BUFFALO – RED RIVER WATERSHED DISTRICT

1303 4TH Ave. NE
Barnesville, MN 56514
218-789-3100
www.brrwd.org

Board Meeting Minutes

Monday May 12, 2025

Managers Present: Peter Fjestad; Catherine Affield; William Davis; Gerald Van Amburg; William Steffl.
Managers Absent: Curtis Stubstad; Troy Larson.
Staff Present: Kristine Goeden, Administrator; Matthew Schlauderaff, Watershed Specialist.
Consultants Present: Bennett Uhler, Engineer, Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI).
Others Attending: June Steffl; Eric Stroh, Wilkin Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD); Adam Mortenson, Wilkin SWCD; Jon Braton, Wilkin County Commission; Paul Krabbenhoft, Clay County Commission.

President Fjestad called meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Agenda: Additions to agenda:
River Keepers 2026 Funding Request
Clay County Ditch No. 5, Review and Consider Petition and Set Hearing.
Motion by Davis to approve agenda with additions, **Seconded** by Affield. **Motion Carried.**

Citizens to be Heard:
Eric Stroh and Adam Mortenson, Wilkin SWCD. Soil Health Incentive Program Update and Funding Request.
Stroh and Mortenson provided update on Soil Health programs at Wilkin SWCD. Previous funding requests have been used for soil health programs. Currently, Wilkin SWCD has funding for soil health programs, however, they do not have as much funding for staff time to market and administer programs. Wilkin SWCD requested $25,000.00 to be used for technical assistance on Soil Health programs. They hope to use these funds as match towards state and federal funding.
Motion by Van Amburg to fund request as presented, **Seconded** by Affield. **Motion Carried.**

Introduction of New Manager. William Steffl was appointed by Becker County Board of Commissioners to BRRWD Board of Managers to fill the vacant position for a term from May 7, 2025 to August 31, 2027.

Consent Agenda: **Motion** by Affield to approve consent agenda items:
April 14, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes
April 14, 2025 Upper South Branch Buffalo River Restoration Hearing Minutes
April 28, 2025 Upper Buffalo River Restoration Hearing Minutes
Financial Report
Permit Nos.
25-017, Jim Olson – water and sediment control basin (WASCOB) structure, E ½, Section 28, Cuba Township, Becker County with conditions
25-021, Jon Lowry – wetland restoration, SE ¼, Section 12, Riceville Township, Becker County
25-023, City of Hawley c/o Lonnie Neuner – utility installation, Sections 11 and 12, Hawley Township, Clay County with conditions
25-024, City of Moorhead c/o Michael Aamodt – street improvements and underground utility installations, City of Moorhead, 14th Ave. S, 3rd St. S, and Elm St. S, Clay County
25-025, City of Moorhead c/o Michael Aamodt – street improvements and underground utility installations, City of Moorhead, River Dr. S, 18th Ave. S, 3rd St. S, and Elm St. S, Clay County
25-026, City of Moorhead c/o Michael Aamodt – street improvements and underground utility installations, City of Moorhead, 10 ½ St. N and 17th St. N, Clay County

25-027, City of Moorhead c/o Michael Aamodt – land development, NE ¼, Section 28, Moorhead Township, Clay County.

Clay County Ditch NO. 30, Channel Liner Repair Final Pay Estimate for $22,900.00

Seconded by Davis . **Motion Carried.**

Permits for Discussion:

Permit No. 25-016, Jake Nelson. Applicant proposing to install WASCOB in Section 31, Hamden Township, Becker County. Project designed to Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) standards. Natural flow path of water remains unchanged. Tile outlets onto applicant's property, which is an adequate outlet. Uhler recommended approval subject to standard tile conditions. **Motion** by Affield to approve Permit Nos. 25-016 with conditions outlined above, **Seconded** by Steffl. **Motion Carried.**

Projects:

Upper Buffalo River Restoration. Review and Consider Findings and Order. Landowner comments from the Hearing on April 28, 2025 were discussed. Uhler provided responses to landowner comments.

Comment: Landowner discussed easement payments being approximately $800,000.00. **Response:** Easement costs would be approximately $425,000.00, Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) would contribute approximately $175,000.00, so total project easement cost to BRRWD would be approximately $250,000.00. Depending on construction bid, it is anticipated that BRRWD will use district-wide funds to cover easement expenses.

