

NEVADA COMMISSION ON NUCLEAR PROJECTS
MONDAY, November 20, 2023; 1:30 P.M.

LOCATIONS:

Zoom Web-based Meeting.

Commissioners in Attendance:
Senator Richard Bryan - Chairman
Michon Mackedon – Vice Chair
Frankie Sue Del Papa
Brian Knudson
Ross Miller
Aurela Roberts

Call to Order

Senator Bryan called the meeting of the Commission on Nuclear Projects to order and roll call was completed. **Director Dilger** specified that the meeting agenda had been posted per the open meeting law. **Senator Bryan** announced for the record we have a quorum. We followed the open meeting law.

Comments from the public on Agenda items

No comments

Approval of minutes of the June 28, 2023, Commission on Nuclear Projects Meeting

Senator Bryan called for the approval on the June 28, 2023, meeting minutes, **Commissioner DelPapa** moved to approve and **Commissioner Knudson** second the motion. All were in favor.

Report from the Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects – Executive Fred Dilger

Director Dilger – gave a brief presentation on the Nuclear Status Update: Implications for Nevada.

Current Situation

- There was a dinner held on October 12th in one of the house office buildings by the ANS which is the premier technical professional group in the nuclear field. There were a number of elected officials and Yucca Mountain die-hards in attendance. Our report from the dinner was that the consensus is that it is time to move on, Yucca Mountain is over. This was followed up with an editorial from ANS CEO Craig Piercy; “Time to move on”.
- While attending a meeting in Idaho Falls, we were going to see the NuScale facility. The morning of the tour the word came down that the NuScale project has been cancelled. Which was a huge blow to the Advanced Nuclear development.

- Senator Manchin, who has been a supporter of nuclear waste legislation has also announced his departure.

Where: Markets for Advanced Reactors

- Based on assessment of the situation and what we're seeing at the various meetings is that the market for advanced reactors may not need to meet a market test. They will begin with micro reactors developed by the military. The military is eager to deploy them at remote bases. The primary one they are looking at is Elmendorf Air Force base in Alaska.
- While attending the meeting in Idaho Falls, a party involved in this stated that the cost of the micro reactors is referred to as "budget dust". We drove by the place where the advanced reactors are being developed and the test beds. This is happening right now.
- Just last week the Administration announced that they are going to support the development of an additional 200-gigawatt of nuclear energy. While attending another meeting it was said that there are no plans for new large 2000/1000-megawatt reactors, the only plans are for advanced reactors, those are 300-megawatt. That would mean about 700 nuclear reactors around the country. Smaller but much more enormous numerous. This is a very big change.

Why Advanced Nuclear?

- We have fallen behind in terms of nuclear technology, there are military considerations, and commercial interests at stake. There is great power competition between us, China, and Russia.
- The phrase being used by utility people is "we need all the things", every kind of energy. They are going to have a hard time fulfilling the energy needs of the economy going forward.

How should Nevada respond over the next 6-9 months?

- Continue to watch developments,
- Work with delegation/Governor's office to advance legislation to fix the problem,
- Deploy opinion pieces/social media that amplify the message the failures of Yucca Mountain as a site,
- Deploy opinion pieces/social media that amplify the message that the nation needs new legislation,
- Promote the social media during the early spring 2024 (late February through May)

Senator Bryan - I think we need to be proactive. This is an opportunity for us currently. I never feel that we can rest on what we've been able to accomplish over the years and getting this project put off, on hold, not funded all those good things that's occurred. What are the options that we can pursue right now?

Director Dilger - We should begin right away hitting them with op eds. Beginning with the assumption that Yucca Mountain is dead and now there's something new that must be done.

New legislation is necessary. Maybe we could offer support to Manchin's legislation, I know that Marta has done a detailed review of it and there were significant problems with legislation and if they were changed, we could get by.

I think we should begin with the opinion pieces immediately we should begin to produce new social media. The social media we previously produced know that it has had an effect. We

produced two new pieces of social media. One is with the Tribes the other is with the Nuclear Waste Negotiator. We know that the feedback from the tribal one has been excellent and the one on the Nuclear Waste Negotiator has also been good.

