TRI-STATE WATER RESOURCE COALITION
GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2010– 9:00 A.M.
CITY HALL, BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

Welcome & Introduction:

Chairman Bob Nichols called the meeting to order. He asked those present to introduce themselves. The following were present:

Lynn Calton – City of Lamar, Missouri
Hal VanDaGriff – Verona, Missouri, representing Empire District Electric
Brian Bingle – City of Nixa, Missouri
Pete Rauch – City of Monett, Missouri
Jan Tupper – Joplin, Missouri
Matt Barnhart – Missouri American Water Company
Bob Williams – Carthage Water & Electric
Roddy Rogers – Springfield City Utilities, Springfield, Missouri
Bob Nichols – Webb City, Missouri
Jim Whitford – P.O. Box 401, Webb City, Missouri
Melinda Piper – CPWSD #1, P.O. Box 586, Lamar, Missouri
Paul Crabtree – Liberal, Missouri
Elizabeth Grove – Missouri Rural Water Association, Ashland, Missouri
Bill Johnson – 4197 Hwy. NN, Joplin, Missouri
Geraldine Bagby – 4257 Hwy. NN, Joplin, Missouri
Thomas E. Bagby – 1603 Ryan Lane, Joplin, Missouri
John Harold – 7588 Coffee Drive (did not state what city)
John Bartosh – Jasper County Commission
Steve McIntosh – Congressman Roy Blunt's office
Don Lucietta – Congressman Roy Blunt's office
Stacy Burks – Senator Christopher Bond's office
David Rauch – Senator Claire McCaskill's office
Wally Kennedy – Joplin Globe
Gail Melgren – Executive Director, Tri-State Water Resource Coalition
David Hertzberg – City of Joplin
Susan Champlin - City of Joplin

Approval of Minutes of July 21, 2010:

Mr. Nichols asked for comments or corrections to the minutes of the meeting of July 21, 2010.

Bob Williams moved, seconded by Brian Bingle, that the minutes of the meeting of July 21, 2010 be approved as written. The motion passed, with all voting "aye".

Consider Forming a Joint Municipal Utility Commission:

Mr. Nichols reported on the recent meetings regarding potential reservoir sites 1, 2, and 12, with a lengthy discussion not particularly about the sites, but the need to organize the coalition into a

governmental entity form. He explained that the coalition's attorneys have developed a memorandum. He invited Elizabeth Grove from the Missouri Rural Water Association to attend this meeting to discuss her experience with municipal utility commissions.

Elizabeth Grove:

Ms. Grove reviewed the memorandum that the coalition's attorneys drafted and explained that the joint municipal utility commission (JMUC) has advantages over a non-profit organization. The commission would have the power of eminent domain and the authority to issue revenue bonds to finance improvements. As a political entity, the commissioners can access federal and state funds.

Ms. Grove mentioned some flexibility in developing a joint contract, and if a new entity wishes to join the commission, they become a party to your contract. The joint contract forms the commission, with the participating entities adopting the joint contract.

Ms. Grove explained that the joint contract is the governing document, and expressed the need to make sure the document is well-crafted. She also discussed the formation of additional rules and regulations as being the operating guidelines, similar to by-laws.

Ms. Grove explained that her organization's joint contract was written to be very difficult to change, with approval of every participating member required to change any aspect of the contract. With the rules and regulations, however, only a vote of the board of directors was required by her organization to make a change.

Ms. Groves stated that the joint contract is a very good instrument for an organization that involves multiple entities. It provides flexibility but gives the commissioners the authority they need to do a project. She thought the coalition's attorneys did a good job outlining what the JMUC would involve.

Ms. Groves discussed the Clarence Cannon JMUC in northeast Missouri. Pete Rauch asked if Clarence Cannon provides raw water or treated water, and Ms. Grove replied treated water. The water is centrally treated and distributed out.

Mr. Rogers asked if the JMUC is subject to the provisions of the Sunshine Law, and Ms. Grove replied that is correct. The JMUC has the same restrictions as any public entity.

Mr. VanDaGriff asked at what cost that water is distributed. Ms. Grove was not sure, as she is no longer employed by Clarence Cannon.

Mr. Rogers asked if you would have 30 board members if 30 entities are involved, and Ms. Grove replied that their board had 24 members. Provisions were made for an executive committee, with that committee being granted whatever powers the board wished to grant it. The executive committee handled the routine business, with an annual board meeting.