Comment: Landowners stated upstream landowners receive no benefit. They also noted that they have no control over water moving downhill through project area. **Response:** Water management districts (wmds) are established based on who contributes to the water resource issue. Water from upstream landowners continue to washout Buffalo River and cause continued downcutting.

Comment: Landowners stated this area is different than other areas of BRRWD that are flat. This area has a significant amount of fall. **Response:** The proposed project area is similar in topography and river type to the Buffalo River Restoration in Hawley, MN, completed in 2016. There is several hundred feet of elevation change over the span of a few miles around Hawley adjacent to the river as the Buffalo River makes its way through the beach ridge. Land adjacent to the Upper Buffalo River Restoration also experiences several hundred feet of elevation change over the span of a few miles.

Comment: Landowner requested work be completed on outlet of Buffalo Lake. **Response:** Request is outside scope of proposed project. In addition, request for new culverts under Highway 34 are not within BRRWD jurisdiction.

Comment: Landowner requested to use funds to pattern tile landscape. **Response:** Request is outside scope of available funding. In addition, pattern tile would not decrease water flowing downstream to Buffalo River.

Comment: Landowner stated there would still be sediment accumulation in channel after project because of the topography with hills meeting flatter land. **Response:** Proposed project is similar in river type and geometry to the Buffalo River Restoration through Hawley, MN. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) has completed field monitoring through project reach near Hawley since its completion in 2016 and found channel geometry and profile to be stable. The river through this reach is passing sediment, while not aggrading or degrading, which is the same outcome expected for the Upper Buffalo River Restoration.

Comment: Landowner expressed concern about where funds will come from if there is a catastrophic event that causes significant damage. **Response:** BRRWD has historically looked for outside funds (i.e. FEMA) to pay for project repairs after catastrophic flood events.

Comment: Attendee asked when BRRWD has attended a County Board or SWCD Board Meeting to discuss project. **Response:** This is generally not standard practice. BRRWD is required by law to notice the County Auditor, which was completed. BRRWD attends County Board Meetings when requested. Sometimes,

county boards require presentations during permitting process. When this is the case, BRRWD attends and presents to Board. BRRWD has discussed proposed project with SWCD staff. SWCD staff have also been involved in acquiring RIM easements. At any time, SWCD Board could have asked BRRWD to present. They have now asked for a presentation at their May 22nd Board Meeting. Goeden and Uhler plan to provide a presentation.

Comment: Landowner stated installing tiling is doing their part and should preclude them from paying an assessment. R**esponse:** Installation of tile does not decrease overall water contribution downstream.

Comment: Attendee asked if wmd should be set up to include downstream landowners who are receiving water quality benefits. **Response:** A wmd includes land contributing to a specific pollution problem or water resources issue. It does not include land downstream of proposed project area (those who are receiving water quality benefits).

Comment: Landowner requested Board of Managers consider removing land with zero-discharge feedlot permit from wmd **Response:** Staff contacted Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) who stated there is still discharge from the feedlot, however, to be compliant with their permit, landowner is not able to discharge polluted water into public water.

Board of Mangers discussed draft Order presented. Davis noted wmd is set up based on land contributing water to project. Steffl stated project does not solve issues contributing to erosion on Upper Buffalo River. Steffl stated the purpose of a wmd is to solve problems and in this case, he does not see the wmd solving the problem but fixing the result of the problem. Uhler stated the problem is a result of the water entering the project area and interacting with ditching that occurred around the historic channel. Uhler stated proposed project fixes erosion issue and sediment problem occurring downstream. Steffl stated the project is not the issue. Steffl stated Becker County, Becker SWCD, and the majority of the landowners within the wmd are against the project. Steffl stated Board of Mangers do not understand how assessment will impact landowners. Davis noted Board of Mangers do understand how landowners are impacted by assessments and Board of Managers do not take that lightly. Steffl asked if project is constructed if the wmd is responsible for maintenance if there is any damage. Uhler clarified the wmd would be responsible unless Board of Managers decided to contribute watershed-wide funds to a repair.

