



1 There being no one else who wished to address the Board, the Chairman closed the floor  
2 for public comment.

3

4 Mr. Ricky Harper arrived at 5:38 p.m.

5

6 Ms. Price commented that the Board had acquired two new companies in the current year.

7

8 Mr. White remarked that they were employees with an independent firm, and that they  
9 went through an RFP process in the previous year; additionally, the current auditors were  
10 selected by the current Board in January 2023.

11

12 On a motion by Ms. Price, seconded by Mr. Smith, and carried unanimously by a vote of  
13 4-0, the NLCHD Board approved the financial report audit.

14

#### 15 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

16 On a motion by Mr. Hurley, seconded by Ms. Price, and carried unanimously by a vote of  
17 4-0, the NLCHD Board approved the Minutes of January 19, 2023.

18

#### 19 PRESENTATION OF QUARTERLY AUDITS

20 Mr. White related that the CPA firm of Moore Stephens Lovelace was unable to attend to  
21 present this information, and that they had asked that he would present it in their stead. He  
22 reported that included in the packet was the October 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022 agreed  
23 upon procedures regarding the indigent care reimbursement submissions, and that based  
24 on the testing results, they had approved amounts for each provider listed in the  
25 presentation.

26

27 Ms. Price commented that this audit had a 95 percent accuracy.

28

29 Mr. White indicated that this was correct, and said that they were an independent CPA firm  
30 of the NLCHD Board engaged to provide procedures described to them and listed in the  
31 packet. He mentioned that they conducted the procedures the district asked them to do and  
32 provided a conclusion, and that the sampling methodology they used resulted in a 95  
33 percent confidence level.

34

35 Ms. Price asked if the costs they used compared with Medicaid.

36

37 Mr. White said that it was, and that according to their report, the cost was at a rate that was  
38 less than the Medicaid reimbursable. He stated that the next half was a draft report for the  
39 period of January 1, 2023 through March 31, 2023 done with the same process, testing  
40 selection, sampling methodology, and confidence level rating based on a statistical sample,  
41 and that they had provided a list of providers, the amounts that would be approvable, and  
42 the reimbursable cost to the providers. He mentioned that both the December 2022 and the  
43 March 2023 reports and the amounts listed were within the approved budget for FY 2022-  
44 2023.

45

1 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Harper, and carried unanimously by a vote of  
2 4-0, the NLCHD Board approved the October 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022 final  
3 report.

4  
5 On a motion by Mr. Hurley, seconded by Mr. Smith, and carried unanimously by a vote of  
6 4-0, the NLCHD Board approved the January 1, 2023 through March 31, 2023 draft report.

7  
8 SCHEDULING OF BUDGET AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

9  
10 Ms. Donna Catterson, with Crippen and Co., stated that the only change they made was  
11 due to the truth in millage (TRIM) procedures, and that they were initially going to have a  
12 meeting on August 31, 2023 for the preliminary budget, which was too soon; therefore, the  
13 preliminary budget meeting would now be on September 14, 2023 with the final budget  
14 meeting on September 28, 2023.

15  
16 Ms. Price remarked that she would not be available on September 28, 2023.

17  
18 Ms. Catterson replied that she would see what else was available, noting that they had a  
19 timeline.

20  
21 Mr. Smith stated that he would not be able to attend the August 17, 2023 meeting, and that  
22 he would not attend remotely, noting that it was not feasible.

23  
24 Mr. Hurley mentioned that he would be in Africa at the time of the August 17, 2023  
25 meeting.

26  
27 Ms. Kirste noted that these dates were presented in January 2023, and that she had asked  
28 them to schedule them and confirm them, noting that at the August 17, 2023 meeting they  
29 would review the funding requests for all the hospitals.

30  
31 Ms. Price commented that it would not be a voting meeting, and that it was for funding  
32 requests.

33  
34 Mr. Smith said that he could watch the meeting later.

35  
36 Ms. Kirste explained that the hospitals provided detailed presentations to the Board, and  
37 opined that it would be good have a quorum.

38  
39 Mr. White said that they would make every effort to accommodate the schedule change  
40 requests.

41  
42 Ms. Price inquired if the Board would receive some type of documentation with the  
43 presentations from the clinics and hospitals, noting that the Board members who were not  
44 present could review it later.

