LRITF Meeting

Thursday, April 13, 2023

1:30 PM

Webex only

Chris Rowley opened the meeting and introduced himself as being with Oncor and a co-Chair of the LRITF and noted the other two co-Chairs.

Chris proceeded by reading the Antitrust Admonition.

Chris read the agenda with a brief description of each item. He noted the bulk of the meeting will be focused on Chapter 5. He would like Shawnee to provide a brief update on the PowertoChoose website.

There were no questions asked or changes to the agenda. Chris noted that Debbie McKeever would be taking notes today.

Attendees as noted on the webex:

* AZ
* Abraham
* Adrienne Downey NEER
* Amy Sue Stirland LP&L
* Angela Ghormley – Calpine Energy
* Bednaz-Just Energy
* Bill Snyder – AEP
* Brandyn Sanchez
* Call-in-user 10
* Call-in-user 9
* Carolyn Shellman – LP&L
* Chris Burch – PUC
* Chris Sims – Lubbock Power
* Cindy Duong – Just Energy
* Clint Gardner, LP&L
* Dailey Smith – LPL
* Dale Gibbs – Just Energy
* Dawn Compton - Oncor
* Deb Belin Earth Etch
* Debbie McKeever - Oncor
* Dee Lowerre - Reliant
* Dillon
* ERCOT-David Michelsen
* ERCOT – Jordan Troublefield
* ERCOT-Kathryn Thurman
* Eric Broach – NextEra Energy
* Eric Lotter – GridMonitor
* Greg
* Harvey Hall LP&L
* Jamie Wood LP&L
* Jarrod Huse – LP&L
* Jessica Hernandez-Chariot
* John Schatz/TXU Energy
* Joshua Kane
* Kathy Scott - CNP
* Katy Tumlinson – LP&L
* Krista Ortiz – LP&L
* Kristin Abbott/Austin Energy
* Kyle Patrick/Reliant
* Laura Gomez-LP&L
* Lauren Damen- Reliant
* Livia - Just Energy
* Lori Lee Barfield – Just Energy
* LP&L – Luke Miller
* Mary McIvor
* Michael Winegeart – LP&L
* Pam Shaw – LP&L
* PUCT – Floyd Walker
* Ross Delahoussaye – Octopus Energy
* Rowley, Chris – Oncor
* S Fisher
* Sam Luna – BKV Energy
* Sam Pak - Oncor
* Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto PUCT
* Sheri Wiegand – TXU
* Tom Jennings – LP&L
* Tyler Krueger BDE
* Veloria Watts
* Viviana Valdez LP&L
* Yohan Sutjandra - Octopus Energy

Chris stated we will begin with Chapter 5 and said he is turning it over to Sheri.

**Chapter 5**

Sheri asked Michael for an update. She noted there are 40 people on the call so they probably would like an update. TXU, Reliant and the PUC have all submitted comments and questions and Lubbock has all of those but maybe we can use this time to go over the approach and see if there are any questions anyone else has. Sheri asked if that was alright with everyone.

There were no objections.

Michael said that obviously when they were drafting chapters 4 and 5 they started with 5.1 and 5.2 and since those came from the Commission they didn’t feel the obligation to change that so they went into rates and then customer protection rules and that’s something that this group and the RMS group wanted to see.

To start they went through the Sub-chapter R rules and they scrubbed out anything to do with the TDUs. A lot of those don’t fall or have governance since they are a utility within the city of Lubbock and they are a municipality. They stated they would abide by those and they didn’t want to have anything that would be contradictory to anything that would cause a problem for them and the REPs.

For the REPs, they followed up with construction practices and if we look at that we can see that much of it was copied and pasted from the TDU tariff and they don’t have that so they took certain parts. That’s kind of where they are coming from and the initial feedback they received got them to thinking on governance and things like that and they hear their advice and maybe they will scrub customer protection from chapter 5 and they want to make sure they chase things down before they move to have it approved by their Board Council. What Lubbock is going to do is push the approval process with the Council and the board to next month. Given the comments provided they don’t see anything to be able to be done by the time of tomorrow morning. What that means is they are going to accept market comments and extend that out from today to next Friday and give everyone that time to send in comments and maybe in a week or two that they can take it up.