Steffl stated BRRWD is required to work with county boards in design and funding of capital improvement projects per the Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan (CWMP). Uhler clarified BRRWD brought project through the Project Team process to discuss project with stakeholders. Uhler also stated project was discussed with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) which would further bring project discussions to stakeholders.

Steffl stated there are areas where wmds work well, and he believes it does not work well in the Upper Buffalo River watershed. Steffl stated there are no improvements made upstream to benefit those landowners. Steffl stated an improvement upstream would be if funds from wmd were used to reduce flows coming off fields.

Steffl stated currently private landowners are taking care of channel, specifically as it relates to beavers. Steffl stated he believed it is bad public relations to have upstream landowners pay for beaver management. Uhler stated this has been standard practice for BRRWD and this was the first wmd where landowners expressed concerns about wmd paying for beaver management.

Davis stated he was onsite and the river was significantly eroding at the headcut. Uhler stated Upper Buffalo River is cutting back to the railroad tracks and moving towards Highway 59. Uhler stated at the hearing a landowner stated if project is not completed infrastructure could be impacted. Uhler clarified, landowner was referencing railroad and Highway 59. Steffl stated project would not stop erosion problem on Upper Buffalo. Uhler explained how project design would repair headcut.

Steffl stated he had no problem with the project but could not support the wmd. Steffl expressed that the wmd was lousy politics and public relations. Steffl stated setting up wmds are legal. Steffl stated that all the

landowners within the proposed Upper Buffalo River wmd are opposed to the wmd. Steffl stated maximum assessment would be assessed every year for 10 years to cover landowner portion of construction and landowners do not benefit from project. Van Amburg noted discussion is centered around disagreement about wmd versus project. Van Amburg noted Board of Managers needed to consider concerns of Becker County because it is important for BRRWD to have cooperative relationships with all of the counties. Van Amburg recommended Board of Managers review project and wmd and see if there need to be modifications. Van Amburg stated he believed proposed project was good and beneficial.

Fjestad noted there is state funding currently available for proposed project. Steffl clarified he is okay with using state funding for proposed project, however, he does not think it is fair for upstream landowners to pay for maintenance. Fjestad questioned if landowners whose water contributes to a problem should pay for maintenance. Steffl stated private landowners should be responsible for beaver management. Van Amburg asked about funding timelines. Uhler stated of the $1,700,000.00 from Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) $1,300,000.00 must be spent by June 30, 2026 and $2,415,000.00 from Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC) has a deadline of June 30, 2027. Uhler stated funding from LSOHC can be used for other stream restoration projects within BRRWD. Goeden stated with the short construction season, BRRWD would need the $1,300,000.00 spent during the 2025 construction seasons because contractors often do not work in the winter and conditions do not allow much work to be completed before June. Davis noted if project moves forward and $1,300,000.00 is not able to be spent by 2026 deadline due to delays landowners would be responsible for those expenses.

Steffl stated he believes wmds work in other parts of BRRWD but not in the Upper Buffalo River watershed. Steffl stated this is because landowners in the Upper Buffalo River watershed receive nothing from proposed restoration. Steffl stated there were no landowners upstream of the project within the wmd that supported project. Steffl noted no landowners at hearing for Upper South Branch Buffalo River Restoration spoke against project. Davis clarified landowners in Upper Buffalo River Restoration wmd were not against project but against the wmd. Steffl clarified landowners are not worried about paying for it, they are concerned about paying for it and getting nothing for it. Steffl stated everyone at the Upper Buffalo River Restoration Hearing was against project including Becker SWCD and Becker County. Steffl stated this wmd is different than other wmds because everyone was against it. Steffl stated the law allows BRRWD to use wmds and it is the Board of Manager's decision to use the law.

Davis asked how project was brought to attention of Board of Managers. Uhler stated landowners brought concerns to Board of Managers. Uhler clarified sediment accumulation downstream, near the outlet of Becker County Ditch No. 21, caused by the headcut moved project forward. Steffl questioned if currently landowners became willing landowners to move project forward. Goeden clarified it was the issue at the outlet of Becker County Ditch No. 21 into the Buffalo River that moved project forward. The repair of the headcut moved forward at the same time because it was contributing a significant amount of sediment downstream. Landowner near the outlet of Becker County Ditch No. 21 was unwilling to work with BRRWD, so that portion of the proposed project was removed and BRRWD moved forward with repair of the headcut. Steffl stated landowners in area have known about problem for about 50 years. Steffl stated project is bad public relations and bad politics because the County is also involved.

