

PREQUALIFICATION COMMITTEE  
OPEN SESSION  
MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2012  
9:00 A.M. EST

The following Committee members attended the meeting:

Tiffany Mulligan	Director of Economic Opportunity and Prequalification; Chair and Non-Voting Member
Karen Macdonald	Prequalification Engineer; Committee Secretary and Non-Voting Member
Greg Kicinski	Director of Project Management; Voting Member
Mark Miller	Director of Construction Management; Voting Member
Joe Novak	Crawfordsville District Construction Director; Voting Member
Mark Ratliff	Director of Economics, External Audit, and Performance Metrics; Voting Member
Jim Stark	Deputy Commissioner of Capital Program Management; Voting Member
John Wright	Director of Highway Design and Technical Support; Voting Member
Jay Wasson	Deputy Commissioner of Engineering Services and Design Support; attending for Ryan Gallagher as Voting Member

Also in attendance:

Heather Kennedy	Attorney, Economic Opportunity and Prequalification Divisions; INDOT
Maurice Moubray	Prequalification Auditor; INDOT
Fred Bartlett	Prequalification Research Analyst; INDOT
Blaine Hayden	Prequalification Coordinator; INDOT
Daphne Widdifield	Prequalification Assistant; INDOT
George Dremonas	Managing Attorney; Legal Division; INDOT

Jennifer Jansen	Attorney; INDOT
Ronald Boehm	Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM)
Greg Ellis	Construction Engineer, Vincennes District; INDOT
Don Thornton	Highway Engineer; INDOT
Anita Snyder	Engineering Technician; INDOT
Chriss Jobe	Construction Area Engineer, I-69 Office; INDOT
Laura Hilden	Office of Environmental Services; INDOT
David Alyea	Contracts Compliance Specialist; INDOT
Jeremy Brummond	General Counsel for Fred Weber, Inc.
Chris Gottman	Fred Weber, Inc.
Mark Hartman	Fred Weber, Inc.
John Byrd	Fred Weber, Inc.
Lina Klein	Fred Weber, Inc.
Paul Berebitsky	Indiana Construction Association (ICA)
Steve Christian	Stephen J. Christian & Associates; representing American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)

\*\*\*\*\*

The Committee reviewed the following agenda items:

1. Adoption of October 4, 2012 Meeting Minutes
2. Fred Weber, Inc.- Follow up from the October 4, 2012 Committee meeting regarding compliance with Erosion and Sediment Control requirements and contract requirements to protect the Indiana bat on Contract IR-33051, I-69 Section 3.
3. Committee discussion on 2013 meeting dates

PREQUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
OPEN SESSION  
DECEMBER 6, 2012

Ms. Mulligan, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. EST. All Committee members were present, with the exception of Mr. Gallagher. Mr. Wasson attended for Mr. Gallagher.

Ms. Mulligan asked that everyone sign the sign-in sheet that is circulating. She facilitated introductions of all individuals attending the meeting.

1. Adoption of October 4, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Mulligan called for consideration of the meeting minutes from the October 4, 2012 meeting.

Mr. Novak moved to adopt the meeting minutes from the October 4, 2012 meeting. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. Ms. Mulligan stated the minutes would be posted on the INDOT website within a few days.

2. Fred Weber, Inc. –Follow up from the October 4, 2012 Committee meeting regarding compliance with Erosion and Sediment Control requirements and contract requirements to protect the Indiana bat on Contract IR-33051, I-69 Section 3

Ms. Mulligan introduced this item regarding Fred Weber, Inc. (Weber). Weber was brought to the Committee on October 4, 2012. Today's meeting is to follow-up on Weber's performance. She explained the Committee meeting procedures: representatives from INDOT present the issue(s) first, the contractor is allowed to respond, then Committee members and the audience may ask questions.

Mr. Boehm with the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) gave a PowerPoint presentation that included an overview of Weber's performance on Contract IR-33051, including detailed pictures showing what was observed in the last few weeks. The dates of the site visits were November 15, 2012, November 26 and 27, 2012 and December 4, 2012. He also had some slides with pictures dated September 3, 2012. The first seven slides showed pictures that were taken on December 4, 2012 and showed how Weber was using good erosion control measures, such as using erosion control blankets in the median and down a slope, providing and maintaining median inlet protection, and using riprap at the base of an embankment to allow construction equipment to cross the ditch. Mr. Boehm stated that when using a coconut blanket, it may be a few months before the grass will come in.

