MINUTES OF MEETING
INDIGO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Indigo Community Development District was held on Tuesday, February 18, 2014 at 2:00 p.m. at the Holiday Inn Daytona Beach LPGA Blvd., Boardroom, 137 Automall Circle, Daytona Beach, Florida 32124.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Robert Welsh	Chairman
Ed Bertsch	Vice Chairman
Don Parks	Supervisor
John McCarthy	Supervisor
Tom Leek	Supervisor

Also present were:

Jim Perry	District Manager
Jonathan Johnson	District Counsel
Katie Buchanan	Hopping Green & Sams
Kurt von der Osten	Field Operations Manager
Erin Banks	Counsel for KB Homes (by phone)
Trip Stanly	Blackwater Capital
Steven Greathouse	Consolidated Tomoka
Kevin Bond	Coastoak Group (by phone)
Julio Aponte	Trustee (by phone)
Jamie Rountree	Team Rountree

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS **Roll Call**

Mr. Perry called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS **Audience Comments**

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS **Approval of Minutes of the January 22, 2014 Meeting**

Mr. Perry stated included in your agenda package is a copy of the minutes of the January 22, 2014 meeting. Are there any additions, corrections or deletions?

Ms. Buchanan responded we need to revisit the motion box on page 11 and make sure it is correct.

Mr. Johnson responded we will defer the minutes until the meeting.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Discussion of Supplemental Assessment Methodology Reports Series 1999C and 2005 Bonds**

Mr. Perry stated each of the supervisors has a document in front of them that has a number of tabs. The last tab in section seven, the last part of that is a letter from Hayman Woods dated February 12th and right after that is a letter by Julio Aponte dated February 14th. That letter deals with the process the District is undertaking.

Mr. Julio Aponte left the meeting by telephone.

Mr. Perry stated I am going to try to go through the different methodologies that are included in this. As Jonathan mentioned, the process we would be looking for is to continue this meeting and then the board will consider these reports. Then also to set a public hearing date for sometime early April.

Mr. Johnson stated Jim is going to make an overview of the information and present it to you but we are not asking you to take any action on it today.

Mr. Perry stated section one gives you a brief overview of what each of the reports are. The first report is going to be a status report for the 1999C and 2005 bonds. It has a little historic background. I think you have seen some of this information before. Also included in that report is the England-Thims & Miller development reevaluation report, which provides a basis for reallocation of debt assessments for the two bond series. After that, there is another report, which is a supplemental methodology for the 1999C bond series. That is going to provide for debt reallocation to the undeveloped lands within the District. Keep in mind, the 1999C bonds cover all of the District, the north and south assessment areas. After that, there will be a construction fund close out report or completion report of the construction funds in the 1999C bonds. The dollars related to that is about $180,000 in the construction funds that will be reallocated to all of the lands within the District. The next report is in regards to the 2005 bond series. That provides for the reallocation of debt to the undeveloped lands within the Districts south assessment area. Then you are going to have a construction fund close out report or completion for the $6.8M in construction funds that remain in that 2005 bond series. Those funds will be used to redeem bonds and then the allocation of that redemption will be spread to all of the lands within the south assessment area. It will go to the platted and undeveloped lands.

