

OKLAHOMA ABSTRACTORS BOARD
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
April 16, 2024

1. A special meeting of the Oklahoma Abstractors Board (OAB) was called to order by Chairperson Scott Ward at 10:00 a.m., at the OLERS Conference Room, 421 NW 13th Street, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
2. Sue Ann Loggains called the roll. Attending were: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Absent: Darin Kent
3. The Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the OAB, conducted on March 19, 2024, were reviewed. Sue Ann Loggains noted a correction that was needed because she had called roll. A motion was made by Ms. Ringo to approve the minutes with the correction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lower. Motion carried.
Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.
4. **Chairperson's Report - Scott Ward:** Mr. Ward reported that he had been working with the Executive Committee and handling business as it arises.
5. **Administrator's Report (Board Report):** Ms. Smith reported that progress was being made with online licensing. Ms. Harper is going through training and testing the system. An outside user has also been recruited to test the system from the user side. Go live date is tentatively set for the middle of next month which would be good because license renewals are slower during the summer. Ms. Smith also announced that she would be out for vacation the following week.
6. **Committee Reports.**
 - a.) **Budget and Finance – Jeff Mapes:** Mr. Mapes gave an update on the budget for February. The annual budget is still \$303,532.00 with encumbrances of \$41,840.224, which gives us a total Year-To-Date Encumbrances and Expenses of \$224,504.59 and a variance of \$79,028.41. The revenue for the month of March was \$35,385.00 and expenses were \$23,703.24 which leaves us with an ending cash balance of \$1,031,273.68. After review and discussion, Mr. Mapes made a motion to approve the report as presented. Second by Ms. Ringo. Motion carried.
Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Mr. Ward reminded everyone that Ms. Smith had sent out the proposed budget for FY25 to give plenty of time for review before it's on the agenda for the month of May.

- b.) **Rules and Regulations – Randy Coffman:** Mr. Coffman reported that the rule has been submitted to the legislature but hasn't been acted on as of yet. Ms. Smith stated that rules almost always are dealt with at the last moment. Ms. Loggains asked when the deadline was for action and Ms. Smith replied that they had until the end of session which is the end of May. Mr. Coffman stated that even if the legislature doesn't act, the Governor can approve them.
- c.) **Licensing and Testing-Rex Koller:** Mr. Koller reported that since the last board meeting, four people had taken the test and all four had passed. The next testing date is May 1st at the Basic Abstractors School and May 16th at the OAB offices.
- d.) **Inspections-Katherine Smith:** Ms. Smith reported that there had been six inspections since the last board meeting. In the packet is listed the inspections and recommended action from the Enforcement Committee. She asked for any questions, but if there were none, for a motion to accept the inspection reports as presented and approval of the action recommended by the Enforcement Committee. A motion was made by Ms. Ringo. Second by Mr. Coffman. Motion passed.
Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Consent Orders: Ms. Smith reported that there was one consent order in the packet related to a revisit inspection at Eufaula Abstract. The company had made significant improvement since their official inspection, but still had some indexing errors. The company agreed to the proposed fine of \$300 and signed the consent order so she asked for a motion to accept the consent order, authorize the Chairperson to sign off on it, and officially close the matter. Mr. Coffman pointed out that there was an error related to the county on the order so the motion was amended to include the correction. A motion was made by Mr. Lower. Second by Ms. Ringo. Motion passed.
Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Mr. Ward stated that this was a revisit and the improvement shown by companies being revisited has been significant and is working well.

- e.) **Enforcement Committee Reports-Jeff Lower:**
Applications for Licenses: Presented to the Board for approval was a list of applicants for abstract licenses or renewals, which are set out in the attachments hereto. A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve all the licenses presented, subject to administrative review and to make sure all compliance issues were met, and appropriate fees paid. Second by Ms. Loggains. Motion passed.
Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.
Abstention: Ms. Ringo, Mr. Koller, and Ms. Loggains abstained from those licenses related to their employer's businesses.

