

CITIZENS PROPERTY INSURANCE CORPORATION

**MINUTES OF THE
ACTUARIAL AND UNDERWRITING COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, September 26, 2023**

The Actuarial and Underwriting Committee (A&U) of Citizens Property Insurance Corporation (Citizens) convened at FSU Turnbull Center, Tallahassee FL, on Tuesday, September 26, 2023,

The following members of the A&U were present:

Chair Carlos Beruff
Josh Becksmith
Vice Chair Scott Thomas
Charlie Lydecker
Fred Strauss (telephonically)

The following Citizens staff members were present:

Tim Cerio
Jennifer Montero
Barbara Walker
Joe Martins
Kelly Booten
Christine Ashburn
Andrew Woodward
Jeremy Pope
Violet Bloom
Mark Kagy
Jay Adams

Call Meeting to Order

Barbara Walker: Good afternoon, and welcome to Citizens' September 26, 2023, Actuarial and Underwriting Committee webinar that is publicly noticed in the Florida Administrative Register to convene immediately following the Finance and Investment Committee and will be recorded with transcribed Minutes available on our website. For those attending today's session through the public link, you are automatically in listen only mode. Panelists, thank you for identifying yourself prior to addressing the committee. Chair Beruff, we have no speaker requests for today's meeting. I will proceed with roll call.

Roll was called and quorum established with Chair Beruff, Governor, Vice Chair Scott Vice Chair Thomas, Governor Becksmith, Governor Lydecker and Technical Advisor Fred Strauss.

Barbara Walker: Chairman, you have a quorum.

1. Approval of Prior Meeting's Minutes

Chair Beruff: Thank you. The Board will entertain a motion to approve the prior meeting Minutes (July 11, 2023).

Governor Lydecker: So, moved.

Fred Strauss: Second.

Chair Beruff: The motion passes. Let's move on and we have Ms. Montero back at the front in the hot seat.

2. Chief Financial Officer Report

a. 2023 Rate Filings Update

Jennifer Montero: Well, I am actually going to turn this one over to Mr. Donovan, our Chief of Actuary, sorry. Chief actuary to go over the rate filing update.

Chair Beruff: Welcome, Mr. Donovan.

Brian Donovan: Good afternoon, chairman, committee members. As Jennifer said, I am Brian Donovan, Chief Actuary at Citizens and I will give an update on the rate filings. On August 18, Citizens received rate orders from the OIR. With two exceptions, the rates were approved as filed. The overall proposed rate change was 13%. 12.2% is what was approved. The first exception, and really the only, I say there are two exceptions. Only one of the exceptions actually impacted the proposed rate and brought it from 13 to 12.2, and that has to do with the competitive rating. If you recall back in March when we first presented the rates, we recommended the maximum amount across the board wherever we could demonstrate that Citizens' rates were much less expensive than the private market. So we recommended 12% across the board. And this recommendation was based on common rating examples that private insurers provide to the OIR and the OIR provided to us. In the order, the Office, you know, did not approve the 12% across the board. They said the information was limited, you know, was too limited, was not broad enough, robust enough. So based on that the order instead of 12% across the board for personal lines primary, all primary risks, all rates will be capped between zero and 12%. And this led to the personal line impact decreasing from 13.1% to 12.3%. And of course, an obvious question as a reminder, how do you get to 12.3% if everything is capped between zero and 12%, and that has to do with the non-primary which I will talk about as well in the minute, but that is a reminder that was capped at 50%. But for a primary risk everything is between zero and 12%.

Chair Beruff: Mr. Donovan, I have a question. If we didn't have glide path and the statutory constraints that we operate under with, what should our insurance rates be?

Brian Donovan: About 55% higher.

Chair Beruff: 55% higher.

Brian Donovan: Yes.

Chair Beruff: So if it wasn't for the laws that we operate under, our policyholder that was paying \$1,000 would be paying \$1,555?

Brian Donovan: That is correct.

Chair Beruff: I just want to be clear on the record. And that is actuarially defensible.

Brian Donovan: Absolutely. It is reinsurance –

Chair Beruff: That is the facts.

Brian Donovan: Yes.

Chair Beruff: Thank you.

Governor Becksmit: What you were told at the Office of Insurance Regulation, was there justification on the primary going from 13.1 to 12.3, which weighed, impacted given what the Chair just highlighted and what you just said. What was -- expand on that a little bit.

