

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE UTILITIES AUTHORITY, TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2011, 4:00 P.M., CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS.

Members Present: Chairman, Darrell Drummond; Vice Chairman, Pamela K. Cully; Secretary, Michael A. Perri, Jr.; Deputy Secretary, Robert W. Summerhays, Jr.; Mayor Robert J. Benton III; and David Recor, Ex-Officio Member/City Manager.

Others present: William G. Thiess, Director of Utilities; Rupert N. Koblegard, III, FPUA Attorney; Nina Hurtubise, Director of Finance; Timothy E. Perkins, Director Water/Wastewater Systems; Thomas W. Richards, Director of Electric and Gas Systems; Arne Taranger, Acting Risk Manager; and Levette Dixon, Communications Manager.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Drummond.

Invocation by Craig Brewer, Superintendent of Electric T&D.

The *Pledge of Allegiance* was recited.

The roll was called and a quorum declared.

Mr. Drummond asked if the Board or Staff has any item they would like to pull for further discussion. (No items were removed.)

A motion was made by Mr. Summerhays, seconded by Mayor Benton, and unanimously carried to approve the items listed on the Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 1, 2011.
2. Approval to award a contract with D & L Trucking and Excavating, LLC, Fort Pierce, Florida, for Dry Lime Sludge Removal at no cost to the Fort Pierce Utilities Authority.

An email was received from SFC W. H. Swartz, Jr. of the US Army thanking the entire FPUA family for the wonderful packages sent to him over the past year. A special thank you to Shari Franco of Human Resources for her kindness and caring in her assistance in coordinating and shipping the packages.

Bill Thiess, Director of Utilities, presented the Local Preference in Bidding agenda item. He said at the Strategic Planning workshop there was a short presentation on local preference and the Board was given a copy of the City of Fort Pierce's (City) rules on local preference and St. Lucie County's (SLC) Ordinance. Mr. Thiess said also presented at that time was a one page table showing the primary differences between the City's and SLC's local preference procedures. He

said the most important item on the table is the mechanism where they let the low bidder within 5% get into the bidding game. The primary difference is the City will look at the next low bidder within 5% and will allow him and the out of town (non-local) bidder to go at each other again in separate bids. The County, if it is a non-local low bidder and the next local low bidder within 5% wants to match that bid; they get to match it and do not give the non-local bidder a chance to bid again. That is the primary difference and there are some other differences in the length of time their local office has to be open to be qualified as the local bidder, but Mr. Thiess said he does not believe that is as important as the bid process. Staff is bringing this back to the Board because they did not get a clear direction on where the Board wants to go on this. Staff has not made a recommendation; it is here for discussion. If the Board would like staff to pursue a local preference policy, either the City's or the County's, or something else all together, we would like to get some direction which way to go with it.

Mr. Drummond said one of the questions the Board has is whether or not the County's policy would meet muster from a legal standpoint.

Mr. Koblegard said he has checked that through the Statutes and it does not really address it specifically. He said he thinks the way that it is made legal is that it is advertised as part of the bid process. Everyone bidding knows there is a local preference ordinance that allows the local bidder if he is within 5% of the low bid, basically wins the bid. As long as everyone knows that up front, Mr. Koblegard said he cannot see any reason why that would not be allowed. He knows the County thoroughly looked into this before they passed the ordinance. It does say that it does not apply if it is contrary to any Florida Federal Statute or has any impact upon grant money. Mr. Koblegard said he believes the way the County has done theirs is fine.

Mr. Thiess said another difference in the table is that with the City, if a non-local bidder uses 60% – 75% subs or materials or 60% -75% local employees, they can qualify as a local bidder based on those percentages. The County does not allow that.

Mayor Benton said he likes the City's and he has his concerns on whether it can be challenged legally or not. He knows from sitting as a City Commissioner they have had a couple of contractors come in, and he is not sure if this is the item or if they might not have a legal challenge, but they had the ability to challenge and ask the City to take a closer look at it. Mayor Benton said this opens the door for that and it could be something this Board might have to look at. He said with the sub-contractors and the aggravation with the federal courthouse where the City was told there was going to be a percentage of local and there had to be, but that has not been the case. He said it works for the City anyway because they have a lot of folks that are sub-contractors that cannot qualify for bonding issues or something else and could not get the job without that added.

