

Minutes
New York State Reliability Council, L.L.C. (“NYSRC”)
Executive Committee
Meeting No. 10 - January 31, 2000
New York Independent System Operator Offices - Guilderland, N.Y.

Members and Alternates:

Richard J. Bolbrock *	Long Island Power Authority (“LIPA”) - Chairman
John A. Casazza *	Unaffiliated Member
William H. Clagett	Unaffiliated Member - Vice Chairman
Roger E. Clayton	Wholesale Sector, PG&E Generating
Mark J. Cordeiro *	Municipals, PLM, Inc
Joseph C. Fleury *	New York State Electric & Gas Corporation - Secretary
H. Kenneth Haase	New York Power Authority (“NYPA”)
John Hauber	Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation
George C. Loehr	Unaffiliated Member
Kenneth A. Mennerich	Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation (“CHG&E”)
P. Donald Raymond	Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (“NMPC”)
Mayer Sasson	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (“Con Edison”)
Robert M. Loughney	Retail Sector, Couch, White, LLP (Alternate)

Others

John M. Adams	New York Independent System Operator (“NYISO”) (Alternate)
Alan M. Adamson	Consultant - Acting Treasurer
Paul L. Gioia	LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae (“LLG&M”) - Legal Counsel
Keith O’Neal	New York Public Service Commission (“PSC”)
Frank J. Vitale	Consultant

* - Denotes individual participated in the meeting by telephone.

Agenda Items - (Item # from Meeting Agenda)

1.0 Introduction/Open Session Topics

The Committee discussed various topics to be addressed during the Open Session. See below.

2.0 Approval of January 11, 2000 Minutes - Meeting No. 9

After Committee discussion, Mr. Casazza moved that the Draft Minutes from Meeting No. 9 be approved as modified, which was seconded by Mr. Clayton, and carried unanimously by the

Committee Members in attendance (13 to 0). The Secretary will issue the final minutes for Meeting No. 9 - **AI #10-1**.

1 .Organizational Issues

2 . NYSRC Web Site

The Secretary reported that the NYSRC web site (“nysrc.org”) is now available with a limited amount of information posted. The Secretary shall coordinate with the web site consultant to post the documents approved by the Committee at the last meeting - continuation of **AI #9-8**.

3.2 Tax Exempt Filing Status

Mr. Gioia reported that Mr. Kenworthy of LLG&M sent the forms for submission to the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) to Mr. Bolbrock to sign and forward to the IRS - **AI #10-2**. LLG&M has responded to questions from the IRS and discussions to date with the IRS indicate that there are no significant issues. Mr. Gioia noted that upon submittal of the forms to the IRS, the only action remaining is for the IRS to act on the request.

3.3 Legal Counsel

Mr. Gioia noted that a draft Legal Retention Agreement was sent to Mr. Bolbrock for comments. After brief discussion by the Committee, Mr. Casazza moved that approval authority for this agreement be delegated to the group of Messrs. Bolbrock, Clagett, Mennerich, and Fleury, which was seconded by Mr. Raymond, and carried unanimously by the Committee Members in attendance (13 to 0). Mr. Bolbrock will forward draft agreement and comments to the subgroup - continuation of **AI #5-10**.

3.4 Financial Issues

a. Funding Mechanism

Mr. Gioia noted that one protest was filed at FERC in the NYSRC’s December 22, 1999 FERC filing regarding the proposed NYSRC funding mechanism. Mr. Gioia noted that other parties, including Multiple Intervenors and Con Edison filed documents in support of the proposed revisions, and the NYISO filed an intervention. An answer to the protest filed by Rochdale was filed at FERC by LLG&M on January 27, 2000. Mr. Gioia shall forward the answer filed at FERC to the Secretary who will distribute to the Committee - **AI #10-3**.

b. NYSRC Treasurer’s Report

Mr. Adamson reviewed the 2000 cash flow for NYSRC expenditures. He reported that one party has not submitted its payment in response to the November 5, 1999 and December 9, 1999 call for funds. The Committee briefly discussed and agreed that, if FERC approves the proposed funding mechanism, the members should be reimbursed for payments in excess of the \$5,000 annual limit. Mr. Raymond moved to authorize Mr. Adamson to issue a call for funds for \$5,000 due on March 1, 2000, with a subsequent call for funds for \$5,000 due on April 1, 2000, if required, subject to reimbursement when the filed funding mechanism is approved by FERC.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Loughney and carried unanimously by the Committee Members in attendance (13 to 0). Mr. Adamson shall prepare and send the call for funds to the Committee this week - **AI #10-4**.