Goeden asked how Board of Managers could review project and wmd to modify per Van Amburg's recommendation. Steffl stated the three issues are 1) paying $195,000.00 of initial construction, 2) paying for ongoing maintenance, and 3) there is no stopgap if there is a catastrophic loss. Goeden asked Steffl if he, representing Becker County, believed there would be significant opposition to the project as long as wmd was associated with project. Steffl stated there is significant opposition to the wmd. Steffl explained WASCOB projects installed in the Upper Buffalo River watershed were part of project. Steffl stated Board of Managers did not consider politics or public relations of project, otherwise landowners would have supported the project.

Van Amburg stated he is concerned about public relations and how a decision could affect future projects. Van Amburg stated he wants project completed but wants to make sure BRRWD carefully considers the

concerns of the public. Affield stated even though most in attendance at the hearing were opposed to the project, she believes there are likely others in the watershed that support the project. She clarified it is common for landowners in support of a project to not attend the hearing. Affield stated when she was onsite, the erosion on the channel looked like a problem. She stated everyone in the watershed contributes water to the problem and that is why a wmd is needed.

Davis asked how much money BRRWD proposed to contribute to the project. Uhler stated the proposed plan includes BRRWD contributing $390,000.00 from the watershed-wide funds, however, this could be modified by the Board of Mangers. Uhler clarified $195,000.00 proposed for wmd contribution to construction is an estimate. Depending on contractor bids, contribution could be lower. Actual assessments would be determined at the annual budget hearing by Board of Managers. Davis stated that of the watershed-wide funds, most of the funds are paid for by Clay County residents. Fjestad reiterated that funding for project has strict timelines. Fjestad stated the State is contributing significant funds to proposed project. Fjestad stated the State is funding most of construction and BRRWD is proposing contributing landowners pay for long-term maintenance. Steffl stated landowner get nothing from the maintenance of the proposed project.

Steffl asked if BRRWD ever ordered in a wmd where all landowners were opposed. Van Amburg stated he does not remember a lot of opposition to other wmds. Davis asked if water gets to river faster with tile. Davis stated landowners say they have no benefit, however, tiled land is draining to project area. Davis stated at hearing landowner stated clean water is coming out of tile lines. He continued that water may be clean leaving the tile line but it continues to pick up sediment as it moves downhill to the river. Steffl stated there was no tile in the ground when Upper Buffalo River jumped its banks and started eroding. Davis stated if nothing is done channel will continue to erode to railroad tracks and Highway 59.

Fjestad clarified that Steffl is in favor of project but does not support wmd. Steffl confirmed, but stated he believed there are less expensive alternatives that could have been done to resolve the issue. Steffl stated he believed it was a waste of money to install an estimated $1,000,000.00 of culverts for access across the river on private land. Uhler clarified BRRWD has to maintain access for landowners to access land across river. Steffl stated landowners do not currently have crossings there. Uhler clarified the landowners do have existing crossings that would need to be replaced with project. The size of the culvert is dictated by MN DNR requirements for permitting. Steffl asked why existing culverts could not be left alone. Uhler clarified existing culverts are not acceptable for MN DNR standards, stable rivers, and fish passage. Uhler clarified leaving existing culverts with the reconnection to the historic channel would cause a lot of problems on the landscape because channel capacity would be limited. Steffl stated crossing are not necessary because landowners can access their land from both sides of the river.

Fjestad asked if a wmd could be formed after construction is complete. This would allow BRRWD to use State funds available for project. Uhler confirmed. Affield questioned if that is something Board of Managers should consider. Fjestad wondered if that was the best option if the wmd was causing the public relations problem. Affield stated a wmd is needed to take care of project. Goeden stated BRRWD is working on establishing wmds for projects established without them in the past. Goeden stated if the Board of Managers decided to not move forward with Upper Buffalo River Restoration, most of the funds from the State could be transferred to other projects within BRRWD. The funds that could not be reallocated are the $1,700,000.00 from MN DNR. Van Amburg stated he would not support a scenario where the project is not completed. Van Amburg stated BRRWD needed to assess concerns with the wmd and move forward with the Upper Buffalo River Restoration. Affield stated there has to be supporters that did not attend the hearing. She stated she saw so much erosion that project should be completed. Steffl stated erosion is caused by elevation dropping east of project area and the soil type. Steffl stated area has been eroding forever.