Brian Donovan: Sure. So the idea –

Governor Becksmit: So that we understand, thank you.

Brian Donovan: No, no, I think it is good to get clarification on this, it is important. So typically that we do is just the actuarial indicated rate and, you know, we cap those and that is that, and that would be zero to 12%, but per, I think it was Senate Bill 2-A, Citizens was supposed to be noncompetitive as well, but still subject to this capping. And so there were segments of policies where our indication wasn't at the max percent of 12%, you know, if we just looked at as you said, Chairman, the facts, there were certain segments and certain lines of business where it was less than 12%, but we looked at these rating examples, but we, the OIR has, collects these rating examples, common rating examples from everybody, every company who makes a rate filing, they have to include, every insurer includes the same ones. The pre-defined, you know, amount of insurance, 300,000, all these policy characteristics are the same. Every single insurer has to provide the same rating examples. So the OIR provided that so we could see, like for example, if HO3 there was only three of these ratings, or four of these rating examples.

And so based upon that we can look at that at each county look at these rating examples, look at Citizens rating examples so you are comparing to these apples-to-apples hypothetical policies and we could see that based on that, Citizens rates was much lower than the primary, the private companies. So based upon that we went through line by line, line of business, county by county and said, all right, any county where we can see where these rating examples demonstrate that Citizens rates are 50, 60, 70% less, just based upon these rating examples, we

are going to say 12% across the board maximum amount. The Office in discussions with them felt that that was not thorough enough support. Like we are just looking at a handful of rating examples for a specific type of risk and they felt that, you know, they were not comfortable approving 12% across the board based upon that, and that we need to provide much more detail, a more, you know, given the weed much more. And in fact, Jennifer has a rating action related to that that we will talk about to help us get there. Because it is, well, first let me stop there. Did I answer your question?

Governor Becksmith: Yes, but there is a follow up question now that you just made me think of. Did we -- do we possess the ability to address this rate filing to their satisfaction in order to get to the full 13% in this case?

Brian Donovan: At this point we do not, but we have a plan in place, and the fact, Jennifer is going to talk about it at this meeting where we have an action item and an ask to purchase, you know, help from a vendor who has done this sort of work where the idea would be we would be able -- like we used to do this before everything became trade secret, where we would take all Citizens policies, every single Citizens policy and then re-rated in all the different companies' rating manuals. We would go through and actually rate it and that, you know, you can't get more thorough than that, right. You say, here, here are the actual real policies, here is what Citizens charges, here is what every other company charges for that particular risk. So I think that would get us there.

Governor Becksmith: But, so am I thinking about it right that on average we are 55% below the market and Office of Insurance Regulation denied a 13% for a 12.2% because they wanted information that you couldn't -- you weren't able to provide?

Brian Donovan: That is mostly true, but I do need to correct a nuance there. When I say, 55% --

Chair Beruff: Mr. Donovan, the short answer is because we didn't give them weeds, we couldn't get that eight-tenth of a percent, because the reality to me is like, who cares. We are \$55 below the market. So, we should get whatever we ask for, because at the top end we are still 55% below the market.

Brian Donovan: Right. But I need to clarify something real quick because I think it is important. When I say, 55%, we are not 55% below the market. We are 55% below --

Governor Becksmith: Actuarial correct rates.

Brian Donovan: As far as where we are in the market, that varies anywhere from 20 to --

Chair Beruff: 20 to 30%.

Brian Donovan: Much higher. We have seen examples of 100 percent, you know, but there is other considerations there. But that, that was the point of the Commissioner was, look, you read need to nail down how much are you. Clearly how much are you --

Chair Beruff: So, all right, so we didn't have the information because we don't have that dataset because of trade secrets and so forth. So now you come up with a way to get the information and do we have to wait all year or can we pose this information to the OIR in the next few months?

Vice Chair Thomas: OIR come up with something new. How is this not bringing sand to the beach? I mean, this is OIR's information. They have it, they approve every rate filing in this state an every county. How is it that they give us examples, we use those, we submit that and they say, well, you need to give us more data? It is their data.

Brian Donovan: Right. I do believe they will work with us. You know, we have had discussions with them about –

Vice Chair Thomas: We certainly work with them. I don't know about the other way around.