It is allocated between the two. You will notice that in a lot of these reports the tables will look familiar. They kind of flow from one to another. As you can see, in trying to do just one report encompassing all of this it would be very confusing. We have tried to lay it out, so it is a progression as to what we are doing. Section two is the status report for the 1999C and 2005 bonds. It is for both the north and south assessment areas. Table number one is a summary of the bond series, comparing it to the reevaluated development program. As you can see this is just on the south assessment area. When the bonds were issued in 2005, there was considered to be 4,085 assessable units within that south assessment area. Based upon the reevaluated development program and the ETM report that is attached to this, there is 3,466.8, so there is a reduction in assessment units in the south of about 618 units. If you recall when the 1999C bonds were originally issued, the development program in the south was about 3,200 units. If you go back historically, we had about 3,200 units in 1999. The 2005 bonds were issued. The south assessment units went up to almost 4,100. Based upon the reevaluation report, it goes down to about $3,500 or a little bit less. Table number two shows the impact of the evaluation report to the north assessment area. This is only on undeveloped lands that we are looking at here. It does have some true ups at the bottom. You will see in regards to Eagle Marsh South, Renar, Woodside and Daytona Holdings are true ups due from various entities related to the assessment units that were assigned to their lands and the number of units that were actually platted. In regards to the north, you can see there is not a lot of parcels that are still undeveloped but based upon the development report by ETM, there is approximately 51 single family units in total, 447 multifamily and 200 hotel rooms, along with about 89,000 square feet of commercial acreage. In regards to this methodology, you will see the reallocations and true ups. Based upon that ETM report, we determine the assessable units with each parcel and compare it to the 1999 methodology. We have a reduction of about 69 units on the north. Table three is basically the same type of table but you will see in table three, it is all to the south assessment units. We have the different parcels on the underdeveloped land. Based on the ETM report, there is $2,275 single family units. There is 312 multifamily. There is 245,000 square feet of office. It has 590,000 or 82,000 in commercial square feet. The undeveloped properties go down to 3,000 units. Keep in mind, we have 466 platted lots already down there. The last column is the reallocations in regards to certain properties and number of units that have decreased in total of 618. After that is the ETM evaluation report. It is dated November 8, 2013. I think there were a few minor changes after that but they retained that same date. Page two of that report shows a map of the District and numbers that are referenced to the parcels to the right. It does provide a parcel identity or name, the proposed use, the total acres, wetland impacts and then what type of product is associated with each parcel. On the far right hand column is the source. You will see the source, ACOE, is the Army Corp. of Engineers permits. The St. Johns Water Management District is WMD. Environmental Services, Inc., ESI, is some of the sources they utilized to compile this information. On some of these it is not only just one of those sources but could be several sources. The one thing to keep in mind in regards to this is if you recall when ETM started this project, there was question about a number of parcels and the wetland impacts on that. The bondholders hired Environmental Services, Inc. to do a study of that and determine what the wetlands really were. When you see the reference to ESI there, those are based upon that report that was done last year. That information is pretty current. After that page it will show the parcel outline, the total acres for that parcel, wetland impacts, etc. There is a map of the whole District. You have that for each of the parcels. When ETM did theirs, they laid out the parcel numbers all over the place. What we tried to do was show going from north to south and breaking it up. This is just a status report. Under section three is the supplemental special assessment methodology report for the 1999C bonds. Keep in mind, what we are doing here is we are reallocating the assessments on the 1999C bonds, based upon the shortfall of development units. We do not affect any of the plats lots in the north or south in this methodology. Those assessments stay the same and debt. Table one of that report gives you historical background of the 1999 development program, where assessments totaled $4,842. When the 2005 bonds were issued, they adjusted the assessable units in the south up to 4,085 and kept the assessable units in the north at 1,588. The increase in assessable units is about to 5,673 units. Currently, based upon the reevaluation report, the total number of units would be 4,957 and the total shortfall of assessable units is 716 but we do have 29 units for a true up. The reallocation is 687 units. Table number two is in regards to the reallocation of debt and true up. At the top is the reallocation of debt in regards to undeveloped lands in the north assessment area. You have the south assessment area and that shows the same information. It has the parcel description, the notes in regards to what parcel it is, the ETM references, the current total assessable units and the 1999 methodology. At the bottom is the summary of the changes based upon this reallocation by entity. In the south assessment area, you will see Indigo Grand