Sheri wanted to confirm that comments would be due on the 21st. Michael agreed and said that is right. A week from tomorrow. Sheri said that maybe they need to revisit the governance issue and make sure that everything that REPs are looking for to be standard and guidance where that can be codified. REPs would know where that is so they can participate in the market. Included in that would be Lubbock and staff and maybe Shawnee could provide some comments to the overall framework to Lubbock and get an overall framework.

Shawnee said that yesterday they voiced concern to Lubbock and the REPs whether or not the PUCT would be able to handle complaints and what customer protection rules would be in effect. They have had a team of legal folks engaged and they might have had a breakthrough last night but they would still like some more time if that’s ok. They want to think more about it. Sheri said that is ok and these are the guiding principles and we want to make sure to get this right. Shawnee expressed they are looking to make sure there are not “bad actors” so they share the same goal. Carolyn would like those early next week so they can have time and to make sure everyone is reading those the same way. Shawnee said that they are going to meet up with Jenny and Carolyn too. Carolyn said that they are reviewing and understanding the Commission rules and want to work with the PUC on that. Carolyn stated they have in mind a concise approach that would allow the REPs to see something standard.

Sheri said that from the Customer Protection standpoint they are looking for the same thing…standardization which is great.

If there are others that want to look at this…at least for rates and discretionary service charges they could take a look at this today.

John asked if the date of April 21 is still the date or if that had changed. Michael confirmed the date is good. Sheri said if we look at the timeline, then the City Council and the Board would meet mid-May. The REPs are looking for the Access Agreement, Mass Customer List and all the paperwork so they can get everything in their systems so they would be ready to compete.

Michael responded that literally this was decided about an hour ago.

Michael provided that the normal date for the utility board is the 16th and the Council would be the following Tuesday. There won’t be an approved Appendix A until the morning of the 24th and they won’t be able to sign that. If they signed Appendix A, that would allow the MCL.

Sheri went through the dates and said that it’s only pushed a month. The 24th is when the MCL would be available and the Welcome Packages would be the 2nd week in May.

The Access Agreement is available the 3rd week in May…looking at the end of …looking to get the MCL and the ESI id list. As soon as the REPs are able turn around the access agreement, the MCL would be available. Michael thinks that is how it would work. Sheri said she is trying to summarize. That would push that to the second week in June?

Michael said that their project team would be working to have the ESI ids available 2nd week in May but will have to set on that until the day after the Council meeting. Sheri said she’s thinking out loud and the Mass Customer list will have the Customer info and the ESI id so the REPS could start integrating that into their systems. Michael said he isn’t sure if the they can get the full list and Sheri wasn’t sure but think at the last meeting they talked about the opt out letter and that the REPs probably don’t want to wait…

Even prior to the Access Agreement, even if it’s only a list of ESI ids with service addresses that may be available…Jenny or Jamie…said that they are going to have that available for them but wonder about the comfort level of the retailers to go ahead without all of that information available. Can they sign the agreement prior to the 23rd? Jamie/jenny said no. All the ESI ids and the MCL and the DG list…all of that will be ready to go as soon as they can sign the access agreement and whatever that looks like timeline wise, probably the end of May or the mid of June.

Sheri asked if there are any questions.

Kyle said he has a question. He wants to ask…”what is the transportation” for that list. He assumes it is secure FTP but he’s thinking that isn’t a relationship where they are all set up with Lubbock so they have to kind of put that into the timeline as well because they need to send it and they aren’t going to send through ERCOT with that info in it so it would have to be done point to point.

Jamie replied…get the access info signed, get the FTP info and get the MCL on that. Jamie said that they thought it would only be a couple of day process for that. Kyle said that he was trying to make it known and get the files and data confirmed and he wanted to make sure he knew how it looked from their perspective. They need the file and for those that have an “umbrella” relationship then each of those umbrellas, will they have their own or will there be one file to the umbrella? Kyle explained he wants to make sure that’s the communication method they want to use in order for everyone to have access to it. Sheri said that’s a great question and how would they get that.

Dylan put his question in chat…wanted to know if load profiles will be included and Sheri said no. Sheri said that her understanding is that the MCL does not have load profiles. Dave Michelsen was on. Sheri said that they will come back to that one.

