

## Water Use Advisory Council (WUAC) Meeting

Hosted by the Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE)

**Tuesday, April 12, 2022**

**1:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.**

Con Con Conference Room  
South Atrium, Constitution Hall  
525 West Allegan  
Lansing, MI 48933

Remote Option Available Via Teams

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

**Or call in (audio only)**

[+1 248-509-0316](tel:+12485090316), [798308928#](tel:+1798308928) United States, Pontiac

Phone Conference ID: 798 308 928#

### AGENDA

1. Welcome  
Laura Campbell, Co-Chair, Farm Bureau, welcomed members and guests and shared the logistics for participation in the meeting. She noted she would be sharing the Chair role with fellow Chairs Burroughs and Eggers.
2. Roll Call—yellow is here  
Campbell took roll call attendance of members and/or alternates.

#### **WUAC Members/Alternates Present at Constitution Hall:**

Ben Tirrell, Michigan Farm Bureau  
Brian Eggers, AKT Peerless  
Bryan Burroughs, Michigan Trout Unlimited  
Buddy Sebastian, Michigan Ground Water Association  
Christine Alexander, EGLE  
Dave Hamilton, The Nature Conservancy Retired  
Frank Ettawageshik, United Tribes of Michigan  
Jim Nicholas, Nicholas-H2O  
John Yellich, Michigan Geological Survey  
Kelly Turner, Michigan Agricultural Irrigators  
Laura Campbell, Michigan Farm Bureau  
Megan Tinsley, Michigan Environmental Council  
Pat Staskiewicz, Michigan Section American Water Works Association  
Rachel Proctor, Consumers Energy  
Steve Crider, Consumers Energy

#### **WUAC Members/Alternates Present via Teams:**

Clyde Dugan, Michigan Section American Water Works Association  
Mike Gallagher, Michigan Lake Stewardship Associations  
Margaret Bettenhausen, Michigan Attorney General  
Steve Kohler, Kalamazoo River Watershed Council  
Tom Frazier, Michigan Townships Association  
Jim Johnson-Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD)

**WUAC Members/Alternates Absent:**

Abby Eaton, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD)  
Charlie Scott, Michigan Golf Course Owners Association  
Doug Needham, Michigan Aggregates Association  
Grenetta Thomassey, Tip of the Mitt Watershed Council  
James Clift, Deputy Director, EGLE  
Jason Geer, Michigan Oil and Gas Association  
Jason Walther, Michigan Agricultural Irrigators  
Kyle Rorah, Ducks Unlimited  
Rich Bowman, The Nature Conservancy  
Sue Hanf, Michigan Aggregates Association

**Non-members present:**

Adam Zwickle  
Andy LeBaron, EGLE  
Austen York, EGLE  
Brandon Ellefson, OHM Advisors  
Caroline Liethen  
Christine Spitzley, OHM Advisors  
Christopher Gothberg, EGLE  
Clayton Joupperi, EGLE  
Emily Finnell, EGLE  
Hannah Arnett, EGLE  
Jacob Sauter  
Jeremiah Asher, MSU  
Jim Milne, EGLE  
Joel Henry, Golder  
Katie Lindstrom  
Laura Schnoebelen  
Mark Seamon  
Michael Frederick, MGWA  
Nathaniel Shuff, EGLE  
Ralph Haefner, USGS  
Sherry Thelen  
Simon Belisle, EGLE  
Todd Feenstra, Tritium

3. Approval of Agenda-Roll Call Vote

Campbell noted there is a quorum. Discussion of recording committee meetings was added to the agenda. Sebastian objected to Jeremiah Asher's presentation on Preventative Measures. Campbell responded that the presentation is for information only. Sebastian requested his objection be on the record.

4. Approval of Minutes-Roll Call Vote

Campbell reviewed the PowerPoint slides that highlighted the comments and corrections that were received.

- June 2021 –Yellich had noted via email Jason Geer is now Executive Director of Michigan Oil and Gas Association. There were no other corrections.
- August 2021-accepting the changes noted by Hamilton via email on August 20, 2021, regarding Page 4, C. Models Committee, the minutes required no other corrections.
- October 2021-There were no comments or corrections
- December 2021-It was noted the spelling of Pearson’s name was incorrect. Via email on December 22, 2021, Yellich noted Jason Geer is with Michigan Oil and Gas Association and shared requested changes to Page 7. LeBaron also provided edits via email on December 22, 2021, to page 5, second paragraph. With the acceptance of those edits there were no other comments or corrections.
- February 2022 –Hamilton via email on February 22, 2022, provided edits to page 4. Hamilton he also added that after first “the” on line 6 of the first paragraph of his corrected text is should also read “precipitation in”. There were no other corrections or comments.

