



CONSOLIDATED COMMISSION ON UTILITIES

Guam Power Authority • Guam Waterworks Authority
P.O. BOX 2977 • Agaña, Guam 96932

GUAM WATERWORKS AUTHORITY
GWA Conference Room, GWA Main Office, 2nd Floor
5:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 8, 2005

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

CCU Chairman, Simon Sanchez, called the meeting to order at 5:20 p.m.

PRESENT:	Comm. Simon A. Sanchez	Chairman
	Comm. Gloria B. Nelson	Vice-Chairperson/Secretary
	Comm. Thomas C. Ada	Vice-Chairman/GWA
	Comm. Benigno M. Palomo	Vice-Chairman/GPA
	David R. Craddick	GWA General Manager
	Randy Wiegand	Chief Financial Officer
	Sam Taylor	GWA Legal Counsel
	Pauline J.S. Onedera	GWA Board Secretary

GWA Employees: Paul J. Kemp, ESCS; Mark Miller, Production/Distribution; Anthony Chargualaf; Collection/Distribution; Elaine Cruz, HR; Carmen Sian-Denton, Lab; Inas Mesngon, NDTP; Anita Matanane, Training; and Gilda Mafnas, Accounting

Guests: Frank Louterbur, UBS Financial Services; Brad Gewehr, UBS; Russ Reyes, UBS; Bill Dunbar, R.W. Beck; Alan Bushley, R.W. Beck; Natalie Quenga, PDN; Sabina Perez, Concerned Citizen; Jesse Garcia, DPW; Larry Perez, DPW Director; and Tony Lamorena, GVB

Chairman Sanchez introduced Mr. Frank Louterbur of UBS and had him introduced the rest of the group who are Brad Gewehr and Russell Reyes; also the Consulting Engineers of R.W. Beck who are Bill Dunbar and Alan Bushley.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S/C Comm. Palomo/Comm. Nelson
Minutes of the November 23, 2004 meeting were approved subject to amendments, corrections, and deletions. Motion carried.

Comm. Ada requested that at the next meeting the minutes of today's meeting be made available for approval and any other comes later.

III. GM's REPORT

05-18 FY 06 CIP Budget Amendment – In this report GM David Craddick is requesting approval to amend the FY06 CIP Budget.

- Approved 06 CIP Budget included funding for design of island-wide water transmission system, expected to cost in the range of \$100m.
- Proposal was to reduce the transmission lines and replace them with a water collection system that brings water to the storage tanks.
- \$100m cost will be reduced in the range of \$60m.
- Replacement for the transmission system will be a series of six "Collector Wells". Collector wells will cost between \$15m and \$30m depending on how the project was done.
- Net effect is the transmission lines as revised with the collector wells will cost no more than \$30m instead of \$100m previously planned for.
- Will be meeting with the military personnel on Thursday, March 10th and the GM would like to be able to inform them that the Board is behind this project.
- Need to revise CIP presentation with PUC.
- Will have an effect on this year's budget in that some CIP will not need to be done. Attached with this report were SO Project Encumbrances indicating that the \$10m is for the water transmission line construction; the \$7m to replace the 100 water wells; and the \$1.3m to replace 10 water wells; and a schematic of what it looks.

Discussion: Comm. Ada - Two things that the Board is approving the horizon collector well system; and the adjustment of the CIP budget and the GM responded that was correct. Chairman questioned the Commission if they have enough information to adopt the system? Other than savings, would it give the public better service? It would remove the vulnerability issue and that would in the end provide better service; water is properly disinfected. Quality "safe water" would be continuous rather than what's happening now or before? Response was with this you would have 6 sites to take care of versus now where it's at 100 sites. You would need much people to take care of it.

It was questioned by Comm. Nelson if this would have to be bid out and the GM responded that the difference between the \$15m and the \$30m. The equipment would have to be custom-made to go down in the gap.

