bathtub you might die, obviously causes a little bit of concern. And the work y'all

are doing here is tremendous because what you guys are doing is help to codify and really create stringent standards for water safety. And if anything, St. Bernard has proven how important that is that y'all guys' work continues. Some of the concerns people had were basic stuff during this meeting. Stuff like: what is the chlorine standard supposed to be in the water supply? And when parish officials weren't able to provide definitive answers to those issues at their Thursday meeting when the state came down, when DHH came down, both with CDC and EPA to provide answers to very basic questions. Like I said, you went from a very panicked populous to a populous that was still very concerned, but with the excellent information and the ability to combat misinformation that meeting provided it has changed a lot of the tenure how people feel in St. Bernard Parish. But going forward, I think that when you look at what happened in St. Bernard, something that people don't realize, this amoeba parasite, in particular. Dr. Guidry, or Jake, or someone wants to go into it. It's actually pretty common in the State of Louisiana, in general. If you go swimming in a bayou or a lake in Louisiana you're pretty much doing it at your own risk, with something like this. The difference is that with the standards that DHH holds municipal water supplies to, that is why this incident was so shocking. And people were surprised it happened because in properly managed water supplies, proper chloride levels, this amoeba should not be present. The work y'all do here is so immensely important because when you guys set those standards and what parishes and municipalities follow it, something like this doesn't happen. I just wanted to come here today and thank DHH, thank OPH for being at the meeting. Thank you for bringing CDC and EPA. That was a tremendous help because it's always great to have both state and federal players in the same room to deal with constituent's questions and concerns. And going forward one of the things that came out in the meeting, which I think is very important for ya'll to contemplate, is there was some concerns that may be we should revisit what our minimum chloride levels are. Because like I said, this amoeba exists in the State of Louisiana, just in general. If it would make our water supplies more safe to have a higher mandated chloride level. Something that you guys should consider because I would hate for the tragedy that happened in St. Bernard to repeat itself somewhere else. Thank you. And I have to

apologize. I have another thing I have to go to, so I'll be slipping out of here briefly.

J.T. LANE: Thank you. So with that and just given all the information and the coverage around all this, I really wanted to just take a few minutes to, I guess, open it up to the committee members to see if you guys had any comments or questions of myself, Dr. Guidry, or Jake, or Caryn about what has transpired, or any of the events around this particular incident. So we'll get started. Thank you Senator very much. Next, on our agenda is old business and approval of the minutes. I think Sheree received those already?

SHEREE TAILLON: Yes.

RICK NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman, we had received the minutes and I think Ms. Hebert did a great job. There are a few instances of some typos, primarily due to technical language, or what have you. Like on page 54. Code form should have been coli form, that sort of thing. I've gone over with Ms. Hebert. I'd like to ask that-- nothing to change the context, but those corrections to be made per my discussion with her. We can go through them one at a time if you want to, but I'd rather not take up the time because it doesn't change the meaning or context. Simply I think, no offense, maybe a nontechnical person recording a technical discussion.

SHEREE TAILLON: If everyone else agrees, we will take a vote to approve the minutes. All in favor? Any opposed?

J.T. LANE: Now on to new business. We have three major new business agenda items. The first of which is to establish a number of subcommittees for our work going forward. The four that we had initially outlined I will go over real quickly. General design and source development. Treatment and chemical application would be number two. Subcommittee three, pumping facility and finish water storage. And number four, distribution system and backflow protection. Those were the four. And ideally what we were thinking is that we have three people on each subcommittee. One committee member on each subcommittee. We have three volunteers thus far for individuals to serve on subcommittee of the committee. And then have two nonmembers for each subcommittee based on

that. We have those four thus far. Is there any discussion, or addition that you would like to discuss, or around the subcommittee assignments? Those four topic areas.

RANDY HOLLIS: Mr. Chairman, Randy Hollis. The formation of subcommittees was explained to us during the last meeting as to very strict regiment and having to hold public hearings, to have public notices. And our concern is that we need input from homer to home up, from every operator, from every engineer, and every person in this state who can not travel to Baton Rouge to attend these meetings. And so the formation of subcommittees and the rules that were outlined to us is really going to tie our hands in the input that we can have in these documents that are going to be critical from now on. What I would like to suggest is, can we not use subcommittees and can instead have a person on this committee be a leader of a forum? The forum would be an open meeting by webinars, or by public meetings, or whatever that wouldn't be so hamstrung with the requirements for subcommittees to gather information. To look at a specific part of the ten state standards via section one through nine and to try and put together a document that reflects everyone's input. Not just two people on the committee and two or three others. In doing so, that person would then bring back to this committee a section of ten state standards. That section would then be presented to the committee at one meeting. We would have a month to look at it, and then we could vote on that as a committee and discuss it openly in a public meeting all the comments about that section at the next meeting. And I think that better suits the intent of what we're trying to do to develop standards to this entire state, rather than tying our hands in a subcommittee format.

J.T. LANE: Before I comment, is there any other comments anyone wants to make?

CHERYL SLAVANT: I'm probably the only nontechnical person on this committee, but for the past 20 years I have gone from town to town, system to system helping people have clean drinking water. Not to be throwing a glitch in anything, but there's more to having clean drinking water than the plumbing and the chemistry. I don't see a committee being set up to address those issues.

J.T. LANE: Well, I think that in terms of we certainly can have more out reach on those other

issues, but I think if it's not covered under what was in act 292 that would be something in addition to that. I think those are good points. I think that we should definitely make it as expansive as possible and manageable as well. If there are any particular issues that you see from the field, an entire team of constituents that come up really often, then we can definitely cover those as well. Be educated or provide feedback. I think that's a good suggestion.

CHERYL SLAVANT: I think it's important. You can have all the good plumbing and chemicals you want to, but there's a lot of other issues to fix that stop people from having clean water. And if they are not addressed, y'all can do all y'all want to and still have dirty water. There needs to be some attention paid to that issue.

J.T. LANE: I don't disagree with you at all. Like I said, where we can manage to get more of that in, I think we should. But the committee already has a very big assignment before it that we have to get done as well.

CHERYL SLAVANT: Well, I think this gentleman's suggestion here may have made some opportunity.

SPEAKER: We can't hear a word y'all are saying. I have a hearing problem, so I apologize. If you use the microphone close and look at the microphone we might be able to hear it.

CHERYL SLAVANT: I apologize. Yes, there's a big difference. I was just saying I was the only un-technical person on this committee, but for the past 20 years I've gone from community to community, all over the state helping people have clean drinking water. But there's more to it than the plumbing and the chemistry, and I was just asking if we couldn't make room somewhere in this committee sometime to address that issue. Because you can get all the plumbing right, you can get all the chemistry right, and people still have dirty water if those issues are not addressed.

RANDY HOLLIS: In lieu of the four subcommittees that were mentioned, four topics, there are nine sections of ten state standards. One of the most important is not even in those nine parts and that is the forward, as well as the very beginning of it. There are policies on UV, membrane treatment, pilot

plants, unattended operation of surface water plants, bag and cartridge filters. A number of things that are in the beginning of ten state standards that are not even in the nine parts. And then we've added another subject of backflow prevention. We have 11 different topics to cover. And I think it might be critical that we divide the subjects into 11 sections, maybe each person in this committee handle each one of those as their section in lieu of just four. This is a huge document to go through.

J.T. LANE: It is.

GREG GORDON: I was going to add one thing is that I agree with that. Just the mechanics of it though. Maybe we convene here at the beginning of the meeting, and then we recess, and maybe have break out sessions back to back to back on the subject matter. Limited depending on the depth of the subject matter. I hate to say like a town hall type of format, but something along those lines where you can have subject matter experts from the audience can speak. And they can also put their input on after a section, for example, has been presented and in the manner that we've kind of previously discussed with DHH coming forward saying this is kind of the way that we see things at first. Kind of a draft level. Please give us your comments. You can have the subject matter experts speak. All that can be taken in by the committee members, and the public, and DHH and go maybe a few and then reconvene the meeting at some point and start to take votes on that. One way I was looking at it.

RANDY HOLLIS: Let me continue through. Trying to go through this entire document during these scheduled meetings is going to be impossible. I've probably spent three days trying to go through parts one and two. It's very extensive. If we go to simply a contact person and then a forum, could we not hold those at anytime during the month and as many times as we want to? We can have webinars where we announce it, go out to all of our members and have a webinar that may be in the middle of the month so that we can all participate in it and spend as much time as we need to. And then once this key person assimilates all the information and brings that back to this committee, and we can have an expert then speak at this committee while we're presenting that section of it. But I think we need more time than what's just allowed in these scheduled meetings to go through this entire document.

J.T. LANE: I agree with you on that, definitely. That was our original approach for the subcommittee arrangement. Just to make sure I'm clear, you want to do, basically, 11 sections subcommittee forums on those particular issues in other parts of the state?

RANDY HOLLIS: Not necessarily the other parts of the state. The person in charge of that section, the point person, would then either have a webinar at LMA, or wherever they would like to hold this. They would not be hamstrung to specific locations and they could send out, I know with me I can send out a group email to a hundred engineers right now and ask for their input. So during the month, if it would be up to me, that person to collect the information and bring it back to this committee. It wouldn't be a specific scheduled meeting unless they wanted to hold it. I'm trying to get away from being hamstrung by the subcommittees and having public notices and not being able to get much accomplished.