45

1 Ms. Kirste related that they had always asked the clinics and hospitals to provide their  
2 presentations five days before the meeting, and that they usually did; however, there had  
3 been issues when they had received audit reports with last minute changes.

4  
5 Mr. Hurley remarked that he had not received the information packet for the current  
6 meeting until the prior evening, and that he not had time to study what was being discussed.

7  
8 Ms. Kirste noted that she had not received it until the prior day, and that she could only  
9 provide it after she had received it.

10  
11 Mr. Smith opined that it was difficult to read through the material with so little time to  
12 prepare, especially for those who worked during the day, and opined that if the hospitals  
13 would be coming to the Board for funding, then they should adjust their schedule around  
14 the Board's.

15  
16 The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

17  
18 Mr. Phil Braun, Vice President and General Counsel for University of Florida (UF) Health  
19 Central Florida, explained that they would come when the Board was scheduled to have a  
20 meeting, and opined that the issue was the Board having a quorum.

21  
22 There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the  
23 Chairman closed the floor for public comment.

24  
25 Ms. Price asked if it was possible to receive the budgets sooner than the day before. She  
26 explained that in prior years, the tentative millage rate was set without the Board's input,  
27 and opined that it was important for this Board to set that tentative millage.

28  
29 Mr. White commented that they would strive to inform the Board sooner; however, they  
30 had to wait for some reports for the tentative actual columns.

31  
32 Ms. Price opined that the two groups they had just hired had done a great job, and that they  
33 were very thorough and easy to work with.

34  
35 Mr. Smith questioned how long Ms. Kirste had been the Board's attorney, and Ms. Kirste  
36 said that it had been since 2008. Mr. Smith opined that there should be term limits, such  
37 as four years.

38  
39 Ms. Kirste remarked that if the Board desired, she would put out an RFP.

40  
41 Ms. Price opined that change was occasionally needed, and asked Ms. Kirste if she wanted  
42 to continue as the Board attorney, or if she was willing to step down.

43  
44 Ms. Kirste replied that she was willing to stay, and noted that since that time period, she  
45 had not changed her rates.

46  
47 Ms. Price stated that the Board budgeted \$11,000 per year for attorney fees.

1 Mr. Harper commented that he would be fine receiving the information one piece at a time,  
2 and that he could review the documents as they came in.

3  
4 Ms. Kirste relayed that she could send the information piecemeal.

5  
6 Mr. Smith indicated that this would be fine.

7  
8 Ms. Price opined that the budget was very important, and relayed her understanding that  
9 Ms. Catterson would see if the dates for the future meetings could be changed.

10  
11 Ms. Catterson explained that they had to advertise, and provide the final budget meeting  
12 dates for the TRIM, noting that everything had to be done by October 1, 2023.

13  
14 BUDGET SCENARIO WORKSHEET DISCUSSION

15 Ms. Kirste said that the Board needed to discuss the budget scenario worksheet to  
16 determine a proposed tentative millage rate to be submitted to the Lake County Property  
17 Appraiser.

18  
19 Mr. White related that initially included in the packet was a preliminary budget worksheet  
20 scenario, and that the expenditures of the actual column was modified earlier on the current  
21 day to reflect some of the tentative costs that would be more realistic for the current fiscal  
22 year. He explained that there was a summary scenario for the millage rate as requested by  
23 the trustees, which included the millage, the ad valorem taxes, the associated interest, the  
24 fund balance at the beginning of the year, the expenditures, the medical care provided by  
25 both the clinics and the hospitals, what was adopted in the prior year, and other scenarios  
26 based on lower millage rates.

27  
28 Mr. Smith relayed his understanding that according to the Lake County Property Appraiser,  
29 that there was supposed to be a 13 percent increase overall in valuations. He mentioned  
30 that he had met with Mr. Edward Jiminez at the University of Florida Health Shands (UF  
31 Shands) in the City of Gainesville who did not want the Board to stop their funding  
32 suddenly, but incrementally. He related that in the prior year the NLCHD was able to give  
33 both major hospitals about \$1.2 million, noting that it was a large difference from the \$4  
34 million they had received in previous years. He opined that the NLCHD should fund the  
35 clinics but not the hospitals who he opined did not need it at this point. He also opined that  
36 people should not be required to give funding to an organization that they may or may not  
37 want to fund, and that they should be able to spend their money as they saw fit. He stated  
38 that he would support a zero millage, and opined that this Board should go away. He  
39 opined that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) could provide for any special needs  
40 and do a more professional job than this Board.