Ettawageshik asked if the minutes can be approved if there was not a quorum with the online and in person combined attendance. Bettenhausen responded that even if there was not a combined quorum, it was acceptable because the meetings held no action just information.

Burroughs motioned to approve the June, August, October, and December 2021 and the February 2022 WUAC minutes, motion supported by Nicholas. After extensive discussion regarding the legality of the minutes, Burroughs noted he would be willing to reconsider in the future if provided with a written legal analysis. Motioned approved by consensus.

5. Public Comment (3 Minute Limit)

There were no comments at this time.

6. Legislative Update

Campbell announced \$10 million was approved by the legislature (Senate Bill 565) for WUAC recommendations. Additional legislation is still outstanding on Michigan Geological Survey for geological mapping. House Bill 5782 for EGLE appropriations is also pending. Eggers noted this is a great milestone.

***(At this time, Co-Chair Burroughs assumed role of meeting Chair.)***

7. Preventative Measures—Jeremiah Asher

Jeremiah Asher presented a condensed version of a presentation that has been shared with some of the committees on how a a Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT model) can be utilized to improve the management of Michigan’s waters. Conservation technicians work directly with a landowner and model in real time how land use affects recharge in the area.

An overview of the different soil zones (A, B, C, D) were discussed along with their impact on water quality and the influences on base flows in streams. Infiltration feeds streams during times of baseflow and increasing impervious surfaces reduces infiltration and increases runoff leading to higher peak flows and lower base flows. Higher infiltration flows lead to colder water recharge for the stream baseflows and supports healthy steam ecosystems. The differences in water quality coming off of various landscapes (e.g., crop vs bare) were discussed.

Asher noted the proposed concept considers taking a broad approach to manage streams by considering and managing infiltration as opposed to just monitoring end point flows. He shared

a slide that showed taking infiltration into the equation helps us start to think about improving flows and managing system so the left in the A and B zones instead of managing to the right in C and D Zones.

Asher said currently in our system, only withdrawals of water are monitored. By using the tools presented here, infiltration can also be taken into consideration and withdrawals can be offset by various infiltration improvement projects. Similar projects performed by Coca Cola are using these tools and paying landowners to increase recharge and offset their withdrawals to better manage groundwater recharge. This could be particularly important for streams that are sensitive to cool and cold water and at risk from sediment loads. Managing aquifers for recharge (MAR) is a method that can help combat aquifer over withdrawals.

Results of a demonstration were displayed that was performed by the University of Delaware showing five different ground cover materials and how runoff and infiltration are affected. This showed the significant differences and impacts that different cover crop and soil management tactics can have on infiltration and sediment runoff. The SWAT model can be used to simulate adjustments to the cover and land use within the watershed and evaluate the changes to infiltration and runoff.

Two methods were suggested to incorporate this thinking into a water withdrawal assessment tool. Method one would utilize the existing language in legislation that talks about preventative measures and would be adjusted to incorporate infiltration and recharge as a preventative measure through a permit process (MCL 324.32723). Method two suggested that the same method be applied to high-capacity water withdrawals and the home watershed. If proposing a water withdrawal, the same logic could be applied to the permit approval process if recharge is being applied back into the watershed as part of the permit. Using these methods, a safety factor of 50% could be applied and has been used before to enable for increases in infiltration over time.

For improving water management, this could be a useful tool. It could provide cost effective alternatives to running pumping tests or other methods that are used for site specific reviews. This type of management would require a paradigm shift to think about managing to the left (A and B zones) instead of managing to the right (C and D zones).

In 2016, a small group of farmers performed a mock exploration session using real fields and practices. Collectively the group was able to offset about 10,600 gallons per minute in withdrawals in the watershed areas where they were located.