J.T. LANE: I feel you on that. Steve or David have any input from a legal standpoint on the bill and requirements so fourth?

DAVID MCCAY: Well, my thought is, again, keep in mind I've talked a lot about open meeting's laws and its affect on people, committees and subcommittees. You could, of course, any of you if you have a subcommittee of three people could receive individual input from anybody here in the state. And you could, probably as a member of the subcommittee, do kind of what you're talking about. One of you could hold a webinar and invite comment from the public, in general, wherever they be in the state. All three of you, or even two of you, I guess, would be a quorum would participate in that together. That would be a violation of open meeting's laws. But all of the committee and subcommittee members could also receive all of the information. If anyone of you receives input from any stakeholder or citizen in the state you could pass that along to your fellow subcommittee members as long as you don't, and I guess this would be by email probably, don't invite their thoughts back. Information can be disseminated and received. What you can't do is have a behind the scenes, out of the public's view, which email would be, discussion of well, what do you think of this? How do you like

this? Would you vote yes to this or no? I don't know that the subcommittees would be as restrictive as originally indicated it might be. Now, whether it's a good idea to do that verses the other, I think if it's a thought that there's a good idea to have one person be a point person. I guess that wouldn't be a subcommittee, and therefore there would be no open meetings impact upon whatever that person does, be it going around the state speaking to people soliciting input. But if you were to have a webinar, for example, the one point person on, I don't know, water distribution, you can't get a quorum of this committee members involved in that because then you would have a public meeting. I think probably my first thought is, and of course we like to in legal have a little time to review any particular proposal as to how you want to do this. My thought is that feasible point person approach, and does not present any problems with violating open meeting's laws, if you do it right, but that probably a subcommittee of three people could essentially may be accomplish the same thing in a way that doesn't violate the open meeting's law. But you are absolutely correct. That open meeting's law does put some restrictions on what you can do and can make things more cumbersome. And Steve, I would invite any of our executive council to chime in.

STEVE RUSSO: No, you've said it.

J.T. LANE: My question would be, in terms of language, would webinars satisfy the requirements of the meetings being held in Bienville and that sort of thing?

DAVID MCCAY: No, it would not. But it's not a meeting if it's just one member of this committee participating. It's not a quorum of this committee participating so it doesn't have to be an open meeting. Any particular committee members can go talk to anyone they want, solicit any input they want. In fact, they probably talk to other members of the committee about something as long as they don't really make that discussion between them of a quorum of the committee. Which I forget if that's a quorum of the number set fourth in the act. Committee members themselves can go and do anything and talk to anyone they want to, and can, in some limited fashion, may be talk to other big committee members. But you can't have, if 12 is a quorum, I forget what it is, you can't have 12

members of this committee discussing something that's under the purview back and fourth via email. Because that would violate the open meeting's law.

J.T. LANE: So Randy, clearly we want to forgo the four and have eleven for the section subcommittees?

RANDY HOLLIS: Yes, correct. I would like eleven sections instead of four. Eleven point people instead of just four.

CHRIS RICHARD: Just one comment on the preambles, not the preamble, but the policies in front in the standards. A lot of those deal with sections located in ten state. It's almost like an addendum that deals with disinfection and treatment. So rather than have 11, it might be better to take those sections and put them in the chapter they should be covered in any way. For instance, if it's on pilot testing, put it in plant. If it's on disinfection, put it in the proper section, rather than have a whole section just covering these very items. And then the other question I had is regarding to the current sanitary code. Are we going to incorporate this into the current sanitary code, because we haven't discussed that that I'm aware. The first section, in general, needs to be addressed. It has the definition go along way into everything that follows. I think before we get too far in to it we need to look at the current code and what it has to kind of use the ten state standards from there, but not leave it out the picture.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: One question about developing these ten or eleven, I'll call them forums, with a point person. Where are the members of each of those going to come from? From other members of this committee, or looking outside this committee to bring in members or staff to support that? So if you're a point person on chapter eight, are you also a committee member on six and seven? Something to think about. I don't know how you plan on staffing these. I completely agree with Randy as far as breaking these in to each individual, otherwise very cumbersome, overlapping if you don't.

J.T. LANE: I agree. So basically, the subcommittee set up would be that maybe we obviously need an odd number. We thought three with given the scope of work and given our assumptions on

how many volunteers we might get. I would assume that if we go with eleven that would mean that each subcommittee would be headed by a member of this committee, which would then have two members named that are not on this committee. That's the way it would be set up for that. If that is the desire of the committee, we can certainly go back that way.

RANDY HOLLIS: If I can add to this. I think the only person to bring information back to this committee, to comply with the law, would be the person that's named on this committee. As they gather information that is the person that has to bring it back to this committee for consideration. But certainly, that forum can be participation. Participation could be anyone in the state in that forum.

J.T. LANE: Sure.

GREG GORDON: So if that one subcommittee member, or the one member of the larger committee is going to have these subcommittees or forums, that person is going to get some kind of staff support, so to speak? If you want to call DHH for information to present to everybody at that moment.

RANDY HOLLIS: They will collect the information over a month, and then the information they collected from that particular section brought back to this committee given to them in a meeting in a public forum. Everyone is given in an open meeting all of the information in that section, but we do not vote on it then. We vote on it at the next meeting so we have a month to consider.

JAKE CAUSEY: I certainly agree with Mr. Richard. We do have nine sections in some of the policy statements would fall within some of those. Just putting those in treatment or wherever they might fall. Make a lot more sense. Talk about that. I guess I heard eleven, ten, and nine, so I'm just trying to find a number that we're working with as far as the nine parts. Chris had mentioned a lot of the policy statements, UV and filtration, which are for treatment. I think would generally fall in the treatment section. I think it's going to be the largest undertaking. Not sure who's volunteering for that one. I guess we're talking about nine groups, forums, subcommittees, whatever we're going to call it. I'm not sure where the forward fits into. Maybe part one or not, but I know the policy statements on

different technologies and things certainly all within those.

RANDY HOLLIS: The eleven sections is because there are nine sections in ten state standards, and then we have backflow prevention thrown in, so that's ten. The forward ten state standards is extremely critical because that section covers the mandatory parts of the ten state standards of the shall that are mandatory, verses those that are recommended. And I think this committee needs to make a decision. How is DHH going to handle the recommended improvements verses those that are mandatory? And I think that should be discussed thoroughly. So that's why I suggest 11.

J.T. LANE: And certainly for those 11 for the preface of that last part, we need to decide that sooner rather than later because that will result in additional work for each committee.

ROBERT BROU: I fully support what Randy is saying. I do think it's critical that every member of this committee is allowed to give input to that member. It could be the first step in that process. If Randy is heading up treatment everybody on this board will have comments related to that section that we can get out. One way communication through DHH and directly to that board member, but it needs to be input and then considered in your forum.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: I just want to check from a legal. We can't do that as a mass email because it becomes a forum, correct?

DAVID MCCAY: On the open meeting's law I think we rely heavily on the AG's opinion. Not nearly as many court cases as there are AG's opinion. I have an AG's opinion in front of me that I'm looking at right now that sort of speaks, I think to this issue. And I'll just, if I can, I'd like to just read. It's not long, but this is a summary published by AG of their opinion issued in 2012. The short summary is as follows. Without additional facts suggesting intent to circumvent the open meeting's law, and without inviting a discussion on content of the material sent, the following is permissible behavior under the open meeting's law. Number one, a council member relaying an opinion to other council members via email about a topic which may later be discussed by the public body as a whole. Number two, a council member forwarding requested information or opinions receiving from constituents to other council

members on the topic which may later come before the public body. And three, a council member forwarding a request received from a constituent requesting that council members take action on a particular matter forwarding to other council members. I guess my initial thought is you spoke of one-way communication. It sounds like that's permissible under this AG's opinion. Council member relaying an opinion to other council members through email about a topic which may later be discussed by the public body as a whole. I always worry when you start having the emails back and fourth between members, you know, because it's easy to cross the line. But my initial thought is, based on this opinion, if it is just strictly a one way thing, it's permissible, perhaps. I hate to say perhaps. I know that's not very helpful to you guys. I think that's the best I can give right here, right now.

J.T. LANE: I think a good thing to point out, the work of the committee, I think we can all agree, is so expansive and massive and requires a lot of thought. And we have a year to get this in order. We want to find a way that's going to maximize input from everyone because I fully agree with you on that Randy, but also allow us to get our work done by the deadline that the legislature asked us to get it done.

RANDY HOLLIS: Let me follow up on that. If I'm given a section of disinfection and not treatment police, I would really want Robert or Rusty, one of them, to send me their comments about a section. And as I understand it, if they are corresponding back to me about that section and I'm assimilating the information that would be legal. It's to start a forum and discussion between all of us that would not be. I would certainly want each person to comment back to me on that section so I can assimilate and put it together. Then we bring it back to this committee where then we can discuss it openly, and each section, and even controversial parts.

DAVID MCCAY: I think that's a good statement.