Dee had a question. Dee said that she apologizes for the pushy line of the question. She wanted to know if a special Board meeting could be held before the 16th if things are ready to go before that. Michael said that’s not pushy but they want to make sure they are ready to go before they approach the Board with that. He explained there is another Council meeting on May 9th and that there is a possibility to do that like they did this month with the rates.

Dee said that she had a question and wants some clarity. If the tariff and if the customer protection rules will be removed, could that go forward? Michael responded, not even that part would be ready to go by tomorrow morning and he didn’t think that they would want to sign the access agreement if not all of that is ready. She said that some MPs might want be willing to sign that tariff and get that MCL sooner. They would be interested in that. Dee noted she was just throwing that out there.

Sheri said that Tyler with Big Data confirmed the format of the MCL and that it’s a CSV format and it does not contain Load Profiles.

That is the approved format that will be used by Lubbock. Dylan asked if they could get the Load Profiles ahead of time. Sheri said she didn’t think so.

Kathy said that was intentionally designed that way to keep the CRs from cherry picking.

John asked when if the load profile be available. Sheri responded that it would be through the normal process when the REP receives the 814\_05 transaction from the utility upon enrollment.

Interval Data

The interval data would be provided through the usual process and they will get “this” through the LOA process. Sheri asked Lubbock to respond. Sheri said that it did say monthly and interval but there wasn’t a place to designated you want both.

Lubbock replied it doesn’t indicate both, but that’s something they can accommodate when the LOA is sent in.

Dee asked when the LOA would be accepted and would that be after the access agreement. Sheri said that she thought those could be submitted now but they don’t have the ESI id and Jamie said that they can do that now with an address or meter number.

Sheri said that she put in chat to have all the send the comments to Michael Winegeart. Send by April 21st. They need to get those in Michael’s in box to keep it all straight. Sheri asked Debbie to please include that in the notes.

Sheri wanted to know if they can go into more detail to discuss anything like a service charges…other type of questions.

She said she will open it up for questions or comments but as indicated earlier, the PUC and TXU and Reliant have been able to provide their comments already and they wanted to see if anyone has any questions on those.

Sheri asked if there are any questions on the *definitions*. Michael said that there are some common things among those.

Document was displayed and reviewed/scrolled and Michael provided comments to each as available.

Question: When is it not normally 15 minutes? Said he was looking at what was displayed on the screen.

He said they will address the differences when it doesn’t match the definition.

*Comments on CIAC*

Change from “customer shall provide” to “property owner”

The next on multi-tenant billing…to allegedly disconnect. Seems like the wording didn’t work with what was above.

*Rate schedules*…5.3

Paragraph starting with “any adjustments”, Michael said it was possible he might have skipped some of the comments…not seeing TXU comments…sorry. Sheri said that her questions were around the rate schedules. The question she did have is do they have any *subtractive metering*. Michael said that he would need to find out. Jamie said that there’s at least one.

“The top comment…any adjustments there…REP will be contacted and the customer will contact LP&L

Another comment about *back billing*…conflicts with 4.4 c 1 LP&L under billed charges.

*Terms of payment* - Consider clarifying REP payments to LP7&L

Michael said they will clarify “if it’s REPs to us or direct billing construction issue or dual billing but needs to be in the first tariff because they are approving before they are using it, right?

*Applicability* – where are the assumed values for unmetered

Michael said he’s just going through these and he doesn’t have answers for these yet he is just letting us know.

Same two comments that were for *interconnect agreement* and values for unmetered

For a customer that achieved the 10 kW threshold, yet in subsequent billing period is below the threshold, will the customer have a minimum stay on the rate?? Michael said that Jamie responded earlier and thinks the answer to that is yes.

Will the charges be *prorated* for the demand charge? Michael said in the current practice they don’t do that so it’s something they are looking at. There’s a reference to 30-minute periods and he’s not sure if that language will stay. They are looking at it.

They have a few questions on there so they will “shore” that whole area. Same with Power Factor and they don’t have any enforcement and he believes the customer could have something to correct it and whatever they decide to do is what they need to spell out there.

Transition, proration was include in there and maybe they shouldn’t have put it in there and know that is being requested so Lubbock will take a look at that.

Harvey said that they accidentally included prorate in transmission and they have been removed so prorating does not apply to those.

Michael brought up street lighting…some of the comments…section O

Sheri mentioned to Michael that the version posted for the meeting today doesn’t have street lights in there.