Turner asked Asher to define "preventative measures". Asher said preventative measures language is in legislation. Potentially under a permit scenario infiltration could be used to offset high withdrawal under specific scenario for specific user. Sebastian asked where infiltration is coming from. Asher said from rain events and changing land use to increase infiltration of precipitation and change in infiltration rates and amounts is what is being proposed. Essentially the difference to quantify the change in infiltration rates and amounts can be modeled.

Yellich stated that farmers are the smartest people in Michigan and from what he has seen over the last eight years they are already doing these kinds of things now and managing moisture and erosion. He questioned how this will make a difference. Asher agreed with Yellich that farmers are making great decisions, but he sees lots of fields that are not managed properly with no

cover, no buffer and many scenarios for improvements. Not for everyone but a change for fields which do not have best management practices (BMP) in place. This would be for identifying areas that do not have best management practices in place to work toward an appreciable change. Yellich stated it is incumbent on Ag Community and the Natural Resource Conservation District (NRCS) to work with the farmers. He does not think this is something WUAC should be doing right now. Asher stated he is not asking WUAC to do NRCS's job but to look at opportunities for some people to do a preventative measure that will allow them to do a withdrawal that they may not otherwise be able to do. Asher said the larger question is whether we could incorporate infiltration into water management.

Crider asked how a permits/credit system would work and who would manage it? There is obviously a big cost burden in doing this. Asher responded there is language for preventative measures currently in place, so the suggestion would be to utilize existing language to see if infiltration could be used in those scenarios.

Milne said there is a possibility of a permit applicant proposing preventative measures, but there is not one yet. Were EGLE to issue a permit based in part off preventative measures, then they would need to condition them appropriately. It was clarified that this is the distinction, this is not a registration, and this would have to be done through a permit. Milne also noted in a site-specific review, there is some leeway to adjust for a return flow credit, so that is a possibility.

Nicholas asked if the water that is infiltrating serving same purpose as the water being withdrawn. Asher responded there are opportunities to have more discussions about this and this can be addressed through site specific review.

Burroughs asked how much literature do you have, published studies, that have tried to look at empirical/application level. Have they found any significant response? Asher responded he does have a number of studies that have been done that he can share with WUAC. There is potential to do measurements and monitoring to get a better understanding of how these can be tracked at some case sites.

Campbell said we have a model that suggests we can have a positive impact on groundwater. The next logical step is to see if we can do some withdrawal offsetting with larger quantity withdrawals. But given that the penalty for getting it wrong is pretty high, she has a lot of hesitation about moving forward with any kind of recommendation that is very conceptual and could put the WUAC in any legal jeopardy. Asher replied his presentation to the WUAC is not to get a recommendation but to explore and see what next steps could be taken. If the WUAC wanted to further explore and see if additional modeling could be beneficial and provide some additional light on how those compared with model outputs would be supportive of that.

Hamilton said he asked for this presentation because the topic is an important one for the WUAC to understand. If, as a Council, we are concerned about this from a policy point of view that the Council thinks is not valid, then we don't need to spend more time on it. But if the answer is yes, we need to pursue and figure out how to encourage this. Hamilton believes the concept is important and has merit. The Legislature put preventative measures in place to explore if worthwhile. We need to find something that is tangible. This is something that is tangible but is unclear for some people.

Milne would like to have a policy discussion. He spoke to Pat Staskiewicz and Jason Walther because there has been some previous work done on preventative measures and he asked the New Topics Committee to investigate. He would like to make it a future topic.

Burroughs noted this was one of the first tasks he worked on when he joined the WUAC. Nobody has used it but it's in the statue. It seems like this has a long way to go to figure out whether it is an applicable tool, but he appreciates the attempt to see if this tool can get to a yes.

Feenstra asked how this work ranks in priority with other topics. He stated Lyndon Kelley and Dr. Younsuk Dong have been doing a lot of work with seepage meters in fields. There have been a lot of surprising results as to how little water actually infiltrates down into the aquifer systems. It would be worth pursuing and bringing in their expertise if the WUAC pursues this. He further commented on the current groundwater and surface water information that appears to be showing that the depletion model is not as accurate as we had hoped. He has concerns that to put another model back in that might push the problem down the road. How will new models be proofed? Using unverified models will not fly if we are talking about site specific review and implementing enforcement and fines and opening up private property for inspections. We need a higher standard now that we are 15 years into this. He would be careful about putting another model in place unless we have the data to back up those predictions. This seems to fit a whole lot better with best management practices rather than adding it to the stream depletion tool.