J.T. LANE: Any more questions? I think after we make a motion the next step we make we need some assignments on these 11. Do I have a motion to accept, I guess, the ten state standards as a basis and then move forward with the 11 committees as outlined in our discussion as our frame of work?

GREG GORDON: I'll make a motion.

RICK NOWLIN: I have a question. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the direction we are apparently going here, but I do have a question. We all know the importance of the ten state standards, but I'm wondering what is the end game objective here? Is it the chairs intent to either ratify, or ratify with amendments, or exceptions, or revisions the ten state standards as the state code in lieu of the existing sanitary code? Or are we going to use the suggestions or recommendations based on the subcommittee work, and eventually the committee work to revise the sanitary code? Is it one of those two, or something else?

J.T. LANE: The goal of this committee is to come up with design and maintenance standards for water systems in the state, period. It was suggested in the last meeting that we should begin our work, rather than starting from ground zero with nothing, that we would use the ten state standards as the basis. That was suggested by Mr. Brou. That's what we're working from.

RICK NOWLIN: Is it correct to say then that we do not intend to simply revise the ten state standards and adopt it as a code? Because to me that could be a violation of act 292, which clearly states the ten state standards is to be used as a guide only.

J.T. LANE: We are writing the code, period. Ten state standards we'll start from that, and what results at the end of this process will be the work of this committee. And I would call it the Louisiana standards, period.

RICK NOWLIN: I want us to be very careful. And we have an attorney here, two attorneys here, at least, and I'm not one of them. But I want us to be very careful that we don't go beyond or do something in conflict with intent of 292. If we were, for example, to simply say okay, we're going to change these 76 items and otherwise the ten state standards is our design code. I think that would leave a legal question.

J.T. LANE: Yes. So I would say that to clear the Legislator asked us to empower this committee to make those decisions. One of the committee members recommended that. There were no major

objections. I think that we all realize the volume of work that's ahead of all of us. So again, my main goal is for us to be able to do that. Get the standards that we agree to and put them explicitly in the code.

RICK NOWLIN: So then you agree that the ten state standards will simply be a guide for a development of a Louisiana code? If we simply say we're incorporating the ten state standards as a must do, we're not only, I think, not in compliance with 292, we're actually basing our code on a code that we have no control over.

J.T. LANE: So let me be clear. When we're done the ten state standards will not be mentioned in the code, period. It will be our standards that we agree to and voted on and promulgated based on that discussion and agreement.

RICK NOWLIN: Thank you.

CHRIS RICHARD: One question again about what happened with the sanitary code. Is this going to be added to the current sanitary code with the definition, because we're not addressing that at all? We're addressing all of the details of the code, but we're not addressing how it's going to be incorporated at some point in time. Is that the intent?

J.T. LANE: Yes, that is the intent. I think that's one thing that I heard loud and clear from a lot of people. It was unclear as to what exactly the rules are because you pretty much sanitary code reference another set of guidelines. And so I feel the same way as you that we need to be as clear as possible. The best way for us to do that is to agree, as a group, what the rules are going to be going forward and incorporate those explicitly in the code itself. That means the code is going to get a lot of new text.

CHRIS RICHARD: So should we address, I hate to add to the work of the committee, but somebody needs to look at the current sanitary code and see how it inter measures with ten state, because there's going to be possibly some conflicts, some duplication.

J.T. LANE: We will remove that language. When we promulgate our rules and regulations we will take care of those.

RICK NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your clarification. Historically under the ten state standards the DHH district engineer and the local consulting engineer had a certain amount of discretion in which they could use their professional judgment as what is required for a particular system or facility. Will we still have that professional judgment avenue available to us, or we simply going to end up with a code where somebody can go through and check the boxes and say we did it, or we didn't do it, and therefore you're in violation or you're not in violation? Care to comment on that?

J.T. LANE: I would say that what we're striving for is to provide some basis from which to start. We all know that no system... there are 1400 systems in this state. No system is the same and so there is going to be... we have processes built in already through request, and what not, and that's the approach that we want to take going forward. Definitely, engineers all have to consult on issues that pop up and I want that process to stay in place. And that we get the best outcome from that discussion. Now that's not to say we're always going to necessarily agree on each episode, but yes, absolutely. We want to be flexible when it makes sense.

RICK NOWLIN: Thank you.

CHERYL SLAVANT: When an engineer makes recommendations is that what it's gone by that no one overrides that decision? Because I found that happens a lot. When an engineer goes out on the job and says this is what needs to be done, will someone else be able to override that decision? Will the engineer be in control, is what I'm asking?

J.T. LANE: So the field engineer, or district engineer, or even all the way up to Jake or Dr. Guidry and I be able to override decisions like that? Yes ma'am.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I've been doing this for 17 plus years. It's a double-edged sword. If you write down everything that you have to live by everybody knows it's impossible to write every possibility, every scientific explanation. So you bring in your experts, your engineers who review and try to figure out does this put people at risk. There is no way this committee will write down every possibility and every contingency. You have to have some expert review and expert advisory. When our experts are

looking at it there's not always an agreement. There should be a process where we can work out disagreements. We're going to try to make it simpler and clearer so it's not left up to a lot of interpretation. That means that as we go through these standards we're going to try to make it as clear as possible what we're looking for, what protects human health. But to try to say that we're going to write every possibility, that's just not possible. And what we're talking about today and where people get upset is that you go to nine different regions of the state, there's nine different engineers, there's nine different interpretations that can happen. Some things are just very generic, very broad. So you might find a citation in New Orleans that you don't find in Lafayette. And the people in New Orleans are upset they got to live by it, but Lafayette people don't. We're trying to make sure that the standards are clear and everybody knows what we're looking for. Everybody's trying to meet the standard to protect human health. And that's a tough job. This is going to be a complex job. We have a year to do it, which is not a whole lot of time, because it's taken years to get where we are today. And I just want to be clear that where there's a lot of heartburn people don't understand. And it's not clear we want to have input, like we said, hear from the people that do this every day and try to make it where everybody's on the same page. That's very hard to do. Not everybody has the same level of interpretation, the same level of expertise, the same understanding. Sometimes we make a decision based on protecting human life and nobody out there understands why we chose to do it that way. That's where the education part comes in. That's where the experts come in. Like she says, there are other things that we are not going to address that do impact health that we might not think about. But what I've learn in the past, when you start hamstringing yourself that you make very clear that you do this, not this. Be careful what you ask for because there is no variance with that. You live by that. That is your code. That is your sanitary code and if you make it very clear and all of a sudden you got to do something to your system because it's a two inch instead of two and half inch. It's written in a code. There's no discretion. So the more detail, the more explicit, the less you can vary from. The less detail, the less explicit, the more people are not confused. It's a balance and that's going to be our job as experts to make sure that it's clear and

it protects health. I am going to do whatever it takes to make sure people don't get sick. I don't need to wait for people to die or get sick to decide it's time to do something. I need to do it before that happens. I'm always going to try to do that. I'm saying this to explain as we go through this there are things in the code right now that I can't do without. They protect health and we'll have to explain as we go along. We can't change some things. There are other things we can change. I think clarity, education, getting input, that's key so that everybody, we all want the same thing. We just don't agree on how to get there. We don't agree on what to pay for. That's what we have to work on. That's what we're going to be shooting for is to try to get a Louisiana code that's clearer. As simple as we can make it so everybody understands, but is still going to take our experts going look at something and saying I haven't seen this anywhere else in the state. Does this put the public at risk? Because I guarantee you there are all these systems have some variances, some differences in how they were built, and what they are doing, and what the risk are. Our biggest risk in the state right now is our water sources and in our systems that are getting old. Maintaining them, that's our biggest risk and that's very expensive to upkeep. For clarity's sake, the whole idea is to write a Louisiana code, not going to be ten state standards. Going to have some ten state standards that we may use, but it's not going to use all of them. They're going to apply to Louisiana and they are going to protect health.

RICK NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you for your intelligence. I agree totally with the Doctor. Hypothetically, and I hope we don't ever see this happen, but we could have a difference of opinion between the consulting engineer and the department. And the department says you must do something this way and so they say, we'll do it that way and then there's a problem. Is the state then going to assume liability for that situation if it can be shown that had they done it the way the consultant engineers had recommended, it probably wouldn't have happened. I mean Dr. Guidry has a very heavy responsibility, but the people that put their stamps and signatures on the plants also have an obligation. I just don't want to create a problem down the road that way and somehow we've got to work through that.

JIMMY GUIDRY: My answer to that is, and people that know me know this is the way I operate, if there's a disagreement and somebody says, I'm betting my license that this is wrong and this is going to make people at risk and there's nobody, you know, on our end we're saying no, we don't agree, you're going to do what we say. At that point I want them to ask for us to have a group of us sit together. When I find there's a lot of disagreement there's usually a reason. When we sit together with our experts and I sit at the table we all get educated. If there's some disagreement like that the state's always libel because no matter what goes wrong we end up having to explain why it happened, why we didn't catch it, or why we allowed it. We're always on the hook which is why I try not to do things that get us in trouble. If there's an engineering disagreement, expert disagreement, and the engineer is not happy with the response, then I would say they need to ask for us here to have a meeting to address that.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: One thing that I want to clear and kind of goes along with Doctor's comment. Is once we pull all this together and we have a new modified state sanitary code that is going to be enforceable, the ten state standards is a standard. It's a guideline and so there are things that are in it that may not necessarily be appropriately enforceable. I'm going to refer to the waste water ten state standards one because I have an example. For an 8 inch gravity sewer it says that it needs to be laid at a .4 percent. If it's laid at a .38 percent it's still going to work. But if we go and we set in to this code and say it's .4 and somebody turns in a set of plans that it's .38, they can be fined. So we're going to have to be careful based upon that. We're now creating something that is enforceable for fines and we're going to have to be careful that some of these guides are stipulated as guidelines, and not necessarily hard, concrete elements of this.