Renewal of Certificate of Authority (With No Changes): Presented to the Board for approval was an application for renewal of Certificate of Authority with their rate sheet by AAA Abstract Company (Adair), Adams Abstract Company (Leflore), Alfalfa Guaranty Abstract Company (Alfalfa), and American Eagle Title Insurance Co. dba Union-Creek Abstract Co. (Creek). A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the application. Second by Mr. Coffman. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Renewal of Certificate of Authority (With Fee Changes): Presented to the Board for approval were applications for renewal of Certificate of Authority with their rate sheet by Dewey County Abstract Company, Washington County Abstract dba Southern Abstract Co., Woodward County Abstract Company. A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the applications with the exception of Woodward County Abstract. Second by Ms. Yates. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Mr. Koller asked about the rate sheet for Woodward County Abstract Company because the fees for final title reports and final abstracting were higher than the lowest extension rate for platted land on page one. After discussion, the board made the decision to send the matter back to the enforcement committee for review. A motion was made by Ms. Yates to do so. Second by Mr. Koller. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Mr. Ward commented that the standard procedure for the Enforcement Committee in these types of situations is to return to the applicant and ask them for justification for whatever is creating the issue.

New Certificate of Authority: Presented to the Board for approval was an application for a New Certificate of Authority by Smith Brothers Abstract & Title Co., LLC (Cimarron). Ms. Smith reported that while performing the inspection, she did go to the Court Clerk's office and talked with the Clerk who stated that an individual from the applicant had been in the court clerk's office and spent a significant amount of time pulling files and reviewing records.

Ms. Loggains stated that she had been trying to figure out who owns the company on the application and it seemed that there were a few issues with the partnership companies owning it. She asked if it mattered that several of the companies listed as a partner in the ownership entity were not in good standing with the Secretary of State's office.

Ms. Smith responded that the only company that is reviewed is the one applying for the COA. Ms. Loggains asked if it mattered that there were companies in ownership of the company applying for the COA that were not in good standing with the Secretary of State. Ms. Scimeca stated that it didn't and that as long as the main one applying for the COA, we are okay.

The floor was opened for comments from both the existing COA holder and applicant. There were none.

A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the amended rate sheets. Second by Ms. Loggains. Motion passed.

Yeas: Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Abstention: Ms. Ringo and Mr. Koller abstained from voting as the applicant is related to their employer's businesses.

Application for Renewal of Permit to Build: Presented to the Board for approval was an application for a Renewal of Permit to Build by Enterprise Land Title Data of Oklahoma, LLC (Oklahoma). A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the application. Second by Ms. Yates. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Lisa Yates, Jeff Mapes, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Application for Renewal of Permit to Build: Presented to the Board for approval was an application for a Renewal of Permit to Build by Oklahoma Digital Abstract, LLC dba Delaware County Abstract. A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the application. Second by Ms. Ringo. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Application for Renewal of Permit to Build: Presented to the Board for approval was an application for a Renewal of Permit to Build by Lawyers Title of Oklahoma, LLC (Pottawatomie). A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the application. Second by Ms. Yates. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Application for Renewal of Permit to Build: Presented to the Board for approval was an application for a Renewal of Permit to Build by Lawyers Title of Oklahoma, LLC (Grady). A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the application. Second by Ms. Yates. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Application for Renewal of Permit to Build: Presented to the Board for approval was an application for a Renewal of Permit to Build by Mod Marshall, LLC. (Carter). A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the application. Second by Ms. Yates. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Application for Renewal of Permit to Build: Presented to the Board for approval was an application for a Renewal of Permit to Build Chicago Title Oklahoma Co. (Canadian). A motion was made by Mr. Lower on behalf of the Enforcement Committee to approve the application. Second by Ms. Yates. Motion passed.

Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.

Abstention: Ms. Ringo and Mr. Koller abstained from voting as the applicant is related to their employer's businesses.

7. **Requested Agenda Addition – Discussion Regarding Enforcement Committee**

Procedures: Mr. Ward presented the agenda item and stated that it was something that had been requested to be included on the agenda and that it was an item only for discussion. No vote or action would be taken as part of the discussion. He pointed that the Board members had in their packets, the procedures rules for the committee. He called their attention to section E of the rules and their action abilities. One of them states that the committee can suggest action in a situation and that has to be taken to the Board for approval, but the other is that the committee can seek an informal resolution which is what he believes is being questioned. They can also seek further investigation and hold that file while awaiting further information. Also included are the responsibilities of the investigators. He opened it to the Board for discussion.

Ms. Sue Ann Loggains stated that, possibly because she's never been a member of the Enforcement Committee, she didn't have understanding of what it meant to attempt an informal resolution of an allegation. She feels that it should be part of the process to get input from both parties involved in the complaint to get both sides. Then a resolution is agreed to by both parties rather than someone just being told what to do. She asked for the agenda item because she wanted to be sure that the Enforcement Committee isn't overstepping.