Hamilton believes it could be a whole water management tool Sebastian commented that it seems the larger concern is how much water is entering and if it is warm or cool. There are a lot of variables, and he does not want to see preventative measures giving a yes and then cause an ARI due to uncontrollable variables.

It was noted that this discussion isn't finished. People are encouraged to provide thoughts on the validity of this idea to Hamilton so we can determine a path forward. Dr. Asher was thanked for his presentation.

## 8. Committee Chairs Reports

### **A. Data Collection Committee**

Burroughs reported the Committee held a meeting on March 23. At this meeting they reviewed past charges and open topics, future work needs, and opened discussion of any new possible priorities. They determined the focus of the Committee for next report will be

- Develop standards & protocols for collection and use of new data within the program.
- Continue to pursue an approach to the inland lake ARI issue, conceptual framework, and data options. How to use the data and if data was missing. If data is missing identify the priorities.

Focus of Committee, outside of the next report:

- Begin preparing for implementation of projects from past recommendations, following acquisition of funding for them
- Integrated water management databases
- Systematic data assessment and long-term prioritization and planning needs
- Groundwater monitoring well network development
- Stream gage network maintenance/expansion

The next meeting will be held on April 21, 2022, at 9 a.m. If you would like to be added to the committee list, let Megan Tinsley or Bryan Burroughs know via email.

Nicholas asked if there would be a captured list of types of data. Burroughs responded that yes, the Committee has and will continue to assemble a data list. Nicholas asked second question of inland lakes and the definition of what would constitute an adverse resource impact and how does that fit under Data Collection or would New Topics be a better fit. Burroughs believes if you look back six or eight years, the inland ARI group focused on missing data and that was what was needed at the time, and it has just stayed in the Data Committee. The Committee has been discussing the ARI definition for years. Is there another way to address this from another direction? They do not have an answer yet. Ettawageshik asked if the public has ever been asked what they think an impact would be on a lake. Discussion on forms and sources of public input, opinion and engagement took place including past attempts to use legal lake levels.

## **B. Models Committee**

Hamilton provided a summary of the Committee's activities. A summary of the Committee's work is available if anyone is interested, please reach out to Hamilton. The first task is to develop tools to better represent streamflow depletion in SSRs. They have been working on two reports with EGLE and that will be brought back to Models Committee for input. These reports are:

- a) Groundwater Model Report Format Guidance
- b) Aquifer Testing Work Plan Guidance

The second Committee task is to develop recommendations to incorporate Downstream Accounting and Return Flows into the WWAP accounting process. The Committee presentation last month showed we have the ability to do downstream accounting. The Committee is looking at this from several angles in an attempt to settle this topic and move it forward. The Committee is researching other work that has been to help inform this topic. If anyone has expertise in these areas and ideas for additional work, please share them with the Models Committee.

The Committee's third task is to review ways to use existing models that may assist the WWAP. Models being reviewed include:

- 1) Cass County
- 2) MichIndOh model which is an estimated 2-3 years out
- 3) Wolf Cr/Skunk Cr by USGS

Regarding the allocate Streamflow Depletion (half max rule) and the presentation in December, the web squared method is very promising, and the results look really good. Questions remain about the accuracy and whether or not it is an improvement over what we are currently using. Committee is working on verification.

Committee would like to work with EGLE on the issue of dealing with "depleted" WMAs and how to respond to an ARI.

The final topic is a follow up on recommendations from the 2020 report that were recently funded. This includes developing the Michigan Hydrologic Framework. Models Committee

is a pleased to see funding for recommendations and will coordinate with the Implementation Committee.

Hamilton asked the WUAC to approve the following recommendation “The Models Committee concludes the majority of gaged watersheds showed little change in low flow trends with the 2007-2018 incorporated data, as compared to data collected prior to 2007, we recommend that an overall statistical update of all index flows is not yet necessary. The need to perform this statistical update should be reviewed at least every five years. The Models Committee asked the Council to concur that an overall statistical update of all index flows in not yet necessary.” Approved by consensus.

**C. New Topics Committee**

Staskiewicz reported the Committee has met since February. They will likely consider taking up the topic of preventative measures. Milne has another potential topic he will share during his presentation today.