CHRIS RICHARD: Just to add to that is, my opinion is that the code should be a code, and as an engineer we use ten state standards. We learned about it in school. I was in school 25 years ago. Everybody uses ten states. There's a lot of resources we use in the design experience, experience of your firm, all kind of things. Recommendations that are contained in ten state standards are just that,

recommendations. And I don't think they should be in a code. A code should be you shall do. A recommendation should be up to the engineer on how he sees it, and if you put it in the sanitary code it's going to be misinterpreted by someone down the line. Give the leeway to the engineer. Code should be simple, like Dr. Guidry said, so it's enforceable. X is X. May be you should consider this. I think that should be left out of a code.

J.T. LANE: I totally agree. That's what we're striving for.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: I'll give it kind of another example. ASTM says you have to, if you're making a pipe, the pipe has to stand up to certain design or testing criteria. It doesn't tell you how to make the pipes. You can make the pipe however you want to, as long as it passes these tests. It's kind of the same thing. We want the water to be of a higher quality, but you can't dictate how to do it because of all the technologies that are out there. Some are going to work, some are not. We need to make sure that whatever we decide upon works and those need to be standards based upon expertise a lot of times.

J.T. LANE: I think, at this point, given the discussion we've had, and before we make the formal notion to adopt, anyone out there that would like to make any comments?

ROBERT GILLBRIDE: My name is Robert Gillbride, I'm a certified waste water operator. I apologize up front because I'm not always politically correct. So I guess my first thing is clarification, Mr. Randy, on subcommittee. You are saying that you don't want any other members to serve on the subcommittee? You want to just do an open forum, is that correct?

RANDY HOLLIS: The open forum would be led by a member of this committee. So he would be the person gathering the information and collecting it. I think Mr. Lane, Mr. Chairman said I think two other members of this committee would also attend that, or be a participant in that form.

J.T. LANE: That was our original proposal.

RANDY HOLLIS: And as long as information is one way, then that is legal and it is fine. Then anyone else in the state can participate in that forum. So you could participate in all 11 forums if you

would like.

ROBERT GILLBRIDE: There would be no public input? You would have the soul ability to make decisions without anybody else?

RANDY HOLLIS: No, not at all. The intent is to gather all of the information to bring it back to this committee for consideration. And you would be given 30 days to consider everything so that each person on this committee then looks at what the point person has recommended. So there would be feedback, and there would be changes, if necessary.

ROBERT GILLBRIDE: I'm just under the opinion that I understand everybody here is appointed. If you do a subcommittee that there ought to be John Q public involved that could help in the decision making because, to me as an operator, I'm a contract operator. I operate many systems for many people. There is a lot more smaller systems, community/non-community, transient/non transient out there than there is big ones. So if we leave the decision making up to, again, not politically correct, but to me it seems like big brother, or one person other than having these other people that have a say so other than just a forum. Then we're not doing justice to the public and to the smaller systems. So I think when the discussion of subcommittee came up it would be an important member of this committee, as well as other people in the public, that could serve on that subcommittee and have voice in that.

RANDY HOLLIS: I think we're so hamstrung with the requirements for subcommittees you would not get the input of small operators like we would need. I think the public forum allows us to get that input from every single operator in this state, be large or small. And I think it would be a mistake to try and go back to subcommittee, because then they would have to be held in this building, in this office, under certain guidelines. And small operators can't come here. The public forum would allow everybody to participate.

ROBERT GILLBRIDE: But the public forum, most operators would be working during the day. Most small companies don't even understand what it is. When you have people that own trailer parks

or stores, that are actually water systems, they have no clue. That's why they hire operators such as I. I just think it's a disservice to the customers, to these small operators that one big vote, or person could make that without other people inputting in that decision. I just think a subcommittee would be better served for this purpose. And I understand where we have to do that, and being in here our hands tied, but I still think it's a better service to people.

JOHN BARKER: John Barker, State Plumbing Board of Louisiana. I think the record will reflect at the last meeting that there was no objection by this council or committee to have the subcommittees with subject matter experts. I think we discussed that at the last meeting. And I think that is very fair because subject matter experts are not necessarily worried about protecting profits. They are worried about protecting the public. I think there was no objection. The record may reflect that when we talked about putting subject matter experts with each field 9, 10, 11. Whatever you all choose to do.

TOM ED MCHUGH: Tom Ed McHugh with Louisiana Municipal Association representing small communities all over the State of Louisiana. We have a very keen interest in what you are doing. I totally agree with what Randy's suggesting. Undoubtedly, there is a miscommunication problem because this system would allow people like him more input on more occasions than any committee structure that you might desire. On behalf of all these small villages and towns across the State of Louisiana, those webinars could be at night time. They could be on the weekends. They could be many occasions where folks would never have a chance to come to a committee meeting, would have a chance to have input. So I strongly recommend that you consider what he has set in place. That would get more input and let more people participate than any other system that the committee structure could give you. Thank you.

VERN BRELAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on that as President of LMA. I know I've had discussions with Tom, Ed, and Ronnie about the webinars. That LMA is willing to assist and make our building available, whatever we need to do to make the webinars happen. And also, I know Louisiana Rural Water, we can send an email blast out to them and they can blast it out to their

members, and LMA can do the same thing. You will, actually, through the use of webinars and emails, we can open it up to a whole section that wouldn't be allowed to be here in Baton Rouge to attend these meetings or subcommittee meetings. That's the position that we're taking on this, and I would like everybody to give that a strong consideration.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I'm just trying to get his input to match up with what you're saying. There's no question the more input we get from the people that do this every day, the people that are impacted by this every day, the more likely we're going to get a better product. I think his concern was that that webinar was gathered by one person. That one person would come into recommendations which might not represent that information. But what you're proposing is the information is shared with this group that is gathered. Not that you're going to bring, you might bring some recommendations, but you're going to bring to us what are people saying. What are people asking for. I think it's what we all want. We want to hear from the public, the ones that provide the service, the ones that receive the service, what it is they are looking for, and then make our decisions based on that input. But this committee is going to then weight in as to what's the best approach dealing the subject. That's kind of like the best of all worlds. We get an avenue to reach more people and bring it back to where we have more information to work off of. That's the way I'm interpreting it.

J.T. LANE: Anything else? All right. Do I have a motion to start the committee's business with the current ten state standards, eleven subcommittees moving forward. Any objections?

DAVID MCCAY: J.T., I have a question just so I can follow what's going on. Are y'all taking about doing subcommittees, or doing 11 point persons for each topic?

J.T. LANE: Eleven point persons.

DAVID MCCAY: There will be just one person. There won't be any other committee members with them. One committee member as a point person. In particular, one of these 11 subjects. Is that right?

J.T. LANE: That's what the proposal is.

CHRIS RICHARD: Can we have, instead of just a single point person, have other members serve on multiple committees and offer input and assign because we have a lot of people on the committee?

DAVID MCCAY: Well, that's my question. I think if you have two people you have a subcommittee whether you want to give it that name or not. If you have one member going out and soliciting information from the public I think that's fine. If you have two people that's arguably, in my view, a subcommittee bound by all the provisions of the open meeting's law that would apply to subcommittees, which is, essentially, all of them, other than having to have an agenda. That's why I wanted clarification on which direction you guys were headed.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: Didn't we decide we were going to have one point person, and then we would have volunteers from out in the public serve on that point person's knowledge team, or whatever you want to call it?

J.T. LANE: What we proposed was four subcommittees that make up the committee would be chaired and have each subcommittee headed by a member of this committee with two nonmembers, or members, whoever wanted to participate. Now that we have an alternative, do we want to, what I'm hearing is that A the other proposal was to have one heading up a public forum, but could be achieved the same by using, if that's a concern, by having, again, the same subcommittee chair. Having two others working with that person to have the same format of the forum publicly.

DAVID MCCAY: J.T., my thought is that's a subcommittee, whatever you want to call it. That's no different from the original plan of having a subcommittee that Mr. Hollis' idea was to avoid, in essence, because of the restrictions placed on them by the open meeting's law. That's my thought. Whatever you call it, if you appoint two or three people to it, that's essentially a subcommittee.

CHRIS RICHARD: If I'm understanding it, if I'm not on a committee I'm not allowed to offer any input as a member of the public because I'm on this committee. So what we're doing is we're restricting everybody on this committee from participating in anything.

DAVID MCCAY: That was the AG's opinion I read from earlier. That I think each, individually, any

member of this committee could offer some opinions, or input to the point person. Again, as long as you don't start a chain where you're going back and fourth. You're, in essence, debating the very topic by email.

