



COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
CANNABIS COMMISSION



BLDG., #1341, Asencion Ct., Capitol Hill
P.O. BOX 500135 Saipan, MP 96950
Email: info.cnmicc@gmail.com
Phone: (670) 488-0420

A regular meeting and public hearing of the CNMI Cannabis Commission will be held on **Thursday, August 31, 2023, at 1 P.M.** at the office of the CNMI Cannabis Commission Conference Room at Ascension Ct. Bldg. 1341, Capitol Hill, Saipan.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum
- III. Consideration and adoption of Agenda
- IV. Consideration and adoption of Minutes of prior meetings
- V. Public Comment
- VI. Public Hearing
- VII. Chair Report
- VIII. Old Business
 1. Revision of application
 - Amended Individual History Form with the addition of notary requirement; discussion and voting
 2. Fees:
 - Determination of application and license fee charges; discussion and voting
 - Charge accounts and codes; discussion and determine next steps
 3. Update Processor applications: solventless/solvent based
 - Amended processor and application forms; discussion and voting
- IX. New Business
 1. New premises inspection letter; discussion and voting
 2. Develop regulations for abandoned applications and amend §180-10.1-350 Withdrawal (a&b); discussion and voting
- X. Treasurer's Report
- XII. Executive Session
 1. Commission Business
 - Interview of Managing Director applicants
- XIII. Adjournment

Copies of this notice and agenda have been posted at the Administration Building Entrance Hall, House of Representative Entrance Hall, Senate Entrance Hall, and www.cnmicc.com, the CNMI Cannabis Commission's official website.

Written comments on the agenda may be submitted to the office of the CNMI Cannabis Commission located at Ascension Ct., Bldg. 1341, Capitol Hill, Saipan or emailed to info.cnmicc@gmail.com on or before the meeting date. Oral testimony may also be presented during the meeting on Thursday, August 31, 2023.

**CNMI Cannabis Commission
Regular Session Meeting Minutes
August 31, 2023**

I. Call to Order

Chair Palacios called the CNMI Cannabis Commission's meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., which was held at the Office of the CNMI Cannabis Commission Conference Room located at Ascencion Ct., Bldg. 1341, Capitol Hill, Saipan.

II. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum

The chair introduced the following individuals present:

Commissioner Journie Hofschneider [Vice Chair], municipality of Tinian;
Commissioner Thomas Songsong [Secretary], municipality of Rota;
Acting Managing Director Erik Basa;
Executive Secretary Natasha Palacios; and
Legal Counsel AAG Keisha Blaise.

The chair indicated that Commissioner Juan Iguel [Treasurer], was absent and excused as he was involved in preparations for a family funeral.

The executive secretary then called roll of the commissioners: Commissioners Songsong, Hofschneider, and Palacios were present, and quorum confirmed. Commissioner Iguel later joined the meeting during the chair's report.

III. Consideration and adoption of Agenda

Vice Chair Hofschneider motioned for approval of today's agenda, seconded by Secretary Songsong. All commissioners voted in favor of the motion; motion carried.

IV. Consideration and adoption of Minutes of prior meetings

The secretary had no prior meeting minutes to offer for adoption and motioned to table this agenda item to the next meeting, seconded by the vice chair. All commissioners voted in favor of the motion; motion carried.

V. Public Comment

The chair opened the floor for public comment. There were no members of the public for public comment.

VI. Public Hearing

The acting MD reported there were no applicants ready for licensing determination.

Chair Palacios asked the acting MD about the two other applicants (AIPs) and if he had communicated with them. The acting MD replied that one AIP applicant is still working on completing requirements and being that he is also an existing licensee, he is also currently preparing for license renewal due on September 30th.

VII. Chair Report

The chair shared information with Commissioners Hofschneider and Songsong that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services called for the re-scheduling or the re-classification of marijuana from a schedule I substance to schedule III through a memo to the Drug Enforcement Administration dated August 29, 2023, consistent with U.S. President Joe Biden's directive to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services... and expressed that this is in line with the commission's plan to expand and grow the industry in a way that is manageable and not end up poisoning our own well; this is good news for the industry as a whole in that once it is declassified and falls under schedule III, which is considered less likely for abuse and also with some medicinal attributes, can be seen where it will go as far as inter-island [transport] and export.

