



**North Carolina Aquarium at Pine Knoll Shores  
Pier Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes  
June 29, 2009**

**Present:**

Dr. Bogus (Richard Ehrenkauffer) - Chair  
David Griffin- Director, NC Aquariums Division  
Mark Joyner- Exec. VP, NC Aquarium Society  
Jay Barnes- Director, NC Aquarium at Pine Knoll Shores  
Art Schools- Emerald Isle Mayor  
Frank Rush- Emerald Isle Town Manager  
Mal Boyette - Committee Member  
Jim Woolard- Committee Member  
Don Eglinton- Committee Member  
Rick Luettich- Committee Member  
Randy Mason- Committee Member  
Alex MacFadyen- Committee Member  
Greg "Rudi" Rudolph- Committee Member  
Tim Reid- Moffatt & Nichol, Principal in Charge  
Mike Winters- Moffatt & Nichol, Project Manager  
Jennifer Amster- BJAC  
Mark Sealy- BJAC  
James Briglia- BJAC  
Dr. Louis Daniel- NC Marine Fisheries Director  
Lisa Stover- Minutes

- Welcome statement from Dr. Bogus. Quick introductions were made.

Dr. Bogus mentioned that one of the things we are trying to do is to get community input and he has distributed a couple of lists with that information. One is from Al Baird, creator of the North Carolina Fishing Pier Society. He is a huge pier supporter and is currently writing a pier book and his perspective will be very valuable. He has fished all of the piers along the North Carolina Coast and he can judge what works and what does not work well. A second list of suggestions was from Jerry Robinson, who is a handicapped pier fisherman. Dr. Bogus is working on getting more input at the moment and if we do have a public meeting sometime in September, we should be able to compile some ideas there. Rick has also developed a list from the researcher's perspective. Dr. Bogus would like to evaluate and rank these items by possibly coming up with a numerical score system to determine importance. He has requested that you forward any ideas you receive to him via e-mail, [drbogus@drbogus.com](mailto:drbogus@drbogus.com).

Dr. Bogus also mentioned that since the last meeting, a number of the committee went to the sand-breaking at Jennette's Pier. It was good to meet some of the people involved in the project up there. He has gotten the names of those on their committee and has not contacted them yet but feels they will be a good resource to see what their experience was. It was also very encouraging to see the support for that pier even in the

economic times we are in. Jay agreed that it was good to see the sand-breaking for Jennette's and commented that later in the meeting David was going to discuss that project. At the last meeting, there was a lot of interest in that project and a lot of questions that he could not answer but fortunately, David can give an update today.

### Planning Update

Jay mentioned that there are a number of things that he and Frank would like to give an update on today. At the last meeting, we sort of developed a format with the Moffatt & Nichol and BJAC team that seemed to work well. We had the advisory meeting in the morning and then in the afternoon, the architectural team met with our curators and managers and had a very productive afternoon. We toured this facility and there was a lot of benefit in seeing our behind-the-scenes areas and classrooms as well as life-support systems, back-up spaces etc. that are going to be very important in the design of the pier house. We will be following the same pattern again today. The pier house can only be so big, but we are early enough in the process that everyone is throwing out ideas, and we will pare them down to what is actually feasible. One thing he would like this group to begin thinking about is that this will be an Aquarium pier, and we want to showcase the species that you could catch off of the pier. But we know that building aquarium tanks can be expensive and take up a lot space so we would like input on the quantity and size of tanks and what species to exhibit.

Jay reminded everyone to visit our website, [www.ncaquariums.com](http://www.ncaquariums.com), where all of the minutes from our meetings will be posted. We want to use the website as a tool to communicate back to the public what is happening. Jay and Frank's e-mail contact information is on there as well. In our last meeting we also mentioned having a public meeting sometime this fall and he would like to get a date set, possibly a Saturday in September. Frank agreed that a Saturday would be good to give the second homeowners an opportunity to attend. Dates were discussed and settled on Sept. 19. This is tentative and we may revise later if needed. Location would most likely be here but if the room is not available, Frank offered the town meeting room.