Comm. Palomo asked how does it relate to the master plan and how was size selected without input from people and Mr. Craddick responded based on tank site because we're trying to get water to the tanks. He questioned if the master plan will still be needed and Mr. Craddick explained that it's still needed because the many other things going on besides this. Chairman Sanchez explained that the master plan is in the court order and we would have to ask the court to take it out. GWA inserts the transmission lines EPA is not concerned how we handle the transmission lines, but we want the court order to make sure we insert the transmission line. The Board would like a better understanding maybe

just by looking at other materials or getting an opinion from EPA. Approval of the concept is all the GM is requesting. Comm. Ada sees it as an efficient concept, sees savings, but wondering on the negative implications, he brought up about doing one as a pilot project, but the GM explained that once you have the equipment to drill a 10' diameter hole you can't let it go until you've completed it all. The GM explained how the idea came about and he thought about a tunnel, then he found out micro tunneling could back up so digging holes every so often would be needed. Also attending the Underground Construction Technology Conference in Houston, Texas last January he found a company that makes micro tunneling equipment that backs out, it could be auger and people that also do horizontal drilling rings could make something that could go down and make these holes.

Comm. Ada's concern is do a feasibility study on the time frame of getting out an RFP, the time of mobilizing the equipment; given all this, would we be able to meet the timeline with the SO. Response from GM was that he did this study and this is what he came about with the 15-30 days and whether we purchase the equipment or someone else provides the equipment. GM recommends that we keep the equipment because should an earthquake occur and these tunnels collapse we have to clean it. It was questioned if the employees have to go through certification and training. Response was that the crews that pull the pumps now should be able to do this. It would be the same number of employees to pull the pumps. Cost depends on what is done for the design work and for this the GM is thinking of requesting for the \$1.3m to be used because it's a generic design and that's all that's needed. The equipment to drill the hole probably cost \$5-6m and the drill bit alone cost just well \$1m. Comm. Palomo agrees that it's a good concept, he's not prepared to approve it tonight unless a third party is given the opportunity to express their views. Chairman Sanchez expressed what appeals to him would be to get WERI, John Menkee, or EPA who have made representation to the GM to provide the information to the Board to supplement what the GM has presented. The Board suggested that the GM get supporting documents, drawings, more information rendering on this project from other professionals it would help give the Board a basis of approving it. Decision from the Board was to get more justifications, information, and back up and present it at the next meeting.

NOTE: To be placed under Old Business

05-19 Approval of Water System Development Fee Policies – GM David Craddick is requesting approval of proposed Water System Development Fee Policies.

- First major issue is who pays for new connections to the system. Is it the existing ratepayer or the entity needing the new connection? Recommendation is to charge the user of the new connection and not charge existing ratepayers.
- Second issue is, what is the fee basis? Is it based on list of projects or on equity users have in the system? An argument can be made that the Guam and U.S. Federal Government paid a lot of the infrastructure and the existing users have no equity. The fee determined by equity buy-in has never been successfully challenged in court. Project list basis has been successfully

challenged and the fees have been reduced or eliminated. Recommendation is to base the charge on the Equity Buy-in methodology.

- Last issue – what the fees used for and what happens with interest on unspent funds. Whether the fees are restricted for building only new capacity or to assist a replacement CIP to add new capacity needs to be decided. Replacement of used capacity can piggyback on existing replacement projects rather than building separate systems. Recommendation is to allow the piggybacking of projects.
- Interest on the fees collected is an issue. Interest should always remain with the funds that generated the interest. Reason for this is due to the time lapse between the fees are collected and a project is built. Cost goes up due to inflation and the buy-in method only collects what replacement costs are.
- The concerns over what is included in the fee can be decided once the fee is known and does not need to be decided now.
- An issue such as mandatory connection is an issue for the future which are of the following: water section - treatment of water; transmission; storage; distribution (not always); connection; customer facilities; land; professional services; and over sizing. Recommendation – self-distribution system, projects specific within the development. Waste water section – collection lines over 12” diameter; force mains; booster stations; treatment facilities; connection; customer facilities; land; professional services; over sizing; and the primary collection system – lines that are under 12”.
- Mandatory connection – is everyone going to get connected right away.
- Legal issue – charge must be based on a reasonable connection between the cost to GWA and the new development and amount collected.
- Maintaining fairness between existing and future customers.
- Uniform consistent methodology.
- Generally accepted accounting and pricing practice.
- Financial objectives of GWA.
- Fee Development Basis – Proposed project List (Increment Cost): service area; planning period; growth rate and magnitude; capital improvement plan for expansion; excess capacity in the existing system. Equity Method (Buy-in approach) system assets; system liabilities and equity; and system usage.

