

MINUTES

Advisory Task Force Meeting

Meeting #1 – Wednesday, October 8, 2008

6:00 - 8:30 PM

Red Wing Public Library

Community Room

225 East Avenue

Red Wing, MN 55066

The meeting began at approximately 6:10 pm. Mr. Storm welcomed the members of the advisory task force (ATF), thanking them for their participation. Mr. Storm led the members through the contents of the information packet he had distributed among the ATF (agenda; membership; Xcel Energy's slides; process figures; poster board 1, 2, & 3; the Draft Scoping Document; and scoping worksheets).

The members then gave a brief introduction to themselves, along with a statement of why they wanted to be on the task force and their areas of interest:

Katie Himanga, a citizen from Lake City. Water resources are a primary concern, both withdraws and discharges, since Lake City is down-stream from the PINGP. The discharge of warm water uniquely affects downstream communities.

Andru Peters, a citizen from Lake City. Mr. Peters also expressed concerns regarding water resources; in the area of thermal impacts, Mr. Peters stated that he has observed the thinning of ice (and lack of ice cover this past winter) on Lake Pepin which he feels is not associated with global warming or natural weather cycles. He is also concerned that coordination between the various regulatory agencies governing water use along the Mississippi River is inadequate. Mr. Peters also stated that water quality and plant safety/security are areas of interest. Mr. Peters also submitted a written history of Lake Pepin and the surrounding towns.

John Howe, a resident of Red Wing. Mr. Howe also expressed concerns in the area of water resources; the affects of the additional draw-down and increased water temperature. Another area of concern for Mr. Howe is the issue of nuclear waste storage; safety, the anticipated timeline for reaching a permanent solution, where PINGP waste would be in the "queue" of a solution. Additionally, Mr. Howe expressed concerns about PINGP being located in the Mississippi River flood plain.

Philip Mahowald, designated representative of the Prairie Island Indian Community (PIIC). Mr. Mahowald expressed concern on how the PIIC will participate in light of the 2003 Settlement Agreement. He also stated that he was interested in bringing the PIIC's concerns to the process, such as archaeological issues, health and safety of residents living near the PINGP, water resource issues (thermal impacts and water withdrawal), releases of radioactivity (tritium) and the monitoring of these releases.

Wayne Wells, designated representative of the PIIC. Mr. Wells stated that he hoped the environmental review would include potential affects of operation of the PINGP and ISFSI on the health and safety of children and future generations living near the facility.

Carol Duff, Red Wing City Council President. Ms. Duff stated that while she felt that nuclear energy was an appropriate item to have in the state's energy portfolio, her concerns included the ultimate disposition (permanent storage, reprocessing, etc.) of the waste. Ms. Duff also expressed concerns on thermal water discharges.

Joan Marshman, Florence Township Supervisor. Ms. Marshman also expressed concern as to the long term solution for the waste (disposal and/or reprocessing). Issues of safety relating to the ISFSI and of the effects the EPU will have on the health of the residents of Red Wing, the Prairie Island Indian Community, casino employees, and casino guests.

Lea Foushee, the North American Water Office. Ms. Foushee stated that her organization was concerned about several issues relating to both the EPU and the ISFSI, including access to routine monitoring data (water and air emissions); the adequacy of the current monitoring program; the potential expose to radioactivity, and the health and safety of nearby residents. Ms. Foushee also stated that she would like the environmental review document to include an evaluation of the “nuclear chain” impact on indigenous people, people of color, and economically disadvantaged persons. Ms. Foushee would like to see alternatives to the proposal be incorporated in the document.

Sigurd Anderson, Communities United for Responsible Energy. Mr. Anderson is concerned about the affect of the proposals on the river environments, including sedimentation, biology and human impacts. Mr. Anderson also expressed concern over the lack of engineering (hydrological) studies in the evaluation of these potential impacts, as well as the monitoring of the aquatic ecology.

David Tincher, Hay Creek Township Deputy Clerk. Mr. Tincher expressed a general interest in energy needs and meeting them in a sound environmental manner. He commented that once he has an opportunity to review the proposals that he looking forward to a dialog on the various issues.

Bruce McBeath, a resident of Red Wing. Mr. McBeath stated that he hopes the process will help match the energy needs of the state and with the desire to protect the environment.