Mr. Perri said he prefers the County's and one of the reasons is if it is put out for rebid, we might be out of time. He said if we have a project that needs to be done and it has to be put out for rebid because of the City's constraints, you have to let everybody rebid. As Mr.

March 15, 2011

Page 3

Koblegard said, the people that bid may know out in front that there is a possibility. As far as the 60% - 65% of local employees, the courthouse is a perfect example of that and it would be very hard to police. There is no control and it would be added expense to police something like that to make sure an outside contractor had 60% of local employees and 65% of the material locally. Mr. Perri said the County is right in protecting the people that live, work, and pay taxes in this county. He said they should get the benefit of the doubt. He is for modeling it after the County's and let Mr. Koblegard draft something that is similar to theirs and supposedly it will work.

Mrs. Cully said she understands what Mr. Perri is saying and she feels under the circumstances with our economy, and this can be changed at a later date, she would like to go with the City's because it is fairer.

Mayor Benton said to add to what Mr. Perri has said and when it comes down to a timeframe, if there is a need to get a contractor in there, there is always the ability to say it is an emergency and then the bidding process can be waived completely. He knows this would be very hard to police, but it sends a message and gives the contractor notice up front that we want them using as much local help as possible. Mayor Benton said from his staff's point before they start the work, they have an idea if it is close to it or in the ball park. He said sometimes they are told that is the case and has had non-local contractors from down south come in and rent a bay for 30-60 days and they call themselves local, even if they do not receive mail or have a phone there. It is a tough one for the City to police because if they get an occupational license they could be considered local.

Mrs. Cully asked if in regard to the 60% to 75% of local subs, if they cannot find that many people, then would they be able to hire outside?

Mayor Benton said he would have to ask Mr. Recor on how that would be dealt with.

Mr. Recor said he could not tell them today and he does not see anyone here from purchasing. He said he could not answer the question.

Mr. Perri asked if there is paper work or forms that hold their feet to the fire about this 60% or is it just something that is expected for them to do on their own.

Mr. Recor said it is something that is specified in the bid packet, but Mr. Perri raised a legitimate concern.

Mr. Perri asked if there was a way to hold their feet to the fire. He said we should be giving the consideration to the people that live in this community and the contractors every consideration and not farm work to somebody in Fort Lauderdale or anywhere else. We are talking about a 5% thing. Mr. Perri said we recently had a bid where a Port St. Lucie contractor was the next lowest bidder, but he was not within 5% so it is a moot point. He said we are talking about a

March 15, 2011

Page 4

very little sliver there that would give the advantage to somebody that lives, works, plays, pays taxes, and hires local. That is a lot more important than giving to contractors that are out of town and giving them second chances to bid it.

Mr. Recor said there is not a way to hold their feet to the fire.

Mayor Benton said he does not believe the City's policy would do that and there is no law saying we have to take the low bidder. He said he knows as far as the City is concerned, they look at people they have dealt with before and the quality of work they do and if it is 5%, the local guy is going to get it hands down. Especially if it is somebody they have dealt with before.

Mr. Perri asked if FPUA sent something out for bid, could we do what the City does and not have to take the lowest bid.

Attorney Koblegard said if it is called the lowest, best, and most responsive bid, there are considerations beyond the price, but you would have to be careful of how that is drafted. He said he knows that has been done on occasions, especially when they are ranking them.

Mayor Benton said the City also grades them by their quality of work and Tony Barnes is here now to explain why.

Mr. Drummond told Mr. Barnes there are a couple of questions the Board has. He said the Board is looking at the City's local preference and it speaks to 65% of local subs and materials being used. How is that tracked?

Mr. Barnes said they have to provide that list to the City and they verify that those people are local citizens, local contractors, or vendors in our area.

Mr. Perri asked if he has ever done that.

Mr. Barnes responded no.

Mr. Perri said he rests his case.

Mrs. Cully said they are talking about 60% to 70% local subs and if there are not enough to do the job, can they hire non local?

Mr. Barnes said that how it works is they can get that status if they provide that information before hand. He said they have never done that because the City very seldom has had to verify it. They have only exercised that provision one time in the whole time that it has been there. They have to provide that information to the City up front and if they do not, they do not get local preference. They are considered to be a non local vendor.

March 15, 2011

Page 5

Mr. Summerhays said both of these plans have their good points and their bad points. It would seem to him to be prudent since we do our purchasing through the City's purchasing department, that we adopt the same plan. He said he sees good and bad with both of them and he would not have a problem with either one of them. We ought to have a local preference and it would seem to make more sense to him to use the same one.