I am thinking about doing an assortment of maybe a roundtable with experts about the future of Nuclear Waste policy in the United States that begins with the assumption that Yucca Mountain is dead and so now how do we go forward. There is widespread agreement that Yucca Mountain won't work, so now we must seize the opportunity to try to define what could happen in the future that doesn't include Yucca Mountain. It is possible that with Advanced Nuclear going forward regardless of the market conditions that we would be left in a situation where Yucca Mountain is seen as the only alternative.

Commissioner Del Papa - Thank you Fred. I'm so happy to see Sunny in the meeting because I think it's really critical to have the Governor's office involved. I have a number of suggestions. I would ask Fred to come with a detailed action plan for the December meeting as to all the steps that we plan to take to address these issues. The first thing I would suggest Senator is that I think it would be great if we could get a joint letter signed by you Senator Bryan as Chair of this Commission and the Governor of our State expressing concern to the president of the United States with a copy to the Department of Energy in terms of this deployment without dealing with the waste that all of this is going to come about. That's the first thing that I would suggest. Secondly, I would suggest in this action plan, that I hope we see in detail at our December meeting. I would ask to see who our Targets on the offense are. I would assume the New York Times I would assume the Washington Post. I'd like to see what is our plan. What is our strategy in that regard? I think the idea of a round table is a terrific idea. Where does that fit in, how is it going to be done, is it going to be done in person, do you want our participation?

Director Dilger – We are working on just that kind of detailed plan. We have a set of new social media that we are producing. We have the five options ready to go. They are being reviewed right now to see who we should have tasked as the author of them and where they should be placed. We have five more that we're planning on placing. The YouTube and podcasts were deciding who we should have do that and where they should go. Now in terms of who they are directed to Commissioner DelPapa we have the most sophisticated digital system it has reached two thousand people now. When we begin to deploy these those folks will be blanketed with our links to our websites and our social media. It's intended to extend to reach our targeted audience and social media. We know that there is a certain niche, and we want to focus on influencing the people who are involved in this and who care about this. So, we have done that before and we're planning on doing that again. The timetable for that with me February March late February early March through May.

Commissioner Del Papa - Is Andrew Cochran from Harper's on your list? Because if you remember that January 22 article that he wrote was a fantastic Spent Fuel the Risky Resurgence of Nuclear Power as far as I'm concerned it should be in the top five

Director Dilger – I will check.

Commissioner Mackedon - To follow through with Frankie Sue a couple of questions and comments. The latest Scientific American is also labeled front page the New Nuclear Age. There are five or six articles some of them having to do with new vessel system in Nebraska the Sentinel vessel replacing the Titan warheads and the risk of new nuclear releases it also goes to Los Alamos and examines the long-term problems with the release of plutonium and tritium into the soil and the water. I guess the point is that the national news is now turning its head back to all kinds of nuclear issues and the time is right. My hesitation or question would be do we want to actually name Yucca Mountain; do we want to put that on the lips of people, or do we just raise the specter of a lack of a plan? I am a word person and I think the more you use a term the more it becomes embedded in the public imagination and Yucca Mountain as Director Dilger said is kind of a dead issue. So, do we want to enliven it linguistically by talking about Yucca or do we just simply want to keep the focus on “where’s your plan”? The question to the administration and of course working with the Governor’s office demanding the plan without even really evoking Yucca Mountain with the kind of dead air around that.

Senator Bryan – Fred what are your thoughts on that?

Director Dilger – Michon has put her finger on the critical issue. This agency is chartered to provide information to the public about the Yucca Mountain site, that's one of the things in the legislation that we are asked to do. However, if we are going to go a little further than that and begin by saying look Yucca Mountains dead let's talk about where we can go from this right from here, I think that would be the most useful thing, both for Nevada and for the Country.

Commissioner Mackedon - The operative word here is planned. We are bouncing the ball back to the administration and other players and we're demanding a plan without even mentioning Yucca Mountain except in the context dead.

Director Dilger – I completely agree and think that’s what we should do. We should treat it as dead.

Commissioner Mackedon - I think Frankie Sue is absolutely right that we do offense and with all the major journalistic outlets but especially those who are turning their eyes toward the larger nuclear issues including waste.

Senator Bryan – Any other questions or comments from the Commission?