Mr. Boehm took pictures of various areas of concern on each of the days he visited the site. One area of concern was at Doan's Creek. At this location, on November 15, 2012 the silt fence was blown out from a rain event and sediment dumped into the creek. On November 27,

2012 at the same location, the silt fence was fixed, but there was soil upstream, the hole was still there from the sediment washout, and the silt fence was not installed correctly. Mr. Boehm stated that Weber should have backfilled behind the silt fence and they should have buried the end flap. On December 4, 2012 he observed that the failure had been fixed by using a rock filter berm.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures showing holes in the wrap used around an inlet on November 15, 2012, and it had not been corrected when he visited on December 4, 2012.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures of erosion down embankments from underdrains that outletted halfway down the slope. In one location that had been observed on September 3, 2012, the erosion went all the way down to the creek and sediment was deposited in the creek. The problem was still there when he visited on November 15, 2012 and December 4, 2012.

Mr. Boehm stated that we have had a mild fall. The erosion would have been worse if there had been a heavy rain event.

A representative from Weber stated that the pictures show the sediment load had changed in each picture.

Ms. Mulligan stated that INDOT has the floor and is still presenting the issues.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures of silt fence adjacent to First Creek taken on November 15, 2012 and November 26, 2012. There was erosion under the silt fence in a few locations, and the silt fence was not tied off where it had tied into another silt fence.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures of erosion control blankets that had been placed down an embankment, through the side ditch, and up the backslope. Pictures of this area were taken on November 15, 2012 and December 4, 2012. Blankets were placed over weeds and they were not anchored in place. Rills had developed on the slopes and the blanket was loose in the side ditch. Mr. Boehm showed pictures where he had pulled the blanket back to show that it was not anchored in the side ditch.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures taken on November 15, 2012 and December 4, 2012, where a side ditch was built halfway up the slope to divert water from getting to a jurisdictional waterway at the bottom of the slope. There were bare spots where the mulch did not stay in place. He stated that a requirement of the contract is to stabilize areas within seven days. This area should be corrected to prevent slope failure. In a picture Mr. Boehm showed later in his presentation, there was a cut through the berm between the two ditches. This occurred where the diversion side ditch was closer to the bottom of the slope. That picture was taken on November 26, 2012.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures of an embankment where rills had developed down the slope. Sediment had plumed out at the bottom of the slope into the creek at more than one location. He also pointed out bare spots on the embankment and the flatter backslope area where mulch was sparse.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures that showed the mid-slope ditch mentioned earlier running into a ditch adjacent to a railroad track, then the ditch flowed to the jurisdictional waterway that was at the bottom of the embankment. At the point where the second ditch met the jurisdictional waterway, there was a riprap check dam. Mr. Boehm stated that the check dam was not big enough.

Mr. Boehm showed a picture of a bare, wide backslope and other pictures with bare foreslopes, where much of the mulch had blown away. He stated that Weber needs to crimp the mulch to help it stay in place. The areas need to be stabilized to reduce erosion. He showed pictures of a channel that was not stabilized. Coconut blankets had been placed in the channel, but they had moved, because they had not been pinned down and was lapped in the wrong direction.

Mr. Boehm showed pictures taken on November 26 and 27, 2012 that shows no erosion or sediment control where water runs under the new pavement and down the embankment at CR 900E. There is a natural spring onsite that was diverted while the bridge was under construction. This natural spring is a jurisdictional waterway. Jurisdictional streams are Waters of the US, and are required to be managed resources. A solution is needed by Weber, INDOT, IDEM and the I-69 team.

Mr. Boehm showed several pictures taken on December 4, 2012, which show better erosion and sediment control practices. He stated that the project looks better; however, the erosion control blanket is loose in a few locations. He stated the project looks good now, but it took awhile to get there.