The chair said that as far as a laboratory is concerned, he spoke with Sylvan [The DLNR Secretary regarding the hemp industry] and what was suggested to avoid diversion from federal guidelines, the aspects of it, is that the commission can enter into a Memorandum of Agreement with DLNR and basically designate the cannabis commission to administer, oversee, and put up policies and procedures in regards to laboratory; the two different types would come into play based on the processor process, which is the solventless and solvent-based cannabis processing, as far as lab testing is concerned, and how the commission can go about putting up the regulations; Commissioner Songsong brought the institutional knowledge from the beginning and is diligent and updated with information regarding processing itself, with solventless processing being more user and environmentally friendly and less restrictive compared to solvent-based processing; that is something that would be left up to Commissioner Songsong as to how this would be approached, of course the commission will collectively provide input but this is his wheel and has the expertise on it, he has talked about it and it is only proper, so that is something looking forward; how fast the DEA would go into the declassification of marijuana, that process started back in April, so it has taken HHS three to four months to issue its memo per the president's directive... looking at that same timeline, it could probably be a Christmas bonus for the industry as a whole, but be mindful also that if that happens, competition from Guam, as an example, would then become more realistic in a

faster timeline because right now the reason why they [Guam] has been stagnant for the last fifteen or sixteen years is because it is just that they are trying to get around the different requirements; as an example, doctors in Guam do not want to recommend marijuana use because it may jeopardize their DEA license for prescription [drugs], authorization, but with the reclassification of marijuana to a schedule III, it would be easier to do and less restrictive, if anything, it would be more revenue generating for them...

Chair Palacios then informed meeting participants that Commissioner Iguel is joining the meeting through Zoom, welcomed Commissioner Iguel, and then... [paused; worked through Zoom/audio connectivity]; the chair then updated Treasurer Iguel with what was discussed and acted on in the preceding agendas leading to the chair's report... [paused; Zoom connectivity issue occurred; waited for the treasurer's reconnection]; the chair subsequently continued to update the treasurer...

The chair continued his report, spoke of the managing director's position in which an interview will be conducted today with the applicants that may carry over to tomorrow [September 1, 2023] and concluded that on labor day, the commission will share tent with the Office of the Governor's tent and invited commission staff and commissioners. The chair then asked if anybody had any comments in which there was none.

VIII. Old Business

1. Revision of application

- **Amended Individual History Form with the addition of notary requirement; discussion and voting**

Vice Chair Hofschneider stated that the revised individual history form was circulated to everyone which included a notary section and asked Commissioners Songsong and Iguel if they agreed with the amendment. Both Commissioners Iguel and Songsong agreed with the amended form.

The chair inquired about notary fees, then Secretary Songsong asked if there was a government agency in Saipan that offered notary services other than private businesses.

The chair expressed his reason for raising the question of notary fee is because it is a cost and who would shoulder that cost; or for that matter, as an applicant, his question would be, does the cost of notary of five dollars be inclusive of the overall cost of the license.

Secretary Songsong shared his concern about placing applicants into another situation of seeking notary services; for example, on Rota there are government offices that offer no

charge notary services, not knowing how it works in Saipan, he was once a notary in a government agency that offered notary services for its office, and said that there may be no fees for a government employee of the commission in becoming a notary for the commission, that was just his question and concern about [applicants] paying an additional fee for notary services.

Vice Chair Hofschneider asked if the commission wanted to table this agenda item.

Chair Palacios expressed that he is for it [notary of the individual history form], he was just concerned about additional delays for notary services or an additional incurred cost by an applicant; as little as it may be, is the five-dollar notary fee included in the commission's thousand-dollar fee... and wants to avoid the impression that the commission is lowering fees but adding on a notary fee...

The vice chair raised Commissioner Iguel's previous point that leases or land titles should be notarized. Secretary Songsong indicated that he believes that is a common practice that lease agreements are notarized.

The chair inquired with the acting MD about this new [notary] fee that the commission is creating. The vice chair entered into discussion with the chair... proof of ownership, lease agreement, and individual history form [require notary] ...

The acting MD explained an incident in that an applicant [a particular principal] was required to submit an individual history form, and the question arose where one of the principals requested if he can sign for the individual, and because the individual history form requires a particular principal to indicate whether or not they had a conviction [or prior conviction]; if someone signs for another, it becomes a question of validity of that document, but if it is notarized, then it can assure that the person that filled out that form is the same person that signed it.