Chair Beruff: I would like to hear if there is any other Board questions before I -- Mr. Cerio has got his hand up. So I am happy to entertain you, Mr. Cerio.

Tim Cerio: Well, with trepidation I cut off CFO Montero, but I do want to say, and I know there is some frustration, this was not an edict. There was a lot of discussion. I do want to say the Commissioner spent a lot of time with us. We went round and round with his team. There were questions. There was an acknowledgment on both sides that there was additional data.

Chair Beruff: I would like to interject a comment. First of all, this is not a critique of OIR.

Tim Cerio: Understood.

Chair Beruff: Let's be clear. The critique is the laws that we have to live by, they're the statutory mandated by the Legislature who had done a fabulous over the last 12 months making significant corrections to the issue of legislation, but the glide path, which is something we all have to work with and exist independent of all of the wonderful things that the Legislature has done for the insurance industry, particularly to Citizens relates is not impactful when it comes to the fact that we have this glide path that we have to, you know, it is like an airplane. You can't just go like this or like this because you have to follow this glide path, and the glide path is killing us because of so many years that we were not able to keep up with actuarial correct billing. So now we are 10 years into this thing and the average is 55%, some are only 25% lower. We are higher and some are 100% as you mentioned, Mr. Donovan. So I want to make sure that there is no, now, when it comes to the information to Governor Vice Chair Thomas' point, if the information that we now have to buy from a vendor is already in OIR'S records, why are you buying it from a vendor if they have the information that Mr. Donovan needs to prepare the proper product for them to give us our maximum rate filings which is handicapped by the glide path to begin with?

Brian Donovan: Well, it is true that they have all the rating manuals, they rely on it, so they have all that information which is trade secret. However, they don't really have the capacity to go through, you can't just look at a rate manual and say, oh this is high or this is low. You actually have to go through a process because rating plans are so different and treatment and different

approaches by each company, you really need to go through and re-rate policies with each other, you know, with all these rating manuals.

Chair Beruff: So to your point then why doesn't OIR go get the vendor that has, that can give them the ability to do that, and then why, why are we given the burden? We know we are right, we know we are right about what we are trying to achieve. So why do we have to spend more money to prove that we are right?

Tim Ceiro: I would just say, Mr. Chair, and I will turn it back over and get out of everybody's way. I think on this product that will be presented, the juice is worth the squeeze because we have to get there. And I would say I am optimistic that, and I mean this, the Commissioner and his staff understand the struggles we have with the glide path, and they understand, and I think they're committed to getting us to where the law requires us to be, which is not only actuarially sound and noncompetitive, it is very, it is slog that they're working with us and we are working our way through it.

Chair Beruff: I can appreciate that.

Vice Chair Thomas: Can I ask a couple of quick questions? When do we put in the rate filing just out of curiosity? The rates, when do we put the request in with the OIR?

Brian Donovan: When did we put the requests in. We started in April is when we started filing.

Vice Chair Thomas: now that it has been approved, when would it go into effect?

Brian Donovan: The effective date now for personal lines is 12/16/23, and for commercial lines, 11/20.

Vice Chair Thomas: And is that typical that it takes eight months, seven months to go through?

Brian Donovan: Now, this was a longer timeline than usual.

Jennifer Montero: Typically, 45 days from the time we file to the time that we have a public rate hearing within that 45 days and we get the order back.

Chair Beruff: Mr. Donovan, to the Governor's point, how much did it cost us in lost revenues per month?

Brian Donovan: I believe that number we estimated to being around \$40 million a month. So really our initial effective date, if everything would have went according to plan and the 45-day, when we say, 45 days, it is not 45 days from the time we file to the time we have an effective date. Forty-five days from the time we file to the time we get their rate order, and for example, for H03 it was 80 days past the 45 days. So our initial effective date for, for personal lines was going to be 11/01. So now it is 12/15. So about a month and-a-half.

Chair Beruff: That cost us \$60 million.

Brian Donovan: Thereabouts.

Chair Beruff: That is normal. The normal is our rates change November 1, is that correct, Ms. Montero?

Brian Donovan: It varies year to year just because different things happen. Like Irma came and disrupted that timeline. COVID disrupted that timeline.

Chair Beruff: But over an average of 15 years our rate increases is in November 1?