Champion 1-11, LLC. They are going to be allocated an additional 248 units on the lands. Table three is more detail in the north assessment area. It shows the adjustments to each of the different tracts of undeveloped lands. Table four is also in the south assessment area. It breaks it out a little bit differently instead of having the summary on table two, this gives you a little bit more detail in tables three and four. Table five quantifies the reallocation in regards to the north and south assessment areas and the amount of debt to be reallocated to the undeveloped lands. It also shows the remaining units for reallocation in the north and the south and the additional debt per assessable unit allocated to those undeveloped parcels. It also shows the bond balance adjusted total in regards to undeveloped parcels in the north and the south. In regards to the 1999C debt, you will see the debt is quite higher for the north parcels at 3,190 versus the $536. The reason for that was they knew they were going to do another bond issue, so the 2005 bonds are only related to the south area. When those bonds are issued, the north area didn't get any more debt assigned. Table six shows the reallocation of debt in the 1999 bond series in regards to the north lands or north assessment area. You will see the change in debt allocation over to the right, which shows what the adjustments would be made to each of those parcels. For example, the resort parcel has 338.5 assessable units that have been assigned here. The current assigned debt is $771,000. The reallocated assigned debt based upon this is $1,080 for an increase of $308,000. Table seven is just like table six but it is for the south assessment area. You can see the changes in debt allocation to each of those parcels. Table number eight is just the reconciliation of the bond series 1999C debt. This shows what the current assigned debt is, what the reallocated debt is and shows you the delinquent debt service through 2014. It also shows you the total delinquent debt service and also the total past due interest on the right column. Table nine shows the adjustments to assessments. For the north assessment areas, you will sêe there is no change in the allocation of assessments, so there is no increase in your assessments for platted lots. There is an increase in annual assessments per unit for the north for unplatted lands of $13.47 per unit. Then in the south for the platted lots, there is no change in the assessments but for the undeveloped lands, there is a change in each assessable unit of $13.33. After that is the assessment roll. This takes the report and adjusts all of the numbers to each of the platted lots and undeveloped lots within the Districts boundaries. Section five is the supplemental report for the Series 2005 bonds. Table one shows the development program originally for the 2005 bonds and what is being proposed today under the reevaluated development program, a reduction of 618 units. Table two shows the reduction in those units. It shows the different parcels related to those. The one to note at the bottom of that is Indigo Grand Champions is going to have an increase of about 248 units. Table three shows what the impact of that is and how we have to increase the additional debt per assessable unit and the additional debt service related to the undeveloped lands within the south assessment area. We are going to layer on an additional $546 of debt and the debt service will go up by $43 for each of those assessable units. Table four shows the undeveloped lands within the south assessment area. What you will see on the last right column, it will show increases and decreases to the various parcels based upon this reallocation. It totals a negative $.97 and that is just because of rounding. We are just reallocating the debt on these various units. It shows a negative $12.12, which is just rounding. You will see at the bottom here, the additional dollars and increase in annual assessments that will occur. Indigo Grand Champion will have an increase in annual assessments of about $81,000. Table five is a reconciliation of the bonds. As you can see under the south assessment area, the first line item is related to platted lots. There is no past due interest associated with that but with the undeveloped lands, there is approximately $200 of past due interest on those lands. Under tab six is the completion report for the 2005 bonds. We have reallocated the assessments to the various undeveloped lands within the District and now we are going to go in and we are going to collapse the construction funds and those funds will be utilized to redeem bonds. When we redeem those bonds, now we are going to spread that benefit or reduction to all of the landowners in the south area. This report is somewhat incomplete because we do have to get the engineer of record to certify a completion of the project. What you are going to find here is under uses, the original bond funds for construction were approximately $11.8M. We utilized about $5M of those funds and we will put them in these various categories up above. I just don't have that detail broken down right now. There is $6.8M available for redemption. It is really $6,806,000. We typically redeem bonds in an even amount of $5,000. There might be some costs associated with this, so I just assumed we would redeem $6.8M instead of $6,806,000.

Mr. Welsh asked would that change our credit rating?

