

**MINUTES OF THE INFORMAL MEETING OF THE JOHNSON COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:
JANUARY 19, 2011**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| | Page |
| Johnson County Strategic Plan..... | 1 |

Chairperson Harney called the Johnson County Board of Supervisors to order in the Johnson County Administration Building at 9:02 a.m. Members present were: Pat Harney, Terrence Neuzil, Janelle Rettig, Sally Stutsman, and Rod Sullivan.

JOHNSON COUNTY STRATEGIC PLAN

Executive Assistant Andy Johnson said his plan for this meeting is to briefly cover the notebooks and the calendar, update the Board on what is happening with the Communication Committee’s plan, and then cover anything else the Board would like to update. The Board has been having budgeting meetings and has been talking about the Strategic Plan, but he thought the Board could also touch base on the decisions made so far and make sure they are following the Strategic Plan. Johnson said he met with the entire Board except for Neuzil because there have been a couple of meeting times that did not work out. The Board has a tentative schedule set and this meeting is very open.

Johnson said the Board has their notebooks that Secretary II Jo Hogarty put together. He thinks it is self-explanatory. There is a separate sheet for each action plan and a place to keep notes to keep track of what items are discussed and what the next step is. Those sheets list the objective number at the top so there is a way to keep track of which objective the Board is on at any given time.

Neuzil asked if the timeline is part of this. Johnson said not yet. Neuzil clarified that it is still being developed. Johnson confirmed. Johnson needs to get it printed and formatted. Neuzil said as the Board starts this whole process, they have to think realistically. There are a lot of things on that timeline and realistically the Board should prioritize what they put on it. Neuzil said Johnson has been working with the Supervisors on that, but he thinks there needs to be a realistic game plan because there is another section listing justice center responsibilities, which is listed under the appendix. Supervisors need to step up and start checking on some of those things as well. Stutsman thanked Hogarty for putting these notebooks together. She thinks Hogarty did a nice job.

Sullivan said over the past three weeks or so he has been a little concerned that the Board is setting themselves up to fail regarding the timeline. While it is good to be ambitious with this, he also wants to be realistic. The Board may want to reevaluate some of those time frames and give themselves a little more time. Sullivan said Johnson reminded him that this is a three year Strategic Plan and it does not mean that it all has to be done in the first year.

Johnson said as far as keeping track of this as a working document, on the timeline for objective IV(A)(2) concerning the web-based survey, he noted that the date was changed to March 2011. Hopefully the Board will keep track of changes within the document as they are made. That would have to be reflected in the timeline as well.

Johnson said the next item is the calendar for the Strategic Plan Meetings. So far it seems like it has worked out very well to have a work session on particular priorities or specific goals within those. Johnson said it is his hope that as the Board works through the calendar they will work together to plan that work session and think about what they need to have and who needs to be invited. He said the Board is scheduled to talk with Human Resources Coordinator Lora Shramek to look at the staffing levels and the span of control on February 4, 2011. The Board will need to have the appropriate people present for the Planning and Zoning Department (Planning and Zoning) and Secondary Roads Department meetings. Johnson said that is what the Board is looking at through June 2011. He asked that the Board would do Strategic Priority V as a group because he did not get time to do it as an individual session.

Rettig said she has written down that the meeting is scheduled for 10:30 a.m. on March 4, 2011, and she had indicated it would be a long meeting through the afternoon. She asked if the Board talked about that as being a day-long meeting at one point and has since changed their minds. Neuzil clarified that Rettig had it starting at 10:30 a.m. Rettig said she had it starting at 10:30 a.m. and going through the whole afternoon. The Board had talked about adding more time to one meeting if they could not schedule additional meetings. Rettig asked Johnson if he could tell her the current game plan. Stutsman and Harney said they just have it written down as starting at 10:30 a.m. Neuzil said he does not have anything after that. Rettig said she just wanted to know because the Board obviously talked about something at one point. She asked Johnson if he wanted the Board to mark off until 1:00 p.m. Johnson said generally on those meetings he was assuming to mark off an hour and a half, but if the Supervisors have the flexibility to plan on meeting until 1:00 p.m., they could do that. Rettig clarified that the plan is to block off until 1:00 p.m. for meetings that start at 10:30 a.m. Neuzil said that is fine by him.

Johnson asked if that is okay with Harney, Stutsman, and Sullivan. Stutsman said yes, if the Board needs it. She said she does not want to sit until 1:00 p.m. just because they said they were going to, but they can block it off. Sullivan said maybe the Board could talk about it ahead of time and get some idea as to if they think it is going to be that long. It would be good to know ahead of time. Sullivan does not have any issue with doing it. Neuzil said blocking it off is the main thing so Supervisors do not schedule anything else. Johnson said the meeting scheduled for February 4, 2011 with Shramek could go longer. He said it is kind of hard to predict on a lot of the meetings.