Brian Donovan: No, actually they used to be 01/01 and 02/01, but they were for many years, and then for various reasons some of what I just mentioned, it kind of got knocked off of that schedule. And so it doesn't follow, you know, we would love to get back to a schedule where it is 01/01 every year.

Jennifer Montero: We were asked to delay some rate filings in prior years for a couple of reasons.

Chair Beruff: Reasons, reasons.

Jennifer Montero: Reasons.

Chair Beruff: That is all, reasons.

Jennifer Montero: So, it kind of knocked us off in trying to get back on that schedule. We are slowly trying to get there.

Chair Beruff: Is there anything that precludes us from, for filing our rates for February 1 instead of April?

Brian Donovan: That has –

Chair Beruff: Do you have all the data that you need in order to file your rate requests February 1st in '24 to help the OIR have more time to reach their conclusion to help us implement our rate changes in a more timely basis?

Brian Donovan: Well, that would, if I understand what you are suggesting, and I think I do, that basically have another rate increase, another full filing and rate increase that goes into effect before 12 months. Within a 12-month period, right?

Chair Beruff: Well, if we are constantly pushing it back at some point we are going to be 24 months behind if we are constantly pushing the rate increases back by a month or two. So at some point you need to get -- what is it -- the business should have the rate increase should be August 1st or some other number that I had heard previously, August 1st or November. What was the original time that we could raise our rates?

Jennifer Montero: January 1 and February 1.

Brian Donovan: Yes, that is done –

Chair Beruff: Okay, so you are telling me that January, so we have actually moved our rate increases forward?

Jennifer Montero: No, do a full circle.

Chair Beruff: A whole year, right?

Brian Donovan: This is the (INAUDIBLE) but really when you give up three months, you give up three months and there is no getting it back I think, unless you go through, like these indications and rate filings are for annual rates. So, let's say we were supposed to be 01/01 and now that got pushed to 04/01.

Chair Beruff: No, all I am talking about is new policies. If policy, if the rate goes into effect August 1st, it only affects the new policy. It doesn't affect the old policies.

Brian Donovan: No, it affects everyone at renewal.

Chair Beruff: At renewal.

Brian Donovan: Right.

Chair Beruff: So, what. At renewal, it is at the end of their 12 months. It is at whatever that rate is then, who cares.

Jennifer Montero: But that would be the same no matter what date you pick. Wouldn't January be the same way?

Chair Beruff: I am trying to get us income increase to get us to be noncompetitive.

Brian Donovan: Okay.

Chair Beruff: The faster I can raise the rate the faster I become noncompetitive, and I become the insurer of last resort which we are legislating it to be.

Jennifer Montero: Correct.

Brian Donovan: I think the crux of your question is this, the gist of what you want, there is no way of getting around it. This is the answer to what you are getting at, and that would result in going ahead and making the filing and having an additional rate increase proposed, and in effect before 12 months is up. That is the only way to do that.

Chair Beruff: That is fine. I mean, at the end of the day, can you have the rate increase ready to go February 1st? That is the key.

Jennifer Montero: And what happens to the people, do they get doubled?

Brian Donovan: It might not have the effect you are thinking, because the glide path would still be in effect. So somebody is still going to get 12 percent. Now whether -- they're not going to get 24 percent.

Chair Beruff: Well, of course not. And that is not the intent. The intent is not to lose \$60 million like we did this year, that is the intent.

Tim Cerio: And Mr. Chair, on that point I can say, not commenting on whether or not our next rate filing it is approved in total or in part, but the Commissioner and I have had discussions about the 45 days and moving things along more quickly.

Chair Beruff: Well, again, I am not saying that they don't have real things they have to deal with.

Tim Cerio: Absolutely.

Chair Beruff: These data they have to deal with. So if we as good partners can give them the data earlier instead of April, give it to them in February, then doesn't that help us stay on time and not lose \$60 million in revenue.

Tim Cerio: That was the gist of discussion is what do we need to do to get you to the document, get you the information earlier and what steps would you like. Those discussions are ongoing.

Chair Beruff: If I am on this Board, I don't want to be sitting here next year having the same discussion, why did we lose \$60 million in revenue. That was a very long discussion. Anybody else? Mr. Donovan, do you have anything else to say?

Brian Donovan: Regarding this?

Chair Beruff: Governor Vice Chair Thomas.