Jay gave an update concerning the budget. Right now the legislature is in the process of finishing the state budget and the Senate and the House are in negotiation. The House's budget has a large cut for the aquariums, about \$2.5 million, which is essentially 25 percent of our operating budget. The intent would be that we would somehow make that difference up using our admissions revenue. The problem with that is it does have a direct impact on the pier projects because the admissions revenue is being used to complete the Jennette's Pier project and is a potential future source of funding for this project. If this legislation passes and we get the \$2.5 million cut, we can pretty much write off any admissions funding going to the Emerald Isle Pier, so this is very serious for us right now. The Senate did not include that cut in its budget. David commented that this is definitely a serious threat. We have relied on admissions funds for new exhibits and expansions and they have been ear-marked for the Jennette's Pier project. If we lose the \$2.5 million, we will not have any excess funds; we will be living off of our admissions revenue. We also do not want to seem like we are wasting money in these economic times and if we did not have these pier projects, David would be fine saying we would make do without the money. But frankly, the Jennette's Pier project will have significant holes if that money is taken away. Jay mentioned that if anyone knows someone that is on the conference committee for this to please mention to them the severity and details of the situation. Rick asked if anyone in this area is on that committee. Rep. Wainwright and Senator Don Davis were mentioned.

Frank mentioned that we were originally awarded \$2.2 million in WAMI funds. This money was to be used for design services, with the remaining funds possibly used for site development, land acquisition or other needs. There is now a strong potential that it will be reduced to \$1.2 million. It is not final but is an idea that is under consideration right now and is being discussed by Sen. Basnight and his staff. That will obviously have a direct impact on what we're doing right now and there have already been steps taken to reach a contract with Moffatt & Nichol and BJAC to not exceed \$1.2 million. In discussions with David and Jay, we don't expect that it's going to slow us down significantly on the design process. The core aspects of the design and the timeliest aspects will be included in the revised contract to go forward. He thinks worst-case scenario is it would delay us as we get a couple of years down the road. Our initial timetable of having this done in four years becomes a little bit longer. Having said that, the town is absolutely committed to this project and it is its highest priority and from the town's perspective, we will be working as hard as possible to come up with the money to build.

We will be seeking out every possible grant funding source. A meeting is scheduled with the people from Carolina Beach to strategize how to secure funding for these projects. Hopefully within in a couple of years, the economy has turned back around and the state budget will be back to some sense of normalcy. Alex asked where Senator Basnight and his staff stand on this matter. Frank responded that there are other resources needs in the state other than a pier in Emerald Isle that are probably timelier right now. They are looking at trying to take care of the things that are more current, whereas we are several years out.

Jay mentioned that Mike has had some discussion with Chris Ivers and the State Construction Office about the impact of this on their contract and asked him to comment. Mike responded that the original contract included construction administration services, which can be very costly for a project of this duration, which will be eliminated. We will also eliminate some of the testing services such as geo-technical, which requires a substantial fee due to equipment used to do the borings in a tidal zone, but it will need to be done at a later date. We will go through the design with some assumptions before we do the final design for construction when we will need the geo-technical information. They have also discussed on the ride down here some other possibilities they may need to visit. We are risking some redesign after getting the geo-technical tests back.

Rudi commented that he feels the design fees are important because it may end up costing more money in the long run if we have to go back and redesign after getting the tests back. He understands you need to choose your battles but there are some big assumptions to work with. Frank commented that he understands that sentiment but he thinks the underlying theme to all of this is to try to really help us overall and maybe we do need to rethink if testing is what needs to be eliminated or if something else can be put off to a later time. Obviously he understands that the design team is more privy to the contract, though. David asked if the contract included any weight modeling analysis and structural integrity. Mike replied that it is in the design and that they do it in-house. Jennifer commented that one approach they have talked about is not limiting or eliminating any of the intensity of the design service but taking it as far as we can. Frank commented that our intention/ expectation is clearly to identify funds throughout the next year or two while the design process is occurring so we will be able to add all of the eliminated things back and keep it moving along.

Alex asked where the advisory committee's role begins and ends, and are they involved in any of the negotiations or discussions with the engineering and architectural team. Dr. Bogus replied that we should understand the full scope of our role. Don

commented that, in his opinion, being an advisory committee really means that we do not have any authority truly, but our advice is needed to maybe sensitize the design team to decisions the owner has to make. Art commented that he feels your opinions will be strongly considered but ultimately the Aquarium makes the decision. Thus, there was some agreement that this committee's role is advisory, and that the Aquarium and the State will maintain ultimate authority over the project.