**D. Conservation and Efficiency Committee**

Turner provided the update for the Conservation and Efficiency Committee. The Committee meets monthly although they skipped the March meeting to allow more time to review the 2014 recommendations.

The Committee finalized their 2022 Work Plan at their April meeting and determined what they could move forward with especially the ideas that came out of the from the Dow Fellows report including:

- Develop statewide Great Lakes education and outreach program (also from WUAC 2014, Michigan Water Strategy)
- Advance efforts to promote water energy savings programs through collaboration with energy utilities
- Restart and rebuild capacity in EGLE’s Retired Engineers Technical Assistance Program to assist businesses with sustainability assessments
- Further discussions on water conservation metrics for water infrastructure investments

The Committee reviewed and discussed the 2020 Recommendations and the new funding. Regarding Recommendation 1. Advance Michigan’s Water Conservation and Efficiency Efforts through State Climate, Energy, and Water Infrastructure Initiatives. The Committee discussed potential for funding for review and update of water sector BMPs with a focus on how climate migration/climate change may impact water sectors and how they are planning to mitigate and adapt. They also are interested in how climate migration will affect sustainable water use and how will water sectors adapt and mitigate climate affects. Crop migration is also a consideration.

The Committee is also working to advance progress on Recommendation 2. Ag Efficiency. Michigan State University is ready to proceed if funded.

The Committee has reviewed 2014 WUAC recommendations. The next steps are to develop a process for prioritizing topics for potential 2022 Committee recommendations to WUAC. The Committee would also like to know what else the WUAC would like them to focus on.

## E. Implementation Committee

Campbell noted the Committee is planning to meet next Thursday, April 21 at 1 p.m. The main topic will be the discussion of the appropriation from SB 565 (\$10 million for WUAC recommendations) and what guidance EGLE needs for implementing 2020 recommendations. All the Committees and WUAC members will be crucial to making recommendations to EGLE for distributing and implementing the new funding. This meeting will focus on distributing the funding. Campbell noted this is the first but will not be the only opportunity for input. The appropriation is to EGLE. The WUAC's role is to make recommendations.

For more information contact Co-Chairs:

- Doug Needham, [dneedham@miagg.org](mailto:dneedham@miagg.org)
- Laura Campbell, [lcampbe@michfb.com](mailto:lcampbe@michfb.com)

Yellich asked meeting information to be sent to entire WUAC.

### 8. 2022 WUAC Report Update: Content, Logistics and Timeline

Burroughs reminded the WUAC the 2022 WUAC Report is due to the legislature at the end of the year. The goal is to have the final draft report ready to share at December 2022 meeting. In order to reach consensus in time to complete the Report, informational presentations are anticipated to be held in August, September, and October. Final edits and consensus will need to be completed in November. Present for information then asked for consensus. Quorums will be required to support the decisions needed to complete the report.

***(At this time, Co-Chair Eggers assumed role of meeting Chair.)***

### 9. EGLE Update

Milne provided the updated program metrics for the Water Use Assessment Unit. Compliance communications include after the fact registrations, missing pump information requests, revised registrations, and installation verification requests. Violation notices included violation notices for unregistered wells, and wells installed and/or operated differently than authorized, this number also includes second violation notices. Complaints include water level drops and new irrigation systems which may or may not be authorized. If multiple complaints were made for the same operation, it was only counted once.

Nat Shuff has taken over doing pre-screening reviews for new or increased public water supply large quantity withdrawals (LQWs) for EGLE Drinking Water & Environmental Health Division. The pre-screening reviews are like Part 327 site specific reviews (SSRs). EGLE provides suggestions to the Drinking Water and Environmental Health Division for additional information or withdrawal modifications. Part 327 permits are required for new or increased LQWs > 2,000,000 gallons per day (2 MGD). Four permits were issued this quarter. Between July 9, 2021, and March 31, 2022, there were 223 Water Withdrawal Assessment Tool (WWAT) registrations and 164 SSR registrations. One hundred and sixty-four SSRs were authorized, four were denied and fifteen were retracted by the applicant. Another nine were still pending when this data was queried.