Mr. Drummond asked if the City has found since they adopted this policy hesitancy on outside bidders.

Mr. Barnes said no.

Mr. Drummond asked if they are still willing to bid on the program.

Mr. Barnes said yes.

Mrs. Cully asked if when the economy gets better and we have a lot more activity, Mr. Recor said that at this time there is no follow up to make sure they are local subs. Is there a follow up plan that would take place to make sure that this is done?

Mr. Barnes said that in Purchasing they do all the due diligence to make sure that what they have there is factual. He said they do that and also send somebody to the site to make sure they are doing what they are supposed to do.

Mrs. Cully said Mayor Benton was talking about the federal courthouse and she asked if there was any time that the City checked to make sure they were local.

Mr. Barnes said that is not the City, it was the federal government.

Mayor Benton said the City had asked them to use local.

Mr. Barnes said they asked and put some pressure on them, but once they got their contract and got it up and going they told the City they did not need them anymore. He said that is what happened there, but the City was still able to get some local vendors in. He has the list somewhere in his office and he could probably find it. Mr. Barnes said that not only were they able to get local people in, but they were able to get some local minorities in there too. He said they are using our local vendors, most of them are in the Port St. Lucie area, but they are using local vendors for that project.

Mr. Koblegard asked Mr. Barnes when the City has a local bidder within 5%, how much time do you give those two to submit a new bid? Is it a pretty short fuse?

March 15, 2011

Page 6

Mr. Barnes said seven days in most cases unless it is a job that it is going to take a little longer for them to get their numbers back. He said they would then give them a little longer on a major project, but on most of them they get 6 to 7 days.

Mr. Drummond said we need to give staff some direction on the way the Board would like to go and we do not necessarily need a vote. He said he is looking for a consensus on which one we would ask staff to bring back in the form of a resolution.

Mrs. Cully said she would stay with the City.

Mayor Benton said he also would use the City's.

Mr. Barnes asked what the other option was because he was not in the room when the others were discussed.

Mr. Drummond said the County's plan is the other option.

Mr. Barnes said the County put theirs in their ordinance. He said the City did not put theirs in their ordinance because if the time gets better, then the City can take that out and will not have to jump through all the hoops to get it back out. That is one of the major differences, the City decided not to make it a part of their ordinance so they can massage it any way they want.

Mr. Drummond asked if the City approved a resolution.

Mr. Barnes said there is no resolution; it is part of the purchasing policies.

Mrs. Cully asked what Mr. Barnes meant by "massage it"?

Mr. Barnes said if times get better, we may not need a local preference policy any more. We are doing that to try to keep our businesses here up and running. If it gets better to where they are competing and the economy gets better, we can take that out. We would not have to do what the County did by making it a part of their ordinance. We can just pull it out and say we want to take it out because the economy is doing better for our local people. Everybody is staying in their particular communities and doing their work there and not all over the place trying to get work.

Mayor Benton said he heard from a lot of contractors where there is good and bad with this. When times get better there are a lot of contractors in St. Lucie County that are doing work throughout the State of Florida and if everybody said they are only going to hire folks within our county or within 90 miles, we definitely handicap them. We would not want to do that. Mayor Benton said what the City did is follow what started down in Palm Beach County. They got really strict down there and did not like folks coming in from both north and south. It then took

March 15, 2011

Page 7

off like a domino effect and the City jumped on the wagon. In better times, Mayor Benton said he believes it should be opened up.

Mr. Barnes said most communities have it now.

Mr. Drummond said we have two Board Members for the City plan.

Mr. Summerhays said for simplicity sake he would choose the City plan.

Mr. Perri said he believes the County is the better option for the people we serve.

Mr. Drummond said for many of the reasons on both sides, he said he is pulled towards the City's as well. For no other reason it is the one the City is using and we particularly use the City for our purchasing, it makes it a lot simpler for us. He asked Mr. Thiess and Mr. Koblegard what was the cleanest way to implement this.

Mr. Koblegard said he could draft something for the Board to look at and decide then if it is best to make it a part of our manual or in the form of a resolution. He said a resolution is easy to change.

Mr. Drummond said he believes Mr. Koblegard has a sense of where the Board would like to go with it.