Johnson asked if the Board could go to Strategic Priority V. He would like to go through Strategic Priority V and the objectives and plug them into the calendar to see what works. Because these goals include Block Grants and because there has been quite a bit of discussion on Social Services Coordinator Amy Correia's budget request, it will

be good to have the whole Board's input regarding the timing of that. Johnson said the goal for objective V(A)(4), goals and criteria eligibility for funding, is to have a July 1, 2011 timeline. He said February 16, 2011, is an open date in the calendar. He asked if the Board would be ready to have a joint session with the Social Services Department and the Economic Development Block Grant. This way the Board could be outlining a process as to what their expectations are. Stutsman yes, February 16, 2011, works. Johnson said it is a regular Strategic Planning Meeting.

Neuzil said he would want a little input particularly from Correia. He said Correia had given the Board some reasons as to why the next several months could be fairly busy for her with the loss of an employee and Decategorization Board funding. It may be good to get some of this done early before some of those other things take place. He said Correia polled the Board, six months to a year ago, in regards to each of the Supervisor's philosophies on Block Grant funding. It would be nice to get a feel for where the Board is with that process, get that started, and see if Correia found any continuity between the Board Members. Johnson said OK. He thinks that as the process is developed for the Block Grants, especially for the Economic Development Block Grant, the Board is going to need some clear direction. If the Board wants a truly competitive system that is scored and a recommendation is then brought to them, some expectations are needed as to what the process will look like. In most instances the Board will accept the recommendations, but also has the flexibility within it to also make some changes. It seems that moving from one system to the other will require some conversation and clarity. Johnson he will put that in for February 16, 2011.

Johnson said the Board will move on to objective II(B)(1), the definition of a farm, which is appointing a task force by March 1, 2011, and a preliminary report by September 1, 2011. Appointing that task force seems like something the Board can talk about in this meeting. Neuzil said he is not sure the Board is going to have a task force appointed by March 1, 2011. The Board needs to think about the time they are going to take to advertise. He said Planning and Zoning probably has four or five different examples from the building inspection division of 1999 and 2000 as to how they developed that committee. Sullivan said Planning and Zoning Administrator Rick Dvorak has mentioned that this has the potential to be a can of worms. He thinks the Board needs to go through this very carefully and thoughtfully. Planning and Zoning needs to go through and find out every place they reference a farm. Rettig said right. Sullivan said the word "farm" is in almost every ordinance and rule the County has. He said Planning and Zoning needs to go through and compile that information. The Board needs to make sure this is what they want because if they change the definition, it then changes in those hundreds of places that the word "farm" is used. The first step is having Planning and Zoning identify all of the different places that the definition applies. He said he is assuming it is mostly related to Planning and Zoning, but there could be other departments it would affect.

Stutsman asked if the Public Health Department references the word in any of their ordinances. Sullivan said maybe. Neuzil said the Assessor's Office have their own definition as to what they consider a farm. That might help the Board too. The

Assessor's Office has to go through that fairly often now, trying to distinguish houses that are on farms and farms that are farms. Stutsman asked if the legislature is working on this too. She was thinking there were some legislative proposals from the assessors to define farms. Sullivan said he does not know if it is going to go anywhere. Stutsman said maybe the Board could monitor that.

Sullivan said there is a push from the Farm Bureau to make more property considered a farm. He thinks that is actually potentially counterproductive for the Farm Bureau. Neuzil said right. He said originally his idea as to why this was a priority had a lot to do with loosening up some of the County's zoning for smaller farmers by trying to encourage more micro farms. The Supervisors might have different opinions on this. It is easy to just say that 40 acres is a farm, but then there is the other side in which the County could encourage more micro farming. Stutsman said there are always unintended consequences. If the County says two acres is a farm, someone can still put confinements on two acres. Neuzil agreed. Sullivan said the bigger issue right now is that the County says a person can build one house on a farm. Rettig said if the County lets two acres be a farm, then someone could create a subdivision of 30 little houses. Stutsman said all of them would be one acre in size.

Neuzil said the Board has to be careful because there might be different levels of definition. Rettig said she thinks Sullivan's point is well taken. The Board needs a staff report detailing everything that would be affected by changing the definition of a farm. That report will lead the Board in the discussion of whether they are looking at a tiered definition. It could be that they have a definition of a farm as a micro farm which could provide an incentive for micro farming in some way, whether it is exemption from ordinances or granting a grant. There are a lot of ways the County could go about doing it.