Stephen Castner, Red Wing City Council member. Mr. Castner also expressed an interest in energy and the hope that this process would allow the state to meet its energy needs in an environmentally responsible manner.

NOTE: Ms. Michelle Rosier, Sierra Club North Star Chapter representative could not attend the first meeting. Dr. Ronald Allen had a previous engagement which caused him to miss the introduction portion of the night’s meeting.

Mr. Storm explained that he would facilitate the meeting in an effort to keep the group on the charge since time was short. The ATF discussed whether it should pick a member to facilitate the ATF meetings as opposed to Mr. Storm.

Following the Introduction portion of the night’s meeting, Mr. Storm asked the ATF members if they would like to hear the Xcel Energy representative’s prepared presentation. A show of hands indicated that the ATF would like to see this material, at that point Mr. Storm handed the meeting over to Mr. Brian Zelenak, Manager of Regulatory Administration for Xcel Energy for the presentation and a short Q & A period following. Also present and representing Xcel Energy was Mr. Terry Perkins, Director of Regulatory Policy. Mr. Zelenak presented a power point slide show on the Extended Power Uprate and the Request for Additional Dry Cask Storage (See October 8, 2008 ATF Meeting Attachment 1). During the Q & A session various issues were raised, both as clarifying questions on the proposal or anticipated impacts of the proposal and also expressions of concerns by some of the ATF members. These are summarized below:

- Members inquired as to the monitoring of cow’s milk down-wind of the PINGP; the reasons why cows were selected and if other animals were also tested. Was human milk tested? Xcel Energy representative responded that to their knowledge cows were preferred because they represented a “full-time” controlled receptor, whereas, with human samples the potential time of exposure would be less. Also, since humans move about, their exposure pathways would not be as “controlled” as grazing cattle. The question of whether other animals are tested was unknown by Xcel representatives.

Mr. Storm offered that the EIS could contain a detailed description of the biological monitoring program performed for the PINGP.

- The question of how old the steam generators were at the PINGP was raised. Xcel representatives stated that they would get back to the ATF with that information, but stated that most components within the PINGP are not original and are replaced or up-graded with time.
- The question of whether the temperature of the spent fuel rods (new design to meet the EPU) that would be placed into the cooling pool would be significantly higher and would this cause any potential issues. Xcel representatives stated that the rods (new design) would in fact be thermally hotter than previous rods; however, this would not cause any problems with the pool or eventual transfer to dry cask storage. Additionally, Xcel representatives stated that the temperature of the rods when a transfer occurs is regulated by the NRC.

- A question on the operation of the tertiary loop, when it is used and a clarification of its function was raised. Xcel representatives returned to the pressurized water reactor schematic and explained how and when the tertiary loop is operated.
- The coordination among the various agencies (MDNR, MPCA and US COE), as well as cross border (Minnesota and Wisconsin) coordination, with respect to the cumulative effects of water appropriations and discharges as well as temperature changes was raised. Mr. Storm stated that he believed the hydrologists for the DNR that model water availability and approve and set conditions on water appropriation permits, must coordinate with other agencies. Mr. Storm stated that he will solicit from the DNR technological representative a narrative, to be incorporated into the EIS, on how the various agencies coordinate the hydrological management of the many projects and programs that effect water flow on the Mississippi River.
- The same coordination question between the various agencies (MDNR and MPCA) was raised regarding water quality and NPDES permits issued. Again, Mr. Storm offered to seek a narrative from the MPCA technical representative on how water quality concerns are coordinated in the various NPDES permits.
- The issue of reprocessing of spent fuel was raised. Xcel representatives stated that while some countries do indeed reprocess, here in the United States there currently are no licensed reprocessing facilities. They further stated that if that became a possibility in the future it may reduce the required on-site storage capacities (ISFSI) of the nation's nuclear facilities.
- The question of what the total curies emitted from all sources at PINGP was raised. Xcel representatives stated that this information was contained in the CON documents and on the MDH web site, but they did not know the number off the top of their heads. They stated that they would be more than happy to provide that information to the ATF.
- The question of how old the pool is and if its age presents any problems was raised. Xcel representatives stated that the pool is of concrete construction and lined with steel; they believed it was original and that the inspections have not determined there to be any problems associated with the integrity of the structure.
- The function of the berm surrounding the ISFSI was asked. It was stated that the berm, which is approximately 17 feet high, functions to provide additional shielding of radiation from the ISFSI.
- The issue of power uprates at other nuclear facilities around the country was raised and if problems had been encountered. Xcel representatives stated that yes in fact approximately 108 power uprate projects have been completed under NRC review across the country. They also stated that Section 3B of the CON application contained a discussion on power uprates.