41  
42 Mr. Harper relayed that he wanted to do whatever their guidelines recommended to keep  
43 their funding in place for the next two to three years and to cover what expenses they were  
44 required to cover.

45  
46 Mr. Hurley inquired about the first quarter budget, and expressed concern about inflation.  
47 He said that he did not know how the hospitals would be affected by illegal immigrants,

1 opining that they would qualify for indigent care. He opined that the current meeting was  
2 premature because they did not yet know what funds would be needed, and that they had  
3 been elected to help take care of people who were less fortunate.

4  
5 Mr. Smith remarked that hospitals were non-profit organizations, and that they were  
6 required to provide indigent care whether or not this Board gave them funding.

7  
8 Ms. Price commented that she did not like to tax people, and opined that it was a burden to  
9 Lake County residents, noting that she would not be willing to go any higher for the  
10 tentative millage than 0.25 mills.

11  
12 Mr. Smith inquired if they could raise the millage from the tentative rate.

13  
14 Ms. Price indicated that it could not be raised, and that the tentative millage rate was  
15 presented to the Lake County Property Appraiser so he could complete his proposed TRIM  
16 notices that would go out to homeowners. She explained that whatever millage was set,  
17 the Board could stay the same or go lower.

18  
19 Mr. Hurley questioned how the Board would know if 0.25 mills would provide enough  
20 funding to meet the requests.

21  
22 Ms. Price opined that those organizations should be frugal.

23  
24 The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

25  
26 Mr. Braun opined that there could not be a vote on the final millage at the current meeting,  
27 and asked if the Board had a tentative amount.

28  
29 Ms. Price answered that it was about \$15 million.

30  
31 Mr. Braun opined that the Board would be setting a tentative millage prior to obtaining  
32 property values, which would not be until after July 1, 2023.

33  
34 Ms. Price noted that the Board had set a tentative millage rate in the previous year.

35  
36 Ms. Catterson said that the Board could set a tentative millage rate but could not adopt a  
37 budget based on the millage, and that once it was set, the Board could not raise it.

38  
39 Mr. Hurley inquired what good it would do to set a tentative millage rate if it could not be  
40 changed.

41  
42 Mr. Harper asked why the Board would want to set such a low tentative rate.

43  
44 Ms. Price opined that it should never be assumed that the tentative rate would be 1.00 mills  
45 as it had been in previous years, and that if the rate started out high, it may not come down.

46  
47 Mr. Hurley stated that if the rate started out low, it could not go up.

1 Mr. Smith opined that the indigent would not be harmed if the millage rate was zero, and  
2 that the only reason to have more of a millage rate would be to fund the clinics.

3  
4 Mr. Hurley said that he wanted to hear from the hospitals and clinics to see if that statement  
5 was true.

6  
7 Mr. Rollins opined that the hospitals and clinics would request as much funding as possible  
8 even though the indigent could not be refused care, and opined that they could live within  
9 their budgets. He opined that they should not come to this Board and give an amount of  
10 how much taxpayers should be forced to pay, and that this was not a charity, but a  
11 government organization that forced people to pay taxes, which would allow hospitals to  
12 pay their executives large salaries. He said that if one wanted to donate to a hospital, there  
13 were many opportunities; however, he opined that the Board should not force those who  
14 struggled to stay in their homes to pay for others. He opined that the Board should set the  
15 millage rate as low as possible and make hospitals and clinics work within that budget.

16  
17 Mr. Sabatini opined that Lake County did not need this Board, and that the hospitals in  
18 south Lake County were doing better than ever even though their taxing district had been  
19 deleted. He asked the Board to set the millage to zero, and opined that anything more than  
20 that was wrong.