The average number of days to complete an SSR was 13.1. Fifty-seven percent of the SSRs were completed within the 10-business day statutory deadline. Milne shared a slide containing two graphs. The top graph showed the cumulative trend in the average number of days to complete an SSR. The bottom graph showed the cumulative trend in the percentage of SSRs completed

within 10 business days. He then shared a map showing the total number of LQW registrations, WWAT and SSR requests, by county. Turner asked what the longest approval time has been. Staff estimates some have taken years, but those cases are few and far between. Reasons for lengthy delays can include resolving open Part 327 violations, index flow reviews, and delays in getting responses from applicants or agents.

Milne shared a statewide map that identified depleted Water Management Areas (WMA) shown in red. EGLE has also been collecting miscellaneous stream flow measurements shown in the green WMAs. EGLE is planning to collect additional miscellaneous stream flow measurements shown in the blue Water Management Areas. EGLE also has a Joint Funding Agreement with USGS to have USGS collect miscellaneous stream flow measurements at an additional 30 locations.

The Michigan PFAS Action Response Team (MPART) has a web map that shows the locations of PFAS contamination sites and sampling locations in Michigan. The Water Use Program is aware of at least two sites where irrigation withdrawals have been impacted by PFAS groundwater contamination plumes and ended up spreading the PFAS contamination into the soil and/or groundwater beneath the irrigated fields. EGLE's Environmental Mapper GIS site can be used to locate other sites of environmental contamination (Parts 201 and 213), underground storage tank facilities (Part 211), and baseline environmental assessments (Parts 201 and 213). Property owners or their agents should contact EGLE Remediation and Redevelopment Division district office staff for additional information about PFAS and other contamination sites that are located near your existing or proposed large quantity water withdrawals.

Milne shared a screen shot from PFAS map site for the Greater Lansing area. The purple triangles represent PFAS sites. The green squares represent PFAS surface water sample locations. The fuzzy blue dots mark PFAS public drinking water supply sample sites. A second screen shot from Environmental Mapper zoomed in on the downtown Lansing area. Green triangles show closed leaking underground storage tank sites. Orange circles identify open leaking underground storage tank sites. Brown squares mark Part 201 contamination sites. Brown crosses represent active underground storage tank facilities. Blue stars mark closed underground storage tank facilities. Purple dots with a B inside them are baseline environmental assessments. Campbell asked what the approach for determining PFAS contamination. Pond withdrawal and if MPART told the producer this irrigation source is contaminated? Staff responded that EGLE provided notification asking to cease irrigating from these ponds.

Milne noted information needs to be shared and it is only recently they were notified of the PFAS in some of these wells. Milne said Part 327 only deals with groundwater quantity not quality. MCL 324.32723 requires compliance with all applicable statutes, including Parts 201 & 213. But that's only for permits (> 2 MGD). WWAT & SSRs don't have similar requirements. There was support for this topic as an item for the New Topics Committee. The 2020 WUAC Report recommendation for "data warehouse" to prevent silos of data and share it will hopefully help end this issue.

Eggers thanked Milne and asked for any other comments. Sebastian asked about wells for fire protection. They are treated like regular production wells but only turn on every 90-120 days, yet those wells are in the tool. LeBaron responded there is specific language in the recognize that fire suppression wells are only used for infrequently during emergencies. Fire suppression

wells are exempt from the ARI prohibition. EGLE works to zero out the wells for fire suppression wells.

10. Future

a. Meeting Dates

- June 14 (Tuesday)
- August 9 (Tuesday)
- September 13 (Tuesday)
- October 11 (Tuesday)
- November 10 (Thursday)
- December 5 (Monday)

Addressing the agenda addition, Turner said the Conservation and Efficiency Committee they record every meeting and then download along with minutes. Turner suggests all Committees record all meetings. Campbell believes there is a way to record but limit access and to provide a direct download. Turner volunteered to put together how to guidance documents for Zoom and Teams.

b. Formats

In person meeting formats will be preferred going forward. Staskiewicz suggested voting members who are not able to attend in person notify the Chairs. Going forward a RSVP will be included in meeting and agenda notices.

c. Quorum

Furthering the discussion on meeting formats, it was noted that quorums will be important for the decisions that will need to be made related to the compilation of the 2022 WUAC Report to the legislature.

11. Open Comments (3 Minute Limit)

There were no comments.

12. Motion to Adjourn

There being no further business it was MOVED by Ettawageshik and SUPPORTED by Burroughs to adjourn. MOTION CARRIED. The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.