Mr. Storm offered to address that issue for the "record" as he had done in the MNGP EPU relative to boiling water reactors.

- A question was asked about the location of monitoring sites or stations utilized in the monitoring program. Xcel representatives stated that they could not state the various locations off the top of their heads, but that information is available on the MDH PINGP web site referenced in the slide presentation.
- The question was asked if there were any standards or regulations, from state or federal agencies, that Xcel Energy felt were too high, too low, or otherwise inappropriate. Xcel representatives had no comment.
- The question of whether the dry cask meets "transportation code" was asked. Xcel representatives discussed the various dry casks (TN 68, TN 40 and TN40 HT) and the current status of compliance with transportation standards; the new casks will meet the transportation codes and a compliance status determination is currently being sought for the previous casks.
- The question of whether Xcel Energy anticipates the use of a hot box during spent rod transfers was asked. Xcel representatives answered that they did not anticipate that would be necessary.

Following Xcel Energy's presentation and Q & A session, the floor was returned to Mr. Storm.

Mr. Storm gave a short review of the process for application review for the three dockets relating to PINGP currently before the commission: the CON docket for the Extended Power Uprate, the CON docket for the request for additional dry cask storage, and the Site Permit docket for the EPU. Mr. Storm talked about the various process items that would be coordinated or combined and the concept of a single environmental review document to satisfy the requirements for all three dockets.

Mr. Storm explained that the PUC accepted Xcel Energy's applications for a certificate of need for the extended power uprate and request for additional dry cask storage on July 15, 2008; that the PUC accepted Xcel Energy's application for a large electric power generating plant site permit for the extended power uprate on August 15, 2008; and following the initial public information/scoping meeting held on September 9, 2008, the PUC received from the public a request for the establishment of an ATF.

Mr. Storm also stated that the PUC authorized the Office of Energy Security (OES) to establish an ATF on September 25, 2008, and at that time determined the structure and charge: the structure is to be comprised of LUG, NGO, the PIIC and private citizens.

Mr. Storm further stated that the charge was:

1. Familiarize the membership of the ATF with the proposed projects by reviewing the Certificate of Need applications and the LEPGP Site Permit application;
2. Review the Draft Scoping Document produced by the OES EFP staff; and
3. Assist in determining specific impacts and issues of local concern that should be assessed in the EIS by adding detail to the Draft Scoping Document.

This led into a review and discussion of the Draft Scoping Document; the ATF began with those items listed under "matters not within the scope of the EIS". The fact that legislation [Minn. Statute 116C.83, subdivision 4, item b], prohibits the consideration of off-site alternatives (Minnesota) was discussed.

The ATF was starting to talk about the nuclear fuel cycle not being addressed in the EIS when it became apparent that time was running out (the librarian had made several closing announcements) and the ATF moved to wrap things up for the evening.

A reminder of "home work" to review the applications was quickly talked over, as well as, Mr. Storm agreeing to prepare and circulate the minutes and draft agenda for the next meeting.

The meeting ended at approximately 8:44 pm.

MINUTES

Advisory Task Force Meeting

Meeting #2 – Wednesday, October 15, 2008

6:00 - 8:30 PM

Red Wing Public Library

Community Room

225 East Avenue

Red Wing, MN 55066

The meeting began at approximately 6:10 pm. Mr. Storm welcomed the members of the task force, thanking them for their participation. Mr. Storm led the members through the contents of the information packet for the meeting – the minutes from the first meeting of the task force, the proposed agenda, the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) order establishing the task force and its charge, a letter from the Minnesota Dept. of Natural Resources, and draft worksheets based on comments and discussion at the first task force meeting. Mr. Storm noted that all comments received during the scoping period for the environmental impacts statement (EIS) were on the PUC website.

Mr. Storm asked members for any edits or additions to the minutes from the first meeting. Edits and clarifications were suggested by several task force members; they were agreed to by the task force and incorporated into the minutes.

The task force reviewed the proposed agenda for the meeting. Mr. Storm noted that agenda item #3, an Xcel Energy Q & A, was optional. The task force, feeling the need to “get going” on the work at hand, decided to wait and see if additional discussion with Xcel Energy representatives would be helpful.