Stutsman said in some circles, some people want farms to be bigger. A true farm is no longer 40 acres. Rettig agreed. She asked how someone could make a living off of 40 acres if they are not a trunk farmer, an organic farmer, or an orchard. She does not think the Board can appoint a task force without giving them some direction as to what the Board is looking for. Stutsman and Neuzil agreed.

Neuzil said he thinks the Board needs to look at the timeline and bump this out a little further. It is a little unrealistic that the Board will appoint a task force by March 1, 2011, when they do not even have an internal subcommittee to discuss it yet. Sullivan said it would take Planning and Zoning quite a while to go through and look at all the different places that the word "farm" is referenced. Rettig said it could be that Planning and Zoning could just word search the word and it would bring it up. She said that can be done with the Iowa Code. Stutsman said that is true.

Neuzil said he is envisioning that this will not really start until after the fall harvest. He asked Stutsman for the best time to have a farm committee. Stutsman said before March 2011 or April 2011. Neuzil said realistically, the Board is thinking of appointing the committee sometime around November 1, 2011. Stutsman said research can be done

before that. Sullivan said staff can research. Neuzil agreed. Neuzil said he is talking about the actual appointment, which would be a project for this upcoming winter of 2011. Rettig said that date can be set if the Board wants to delay it out that long, but staff can have a deadline for doing the research by March 1, 2011. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said for example, the Board can say that they want the committee to be half hand-picked, because they want to ensure that certain voices are at the table, and the other half to be advertised. The Board could then appoint the committee by July 1, 2011, and request a report back by September 1, 2011. She does not know that a committee has to meet six times to work through their thoughts on this. More meetings are not necessarily good.

Johnson said a suggestion is to compile research and then use one of the Strategic Planning Meetings for the Board to decide the charge and the goals of the committee. Stutsman said they will also decide who will be on the committee and how the Board wants to structure it. The Board can decide whether they want to specify certain categories, such as farmer, banker, citizen, and the League of Women Voters, like they have done with other committees, and then have that application process. Neuzil said that makes sense. Johnson asked if June 3, 2011, would be too late for the Board's work session on that. Stutsman said she thinks that makes sense.

Rettig said the Board also has open work sessions that they have not filled yet. Johnson said right. Rettig said if one of those work sessions was going to be with Planning and Zoning anyway, then this could be one of the items on that agenda as opposed to on one of the Strategic Planning Meetings. She clarified that Johnson put in some open work sessions on the calendar and has not filled them. Johnson said right. He said something that will be addressed later in the day is if the schedule for the Elected Officials Meetings will change. It hinged on that, and now there is a problem with it. Presumably that would just be the matter of choosing which Wednesday of the month it would be. Johnson said an Elected Officials Meeting is scheduled for January 2011, a work session with Secondary Roads is scheduled for February 2011, and the work session scheduled for March 2011 would be one of the open ones.

Rettig clarified that if the open work session was open, the Board could have a work session with Planning and Zoning. There are going to be needs for those work sessions because Planning and Zoning not only has a property maintenance code, but they have a storm water management ordinance in the Strategic Plan that is due July 1, 2011. She said she would assume that Planning and Zoning is going to need to be checking in with the Board quickly, so the Board might want to think about setting the open work session in March 2011 as a Planning and Zoning one. Planning and Zoning is supposed to have a storm water management ordinance to the Board by July 1, 2011. The devil is in the details because ordinance actually says "adopt." She has read this ordinance 30 times, but she never noticed the word "adopt" until yesterday. Sullivan said language can be important. Rettig agreed.

Sullivan said it is entirely possible that the Board may find that they feel the need to keep the definition of a "farm" that they already have. That does not mean the Board cannot do things towards helping smaller farms; they just may have to approach it

differently. That would be good to know. Rettig clarified that goal III(B)(1) is to adopt a specific storm water control ordinance due July 1, 2011. She said it makes sense that a work session on all of these would be in line around March 2011. Stutsman asked what that work session would entail. She asked if the Board would be touching base with Planning and Zoning or if the Board would be expecting them to have all of the research completed regarding the definition of a "farm" and its impacts. Rettig said that research will be complicated, but she thinks Planning and Zoning could have it done. The County has computer programs that can pull out the word "farm" and detail all the times it appears. Rettig said she warned Planning and Zoning this week that they have to have this preliminary specific storm water control ordinance done. She said she told Planning and Zoning not to worry about the word "adopt" because that will be the Board's scheduling problem, so they are now aware of that. She said it seems that the Board would have the definition of a farm, the storm water control ordinance, and something dealing with the property maintenance code coming up at that same time.