Michael said that was their mistake and they will put Streetlights in and when they get ready to send that out, it will be there. The Council has to approve.

That’s the rate that hasn’t been approved by the Council.

**Rates**

Comments from Michael

#1

Multiple comments from everybody…so we need to specify by business for 820s???

Disconnect at meter that’s there…there was a comment asking for…they need times for completion by…Michael said that yes, they will look at that…if they need to reconnect by two hours.

Sheri said she can add some context to that. Most of that language is stated with the Discretionary Service Charge…REPs will need to provide that info to customers when the customers are calling them. Michael said they understand. Sheri said she just wanted to provide a little context. They need to define better what expedited means.

#12

Does this include the “up and down charges”? Sheri said that was for the installation and removal. Also further back in the tariff towards the end, there is another service connection/disconnection it was R1000 and what was the difference in those two temporary services?

Meter test

Normal meter market practice is “one free every four years”. Michael provided some commentary and noted they are trying to make it easy on the customers.

Right at the bottom of that…at the completion…number 13 there is a comment on that too…thought that was sent transitionally to the requesting REP

Under Tampering - Is LP&L going to apply send through ERCOT as the TDUs do today?

Lubbock responded, they will apply the Switch Hold to premise as the TDUs do today.

They need to clarify their language for lost or deferred kWhs. They could do that as well.

Then miscellaneous charges, “shored” up the language for what the TDUs call “as calculated”.

This part is **“Customer Protection rules”** which may become its own document. That was strongly recommended yesterday and Lubbock will try to do that.

First paragraph and then F

There are about 10 comments, mostly rewordings.

“Should we call if 25 subchapter R - references to PURA so they need to look at the language. Question: Are they going to have different rules from ERCOT, from the rest of ERCOT?

How are they going to address that?

They will reword to the Texas Admin code.

There is a question on the definition of customers.

They are looking at the definition and the same thing for electric service. Change the wording on 16 Texas Admin code…same thing under REP. Is that definition even needed if it’s defined above?

Privacy of Customer Information

Do they need to have more language there?

Selection of REP

Several comments.

Move ins and switches weren’t in the rates, neither was timing…needs to be somewhere in the tariff. Define the timeline in chapter 5. All on the same page. Lauren said that they can put the timeline and that’s needed somewhere regardless of where they put that. Michael said he is making a note.

Fees

Suggestion was made for a rewording. “Purposes for sending the switch…put some timing in.

They will look at that.

Load shedding…commercial customers…he understands what they are saying…yes…just retitle that.

Past 1 and 2

They start talking about switch holds…few comments there…even right above switch hold…would be helpful to know how the info will be provided.

Comment on why they would wait until after the customers’ contract expires before they remove the switch hold…they need to address that.

If they are going to apply a switch hold for tampering do they need to remove that comment?

 Lauren replied that the reason to remove the switch hold could be that there is a special provision. The REPs have options…pick a product or put on a special rate, product or take the switch hold off. She thinks it could be in there but may not be in the Order of the Rule.

Michael explained formatting issues caused subsections to be off.

Wording under “Mass Transition LP&L shall remove”, maybe add some wording

Going to read that for Move-in transactions…indicating the transaction is for an ESI id.

“Move in subject to a switch hold”

Moving down to #4

Need to have a practice on what they are doing there.

Section that starts “the REP shall” prior to disconnecting critical care, there is a formatting error.

Please note this is different from current practice…last part of that section there…they need to get with the REPs and see what the current practice is…the next section…if LP&L refuses to disconnect a critical care customer, do they not address that or do they leave it to the rule?

Michael said they will look at that language as well.

There are more references to Texas “16” Admin Code

If heat advisory is issued…There is no specific national weather notice

Can LP&L use the ERCOT Weather Moratorium list serve for communication of this?

That is Lubbock’s intention so the REPS would know that info.

They will get more clarity while Carolyn and Shawnee are working on that.

Next section of comments…reconnect times and how they will communicate to customers.

#3 – why wouldn’t nonstandard and premium meters have the same timeline?

Disconnection of a premise. “LP&L and l can never disconnect a 999 customer”.

To “the affected REPs, the Registration Agent…down where it’s highlighted. The references are off. Just so everyone knows while they were working on the document, the numbers were off.

Texas Admin code reference

Down to DG Interconnect Policies

Should we add critical natural gas to this?