Mr. Storm reviewed the PUC order regarding the task force and its charge. He noted that the deadline for the completion of the task force’s work is the issuance of the EIS scoping decision by the Commissioner of the Dept. of Commerce, scheduled for October 26, 2008.

Mr. Storm reviewed the draft scoping document and the environmental assessment worksheet (EAW). He noted that the EAW provides breadth and depth to the draft scoping decision. It also provides additional information on project impacts and how these impacts will likely be addressed in the EIS.

Mr Storm then asked task force members how they would like to proceed with discussion of the draft scoping document and EAW. There was discussion among task force members as how best to proceed. Members decided that the identification of issues and impacts to consider in the EIS (agenda item #5) was of primary importance. Discussion of the scoping documents (agenda item #4) could be rolled into this identification. Members discussed whether small-group discussions would be the best way to proceed and how best to divide into groups. It was decided to divide into two discussion groups – group #1 to discuss the proposed power uprate, and group #2 to discuss the proposed ISFSI expansion. Groups would discuss and then report back the issues and impacts they had identified. Group discussions started at approximately 6:45 pm and continued for about one hour.

Ms. Rosier reported back for group #1. The group identified several impacts and issues to consider in the EIS (Attachment 1). Mr. Storm and task force members asked brief questions for clarification. There was discussion of how task force members’ interest in improved or enhanced monitoring of environmental and radiological impacts might be included in the EIS. Mr. Storm noted that the EIS could describe monitoring efforts (past, current, and proposed), and could discuss monitoring as a mitigation tool. It might also identify data gaps. However, it was not the role of the EIS to say “here is a data gap and here’s how it should be filled.” He noted that suggestions as to how to fill data gaps or how to improve monitoring would be best presented at the public hearing for the project.

Ms. Marshman reported back for group #2. The group identified several impacts and issues to consider in the EIS (Attachment 2). The group noted that it had not made it to a discussion of item #7 on the draft scope for the ISFSI – Alternatives to the Prairie Island plant.

Mr. Storm noted that group members could submit additional impacts and issues to him by email, but to please send them promptly (by the end of day, Thursday, October 16th).

Mr. Storm noted that he would send minutes and the notes of the identified issues and impacts to task force members for review by Friday, October 17, 2008.

The meeting ended at approximately 8:35 pm.

MINUTES

Advisory Task Force Meeting

Meeting #3 – Wednesday, October 22, 2008

6:00 - 8:30 PM

Red Wing Public Library

Community Room

225 East Avenue

Red Wing, MN 55066

The meeting began at approximately 6:10 pm. Mr. Storm welcomed the members of the task force, and thanked them for their participation. Mr. Storm led the members through the contents of the information packet for the meeting – the proposed agenda, minutes from the second meeting of the task force, worksheets from the second meeting, and a task force evaluation form.

NOTE: Mr. David Tinchler could not attend the meeting. Mr. Mike Schultz, Red Wing City Council Member, attended the meeting for Ms. Carol Duff.

Mr. Storm asked members for any edits or additions to the minutes from the second meeting. No edits were suggested.

The task force reviewed the proposed agenda for the meeting. Mr. Storm noted that the Xcel Energy Q & A session was optional. The task force decided to ask questions of Xcel representatives as they occurred during the meeting rather than having a formal Q & A session.

Mr. Storm asked task force members how they would like to proceed with the review of worksheets. He noted that Ms Himanga had volunteered to assist with the review process by editing the worksheets via computer as task force members viewed them on the screen. Mr. Storm suggested that he could step through the worksheets and provide his interpretation of what task force members were suggesting be included in the EIS. Task force members could then clarify or add to their suggestions. The task force agreed to this approach.

The task force reviewed and discussed worksheet suggestions from meeting #1 and meeting #2 (combined into one Word document by Ms. Himanga). Some discussions were fairly brief, i.e., the suggestion was clear, succinct, and/or Mr. Storm's interpretation jibed with the intention of the task force. Other discussions were lengthier or more involved. These discussions are summarized below. The results of all discussions (the revised worksheets) are attached (Attachment 1).