Mr. Boehm stated that he still has some concerns. 1) Weber needs to correct and/or stabilize the concentrated flow areas. 2) We need to be concerned with the area in the woodland/wetland. Sediment was removed and the area was stabilized with blankets, but a concentrated flow may transport sediment to the wetland again. 3) The mulch should be crimped. 4) Weber should have used blankets on more embankments. A lot of blankets were used on a huge flat area. 5) Weber needs to stabilize areas when check dams are removed. One had been removed for clear zone issues. 6) Watch that blankets don't bridge dozer ruts. The blankets need to come in contact with the soil, otherwise you will have erosion underneath and/or the seed will not take. 7) At CR 900E there is a jurisdictional wetland. The drainage flows towards the wetland, and there are no sediment control measures. 8) The site needs to be stabilized for the winter.

Mr. Boehm showed a picture of four pipes outletting mid-slope on an embankment. He stated that Weber could have extended the pipe with corrugated pipe to direct the clean underdrain water down to the rip-rapped channel.

Mr. Boehm's last slides showed Weber's self-monitoring Sediment and Erosion Control Inspection and Maintenance Report. His concern is that not all of the problems that he observed were listed on the report by Weber.

Mr. Boehm stated in summary that he saw some good measures, and saw some other areas that need correction.

Mr. Jobe, Construction Area Engineer, I-69 Office, INDOT, provided a summary of the I-69 team's recommendations. Weber was brought to the Committee on October 4, 2012 to discuss and address the on-going issues with environmental permit non-compliance on contract IR-33051. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Committee directed Weber to submit a Work Improvement Plan (WIP) to INDOT. Weber agreed to improve the overall work. Weber originally submitted their WIP on October 18, 2012. It was reviewed by INDOT's I-69 team, the Office of Environmental Services, and Construction Management and those comments were provided to Weber on October 26, 2012. Weber resubmitted the WIP on November 13, 2012. INDOT's I-69 team, the Office of Environmental Services, and Construction Management approved the WIP on November 21, 2012. Mr. Jobe stated that INDOT project personnel observed improvements in Weber's environmental efforts immediately following the October 4, 2012 Committee meeting. Weber's improved efforts included a more proactive field response to correcting erosion and sediment control deficiencies and detailed weekly inspection reports; however, in the last three weeks INDOT observed a decline in Weber's performance and there have been significant environmental non-compliance issues that have arisen. These concerns were addressed in Mr. Boehm's presentation. INDOT could be at risk from getting permits for future work on I-69. The I-69 Team's recommendation today is for INDOT to suspended Weber from bidding on future contracts.

Mr. Wright asked if representatives from Weber were with Mr. Boehm when he inspected the site.

Mr. Boehm replied that Weber was at the December 4, 2012 inspection.

Mr. John Byrd, Project Manager with Weber, stated that it would be good for Weber to be at the inspections. He asked if the Committee members had a chance to review the WIP.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the WIP was provided in the members' packets.

Mr. Byrd provided a PowerPoint presentation that included an overview of the improvements that Weber has implemented. Mr. Byrd explained that John Alexander is the sediment and erosion control manager and Tyler Weaverson is the Quality Assurance manager for Weber. He stated that Tim Arthur no longer works for Weber and resigned for personal reasons. Weber intends to have three personnel trained in the Certified Compliance Inspector of Stormwater (CCIS) program and the annual refresher will be required. Weber will have at least one CCIS person on site. Weber will do site-specific erosion control plan reviews at the project kick-off meeting and pre-clearing activities. He explained that Weber has weekly Tool Box Talks to cover sediment and erosion control. The Tool Box Talks show good and poor installations.

Mr. Byrd stated that Weber has developed a weekly report, which is a self-monitoring form. They will also inspect and report after rain events. The report asks for the station, feature, deficiency, and whether it was reported previously. The date of the repair is to be listed on the

report, to show that it was corrected within 48 hours. If it rains and the measure needs to be repaired again, then the report will show that. He stated that 90 percent of deficiencies are fixed within 48 hours.

Mr. Byrd explained that the areas shown in the pictures presented by Mr. Boehm had ongoing work at those sites. In some cases the conditions were not conducive to correcting the problems, for example November was wet. Mr. Byrd explained the aggressive schedule to get I-69 open made it difficult to control erosion and sediment. Weber may need to redo some measures. They were directed to seed and straw before the road was opened. He stated that more damage would be done to an area if they use a tractor or dozer to fix a six inch rill.

Mr. Byrd stated that Weber hired Weaver Boos to be an independent third party inspector, and Bernardin, Lochmueller, and Associates (BLA) (INDOT's consultant performing construction inspection) is working closely with Weber on all issues. Weber compares their reports to Weaver Boos' and BLA's reports.