3.5 Insurance Requirements

Mr. Gioia reported that he received comments from the Committee on the proposal received from Marsh, Inc. for NYSRC insurance requirements. After discussion by the Committee, Mr. Gioia was asked to obtain quotes from Marsh, Inc. for General Commercial Coverage for \$25M, \$10M, and \$1M, along with Directors and Officers (“D&O”) Coverage for the NYSRC Members/Managers of \$25M - **AI #10-5**.

3.6 NYSRC Code of Conduct

Mr. Gioia noted that revised drafts of both the Code of Conduct and Confidentiality Agreement were sent to the Committee on January 27, 2000. The Committee discussed and provided comments on both documents. Mr. Gioia shall incorporate the comments received into final drafts and forward to the Committee for review and approval by email - **AI #10-6**.

3.7 Coordination with NYISO, NPCC, NERC

Mr. Bolbrock reported that he will be scheduling NYSRC representatives to attend the upcoming NYISO Committee meetings to present an overview of the NYSRC organization and its committee structure; agreements between the NYSRC and NYISO; the Installed Capacity studies completed; and the reliability compliance monitoring program. In addition, Mr. Bolbrock noted that a meeting has been tentatively scheduled for February 24, 2000, pending confirmation by NPCC, between the NYSRC Committee and Subcommittee Chairpersons and the NPCC, regarding coordination of all activities. A separate meeting will be scheduled with the NYISO Committee Chairpersons.

Mr. Casazza requested Mr. Adamson review the work of the NYISO Business Issues Committee Installed Capacity Working Group and report any reliability compliance issues with the NYSRC activities at the next Reliability Compliance Monitoring Subcommittee meeting - **AI# 10-7**.

1 .Revised NPCC Membership Agreement

Mr. Gioia reported that he and Mr. Bolbrock have discussed the process for incorporating the Committee’s comments on the NPCC Membership Agreement, with Ed Schwerdt of the NPCC - continuation of **AI #7-11**.

4.0 Millennium Gas Pipeline Project Status

The Committee discussed Mr. Loehr's draft NYSRC filing in the FERC proceeding on the proposed project. Comments were received and discussed and will be incorporated into a revised draft by Messrs. Loehr and Gioia and sent to the Committee for approval by email - **AI# 10-8**. Mr. Loughney expressed concerns that a filing by the NYSRC is beyond the NYSRC's charge pursuant to the NYSRC Agreement. Mr. Gioia noted that the NYSRC Agreement does not prohibit the filing of comments. Mr. Clayton also noted that NYISO studies do not show dire consequences for loss of the transmission lines on this right-of-way. The concern was raised that routing the gas pipeline within the same right-of-way as 6-345kV transmission lines supplying New York City, along with back-up service to a nuclear plant constitutes an extreme contingency and a potential threat to reliability. The Committee agreed, without a formal vote taken, to file the comments with FERC, however, Mr. Loughney noted that the Retail Sector's position on the issue is that the Committee should not be filing comments in this proceeding.

1 Proposed NERC Legislation Status & NYSRC Course of Action

5.1 & 5.2 - Mr. Bolbrock noted that a letter was sent to the NPCC Executive Committee on January 25, 2000 to solicit support from NPCC for draft language, in response to the December 20, 1999 letter from NERC to the Chairman of the House Commerce Committee requesting the removal of text regarding the NYSRC. Mr. Bolbrock noted that a letter was also sent by the Chairman of FERC requesting removal of the NYSRC text. Mr. Bolbrock shall contact Mr. Landgraf of LLG&M to schedule a meeting with the House Subcommittee to discuss the NYSRC's concerns with the proposed legislation - continuation of **AI #7-13**. Mr. Bolbrock reported that no progress was made in drafting the response to the December 20, 1999 letter from NERC.