Chapter 1, Sections 1 & 2

- In the discussion of the Prairie Island Plant (PINGP) and its components, Ms. Rosier requested that the EIS include discussion of incidents or events at the plant, in particular Reactor 1 groundwater leaks and leaks involving the containment sump. She noted that incidents at reactors nationwide are tracked on several websites.
- In the discussion of wastewaters, Ms. Fourshee requested that the EIS include a discussion and data on hexavalent chromium (CR6) in PINGP wastewater.
- Mr. Rosier and Ms. Fourshee requested that EIS address the nuclear fuel cycle and its impacts. Ms. Fourshee noted that Xcel Energy is claiming the proposed uprate as a "green technology," particularly with respect to climate change. She noted that this claim needs to be verified. Mr. Storm noted that the safety of the nuclear fuel cycle is within the purview of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Ms. Rosier asked that a summary of the fuel cycle be included in the EIS, even if the NRC will be reviewing the fuel cycle in its relicensing review for PINGP.

- Mr. Peters suggested that the surface transport of waste from the Prairie Island plant be included in the EIS. Mr. Storm noted that such transport was outside the scope of the EIS. Ms. Rosier noted that the rationale for excluding transport wasn't clear, i.e., there wasn't a rationale given in the draft scoping document.
- Several task force members commented about the need for a thorough discussion of Yucca Mountain and long-term waste storage, particularly with respect to the proposed ISFSI expansion. Ms. Fourshee noted that Yucca Mountain is a political decision and therefore there is uncertainty about its functioning as a waste depository. This uncertainty should be noted in the EIS. Ms. Rosier asked if there was a "Plan B" if Yucca Mountain did not open. Ms. Marshman noted that the uncertainty about long-term waste storage needs to be in the EIS. The dry cask systems being used have not been evaluated for long-term storage. Mr. Storm noted that the EIS will discuss the ISFSI and its temporary nature relative to Yucca Mountain. It will discuss Yucca Mountain and the uncertainty related to its opening. He noted that the EIS describes "what is" and points out uncertainties and gaps in data. It can't "answer" these uncertainties.

Ms. Fourshee noted that the EPA recently issued radiation protection standards for Yucca Mountain, and that these standards apply for up to one million years of storage at Yucca Mountain. Mr. Sigurd noted that the uprate and ISFSI expansion depend on safe storage of spent nuclear fuel; however, safe storage is a critical uncertainty. Thus, there is an intellectual disconnect. Mr. Storm noted that decision makers (e.g., PUC, Minnesota Legislature) will have to weigh this uncertainty and proceed accordingly. The EIS can not resolve this uncertainty. Ms. Fourshee noted that there is not room at Yucca Mountain for the 35 additional casks that Xcel Energy is requesting. Mr. Storm noted that the EIS will discuss Yucca Mountain and its capacity – if there are "more dancers than chairs," it will be noted in the EIS.

Mr. Mahowald noted that the NRC is currently taking comments on its Waste Confidence Rule (confidence that spent nuclear fuel can be safely stored until a final depository is available) and that task force member could participate in the comment process.

Chapter 1, Section 3

- Mr. Peters asked how the CapX project interacts with the proposed PINGP projects. Mr. Storm noted transmission will be looked as an alternative to the uprate at PINGP. It's unclear how or if a transmission alternative would interact with the proposed CapX transmission lines.
- With respect to alternatives to the proposed uprate, Ms. Rosier noted that Xcel Energy had recently updated its resource plan and forecasts. She asked if these new numbers would be used in evaluating the need for the uprate. Xcel representatives noted that these numbers would likely be updated again before being evaluated by the Office of Energy Security, Energy Regulation and Planning (likely Spring 2009).
- In the discussion of Demand Side Management (DSM), Mr. Howe asked whether DSM could be combined with another power source, e.g., wind power, to create an alternative to the uprate. Mr. Storm noted that this was possible. He noted that DSM will be described in the EIS. He also noted that timing, i.e., whether the proposed alternative would be available in a timely fashion, is important in evaluating an alternative.
- Ms. Fourshee suggested that co-generation could be an alternative to the uprate, i.e., why can we use the waste heat from PINGP? Ms. Rosier suggested that if couldn't be termed an alternative, it might be a means of mitigating the thermal discharge into the river (thermal plume).
- Mr. Mahowald noted that a power uprate at a different Xcel plant would be an alternative to the PINGP uprate.

Chapter 1, Section 4

- The task force started a discussion of Section 4, Environmental Setting, but decided that their concerns were more appropriately part of Section 5, Human and Environmental Impacts. Thus, the task force left Section 4 as is and moved onto Section 5.