Mr. Perry responded well, the District doesn't have a credit rating right now. Table one shows the redemption that we are going to apply. Table two shows the construction funds that are going to be applied. It shows the debt allocated to the 466 platted lots and the original debt also to the unplatted lands. It shows what our current debt is. It is reflective in the south area that there was 34 lots that did pay off their debt. Once those lots paid off their debt, they are not going to be credited for this reallocation and the redemption of these funds. That is consistent with what we do in Districts throughout the State. It shows you the amount of funds that are going to be utilized, which is $6.8M and then the adjusted net debt after the redemption, the adjusted debt per unit, the current debt per unit and shows you the reduction in debt for a platted lot would be about $3,800. For an unplatted assessable unit, it is going to be about $1,723. Table three shows you the annual debt service after redemption. The reduction for a single family lot will be $299 and for an unplatted assessable unit, it will be $133. Table four is a benefit analysis showing what the benefit was determined in the original analysis with these bonds. It shows you the adjusted benefit for assessable unit and then in regards to the original debt allocated on a development unit and what it will be adjusted to after this reallocation. After that is a summary of the assessment roll after redemption. This assessment roll here really gives you more detail on the undeveloped lands. If you look at the bottom of this it will show the increase or decrease in assessments by landowners. In regards to Grand Champions after this redemption, it will have a decrease in debt of about $105,000 and a decrease in assessments of about $5,000. After that is the assessment roll, which includes all of the platted lots plus the unplatted lands that are included in table five. It will be the same process in 1999 bonds. We went through the reallocation based upon the ETM report. Then we are going to close out the construction funds and allocate those to the lands within the District. The only report I don't have in here is the 1999C bonds. It is less than $200,000 of reallocation. It would be minor impact with the lands within the 1999C area but we will do a report for that also. There are two letters in the back under section seven. I believe the letter dated February 12th had been provided to you. I know I sent an email to each of you also with it. I don't know if Jonathan has sent out this one to Greenberg.

Mr. Johnson stated I have not.

Mr. Perry stated I just got this yesterday. It is the letter from Julio in regards to the trustee.

Mr. Johnson stated they are saying they are in agreement and they would like us to move ahead as fast as possible with the process. We are not asking you to take any action today.

Mr. McCarthy asked the number of parcels is changing, right?

Mr. Perry responded no. There may be a few parcels that did not have any debt allocated to it previously but those are somewhat minor.

Mr. McCarthy asked so the number of parcels in the north and the south remain the same?

Mr. Perry responded pretty much, yes.

Mr. Johnson stated it is the number of units of those parcels and how they are spread.

Mr. McCarthy asked so if we agree with this study, we are also agreeing that our O&M is going to change?

Mr. Perry responded there is definitely going to be a change in O&M.

Mr. Leek asked what kind of percentage are we talking about of the O&M assessable units?

Mr. Perry responded it is less than 10%.

Mr. Leek asked so we would have 10% fewer properties for the O&M assessment?

Perry responded in theory, we would hope that we would have more payers of the O&M based upon the allocation.

Mr. Johnson stated you will have fewer overall units within the boundaries of the CDD. Right now, many of those units are not paying their annual O&M. To the extent that this allows us to move forward, potentially with a foreclosure or other solution to those properties, which are delinquent in both debt and O&M, we hope the net increase in numbers of people who pay will more than offset the 10% decrease in the amount of units able to pay.

Mr. Leek asked but if nothing changes then we will have 10% less of a budget than we have currently, unless we increase fees?

Mr. Johnson responded right now if you divide your O&M between platted lots, which are predominantly paying and unplatted properties, which are predominantly not paying. The 10% decrease is only on that unplatted, so you will have 10% drop in the number of units in that unplatted area. Most of those units are not paying you a thing right now. When you come to your budget season in August, you are not going to see a 10% drop in the number of units you are currently getting money from today. It is a 10% drop in what you could be getting money from someday out of that unplatted property.

Mr. Leek stated yes but we have to budget on what we are assessing rather than what we are receiving.

Mr. Johnson stated we do, although we have some line items in there to help us deal with that, so maybe we could then drop those line items.

Mr. McCarthy asked these entities that are not paying, for instance Coastoak Group, they support the study?

Mr. Johnson responded I would not necessarily say that. In fact, I think we have a letter from Hayman Woods, who I would say is acting substantially on behalf of the Coastoak Group with some specific objections, which is embodied in the letter you have.

Mr. McCarthy asked so those that are not paying, they are going to sell their land to someone who might pay?

Mr. Johnson responded that is one scenario. If we conclude this process and the trustee directs us to commence foreclosure then that land could be taken from them and sold and marketed by the District and the bondholders, to someone who would pay.

Mr. Leek asked so technically, we are not going to get anymore or any less cash if nothing changes?

Mr. Perry responded correct.

Mr. Leek asked but we are going to be billing less?

Mr. Perry responded we are going to have to adjust the budget. There will be adjustments to the budget. We made provisions to that three years ago, so we should be okay.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

There being none, the next item followed.