6.0 NYS Assembly Statewide Reliability Study

Mr. Bolbrock reported that Mr. Casazza will be representing the NYSRC at a February 9, 2000 meeting of the Steering Committee to discuss the work scopes for the completion of the statewide reliability studies.

7.0 NOx Emission Constraints on NYC Generating Units

Mr. Sasson reported that Mr. Buechler was in the process of drafting a recommendation on what action the NYSRC should take regarding the issue raised at the last meeting by the NYISO and Con Edison regarding environmental constraints on NOx emissions from generating units in New York City under the ownership of four entities. Mr. Sasson noted that three of the four owners are in agreement to propose to the NYS Department of Environmental Protection that the emissions constraints continue to be imposed on all of the units bundled together. Mr. Casazza asked whether a reliability rule could be developed to address this concern, and noted the need for a reliability rule requiring investigation of the reliability impacts of retirements or major modifications in generation as specified in his December 28, 1999 letter to the Committee. Mr. Sasson noted that these issues will be discussed by the Reliability Rules Subcommittee on

February 3, 2000. Mr. Sasson shall contact Mr. Buechler regarding the draft recommendation - continuation of AI# 9-12.

8.0 Reliability Rules Subcommittee

8.1 Subcommittee Status Report

During the Open Session, the Reliability Rules Subcommittee (“RRS”) and Installed Capacity Working Group (“ICWG”) reports were focused on the Installed Capacity Report:

- i. **Recommendation on Installed Capacity Report** - See Item 8.4 below.

8.2 Reliability Rules - Status of Revisions

During the Closed Session, Mr. Sasson noted that the RRS is proceeding with its review of the NYSRC Initial Reliability Rules and is in the process of compiling a list of potential revisions to these rules.

8.3 RRS Discussion Issues

See Item 8.2 above.

8.4 Installed Capacity Working Group

- i. **Status Report & Discussion Issues**
- ii. **Installed Capacity Report/Recommendation**
- iii.

During the Closed Session, the Committee discussed, in detail, the ICWG’s draft report, “New York Control Area Installed Capacity Requirements for the Period May 2000 through April 2001,” dated January 7, 2000. Many comments were provided by the Committee Members, Consultants, and NYISO Staff supporting positions to lower or maintain the current statewide Installed Reserve Margin (“IRM”). The Committee did, however, agree that economics should not play a role in the NYSRC’s decision on a statewide IRM.

iv.

Comments supporting the lowering of the statewide IRM included, but were not limited to the following: (1) the study used a multi-area model, rather than the two area model used in past studies; (2) the results under the base case scenario indicate a statewide IRM of 15.5%; a recommendation of 18% provides a 2.5% cushion or 16% over the base case; (3) the results of the latest study confirm the results of the 1996 Study which were not implemented by the NYPP due to business issues related to generation divestiture and operation under an ISO using LBMP; (4) the study results meet the one day in 10 year reliability criteria; and (5) maintaining the current 22% statewide IRM will not improve the reliability in New York City and Long Island, and does not help in meeting the one day in 10 year criteria because of transmission constraints

into these areas and because the extra capacity would not be located in New York City or Long Island.

v.

Comments supporting maintaining, and possibly increasing the statewide IRM at the current level of 22% included, but were not limited to the following: (1) load forecast uncertainty for the Summer 2000 capability period; (2) need to thoroughly review the Summer 1999 system problems experienced before reducing the statewide IRM; (3) experience is needed through a summer peak with the new market structure under the NYISO; must consider the shift from a coordinated pool operation to a competitive operation under the NYISO; (4) uncertainty of what the forced outage rates will be for generation under NYISO operation as compared to NYPP operation; (5) concern that emergency operating procedures such as voltage reduction and load shedding will no longer be acceptable by customers and government; (6) New York can not be dependent upon neighboring systems for resources when shortages are widespread such as they were during the summer of 1999; (7) in determining the statewide IRM for a system, the concern should not only be for generation adequacy, but for the reliability of the entire system, including transmission; and (8) the study does not sufficiently recognize potential changes in transmission outages due to the increasing age of transmission lines and substations.

vi.