Jim W. asked how many samplings would need to be taken over a 1,000 foot span. Mike responded that they are doing four water borings, two on shore and several on land for parking and the wastewater system. Rick asked how the \$1 million cut would affect the staging for the sound side area. Frank responded that under that scenario, the soundside improvements would not happen prior to the ocean side improvements. He also stated that his recommendation to the group is continue on the path you are on for input in the design process. Once again, it is our expectation to get funds to keep this project moving along and whatever does happen, he doesn't feel that it in any way changes the advisory committee. Jay commented that from a functional stand point there are two things that would be delayed if we lost the \$1 million. The first being the soundside area improvements, and second would be the potential for additional land acquisition. Rudi asked if the \$1 million that could possibly be taken away is going towards shovel-ready projects. If that were the case, he feels that we could prove that the soundside area is a shovel-ready project. Frank said that Rudi's points are well taken and the town has this project at top priority.

*Note: Following this meeting, it was learned that the discussed \$1 million reduction in WAMI funds for the pier project will likely not occur. Thus, the Moffatt-Nichol contract for pier design, testing and contract administration should continue as previously planned.*

### Marine Fisheries Perspective

Louis began by saying that he appreciates the opportunity to come and provide Marine Fisheries perspective. They fully support the Aquariums and the goal of the three piers and feel that it is an outstanding opportunity for public access and would be a new chapter in the history of our ocean fishing piers. Some things we would love to see are as follows:

- Dedicated parking for one or two Marine Patrol as well as Port Agents.
- An interview station where we can sample catches and process fish right in front of them, to be able to show them the type of information we are trying to collect and why it is so important.
- Carcass collection program station equipped with heavy-duty bags to put their catches in and write pertinent info on. Would require a freezer on site.
- After reading through the lists that Dr. Bogus previously distributed, there were a lot of good suggestions but not too sure about live-bait wells. Did not hear anything about handicap accessibility and potential for lower rails and rod holders for handicapped individuals.
- At another WAMI site, the pier at Radio Island, they are going to try to drive the pilings through reef balls as fish havens. Suggested we explore potential for fish habitat under pier.
- Tackle rentals are very popular.
- Line collection facilities, recycling.

- Information at the end of the pier and Board of Fame is popular.

Some information you may want to know is that gill nets/seine nets are not allowed within 300 feet of the pier and you can mark/buoy it. You can even extend it out to 750 feet on either side of the pier. He commented to Jay that if exhibit space is limited, to seasonally change the species as to what can be caught at that time. Jay responded that they are definitely going to talk about it this afternoon and he was curious by his earlier comment about live wells maybe not being possible. Dr. Bogus commented that a number of piers already do have live-bait wells on the pier. Louis just thought that they may need to be too big. Jay mentioned that they do envision having a saltwater intake system. Louis also mentioned that lighting is important and Dr. Bogus stated that Mal has mentioned that before as well; underneath lighting is definitely very popular. Louis stated within the request for approvals there is an opportunity to try to secure a Coastal Recreational Fishing License grant for the sound side pier and possibly any leftover money from existing WAMI projects to go towards the soundside area. It would by no means be a lot of money but a possibility. Art asked for the submission and award dates. July 31 is the deadline for Salt Water License proposals, which will be awarded around mid-March. He also asked if Louis had a projection of how much the pot of money may be. As of now, Louis is guessing about \$2.5 million.

Art commented on handicapped accessibility. He is heavily involved with the Mayor's Committee for Disabilities in Carteret County and he will do what he can to make sure it is addressed and well considered. Jay asked who our contact would be at Marine Fisheries if we have questions. Louis responded either himself or Randy Gregory. Jim asked if this pier would be a citation station. Louis replied that it definitely could if they wanted it to be. Jay asked if the blanket fishing license for piers is per linear foot. He said it is by foot and he thinks it is about \$6.50 per linear foot.