Mr. Byrd stated that Weber's pre-activity planning meetings will include the erosion and sediment control manager, project supervisor, foremen, field personnel, and subcontractors. They will pass out the erosion control plan and map of jurisdictional waterways. Weber will make sure everyone is clear at the onset of the project.

Mr. Byrd addressed the pictures again. He stated that the water table was high in one side ditch. You cannot crimp the straw when the site is wet. The slope is not always the deciding factor on whether you should crimp. Weber used a tackifier in some areas. They will re-seed where the seed did not take. They used blankets to stabilize some slopes. It was an aggressive schedule and some areas were seeded at the last hour. Weber is still working in some of the areas that Mr. Boehm showed.

Ms. Klein, Environmental Manager with Weber, provided a PowerPoint presentation that included explanation of the CCIS and Certified Preparer of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (CPSWPPP) training. The CCIS training is online and includes quizzes and final exam. It is a two year certification and the participant earns 16 professional development hours (PDH). The CPSWPPP training grants 18.5 PDH's and the certification is for two years.

Ms. Klein explained that the Tool Box Talks will include "How to build a better BMP", and it is still under development. The source of information is from the Indiana Storm Water Manual. The weekly meetings will include review of the previous week. She stated that reiteration is a good learning tool. She showed an example of a Tool Box Talk on inlet protection.

Ms. Klein explained Weber is using SharePoint so that in addition to the training, the employees will have access to information at all times, Weber is researching other training for erosion and sediment control to be implemented in the near future.

Ms. Klein stated that Weber will hold the annual refresher training in January/February. It will be 8 hours. Weber will hold site-specific pre-activity meetings. They will review the erosion and sediment control plan and the stormwater pollution prevention plan.

Mr. Ratliff asked where the supervision of Weber's staff was when they threw the blankets over the weeds.

Mr. Byrd stated that we were told to cover everything up to make it look nice.

Mr. Hartman stated that it is a 10.5 mile project and they are still working on that project.

Mr. Byrd stated that Weber is still working at CR 900 and Weber did not know the flow of water at the natural spring. They found that the water would overtop the road. They needed to pipe the water to the other side. Weber went to INDOT and asked to put in a pipe, but it is a jurisdictional waterway. INDOT and IDEM came to the site and said they could not put in a pipe in a jurisdictional waterway. The water was diverted for one year while the bridge and MSE walls were built. Weber dug the ditch after the bridge and MSE wall work was completed and they placed straw. Mr. Byrd said this area has been very confusing from day one because of conflicting information.

Mr. Hartman stated that Weber is being painted as a bad picture and Weber has addressed the issues. Weber has not been negligent. Some areas that have had issues are being addressed and some areas that are bare in the pictures have already been addressed.

Mr. Byrd stated that if Weber is not allowed to bid on contracts because of bare spots, it would not be fair. The seed and straw satisfied the contract.

Mr. Hartman stated that INDOT asked Weber to blanket the area and the contract required seed and straw.

Mr. Byrd and Mr. Hartman stated that adjacent contracts along the corridor have bare spots too.

Mr. Boehm stated that Weber admitted they hand laid straw at the location where the picture showed the pen laid on the bare spot. He questioned why Weber would hand lay straw next to a jurisdictional waterway.

Mr. Stark asked if Weber submitted the WIP and if it is approved.

Ms. Mulligan explained that Weber still has the floor.

Mr. Byrd stated that Weber reached out to INDOT, BLA, and IDEM. Three people were satisfied with Weber's efforts.

Mr. Stark asked who was at the meeting.



Mr. Byrd replied that Greg Ellis and Wes Zeller.

Mr. Jobe stated that it is an overstatement to say that INDOT was completely satisfied. He stated that BLA was concerned with the 6 to 1 slopes.

Ms. Mulligan stated that we need to give Mr. Byrd the floor.

Mr. Gottman, Regional Manager with Weber, stated that there have been great improvements from the first day Weber went back. Comparing the BLA and Weber weekly reports, some had two items listed, some ten. Now the Weber and BLA reports are down to four deficiencies.

Mr. Byrd stated INDOT was satisfied at the last meeting and it generated a lot of emails.

Mr. Gottman stated the project was opened and the areas are being taken care of. It is not a lack of effort on Weber's part.