Mr. Sasson provided the Secretary a copy of a White Paper titled, "New York State Installed Reserve Margin Summer 2000 Level and its Effect on New York City," dated January 31, 2000, documenting Con Edison's concerns with lowering the statewide IRM from the current level of 22%. Mr. Bolbrock indicated that statements summarizing the information provided during the meeting could be supplied later for inclusion with the minutes. Mr. Casazza subsequently provided such a statement summarizing his comments at the meeting. Copies of Mr. Sasson's White Paper and Mr. Casazza's subsequent statement are available upon request from the Secretary.

vii.

The Committee conducted a series of straw votes on the statewide IRM percentage. The first straw vote established Committee Member's positions on a minimum, maximum, and preferred statewide IRM percentage. Based on the results of the first straw vote, a second straw vote was taken on a statewide IRM of 18%, with nine (9) affirmative votes received out of thirteen (13) votes cast. A third straw vote was taken on implementing a statewide IRM of 20% in 2000, followed by a reduction to 18% in 2001. The results of this straw vote were five (5) votes in favor and eight (8) votes against the proposal. Based on the results of these straw votes, the Committee drafted a resolution to be presented and voted on during the Open Session recommending the adoption of a statewide IRM of 18% for the capability year from May 1, 2000 through April 30, 2001.

viii.

During the Open Session, Mr. Cordeiro summarized the ICWG's draft report, "New York Control Area Installed Capacity Requirements for the Period May 2000 through April 2001," dated January 7, 2000. Mr. Bolbrock expressed his thanks on behalf of the Committee to the ICWG for their extraordinary efforts in completing the studies and report. The Secretary then read the following resolution to be considered by the Committee ("Resolution"):

Resolution:

NEW YORK STATE RELIABILITY COUNCIL, L.L.C.
APPROVAL OF STATE-WIDE INSTALLED RESERVE MARGIN FOR THE
MAY 1, 2000 THROUGH APRIL 30, 2001 CAPABILITY YEAR

WHEREAS, reliable electric service is critical to the economic and social welfare of the millions of residents and businesses in the State of New York; and

WHEREAS, the reliable and efficient operation of the New York State (NYS) Power System is fundamental to achieving and maintaining reliability of power supply; and

WHEREAS, The New York State Reliability Council, L.L.C.'s (NYSRC) principal mission is to establish Reliability Rules for use by the New York Independent System Operator (NYISO) to maintain the integrity and reliability of the NYS Power System; and

WHEREAS, the NYSRC is responsible for determining the state-wide annual Installed Capacity requirement; and

WHEREAS, the technical results of the Multi-Area Reliability Simulation study conducted by the NYSRC Installed Capacity (ICAP) Working Group show that the required New York Control Area's (NYCA) installed reserve margin (IRM) for the May 1, 2000 through April 30, 2001 capability year is 15.5% under base case conditions; and

Resolution (Continued):

WHEREAS, the study considered the following sensitivities and determined that the IRM could vary from 11.8% to 17.0% depending on key assumptions:

- Internal and external transfer limits
- Load forecast uncertainty distribution
- Source and magnitude of external ICAP
- Emergency assistance from neighboring areas
- Generator unit availabilities; and

WHEREAS, the above results have a 99% confidence limit of +/- 0.5%; and

WHEREAS, it is considered prudent to take into account the additional factors (such as those identified below) when establishing the NYCA IRM:

- The combined impact of the sensitivity testing and the confidence limit on the base case IRM
- The changes in electric dispatch protocols associated with transition to the NYISO and neighboring ISOs
- Other uncertainties associated with electric industry restructuring, including regulatory and legislative actions; and
- Further consideration and review of the experiences of the Summer of 1999, including the impact on New York City and other major load areas

WHEREAS, with due recognition that the current NYCA IRM is set at 22.0%;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that, in light of the study results and the factors noted above, which argue for a conservative approach, the NYSRC set the NYCA IRM at 18.0% for the May 1, 2000 through April 30, 2001 capability year; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the NYSRC ICAP Working Group be directed to monitor the actual operating experience of the NYISO and factor this experience into its IRM recommendation for the period commencing May 1, 2001.

End of Resolution

The motion to adopt the above resolution was seconded by Mr. Raymond and was adopted by the Committee by a split vote of nine (9) in favor of the Resolution, to four (4) against the Resolution. The votes were cast by the Committee Members, along with comments, as follows:

R.J. Bolbrock - LIPA: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution based on the merits of the ICWG's study. Mr. Bolbrock recognized that the study and report by the ICWG were thorough and accurate and the statewide IRM of 18% was acceptable.