Mr. Ward stated that the Enforcement Committee doesn't only act on complaints. They also review renewals and other items. Therefore, it's not always a situation where there are two sides to an issue and it applies to everything they do. There are all kinds of informal resolutions such as with the rate sheet that was pushed back to the Enforcement Committee for review. There has also been times when board members have been given leeway to act in an informal manner in certain situations.

Ms. Smith stated that yes, there have been times when board members have acted on behalf of the Board. She gave an example of Mr. Luttrull going to a county that was struggling with completing orders in a timely manner. He visited the company and had a discussion with them and tried to help them find a pathway to resolve their issues. She has also gone to companies where there hasn't been a formal complaint at the direction of the Enforcement Committee to have a discussion where's she's offered help with processes and procedures to help improve efficiency.

Ms. Loggains stated that she felt that with the mention of an Investigator that she thinks that maybe the Chair of the Enforcement Committee should be more involved with the resolution. She recalled that Mr. Luttrull had gone and Ms. Terri Parrish had gone to companies. It should be left up to the Executive Secretary to be the person to find the resolution. It should be left to a board member.

Ms. Smith clarified that when Ms. Parrish visited companies, she did so as the Inspector as an employee of the Board, not as a board member. She also stated that when she was hired by the Board, the Director and Inspector positions were combined and she now holds both of those roles under the title State Administrator of Abstracting.

Mr. Ward added that the Inspector is not the one who makes a recommendation on what needs to be done. It is the decision of the Enforcement Committee. Ms. Smith said that she doesn't make any kind of recommendation to the committee. She collects the information and leaves it up to the committee to decide what needs to be recommended although she does give historical information related to what's been done in the past in similar situations.

Mr. Lower stated that as Chair of the Enforcement Committee, he views what it going on in the current situation, what the background of the company is and have there been ongoing issues, and how does that match up with the law. There is a concerted effort to avoid overstepping what's allowed in the rules. And, unless there is a written complaint, the committee tries to err on the side of keeping the matter private to the committee. This is a general outline of how things go within the committee.

Mr. Ward stated that when he first started, he also struggled with what goes on with the Committee, but agrees that part of the benefit of having a smaller committee is that matters can be addressed confidentially and informal resolutions can be sought which wouldn't be the case with every single thing going directly to the Board for discussion before a resolution can be sought. He feels that while the Director does a great job of onboarding board members, there is room for improvement when it comes to committee involvement. Eventually, all board members will spend some time on the committee.

8. **Requested Agenda Addition – Discussion Regarding Cease and Desist Notification Sent to Adams Abstract Company:** Ms. Scimeca pointed out that this item was a request to be put on the agenda. There has been no formal complaint filed in this matter, nor notice given, and does not fall under the Administrative Procedures Act.

Ms. Sue Ann Loggains addressed the Board as a business owner, not as a member of the Board.

Ms. Yates asked whether, as a board member, Ms. Loggains should be addressing the Board at all. Ms. Scimeca replied that it was a unique situation because it was a requested agenda item only for discussion for which the Executive Committee (Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary) have discretion over. It was approved to be on the agenda and the Chair has allowed Ms. Loggains to be part of the discussion.

Ms. Yates stated that doesn't really answer the question. She said that if this matter goes further and ends up being reviewed from action by the Board, shouldn't Ms. Loggains recuse herself. Ms. Scimeca replied that is where the difficulty lies because a formal complaint hasn't been filed and this isn't a hearing, it's kind of like putting the cart before the horse. If it went to a formal hearing, she would have to recuse herself as a board member, but at this point, we're not there.

Ms. Loggains thanked the Board for letting her speak. She said she thinks that by not speaking a year ago in March 2023 when they received their first email, it caused things to escalate. In 2023, Ms. Smith received several phone calls from Realtors about an email Adams Abstract had sent that was poorly written and it scared some Realtors who contacted the office. Ms. Smith called and told Adams that a phone call to the customer is considered an unnecessary delay when a request for an abstract is received and could be a violation of Title 1:43 unless specific instructions from the consumer had been received regarding the release of their abstract, then a phone call wasn't warranted and the abstract should be released.

She said that if a competitor calls and asks for an abstract, it is ready the same day. Therefore, there is no way they could be in violation of Title 1:43. It may have taken longer, up to 2 days, when they had difficulty locating an abstract, but the company built a new vault that allows for easier location.

They give a receipt at closing that tells the customer that they have their abstract, but they're not allowed to contact the customer to tell them their abstract is being sent elsewhere. And now they're being told to not use a form to secure that written restriction on releasing an abstract. It seems to her that the Board is giving out Certificates of Authorities like lollipops and aren't willing to let us have competition. When the competition opened their company in LeFlore county, they were scared and nervous and then they come to Adams asking for twenty and thirty abstracts every day. Adams is over that and should be allowed to compete.