Ms. Groves explained that Clarence Cannon was the first water commission in the state of Missouri, so the joint contract was deliberately made difficult to change to give certain assurances to the commissioners.

Mr. Tupper asked about the water issues in northeast Missouri, and Ms. Grove replied that northeast Missouri is noted for its lack of water supplies, with no ground water sources in that area. The rural water districts could no longer obtain funding to expand service since the cities they were buying water from did not have the water to sell to them. Some communities only had a 90-day water supply in their reservoir.

Mr. Tupper asked if some of the communities have disappeared in the water districts, and Ms. Grove replied that they are all still independent and run their own distribution systems. When Clarence Cannon began selling water in 1992, five water treatment plants were shut down, with six additional plants being shut down since that time. These were surface water plants as opposed to ground water plants, with the surface plants being much more expensive to maintain.

Mr. Tupper explained that many of the surface treatment plans have been cited by the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR) in the past, and Ms. Groves replied that some of the later plants were in violation of the disinfection by-products rule and would not comply with the requirements without a multi-million dollar investment per plant.

Mr. Rogers asked about infrastructure and operating staff for the JMUC. Ms. Grove replied that Clarence Cannon owns the central treatment plant and the transmission system, with everything being subject to DNR regulations. All member systems must meet the DNR requirements.

Pete Rauch asked if the water is delivered to the front door. Ms. Grove replied that the water is delivered to the entities, with the JMUC providing one master meter to the wholesale commission.

Ms. Melgren asked Ms. Grove if the joint contract and rules and regulations documents are public documents, and she replied that they are. Ms. Melgren asked Ms. Grove if they are posted on her website, and she didn't believe so, but she will provide Ms. Melgren with copies.

Mr. Rogers asked Ms. Grove if dues were charged. She replied that when Clarence Cannon was first organized, dues were charged based on the number of meters. She thought the cost was $1.50 per meter. The joint contract allowed the JMUC to waive that fee if they so desired. Membership fees weren't charged as the operation began growing, in that the operation needed some money just to get started.

Ms. Grove explained that construction had not begun when Clarence Cannon initially hired her. As the funding fell into place, and it became time to sign purchase contracts, there were several entities who were a party of the joint contract who were not going to sign a water purchase contract. A decision was made that in order to become a party to the joint contract, a water purchase contract must be signed. Any entities who signed the joint contract but had not signed a water purchase contract became associate members. The associate members could attend board meetings but were not eligible to vote.

Pete Rauch asked Ms. Grove about the capacity of the reservoir, and she replied 20,000 acre feet per day, or 16 million gallons per day being available for drinking water purposes.

Vickie Westerhaus:

Mr. Nichols initiated a conference call was scheduled with the coalition's attorneys, Vickie Westerhaus and Steve Chinn from Stinson, Morris, Hecker, LLP to discuss Tri-State's formation of a JMUC.

Mr. Rogers asked if the contracting municipalities are the same as the board members, and Ms. Westerhaus replied that the municipalities would be able to delegate one board member and one alternate. Mr. Rogers asked if the number of board members could be unlimited, and Ms. Westerhaus replied that is correct.

Mr. Nichols asked about having a smaller executive committee, and Ms. Westerhaus replied that a smaller executive committee could be appointed.

Mr. Rogers asked if it is difficult to change the contract after it is in place, and Mr. Chinn replied that each contracting municipality would have to authorize their governing body to approve any amendment to the joint contract by written consent.

Mr. Rogers asked if a separate contract must be signed by each member, or if there is only one contract. Ms. Westerhaus replied that there is one joint contract, and each member signs it.

Mr. Williams asked about memberships from other states and special provisions when they participate in projects. Mr. Chinn replied that it is not specifically allowed, but because of the authorization of new projects in Missouri and outside Missouri, contracting entities might contract with each other across states. Ms. Westerhaus mentioned vehicles in other states where similar entities from each state entered into contracts with each other.

Pete Rauch asked if it wouldn't be a matter of entities in other states having to become customers, but they would actually join under their own commission. Ms. Westerhaus replied that they would form their own commission, and the Tri-State commission would enter into a contractual membership.

Mr. Barnhart asked if the entities from Kansas and Oklahoma could enter into a contract similar to any contract with a utility company like Missouri American Water or Empire District Electric, and have a board member under that contract. Ms. Westerhaus replied that this would be an alternative to having a commission in their own state.

Mr. Rogers asked if the JMUC would also be a governmental entity, and Ms. Westerhaus replied that is correct.