The vice chair added to the acting MD's statement that the person did not ask about it, the form was just signed for another person. The acting MD acknowledged and said that he addressed that situation with the individual who had power-of-attorney.

Discussions followed about the notary of the individual history form, authorized representative, power-of-attorney, the individual history form's applicability to each principal, shareholder... notary for cannabis applications because of an incident with a shareholder who indicated that he was not the one that filled out information in the cannabis application... avoidance of commission employees being notary public...

Secretary Songsong expressed that for his part, he is not in favor of adding an extra step to the individual history form and an additional cost.

Chair Palacios asked the vice chair's suggestion who replied that she would like to hear Treasurer Iguel's input because he recommended it for lease documents as well.

The treasurer said his opinion and from experience, he strongly recommends that proper leases be notarized, it protects the commission; the commission asks applicants for financial disclosures and conducts inspections, and having documents notarized, especially a land lease, it solidifies that the commission is dealing with the right people... [Zoom disconnected/malfunctioned].

Vice Chair Hofschneider suggested communication with the treasurer through phone.

Secretary Songsong expressed to the chair and vice chair that being the acting MD recommended the individual history form be notarized for assurance purposes, he would support the acting MD's recommendation if that's how he felt it should be done.

The chair contacted the treasurer via phone and indicated that his meeting participation would be through phone as he keeps getting cut off [from Zoom connection].

The treasurer agreed and continued his comments that the notary is for protection and takes away any delays that may be forthcoming in relation to un-notarized documents, and expressed his belief that notary cost is about twenty-five to thirty dollars today. The treasurer continued to say that he experienced himself while employed at a previous government agency with applicants that did not have their land lease agreement notarized which caused a huge delay and placed the agency in an awkward position... there is a need to set good standards and a model for future members and staff of the commission; his intention is not to place an additional cost on applicants and concluded that he believes it is normal practice that lease agreements or important documents are notarized to show validity and to ensure that the people that signed those documents are liable.

The chair asked the treasurer if he recommends the commission implement a notary requirement to the individual history form. The treasurer acknowledged that was his recommendation. The chair then asked if anybody else had something to say about the matter. A brief discussion followed on the notarization of inaccurate or falsified documents and then the chair asked if there was a motion on the matter.

- Vice Chair Hofschneider motioned for approval of the proposed change to the individual history form to include a notary section, as well as to add that

requirement on the application appendices, specifically for the ownership or lease documents requiring notary, seconded by Secretary Songsong. All commissioners voted in favor of the motion; motion carried.

2. Fees:

- **Determination of application and license fee charges; discussion and voting**

Vice Chair Hofschneider requested this agenda item VIII (2) be tabled for now and to move to the next agenda item.

Chair Palacios acknowledged, tabled this agenda item, and moved to the next agenda item VIII (3).

- **Charge accounts and codes; discussion and determine next steps**

3. Update Processor applications: solventless/solvent based

- **Amended processor and application forms; discussion and voting**

The vice chair stated that the three amended forms circulated to everyone consisted of the:

- a. Processor endorsement application;
- b. Supplementary form with the proposed changes that Commissioner Songsong provided that was voted on previously regarding solvent-based and solventless extraction and the language on each section to describe equipment and compounds used; and
- c. Appendix B, which is associated to the processor, includes the definitions of solventless and solvent-based and notary requirement, and an additional form in case extra space may be needed for processor itemization, which includes the same language as in the endorsement form.

The vice chair expressed that this matter is placed for discussion, voting, and asked if anyone has any comments or questions.

The chair said that he was good with the amendments to the forms. The secretary and Treasurer Iguel also expressed their agreement with the amendments.

Vice Chair Hofschneider indicated that she would update the commission's website information upon everyone's agreement and vote on the amendments to the aforementioned forms.

The acting MD mentioned that with Commissioner Iguel's input about the removal of hand drawings from floor plans, asked the vice chair if the regulations also need to be updated because he reviewed the regulations of its existence.

The vice chair replied that it is not in the regulations and inadvertently failed to mention it and make the changes because she jumped to the notary parts of the applications/forms and did not go back to the hand drawn issue, which is a policy.

The vice chair then revisited the hand drawn issue... reviewed regulations of the requirement... and then said to the acting MD that it was an adopted floor plan analysis; it is a requirement to create the floor plan layout. The acting MD acknowledged.