### Update on Jennette's Pier

David commented on the great progress this group has been making. He has been following the minutes as well as discussion with Jay. He did not want to go into great detail on Jennette's Pier design itself; he would allow the committee's questions to drive that aspect of the conversation. This project needs to go through approval from State Construction and the Department of Insurance. Some changes that have been made are as follows:

- Due to the size of the pier house it requires two ramps; the original plan had one. The Department of Insurance also wanted three points of egress and it was a very hard sale for that third to be the end of the pier.
- Pilings went from 36" round to 24" squares and from five per cent to four per cent, granting huge savings
- Structure remained the same size but we stripped out a lot of finishes, flooring costs reduced, lighting costs reduced, etc.
- To get the project under contract, there were some things we had to lay to the side and those are the items we need funding to get back, such as the wind turbines, a saltwater intake system that will store water to be shipped to the Roanoke Island Aquarium, saving them thousands on making saltwater, solar panels, raised metal roof and a number of other smaller things. There are about \$800,000 to \$1 million worth of components we need to get back in and to be at the level we want to be. We are probably only silver LEED-certified with these omissions.

This is where the Aquarium admission fee is important to complete the project as designed.

The clock started ticking on May 1 for the schedule of this project and it will last roughly 24 months. Dr. Bogus asked if that would be impacted by the budget. If we were to lose our \$2.5 million operating money, and therefore would have to live off of our admissions funds, we will continue to move forward with the contract. There's just going to be some key components that will go missing unless we can find other money to bring those back in. We will still have a pier and we can still do many of the things that we wanted to do; it just won't be sustainable alternative energy demonstration project that we really wanted.

Jay asked if the bath house was cut out of the plan. David responded that it has but the town has applied for a CAMA grant that looks like it may be about \$130,000 and it will cost about \$320,000 to put it back in. Jay asked if all of the underground utilities for it will still be there. David said that as the plans are set up now, they will have the entire needed infrastructure for the omitted items to be put in at a later time. Alex commented about the wind turbines and he thought that Dominion Power was very interested. David said we have actually asked Dominion Power for quite a bit of support and they are talking with some of their high-level executives along with the NC COOP to come together and help fund a lot of alternative energy components.

The marine construction company will actually be constructing a trestle along side of the pier to work from instead of just building off of what they already have done. They are currently driving the steel cylinder piles right now. They should start concrete pile driving in about three weeks.

David wanted to touch upon some "lessons learned" from this project so far. There was great interest locally from the town of Nags Head to somehow allow beach access during construction. When Clancy & Theys came on board, their first approach was from property line to property line, there would be a security fence and there were some intense discussions about this with the town. So Clancy softened the approach that there was a possibility along one property line to bring in the security fence about 10-15 feet and allow a pedestrian pathway to the ocean. After the town was faced with the possibility of picking up liability of anyone getting injured and maintenance of that area and then seeing the construction materials stacked up, it backed off. The point is there was a very loud outcry for access and you may need to put it on record right now that it will not be possible with the Emerald Isle project. The fence also blocks the beach area. They have put gates there on the beach and given keys to the town in case of an emergency. Safety is a huge issue.

Another issue we are dealing with is the pile driving. There are neighbors that are very upset. The noise of the steel piles being driven is very loud. So he suggests that you need to forewarn your neighborhood. We sent out letters about two months ago, as soon as we knew the contract was signed, to every business or rental agency business within a half-mile radius to say this is coming; we are excited about it, but this will be happening first.

- the beach will be blocked off
- noise will be an issue
- traffic impedance

We tried to sell the end point and be very enthusiastic about that but as you can imagine people are concerned with the present. The steel is the noisiest, and once they get to the concrete it will be better. Art asked how long they will be expected to do the steel. It will be intermittent throughout the project because they will be using trestles to walk

down the construction of the pier. It is the most intense right now, though, and the original goal was to have it done before Memorial Day but that did not work out as planned. Rick asked how much oceanfront they had blocked off. David thinks it is about 460 linear feet.

Jay asked David to talk about the land across the street, as far as acquisition and total parking. David thinks that on-site there are about 165 parking spaces and in agreement with the town, it was determined that that was not enough parking for this facility. Therefore the town and we began looking for other land, primarily across the street. The town acquired a little over an acre and we acquired an acre as well and those two parcels adjoin. The primary use for our land is wastewater treatment along with some additional parking, about 25-30 spaces. Their piece has not been laid out yet but it is part of a grant so they must have some recreational value, such as a play area, and then additional parking. We would have one common entry into that parking area. They are talking to DOT about a pedestrian crosswalk either with or without signal. There are also two beach accesses with parking nearby. One is about one block south and the other about two blocks north.