H.K. Haase - NYPA: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution, noting that the 1996 study resulted in the same recommendation of an 18% statewide IRM, however, it was never implemented due to economic issues related to divestiture, not reliability. Mr. Haase noted that based on the base case result of 15.5% IRM, he feels that the 18% requirement is adequate and already a conservative amount.

R.E. Clayton - Wholesale Sector: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution, noting that he participated in the completion of the studies and report, and that he could support a statewide IRM of 17.5%, however, 18% was acceptable.

K.A. Mennerich - CHG&E: Voted **against** the Resolution based mainly on the fact that the market has not matured under NYISO operation that started late in 1999. In particular, CHG&E is concerned about what the forced outage rates will be for generation under NYISO operation as compared to NYPP operation. The MARS studies used 10 years of historic generator outage data that resulted under NYPP operation. Under NYPP operation many generators were under company dispatch and had a "must run" status. Under NYISO operation, generating units are dispatched by the NYISO and are likely to experience more cycling and more changes in state of operation. Both effects will result in greater number of forced and partial outages which means there should be a higher installed capacity requirement. CHG&E is also questioning the acceptance of customers to the existing outage criteria and the frequency of use of emergency operating procedures. Customers are not as accepting of the implementation of emergency procedures such as voltage reduction and customer appeals as they were in the 1960s when these procedures were last extensively used.

J.A. Casazza - Unaffiliated: Voted **against** the resolution, noting that 2.5% margin over the base case IRM of 15.5% is not sufficient to provide adequate reliability. Mr. Casazza indicated his serious concern that because of changes in industry structure, many additional factors must be considered in determining the required reserve margin. He agrees with the results from the study that has been made, however it does not include consideration of many other factors which need to be evaluated in determining the future reserve margin. He presented his personal opinion of the key factors that have resulted in a reduction from the previous reserve margin, the factors that have been important in determining the IRM requirements, the effect of changes as a result of

ISO operation, and experience in the summer of 1999, as outlined in the recent DOE report. This opinion indicates a total possible increase of as much as 9.5% above the 15.5% IRM calculations using traditional methods. Mr. Casazza stressed the need to complete reviews of summer 1999 conditions and obtain additional information in the summer of 2000 before making any changes from the existing reserve margin.

J. Hauber - RG&E: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution. The ICWG has completed a very extensive study using the best available data. Given the uncertainties introduced as the electric industry moves through its transition, moving to 18% is an appropriate and measured step.

W.H. Clagett - Unaffiliated: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution. Mr. Clagett commented that over the many years that he was involved with NERC, he was exposed to many similar studies conducted by various regional councils and stated his belief that this one ranks with the best of those studies. He complimented the study group for doing a great job, and noted that he was confident with the results. As a reminder, he noted that there are “rules” that were accepted for purposes of the study that were established elsewhere such as the use of voltage reductions and use of the one-day-in-10-year criteria for outages. If and when that type of criteria are revisited, he believes that the 18% is conservative enough to allow a cushion that may accommodate adoption of more stringent criteria.

P.D. Raymond - NMPC: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution. Mr. Raymond noted that he was very pleased with the thoroughness and quality of the analysis performed by the ICWG under the guidance of the RRS. Particularly noteworthy are the advancements in modeling and consideration of quantifiable uncertainties, and the thorough sensitivity investigation. The analysis provides a strong basis for an IRM of 16-18.5%, including the much discussed intangible factors. He can support the Resolution to reduce the statewide IRM from 22% to 18%.

M.J. Cordeiro - Municipal & Cooperative Sector: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution noting that this was a significant step by the Committee. Mr. Cordeiro thanked all who participated in the completion of the studies and report.

M. Sasson - Con Edison: Voted **against** the Resolution. Mr. Sasson noted the concerns of Con Edison in lowering the IRM for the summer of 2000. There are a number of intangibles that all together present a powerful picture that any action at this time in lowering reliability standards would be imprudent and potentially dangerous. The recommendation is being made to take the study under advisement at this juncture, to monitor the effect of all factors mentioned herein during the summer 2000 period and to reevaluate the lowering of requirements for the summer of 2001. The NYSRC should not be on record for having lowered reliability level requirements immediately after the most dangerous summer period since the 1965 and 1977 blackouts and in the face of unprecedented changes introduced in the structure of the electric industry. The NYSRC should lean towards prudence and act with responsibility in maintaining current levels of reliability for at least one more year.