CHRIS RICHARD: So as long as you're not an official member of that committee. I'm sorry. Not the committee, the forum, where you have a point person.

DAVID MCCAY: Well, there won't be any official members. If you've got official members, I think you've got a subcommittee.

CHRIS RICHARD: Everybody else can participate, but they are not, they are just public. It's a one way communication. Is that correct?

J.T. LANE: I would also add that there's nothing preventing any of the committee members from offering input at that appropriate time during the meetings on those topics, anyway.

GREG GORDON: Just think about when it's presented before the committee. You're still going to have to ask again for public comments, and you're still going to have one more round of potential public comment.

J.T. LANE: I think that we're going to have plenty of opportunities for public comment with this approach, and not to mention the traditional avenues of email. We've got email addresses set up for anyone who wants to give comments. So with that, and given the additional discussion, sorry to have to do this again, but I want to make sure we're all clear. Do we have a motion to have a ten state standards as the basis, eleven forums headed by one point person who is a current committee member of this committee going forward to conduct the business of this committee? Do I have a second? Any objections? Excellent. Thank you. I guess, essentially, this takes care of A and B of our new business. We were originally set out by the last meeting going to review parts one and two today. Let me gather some feedback from everybody about how they feel about proceeding with that in light of this change in our workflow. I guess I would like everybody's feedback on, in light of the change of our workflow, going with the 11 forums and point people made up of committee members of this committee. How do

we... do we want to proceed with a review of part one and two?

ROBERT BROU: In my opinion, no. We do not. I think we move forward with setting up the forums. I think in lieu of going over part one and two, I have a couple questions. While I don't disagree that the code needs to be very specific about what we strictly want to have enforcement on, I guess I want clarification. In the past, ten state standards was a very useful document for recommendations. Does DHH not want a list of recommendations for design criteria, or do we write a code that has the shalls and must that have the force of law, and have may or should as just recommendations as guidance for y'all? I guess I would throw that back to y'all.

JAKE CAUSEY: I think that was group 11.

ROBERT BROU: That's backflow I thought.

JAKE CAUSEY: Who does the forward? One through nine were the parts, ten was backflow, and I had eleven as forward.

J.T. LANE: Bottom line this is both. Thank you for asking. I think in large part that is a lot of this, we're going to have different opinions about a lot of these questions. I think it's going to have to end up being both. That is the thing I think, fundamentally, even all the meetings we had before this and field business I did with particular water systems. I think part of what caused so much uncertainty for so long was that we had ten state standards, quote/unquote, adopted in our code, but they are, in fact, recommendations. It was unclear, and to me if I were running a system that would create a lot of confusion, long term, and frustration long term as well. I think, fundamentally, the best way to solve that and to help mitigate that is for all of us to be clear about what we're going to adopt as the shallow must, and then what we're going to adopt as recommended. I think everyone agrees that ten state standards is the best place to start so that we don't have to start from the ground up.

CHRIS RICHARD: I just wanted to say that ten state standards is still there, and it's still going to be used by engineers in the state in the design of water systems. We're not talking about doing away with it, we're talking about using it as an enforcement tool and putting it in the code. We want us to

have the code. In my opinion the code is for the protection of the public. Engineer uses ten states along with many other things. And so it's still there, still a very useful tool.

ROBERT BROU: Are we looking to do away with any reference to ten state standards in chapter 12, right?

J.T. LANE: Pretty much. I think that's most responsive to what everyone wants. Any other comments? So I have a motion, I guess, to strike part C. Are there any additions that while we're here today, we meet till 4:00, it's 2:15. Based on this new structure, are there some logistics that we want to discuss and work out, expectations for the forums. I think we need to establish timelines. I don't want to get to Christmas and we're just having our first forums. I think we all agree on that. We don't want to be getting into 2014 and have more work that still needs to be done that hasn't been done in 2013. Can we start that discussion please? Randy, if that's okay with you, since this was your great idea, is there any thoughts first, before we open it up to everyone else. Is there anything else you want to share?

RANDY HOLLIS: Well, I think what we need to do is establish who is going to be point person in each one of the forums. Then that person will be responsible for setting up the forums. How many do they want? Are webinars working better or anyone else to gather this information? So I think the best thing to do is to start designating who's going to handle what section of that. And since Mr. Kerr is not here, I recommend he handle backflow.

J.T. LANE: I think he would enjoy that. Why don't we do that. Jake, I don't have the list right in front of me. Can we go through all 11 and ask for volunteers, and then I guess we'll have to start making assignments.

JAKE CAUSEY: Part one, I guess we'll start with submission of plans.

RANDY HOLLIS: Could I request a section of disinfection? Can I ask to handle that one?

JAKE CAUSEY: I'm not going to tell you no. So part one is submission of plans. It's pretty short, so you might want to jump on that. Keith. Part two is general design considerations or public water

supplies. A few more bits of information, design basis, plant lay out, building lay out, stand by power, laboratory facilities, monitoring equipment, sample taps, meter, etc. Dirk. Part three is source development, looking at water wells and intake structures, primarily, source waters. Greg. Part four is treatment. It's a long one. Chris Richard. Part five is chemical application. Randy. Part six is pumping facilities, which is primarily booster stations. Jeff. Part seven, finished water storage. Jim. Part eight, distribution systems. Robert Brou. Part nine is waste residuals, which is primarily surface plants, filters, systems, etc. Rusty. Part ten is backflow prevention and cross connection control.

AUDIENCE: Patt Kerr.

JAKE CAUSEY: There's a unanimous vote. And then eleven was the forward. I guess my understanding is looking at shalls and musts verses recommendations, shoulds and may. I'm not sure how a public forum may come into play in that. I'm just going to throw that out there. A team leader can figure that out, I guess. He said he'll take it. Mayor Vern.

J.T. LANE: So we have some assignments and point persons. So let's talk about, I think it's important that we set some goals on when we have our first forums. And I guess may be before we do that, does everyone feel like in terms of I know we all have copies of each part. What else do you feel like you need outside of that in terms of... made the point earlier about education too. Just education in general. Are there any basic, I guess, slides of when we start these forums. Like five slides about this is how US water system regulation is set up. This is the role of each federal, state, local agency. That sort of thing. Basic education on that point. Y'all think that would be helpful?

GREG GORDON: I think that would be great.

JAKE CAUSEY: I do have one follow up to our team leaders. These are the policy statements. Need to divide those up and see which group they fit in such as UV, membrane filtration. Got a policy statement on arsenic removal, chlorine disinfection. It may be the case that well, there's a policy statement on infrastructures, security, arsenic removal, rapid re-filtration, and surface water treatment plants, membrane. I think, generally speaking, all those fall within treatment. May be except for... okay,

so we're going to assign ultraviolet light and chlorines to the disinfection or chemical application folks. So we got pre-engineered water treatment plants, unattended, automated or unattended operation of surface plants. That may be go into part two, general design. Automated/attended operation of surface water treatment plants. The security would fall under part two as well. Infrastructure security for public supplies. The next one is bag and cartridge filters. I think that would go with treatment. The next one was UV, that's disinfection chemical application. Arsenic removal, that's treatment. Rapid re-filtration and surface water treatment plants, I think that's treatment. Chlorine disinfection would be the chemical application or treatment disinfection. Group membrane technologies, that would be treatment. That's all of them.

J.T. LANE: All right. We'll be sure to recap all of this. So where we left off we're going to provide some basic information, in addition to all the documentation we have currently right now. Is there anything else, I guess, in general content?

GREG GORDON: I was going to mention if you were going to do that also putting on the DHH website that when the webinar and the forums will be. Because if there's going to be a blast to LWRA and others that website could be mentioned. And it could get people like the gentleman who was the contract operator to at least start going to the same site on a consistent basis to get information.

ROBERT BROU: As a follow up to what Greg just said. I know at the last meeting there was a sign in sheet where we requested everybody's email as a means of disseminating some of this information. I would encourage the use of that as well at future meetings. Anybody who showed any interest, whether it was contacting y'all through the website, or whatever, that you can send every one of these forum locations to them directly, not have them come looking for them.

J.T. LANE: We built a database for that. Down our content, and obviously this will be development for a little while as we improve it. As far as timeline, I would think that we want at a minimum two weeks notice to announce for participation. I do agree this would be most helpful for a lot of people who are working to happen after work hours. Generally, 5:30 or 6:00 is the start time for

things when we have public meetings after hours. Generally, we'll give two weeks notice on that. I guess now just talk about, now that everybody's got their own public forum they are going to be leading, what sort of time frame do you think is good for y'all in terms of prep time and things like that to sort of get going on that. Keep in mind our next meeting is October 29th. Is it doable to have a public forum prior to that meeting so that we can have meaningful discussion at the next meeting?

RANDY HOLLIS: If we're going to break this up, I think the most important thing is, since Keith is in charge of part one, it's a small section. I think he could prepare and then he could present part one at our next meeting. So we're not trying to do 11 parts.

J.T. LANE: The original track we were on talking about one and two in one meeting, and three in the next and so fourth.

RANDY HOLLIS: And who's in charge of two? If we could do parts one and two at the next meeting, that would get us back on track. We would have to have the forums and everything before that meeting.

J.T. LANE: Our staff will focus on getting one and two prepared and most supported in that time.