Rettig asked when the meeting in March 2011 would be held. Johnson said under the current system of having the meetings on the third Wednesday of every month, the work session would be scheduled for March 16, 2011. If the Board moved the work session to the fourth Wednesday in March 2011 then it would be scheduled for March 23, 2011. He said March would probably be a good month for it because there are five Wednesdays in it. Stutsman said there is also Spring Break in March. Johnson agreed. Stutsman said she hopes Planning and Zoning can get all of that stuff together by March 2011 because it is almost February 2011 right now. Rettig said the Board just adopted this Strategic Plan and now they are modifying every single one of them. She said the Board should have thought about this as they were adopting it. Stutsman said some of it is just working through it. Neuzil said he thinks the justice center is a top priority and that is fine, but he wants to be realistic. He would like to go through this because the priorities are based on the timeline a bit. He would not mind checking off two or three of these priorities, but not seven, eight, or nine of them plus the entire justice center process, before July 1, 2011.

Neuzil asked if the Board is going to stop doing certain things so they can focus on this or if they are going to work 60, 70, or 80 hours a week. He said he wants to know what the plan is. Sullivan said he does not want to set the Board up to fail. He does not want to set up a situation in which the Board lays out 15 goals, 14 of which they could not get done in time. The Board has to be fair to themselves. He said he has gotten a better idea of what is realistic as he has been digging into the goals he has been assigned and talking with the applicable department heads.

Stutsman said the Board could ask Planning and Zoning if they could have all of that done by March 2011. Neuzil agreed. He said the date for having the task force appointed by March 1, 2011, needs to be changed. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said she thinks that is unrealistic. Neuzil said the Board stacks their meetings this time of year very heavily because of the budgeting process. Board Meetings start to lighten up in April and May and there is a whole lot less work to be done in June and July. Looking at the calendar, and thinking of past experiences, it seems like a lot of this background work

could be more focused in later spring and early summer. Johnson said a way to look at it is that the Board has adopted the plan and their goals now. The Board will be looking at the goals more intently through June 2011 with all of the relevant players involved. He said having the project due July 1, 2011, may be doable.

Sullivan said some of the objectives and the tactics list more than one item so there may actually be multiple time frames. For example, appointing a task force and making a recommendation are really two separate time frames. He said the Board probably needs a time frame for appointing the task force and a time frame by which the Board would like staff to have a recommendation. Rettig said it is two separate things. There is an open work session and the Board needs to decide if they want it to be with Planning and Zoning, just like they did with Secondary Roads. She said there are enough items on this list to have the work session with Planning and Zoning. Secondly, the Board agrees that having a task force appointed by March 1, 2011, is unrealistic. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said this calendar was assuming there would be six months of task force meetings. There may be a way to compress that schedule and still meet the September 1, 2011, deadline or the Board can change that date as well.

Johnson suggested requesting staff research be done by March 1, 2011, scheduling a work session for later in March 2011, and having a task force appointed thereafter. Stutsman said yes. She likes having the date for appointing the task force being set for June 1, 2011. Rettig said she thinks there is still a way to appoint a task force by July 2011, have a preliminary report by harvest, and then the committee could still meet one more time after harvest, such as in November 2011, and give the Board a final report. She said there is a way to nuance that so that the Board is still on target with having some report back by the end of the year, but without such a tight time restriction. Johnson said the Board can decide how they are going to do the task force and what the timeline is once they have all of the information at the work session.

Johnson said the Board is going to discuss goal V(B)(2), with goals and priorities including value-added agriculture, local foods, et cetera. Sullivan said it seems that the Board should check with Woodbury County and ask what they have done, how it has worked, and what they recommend to Johnson County. This may be inherent in the goal. The Board has talked about doing that periodically, but they have never had Director of Rural Economic Development for Woodbury County Rob Marqusee come over. Sullivan said he thinks Story County has done some good things too. He suggested having someone from the Leopold Center, who knows what everyone in the State is doing, come over. Stutsman said Iowa Valley Resource Conservation and Development Food System Planner Jason Grimm has a good handle on what is happening.