Mr. Nichols asked if the JMUC must conform with the laws and rules as any governmental entities, such as the Sunshine Law. Mr. Chinn replied that is correct.

Mr. Rogers asked if the board would have the authority and responsibility over whatever the water source is, and Ms. Westerhaus replied that is correct.

Mr. VanDaGriff asked how long the original formation will take. Ms. Westerhaus replied that it won't take long for her office to prepare a draft contract, but that all the members must approve the contract. Each of the municipalities must approve the contract through their board meeting.

Mr. Nichols asked Ms. Westerhaus for two documents, a basic contract covering the legal requirements, and bylaws to govern the operation of the commission. She can prepare two separate documents, with one document being a joint contract, and the other document containing the rules and regulations.

Mr. Nichols asked if the contract would require unanimous approval by all the members, while the bylaws could be approved by the board. Ms. Westerhaus replied that is correct, with the board members being able to change the bylaws as needed.

Mr. Chinn recommended the board adopt bylaws, because that empowers the executive committee to change the bylaws, so every procedural change would not have to be approved by each of the contracting entities.

Mr. Rogers asked about signing for taking water, and Ms. Westerhaus replied that would be a separate contract.

Mr. Nichols asked if entering into this contract is not a commitment to purchase water at that time. He discussed Ms. Grove's comment that some of the commission members elected not to purchase water, with the commission having board members who really were not involved in the water issue. He asked if the contract might be worded such that the members can be dropped at a future date if they elect not to participate in the water projects. Ms. Westerhaus replied that this language can be included.

Mr. Nichols discussed that the commission dropped these members from their board, but that they became associate members with board privileges except for voting. Ms. Westerhaus asked if those members would still pay assessments, and Ms. Grove replied that they did pay a fee.

Mr. Nichols explained that several of the coalition members are not engaged in the water business but are paying membership fees, such as the chambers of commerce and several industries. Ms. Westerhaus replied that having voting powers shouldn't impact.

Ms. Melgren explained that Ms. Grove indicated that the commissioners at Clarence Cannon decided to include in the joint contract a rule that every member would have to vote "yes" in order to change anything dealing with the joint contract, and that this was above what statute called for. Ms. Melgren asked what statute calls for, and Ms. Westerhaus replied just majority approval.

Mr. Chinn explained that statute requires that all actions shall be approved by a majority of the board or commission, but that the commissioners can provide otherwise in the joint contract.

Mr. Rogers asked if there is one joint commission contract, but several contracts for taking water. Ms. Westerhaus replied that is correct.

Mr. Rogers asked if rates, funding, and the budget are set by the board, and Ms. Westerhaus replied that is correct.

Mr. Nichols asked the board members if they are agreeable with asking the attorneys to prepare a draft contract and bylaws for their consideration. He understood that all the governmental entities

must present these documents to their legal staff for their review. Ms Westerhaus will have a draft contract available for review in the next couple of weeks.

Bob Williams moved, seconded by Pete Rauch, that Stinson, Morrison, Hecker, LLC, be authorized to draft a joint contract document for a joint municipal utility commission (JMUC), along with a document containing bylaws for such commission. The motion carried, with all voting "aye".

Report of Membership Committee:

Ms. Melgren reported that the City of Cassville voted to join the coalition effective January 1, 2011.

Mr. Nichols explained that at the July meeting, Mr. Bartosh raised the question about expanding the coalition's membership. Mr. Tupper thought anyone should be allowed to join the coalition.

Mr. Nichols assumed that if the JMUC is formed, that the Tri-State Water Resource Coalition would transfer their funds and assets to the commission and disbanding the coalition. Pete Rauch discussed leaving Tri-State as an entity, but more of an advocacy group.

Mr. Tupper expressed concern about taking Tri-State's money and giving it to the commission, because when Tri-State accepted those funds, it was not with the intent to forward them to a different group. Pete Rauch stated that not all of Tri-State's members will desire to be a party to that JMUC.

Report of Technical Committee:
Status of Freese and Nichols Study:

Pete Rauch discussed the meetings that were held in Lamar and in Joplin on September 2. Presentations were made regarding the supplemental report prepared for sites 1, 2, and 12. He recommended the approval of the supplemental reservoir report by the board of directors for posting on the website for public review.

Pete Rauch moved, seconded by Mr. VanDaGriff, that the Tri-State Water Resource Coalition board of directors approve the supplemental report from Freese and Nichols and post the report on its website. The motion carried, with all voting "aye".

