Portion of minutes from April 20, 2006 – Meeting with Keith Burdette Not yet approved by the County Commission.

> Keith Burdette stated he wanted to clarify the minutes of Monday, April 17, 2006. Mr. Burdette stated there was discussion (from Monday), some of the folks not in favor of iTown proposal took the conversation at the last meeting and may have construed it with some folks to suggest that the State supported the iTown over somebody else. The minutes were copied and distributed. He talked to the State Development Office and folks from iTown. The official statement is – The State Development Office has made it clear many times it supports all efforts to expand the State's technology and infrastructure including broadband services. The state of West Virginia does not endorse any one broadband supplier over any other. At the end of the day I-Town may ask the State as a conduit issuer to issue taxable revenue bonds to complete a portion of the financing of the (inaudible) of iTown's broadband fiber to the premises network. This is a financing option available to any company doing business or wishing to do business in West Virginia. So if there's any confusion that iTown was being supported by the State over somebody else, he wants to make it clear that is not the case. Mr. Burdette read this from an e-mail.

Gary Deem asked if there was a question about what the minutes say.

Keith Burdette stated they were talking informally and apparently in the discussion there was something about the State supporting the iTown proposal and they were going to issue bonds. They haven't been asked to issue bonds first of all and if they issue bonds, they wouldn't be general obligation bonds because that requires a vote of the people, they have to be taxable revenue bonds that they issue for a lot of companies and the other was the suggestion that the State endorses iTown over somebody else's network, there is no other network.

Robert Tebay made a motion to enter this fax as part of the record to correct any previous minutes that might be incorrect as far as the content. Gary D. Deem seconded the motion.