Discussion: GM informed the Board that a decision need not be made tonight, but these are issues that come up before the PUC and the next meeting will be on April. Comm. Ada questioned if there was an existing statute right, which authorizes the development fee. Mr. Craddick responded that the development does not authorize the fee it authorizes the PUC to set up a fee. First one authorized after being put in got repealed. Sam Taylor, SLC, mentioned there was an issue between him and Harry about who’s responsible for it, Harry thinks its GWA. Comm. Ada wonders if there is something that authorizes the implementation of the existing development fee, it’s a question if it’s you that’s going to develop it or PUC. PUC is trying to push GWA to charge the ratepayers for it, that’s why Mr. Craddick is bringing it before the Board because he does not want to be the only one saying that we’re not charging the ratepayers for expanding the system. Argument is that there are a lot of people with land and they may want to spread it out

and make the cost cheaper for them, but we're already dealing with a fairly high expense for existing ratepayers. Comm. Palomo questioned how do we differentiate their system and the government fee when the rate increases as we proposed? According to the GM it only covers new capacity, but in the Buy-in Approach you're selling existing capacity in the incremental development approach you're selling capacity but you haven't built it yet. Comm. Palomo questioned if the rates were raised what would this pay for and the response was operations (e.g. current payroll, current power consumption, etc.) and the debts at that time.

It was recommended by the Board that a work session be scheduled for this and for the GM to bring together some samples from other communities where the Board can get some kind of sample for the equity and incremental costs.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Sabina Perez – Gave thanks to the Commissioners and GWA Management for showing that there's no need for privatization. She also brought up a question regarding the GM's report 05-19 and because this was discussed earlier it was requested that the Board defer on the discussion.

Board Chairman informed the Board that one of the items on the Agenda is the road repair policy that has been out on the media about issues involved. He added that he; Mr. Craddick; Tony Lamorena (GVB Manager); and Larry Perez (Director, DPW) have been exchanging e-mails regarding the above subject. At this time, the Chairman recognized the presence of both Mr. Tony Lamorena and Mr. Larry Perez.

Larry Perez (DPW) mentioned about the roadway that was a concern brought about by the Hotel & Restaurant Association and the tourists along the San Vitores road, but more at issue with DPW are more reasons because it's island-wide. He mentioned that Mr. Craddick had mentioned that one of the reasons for non-repairing of the roads is because of the non-payment of the fire hydrants by the government and Mr. Perez feels this is a different issue and should be rectified separately. In the future they will identify GWA's projects and disapprove it until GWA has some kind of cash bonds or contracts to ensure that GWA repair the road. They identified the affected roads attributed to GWA and their contractors and the bill will be sent out and with the cost of damage; estimated cost for repair; and GWA can choose to repair it or have DPW do it. Mr. Craddick questioned if the Board is going to agree with this and Larry responded that DPW is doing it because DWP has a mandate and funded by certain money sources and they have to comply with the mandate and Larry knows that it is and outstanding accounts receivable to DPW and they will not allow for future activities until these roads are restored. As far as the fire hydrants, Mr. Perez mentioned that is not his issue but the roads and safety from historical damage. Mr. Perez will inform GWA of the mandates; what are the statutes; and the overflows because they cannot continue to see road damage that will prolong before any accidents take place.

Tony Lamorena (GVB) representing the Board of Directors of GVB. Their concern is the recent water leakage in front of the Pale' San Vitores Church. They understand about

the need to go and repair the damage but they do not see the logic of not restoring the road back to its original state. The construction of the road along San Vitores was just completed and he mentioned the need to have some sort of standard in restoring the road to way it was originally found. Chairman questioned the policy of GWA on road repairs and the response was to repair it as fast as they can. Mr. Craddick mentioned about DPW putting in a pipeline; fix up the road; hook up any existing service is up to the new line DWP puts in with the old lines there where they are going to leak. GWA did not approve the project and just received that the Phase I and Phase II plans as-built and GWA is working in tying the existing services into the new line that was built in Phase I. Phase II will not look much different than Phase I did. Chairman Sanchez brought up that info was given to CCU1 that GWA is going to outsource this and hire professional contractor and the response is that is what is being done now.