Future Activities:

There were no future activities to report at this time.

Concerning Corps Study:

Mr. Nichols thanked David Rauch for scheduling a recent meeting with Cory Dukes from Senator McCaskill's office regarding relations with the Corps of Engineers. Senator McCaskill has expressed support for the coalition's efforts.

Report of theTreasurer:

Mr. Barnhart reported that the current balance is $144,286.75. He has paid Freese and Nichols for the remaining balance for their study, along with some payroll, income tax, and legal fees.

Mr. Nichols asked if this payment concludes the coalition's relation with Freese and Nichols, and Mr. Barnhart replied that is correct.

Status of Communication Plan Proposal:

Ms. Melgren distributed copies of the revised Tri-State communication plan proposal. Mr. Bingle explained that the original communication plan was very comprehensive, but that the board members felt that the communication plan needed to devote more attention towards federal and state legislative bullet points.

Ms. Melgren visited with consultant Mark Maness to further define the deliverables so the board members have a clear understanding of the services he will be providing to the coalition. The first development phase includes the following:

- Development and implementation of Tri-State initiative theme and talking points ($1,500 without stakeholder input; $4,000 with input utilizing focus groups).
- Redesign of webpage to serve as information and communication hub including You Tube Videos ($4,000-$5,000). Ms. Melgren presented a webpage from northwest Missouri.
- Key communicator network development ($1,000). Ms. Melgren discussed a link for membership information, a link for legislative activities, and a link to technical reports, as well as development of videos for the webpage and for speaking with various groups. She also discussed building a good database of federal, state, regional, and local contacts.
- Redesign of brochure and development of targeted pieces for potential direct mail and handouts (printing cost not included) ($2,000).
- Creation of base presentation materials including audio and video ($3,000). She expressed the need for a professional power point presentation and a speakers' bureau to discuss the mission of the coalition.

Ms. Melgren asked for a motion to approve Phase I of this communication plan proposal.

Roddy Rogers moved, seconded by Hal VanDaGriff, that Phase I of the communication plan be approved.

Mr. Hertzberg asked if the coalition has sufficient funding to handle the first phase, and Mr. Barnhart replied that the funding is available.

Mr. Nichols asked about the media training that is included in Phase II, and Ms. Melgren thought it would be a good idea to review the media training and the media relations. She expressed the importance of speaking with one voice with the various stakeholders, and the board members develop a good strategy on communications with the media, and the tools and materials to be used with the media. She did not believe the phone survey is needed. She recommended delaying the development and training of a legislative action team at this time.

Roddy Rogers amended his previous motion and moved, seconded by Hal VanDaGriff, to proceed with Phase I of the communication plan proposal and to also include the development of the media kit and press strategy plan as stated in Phase II. The estimated cost will total $17,500.

Mr. Tupper would like to see a cost limit. Pete Rauch asked if the brochure development does not include the printing, and Mr. Nichols replied that is correct. Mr. Bingle, co-chair with Mr. VanDaGriff of the communications plan committee, explained that these cost estimates are "not to exceed" amounts.

The motion as stated above carried, with all voting "aye".

Status of Agreement between MO-AM & Coalition:

Mr. Barnhart has the agreement at this time and stated that MO-AM's corporate officials wish to see the same agreement that is going to every town. He is meeting with the commission next week on another issue and will discuss this agreement with them at that time.

Mr. Nichols explained that any city may join the JMUC even if they do not have a water utility operation. He asked about allowing individuals on that commission. Pete Rauch did not believe that individuals could be voting members because their interests are so vastly different than a water provider.

Status of Water Conference – November 18 & 19, 2010:

Ms. Melgren distributed copies of the tentative agenda for both days. The mayor of Springfield and presiding commissioner of Greene County will welcome the attendees to the conference. Items to be discussed during the morning of November 18 include the global and national water supply, as well as the state of Missouri's water supply. Mr. Rogers has agreed to discuss the global state of water supply.

The DNR will be addressing the water supply regionally and throughout and the state of Missouri. Tom Crowley, a former chairman of the American Water Works Association, will address water efficiency.

Ms. Melgren asked about also inviting Cara Schaefer from City Utilities to discuss their efficiency programs, but Mr. Nichols expressed concern about having sufficient time.

Discussion topics during the afternoon of November 18 include a focus on the Tri-State Water Resource Coalition as being a regional organization. Regulatory issues, multi-basin issues, and state issues will be discussed. Other discussion topics include water use/cost/waste profiles for regional communities and financing of public water projects.