Nina Hurtubise, Finance Director, presented the status report on the electric power cost adjustment (PCA) for February 2011. She said FPUA had another good month in power costs and she is proposing a decrease in the PCA. We did have an unexpected over collection for the month of February with a swing of about \$1 million of what was projected just last month. It makes it very difficult to predict where we will be next month at any given point and time. Ms. Hurtubise said it is a little bit frustrating from Staff's standpoint. She said we had an over recovery of \$748,000. The rate that FMPA billed FPUA for the month of February was \$71.65 for 1,000 kWh and that was a decrease of \$14.48 as compared to January. This was a drop that was not anticipated, but gratefully accepted. As a result, the over collection has increased to \$3.7 million and she understands it is a very sensitive issue. The source of frustration lies in the table on the screen. The red numbers under the 50% confidence in the month of December, the projections FMPA made were substantially lower than what they actually charged us. We got hit very hard in the month of December with power cost, but now January and February swung the absolute opposite way. In December the projections were less than actual by 17% and in February and January, the actuals were less by 16% and 12%. Ms. Hurtubise said these are huge variances from what they projected. She said that is an average overall for all the months shown. The question is how much do we rely on these projections; well they are all we have. We have to at least use them as a base line. The next chart shows the under collection and the subsequent over collections that we have had. The blue is historical and the orange is

what is projected. For any proposed changes, the shape of the curve would be about the same because we have to pay for the same costs no matter whether we raise or lower the PCA now. The blue line shows what we have charged the customer and we are at \$38 now and this is a proposed reduction to \$36 for 1,000 kWh. If we were to do that, the expected increase is to \$39 as of October 1st. A couple of alternatives have been run which include a \$4 reduction that drops the PCA down to the \$34 level, but then it goes up to the \$40 level October 1st, so the swing is just greater. If we take out the over/under collection and reduce it, there are three alternatives discussed today. The blue line in the middle is \$38, which is where we are today and if we remain steady at \$38, we could keep that \$38 all the way through to December 2012. Ms. Hurtubise said what is being recommended today is the red line, which is a \$2 reduction. Based on current projections, we would have to raise it up to \$39 October 1st. She said for those that would like to give back a little bit more, a \$4 reduction would bring us down to \$34, but then it would mean we may need to increase up to \$40 October 1st and it would take us through September 2012. We are very fortunate to have this over collection and we can kind of control how quickly we give that back and over what period. If there were no under or over collection as of September 30, 2011, which is not anticipated at this point, the power costs in 2012 are expected to be up around \$45 for 1,000 kWh. With every one of these options, we are able to shelter the customer by giving back throughout the entire year of 2012. Unfortunately, we have had three very volatile months of ups and downs with the power costs. Staff is recommending the \$2 reduction at this time and Ms. Hurtubise said she will be back here next month, if the Board would like to decrease it again. It is up to the Board as to whether they would like to give back more now, but it will impact the customers more in the future. The reduction from \$38 to \$36 would reduce the 1,000 kWh bill from \$133.84 to \$131.84 per month. We are also planning on bringing a \$4 reduction to the base rate at the next meeting and that should have a tremendously positive impact on our relationship in terms of our level of bills compared to others in the State of Florida. The recommendation is to reduce the PCA to \$36 effective April 1st and into the future.

Mrs. Cully said we just discussed that December was very volatile and we have had a whole year of volatility. She said although we said what it looks like very nicely with an over collection, she thinks we would not be doing our rate payers justice by dropping it even \$2. She would like to know now, considering all the uncertainty in the world, let alone our nation, we could count on one thing and that is those rates are going to stay steady. We are looking at 50% confidence level through 2012 and she would like to see the steady rates and stay at \$38 from now until 2012 unless some unknown reason we have to raise it.

Mr. Drummond said based on the projection of staff with a \$2 reduction the estimate would be in September 2012 that we would still have an over collection of almost \$3 million.

Ms. Hurtubise said yes, in September 2011. She said in 2012, it is anticipated to be close to zero in any of the alternatives.

Mr. Drummond said at this point, he feels because of our over collection, we have the luxury of providing for a reduction to give some immediate relief to our customers. As Ms. Hurtubise said, staff would be coming back on a continuous basis every month. If these projections continue to be volatile and because of the amount of over collection, we have the ability to make adjustments that will not be as painful in the long term. He is always skeptical of taking long term projections especially 18 months out and making decisions that are going to be long term. He knows what we do have in the over collection bank and relative to the amounts we have been asking our customers to pay, a reduction of \$4 would most certainly be a welcome reduction to our customers in the short term. We have the ability to monitor on a month-to-month basis and if necessary make adjustments.