Tony Chargualaf, Collection/Distribution Manager, informed the Board that GWA has guys working on this project and the delays in the repairs of the work are with the asphalt companies where the asphalts available don't match with the kind needed to repair. Chairman Sanchez recommends that GWA check on the costs and if it needs the PUC adjustment rate, the reality is GWA gets PUC adjustments and increments at \$3-\$4m/year. According to Mr. Craddick there's been no leaks since he's been here, it's all in either the 12", 8" or 6" and 2" lines that are in there. Chairman Sanchez added that the problem was when the new lines were installed the customers were not shifted to the new lines; they were kept on the old lines. According to Tony Lamorena with GTA they had the contractor install it and we paid for those facilities and the fact that GTA paid DPW for it, he's know that they would not put that infrastructure in there unless someone is burden with that cost, so what Tony is going to do is look into their records and verify it. Chairman Sanchez questioned if GWA was involved with the \$10m project and the response was no and he would work closely together with Mr. Craddick and DPW. Mr. Lamorena informed the Board that he wrote a letter to Mr. Craddick requesting on behalf of GVB that because GVB has taken over a multitude of responsibilities besides marketing visitors to the island. They work closely with DPW in taking over Ypao Beach and several parks throughout the island and restored public restrooms; maintained beach cleanups; landscaping of Tumon Bay, and because of taking on these responsibilities that GVB absorbs to its normal functions. Mr. Lamorena indicated that the context of the letter was requesting if GWA could charge agricultural rates for watering and landscaping in the Tumon Bay area. GVB has now assumed that responsibility of paying those rates and the reality because of their limited budget they are requesting from the Board and GWA if GVB can be assessed to agricultural rates. Mr. Craddick asked if there is a meter located for this and Chairman Sanchez asked if Mr. Lamorena has researched on this and requested that Sam (SLC) looked into this because the Commission sometimes does not have the discretion to change the rate and if not the Commission would get legislation doing it or PUC.

V. STAFF REPORTS – Chairman questioned if the Commissioners had any comments or questions regarding the staff reports that were submitted. Comm. Palomo complimented the staff on their reports and he had no questioned for Mark and Tony's part. At this time the Chairman decided to go ahead and go in order.

1. Production/Treatment (Mark Miller) – A written report was submitted and one comment that the Chairman had was that since 97 wells was hard on the graph to make it go up to 97 and likes the historical of the fact that it shows progress. Chairman Sanchez complemented the staff on a good job with their report. Comm. Ada complemented the staff with their report that he only had two questions. On the hard-broke it was indicated that the wells behind the post office in Barrigada was secured and the other in Ligan Terrace you gave a reason for the other but didn't say why. For Barrigada he is waiting for the pump and for Ligan Terrace (M-14) it was there but he lost it. Comm. Ada mentioned that Carmen Sian-Denton provided a report with the chloride level but without a reference value and Mr. Craddick responded that he don't see anything below .2 then we are in compliance. He indicated that under DOC it shows a .1 and questioned what is usually done and Mr. Kemp's response was that when this shows up they are brought up to level within a matter of hours.

2. Collection/Distribution (Tony Chargualaf) – Written report was submitted and Comm. Ada indicated that Tony responded to his questions, but on the column as what the minimum level is before getting calls because of low water pressure. The response from Tony is that most of the reservoirs are situated as such that they are in a high elevation.

3. Financial (Randy Wiegand) – Written report was submitted and he reported that numbers are looking good. For the month of January there was an extended meter reading and that some February billings that are included because the January readings were not in until in February. Probably a little higher than it should be and February would be a little bit lower than it should be. Not much change in the payable listings.

a. Bond Consultant Certification – Randy introduced Alan Bushley and Bill Dunbar and reported that they are here doing Due Diligence here to see how the Agency operate and would be doing a consultant's report that would be included. They're assessing all aspects of GWA and are here observing us.

Comm. Ada questioned under the Balance Sheet - Retirement Fund Deferred Contributions – the rise in the amount and the response is they're still heading back and forth with the Retirement Fund as to how the payment is going to be made. Money has been set aside to pay the health insurance premiums for FY05 until the proper billing is received and from there payment will be made bi-monthly so that every time that they need to pay their health insurance premium a check will be issued by GWA and part of that is GWA is continuing to accrue supplemental because they are some question and that PUC has prohibited any supplemental and they are some questions if GWA is still obligated to pay them. It was questioned where this money is being set aside and response was on restricted cash. The raise in the salaries for YTD Actual for Oct. FY04-Jan. FY05 was questioned because of the reduction of employees and the response was because the retirement contribution rate has gone up.