Discussion topics for the morning of November 19 include an overview of the ground and surface water quality in the Ozarks, the water quality in the Ozarks and its intersection with water supply. A representative from Lewis and Clark Regional Water Supply which serves Minnesota, South Dakota, and Iowa will discuss the water system in their region.

Additional topics for November 19 include economics – effects of a water shortage or insufficient access to water supplies - on economic sustainability/development, and also competing water uses.

Ms. Melgren mentioned the previous discussion about inviting elected officials and asked the board members about forwarding the information on the conference to any elected officials who are in their contact lists. She expressed the need to educate those in legislative positions about the importance of these same issues. She explained that $5,000 is available in sponsorship money to pay the expenses for those who are speaking for the conference.

Pete Rauch asked Ms. Melgren if she is addressing elected officials at the local level, as well as those at the state level. Ms. Melgren thought local, state, and federal officials. Mr. Nichols suggested inviting by written invitation the mayors, presiding commissioners, state representatives, congressmen, and senators. Ms. Melgren is compiling a list of officials to invite to the conference.

Mr. Williams asked Ms. Melgren if she is aware of a water conference taking place in Columbia, Missouri, on October 21-22. He mentioned a topic on their agenda discussing water in southwest Missouri. Mr. Tupper expressed concern about too many conferences and taking this into consideration in the future. Mr. Rogers plans to attend the conference in Columbia.

Executive Director's Report:

Ms. Melgren reported having been asked by Mr. Nichols to look into membership issues – though with the transition to a JMUC the membership issues may change in the relatively near future. Ms. Melgren presented a document to the board which contained the current by-laws and also added revisions suggested by Mr. Rogers. The report showed the by-laws/revisions in a graphical format for easier review and analysis. The document suggested a board structure with general membership, a board of directors, an executive committee, and officers. Several standing committees, with a chair for each committee who is a member of the board of directors, were also listed. Education is not currently defined by the bylaws, but Ms. Melgren suggested consideration of a committee for legislative/regulatory functions.

The third page of Ms. Melgren's report outlined membership issues in more detail, including recruitment, application, dues, meetings, voting, nomination, directors, and officers. The last page of the report contains some additional items in the bylaws.

Some board members thought the communications plan would fill the legislative/regulatory portion of the bylaws. Ms. Melgren thought about using the word "communications" instead of public relations. She suggested conducting a two-hour retreat in January to discuss the bylaws and how to become a more mature organization, and add some additional organizational structure as the coalition moves forward.

Mr. Bartosh explained that as a county commissioner, he receives many phone calls from agricultural interests regarding the reservoirs. He asked about involving the soybean growers, the beef council, and other agricultural groups in the coalition. Mr. Nichols stated that Paul Crabtree is a member of this coalition and represents the irrigators' association.

Several people were present in the audience to protest the construction of the new reservoir proposed as site 12 and located just south of Joplin. A gentleman expressed concern that the

coalition's action has decreased their property values, and he asked for more details regarding the reservoir.

Mr. Nichols explained that the official policy of the board of directors is to obtain water from the existing reservoirs, and that the coalition is making every effort to do that. Their desire to construct a new reservoir at any site is a low priority for the coalition.

Ms. Melgren has prepared a budget for next year and presented copies to the board members for their review. Mr. VanDaGriff took the existing dues structure for non-profit organizations, industries with private wells, individuals, and for-profit organizations, along with the 50 percent category for all the active members. The dollars on the bottom of the second page represent the income for this year. The estimated 2011 budget totals $152,796.00, with expenditures totaling about as much as the revenues.

Mr. Nichols asked if the coalition is paying for internet service, and Ms. Melgren replied that is correct. Mr. Nichols asked about the "air card" and Ms. Melgren replied that it allows you to access the internet from her laptop computer. She has purchased a projector and a laptop, and is prepared to share the story of the coalition with groups.

Public Relations Activities:

Ms. Melgren and Harold McCoy made a presentation to the City of Cassville and will soon present to the Mt. Vernon city council.

Ms. Melgren reported visiting with various leaders in the Branson/Tablerock Lake area, including attending a meeting with the Stone/Taney County legislative committee, which expressed some concern about Tri-State obtaining water from the lakes in their region. She also attended a meeting of Southwest Missouri Council of Governments at which Senator McCaskill discussed the difficulty of obtaining federal money for any project.