Chapter 1, Section 5

- The task force noted their interest in radiological monitoring as an EIS topic. Mr. Storm noted that the EIS will describe current monitoring and data from this monitoring. It will discuss who is doing the monitoring, e.g., Minnesota Dept. of Health, and under what permit(s).
- Mr. Mahowald asked whether the EIS could include a discussion of best available monitoring technologies. Could we compare the monitoring at PINGP with current best practices? Ms. Rosier and Ms. Fourshee concurred in the need for a discussion of monitoring technologies. Mr. Storm noted that the EIS could discuss monitoring, but would not second guess decisions of other state agencies as to their practices and protocols. Mr. McBeath asked if we could reference the protocols and instrumentation that are used. Mr. Storm noted that this was possible.
- Mr. Mahowald asked if EMF could be included as a cumulative impact. Mr. Howe noted that the increased power (power uprate) must be traveling from the plant on a transmission line; therefore, the line must have some change in EMF. What is this change? Mr. McBeath suggested that the change in EMF could be estimated or calculated. Ms. Fourshee and Ms. Rosier inquired as to whether there was an interaction between EMF and radiation, and if so, could it be covered in the EIS.
- The task force discussed a variety of possible adverse health effects related to the power uprate.
- The task force discussed how radioactive wastes are treated and disposed. Ms Fourshee suggested that the EIS should follow each waste stream (solid, liquid, gas) and determine where the radioactivity goes. Mr Storm noted that the EIS would discuss these waste streams.
- The task force discussed impacts to surface waters, in particular the task force's interest in cumulative impacts to the Mississippi River environment. Mr. Howe noted that the proposed PINGP water impacts need to be considered in light of all other water impacts on the river, i.e., in light of other permits and uses. Mr. Storm noted that state agencies work together and coordinate their actions such that cumulative impacts are weighed. The EIS will describe this coordination. Mr. Peters noted that possible PINGP water impacts should be considered in light of the Corps of Engineers water draw-down program. Mr. Storm noted that MPCA and DNR permits take river flows and levels into account.
- Mr. Mahowald suggested that the EIS needs to consider upstream and downstream water impacts, as winds can, at certain times, move surface waters upstream.

The time being 8:00 PM, the task force asked members for any final suggestions on Chapter 1, with a goal of getting at least a few suggestions in on Chapter 2 before the end of the meeting.

- Discussing cultural resources, Mr. Wells asked if any temporary housing would be required for the PINGP projects. If so, this housing needs to avoid cultural and archaeological sites.
- The task force briefly discussed emergency response plans. Mr. Peters suggested that training (for security and emergency purposes) be included in the EIS. Mr. Schultz noted that how an emergency plan gets implemented depends on how the emergency unfolds. Task force members expressed an interest in knowing what the PINGP emergency response plan is, how it was developed, and how it is revised.

Chapter 2

Ms. Marshman noted that she had several comments and suggestions on the Chapter 2 worksheets. She led the task force through a discussion of some of these comments and provided Ms. Himanga with a copy for inclusion in the revised worksheets.

- Ms. Marshman suggested that Mr. Storm use the 1991 EIS for the Prairie Island ISFSI as a reference.
- Ms. Marshman and Ms. Fourshee noted that the dry casks used at the ISFSI had not been tested to failure. Mr. Storm noted that if there was data or analysis on how the dry casks were tested, e.g. by modeling, it would be included in the EIS.

- Ms. Marshman suggested that the EIS should include a projection of the expected lifespan of the TN-40 (TN-40HT) dry casks. The EIS should consider the impacts of all of the casks in the ISFSI. There will ultimately be 98 casks in the ISFSI and this should be reflected in the EIS.
- The task force discussed whether there is enough money in the decommissioning fund for the ISFSI. The task force discussed when the federal government takes title to the casks. Xcel representatives noted that title transfers when the casks leave the site.

The time being 8:30 PM, task force members discussed how they might get final worksheet suggestions into Mr. Storm. Mr. Storm agreed to take worksheet suggestions until Monday, October 27. Ms. Rosier thanked Mr. Storm for his work with the task force and asked if evaluation forms could be mailed in. Mr. Storm noted that evaluations could be mailed in, and asked task force members to please complete them.

The meeting ended at approximately 8:40 pm.