Motion by Steffl to approve Order to establish project without wmd, **Seconded** by Fjestad. Van Amburg and Fjestad clarified the intention would be to establish a wmd once the project is complete. Fjestad noted he is concerned about losing State funding for project. Davis asked where funds would come from without wmd. Goeden stated funds for the project that were proposed to be paid for by the wmd would be paid for by

district-wide funds. Affield clarified that motion would establish project without wmd and commit BRRWD to use district-wide funds to complete the project and maintenance.

Davis opposed proposed motion, stating under proposed motion, Clay County residents would cover most of the local funds for project. Van Amburg stated he would like to see project move forward and the only way to do that at this time is without the wmd.

Van Amburg asked if BRRWD had the ability to fund project with district-wide funds. Goeden stated funds are available, however, they would likely have to be pulled from other project. District-wide funds are allocated out to project at the end of the year. If the Upper Buffalo River Restoration needed additional funding, there would be less available for projects elsewhere in the District. Goeden explained generally, district-wide funds are used during construction to help cover some of the larger expenses and the wmd covers some of construction and long-term maintenance. If district-wide funds will be used for construction and maintenance of the Upper Buffalo River Restoration, construction for other projects may need to be funded with more of their wmds versus district-wide funds. Goeden stated Board of Managers would ultimately determine how funds are allocated.

Uhler clarified variable in cost estimates are the constructions bids. Uhler stated grant funds do not cover easement expenses. If construction bids are favorable where all construction is funded by grant funds then the district-wide funds would be responsible for easement payments. Easement payments are anticipated to cost an estimated $250,000.00. Uhler clarified since project cost is still an estimate, district-wide funds could pay above or below the estimated $390,000.00.

Fjestad asked if this would be a project. Goeden clarified an order would establish Project No. 86. Van Amburg stated BRRWD could fine-tune the wmd and could modify what area the wmd covers. Goeden asked if Van Amburg thought the wmd should be expanded to include more area. Van Amburg confirmed. Goeden stated in the original proposed wmd that included lower portion of Upper Buffalo River near the Becker County Ditch No. 21 outlet, landowners that paid the most in the current proposed wmd were going to have higher assessments. Goeden stated landowners that own a lot of farmland in the Upper Buffalo River watershed, also own a lot of land east of the proposed project.

Steffl said when project was originally discussed wmd was proposed to include Becker County Ditch No. 15 where a lot of developed farmland would pay maximum contribution. Steffl stated wmd boundary was later reduced to include land upstream of County Road 105 and then reduced to current proposed boundary. Goeden asked Steffl if he thought landowners and Becker County would support a wmd that was larger. She clarified if Board of Managers want staff to review wmd boundary, staff would need some guidance on what would be more acceptable. Steffl said he could not speak for the County. Goeden asked if he would support a larger wmd. Steffl stated landowners would need to be able to get something for the assessment. Steffl said he did not know if enlarging the wmd would change landowner opinion. Goeden clarified there would likely be the same feedback from landowners if a larger wmd is proposed in the future. Steffl confirmed.

Davis stated wmds are not about benefits, but about water contributing to an area. Davis stated landowners are not going to support the wmd in the future. Steffl confirmed that was a possibility. Steffl stated he is in favor of wmds if landowners are getting something out of the assessments and in favor of the wmd. Uhler clarified no matter the size of the wmd, the methods would be the same. Landowners upstream of project area would still be included in wmd. If BRRWD decided to keep the annual maximum assessment, maximum assessments per acre could decrease. Uhler stated since methods are the same, if landowners think they are getting nothing from their assessments now, they would likely not change their opinion in the future. Steffl stated method does not work in this area. Steffl stated BRRWD has not ordered in a wmd with everyone at the hearing opposed to it. Uhler clarified that with every wmd, there are landowners that state they do not want to pay assessments for project. Board of Managers have considered those comments before.