Commissioner Miller - How difficult do you think this is going to be to engage in this conversation? I agree with a lot of these concerns that have been raised thus far. I'm paying particular attention to the New York Times article that came out. I think last weekend it was a very lengthy piece on, U.S. bets on small nuclear reactors to help fix a huge climate problem. As near as I can tell the only mention of the waste problem is one sentence at the very conclusion of the article that says we have no plan. It seems to me there is a very coordinated effort to try frame this development and get it into the media as a solution to the country’s clean energy problem, which this New York Times piece is part of a series addressing these issues with absolutely no discussion about the problem that we know will come in front of us. How effective do you think we can be in engaging in these ongoing pieces and getting our view out there?

Director Dilger – We know we have been effective we know we have allies in this, unintentional allies. The American Nuclear Society is filled with technical people they understand that they've got a waste problem that must be addressed in some regard. Now that they're willing to go past Yucca Mountain. I think that gives us a huge opening that we should take. We've produced the legislation that would fix this Senator Mansions legislation, although there are problems with it would mostly address it, it would give us about 95% of what we want. I think at some point we will be able to move forward here and have the influence we need because the recognition amongst the technical folks who are going to drive this is that the waste is a problem, and it is something that the industry cannot get past unless they do something to address it.

Commissioner Miller - Is the lack of mention thus far on that angle just because we haven't engaged or made our voice known? It's just one example and it is a very lengthy piece where it gives a very short script. It has all kinds of angles and issues in that story and the overall waste isn't addressed at all.

Director Dilger – I think that's consistent with the boomtown atmosphere that's come about in a very short period of time. You are right to regard it as a coordinated effort. They see advanced nuclear as the way forward. We made coordinated efforts last year when we filed our motion before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission about which we have heard nothing. What I think we should do is build on what's happening now to raise the issue of waste and do that immediately and do it as aggressively as we can going forward. It won't stop the promotional aspects of this, the let's just go ahead and build 700 reactors and the hell with what happens. But we will get traction among the people watching this, approximately a group of two thousand who are familiar with the nuclear waste problem. There will be support for changing it I believe. I think we can move it our way.

Commissioner Mackedon - You know another sticky wicket I would say with the plan to tackle the waste issue is that we can't risk having Nevada appear contrarian to environmental causes. I think the administration push for advanced nuclear is a result of a lot of campaigning by environmental groups to address global warming. If we simply oppose advanced nuclear then we risk being painted as anti-climate or anti-progress or even anti-administration. I think that these are concerns we need to put on the table it's a fine line to walk but I don't think the state can be perceived as opposing advanced nuclear I think that's something that is kind of the wave that's out there and it's driving a lot of momentum from environmental groups. Although it doesn't serve our purpose, new storage ideas would. Maybe it's a question of emphases. So, are we pro nuclear or are we simply pro sensible on safe storage?

Director Dilger - We've always confined our work to criticizing Yucca Mountain site as a site, and not got into the problem of pro or anti-nuclear, because it's out of our charter. At the same time one of the ways this happened was lobbying that included nuclear into "clean energy portfolio" and so it changes nuclear into a clean technology. We have to continue to bring up the waste issue above and beyond the problems with Yucca Mountain it seems to me. Which goes past our Charter a little bit, but I think is worth doing.

Senator Bryan – The most Dangerous Alliance and I think Michon touched upon it, is if the nuclear folks are able to get the environmentalist changes the entire debate. The American Nuclear Energy Council they have a lot of smart people on board they know that that would be their most important ally because that would split the people who have historically supported us, and all of a sudden the debate now turns toward the environment and all things that have been forecasted will happen to us if we don't make significant changes in reducing the amount of carbon we release into the air. That's a worrisome thing. Tell me what indication if any have you seen with the Nuclear Power Lobby reaching out to the environmentalist. Are there any formal engagements they have? What's the back story on that?

Director Dilger - We have seen some very troubling developments. The Natural Resources Defense Council six months ago issued a statement criticizing advanced nuclear and describing how important it was to manage the back end of the fuel cycle where the waste is. About two months ago they dismissed all their nuclear safety people. People who have been there for decades were just let go with almost no notice. We see this through other environmental groups is that they they're getting rid of the people that had been surveilling nuclear for decades and deemphasizing it. It opens the door first they lose the capability to watch nuclear and understand the issues with nuclear, but then it also raises the specter that's being raised here that we will be pried away so our supporters in the environmental groups some of whom are already gone and this is why I think we need to be as aggressive as we can and as forth right as we can. As quick as we can. And to begin after the turn if the year.