Ms. Melgren also mentioned her participation in the strategic planning process for the City of Springfield, during which she was able to share the importance of future water supply, especially when the committee discussed the land use and natural environment reports. She attended the reservoir site meetings in Lamar and Joplin. She also made a presentation at Missouri Southern State University (MSSU) to the Tri-State Mining District (a group that cleans up superfund sites in the MO, KS, OK area).

Ms. Melgren asked the board members which groups to monitor or visit in the western area.

Mr. Nichols asked Mr. VanDaGriff if he recommends continuing the same dues structure as this year, and he replied that it will remain the same.

Mr. Nichols explained that Mr. Tupper had raised the question about whether the coalition can transfer their funds to the commission. Mr. Nichols recommended mailing the dues statements in October, and if the funds cannot be transferred, to determine if the coalition's funds can be spent on projects that the commission will want to proceed with. Mr. Tupper suggested obtaining a legal opinion as to whether the funds can be transferred.

Mr. Nichols commented that representatives from several Indian tribal groups and federal and state agencies attended the presentation at MSSU, and that he had made contacts through which he hoped to set up a meeting with several of the OK tribes.

Status of Developing Education Program for Fifth and Sixth Grade Students:

Mr. Hertzberg met with Dr. C. J. Huff, Superintendent for the Joplin School District. Mr. Hertzberg will be meeting with their director of academic affairs later this month, with Mr. McCoy and Mr. Barnhart also being invited to attend that meeting.

Mr. Hertzberg also plans educational programs for the Webb City and Carl Junction school districts and some of the eastern districts. Mr. Nichols asked Mr. Hertzberg if he is aware of the program that Missouri American Water is sponsoring, and he plans to include Mr. Barnhart in the program as to not duplicate anything sponsored by MO-AM.

Appointment of Nominating Committee and Nomination and Election Procedures:

Mr. Nichols sent two memorandums to the board members and has discussed these procedures with several of the board members. One memorandum suggests the following three options for the nomination and election of officers:

- Option 1 is for the officers to rotate, in which the treasurer moves the secretary, the secretary moves to vice-president, and the vice president becomes president.
- Option 2 provides for term limits.
- Option 3 allows for the current procedure, in which the nominating committee and the board of directors have the freedom to nominate whoever they believe fits the needs of the coalition at that time.

Mr. Nichols discussed the scenario that if a vacancy occurs within the officers for any reason, the board of directors will fill that vacancy. He asked the board members for any recommendations.

Mr. Tupper explained that Jerry Carter is no longer a Newton County commissioner. Mr. Nichols has discussed the membership issue with Marilyn Ruestman, who will become a commissioner in the near future, but that Newton County has not paid their membership dues.

Mr. Nichols would like to appoint a nominating committee and has asked Harold McCoy, Brian Bingle, and Bob Williams to serve on this committee. Mr. McCoy will chair the committee.

Mr. Williams thought most organizations rotate their officers, which creates more participants and provides for continuity. He thought this procedure would place more responsibility on the executive director. He expressed support for the past president to maintain an active role in the organization and become a member of the next nominating committee.

Mr. Hertzberg asked Mr. Nichols if he needs direction on these options as he creates his nominating slate, and he replied no.

Status of Directors Liability Insurance:

Ms. Melgren presented copies of the insurance contract for the officers and stated that the coalition now has full coverage for the directors and officers and for employees.

Comments by Representatives of Federal and State Offices and Agencies:
Senator Kit Bond:

Stacy Burks was present but had left the meeting due to a prior commitment.

Senator Claire McCaskill:

David Rauch was also present but left the audience.

Congressman Roy Blunt:

Don Lucietta and Steve McIntosh were also present but left the audience.

Missouri Department of Natural Resources:

No one was present to represent the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.

Kansas Division of Water Resources:

Morgan Pearman was not present to represent the Kansas Division of Water Resources.

Oklahoma Water Resource Board:

No one was present to represent the Oklahoma Water Resource Board.

Old Business:

There was no old business to conduct at this time.

New Business:

Mr. Nichols explained that the Indian tribal groups have strong feelings about water rights. He also would like to meet with Mr. Easley with the Grand River Dam Authority.

Mr. Bartosh asked about scheduling a retreat, and Mr. Nichols recommended scheduling the retreat after the draft joint contract and bylaws have been received from the attorneys.

Adjourn:

There being no further business to come before the Board of Directors, the meeting stood adjourned.

David Hertzberg

_____

David Hertzberg, Secretary