21  
22 Mr. Braun remarked that their hospital would continue to provide care to indigent people;  
23 however, that care had costs. He related that they had been losing money in operation costs  
24 for the prior three years, and that they paid more to provide care to Lake County residents  
25 than they took in. He opined that even though they had budgeted and invested their funds  
26 to provide reserves, eventually it would affect care. He also opined that they did more than  
27 the minimum to provide care, and that they did good work; furthermore, this was a  
28 public/private partnership. He mentioned that there were very few for-profit hospitals in  
29 Lake and Sumter Counties, opining that this was because it was not a profitable business.  
30 He relayed that the indigent would still be billed because many people had some money,  
31 and that hospitals had a right to collect money for services that were provided, opining that  
32 the NLCHD funding could help prevent much of that collection. He commented that they  
33 had come to these meetings with presentations to try to educate the Board about how  
34 healthcare worked, and opined that taxes provided funding for services that had to be paid  
35 for as a community. He noted that they were reimbursed for care already rendered below  
36 cost, and that there was no profit in billing the NLCHD for emergency care.

37  
38 Ms. Price commented that when taxes were paid to the County and municipalities, it was  
39 for services that benefited all people; however, she opined that this special taxing district  
40 was not fair to everyone in north Lake County because those who paid for health insurance  
41 were being penalized by having increased taxes.

42  
43 Ms. Erin Burley, with Catholic Charities of Central Florida, stated that her organization  
44 owned the St. Luke Free Medical and Dental Clinic in the City of Eustis, and opined that  
45 they were the smallest of the local clinics. She relayed that they were not reimbursed for  
46 undocumented workers; therefore this was not an issue for the Board. She mentioned that  
47 they helped to keep people out of the hospital emergency rooms by treating residents for

1 issues, such as hypertension, cholesterol, diabetes, and infections, and said that the work  
2 they did helped keep the hospitals from expending their resources and becoming a primary  
3 care center.

4

5 Ms. Price opined that the clinics played a vital role in the community, and that St. Luke's  
6 did a good job.

7

8 Ms. Burley commented that many of the people they served were not homeowners, opining  
9 that there were many people going through difficult times that needed their help.

10

11 Mr. Smith relayed his understanding that some charities had fundraising events for their  
12 funding, and he asked if they obtained other funding this way.

13

14 Ms. Burley replied that the NLCHD was not their sole funding source, and that they applied  
15 for grants and did fundraisers mostly through social media and mailings. She mentioned  
16 that they had stopped hosting specific events because they were not producing enough  
17 funding for the amount of time and money it cost, and that they worked primarily with  
18 volunteers, including the doctors, dentists, and nurses, noting that they only had one other  
19 paid employee besides herself.

20

21 Ms. Connie Hurlburt, a resident of Lake County, observed that there were many urgent  
22 care centers being built, and she wondered why they would do this if it wasn't a profitable  
23 business. She opined that the hospital model was inefficient, and that government should  
24 not fund them.

25

26 Mr. Harper inquired what funds they carried over from the previous year.

27

28 Mr. White answered that it was \$162,000, which rolled into their FY 2022-2023 budget,  
29 pending any unknown payments.

30

31 Mr. Harper asked how much all the entities had requested compared to the current budget.

32

33 Mr. White explained the information located in the packet, and said that it was a portion of  
34 the current year budget that had been approved for payment. He explained that \$9 million  
35 would include the ad valorem taxes as well as the carry forward of the budget, and that the  
36 budget expenditures were \$7.9 million.

37

38 Mr. Harper questioned if Ms. Price wanted to cut that amount in half for the next fiscal  
39 year, and if it would fund what the clinics had proposed.

40

41 Ms. Price indicated that this was correct, and said that she would like to fully fund the  
42 clinics. She relayed that if the clinics followed the same practice as previous years, then it  
43 should be sufficient, and relayed her understanding that the hospitals would also receive  
44 some funding.

45

46 Mr. Harper stated that he did not like having to vote on hypothetical data, which was what  
47 the Board was being asked to do at the current meeting.



1 Ms. Price relayed her understanding that they would not have that data until September  
2 2023.

3

4 Mr. White explained that the current meeting was placed on the schedule at the discretion  
5 of the trustees, and that the funding requests meeting would be in August 2023.

6

7 Mr. Harper commented that if the Board was going to fund this as the voters had asked  
8 them to, then he did not want to shortchange those services to the community.

9

10 Mr. Smith opined that many of those voters also elected trustees who very openly opposed  
11 this tax, and that it was done more recently. He commented that the tentative millage rate  
12 was formerly set at 1.00 mills, and that it was just an arbitrary number to start out with.