Senator Bryan – Fred, there are two things that I take from this. One is a detailed plan we need that. I think clearly to reexamine who are our allies and be very sensitive to the environmental community. I know it sounds like I am repeating what has been said previously but that is a worry for me. I mean the dimension of the debate changes dramatically if they get the environmental people. There will be people that the environment is the most important thing to them and their concerns about nuclear waste will be secondary. I think we need to watch that very closely and think we should recognize that.

Any comments or concerns from the Commission?

Commissioner Del Papa - I'd like to come down and see Sonny, I really think that it's very important that the governor engage in this issue, and I think the Attorney General will be on board.

Commissioner Mackedon - I was thinking back to the way in which the other forces that are engaged in trying to site Yucca Mountain have always used that phrase Not my backyard to kind of denigrate the efforts of Nevada and put them in a selfish light or in a me, me, me lite and we'd really need to do some serious thinking about the PR aspects of keeping the eye on the ball. The ball is not Yucca Mountain the ball is not Nevada. The ball is the larger environmental and danger issues that frankly have been ignored by the NRC and certainly by the administration and by Congress for thirty years now and this is the focus. This is what Nevada is all about. It saves the world, it's not in my backyard. Somehow that's the message that we need to put out there. Frankie Sue is right. I keep tabs on these things and Los Alamos is a mess right now in terms of

its cleanup efforts. It's encroachment on tribal lands and all these issues that have great cache with the public if they are spun in the right way.

Director Dilger – One of the messages we have constantly delivered to the delegation and that we have delivered ourselves in public is Nevada understands how not to do this. We want to be part of the solution.

Senator Bryan – Fred, I think it would be helpful if Frankie Sue would be agreeable, she has in her mind basically the matrix for what this ought to include for our December meeting. Maybe I could come to Carson sometime, that would be convenient for you Frankie Sue and for Fred and talk a little more in detail about this in detail before the next meeting. Frankie Sue, if you are agreeable to that and if Fred is agreeable to that. I would include everyone, but I don't want us to get involved in the violation of the open meeting law. But I think that might be helpful.

Director Dilger – It would be fine with me Senator. We have an action plan largely prepared already.

Senator Bryan – When you get a chance send that to all of us, please.

Director Dilger – I will get that out as quickly as possible.

Senator Bryan – Any other comments or questions from the Commission?

Comments from Affected Units of Local Government and Tribal Representatives

Senator Bryan – Next item on the agenda Comments from Affected Units of Local Government and Tribal Representatives. Any representatives from local Government or tribal units?

Jimmy John Thompson – I am a prior chairman of the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe and current Council Man. I just want to share some of the experiences I've been having lately. I'm involved with several nuclear groups Trent Tech and Net Wick. We deal with nuclear storage and transportation across the nation, and we work with R&C, DOE, and the railroads. We have these meetings a total of eight annually. We have site visits we go to decommissioned sites. The one thing that does come up and I have been hearing it here, talking about Yucca Mountain is dead and they do say that a lot but I will say that every single meeting every single person that is there every organization, still to this day brings up Yucca Mountain. In their eyes they would still like to see that opened up. That's what I see at every single meeting. They kind of look at each other when they bring it up and look at each other waiting for a comment. I just feel like they'll wait for the right Administration to show up to appropriate some funds that way. It's a huge concern for us, and I bring it up at every meeting you know. I tell them if you guys start sticking stuff in that hole you are just going to want to drill another one next to it. And Nevada will become a dumping site. I agree with this huge energy push because it is a huge concern for me as well. A lot of this domestic mining is going to be coming back our way and that includes Nevada. I am hearing that as well. The clean energy push is a huge concern for me just because of the amount of land and space and the possibility of cleanup afterwards. A lot of these people don't realize the amount of destruction it takes to build a lot of this clean energy and I feel that Nevada is the

epicenter of this. I am seeing from solar to wind to just about anything you can possibly imagine. It's popping up in the state of Nevada and it's a huge concern. I just want to make sure the Tribes are involved in the conversations. We do pull some weight we do have voters. I am part of several groups and we do speak nationally. We do meet with the assistant secretary of DOE once a year at our annual. We speak directly with her and share our concerns. I just want to make sure the tribal influence is in there and involved. The one thing I want to say is that Yucca Mountain is still mentioned at every meeting. That is the main thing I want you guys to understand.