Board Vice Chair Thomas: A more general question maybe not for this meeting. But I appreciate the legislative changes and I think certainly the stepped glide path we have compared to the 10% when I came on the Board is a significant change and improvement, but it does cap out at 15%. At that cap of 15%, are we ever going to have actuarially sound rates?

Brian Donovan: That is a very good question and I would say maybe, maybe not. There is always--

Chair Beruff: That is a very good answer.

Brian Donovan: Because there is a lot of moving parts and those moving parts are Citizens size, growing, shrinking, where are we at in that process, what are the reinsurance costs. Now, back in 2000 --

Governor Lydecker: Weather.

Brian Donovan: Weather of course, too.

Chair Beruff: There's that.

Borad Vice Chair Thomas: But we do at least have the prospect of eventually catching our tail.

Brian Donovan: Yes, we do. It is not guaranteed, because this question comes up, you know, we have been doing this since 2010, and the first question, like first year or two or three into it we said, oh it is 50% indication and members of the Board were thinking, and this was asked, well, 10% a year, 50%. We will be actuarially sound in five years and there is just too many other moving parts to do that. But some years we get closer than other years, and this year is a particularly higher than, than in the past and with the -- if the legislation that has been enacted does what we think it will do and there is no reason to think it does not, that could have a drastic impact and that could very well get us to where we need to be.

Borad Vice Chair Thomas: You are right. I guess one of the solutions to competitiveness obviously is a better, healthier private market.

Brian Donovan: Right.

Borad Vice Chair Thomas: There is two layers here, there is to tracks here. It is not just ours, but to health of the private market and private premiums. Thanks, Brian, appreciate it.

Brian Donovan: Well, there is one other thing I will make you aware of, changing gears a little bit, but I don't think you will object to this. You know, as you recall we, you know, just as was alluded to, there is this glide path that is increasing and come 2024, we are currently at 12% in 2023, come 2024, that increase is the 13%. And so actually we are filing today, and we talked about this at the Board meeting when we talked about rates, is that now that we are filing to increase that cap from 12% to 13% and that will be effective 02/01/2024 for personal lines, and 03/01/2024 for commercial lines. So we are implementing, pushing that cap up to get us, you know, where we will eventually be at the 15%.

Chair Beruff: All right, thank you. Any other comments? I think it is Ms. Booten's turn at the table.

b. Competitive Rate Comparison Services [AI]

Jennifer Montero: No, I am not done.

Chair Beruff: You are not done?

Jennifer Montero: We had another one. The competitive rate comparative services.

Chair Beruff: I thought that was easy.

Jennifer Montero: No, this is what Brian was referring to. This is going to try and help us get, well, he didn't mention, the differential between what we asked for and what we got. That is about \$23 million a year, that differences, and that is using December 31st, 2022.

Chair Beruff: You need it as an action item?

Jennifer Montero: I will have an action item for this item.

Chair Beruff: How much is it?

Jennifer Montero: It is, it is over three years. It is 800 -- it comes to up to \$276,000 a year. So, it is \$828,000. Over 36 months.

Chair Beruff: And if we get the magic rate increase to the maximum, that that report, or that consultant with help us with. How much do we get, 23 million in revenue?

Jennifer Montero: The difference between --

Chair Beruff: The 276 and we get \$23 million?

Jennifer Montero: Yes. Hopefully. Brian.

Brian Donovan: That is correct.

Governor Becksmith: Just to clarify though, this is going to take, to make sure that we are all--

Chair Beruff: Yes.

Governor Becksmith: That I am understanding correctly. They're going to take the Citizens rate, I am going to keep this real simple, and put them next to 10 different other insurance carriers and that same home, same condo, same whatever it may be, to provide the backup top the OIR to say, hey, this is why, number one, market, we are below market, and two, actuarially sound, this is where it needs to be.

Brian Donovan: Yes, that is the idea. That is good idea, but just --

Governor Becksmith: Right.

Brian Donovan: -- we are going to give them policies, they're going to re-rate them, they're going to give that back to us and then we are going to be the ones who put it side by side and share it with the OIR.

Governor Becksmith: We're sending the policies out. Do you feel confident that if we would have had this six months ago, that we would have been able to get the 13% from the OIR?