Ms. Mulligan asked that INDOT representatives respond to Mr. Stark's earlier question.

Mr. Stark asked if the WIP was submitted by October 19, 2012.

Mr. Jobe replied yes, it was submitted on time.

Mr. Wasson asked if report was signed by the correct people from Weber.

Mr. Byrd replied that it was signed by several people at Weber.

Mr. Stark asked if we have a final WIP and has it been approved. He asked if the I-69 team is now not approving the WIP.

Ms. Mulligan stated that emails approving the WIP were included in the members' packets.

Mr. Jobe stated that the WIP has been approved and is still acceptable today.

Mr. Stark asked if INDOT gave Weber a timeframe to implement the WIP and is it being done.

Mr. Jobe stated that no timeframe was set by INDOT.

Mr. Stark stated that he wanted to thank Weber for opening of I-69 on time. He asked Mr. Jobe if we are not happy with what is going on now.

Mr. Jobe stated that we are concerned with Weber's performance over the past three weeks.

Ms. Mulligan asked if there is something in the WIP to ensure that performance will not drop off again.

Mr. Byrd stated that the checklists and weekly reports should allow them to stay on top of things. There are four sets of eyes out there (Weber, Weaver Boos, BLA, and IDEM) and Weber has 48 hours to respond to sediment and erosion control deficiencies. If issues are not corrected, it will show up on future reports.

Mr. Hartman stated the pictures don't show the whole story and Weber has not received a formal approval of the WIP. Weber is still moving forward on the work.

Ms. Mulligan asked if there is going to be multiple checks on future projects.

Mr. Hartman stated that Weber will continue to have an independent check.

Mr. Jobe stated that INDOT has weekly checks.

Mr. Ratliff stated that he was CFO for five years for a builder and is aware of erosion and sediment control issues. He stated that chasing rain and wind everyday is difficult. The best laid plans do not work if there is no supervision. It appears there was no supervision in the field. The blankets were placed on top of weeds and blankets placed in the ditches were lapped wrong. INDOT should not accept this.

Mr. Kicinski stated pictures are part of the story, however, you could go to any job in the state and use pictures to make the project a success or a failure. He asked if Weber has done what the Committee asked them to do. He asked if the WIP satisfied the last issues before the Committee.

Ms. Hilden stated that the blankets placed over the weeds should have been noted on the reports. The plan is only good if the inspectors know what they are looking for. She asked if it was noted on the reports.

A representative from Weber stated that the blankets over the weeds were not listed on the reports.

Ms. Hilden stated that these things should have been knocked out before the opening of the highway. She questioned the confidence INDOT can have with Weber's future performance.

Ms. Mulligan asked if the Committee members have questions. She stated that we only have the room for another half hour.

Mr. Kicinski asked if INDOT has the reports from the third parties showing last three weeks.

Mr. Gottman stated yes.

Mr. Hartman stated there is not a big difference in the reports.

Mr. Stark asked if the reports show that Weber's performance is getting better, worse, or is it stagnant.

Mr. Jobe stated that Doan's Creek is a highly sensitive area. There have been consistent problems that have shown on reports over the past several weeks. Mr. Boehm's slideshow addressed this area.

Mr. Gottman stated that it has cost Weber money too and Weber has addressed each issue. The issues at Doan's Creek have been fixed, but it blows out again. He stated there are some communication issues. He suggested that maybe Weber should put in a permanent measure.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Jobe and Mr. Ellis if the WIP is acceptable. He asked them why they lack confidence that Weber will not perform better given time

Mr. Ellis, Vincennes District Project Engineer, INDOT, stated that INDOT has had problems in the past and withheld payments and stopped the job.

Mr. Jobe stated the regression INDOT has seen over the past three weeks is in the self monitoring reporting. Releasing water at an unstabilized area makes INDOT look bad.

Ms. Mulligan stated that the reason the Committee asked Weber back in January was because the I-69 Team said the project was wrapping up.

Mr. Miller stated the project won't be complete until May.

Mr. Stark stated that the WIP has been reviewed and accepted by INDOT. He stated that other than pictures, nothing has been presented to the Committee to show that the WIP is not being implemented correctly. We need to see reports with a recommendation, if it looks like Weber is not going to follow through.