Senator Bryan – Thank you very much for your comments. You are our partner, and we need you. You're an important ally and you have a standing to complain about some of the things being done and speak from a little bit different perspective. I appreciate that and I agree with your observation. I think in a nano second the nuclear power industry would throw us under the bus if they could get Yucca Mountain today.

Commissioner Del Papa – I want to thank Jimmy John deeply for your comments. And I want to ask Fred to include in the plan a detailed specific outreach to our twenty-seven tribes in our state. I attended the RES conference in Las Vegas with four thousand folks at Caesars and this is an issue. You put your finger on it I think very accurately and eloquently. I think the tribes would stand with us. I spoke to young man that is in charge of the inter-tribal energy council. I raised this issue with him. The federal Government is pushing the tribes and dangling carrots in terms of funding for NUC projects. Not even considering what might be done with the waste. I think that might be bait and switch once they get into a reservation. That's my thinking I could be totally wrong. I think you're totally spot on. I would ask Fred to do a detailed subcategory of our plan where we do outreach with our twenty-seven tribes which are critical to playing a role in our state and could help us nationally.

Senator Bryan – Any other questions or comments from the Commission. Fred, any additional wisdom that you would like to provide before we move on to our long-time friends Steve and Judy?

Director Dilger - This is just a discussion I wanted to have, and I appreciate the commission for being so engaged in this because we need this, and we are going to take this all on board and use it.

Comments from the public

Senator Bryan – Any members of the public? I am sure Judy and Steve and have been listening to the comments very closely this morning. Thank you for joining us, Judy.

Judy Triechel - I totally agree with everything that has been said here this morning. I communicate with Allison McFarland every now and then and she was a past commissioner on the nuclear Regulatory Commission in the chairman of the commission and she's consistently very upset that nobody ever wants to talk about waste and she's on many of the National Academy boards and involved in this all the time and they really don't want to talk about waste and we hear that as far as the department of energy is concerned they have programs that they set up that are almost set up to fail. a it's a real problem and in Congress you hear about that too that

people want to talk about everything but nuclear waste. **Continuation from lost zoom connection;** There have been attempts to get environmentalists to join the pro-nuc efforts to fight climate change. The Old Guard Grassroots public information people who are part of radioactive waste Coalition that's been set up now throughout the country and they are absolutely opposed to any sort of nuclear power and will not consider it at all for climate change or anything else and they have been our allies as far as being opposed to Yucca Mountain so I am hoping that there doesn't become a big battle with people on both sides pro and anti-nuc. I think we are facing a dilemma just in my own opinion when it comes to Yucca Mountain, the fact that we mentioned it keeps it alive when in fact many people think it's dead. I'll be working on this and sending ideas to Fred about how we can do this without putting a target on ourselves.

Commissioner Knudsen – I just wanted to say a note of appreciation to Fred because he did a great briefing with me about a week or so ago. All of you have far more experience in this field than I do so I am learning as fast as I can. It's comforting to know that in Nevada we have experts like you all on this and Fred thank you for taking charge on it.

Senator Byan – Glad to have you on board we need new fresh blood some of us old war horses have been on this commission forever, so we are delighted to have you join us. While we are waiting are there other members of the public that wish to comment on the items on the agenda?

Marta Adams – I just want to return to some of the very valuable input we had this morning. One issue that really looms large and I think that certainly Frankie Sue and Michon have touched on it, is the fact that Yucca Mountain is still the so-called law of the land makes it absolutely critical that we've eventually got to get termination language into pasts Federal legislation. That's number one. Number two is Senator Manchin's bill which is a reworked proposed legislation that Lisa Murkowski was pushing over the years. There are two fatal flaws with it and points us again to the legislation that Nevada is advocating for. The problem with the Manchon bill and I call it the Trojan Horse legislation is that consent that could or could not be given by Nevada would occur after licensing. That is a flaw certainly a licensing proceeding is likely to cost half a billion dollars and certainly the pressure that could be brought on Nevada if the project went through licensing would be withering at best at worst put us in a very difficult political situation. So, I think under no circumstances should our delegation be encouraged to support that bill at least as is. Anyway, I just wanted to get those two cents in because I think the conversation has been very good. Finally, I guess the other issue is that although the American nuclear Society is an important player in all of this there's also the Nuclear Energy Institute that has been involved in a lot of litigation that we also have been involved in and they certainly have not dropped their advocacy of Yucca Mountain. So, it's important to note that they may be a split within the nuclear industry and that there are still players out there that don't have leadership as we had with John Shimkus from Illinois. There certainly others out there that are willing to think that Yucca could be the default position if we are unable to get a consent-based repository in another site. The problem with the efforts the administration is making now is it is all dedicated towards interim facilities and no interim facility wants to be the de facto permanent disposal site. I echo Frankie Sues' concerns about ground water because that is a key problem with Yucca Mountain site as it is located above the water table. There are a variety of factors that go into that, but it certainly makes it a very bad site and it would certainly cause many issues with the quality of the water in our very dry state.