CHRIS RICHARD: May not want to do them in order. A lot more time the bigger the section, more complicated, more time. This will come awfully quick for the amount of information.

J.T. LANE: You want to discuss proposal prioritization? I think it's a really good point. I think there were some sizes of some of the complexity and sizes of some of the parts. One and two can definitely, I think, stay in order. Is there any input in terms of what parts would need more time so may be that we move them back?

KEITH SHACKELFORD: Treatment would probably be the largest.

ROBERT BROU: Treatment would be last.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: You had mentioned five slides at the beginning. I think one of the things we can do is standardize so that each of these forums look identical. And so ya'll are going to help?

J.T. LANE: We will help with the development of those. So we have part four and ten would be sort of at the end, or towards the end. Treatment might be the very last thing we cover. Backflow prevention might be before that. Any other parts that you guys feel strongly need as much time as possible?

RANDY HOLLIS: I'd like to see the order one and two, then three, and then we jump to six, seven, and eight. And then we handle five and then four given the topics, cause that throws parts one and two. Three is source development. It shouldn't be that difficult. Skips over, then we have pumping facilities. Then finished water storage, shouldn't be that difficult, then distribution piping. Then we get back into chemical treatment. One, two, three, six, seven, eight, five, and four and then backflow.

J.T. LANE: We have nine and eleven left.

RANDY HOLLIS: Nine before four. Let's put it after eight then six, seven, eight, five, then four. Backflow close to distribution, which is eight. So put backflow right after eight. Distribution and then backflow. I have one, two, three, six, seven, eight, ten and then I'm missing nine. So you want to put nine, which is residuals, and then five and four?

J.T. LANE: So eight, ten, nine, five, four and what about eleven?

RANDY HOLLIS: Eleven be the very last. That's the forward.

J.T. LANE: One, two, three, six, seven, eight, ten, nine, five, four, eleven. Any objections to that? So what we'll do is work with Keith and Dirk on getting the forums for parts one and two scheduled before the next meeting since the discussion will be in next meeting. Need to really move on that. We'll be following up with each of you at the end either today or tomorrow on getting going on that. With the forums are we going to... I know that we're all scattered across the state. So are we going to try to base them where y'all are based and webcast from there? Is that largely what you are thinking Randy?

RANDY HOLLIS: I think LMA has offered their facilities for webinars. It can certainly be held out there and participated by anyone in the state. That would be a great place to hold a webinar there. I

don't know if you have facilities here? But I know they have offered their facilities for anyone to help.

J.T. LANE: I guess for some of you that are traveling out of town though we have facilities in every region of the state where you can base those meetings. Using the web is a great way to interact, but I think at the same time as well, if you are already out there then having them in other places of the state since we're going... to me that's one of the greatest flexibilities on taking this approach is that we can go to other parts of the state to have these meetings to talk to people that we don't get to talk to very often, or at all. So I think to the extent that A that would minimize travel time for y'all. We would be able to have a better reach across the state to do that.

RANDY HOLLIS: What if each individual point person contacted Jake or whoever and coordinated that so that you do it individually?

J.T. LANE: Agree.

VERN BRELAND: Mr. Chairman, my aspect at what I'm going to look at is I'm in Baton Rouge so much as LMA President that I would work out my schedule with Tom Ed. And then normally we have meetings on Wednesday. And the biggest concern is making sure everybody can participate in the evening time. Work it out with them that when I come in on a Tuesday I can actually hold my webinar that Tuesday night so that way, and I plan on having as many as I can have so we can turn out a good product at the end.

RANDY HOLLIS: I'd like to make clear. One of the reasons that I really suggest this is because I wanted it to be unlimited to that point person. That if he wants to hold five webinars, or a blog, or something going it's to assimilate information. Not to restrict him to just one, it's to whatever. If you want to hold one official one, that's great. For operators like Robert that can't come during the day and participate, or may be he's on vacation that day, he can participate even at other times.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: We can get an email list from ASCE, The Louisiana Engineering Society, from The Louisiana Rural Water Association, and The Louisiana Municipal Association and send out a mass email with copies of the sections attached. And if they can't attend a webinar, or a meeting, they

can mark it up, scan it, and send it back and still have their input.

RONNIE HARRIS: Thank you very much. What I wanted to make sure that everybody understands, and pardon me I don't mean to talk down to anybody, exactly what is a webinar? The aspect of what we can provide at LMA may be different than at another facility by another organization. Tom Ed can talk more about the actual technical aspects of what is available, but when a webinar is held in our facility it's primarily just a few people with technology at our fingertips. Once the webinar is conducted everyone can link in, talk, make comments, whatever, and then it's recorded. If you have consistency in the presentation amongst the 11 different point people you have a better product at the end. Plus, for the record, you would have the actual webinar. People who would submit questions would do it by email so it's in writing, and then you have that consistency. When I heard of the point person concept I was concerned about all of this information being funneled through one person who could strangle the information as far as getting to this committee. Everyone has their own personal integrity and professional responsibility so I don't think that would necessarily happen on your point of view, but perception by the public could be different. If you establish the fact that a webinar would be held where as everything is said, recorded, whatever, it would be proof to the public that it's transparent and open. I think you would have a more trustful public, as well as, and I did like the comment you don't have to have just one. You can have a couple in case people didn't hear about it, or the subject is that complicated and you wanted to delve into it. But the other aspect is, and that's why I wanted to talk about facility. Facility, the LMA is here to assist. We'll be happy to work with anyone else who would like to also assist if they wanted to do it at another part of the state. You have a responsibility. You're here today. It would just mean that you would have to come to Baton Rouge for your responsibility on that particular time for that webinar. We will work with you at whatever time is necessary. I would suggest evenings because people can do it. If you want to do late afternoons, early mornings, whatever time you want. We will make accommodations. The other aspect is the quality of the product of what's handed to each of you at the time to make the decision, the discussion. I would

tend to think if you had a document of the ten state standards just imagine in your mind grading all of the text out of it and reviewing it. I said it last time, if you can agree that the sky is blue and that's what it says, the sky is blue, check, you highlight that as being acceptable. And then whatever is controversial you're going to have a pro and you're going to have a con. And I think the point person's responsibility is to itemize this is the subject matter, this is the pro, this is the con. Anybody can make a decision as long as the facts are laid out to you. If one point person does it one way, and another point person does another way, I tend to think it kind of corrupts the system. The presentation of the final product of this committee I think should be a discussion that you guys would take about and agree upon. We stand ready to assist you and I would be happy to answer any questions at the appropriate time.

RUSTY REEVES: J.T., it was going to be one of my questions with your regional offices. Will they be accessible to us, say 6:00 in the afternoon?

J.T. LANE: Yes. We will work with our staff on the ground there and also the other parishes to make sure it's open.

RUSTY REEVES: I guess my other question is, we've been assigned a task or point person. If we knew a webinar was going on and we wanted to participate or take notes for the person, would that be acceptable as long as it wasn't one or two of us went over there?

DAVID MCCAY: Yea I was, in fact, going to reiterate something I think I said earlier and Jake reminded me about it. I certainly think anybody, if there's a webinar, any committee member could, quite frankly, I barely know what a webinar is. I think it's something people watch on a computer. Certainly, I think you can passively watch if you're somewhere, wherever in the state, you get on the computer and watch it. All you have to do is make sure that a quorum of these committee members don't log in and start actively participating in such that it becomes a meeting of this committee because you have a quorum of them all participating in this thing discussing back and fourth. I apologize I don't know more about what a webinar is. I have may be participated in a few. I think you can, certainly, if less than a quorum of you want to even participate, that's probably allowable. I hate to even suggest

that. And again, I don't remember what a quorum of this committee is. If it's twelve and ten of you wanted to get together and participate in a webinar the one point person is putting on, I think that's theoretically allowed because it's still not a quorum. Although, I hate to suggest even going down that road. Better not to even get close to that.

RUSTY REEVES: I understand that. What I was getting to is that I do a lot of webinars and usually there's three or four people helping to disseminate the information, or record the information, look up things to answer questions. Stuff like that there. That's what I was getting to. If there was just two or three of us that went and helped Randy with his, and not the whole group.

DAVID MCCAY: I think just two or three of you is fine because it's not a quorum of this body and doesn't fall within the open meeting's law.

STEVE RUSSO: And I guess just to add on to that, you know when you're dealing with open meeting's law it all goes to, you know, there's some concrete factors with it and other intangibles that go along with it about intent. Like I know David, and I'm sure Representative Nowlin is familiar with this, David said well, probably be fine with something less than a quorum. If twelve of the quorum, if ten of y'all decide to get together and debate ideas well, yes that's factual. But if somebody were to come in and say the only reason they did that was for intentional circumvention of the open meeting's law, literally, that could also be a violation as well. Really it pierces down to what is the intent. Are you intentionally trying to get around having an open meeting, and I guess cutting out the public and their right to have a comment and to participate in the governmental function.