Jay mentioned as a point of reference that BJAC did a drawing, which is a very rough draft of our site and how many, at the most, parking spaces we could get. If there was nothing else on there except for parking, it would leave about 165 spaces. So in actuality we are looking at maybe 125 spaces unless we acquire additional property. Jay commented that not only does he feel that additional parking is going to be very important but we also have to remember that our contract with Moffatt & Nichol only includes the land we already have. Their current planning process does not factor in some other parcel we may pick up.

David briefly commented on the size and structure of Jennette's Pier. It is a very large pier house and is within the footprint of the old Jennette's Pier house. When they went to CAMA and began discussions about building a new pier house, they did not have rules in development and we were allowed to go back as large as the original footprint at two stories. The old pier house was 9,000 sq. ft. What we ended up with was a 16,000 sq. ft. pier house. The rules that are in place now would restrict the Emerald Isle pier house to 5,000 sq. ft and two stories, including covered porch areas. There is a possibility of seeking a variance if there is a lot of interest in having a structure larger than 10,000 sq. ft.

### Discussion of Emerald Isle Pier

David asked the committee if they feel 10,000 sq. ft. is going to be adequate. Randy commented that at this point we don't even have enough parking for the size structure we would have now. Mal asked even if the parking stays the same are we still going to be building the pier, and if we are going to move forward, we probably need to secure parking before we can move forward with the size of the pier house. Jim W. commented that he feels like the area near Flip Flops seems a little impractical. Don mentioned that parking is a major concern with the community as well, and the owners of units nearby are also concerned about security. He asked David what they have done about security at Jennette's Pier. David responded that it has actually not been brought up. Don commented that they are not currently having problems but are concerned that it may come with higher use of the area and like with anything else, they are concerned with the uncertainty of change. Alex inquired that if the parking is not limited to pier users, what happens if we overbuild the pier house and it becomes a nice day in July and there is a wedding. There will not be enough room for everyone to use the facility. Jim

B. commented that as the design team they will design to the fullest the property they were given to work with, and what needs to be present to support this pier house. It will be give-and-take as we go through the process. Of course, one thing that will always be a big impact is money. Jay commented that the parcels of land we were investigating before are still on the market. Although we do not have the funds to purchase them at this time, he was hoping that we would at least be able to do an analysis of the sites. Unfortunately we would not be able to use the WAMI funds to do testing on property that we have not purchased. He said that they still need to discuss some things about this matter because if we seriously want to pursue these properties, we really cannot do so without knowing more about them. Jay suggested that maybe David and Frank could discuss which strategies may be good for acquiring those tests.

Frank mentioned that the town had been awarded DOT funding to extend a 10-foot-wide asphalt bike path from Town Hall to Eastern Regional Access. It is for up to four miles but if the bids come in too high, we may only be able to do three miles. However, we may have the opportunity to stage it where there is one mile down by the access and two miles by Town Hall. This may provide a safe and convenient pedestrian access to some other location, whether it's by the Emerald Isle Mini-Mart or somewhere else we may identify. Frank also mentioned that a parking deck may need to strongly be considered. Jennifer asked if shuttles to another location would be a possibility. Frank replied that it may be an option. Jay commented that the reality of the shuttle, though, is there will be cost issues for maintenance and staffing, the seasonality of it and then communication to the public can be an issue. Mal agrees with Frank, that a parking deck would be a good option. Mike commented that once again money would be an issue. There would be design fees and construction costs to consider. We could be looking at \$15,000 to \$18,000 per space for a parking deck. Another concern is the size compared to its surroundings. Mark S. commented that there would be even more cost to make it aesthetically pleasing. Rick mentioned that if it would cost about \$2 million for 100 spaces, we need to compare that to how much a parcel of land that size would cost in comparison. You might need almost three acres of land to get 100 spaces and we're probably not going to find that in Emerald Isle at all, much less at a good price.

Jay commented that we had the experience here at the Aquarium at Pine Knoll Shores, after renovations, of not having enough parking and what you find is it becomes a somewhat self-limiting thing. The first summer we were open some people would not come because they knew there was nowhere to park. But now we have added about 50 spaces, and on a typical summer day, with about 225 spaces total, it's just right. If we have a big event they will be parked out on the roadside and maybe what we need to do is talk to the DOT and the town to find out what could be done for overflow. Jay guessed that parking along NC 58 is not going to be an option. Frank commented that he does not feel that would be possible either, but perhaps we could investigate doing street-side parking in that area and lowering the speed limit. Rudi mentioned that in the past they have dealt with the DOT right-of-way parking for beach nourishment and the DOT has not been very receptive to that idea.