As an example, she said, if you're a banker, and someone calls for a payoff, is the loan officer of that bank not allowed to call the customer and say, "Hey, I hear you're going with so and so. Next time think of me, our rates are this. I can give you this rate." Is a banker not allowed to call a prior customer. They don't even have their personal property in hand.

What about a Realtor? If a Realtor sees a sign in someone's yard, are they not allowed to call and tell the consumer that if that listing doesn't go through, to keep them in mind? Mr. Ward stated that yes. It is a violation for a Realtor do to that. They can't "cross the sign" and it's considered unethical and charges can be brought against you for that.

To her knowledge, she is a for-profit business and it is her job to steer business toward her company. She stated that she 110% would never delay a transaction and understands that the Enforcement Committee has done this because there have been petty disagreements over abstract companies that have maybe held onto it but Adams would never do that as a company. When the committee is telling her that she's not allowed to contact a customer, it seems that they're overstepping their authority.

Mr. Ward asked the Board to review in their packet the forms that Adams is using. The forms are being used at closing and have a request that the customer signs regarding being contacted before releasing their abstract. He reminded the Board again, that there had not been a written or formal complaint, but the email in the packet that was originally sent was a means of seeking an informal resolution. Ms. Smith stated that there were several phone calls a year earlier in 2023 that instigated the first email. Then in 2024, an email was received showing the company was still using the form.

Mr. Ward added that this was not a complaint. No written or formal complaint had been received. The matter had been looked into years ago because there has been a history across the state, particularly from Realtors that do not want to put in a formal complaint over issues because it feels as if their consumer might be harmed or that they could lose the transaction. Therefore, the Enforcement Committee now reviews items even without a formal or written complaint to see if an informal resolution can be reached.

Ms. Loggains stated that another reason why they started using the form was because of fraud. In a county in Arkansas right next door to their, individuals came in and signed with a Realtor and the property was sold and the actual owners were not aware. When they call, she said they're only telling them their abstract has gone to another company and to solicit future business.

So, even though they were sent an email over a year previous, it was not addressed. Then in 2024 someone sent in another copy of the form. Then in March, they received a letter stating that it was an official cease and desist notification to stop using the forms because they could be in violation of Title 1:43. She stated that there is a bill going through currently, SB979, that modifies the procedures related to abstractors that provides that the OAB may consider extenuating circumstances that relates to an abstractors failure to provide an abstract within 5 days. If that were to pass, it would solve the issue of whether they're breaking the law.

She just wanted to know about the committee's procedures. She doesn't think the board can judge all things the same and that if they're going to investigate, they need to ask why things are happening and why are all those Realtors so upset.

Ms. Smith added some context. Right after 1:43 went into effect there were companies contacting customers anytime an abstract was requested. The Enforcement Committee discussed it at that time because what was happening was that rather than releasing the abstract when requested with everything that's required in 1:43, they were using it as a tool to solicit the order. This seemed to happen mostly in counties where there had been an existing COA holder for a long time that suddenly found themselves having to compete with a new company in the county. They were using the phone call as a way to circumvent contracts and previously given order instructions. The Enforcement Committee discussed it and said, if at the consumer's instigation, they tell you that they do not want their abstract released without their expressed permission and that direction had been papered up in their file previous to the transaction. Any other reason for calling the customer was considered an unnecessary delay.

Ms. Loggains said that Ms. Smith needed to show here where that was in writing in the law. Ms. Smith repeated that it was the outcome of a discussion by the Enforcement Committee. Ms. Loggains retorted that "so they're just supposed to know the law." Then clarified that to mean the consumer when asked to whom she was referring. Ms. Smith replied that in many counties, consumers know the law but in most counties, they go by what the contract states for companies providing services.

Ms. Scimeca interrupted and stated that this was not a hearing, it was only a discussion and there is no questioning and demanding answers allowed.

Ms. Smith stated again that she was just providing history for context because the staff of the Board and Ms. Scimeca are the ones who stay when the board changes, so they are the carriers of the history. When this particular issue was raised in March 2023, Ms. Smith had received contact from several Realtors who also sent her the form. The allegations were that it was being used as a way to contact the consumer to say that the company had their abstract right there so they could just go ahead and do the order for them and do the closing, too. The form appeared to be a way to circumvent the requirement that the request to hold an abstract had to come from the consumer and automatically paper up their file for the next order. It was a year ago that the first email was sent to Adams. Then the form was sent to Ms. Smith again, she took the matter back to the Enforcement Committee to tell them the abstractor wasn't using the form, but their closer was so was it still an issue. She stated again that she doesn't make recommendations. She does what the Enforcement Committee or Board tells her to. She was instructed to send another, more strongly worded letter to the company because nothing had come in response from the company over a year ago when the first email was sent. It was seemingly ignored.