Steve Frishman – I just wanted to add one thing to what we have been discussing. Fred mentioned the American Nuclear Society and that they have proposed at least some guidance for a new environmental protection agency standard for geologic disposal. I think there is some Congressional interest in either directing EPA to do that, or at least start a new rule making as we have seen in a couple of articles as well. There's the idea of just telling EPA to tell Congress how long it would take and what it would cost to do this because EPA is very slow on regulation. There's a general agreement that you can't even go looking for sites until people know what the standards are. If EPA is going to take 5 to 10 years to do a standard, they need to get started on that. Also, with ANS as Fred mentioned they still have within their written policy their interest in moving forward with Yucca Mountain. We discussed internally the idea of trying to convince them to change their mind about that since almost everybody in the technical area anyway at ANS knows that the thing is dead. One of the vehicles that I have looked at and talked to Fred about to some extent is what do we have to tell ANS to get them to change their mind? We need to give them a reason. One of the reasons that I have been working on is that just saying restart Yucca Mountain isn't going to produce anything even if it gets a license because there are so many problems within the license application itself. At least in part or just a result of the fact that everything was shut down in 2011 and things have changed. The biggest single thing that they're going to have to do is revise the license application or amend it in many ways because the whole safety analysis for Yucca Mountain depends on features that are no longer available to them in building Yucca Mountain. The main thing is their whole idea of waste container went away when the license application process was suspended, and it isn't going to come back. It was an engineering approach that wasn't very good at the time, but it's built into the safety analysis so they're going to have to find new way to do a safety analysis with some different kind of packaging. Also, in the license application the DOE in a gratuitous way showed that Yucca Mountain could be expanded to take maybe up to a hundred and forty thousand metric tons when the statutory limit is seventy thousand. The problem is the nature of the discharge fuel from the reactors has changed in this last 10 plus year period. The safety analysis for Yucca Mountain doesn't include the extent to which the nuclear fuel has been burned up. It's called high burn fuel. Almost all the fuel since twenty ten is high burn up. The license application does not include that in its analysis. Almost all the fuel that has been made since the license application has been suspended wouldn't even fit within the safety analysis for Yucca Mountain. I'm just saying this because if we need to give ANS reasons for changing we can show them that to proceed with the current license application is futile. It isn't going to produce the repository that is needed or that anybody wants because time has changed, and their design doesn't work. That's the point that I think is worth people understanding and it would be a big feather for us if we could get them to change their mind officially. I think if nothing else that would pave the way in trying to get new comprehensive legislation that actually has the possibility of producing something in maybe not the near future but the mid-future.

Senator Bryan – Does the Nuclear Power crowd accept your analysis that there is a new category of ways or different elements?

Steve Frishman - Yes. They know what they are producing in the way of used fuel. I think probably they don't know is that the license application doesn't allow that within its safety analysis. That's the point if we are talking to ANS we need to let them know that.

Senator Bryan – Thanks very much, we appreciate your comments. Any questions from the Commission? Anything for the good of the order? Hearing none. Fred, I think we are ready to adjourn until our December meeting. Fred, any comments you would like to make?

Director Dilger – No, just appreciate all the discussion from all the commissioners.

Senator Bryan – I just would like to say I appreciate everybody's involvement and comments this is very helpful. This has been a good meeting, Fred. Obviously, the 14th meeting is a critical one for us.

Adjournment

Chairman Bryan called for the adjournment of the meeting. **Commissioner Knudsen** moved to adjourn, and it was seconded by **Commissioner Roberts**. All were in favor.

DRAFT