So there is another question…will Lubbock be required to PUCT reporting for critical care…that’s probably another governance question.

If the critical care premise is outside the city limits, is the intent that the premise will be flagged by LP&L if it’s a DG premise? John explained that was a question related to a new energy program.

Michael said as we are looking through this, he might need to reach out to each individually for clarity.

Can the DG agreement be moved to the appendix? Michael thought that was a good idea.

Construction service charges

Consider adding language that invoice and payments will be covered by LP&L.

Michael responded that they will see that’s clarified

Street light charge – this is the 2nd mention of this.

Everyone should send their comments to Michael

He turned it over to Sheri.

She said she thought this was good and knows they are going access another draft again and was another meeting needed.

The next meeting is scheduled for May 2nd and is it ok to take the draft up then or is a meeting sooner needed, maybe a Friday. Sheri left it open to discussion and noted we will do whatever everyone wants.

John said that it should be left to when Lubbock thought they would have comments. The 24th is just a few days before the next meeting.

It was agreed that Lubbock will have time to make all the changes and work with Staff on the enforcement issue that Carolyn mentioned and they can have a good report at the next meeting. Get the access agreement approved.

Michael said that some people sending him comments were getting email failures that indicated he wasn’t receiving and indeed he was.

Michael’s email and phone number will be communicated. Sheri said she will add that was well.

**Power to Choose Update**

Chris asked Shawnee about the Power to Choose update. Shawnee said that Chris with the Commission was on. Chris said that he and Shawnee have been working with their IT Department and the Power to choose site is ready to go and Lubbock is added as a TDU option. Power to choose is ready to go when they are.

Chris thanked Chris and Shawnee and asked if there were any questions.

There were no questions.

Chris recapped…switch hold will be reviewed and a question remains open…

**Tampering Practices**

Will Lubbock be working on tampering?

Sheri provided some details and asked if she had captured the process correctly…

Jamie said that she has Katie on and can Katie give the market a quick overview with tampering and fees.

Katie said that Lubbock doesn’t disconnect if it’s a safe condition. Will only disconnect if it is a hazardous or unsafe condition. When that’s complete, a $200 tampering fee is sent once they get the info back from their meter department. That’s when the additional tampering fees can be sent. Any additional documentation; picture, police report they will send to retailers within 5 days.

Chris clarified…when the $200 will be sent, that will be sent to the REP of Record? Katie said that it’s generally less than 5 days but to account for any difficulties it will be 5 days. The data will be sent via email.

John Schatz has a question. At what point in time will Lubbock advise the customer of a tampering situation? Within 5 days. John said that the current practice…the IOUs send the info to the customer including how the customer can receive the charges and suggested that Lubbock consider a similar approach. Kathy said that’s not the practice of Centerpoint Energy. They do not communicate with the end-use customers. John said that he stands corrected bc several of the TDUs do. He still asked that Lubbock please consider the practice of notifying the customer.

Sheri asked if the tampering charge would go on a single 810 or the monthly and Katie said it would be on a separate. In terms of additional fees, that‘s just for the physical damage…for any estimated consumption…would those follow up in a certain timeframe? That would be when the secondary fees are raised.

Chris said she wanted to go back to Johns question and said that the TDUs are required to contact the customer and Kathy said that she is not aware and had asked her back office and they responded they do not contact the end use customers. It’s in 25.1.6 3 and states the TDU is requires to send a letter or maybe a door hanger. Could be possible a letter is being sent. Lubbock responded that they will do a door hanger. Sheri said that’s good to know. Chris asked for other comments on tampering.

No comments were made.

Sheri thanked Katie for her info.

Sheri asked about the 200$ tampering fee…would the 814\_20 go to ERCOT to set the switch hold flag and Lubbock confirmed they would.

**Street light billing practices**

Will there be one ESI id on a street light or will there be multiple types on the same bill? Chris said that most likely the REPs would not want one ESI id per each light. REPs confirmed that is correct. Michael said that they are going to have an ESI id based on type. Chris stated that is how Oncor does that. Sheri confirmed that this is a certain charge with a quantity value. So…it will be one ESI id per type of light per customer per city. The type would be a combination of watt maybe 200 high pressure sodium…it’s by bulb type so Jamie said she wants to get more info and be sure.