Neuzil asked if the Board wants to add anything about rural health care somewhere in this goal if they are able to fund it. Stutsman said she thinks that was under the Block Grants. Rettig said health care is also included in becoming a more livable community. This applies to Block Grants, this item, and becoming a livable community. Neuzil said yes, it is an Economic Development and Quality of Life goal (Quality of Life). Rettig said right. She said it is clearly in this goal, but she does not know which one of the sub-

goals it is. Neuzil said health care is mostly related to Quality of Life, but it would also fall under the Rural Economic Development Committee. Johnson clarified that it is a responsibility of Livable Community for Successful Aging (Livable Community). Neuzil said yes, he thinks health care responsibility falls under a Livable Community, but he thought it would also be a responsibility of the Quality of Life Committee. Rettig said it is under goal V(A)(1), develop measurable goals and criteria for eligible funding, as well. Neuzil confirmed.

Johnson said goal V(B)(2) is primarily a charge to the Economic Development Committee and Planning and Zoning to bring recommendations forward to the Board. Stutsman agreed. Johnson asked if the Board needs more discussion on this until staff is ready to bring something forward. Sullivan said he is still wondering where the education piece comes in. He feels that he still needs some education here. He said that it is his guess that Iowa City Area Development Group President Joe Raso and Iowa City/Coralville Convention and Visitors Bureau President Josh Schamberger are not experts in this area either. He would assume that everyone needs some education from Grimm or a group of people to tell them what best practices would be.

Rettig said one way to do that would be to have a work session or an in service with the Board of Supervisors, the Economic Development Committee, the staff of Planning and Zoning, and invite Grimm and Raso as well. Sullivan said the Board should invite other people who would be on the Economic Development Committee. Rettig said yes. She clarified that the Board should invite some speakers to talk to everyone at once so they could flush out the direction they are headed and then turn it back to Economic Development to flush it out some more. Stutsman said she wonders if the Board should invite the Local Foods Task Force Committee because they have some ideas as to what they would like the County should do. There is such a network among these people who know what is going on in other states and counties.

Rettig suggested plugging in a date for the work session for July 2011 and then the Economic Development Committee would flush something out by January 2012. She said it does not have to be July 2011, it could be June 2011. Stutsman said the Local Foods Task Force is too busy to do anything in June and July 2011, if the Board wants to involve them. Stutsman suggested moving the date to September 2011. Neuzil clarified that the Board scheduled a deadline of January 1, 2012. Rettig said yes, a deadline for a report back from the Economic Development Committee. Rettig said the Board could have a work session in August or September 2011. Stutsman said probably after the first frost. Sullivan said that is what he was thinking. Neuzil said things will really slow down in October 2011. Stutsman said late September or early October 2011. Neuzil said yes.

Sullivan said in order to make an informed decision, the Board and the Economic Development Committee need a little more information regarding best practices. Stutsman said yes, there is no sense in reinventing the wheel. Rettig clarified that the date would be scheduled sometime in late September 2011. Stutsman confirmed. Rettig said everyone would learn a lot, discuss where they are headed, and then it would go

back to the Economic Development Committee for a couple of months to finish up. Sullivan said it would leave plenty of time for the Board's budget process as long as the Economic Development Committee had recommendations back to them by December 2011. Stutsman suggested that the Board touch base with some of these people fairly soon and give them a heads up as to the direction the Board is going because they will then have time to think and pull some thoughts together for the end of March 2011. Johnson said the Board could also be sending everyone information to review ahead of time.

Sullivan said industrial kitchen space is something that people who process their own food really need. It is not something that these people need every day, but they need periodic access to it. There is a thought of having some industrial kitchen space that people could sign up for and rent as they needed. He said that makes a lot of sense to him. He asked if that is the number one goal. If it is, then that may be something the Board should think about funding, but if there is not general agreement that that is the number one goal, then he would like to know that. Stutsman said a lot of this work has already been done. Grimm is the key to so much of this. Sullivan agreed. Rettig said she and Stutsman met with Devotay Restaurant owner Kurt Friese, Grimm, and a representative from the Iowa City Farmers Market. Rettig learned more in a one hour meeting about creating a year-round farmers market from the materials Grimm gave them, and it seems like the Economic Development would not naturally have that information. This is a good idea. Johnson said the Board can look at scheduling a Strategic Planning Meeting in either September or October 2011. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said she thinks by then the harvest slows down, the fall crops are minor, and the weeds have stopped growing. Johnson said he has Grimm's contact information, but asked if Stutsman would let him know who else to contact. Stutsman confirmed.