Chair Palacios inquired that in regard to the floor plan when originally submitted, and then a business grows, down sizes, or the floor plan changes, would that be covered under the, not recalling the specific section in Public Law 20-66, but would that fall under changes in the business...

Discussions followed... any changes to a floor plan layout would require reporting to the commission... hand drawn or computer generated floor plans... the commission has the authority and discretion... consideration to remove hand drawn floor plans, hand drawn was an option for computerless or non-computer users/applicants, consider requirement of computer generated floor plans... floor plan types submitted to the zoning office, same or similar floor plans submitted to the commission, the commission has not received hand drawn floor plans to date... move towards computer generated floor plans was recommended by Commissioner Iguel... add into the regulations... application appendix specifies hand drawn or computerized floor plan... the zoning office accepts hand drawn floor plans...

The chair expressed that now that a notary is required, and now a computerless applicant has to find somebody that can create a computer-generated floor plan, in looking at it as somebody that wants to get into the business or is already in the business where now the commission would require a computer-generated floor plan.

Discussions followed... floor plan layout verification through inspection, comparison with hand drawn floor plan, match with submitted zoning permit floor plan... commission regulations stipulate any changes to floor plans must ensure

zoning approval... hand drawn versus computer generated floor plans, regulations indicate map or sketch... regulatory amendments suggested...

Vice Chair Hofschneider read the regulations related to the subject matter as, “*A map or sketch of the premises proposed for licensure including the defined boundaries of the premises and the location of any primary residence located on the same lot as the licensed premises, and scaled plans or sketch of all enclosed areas with clear identification of walls, windows...*”

Discussions continued on the regulations and the clarification of a map, sketch... consider aligning or consistent with the zoning office’s floor plan types and map requirements...

- Treasurer Iguel moved to table the issue of hand drawn and computer-generated floor plans for now until further notice. All commissioners agreed in mind and spirit [status quo mode].
- The vice chair then motioned for the approval of the amendments made to the aforementioned processor forms without changes on the issue of hand drawn floor plans, seconded by the treasurer. All commissioners voted in favor of the motion; motion carried.

IX. New Business

1. New premises inspection letter; discussion and voting

The vice chair mentioned her circulation of the draft inspection letter for review and asked if anyone had any questions or things to discuss; if not, it is ready to be voted on. Secretary Songsong said that he was okay with it.

The acting MD indicated that the only part that he has concerns with is that the AIP (approval-in-principal) was supported by the motion, adopted, and approved by the [previous] board, and suggested an amendment of that motion to remove AIP and replace it with the inspection notice and to add a little more teeth to that motion as far as an applicant’s non-compliance with the inspection notice and with contacting the commission for an inspection.

The vice chair asked the acting MD for an example of what he is asking for.

The acting MD explained that in the [AIP] motion that the commission has now, which he discussed this with the AAG in regard to his working on the denial [letter], the motion only allows him to deny an application if an applicant fails an inspection; the motion does not cover in the event an applicant does not comply with the AIP, which is to contact the commission for the conduct of an inspection [within the allotted AIP time period].

Vice Chair Hofschneider asked if he meant the abandonment part.

The acting MD acknowledged the vice chair and said that is where it was difficult to clarify the denial because at this point with the AIPs that he is working on denying, that part is unclear.

The vice chair said that she disseminated the proposed regulations for abandonment of application which would allow the termination of an application based on deeming an applicant abandoning the application. The acting MD asked if he could use that... The vice chair indicated that regulation has not gone through the register's thirty-day public comment period...

Chair Palacios expressed to the acting MD that he believes from a previous meeting when the five AIPs [being considered for denial] was spoken of that were already past due, he told the acting MD that he had the authority to use his discretion because he is the one that inspected and saw the progress; the example that was used was the applicant with eighty percent completion and was it eighty-percent since two years ago; if it is eighty-percent, let us not stomp on it, find out what the commission can do to help because they already invested to get to that point of eighty-percent completion, verify if it is something minor as a wall or barrier; if it is something totally beyond the commission's reach, as with the Da Dankery, where they waited for zoning but never submitted an application to the commission, therefore, why is the commission even discussing it; it is not in the commission's responsibility and not culpable in any way, shape, or form because they never submitted an application; it would have been different if they had submitted it and the commission accepted it, then there is a degree of culpability because the commission accepted it, the commission has it in its possession; but in that case, their application was never in the custody of the commission, therefore, the commission does not even need to discuss it, because it was never in the commission's custody, the commission never had it, and because of that, you [the acting MD] have the authority.