Chris asked if they are billing street lights by wattage and bulb type.

Jamie got a response that it’s separated by wattage. Sheri said that makes sense bc the wattage would determine the set kwhs.

Chris asked if there were any requirements on how they need the city to select a REP (similar to the CNP process). They will just do for the city and TXDOT.

Chris asked for other questions on street lighting.

No questions were asked.

Chris said we are at the point for **“open discussion”.**

Sheri said that they need an idea on the EFL template and where would that be codified and it would be needed such as when there are offers on Power to Choose…where will that be noted for customers in the Lubbock territory and that was one question. Another question is MOU verses TDU and Sheri said that at the last meeting it was clear that they are an MOU however there are……direction for that…where would delivery charges be???

What will be included in the RMGRR does include customer choice billing however once that bill passes, the customer option will go away and Lubbock has indicated they do not want to be a billing agent. They want the billing to be done by the REP.

Sheri turned it over to Kyle who had a question.

Kyle said he had a question but Michael sent Kyle the link to the presentation that was mentioned last week which was their customer protection information.

Michael said that Sheri is keeping a list of special meetings they need to have and one is the customer information.

Sheri said that they were going to combine that with the stacking logic…pre-black out period, in the blackout post black out and combine that with customer communication. Michael said that Ashley is taking off today and he will get with her next week and see when they want to have a meeting. Kyle said that they are getting a lot of questions regarding how it’s going to look at stacking…what dates are going to be put in…others…the questions aren’t overly complex but putting those two together makes a lot of sense. Kyle said he will help if needed to put together an agenda. Sheri said that they will be putting together some info. Kyle said that they are trying to put together some things to know such as how things will work for their back office folks such as stacking and everything. Michael stated for everyone to send him their questions and he will make sure that their communications are correct.

John Schatz had a question…the topic is…customers who are currently receiving energy assistance…what will happen at the time of transition for those customers?

When will the customers be visible on the Solix list and will there be a potential gap for customers currently receiving energy assistance and did that make sense. Michael said that he would need to ask someone on Jamie’s team. Jamie asked Katie, “What did she think that would look like”. Jamie said that they don’t use the Solix list and they were not sure how that works. They hope to have looked at that and have something by Tuesday. The question: when would an LP&L customer appear on the Solix list? That is kind of a trigger from the reps…Shawnee said that if Lubbock isn’t participating in the Solix is there a back-up way to find out if a customers is receiving assistance? Normally those customers would not show up a on a REPs list until they are enrolled in Solix and sometimes on mass transitions where a special list is run but she isn’t sure and would it make sense for a special list and some of the different assistance agencies use different criteria to qualify, some provide monthly benefits, some types others like a one-time benefit.

What was discussed is that Lubbock zip codes are already being provided to HSL.

Lauren provided some info that there is an upcoming meet and greet and they will be able to express what they do.

Michael said that is scheduled for Tuesday and he wanted everyone to know there’s a possibility that a customer could wander in or the media…wanted to let everyone know that.

Jamie went to john’s questions…there are different processes for the different agencies…some provide a sum and others a monthly amount.

Reps that do participate in the Solix…not every rep is the same…the files …no one should be …most people haven’t billed by then and then reps…no late fees so maybe they are covered…

Each month every REP sends a list to Solix and they send a list back.

Sheri said if looking at the timing…they want the list by October???

Sheri agreed that timing wise she agreed with Dee that it will be fine and no one should be missed.

Chris read the question/last question in chat…by pushing something back does that push anything else back? Michaels said that the only thing…the FERC ruling and they are waiting on that and expect a ruling in ten days. Outside of that they don’t have anything on their radar to delay the transfer of customers in October. He asked for comments from Jamie. Jamie said she didn’t see any other delays.

Chris noted the next LRITF meeting is on May 2nd after RMS.

Sheri said that the meeting will start at 1:00 instead of 1:30. If they need to push it because RMS is running late they can push it but that will not be a problem. Otherwise it will start at 1:00 PM.

Dee said she was going to ask Matt Rose about the senate bills. Michael said that there’s no update from last week and are being heard in their respective places and they are going to let the house bills pass the house and then go to the senate to be merged…

Dee said she thought she heard one of the senate bills didn’t get passed but said she wasn’t sure what that meant which is why she was going to ask Matt.

Chris thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 3:27 PM.