4. Compliance Report (Paul Kemp) – Written summary was submitted. Questioned if they were any pending deadlines and Mr. Kemp indicated that they are listed on page 2 of his report. He reported that GWA is in progress and would be expecting the deadline. It was questioned about the status of the reorganization package and the response is the first reorganization plan only says the name of people but does not indicate their positions;

whether it sufficiently says what they are doing; and need to give a break down where it shows that they are people there to manage the contract. Other questions brought up were regarding the sampling points; the Santa Rita Booster Pump Station; the DWWP Plan; the DRC position. Status of the DRC position was that it was sent down to the Legislature. It was questioned what are the projects marked in red and response given were they were incomplete projects. Would there be a financial problem with the projects and the response is if GWA does not get the money then there would be a problem. Mr. Craddick indicated that the Master Plan would be a problem because there was no intention to pay it out of cash; Agana Outfall; Agana Treatment Plant; Northern Outfall, it's about \$11m for these projects; also the 'A Series' Transmission Line because GWA was supposed to participate with EPA on this; and some money that were placed on the Santa Rita project.

5. Human Resources (Elaine Cruz) – It was questioned if GWA had its Drug-Free Workplace Policy and Elaine responded that GWA adopted DOA's. What's the stipulation on how frequent is drug test conducted and what are the procedures? The last drug test done was last year in September or October. Normally the maximum being tested is 15-16. After much discussion it was questioned if they ever had any positive and the response is minimum is three and they were referred for rehabilitation.

Status of the **IFB for DRC** – It was questioned if ad was put only through the Marianas Variety and the response was yes because it was the lowest in the ad costs.

6. Legal (Sam Taylor) – Items that he needs to report on would be done during the Executive Session.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

1. GM Report 05-09 Performance Indicators – Comm. Ada indicated that this should be more simply put such as: what is going to be measured; how is it going to be measured; and why. Such questioned was like Training Hours per Employee – measurement is 9.1, what is that and response is number of hours per employee that training was done last year per employee. It was explained by Mr. Craddick that the training was all in Ugum – hundred of hours (average) and this is the performance indicator that you engage without a utility, typically it's the new order of magnitude of 40 hours per employee. Chairman Sanchez questioned if the GM wanted the Commission to adopt the 9.1 and the response was it's the performance indicator. It was questioned what was the indicator for training hours per employee and the GM mentioned that these are things once adopted the GM would see if there's some national norm. These are ones that they have come up with nationally. If adopted these items they would begin to measure standards and next year a goal would be set once the standard is set. Staff is aware of this and is already working on this. Chairman Sanchez indicated that the Board can adopt it and measurement can be started.

M/S/C

Comm. Nelson/Comm. Palomo

Move to approve the Standard Performance Indicators as submitted in GM Report 05-09.
Motion carried.

Comm. Ada brought up about the Peer Review that was mentioned earlier by the GM. The GM mentioned that AWWA in the Peer Review look at 21 business issues when doing a review; it's different but should they come out they would be looking at this indicators, which came out of the QualServe Program. These standards came from the AWWA Research Foundation and they are requesting the utilities to collect the data and submit it so a database can be set up. Comm. Ada indicated that it would be okay to benchmark with someone else but he would want to see us measuring to ourselves. Comm. Palomo questioned on the Water Customer Services what does that indicate if it's yearly, monthly, quarterly or daily. It was questioned who was handling the data collection and the GM responded that it was split up amongst the different sections and the report would start on a quarterly. It was recommended by Chairman Sanchez that now it's been adopted does the ratio by March 15th or April 1st.

2. GWA Personnel Training Plan – Tabled. Mr. Craddick informed the Commission that from the Micronesia Water and Wastewater Training Institute that was initiated by someone from Samoa and they get grant money from DOI and bring people very specific to doing various things in the water utility including customer service, etc. DOI pays for it and because at the request of GWA last year to get some funding and now GWA is going to specify which training plans are needed. They've got an entire list of all the things that goes on with water and wastewater utilities (comprehensive programs).

3. Status of DRC Recruitment – Discussed earlier.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

1. FY'05 Mid-term Budget Review – Randy wanted to make some changes in the budget because of the increment due to the employees that the Commission had agreed on.