TOM ED MCHUGH: Tom Ed McHugh, Louisiana Municipal Association. One of the missions of The Louisiana Municipal Association is training and education, and that's one of our primary goals. We often, often, often meet with the full council in a nonpublic meeting for educational and training sessions. Discussions with the AG's office on numerous occasions have given us complete comfort with that process. There's no vote, there's no agenda, there's an educational training process going on to gather information and understanding about issues. That's exactly what you are going to be doing in the

forum. There's no voting, no decision making. You are simply gathering information to allow y'all to have, because I can assure you, if you don't do it that way you are not going to succeed. You are going to get when it's time to make a report to the Legislator and you are not going to have any. It's too complicated, it's too much. You have too many people that are very busy people. If you don't design this process to where you can have those webinars where people can participate all over the state in the training educational process to gather information, you are not going to succeed. I think that the gentleman that just spoke, the intent is not to limit people, it's to include people. It's to come back in a very public setting and get action by a public body to deal with the information that has been obtained. I think you are on solid ground. I am not an attorney. Every time I practice I get beat. It's common sense. It's what the Legislator intended. You can't function with the challenge that you have if you don't set some mechanism where people can learn and discuss and gather information to move forward with.

DIRK BARRIOS: Just for informational purposes I'm asking. Are ya'll going to give us guidance on what, just giving out information? You're not going to be able to be in a position, at least I don't think you should be, telling people what we interpret these standards to be, right? Am I misunderstanding how this is going to happen? We're going to be out there and looking at part one, go through, read it, try to give the information out as it is written. It's not going to be participation webinar where they'll call in and say, what do you think? And am I misunderstanding something here? Because they may have questions and we can record the questions some kind of way. I think what we ought to be also trying to do is get them to be aware of what's going on and not only may be just calling in questions, but also maybe emailing information and questions. I can assure you, I've been through, and we've been through, and I got a lot of questions. And I know dog gone good and well the treatment Randy can't answer.

RANDY HOLLIS: I got chemical.

DIRK BARRIOS: You understand what I'm saying. A lot of us are being put into positions. It's not

that most of us don't have some expertise in some of these fields. I think that the gist of it is to get the information out, correct?

J.T. LANE: Yeah, I think that's why we're having that discussion exactly how this is going to flow. I want consistency for all of us. That's very important.

GLENN BRASSEAU: Glenn Brasseaux, Mayor of Carencro. I was also the LMA President a couple of years ago. Let me explain. I'm a grassroots guy. I'm not big on technology. What I use webinars for in my staff is we used to have to drive to LMA to participate and get education on a lot of different topics. When we came up with webinar idea my staff and myself can sit at a computer in Carencro. You preregister and it tells you at a certain time you call in. You log into your computer and you're automatically on and you are recorded as being present. Now let's say we're discussing occupational taxes. Say the day before the webinar LMA will email all the information that's going to be discussed, an outline. It's up to you if you want to study up, or just take it cold the next day, but... and then there's a person walks you through it. Whether it be on a slide presentation, whatever. And then if you have a question we type it in. It's all recorded and they will at the end, or during the session, they will say okay, we have a question. They don't identify where the question is coming from, but they will try to answer that question. It's a sharing of information, but the information is sent by email the day before. I hope that clarifies. Typically, me I mix up people more than they were.

RANDY HOLLIS: Mr. Chairman, if I might, let me give you an example. This is the way I kind of envision this happening. Under chemical treatment residual chlorine, and I just happen to turn to this, and it's applicable to what we talked about today. It says minimum chlorine residual and water distribution system should be .2 milligrams per liter. Minimum chlorine residuals practice should be 1.0 points. What I would do in that one paragraph, I envision sending that out to this group be it in a webinar, or being in other forms, or sending a mass email out. If this is ten state standards, please comment. I don't anticipate me sending out saying here's what it says. I think it ought to be 8.0. Giving my opinion, I don't think that's what we should do. I think our goal is to send this out, to ask for

comments and recommendations, and our job is to assimilate that together and bring it back to this committee. It's really sending this out, asking for comments. Some people may say over here on chlorine piping, it doesn't mention this here in pipe material, but I know you can not use brass and chlorine solution piping. Maybe someone should comment. We do not use brass and chlorine solution piping. That maybe something that we include in essence. So we send it out as it's written and we ask for comments and how can this be improving for just our standards.

JIMMY HAGAN: Is it going to be the committee's decision on what the consistency between all of these different focus groups is going to be? The reason I say that is, what works, and we're coming all from different areas of practice. What works in one place does not always work in another. In my particular line of work we represent many, many small communities. The fellow who spoke earlier, the way that you would reach out to and get input from those stakeholders is not always a webinar. There may be alternate means of doing things besides a webinar. I think the webinar would solicit comments from maybe the more sophisticated level of person that would give input, but it doesn't need to negate those who don't have access to that that have meaningful input. I think avenues for getting input, two really good ones, and only because we work with these organizations, but there's been others spoken here as well. LMA has regular meetings, quarterly meetings that are attended by elected officials. LRWA has regular meetings attended by operators who are members of LRWA and many, many other organizations like that that have regularly scheduled meetings that are not necessarily webinars, but that have significant attendance from people who are stakeholders that represent, in fact, all the people of our state who are the ultimate stakeholders. What avenues can we possibly use, other than webinars, and how do you maintain consistency between the delivery of different point people. To touch on Tom Ed's point, if you do that with greater consistency and greater input you have the better product delivered to the Legislator and the greater chance for acceptance by Legislator. Probably a lot of questions and not a lot of answers.

STEVE RUSSO: Well, I think you've got to pierce right to the deal is. The open record's law, y'all

need to be mindful of it, but I also don't want ya'll to be so mindful of it that it's a barrier to communication. Consistency is good in a way, but if you try to be too consistent you could block out some good avenues of getting some good data from folks. Some people may think a blast email to some constituents might be the best way to do it. The LMA certainly at a meeting may want to have just a grassroots kind of discussion amongst the folks at their meetings. Somebody else just because y'all are the heads of y'all certain sections, that certainly doesn't mean that you can't, for instance, go and talk about a different section with members of your constituency or members of your community just to see how they feel. Back to Representative Nowlin, knowing the kind of guy he was, I'm sure he spent countless hours, probably if not days of his life talking with constituents about various items of interest that they would like him to address when he was up at the session. That to me is not a violation of the open meeting's law, and shouldn't really be a concern to y'all. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that's a good way to get data.

RUSTY REEVES: I agree with Jim. We're going to have to reach out to some other meetings and webinars are going to work well. We'll have some training sessions, or whatever. However we can and may even get down to faxing it to somebody and faxing it back to you. One thing I wanted to ask, when we have these forums may be able to submit comments may be a week or two after the forum if they wanted to. Wouldn't be just at that forum. It allows somebody else to get access may be at a later time then they had at the webinar.

STEVE RUSSO: Yeah, and I think that's good as well. Once again, not to, I guess, lighten what the public record's law, the open meeting's law is all about, but it's mainly meant to prevent things like if all of a sudden J.T. calls the next meeting for April 1st of 2014. All of a sudden we all come in, sit around this room again at 2:00 and somebody holds up a big, thick manual and says, I have a motion, we approve. Do you have a second, yes. Any objections, no. All of a sudden the public is going wait a second, something is going on here. There wasn't any open discussion. Somebody had to go behind closed doors in a nontransparent fashion and concoct this document without the public having any

comment. I think as long as that doesn't happen, and of course there's a continuum down that continuum that you can't cross over as well. That's mainly what it was meant to prevent is these clandestine, behind close door meetings where the public couldn't see what the government is doing.

RUSTY REEVES: The only thing I would like to say is, like they mention LRWA does have the capability of mass emails and contacting both the operators and the system contact, the decision makers as well. And get to that point we can just disseminate that information down to them.

CHRIS RICHARD: How is information going to be funneled? I know there was some comments about it going to a single person worrying may be about that person screening it from appearance standpoint. Is everything going to go through DHH and then sent to that point person, or directly to the point person? How are we getting information from the public to the point person?

J.T. LANE: We need to, internally, after this meeting and figure that part out for you guys and let you know. We'll have to find some mechanism internally to get all that and have it submitted in the right format, whether it's a web form that's developed that allows people to attach documents, or type in their comments and questions, and that sort of thing that automatically populates one list or section part one and what not. We'll figure that out for you and let you know.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: So what we're going to end up doing is decide we want to have our forum on November 5th we can contact y'all. Y'all would get it all set up, because as far as recording everything that's going on like we're saying I'm not in a position to be putting on this webinar and trying to copy notes and all this information down while this was going on and probably somebody sends a question. I'm not going to attempt to answer a question at that time either. I don't say I'm an expert in whatever field I may end up being responsible for. There needs to be a straight line format who's doing it, where does that information go, and I think it needs to be gathered by somebody, possibly besides the point person, but then disseminated over to that person for presentation actually at the meeting.

J.T. LANE: Right. I think that what's going to end up happening is that we're going to probably... I agree with you in the consistency part completely. I think, otherwise, if we don't have some

consistency in all this it's going to drive us all crazy. I don't want to do that. So what we are going to do is go through and figure out how to be consistent in places. There are going to be places where we use LMA's webinar capabilities and stuff like that and either in all cases, or in some, the LRWA's list, our list, etc., a variety. A hodgepodge sort of thing.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: I think there needs to be a DHH person at each one of these webinars as the forum coordinator.

J.T. LANE: I agree.