Ms. Loggains apologized and said it wasn't ignored, it was when the Board was staying for the hearing at every meeting and she just put it off and forgot about it.

Ms. Yates asked how the form was used in their business. Ms. Loggains uses it in the closing and tells the consumer that they'll be holding their abstract in storage but if someone contacts the company for the abstract, they have to release it to them. They are

then directed that if they want to be notified of that, they need to check yes, if not, check no. They're also told they can retain their abstract themselves, either electronic or paper or both, if they'd rather not put it in storage.

Ms. Loggains stated that so far, they'd only had one person say no, they don't need to be contacted. Ms. Yates replied that of course they had, because people don't understand how it works. Ms. Loggains said that a lot of rural people don't want their abstracts released. Ms. Yates asked about what is said to a consumer when contacting them that their abstract has been requested by a competitor. Ms. Loggains replied that they say something like, "Hey, your abstract is being requested by so and so, and it will be sent to them. And if you need us for anything further, please let us know." And the abstract is ready the same day.

Mr. Lower stated on behalf of the Enforcement Committee that their job is to enforce the rules. They currently state "no unnecessary delay" but it not defined. There is currently legislation that would put a five-day limit on it... Mr. Luttrull interjected that had been changed to three days and gets rid of unnecessary delay. Mr. Lower continued, stating that if there is an order, any delay is unnecessary. Ms. Loggains said there's not a delay, there's notification. Mr. Lower stated that in their circumstances, that's correct, but in many other operations, that's not how it's being done.

Ms. Loggains said that when the Board is giving out Certificates of Authority how they're giving out Certificates of Authority, there are going to be growing pains. They're all going to have to learn how to compete. They're a for-profit business and her job is to steer business to her company. She will not break the law which is delaying the transaction. She disagrees with Mr. Lower's statement that any delay is unnecessary. If she had his laptop and had given him a receipt that she had it and someone came along asking for it, would he be okay with her just letting them have it. Everyone likes to act like it's just public information, but it's not. It's public information put into an order and certified to and it's worth money and it's someone's personal property. She gave an example of an order that came in and the Receptionist, knowing the owners said she didn't think they were selling their commercial property. The Receptionist called and the owner said they weren't selling and to not release the abstract. They were informed it was a delicate situation and went ahead and prepared an electronic abstract and sent it. Two weeks later, the owner came in with a contract and they were able to complete the transaction. She thinks people care about their personal property than the Board realizes. Rural areas are different and do business different than in the cities.

Mr. Ward stated that based on their form, there's nothing stating that the abstract is being released whether they actually talk to the person or not, that they will simply be notified by a voicemail or email if they don't talk to someone. With the law the way that it is now, it appeared that the company was in violation and creating an unnecessary delay.

Ms. Loggains said that they would have been happy to have some discussion about it because not all circumstances are the same. Mr. Mapes said that the law says now states that if an order is received from an owner or authorized representative of a transaction

comes in, the abstract has to be done. Often there are online companies, in particular, that will have someone check rates and the online company orders the abstract, unbeknownst to the owner.

Mr. Ward closed the discussion and stated that with the new legislation, it will solve the undefined unnecessary delay. If it doesn't pass, the Rules Committee may address it.

9. **Report Legal Counsel-Whitney Herzog Scimeca:** Ms. Scimeca gave an update on the case in Love County CV-2023-38. There was a status request that was supposed to happen last month, but a continuance was requested by opposing counsel so it was moved to April 30th at 11:00 AM. That is just a status conference, probably to see the status of the transcription.
10. **Visitor's Comments:** Mr. Ward asked for any visitor comments. There were none.
11. **Announcement of next meeting:** Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 10:00 a.m., 421 NW 13th Street, Suite 100 (OLERS) Conference Room, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
12. **Adjournment:** Mr. Ward asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion was made by Mr. Lower. Second by Ms. Ringo. Motion passed.
Yeas: Darla Ringo, Jeff Lower, Jeff Mapes, Lisa Yates, Randy Coffman, Rex Koller, Scott Ward, and Sue Ann Loggains. Nos: None.