Brian Donovan: Based on the discussions with the Commissioner, I would think so. I mean, I can't say 100% certain, but I am pretty certain. I mean, that is kind of how --

Chair Beruff: I got you. Until they move the ball again.

Governor Becksmith: Right, exactly. Well, the question is – but you feel confident that it would have helped?

Governor Vice Chair Thomas: It answers their question.

Brian Donovan: Absolutely.

Governor Becksmith: Part of the question on the table.

Brian Donovan: That is correct.

Governor Becksmith: And the .1 percent we are getting what, eight, \$900,000 on each of those? We are actually getting a million and-a-half bucks on each point, zero point.

Chair Beruff: It is \$276,000 thousand a year for \$23 million additional revenue with the higher rate is what I heard.

Jennifer Montero: Yes. And that \$23 million is based off our enforce last year.

Brian Donovan: Right.

Jennifer Montero: Of course, it is much higher right now he, so that would be the higher number.

Brian Donovan: And in addition --

Chair Beruff: But let me get down into the weeds. It is a three-year contract?

Jennifer Montero: It is.

Chair Beruff: Okay. Is the three-year contract, can we put a clause in that says if we don't save money we don't pay the amount?

Jennifer Montero: We could do that. We can also say that if the OIR rejects this, it is a --

Chair Beruff: I mean, I don't have a problem signing up for three years as long as we are making \$23 million dollars a year. I am good with that.

Governor Lydecker: I would be happy to offer a motion.

Chair Beruff: There you go, please.

Governor Lydecker: **I would make a motion to authorize the staff to contract with I4 Integrated Services for integrated services for a term of 36 months for an amount not to exceed**

\$828,000, let the staff take whatever appropriate steps necessary to make sure this gets done, and then subject to Chair Beruff's comments that staff has already accepted.

Chair Beruff: Do we have a second?

Fred Struss: **Second.**

Chair Beruff: We have a second. All those signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Beruff: **The motion carries**, thank you, it is out of committee. All right. Thank you. Ms. Booten.

3. Chief Operating Officer Report

a) Product Updates – September 2023 [AI]

Kelly Booten: Good afternoon, I have one product update, and this is to codify some potential conflicts between general provisions that apply to all insurers, and more specific provisions that apply to Citizens. In the 2023 regular session there were additional provisions passed that placed restrictions on cancellation or non-renewal policies with open claims or unrepaired damage from a covered claim. Additional restrictions may be applied under administrative rules as well. Conversely, Citizens enabling statute provides eligibility requirements for Citizens' policies, including flood insurance when required in a maximum (INAUDIBLE) coverage limits. So, what our proposal here is that when there is a conflict between non renewing for unrepaired damage and the maximum coverage limits, that we leave the policy on at a limit below the 700,000 or the one million, do not apply the inflation factor, and then when the policy comes out from underneath the unrepaired damage clause, then it would get non renewed. For the flood coverage we are proposing that because the flood situation can be cured by the policyholder, that we none renew if flood coverage is not in effect, and then if the consumer gets their flood coverage, then they would be allowed back in.

Governor Lydecker: All right, I think it is pretty straightforward and kind of administrative.

Kelly Booten: May I read the motion?

Governor Lydecker: Please.

Kelly Booten: **If approved, staff recommends the committee approve changes to Citizens' product guidelines forms and supporting documents to clarify Citizens actions for policy eligibility and non-renewal as described in the product updates, September 2023 action item. Authorize staff to make any appropriate or necessary action consistent with the product updates, to include filing with the Office of Insurance Regulation system changes, updates to supporting documents, applications or forms and other relative activities.**

Chair Beruff: **Board is willing to entertain a second.**

Governor Lydecker: Did I hear a first? **I will offer a first.**

Borad Vice Chair Thomas: **I will second.**

Chair Beruff: All those signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Beruff: **The motion carries.** Thank you, Ms. Booten. And I think that is about it. Any new business? Comment on the last subject that we discussed. Will you put it as a policy that as long as that this new contract that we just made annually we would like to see the results of how much money we think we made as to how much money we paid on an annual basis, please? Even if I am not here anymore, you can bring it up.

Kelly Booten: Yes.

Chair Beruff: Thanks. All right. Somebody adjourn this meeting.

Governor Lydecker: I make a motion to adjourn.

Chair Beruff: So moved. We are done, thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded.)