B. Engineer

Mr. von der Osten stated I have one proposal from Rountree on the clearing along Champions Drive between the north entrance back to Tournament Drive intersection. Over the years, the forest creeps into the landscaped areas. Sod doesn't grow. Trees don't grow at all. The oaks and palms intermingle. He has proposed with continuing it to the north entrance at LPGA and clearing a buffer between the forest and our landscaped areas. It is $1,875. We would continue that strip all of the way to the north. It is an item that we undertake every three years to keep the forest at bay.

> On MOTION by Mr. Leek seconded by Mr. Welsh with all in favor the Proposal from Rountree for $1,875 to Clear Along Champions Drive was approved.

Mr. von der Osten asked would you like me to proceed with replacing the LPGA logos in all of the neighborhood monuments?

Mr. Welsh asked how much is it?

Mr. von der Osten responded typically it is like $50 per emblem.

Mr. Leek asked wasn't Consolidated Tomoka going to pay for that when they changed the logo?

Mr. von der Osten responded the topic came up but there was never any conclusion to it.

Mr. Leek stated I think it would be worth making an inquiry and concluding it. I would check with Jeff Andrews. My understanding was when the logo changed, they were going to go ahead and help us make whatever changes we needed to make.

Mr. McCarthy asked how are we doing with the infrastructure with the sprinkler system?

Mr. von der Osten responded we haven't taken any action on it.

Mr. McCarthy asked don't you think we should start moving in that direction?

Mr. von der Osten responded it is something that is a capital expenditure that needs to occur. Irrigation repairs are a lot. Some of those are controller related. Some of those repairs would go away but it would be less than half on the irrigation side because much of the irrigation repairs are the lines and the heads. We will always have those expenses. We are actually looking at the brains of the system. We do have timers go out. We have labor costs involved because it takes much longer to do inspections than going to an up to date system. The brains are probably 15 years old out there.

Mr. Rountree stated yes and in some spots even more.

Mr. Welsh asked what are we looking at cost wise?

Mr. Rountree responded it depends on the system that the board approves. If we take it to the highest level of current irrigation possibilities, it is going to be one cost. If you took it to automatic then that is going to be substantially less cost but it is not going to cure all of your problems. As a board, the first you need to have in front of you are the options. Let me put it together in an actual proposal and review it with Mr. von der Osten and then when he thinks it is ready he can submit it to you. It can go from $50,000 to $100,000. It depends on what you want.

Mr. Perry stated we have looked at this before. I know you have some cost estimates. When you do that think about phasing it.

Mr. Rountree stated by shear definition, it would end up being phased because of the way our power is located out there, we are going to basically pull off of the same cans.

Mr. von der Osten asked how large a phase are you talking about? A three year implementation period?

Mr. Perry responded I would think so.

Mr. Welsh asked could you make something up for us?

Mr. Rountree responded yes. I don't know if I can have it by the continuation meeting but I can certainly have it by the next scheduled meeting. All of that needs to be re-priced because it has been seven years.

Mr. von der Osten stated we are aware that the stone at the interchange has faded, especially on the north side. The proposal to replace all of the stone at the interchange is approximately $9,000.

Mr. Perry stated remember, we have a cost sharing on that, so the actual cost to the District will be $4,500.

Mr. von der Osten stated the City completed the repairs on the weir.

Mr. Leek asked is that satisfactory to you?

Mr. von der Osten responded we will see when tropical storms come through how it holds up. There was a streetlight taken out this morning. The electrician has already removed the pole and capped the wires. It happened at the entrance of International Golf Drive.

Mr. Leek stated I noticed on the way out the City is working on the pavers at the entrance from LPGA to Champions.

Mr. Parks asked is the $9,000 for both sides?

Mr. von der Osten responded yes.

Mr. Parks asked so it would be $4,500 if we did one side and half of that would be $2,200?

Mr. von der Osten responded right.

C. Manager

There being none, the next item followed.

D. Field Operations Manager

There being none, the next item followed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor's Request and Audience Comments

Mr. Leek asked did you get the transaction done yet for the resort parcel?