Stutsman asked if the Iowa State Association of Counties (ISAC) School is going to be held again in November 2011. Rettig said yes, this is the last year. She thought it was over. Neuzil said no, the last year is 2012. Rettig said she thought it was the last year. Neuzil said he is pretty sure. Stutsman said ISAC Board of Directors Member Melvyn Houser and a Supervisor from Cass County have been very involved in this and hopefully while they are in Johnson County the Board can pick their brains. Rettig suggested that the Board request that ISAC have a session on this topic. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said it would be part of the Board's learning. The whole Economic Development team would not go out there, but the Board would get a chance to pick those supervisor's brains while they are in the County. Stutsman said that is what she thought. She would rather pick the supervisors' brains instead of asking them to make a special trip to Johnson County from wherever county they are from. She can bring that up because Houser has always wanted to do something about it. Rettig said she knows there is one more year left for ISAC School, but she does not know if there are two more years left. Stutsman said that might be a good way to connect with some people in other counties. Johnson asked if Stutsman is saying ISAC will come in the fall. Stutsman said the ISAC School will be in Johnson County. Neuzil said in November. Stutsman said she is trying to kill two birds with one stone. Johnson said right.

Johnson said he thinks this timeline is a little ambitious. Rettig clarified that Johnson is talking about goal V(C)(1), define and identify measurable goals to become a more livable community for all ages. Johnson said yes. Rettig asked if the Livable Community Policy Board has been notified of this Strategic Planning Goal. Johnson said Johnson County Task Force on Aging Member Bob Welsh is aware of it because he has questioned the Board to make sure it is on the timeline. Johnson said he does not know if the Livable Community has talked about it. He is just now starting to talk to Correia about the Strategic Planning he will be helping Livable Community with. Sullivan said he thinks the Livable Community Board is aware of it, but does not know what it means. Stutsman agreed. Neuzil said the Board needs to make sure everyone understands this livable community is for all ages too. He said it was Welsh's intent to find a funder for all of these different initiatives. Rettig said the Livable Community is only part of this goal. It has to almost be driven by Social Services with Livable Community as an advisory because they are only focused on senior citizens. Neuzil said this goal is pretty big. He said he could see some of the County's Social Services Block Grants prioritizing some of those dollars away from what they currently do and putting it into some of these initiatives.

Sullivan said it is hard to make a lot of these initiatives applicable to rural living. Those living in rural areas need the cities to have some of these initiatives. A year ago he attended a Hills City Council Meeting for the first time, and they were debating whether to keep the Hills Community Center going because the City had been asked to pick up the cost of the electric bill which they were not funding. There was a tight budget and Hills said they could not afford to do it. He said people asked where some of the senior citizens will go to meet for a cup of coffee, or where some of the kids will go in the winter. He said the more the Hills City Council talked about it, they realized that this is an asset to their community that is worth the cost of an electric bill. He thinks having that asset does make Hills a more livable community. It was interesting to see the process of the Council thinking through that. He said that is the type of thing that is hard to measure and quantify.

Rettig said Correia took the Board's Strategic Plan and started digging into it, which is one of the reasons Correia started thinking about modifying her budget recommendation. Correia had already started on this. Rettig clarified that at her last liaison meeting Correia had given her and Neuzil a starting sheet. She said the Livable Communities Policy Board cannot drive this because that will not include people of all ages. By broadening the definition, the Board is looking for more general goals as to how to become more livable. Stutsman said this will not be done by July 1, 2011. She said this may be done by July 1, 2012 or even July 1, 2013. Johnson said in some ways Livable Community is synonymous with Quality of Life. The County has called that committee the Economic Development and Quality of Life Committee. He said it would be helpful in the grant process if the Board had a definition as to what they think falls under livable communities.

Rettig said the definition of livable communities is almost done. She can get that off of Livable Community's website. She said the question is how to put measurable goals

in that. She does not want to say that the timeline is off without talking to Correia because it could be that Correia is nearly there in having some advice on measurable goals. Whether the Board decides that those goals are something they can adopt and adhere to is a different matter. She thinks Social Services has to lead this and Livable Community needs to be involved in the discussion. The Board needs input from Correia on this. Stutsman clarified that Rettig was talking about the timeline. Rettig confirmed. She said all of the department heads saw this because they were in multiple meetings and had multiple meetings to say if they could not adhere to that timeline, and no one did. Sullivan said he thinks it is really good that the County has an emergency siren in Frytown and that Facilities Manager David Kempf wants to put a siren in Joetown. He thinks those are huge quality of life items that affect a few hundred people in Johnson County. Sullivan said he is in favor of that. He thinks that is a wonderful development and is glad the County is funding it.

Sullivan asked how the Board would weigh that against, for example, more money for the Solon Library. Rettig said increasing the number of emergency sirens is a measurable goal in public safety. That is the goal and the County would measure it by whether they have done it. She said that one is pretty easy to write. Sullivan said that seems too big if that all falls under this. Stutsman said yes, this could be a volume in itself. Neuzil said yes, and prioritizing that. Stutsman said sirens are just one thing. Sullivan said it is a little thing. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said adding in more patrol deputies or having a Westside Ambulance increases the public safety. The County is already making some investments in improving the quality of life for public safety; it is just a matter of putting a measure on it. Johnson said if the Board prioritizes something, it does not mean that they will do everything.