13

14 Ms. Price mentioned that her tentative millage rate proposal also included funding for  
15 LifeStream Behavioral Center, opining that mental health care was important.

16

17 Ms. Nancy Wise, a resident of Fruitland Park, stated that she had voted for the NLCHD,  
18 opining that the residents knew what they were voting for. She opined that it was more  
19 difficult to research Board members and to know what they stood for and how they would  
20 vote, and that she wanted this taxing district to continue. She opined that this meeting was  
21 premature and not required at this point, and that they should first hear from the clinics and  
22 hospitals to make an educated decision. She also opined that limiting the Board to 0.25  
23 mills was premature as the Board had not had the budget meeting, had not heard the  
24 requests, and did not have the statistics and information necessary.

25

26 Mr. Harper questioned what the legal guideline was for this meeting.

27

28 Ms. Catterson replied that Ms. Price as Chairman could set a special meeting at any time,  
29 and that the Board had 185 days after July 1, 2023 to complete the process of the TRIM.

30

31 Mr. Hurley stated that he was a homeowner, and that he had paid only \$90 the previous  
32 year for this tax, opining that he could spend that much going out the dinner. He expressed  
33 concerns for proposing 0.25 mills because it could not be raised, and said that he did not  
34 want to vote on something he did not know about.

35

36 Mr. Smith noted that businesses also had to pay this tax, and that when residents patronized  
37 these businesses, the cost was passed on to them. He opined that this tax was corporate  
38 welfare, and that people should donate to the clinics on their own. He also opined that this  
39 tax was first proposed to incentivize hospitals to come to Lake County, and that it had  
40 already accomplished this purpose.

41

42 Ms. Price opined that 0.25 mills would provide funding to the clinics and hospitals and also  
43 save the taxpayers money.

44

45 Mr. Harper asked why the tentative millage rate needed to be decided before the August  
46 2023 meeting, and who would make the decision on the final millage rate.

47

1 Ms. Price replied that the tentative millage had to be provided to the Lake County Property  
2 Appraiser before the funding request, and that the Board would vote on the final millage  
3 rate at the final budget meeting.

4  
5 Mr. White explained that if nothing was passed in the current meeting, then it would default  
6 to 1.00 mills, and that on July 1, 2023 the Lake County Property Appraiser would place  
7 1.00 mills on the certification of intangible tax in compliance of TRIM. He said that they  
8 would certify 1.00 mills on the advertisements, and that once the Board set the final budget,  
9 the final millage would be set.

10  
11 Ms. Price opined that the tentative millage rate on the TRIM notice could be confusing,  
12 and that she did not want to alarm residents with 1.00 mills.

13  
14 Mr. Harper opined that 1.00 mills would be too high.

15  
16 Mr. Braun expressed concern about setting the tentative millage at the low number of 0.25  
17 mills before receiving the budget information.

18  
19 There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the  
20 Chairman closed the floor for public comment.

21  
22 Ms. Price relayed that for several years, she did not know that the Board could set the  
23 tentative millage, and that she wanted the Board to set the tentative millage at the current  
24 meeting.

25  
26 Mr. Smith opined that Ms. Price should have been told about this by the Board's attorney  
27 who had been in place for 15 years, and that they needed term limits. He opined that the  
28 Board should ask for an RFP, and that the Board should be good stewards of their expenses  
29 as well as the funding being given to the clinics and hospitals.

30  
31 Mr. Harper asked what an RFP would entail.

32  
33 Ms. Price opined that the Board was fortunate with the new additions because one of the  
34 businesses had been working with a hospital district in Marion County, and that experience  
35 should be considered.

36  
37 Mr. Smith inquired if Ms. Kirste would be willing to reapply to serve this Board.

38  
39 Ms. Kirste replied that she would consider it.

40  
41 Mr. Harper opined that Ms. Kirste did not withhold anything from the Board that had been  
42 previously established, and that it was the responsibility of the trustees to ask Ms. Kirste  
43 questions, noting that he would like to go through the dialogue of the packet with Ms.  
44 Kirste and ask what it all meant.

45  
46 Ms. Kirste stated that she would be glad to sit down with Board members one-on-one.