Mayor Benton said he agrees with Mr. Drummond because we are in the time of the year now where we are going into summer and that is usually when it hurts in the wallet the most. He said from what he is seeing around our country and locally in the area, things may be picking up a little bit. Maybe later in the year we will see more of that. If more people are working it does not hurt so badly. Mayor Benton said the price would come up at a time when we would be going into the cooler time of the year where if you want to conserve you could open your windows. In the summer is the time it can be unbearable. As long as we can give them the break, we should do it that way. We said we want to pass it on as things come to us and if we look at it monthly, we will not get in the predicament we were in a couple of years ago.

Mr. Summerhays said he is struck with how often when we do not follow staff's recommendation; we end up with a problem not too long ago after. He said if we drop it \$2 now and we continue to over collect, we can certainly drop it again. He would rather do that than drop it \$4 now and have to pick it up in a couple of months \$2 or \$4. Mr. Summerhays said he does not want to take back in the middle of summer what we have given people. He said the whole purpose of this fund is to smooth people's bills and it would not do to run out and have to go back up during the hot season. For that reason, Mr. Summerhays said he suggests that we do the \$2 and look at it again month to month. Hopefully, we will be able to drop it again, but he would rather step it down than do it all at once.

Mr. Summerhays made a motion to reduce the Power Cost Adjustment from \$38 to \$36. The motion died for lack of a second.

A motion was made by Mr. Perri, seconded by Mayor Benton, to approve a decrease of the Power Cost Adjustment (PCA), for the period from April 1, 2011 through April 30, 2011 and until further notice, from \$38.00 to \$34.00 per 1,000 kWh. Those voting in favor of the motion were: Mr. Perri, Mayor Benton, and Mr. Drummond. Those opposed: Mrs. Cully and Mr. Summerhays. Motion was approved.

Mayor Benton asked Ms. Hurtubise if next month was when she will be bringing the reduction of the wholesale rates.

March 15, 2011

Page 10

Ms. Hurtubise said it will be three weeks at the next meeting on April 5th and it will be in the evening.

Mr. Thiess said staff has completed putting the RFP together for the second Contract Rate of Delivery (CROD) report to exit from FMPA. The City Procurement Department said the RFP should be on the street this week and we are on schedule from what was presented to the Board. We should be getting some proposals in to look at. Mr. Thiess said at the last meeting we talked about having an FPUA Board member on the review evaluation committee for the RFP's. We are open for suggestions if the Board would like to do that and who would be available.

Mr. Drummond said he is anxious to accept volunteers.

Mayor Benton said his problem is that his mind is made up. He said he thinks it is a good deal going out in the future for competitive rates so it is hard for him to go to another consultant. He is looking to his fellow Board members whose minds are not made up. Mayor Benton said his is looking to untie the hands of people that follow us like ours have been tied. He said in this country every time it is competitive, usually it means a better deal.

Mr. Perri said he would take it on and that he is not happy with the proposal that we received. He has a lot of questions about the long term. His fear is if we get out of it by exercising the CROD, then we are boxed in with FPL and at their mercy. We will not be able to buy power from anybody else and include the transmission costs and get any better deal from anybody else. We will not have any choice at all and that is one thing that really bothers him. Mr. Perri said he still believes there is safety in numbers and that FMPA's original association when they originally got in; they did because they needed a collective voice. They have been competitive for years since their inception. It is just the last three or four years they have not and everybody wants to throw the baby out with the bath water. He is not convinced it is the best deal. He said he would volunteer to be on the review committee and do what he could do.

Mr. Drummond said that kind of healthy skepticism is perfect for the committee.

Mrs. Cully said Mr. Perri should go at it because she agrees with him whole heartedly. She has gone to the FMPA meetings for three years before Mr. Perri took over and she agrees. If you make a commitment for thirty years you should not just say this guy says we should do something different, let's go with that. Mrs. Cully said she really wants to hear what somebody else has to say before this Board makes such a huge decision. She is back and forth with it all the time and feels strongly that when we make a commitment we should stay with it. Also, she understands that times change and she would like to hear what they have to say.