Mr. Trip Stanley responded no. We are still having difficulty getting there. Part of it has to do with the letters that you saw today. You obviously saw Hayman Woods objection letter from last week. I have not seen a copy Aponte's rebuttal letter, so I would like to see a copy of that. The resort parcel is clearly one piece of a much larger puzzle, so I don't get to dictate what Adam chooses to do or not to do relative to his desires to sell everything globally. As we try to settle what Northwest 21 is about, clearly the ETM report materially changes the deal as it allocates more hotel units and more debt to the parcels. As it comes down at the end of the day when we true up after we plat, so our plans that are ready to be submitted upon acquisition show 151 single family lots.

Mr. Welsh stated I had 148 lots.

Mr. Trip Stanley stated 148 is what we originally thought. We are able to get 151 with the caveat that the City of Daytona agrees. When we plat that, we have to true up the balance of the units being taken out. We are always operating prior to December on 251.9 units, so we will just use a round number of 100 units. Now it is 338, so now it is a true up of 187 and if you times that by $3,200, so now my true up is double. It has gone from $300,000 to $600,000. That is a material change that the ETM report that Adam objected to materially impact our deal and make it much more difficult. Our plan is to close with GC Land, which is the owner of that parcel upon the de-acceleration of the debt because if you remember they accelerated the debt on all of their holdings. He can't deliver clear title to me with accelerated debt. His plan is to pay off all of the a rears and penalties that you had agreed to and therefore, that would bring Northwest 21 current but the bondholders have to say fine that the acceleration no longer applies to that parcel. As soon as I get that in writing from the bondholders then we are prepared to push towards closing. Internally, now he and I have to resolve this variance of $300,000 if you all approve the ETM report. We have some financial challenges to overcome associated with what ETM is proposing relative to the treatment of Northwest 21 in that report. D.R. Horton, who we will sell to has required a minimum of 60 feet wide by 125 feet deep. Some of them are 72 feet wide. Some of them are 165 feet deep, so the minimum is 60x125 but the average is actually better. There are a lot of deep lots. There are some wider lots but that is the bare minimum I have to deliver to them, so their product type will fit on those lots. Our contract with them is we are required to do all of their site work for them. I can't start site work until we close. I am at a stage right now that either this deal is going to work or its not going to work. I am hoping for resolution. I think everyone wants resolution here.

Mr. Johnson stated I have sent to you and Adam an electronic copy of Julio's letter.

Ms. Erin Banks asked is the public hearing in April going to be set today? Is the meeting going to be continued and then the hearing set at a later date?

Mr. Johnson responded our plan today is to select a date to continue today's meeting. Our hope is to do that the first week of March. If we can do it on March 4th as the continuation, which would be the date that we plan to adopt the resolution declaring assessments and the resolution setting a public hearing. Given the 30 days notice, we would then look to set that public hearing for the week of April 8th.

Ms. Erin Banks stated what we have been looking at are platted lots in the south. We have reviewed both the completion report and the 2005 assessment report as it relates to those platted lots. We don't have an objection. I just wanted to be able to put together a timeline to figure out when we can come to completion.

Mr. Julio Aponte stated I think the letter is pretty self explanatory. From the bondholders perspective, they are just looking to get this done as quickly as possible and to normalize the situation at Indigo.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Approval of Check Register**

Mr. Perry stated included in your agenda package is a copy of the check register totaling $57,589.29.

On MOTION by Mr. Welsh seconded by Mr. Bertsch with all in favor the Check Register was approved.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Financial Statements as of January 31, 2014**

Mr. Perry stated included in your agenda package is a copy of the financial statements as of January 31, 2014.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Other Business**

There being none, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Next Scheduled Meeting – 3/26/14 at 1:00 p.m. @ Holiday Inn**

> On MOTION by Mr. Welsh seconded by Mr. Leek with all in favor to Cancel the March 26, 2014 Meeting & Set Meeting for April 2, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. at the Holiday Inn Daytona Beach LPGA Boulevard, Ballroom, 137 Automall Circle, Daytona Beach, Florida 32124 was approved.

> On MOTION by Mr. Welsh seconded by Mr. Leek with all in favor the Meeting was Continued to February 26, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. at the Holiday Inn Daytona Beach LPGA Boulevard, Boardroom, 137 Automall Circle, Daytona Beach, Florida 32124 was approved.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Adjournment**

Secretary / Assistant Secretary

Chairman / Vice Chairman