The acting MD mentioned that he thinks the note he attained from that discussion was on the issuance of extensions for the AIPs because the discussion was to stop AIP

extensions and once the twelve months is up, then that is it; because he shared with the chair the scenario of that one applicant where... and then the chair allowed him the discretion that if it needs an extension then... Chair Palacios inserted that also and with the other five [AIPs], make contact with them, document it, use discretion and if it is determined that it is really something legit, then again, the commission trusts the acting MD's discretion and is given that trust and authority...

The AAG added that the commission should consider establishing an appeals process to address the decision of the managing director because the regulations say that the application can be terminated unless it can be shown reasonable cause that x, y, and z; perhaps the commission should establish some sort of appeals process of the managing director's decision and that the board will always be the ultimate decision maker.

Vice Chair Hofschneider read the regulations on application abandonment as, *"Upon determination of application abandonment, an official notice will be sent to the applicant's contact information on record; the notice will include the reasons for abandonment, steps that were not completed, and the option for re-application"*; in item number 2, *"an outline of the applicants right to appeal the abandonment status by submitting a written appeals to the commission for its members' consideration"*; in item 3, *"the appeals process, including timelines and required documentation."*

Discussions followed on the regulations relating to application abandonment that covers everything and can be used, and the appeals process...

The acting MD said that was for clarification because he is in the process of working on the denials and is unsure as to having the authority to deny an application for failing to comply with the commission's application process. The chair and vice chair jointly acknowledged that he does have the authority.

The acting MD indicated that the motion says he does but not in this aspect where it is only if an applicant failed an inspection, and in looking into the regulations, it mentioned the commission and not necessarily the managing director.

The vice chair replied that she sees what the acting MD is saying, the regulations do not explicitly say that the managing director can deny an application for any reason.

The acting MD reiterated that the motion does say it is so but only... Vice Chair Hofschneider inserted only for the AIP or inspection, nowhere else it says it explicitly.

The acting MD continued to say that he is leaning towards sending out proposed inspection letters to notify them that if their application is going to move forward to be proposed for denial, however, before that time comes, they will be given the option to withdraw with a deadline provided; if the deadline is not met, the application is going to be proposed to the commission for denial or notification.

Chair Palacios inquired if a delegation of authority would cover the acting MD. The AAG acknowledged that it would and that it is stipulated in the statute of the managing director's duties and responsibilities as needed by the commission, it would be fine.

The chair addressed the acting MD and said the board trusts his decision, he is the one out there and knows those applicants... and if anybody can make a fair assessment, individually, based on what was encountered with them, what was seen, and the overall process, he was there in the frontline, so it is only fair that the acting MD makes the decision; the board trusts his recommendation and will honor his recommendation because he is the one out there; and as far as exposure to liability, as chair, granted the acting MD that authority; if it needs to be in writing, then it will be in writing, but he knows on record at least in the last meeting that the acting MD has the authority on behalf of the commission.

A brief discussion followed which reiterated the development of an appeals process of the acting MD's decision.

- Vice Chair Hofschneider then motioned to approve the new inspection letter [that replaces the AIP letter], which was disseminated to the commissioners for review, seconded by Secretary Songsong.
- The chair reiterated to Treasurer Iguel via phone of the vice chair's motion, seconded by the secretary, to approve the new premises inspection letter, and added for clarification in regards to the authority of the board granting the acting MD to act on the board's behalf using his discretion for approval or denial of applications be it AIPs or the new inspection letter, and further, that the specifics of the process of appeal would be formulated, and then asked all those in favor. All commissioners voted in favor of the vice chair's motion and the authority granted to the acting MD; motion carried.

2. Develop regulations for abandoned applications and amend §180-10.1-350 Withdrawal (a & b); discussion and voting

Chair Palacios indicated that earlier discussions kind of blended into this agenda item on abandoned applications and the amendment to §180-10.1-350 withdrawal...

Vice Chair Hofschneider inserted that it would fall under abandonment which would allow an applicant to appeal...

The acting MD asked the vice chair about the withdrawal part on section (b) where the non-refundable fee was removed and asked why that portion was removed.