Ms. Mulligan stated Weber's prequalification certificate is due to expire April 30, 2013. We can consider concerns at renewal time.

Mr. Novak asked who was responsible for getting the permit.

Mr. Byrd stated it was a design-build project with Weber and Jacobs Engineering.

Mr. Hartman stated that if Weber were lacking in their efforts, reporting and maintaining measures, then Weber's reports would not match the others and Weber would only be correcting 20 percent of the items.

Ms. Mulligan stated INDOT appreciates the issues but INDOT cannot hold the contractors hand.

Mr. Novak stated it is the responsibility of the contractor to do the work, not INDOT. It is all on the contractor, because it was design-build.

Mr. Jobe stated that the pictures shown today show successes and deficiencies. He stated he still has concerns with maintenance and self-monitoring.

Mr. Wasson asked Weber how they will take the deficiencies that were pointed out today and correct them.

Mr. Byrd stated the issues will be taken back to their staff to correct the issues, and they may put them in the Tool Box Talks. He pointed out again that Weber is still working in some of these areas.

Mr. Hartman stated Weber has to be allowed to finish and Weber has not walked away.

Mr. Wasson stated that INDOT wants the weekly reports to show a true picture of the deficiencies.

Mr. Ratliff moved to defer a decision until April before Weber's prequalification is up for renewal. He added that someone from INDOT should report that work has been fixed or not. Weber has not had time to implement the plan.

Ms. Mulligan restated the motion; the Committee is not making a decision today on Weber's prequalification status. The Committee will get a report from the Office of Environmental Services (OES) or I-69 Team. If the report is acceptable the Prequalification Division could process any future application or do we call Weber back in April.

Mr. Ratliff stated that the Committee should have Weber back to the April meeting.

Ms. Mulligan restated the motion; the Committee is not making a decision today on Weber's prequalification status, and the Committee will call Weber back in April. OES and the I-69 Team will put together a report for the Committee.

Mr. Brummond, Attorney with Weber, asked if it would help if Weber responded before the meeting if the report is negative.

Ms. Mulligan replied that it is not necessary for Weber to respond to the report. Weber is welcome to bring a response to the meeting. She asked if the Weber should be brought back to the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting or a meeting in March.

Mr. Stark asked if Weber is required to maintain erosion control measures through the winter.

Mr. Jobe replied yes.

Mr. Wasson stated that if a deficiency is not addressed and INDOT accepts it, it should still stay on the report with a note.

Mr. Novak stated that the April 4, 2013 is fine.

Ms. Mulligan stated INDOT has to process prequalification applications within thirty (30) days of receipt; however INDOT would not process an application submitted by Weber if submitted early, but will hold it until the Committee meeting.

Ms. Macdonald stated that Weber would have their current Certificate of Qualification to submit bids until April 30, 2013.

Ms. Mulligan suggested the combined report be submitted from the I-69 Team, OES, and Construction Management.

Ms. Kennedy asked when the report should be submitted.

Mr. Miller suggested stated Friday, March 15, 2013.

Ms. Klein asked if Weber will get a copy of the report.

Mr. Ratliff stated yes.

Ms. Mulligan summarized the motion; the Committee will require Weber to come back on April 4, 2013. The INDOT I-69 Team, OES, and Construction Management will submit a report by March 15, 2013 to the Committee and Weber. There will be no decision today on Weber's prequalification status.

Ms. Mulligan stated that if Weber wants to submit information, we need it by March 15, 2013 also. It does not give Weber a chance to respond to INDOT's report, but that can be submitted or addressed at the meeting.

MS. Mulligan asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Kicinski seconded the motion.

All Committee members voted in favor.

Ms. Mulligan explained that a letter will be sent out to Weber and a memo will be sent to notify the Commissioner. Weber will also receive a letter of notification for the April meeting at a later date.

### 3. Committee discussion on 2013 meeting dates

Ms. Mulligan presented the last item on the agenda, 2013 Committee schedule. The first meeting will be January 10, 2013.

Mr. Stark asked to change the July 5, 2013 meeting to July 11, 2013.

Mr. Novak moved to adopt.

Mr. Stark seconded the motion.

All Committee members voted in favor.

Ms. Mulligan asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Wasson moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Ratliff seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of adjourning the meeting.

Ms. Mulligan adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:07 p.m. EST.