J.C. Fleury - NYSEG: Voted **against** the Resolution. Mr. Fleury noted that, based on (1) the problems experienced in New York during the Summer of 1999 under a coordinated power pool operation; (2) the fact that the NYISO and the new market structure have only been in operation since November 18, 1999, and have not been in place through a summer peak; (3) the unresolved problems and issues that still exist with the NYISO; and (4) the load forecast uncertainties for the Summer 2000 peak, it is prudent for the NYSRC to maintain the current statewide IRM at the current 22% through the Summer 2000 capability period in order to maintain the safety and reliability of the New York State transmission system.

R.M. Loughney - Retail Sector: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution, noting that based on the 15.5% base case IRM, he is convinced that the 18% IRM is adequate and conservative.

G.C. Loehr - Unaffiliated: Voted **in favor** of the Resolution, noting that the methodology used to calculate the statewide IRM of 18% has been consistently used for over 30 years, and was used to determine the current 22% IRM. Mr. Loehr noted that he supports the recommendation to reduce the statewide IRM to 18%.

The Committee agreed that a filing was required at FERC to change the statewide IRM. Mr. Gioia shall work with the ICWG (Messrs. Cordeiro and Adamson) to prepare a draft FERC filing and send to the Committee for review - **AI #10-9**. The Committee also requested Mr. Cordeiro and the ICWG to provide the final version of the ICWG's report, "New York Control Area Installed Capacity Requirements for the Period May 2000 through April 2001," for inclusion in the FERC filing - **AI #10-10**. Following the Open Session, the Secretary was instructed to send an electronic mail message summarizing the Committee's decision on the statewide IRM, with a copy of the resolution attached - **AI #10-11**.

9.0 Reliability Compliance Monitoring Subcommittee

9.1 Subcommittee Status Report

During the Open Session, Mr. Casazza noted that the Reliability Compliance Monitoring Subcommittee ("RCMS") met twice and issued a letter to the NYISO recommending that the NYISO should continue submitting the reliability report to the PSC, as was done by the NYPP. Mr. O'Neal noted that the PSC is still interested in receiving this report from the NYISO. In addition, the RCMS sent a December 28, 1999 letter to the Committee on reliability considerations in the sale, major modification, or retirement of generating capacity. A letter has also been sent to the ISO recommending a number of studies on reactive supply and voltage conditions that existed in the summer of 1999 to which a satisfactory response has not been received.

Mr. Casazza also reported that representatives of the RCMS will attend the NPCC 2000 Reliability Compliance workshop in February. The next RCMS meeting is scheduled for February 16, 2000.

1 0.System Adequacy Reports/Studies

2 0.Status Report on NYISO Studies

Mr. Adams noted during the Open Session that there was no progress to report on the NYISO Transmission Planning Advisory Subcommittee's ("TPAS") reactive resource adequacy study, and it is expected that the TPAS work will begin in February - continuation of **AI #6-14**. Mr. Adams also noted that the NYISO is participating in a PJM study, and is also developing a scope to hire a consultant to determine the impacts of going from a six month capability period installed capacity requirement to a one month requirement.

0.

1 1.Meeting Schedule

The Committee agreed on a date for the May meeting. Please note that the date for Meeting No. 11 was changed during a conference call on February 24th from March 16 to March 24, 2000. The following are the scheduled dates and locations for the future Committee meetings:

<u>Mtg No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Time</u>
#11	Mar. 24	NYISO Power Control Center, Guilderland	9:30AM
#12	Apr. 13	NPCC Offices, New York City	10:00 AM
#13	May 12	NPCC Offices, New York City	10:00 AM

The Secretary will contact the NYISO and NPCC to make arrangements and will prepare and issue the agendas for the meetings - **AI #10-12**.

The Committee Meeting No. 10 was adjourned at 4:35 PM.

Completed By: Joseph C. Fleury - Secretary
Final Issue Date: March 24, 2000