2. FY'06 Budget Forecast – Mr. Craddick questioned if this was about the money coming in. Comm. Ada responded that in both items he wanted to bring up that by the end of March he would like to see what kind of revenue is being forecast for next year. If there should be an increase or decrease the GM should be informed so that he would know where to start cutting. With the Budget Review, Comm. Ada would like to see around June for GWA to develop a budget to what it thinks on how to run it's money for FY06. Chairman Sanchez says concept is good but on the mid-term budget you book actual and glue on the projection for FY05 and for each month that the actual come you have an actual performance to budget performance but he likes projecting forward as well. Chairman Sanchez says his contribution was not to make it a mid-term review but a rolling budget review where one more analysis can be done as each month closes, he glues that reality to the remaining months of projection and have a rolling picture.

3. CCU Position on Cyfred/Gil Breeze Development – Mr. Craddick drafted a letter in response to this issue. According to him they still feel that GWA should go do their infrastructure for their subdivision because of the previous manager signing an agreement that GWA would extend department money. Mr. Craddick has never been able applying any authorization to warrant the Governor or Legislature to use ratepayer's money to enrich a developer and he portrayed that to them verbally and in writing. They seem to think that the ratepayers are obligated to enrich the developer and Mr. Craddick would not do it. This would be his only response and the Board previously has taken action on this and if this Board wants to reaffirm this, it would make it stronger. Comm. Nelson

questioned if an attachment of the agreement that was agreed by the previous management and both Chairman Sanchez and Mr. Craddick responded that there is a copy available and that the document was attached to the letter. It was mentioned by Chairman Sanchez that in summer 2002 an agreement was signed to provide GWA labor to Cyfred. Mr. Craddick does not even have a plan to do anything or determine what materials to put in. Comm. Ada brought up the fact that at the last meeting it was mentioned that there's a line that GWA in the past provided a waterline up to the entrance of the subdivision and there's suppose to be a distribution system. The issue is was it a valid legal agreement entered into by prior management. All the documents Chairman Sanchez and Mr. Craddick have seen does not show any authority by prior management to make that commitment. No Board authority, no Governor authority, no legal authority, no law that says he can do it on his own; independence and violation of our rules. Comm. Ada expressed that the letter should go under a CCU letterhead with the Chairman's signature because the fact that one of the residents came to the meeting and expressed his concerns on behalf of the 90 families to the Commission. Chairman Sanchez questioned if a resolution should be drafted as far as documents on the basis for the CCU's position. The response from the SLC it might serve the same purpose but not actually giving the Board to put their hands on. You can just adopt the policy, which puts Dave's position in place, which has the affect of one adopting the policy.

4. Road Repair Policy – Discussed earlier.

Board recessed at 8:45 p.m. to go into Executive Session.

VIII. COMMUNICATION

1. PUC ltr dated March 2nd -

IX. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 1. Personnel Matter Update**
- 2. CSC Actions**
- 3. Settlement Claim 02-2005**
- 4. Personnel Action 06-2005**
- 5. Personnel Action 07-2005**

CCU/GWA regular meeting reconvened at 9:55 p.m.

X. ANNOUNCEMENT

The next CCU/GWA Regular meeting will be on Tuesday, March 29, 2005 @ 5:00 p.m. @ the GWA Conf. Room instead of Tuesday, March 22nd.


At this time Mr. Craddick brought up the fact that GWA has an option where he has to make a decision about the QualServe Peer Review if GWA is going to continue with it. They have offered approximately \$40k to de a peer review. The last time they did it EPA paid for it in the amount of \$68k. They are coming the first week of May to do a peer review for Saipan and they feel that sending one extra guy they would be able to do both the same week which puts us at the beneficiary of the fact that DOI paid for the flight over and it would cost us \$40k. It would only mean that we would need to move

extremely fast in getting our self-assessment done and getting the documentation that they require in to them. Chairman Sanchez questioned if Mr. Craddick would like to repeat the peer review three years later and he said it would be really good and it would help and it would be good marketing. Comm. Palomo supports it. It would be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.


XI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:


PAULINE J.S. ONEDERA
GWA Board Secretary

Attested by:


COMM. GLORIA B. NELSON
CCU Secretary

Presented and approved on the 29th day of March 2005.