March 15, 2011

Page 11

Mr. Perri said the projections that WHH Enterprises is recommending for us to exercise the CROD are way out there and he cannot put any validity in those numbers. He has a hard time wrapping his mind around it.

Mayor Benton said he agrees with Mr. Perri when it comes to some of the projections because in this power business, especially the wholesale power business, one cannot project past the next four or five years. With the government regulations that are always looming and everything else, and with what happened in Japan, as much as it hurts him to hear it, he thinks they are going to take some time in this country and maybe put a moratorium on nuclear power until they digest what happened there. We have a lot of areas in this country that are questionable with earthquakes. All those things affect the cost of power and when we look at FPL, and looking in the past when he worked indirectly for them, but they are a different corporation than they were 20 years ago because they are a lot bigger now and doing business all over the world. It is very hard for the little guy to compete in the future, so this gives us more than one option. FMPA is our only option and we would still be getting power from them, but we would possibly be getting power from someone else. Mayor Benton said he does not know how anybody could put those projections together with any kind of accuracy.

Mr. Drummond thanked Mr. Perri for volunteering and said he looks forward to his participation.

Mr. Thiess said so does staff and he wants to make it clear that when the second report comes in, we will have the WHH report and the new one and staff intends to have at least one and maybe another lengthy, involved workshop to discuss this. It will not just be here at this Board meeting. We will do whatever it takes.

Mr. Thiess said he wants to remind our customers and everyone here that at our next meeting on April 5th we will be bringing rate adjustments to the Board. It is a recommended decrease of \$4 per 1,000 kWh on the electric rate and a combined increase of \$1.84 on the water and wastewater. It is a net decrease of \$2.16 in rates to a customer that has the minimal 1,000 kWh electric and 6,000 gallons of water/wastewater. Mr. Thiess said this Board decided a while ago that when we have public hearings, we would have them in the evening, so this will be a 6:00 p.m. meeting on April 5th in these commission chambers.

Mr. Koblegard said that they closed on the Abbiejean property. We have purchased our two acres, are waiting on a partial release of mortgage to arrive, and that will conclude it. He said once we receive that, he will dismiss the condemnation action. We bought it for \$127,000, which was the old contract price and \$100,000 less had we gone forward on the condemnation. Mr. Koblegard said the only issue to still be resolved is that the attorney for the mortgage company that took over the condemnation action from Abbiejean under their mortgage says he is entitled to some \$30,000 in attorney fees because he increased the offer. He did not increase the offer and we are not going ahead with the condemnation action. Mr. Koblegard

March 15, 2011

Page 12

said he told the attorney that it is absurd and he would have to convince a judge of that. We are waiting to see if anything becomes of it and Mr. Koblegard said he does not think the attorney would prevail, but it is still out there. Even if that did not go right, it is still a good deal compared to where we would have been had we gone ahead with the condemnation. It is substantially better and Mr. Koblegard said he does not think the court would award him any fees.

Mr. Perri said he attended the APPA Rally in Washington and got to talk to mostly staff people, but they did talk to Senators Nelson and Mark Rubio. The issues that seem to concern the American Public Power Association and FPUA involve the EPA. They seem to be an uncontrollable monster and they inflict terms and conditions on every aspect of our lives without very much scientific proof or input. It seems like they just churn out papers to keep their job safe. We have appealed to both the congress and the senators to try and get a handle on them, put them on a little bit shorter leash, and make it a little bit easier for power companies to do business. Mr. Perri said their regulations greatly increase the cost of generating power and a lot of them, although they are well intended, are without any scientific foundation. He said they are restricting intake cooling water now, or are trying to. We have existing power plants that need cooling water and they want to shut it off. We have also lobbied for some check on our railroads because we are at their mercy. With 42% of the country's power generated by coal and the only way to get the coal to 95% of the power plants that are using coal is by rail and they have a captive customer. Something needs to be done to keep them in check to keep their prices down to where we do not have to raise the price of the product we are producing. Mr. Perri said they spent 2 ½ days walking many miles through the buildings and talking to a lot of people, mostly staff people. He said he thinks they got the message and has received a few responses and cards from them thanking them for participation and they would consider our interest. Who knows if it does any good or not. If you throw enough stuff against the wall, some of it might stick.

Mayor Benton said that usually that trip to Washington sometimes does get them to notice and when you are willing to take the time from your busy schedule to go up there, usually it is for the better for us.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

SECRETARY

CHAIRMAN