### Site Analysis and Space Planning

The Moffatt & Nichol and BJAC team presented a number of hand-outs. They included four different schemes of the site organization of the oceanside property, site organization of the soundside property, pictures of possible kayak launch systems, breakdown of square footage on both floors, and photos of wind turbine designs. Discussion proceeded as follows:

Mark S. stated that these are by no means set in stone; they are just to try to get the big picture of what needs to be on the property from an organizational standpoint. Jennifer commented that their goal is scope confirmation and relationships. Mark S. continued by saying that they are trying to maximize parking on the site. David commented that the drain field area seems very large if we are using a water re-use system. Mark S. explained that the area they have marked off as the drain field is not exact and as we move along any area that can be taken back for parking, will be. Jay asked if there was any possibility in moving the bath house forward to give more space for parking, but still have it separate from the pier house. It would not count against the 10,000 sq. ft regulation but there are still some requirements.

Frank mentioned that there is a public access walkway on the east side that could possibly be tied into the design and free up some space on the west side. David commented that skewing the pier to one side may upset neighbors as well, so centering it on the site may be the best option. Alex asked if the parking area will be able to accommodate delivery trucks. Mark S. replied that depending on the scheme, there are different service areas. Frank asked if there was any way to put parking over wastewater area. Mike feels that if there were a means of putting parking over wastewater, someone would have done it already. Frank mentioned that he was just curious if there was a way to elevate parking over that area. Jay commented that there could be a way. If you build a deck able to support the weight of vehicles, it is considered pervious; now whether or not wastewater can go underneath it, he was not sure. Tim mentioned that even when using the gray-water system, you still need the same amount of leach field area in case that system ever goes down. David asked Frank if there are any parking requirements from the town for a facility like this. Frank replied he would have to do some research on it. Going back to what Frank said about elevating parking, Mike mentioned that in trying to limit some of the excavation costs, they could put stormwater underneath and basically elevate the parking area anyway.

Mark S. asked if anyone had any questions or comments on the organization of the pier location, pier house, etc. Jim W. commented that he liked the symmetry of having the pier centered but when pulling into the parking area, towards the drop-off area, he doesn't feel like you'll be able to see the ocean. Jay agreed that centering the pier on the site and limiting the impact on the neighbors on either side is a good idea.

Mark S. went over the soundside area drawings. The images of the kayak launches are just an example of some options. Jay mentioned that a floating pier is a really high maintenance item with all of the storms we have, unless you have a relatively easy way to detach it and pull it onto shore. Don mentioned that this area is a heavy barnacle area and it can get slick very quickly. David asked how wide this property is. The sound side area is 60 feet wide. Jay asked if any of that area would be good for extra parking or waste water. Mark S. commented that there are a lot of driveways and utilities so there is not really one solid span of area.

Jim B. led a discussion of the square footage assumptions. Jay commented that at this point we are operating with the assumption that 10,000 sq. ft. is the rule and if we want to go above that we need to try to get a variance, which would be a major thing but may be possible. Jay was originally hoping that it only counted for heated space but it is for all covered space and that is unfortunate because we could have made some covered classroom areas. Frank commented that after speaking to some CAMA officials that you may be able to make some detached covered areas that would not count towards the 10,000 sq. ft. There is some confusion on the rule as to whether it is the footprint or covered areas that matter. Frank is going to take the sheets with square footage numbers and compare it to town ordinances to determine how much parking will be needed. Mark

S. commented that this is not intended to be a floor plan. It is simply a tool to try to see some relationships.

Jim B. went over the examples of wind generation turbines. Most of these have a different look than your standard turbine. Some are customizable and generally aesthetically pleasing.

#### Next Meeting Discussion

Jay suggested that, because there was a lot of information today to digest, a good way to respond may be to put any additional thoughts together and send them to Jay or Dr. Bogus and we can compile them to share. Jennifer suggested setting a timeframe for the input. Comments need to be back by July 13. Next week, officials from Carolina Beach will be meeting with Frank, Art, David and Jay, and they will report at the next meeting what was discussed. Frank commented that the state budget process should be completed by our next meeting and it may be a completely different discussion.

- Next meeting Aug. 4 at 10 a.m.