Johnson said the Board has talked about having a work session for Block Grants on February 16, 2011. He asked about putting goal V(C)(1) on the agenda for the same date, since it ties in, with the understanding that that session is going to be about how to get started. Johnson said he will work with Correia to do that if it works for her. He thinks it will not necessarily take a lot of preparation, but it will be coming to the Board in a discussion as to how to get started and the Board's expectations from the process. He said Correia is farther ahead on her items than the Board is on the Economic Development items. Rettig said she thinks that is a good idea because it is all related. Johnson agreed.

Rettig said it is the Social Services, Economic Development, and Livable Community's policy, so the heads of those departments should be invited to this work session. Economic Development is sharing the responsibility with Social Services on one goal, and Social Services and Livable Community are sharing the responsibility on the other goal. If the Board is going to have a work session on both of those goals, then people from those bodies should be invited. Johnson asked if it makes sense to first have the meeting with staff and have some direction before. Rettig asked if Johnson would invite the Livable Community staff member or just the Board's staff member. The Board has tasked Livable Community to be responsible for this goal; maybe that was their mistake. If Livable Community is going to be responsible for it, then they should be in

the room when the Board is actually talking about it. Johnson said that is fine. He said it is also going to be a work session on the measurable goals and criteria for the funding. Stutsman said she thinks the Board needs to get their act together before they involve the Livable Community. Livable Community may be coming at it from a totally different direction than the Board. Rettig said then the Board needs to remove Livable Community from being responsible. Stutsman said that is fine, she does not have any problem with that. Rettig said it is wrong to exclude Livable Community from a meeting when the Board made them responsible.

Neuzil said he thinks there is a way to work on both goals. He sees both points. Rettig said it is a public meeting so Livable Community can attend. Neuzil said absolutely. He said if this goal is for all ages, then the Board needs to have some understanding as to what this all means. This goal seems gigantic. He wants to make it clear that the Livable Community would be an asset to this, but he hopes the Board is not going to be a funding stream just for people who are 60 and older. Stutsman agreed. She is willing to change who is responsible for the goal or say that at some point Livable Community takes a part in this. The Board needs to get organized regarding what they want before they turn it over to Livable Community. Johnson said Social Services is charged with coordinating with other departments and Livable Community. The Board's primary charge is to Social Services. Neuzil said Rettig's point is taken that it is a public meeting.

Rettig said Livable Community is coming whether the Board invites them. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said the Board might as well accept that as a fact and welcome them. She said she welcomes Livable Community's input any time they want to take the time to come to a meeting. She said she wishes Livable Community were here now. Stutsman said she thinks the entire Board does. Johnson said he will talk to Correia about that and put that on the agenda for February 16, 2011.

Johnson said the Communications Committee has done a media survey as part of coming up with a media plan. Neuzil asked where the media survey would go in the Strategic Plan. Johnson said this would be under customer service. Neuzil said Strategic Priority IV(A), enhance public information and outreach. Johnson confirmed. Rettig asked for clarification. Johnson said IV(A)(3) is to create a media plan.

Johnson said there was a 100% response to the media survey. He thinks there is something from every County office. In some ways the survey is all over the board and it is a lot to digest. He said the Communications Committee is going to take this survey and see what they learn from it to start the media plan in their February 2011 meeting.

Johnson said regarding budgeting discussions, the Board has been good about suggesting things and including some items under the Board's work that relates to some of the Strategic Plan items. He asked if there was anything that had not been covered that should be included. Neuzil asked if there are additional expenses that would be necessary to add to the FY12 budget. Johnson said he is not saying that there are. Neuzil said it does not hurt to open up because the Board should think about that if they are

going to put some of these goals in place. Stutsman asked if the Board put anything in the budget for vehicle fleet analysis. Johnson said yes, \$10,000.

Neuzil said he knows the Board put some funding into the budget for the potential study for a justice center. He thought it was interesting that Cedar Rapids did a study because they are looking at another sales tax initiative. He asked the Board if they knew who did the study. Sullivan said the city of Cedar Rapids. Neuzil said no. He said Cedar Rapids Mayor Ron Corbett's campaign committee paid for a study. In other words, it was an outside entity and Corbett is the only one out there promoting his information. He thought it was interesting. Sullivan agreed. Harney clarified that Corbett did not say who did it. Neuzil said no, but Corbett's campaign committee paid for it. Harney said he is sure Corbett's council person did it. Stutsman suggested that Cedar Rapids Mayor Pro Tempore Monica Vernon did it. Neuzil said he is sure it was Vernon. Stutsman said that is interesting. She asked if that is legal. Neuzil said sure. He said Corbett can do that on behalf of his campaign to learn what his constituents are doing.