Roll Call Vote: Affield – No, Davis – No, Van Amburg – Yes, Steffl – Yes, Fjestad – No. **Motion Failed.**

Project No. 86 – Upper South Branch Buffalo River. Review and Consider Amended Findings and Order. During the appeal period, BRRWD became aware that parcels that do not contribute water to project area for the Upper South Branch Buffalo River Restoration were included in the approved wmd. Board of Mangers reviewed amended Findings and Order to remove those parcels from wmd. **Motion** by Affield to approve Amended Findings and Order as presented, **Seconded** by Davis. **Motion Carried.**

Ditches:

Clay County Ditch No. 9. Review and Consider Findings and Order. Board of Managers reviewed Findings and Order relating to Petition to impound, reroute, and divert drainage system waters on Clay County Ditch No. 9 submitted by Clay County Highway Department. **Motion** by Van Amburg to approve Findings and Order as presented, **Seconded** by Steffl. **Motion Carried.**

Clay County Ditch No. 5. Review and Consider Petition and Set Hearing. Brian Oberg submitted permit application to outlet drain tile into Clay County Ditch No. 5. A portion of the field is not included in the benefit area for Clay County Ditch No. 5. Oberg submitted a petition to use Clay County Ditch No. 5 as an outlet for the S ½ of the SW ¼, Section 9, Morken Township, Clay County. **Motion** by Davis to accept petition and set hearing for Monday June 9, 2025 at 7:00 PM at the BRRWD office, **Seconded** by Van Amburg. **Motion Carried.**

Project and Drainage Repair Recommendations

Drainage	Township	Section	Problem/Proposed Work	Estimated Cost
Becker County Ditch No. 5	Audubon	22	Washout along ditch spillway. Haul in 30 yards class three rip rap to keep washout from expanding.	$4,000 - $5,000
Clay County Ditch No. 2	Spring Prairie	28	Collapsed side inlet culvert end. Cut off 12' and reinstall 18"x12' corrugated metal pipe (cmp) with band and flapgate. Haul in two loads of clay and one load of rip rap..	$4,000 - $5,000
Clay County Ditch No. 2	Spring Prairie	30	Missing flapgate. Cut off 1' cmp and install new 24 flapgate.	$1,500 - $2,000
Clay County Ditch No. 9	Elmwood	6	Damaged side inlet. Cut damaged cmp and add 18"x8' cmp and remount flapgate.	$1,000 - $1,500
Clay County Ditch No. 47	Moorhead	15	140’ concrete liner has fallen into channel. Need to put repair plans together to solicit bids	$5,000
Clay County Ditch No. 69	Glyndon	35	Three damaged 18" flapgates. Cut off 1' cmp, clear one side inlet, and clean two outlets to allow flapgates to open.	$4,500 - $5,500
Pj. 16, Stinking Lake Detention	Cuba	30	Debris plugging water control structure. Hire contractor to remove debris.	$2,000 - $3,000
Pj. 16, Stinking Lake Detention	Highland Grove	36	Scour hole along approach. Haul in fill material.	
Pj. 79, Wolverton Creek	Wolverton/Holy Cross/Roberts	Misc.	Brush mow and spray several locations for willows growing along channel.	$2,500 - $3,000
Pj. 79, Wolverton Creek	Wolverton	10	Seven standing dead trees in buffer and four more that have fallen down. Knock down trees and haul or burn in field.	$4,000 - $6,000

Motion by Affield to approve repairs as presented, **Seconded** by Steffl. **Motion Carried.**

Other:

Financial Investment Discussion. Board of Managers discussed financial investments and if adjustments should be made. It was determined Goeden should look at rates for investment accounts and bring proposal to Board of Managers.

Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting Discussion. Board of Managers held their annual CAC meeting on April 16, 2025. Board of Mangers discussed feedback from committee members.

River Keepers 2026 Funding Request. River Keepers requested BRRWD assess $65,000.00 on their behalf in 2026. Goeden will include request in 2026 budget for approval at the Budget Hearing.

Bills. Motion by Affield to approve bills totaling $432,651.56, **Seconded** by Steffl. **Motion Carried.**

Next Regular Meeting. Monday June 9, 2025, at 7:00 PM in the Barnesville office.

President Fjestad adjourned meeting at 9:30 PM.

/s/ William Davis
Secretary