The vice chair asked the acting MD if was to allow for refund and then questioned what if an applicant is three-quarters through [the completion process] and then they withdraw, and all the [commission] work was done to get to that stage and stated that the regulations state all the application fees are non-refundable.

The chair added that he thinks the only leeway the commission has in regard to fees, the commission can increase fees and only decrease fees no more than twenty-five percent... it is specific that fees are non-refundable.

The vice chair stated that Public Law 20-66 says that the commission shall assess a non-refundable fee for processing and new applications for any license...

The chair reiterated that the only leeway in regard to anything that has to do with fees is that it can be increased with no limit but there is a limit if fees are decreased not more than twenty-five percent; had this discussion in the last meeting... voted to decrease fees for the three municipalities other than Saipan... it is codified that fees are non-refundable by statute... and then went into discussions on application withdrawals...

The vice chair asked if everyone read the proposed amendment of §180-10.1-350 Withdrawal (a & b) or if she should read it through.

The chair and the acting MD indicated that they read it. The chair then reiterated that as far as refund, which is specific and the commission does not have the authority to do that, the commission has the authority to increase the fee and decrease it but no authority to refund it, that is what he is getting at.

The vice chair said she would add "non-refundable" into the regulatory amendment to the withdrawal portion... that the law says the commission cannot refund anything... the vice chair then asked the acting MD where does it say there was a refund.

The acting MD said that when it is read, it says it can be refunded if it is in the best interest of the CNMI and then read, *“The commission shall not direct the refund in all or in part of any fee or other payment relating to any application unless the commission determines that the refund of the fee is in the best interest of the CNMI.”*

Vice Chair Hofschneider replied that it was stricken-out, it was removed. The acting MD indicated that he wanted to leave the part where it says, *“the application fee is non-refundable.”* The vice chair said that she could insert that statement of non-refundable...

Recess: Chair Palacios asked the members if a short recess can be taken... everyone agreed... the chair called for a fifteen to twenty-minute recess at 2:24 p.m.; the meeting was subsequently called back to order at 2:44 p.m.

The chair then stated that the commission would table or pause for now this agenda item on the development of regulations for abandoned applications and amendment of §180-10.1-350 Withdrawal (a & b) and will go into executive session [agenda item XI (1)] to conduct interviews with the applicants for the managing director position.

X. Treasurer’s Report

The treasurer’s report was somewhat tabled as he was closing up soon and making preparations for his family’s funeral tomorrow...

The acting MD asked Commissioner Iguel if he had results from the zoning board’s meeting last Friday.

Treasurer Iguel replied that he knows that Da Dankery was approved, but as far as the letter that was sent, he has no update yet on the [processor] letter that Commissioner Songsong sent to the zoning office on behalf of the commission, no updates on that yet and will follow-up on it next week; that is all he has and reiterated that he know Da Dankery was approved and that was Mr. Josh Sasamoto that came to the commission’s last meeting and asked what are they going to do now that the commission paused producer licensing and that the commission may receive inquiries from them regarding their application.

The chair and vice chair thanked the treasurer. The chair then reiterated for reference the agenda items that were acted on and tabled in today’s meeting as follows:

- The adoption of prior meeting minutes was tabled;

- The amended individual history form with the addition of a notary requirement was approved;
- The amended processor application/forms were approved;
- The determination of application and license fee charges (agenda item VIII (2)) was tabled;
- The new premises inspection letter (agenda item IX (1)) was approved;
- The development of regulations for abandoned applications and amend §180-10.1-350 Withdrawal (a & b), agenda item IX (2) was tabled; and
- The treasurer's report is pending.

XI. Executive Session

1. Commission Business

- **Interview of Managing Director applicants**

Chair Palacios entered executive session at 3:06 p.m. for the commencement of interviews with applicants for the position of managing director.

The chair subsequently stated that the interview with applicant Ms. Queanna Savanna Sablan concluded and that the next interview with the next applicant will be in fifteen minutes and that the commission will go on recess in the meantime.

The chair called the meeting back to order [recording of time cut-off] and back in executive session to commence the interview of Mr. Mikiotti N. Evangelista; the chair subsequently stated the conclusion of the interview with applicant Mr. Evangelista, exited executive session, and went into a brief discussion with Treasurer Iguel under the treasurer's report, agenda item X.

XII. Adjournment

The chair called recess at 4:51 p.m. and said that the meeting will continue tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m. [Friday].