1 Ms. Price commented that Ms. Kirste had always been available when she had questions,  
2 and that the setting of the tentative millage misunderstanding was not the fault of Ms.  
3 Kirste.

4  
5 Mr. Smith stated that he wanted to do an RFP for the attorney position, and that all  
6 applicants could make their presentations either before or at the August 2023 meeting.

7  
8 Mr. White remarked that the date of the August 2023 meeting would have to be changed  
9 to accommodate schedules.

10  
11 Mr. Smith relayed that he would like a special meeting on August 10, 2023.

12  
13 Mr. Hurley wondered if a new attorney selected from the RFP at the August 10, 2023  
14 meeting would know what they needed to do for the following budget meeting.

15  
16 Ms. Price mentioned that to have a special meeting, the Board would have to place a public  
17 notice in the newspaper and place a public notice for the RFP, and opined that it would  
18 cost about \$2,000.

19  
20 On a motion by Mr. Harper, seconded by Ms. Price which failed by a roll-call vote of 2-2,  
21 the NLCHD Board did not approve to table the RFP vote for the Board attorney position.

22  
23 Mr. Hurley and Mr. Smith voted no.

24  
25 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Hurley which failed by a roll-call vote of 2-  
26 2, the NLCHD Board did not approve an RFP for the Board attorney position.

27  
28 Mr. Harper and Ms. Price voted no.

29  
30 Mr. Hurley made a motion to set the tentative millage rate at 1.00 mills, but the motion  
31 failed due to the lack of a second.

32  
33 Mr. Hurley commented that if the Board voted for a 0.25 millage, then the Board would  
34 not be able to raise any more than \$4.6 million.

35  
36 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Price which failed by a roll-call vote of 2-2,  
37 the NLCHD Board did not approve to set the tentative millage at 0.25 mills.

38  
39 Mr. Harper and Mr. Hurley voted no.

40  
41 Ms. Price opined that it was important to make a decision at the current meeting, and that  
42 it was important to the taxpayers. She commented that a millage of 0.40 mills would  
43 provide funding comparable to the previous year's funding.

44  
45 Mr. White stated that based on the tentative information, 0.40 mills was estimated to  
46 provide about \$7.1 million.

47

1 Mr. Harper wondered if the coming year's expenses would exceed that of the previous  
2 year.

3  
4 Mr. White replied that they made an estimate of what the costs would be based on the  
5 attorney's fees, accounting fees, agreed upon procedures fees, auditor's fees, insurance  
6 costs, legal ads, website costs, and other expenses, noting that those fees were also tentative  
7 at this point.

8  
9 Mr. Harper asked if the Board would be liable for any shortage of funding, and if the Board  
10 had a legal obligation to provide funding.

11  
12 Mr. Smith opined that the Board would not be liable and did not have an obligation to  
13 provide funding.

14  
15 Mr. White explained that the funding requests by the clinics and hospitals that were made  
16 and approved were capped at an amount that would theoretically be below what the  
17 tentative millage or ad valorem taxes would be, and that they would only receive that  
18 amount once approved. He relayed that other expenses, such as the overhead expenses,  
19 would be discontinued when there were no more funds, or services would collect in arrears  
20 until the next budget period. He mentioned that if the hospitals and clinics provided  
21 funding requests that were approved, they could be funded at their capped amount up to  
22 the amount available.

23  
24 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Price, and carried by a vote of 3-1, the  
25 NLCHD board voted to set the tentative millage rate at 0.40 mills to be submitted to the  
26 Lake County Property Appraiser.

27  
28 Mr. Hurley voted no.

29  
30 WEBSITE

31 Ms. Kirste stated that the NLCHD had a new web provider, and that the new website was  
32 listed on the agenda, noting that she would be meeting with them on the following day.  
33 She said that the information was in the packet, and that it was still a work in progress,  
34 opining that they would be pleased with the new information. She mentioned that if there  
35 was additional information that the Board would like or other suggestions, they could  
36 contact her office.

37  
38 Mr. Harper inquired if the website had been updated.

39  
40 Ms. Kirste replied that it was a new website, and that it was up to date; however, they were  
41 working on the pages.

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

1 ADJOURNMENT

2 The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

3

4

5

6

7 \_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Price, Chairman

8