RONNIE HARRIS: My name is Ronnie Harris. I'm with Louisiana Municipal Association. I failed to identify myself earlier. I wanted to address Mr. Hagan's point. In no way shape or form are we saying that the webinar is the only way to go. In fact, probably, you know we're in the 21st century, but you have a lot of people who are afraid of computers. They don't want to deal with it, and they want to have a physical presence. If this committee would want to have the point, or the point person want to have or directed to have one of those regular public hearings where the point person is present in Baton Rouge and everybody makes the trip to Baton Rouge and talks like I am to you. You can do that. The webinar is the electronic aspect that would satisfy the gentleman who originally spoke, and his concern what about the small town operator. Well, let me tell you, most operators know how to deal with computers and get the information as Mayor Brasseaux said the day before and have active and constructive input. The point person, although you're technically capable in your field, you know what your job is, as far as that point person? Is to facilitate the discussion and keep the people on track. You're not necessarily there, as you said earlier, to answer questions. That's really not your role. Your role is to gather the input. All these email list that the Rural Water, and LMA, and the list that everybody signed and DHH's list, all that is to blast out there, along with, I hope, a very good press release by DHH talking about the progress of this committee because this is a very good meeting. Y'all are making progress. I see that. With a schedule of saying hey, it's coming, be prepared and the emails will be following as to when part one is on. And whatever you can get started with one and two just as

pilot program to see how it goes. The one other thing that I failed to mention is, for those who did not attend the webinar they are archived and you can go back and listen to it anytime you want to. So even if you missed it you may not have the input at that particular time, but at least you can hear what they had to say. And I think anyone who questions whether this effort is transparent and with the open meeting's law, I think all they have to do is listen to this meeting. It is invariably convincing to all that we're trying to make sure that it's open, transparent. That's what's most important. The consistency of the product that comes to this committee is vital. As I said earlier, stating the point, putting the pro, putting the con, and making the question to the committee so y'all have real discussion and that's when the open meeting's law really kicks in that you're discussing the meat of the matter in the public. So thank you.

J.T. LANE: Thank you. So we have some more work we're going to do for you guys and get back to you on this. Are there any other questions that you want to raise that we should consider? Anything else burning, forums? And, of course, if you have anything in the next couple of days that you want us to consider, please let us know. We'll sit down and try to think of every possible issue that could be faced. If you have any other questions or thoughts in the next couple of days, please do let us know.

RANDY HOLLIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and DHH for showing that as a group, I think we can work together.

J.T. LANE: There was never any doubt about that. Thank you. Okay, the next item I think we can go through fairly quickly. I wanted to provide some clarifications. I know there was a lot of questions around one thing that we have wrestled with directing our staff. We survey water systems once every three years. One third roughly every year surveyed. It's a part of our agreement is that we continue with EPA, especially to continue surveys and so that was part of the reason why I sent you guys... we talked about it in the last meeting. I resent you the list of deficiencies that we paired down, that we ultimately thought that everyone would agree to something that needs to be correct, and stick to. Because, again, we still have staff out in the field that still have 1/3rd of their surveys to do this year.

I want to insure that they are doing them appropriately in the spirit of the law that was passed this past session, and also in the spirit of keeping people safe from contamination. And so that's why we sent that out for review. That wasn't necessarily spelled out in the law, specifically under the preview of this committee. That I did want to give you guys a chance to provide input. There's been feedback provided, and so that's why I asked Steve to see if you guys had any final questions or statements that you wanted to make about that, or any final questions that you wanted to ask of him as we try to proceed to do, again, some enforcement activities which are required of us over the next year as we chart a new course forward. With that I will guess I'll leave it open to questions, or if Steve wants to make any comments?

VERN BRELAND: The original list that we got for the deficiency list in August actually had the ten state standards in it. The new list that we got in September, all the ten state standards, anything that referred to ten state standards was removed, correct?

J.T. LANE: That's correct.

VERN BRELAND: But are these violations still being taken out of the ten state standards and will they be enforced?

J.T. LANE: These are violations that, again, in the spirit of the law that was passed that we would reasonably assume under national drinking water standards that could potentially cause contamination, which is why we severely paired the list down. To me you are asking a question that really goes to the heart of even how we started our work. I mean, we're starting with the ten state standards now. The legal basis for the enforcement is not ten state standards. The fact is is that we're starting our work now. We're going to a lot of what we pass through this committee next year is going to still have root in ten state standards. I hear your question. The legal basis is not that. It is our federal current federal authority. It is the current authority we have to designate significant deficiencies which is part of our agreement with EPA as a regulatory agency. And it's also the reason why I ask for your feedback, again, I want to be sure that our staff, Jake and Caryn want to be sure that the engineers in

the field are adhering to a new way of doing things. And the best way I can do that as they're going out there doing their jobs is to make sure that we give them a new set of guidelines. That's the best tool I have. But the legal basis is not ten state standards. It is what's currently in federal law.

RANDY HOLLIS: I'm not an attorney, but as I read act 292 this committee's job is to develop standards that will be put into future standards. This committee's job has nothing to do with interim standards. I hope you're not asking us to sanction or approve these, because we don't have the authority to do that.

J.T. LANE: No, I'm not. No way asking you to approve it. It was really as I thought about it, again, we were being told we weren't listening. I wanted to make sure even as the interim approach. It was really just a courtesy to all of you. See if you had any feedback, period. We have a job to do, both in our work with y'all. We also have a job to do in terms of keeping everyone safe for the next year and a half as we discuss this and lay this out. It was really merely to see if there was any feedback you wanted to offer. We know at the end of the day that in terms of the safety of the public this department is the one that's on the hook legally, period. Thank you for that question.

GREG GORDON: I sent in comments. Did anybody else? I was wondering if any committee members sent any comments on significant deficiencies?

VERN BRELAND: I did.

GREG GORDON: Do you have roady school on working microphones, you know. Is it on? I was just wanting to know. I made some comments. I didn't know if anybody else had made any comments on significant deficiency. I sent them in. I didn't know if y'all were going to look at any of them, or answer back, or took them as a comment and that was it?

J.T. LANE: Thank you, Greg. I think you were the only one that had direct comments about the documents, so thank you. Yes, we are going to take a look at that. I have not had a chance to circle with Dr. Guidry, and Jake, and Caryn yet to see what alterations we'll make to that, but yes. We'll definitely look at it in very short order. Again, I'm frankly kind of behind in my own mind on how fast I wanted to

get this done. Because again, the staff do need direction from us on how they do their jobs. The last thing I want them doing is going out there to do their jobs, which they're committed to doing, and they're not getting adequate instructions from us on how to do that. And again, I have everyone come back and say that we're not being responsive, or have inconsistent communication in the central office. That's why we'll definitely take a look very, very shortly. Thank you very much. All right. With that, I guess, is there any other remaining comments? We have sort of our check list and our homework that we've got to get done for you guys and details to point out. Are there any other comments that y'all want to make about something?

RICK NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman, has a composite list of all the member's contact data been distributed among the members, because I haven't seen it?

SHEREE TAILLON: It's on the website, but I can send it to you.

RUSTY REEVES: J.T., one comment I would like to make. Ms. Slavant asked about the nonprofit water systems and Ms. Sheree sent out a list and quoted DHH's database as 104 nonprofit community water systems. Actually, under the Public Service Commission there's 225 to 230 that's nonprofits. Of the 1400 water systems that makes up about a 7th of it. I kind of feel like maybe somebody from Public Service Commission ought to be invited to some of these meetings to understand some of these water systems that have to comply with... and actually their last docket on the 13th of this month got several of them under a decree order for failure to pay supervision inspection fees that they impose on nonprofit water systems. There's about six of them that if you would send them a letter telling them to pay our local government they will go to Public Service Commission and get out underneath these fees. Just something I wanted to bring out that they are governed 225 to 230 nonprofit.

J.T. LANE: We'll circle them and make sure our numbers are lining up.

RUSTY REEVES: I understand. A lot of times when you ask the system their self, you may ask the operator and he says, well, we're local government, but actually he's nonprofit. And actually I can send Sheree a list of what we have.

J.T. LANE: That would be perfect. Thank you. I would appreciate that.

RUSTY REEVES: So what I would like to see if somebody from Public Service Commission here because it's a lengthy process to get a rate increase for some of them systems. From what I've seen Public Service Commission don't necessarily agree with the reserve accounts that a lot of systems need to maintain their assets. If you've got a little money in the bank they're not real favorable in giving you a rate increase till your money is gone.

JAKE CAUSEY: I just want to make one clarification. So the definition of a public water system, as far as systems that we regulate, is 15 service connections, 25 people. PSC doesn't have that same threshold. You sell water to one person and you're regulated by the Public Service Commission. There was concern about discrepancies in numbers. There will be a discrepancy. Their rules are different.

RUSTY REEVES: I understand that. I was talking about...

JAKE CAUSEY: J.T. was asking about that.

J.T. LANE: Any other comments from the committee? Any other comments from the attendees of the meeting? Our next meeting is Tuesday, October 29th at 1 p.m. in this room. Looks like we'll be having a couple of forums, may be a few webinars in between now and then. With that do I have a motion to adjourn? Any opposed? Thank you very much.