Sullivan said when he looked at his section of the Strategic Plan, he found nothing that would cost money per se. The part of the media plan that people have bandied about was if there would be a position of a communications staff member at some point. He said that is clearly a full budget cycle away. Rettig said it does not have to be. The Board put in a half-time grant writer. One of the recommendations from the Human Resources Department and Linn County is not to make the definition of the position so tight so that the County could have a grant and communications coordinator. This way the grant writer can assist with communications. Sullivan said the Board is so early into this that it is hard to say. Rettig said the Board does not have a job definition, but they do have it in the budget. There is a way to start working on the communications sooner rather than later, such as doing the monthly updates like Linn County. She thinks Linn County's monthly email updates are done really well.

Sullivan said OK, there might be something there. He has tried to go through the information the Board got back from the survey and he does not think the survey supports the hiring of a person. 80% of the people say that they are doing the work and would prefer to keep doing the work. These people would like an updated list of people to contact. Rettig said the Board of Supervisors actually needs the help from this position. In Linn County's emails, tweets, Facebook posts, and blogs the individual department would feed information into it, but it is the Board of Supervisors communicating, not an actual department. Rettig said it is the Board that needs to communicate better, not a single department.

Neuzil said it is a matter of how much information the Board wants to get out because if they want more information to get out then they are likely going to need to have someone who will make that a priority. This survey showed what is currently being done versus what could be done. He thinks Sullivan's point is well-taken in that the Board is still a little far out from determining if this is a position they would do with a grant writer or just a new responsibility under what Webmaster Gary Yoder does already. Neuzil

asked if the Board could potentially bump up Yoder's salary to add that responsibility. Rettig said sometimes departments do this with interns. Once a department has established a system, their interns do the writing and get publishing credits, which helps interns when they are students.

Sullivan said in looking at the budget for all of the items he is responsible for, that is the only item that would have any kind of significant impact. Neuzil said he looks at that and the video services. North Liberty's media coordinator is also their videographer. North Liberty takes it to a whole other level as far as the kind of programming they have because it is not just city council meetings in North Liberty. The videographer goes all around the community all the time. If anyone were to go to a North Liberty Chamber Committee meeting, they will see the videographer there. Neuzil said one would start to think about how many potential meetings the Board could be having in the community beyond their regular Board meeting on television, with the potential use of the internet. He is not necessarily talking about every one of the Board's regular meetings, but there are times when the Board meets with the community on a very important issue that is not on the Formal Meeting or Informal Meeting on a Thursday.

Rettig said the Board put enough money in the budget to begin to address the issue if they choose to write the job description that way. If the Board wants to begin to address it, they can without using any more money than what is already budgeted. Neuzil said strategically speaking he would like the Board to consider the whole media picture including video and think about that investment versus having their own employee who could be doing a lot of this work. Rettig asked Sullivan which goal he is responsible for. Sullivan said he is responsible for Strategic Goal IV. Rettig said she is responsible for Strategic Goal III. Other than the impact of green purchasing and retrofitting buildings, the Board put the money in the budget to begin to address this goal. There will be major funding decisions down the road. She said the Board talked about Kempf's decision to save for geothermal air conditioning for the Administration Building and elected to bond for it rather than save. She thinks the Board has put the money they need in place to make progress on Strategic Goal IV right now. At another time, there will be more discussion on it.

Stutsman said she is responsible for Strategic Goal I and she does not think there is anything that needs to be budgeted. Neuzil said yes because there are a lot of things that the Board has added to Strategic Goal V this year. Rettig said regarding Strategic Goal I, the Board has been discussing fund balances. Based on the Board's conversation on January 18, 2011, if they bump up the fund balance they will begin to meet this goal prior to the Finance Committee giving them formal recommendations and having a work session on it. She thinks by not decreasing fund balances as much as originally proposed, they are making progress.

Rettig asked if Harney is responsible for Strategic Goal II. Harney said most of Strategic Goal II is busy work between the Board and Secondary Roads regarding road improvements and planning for future quarters. There is really not a lot of expense unless the Board is going to do something more with developing a concept. Rettig said

the Board is making progress with their decision on January 18, 2011, to put more money toward maintenance. Stutsman agreed. Harney said he thinks the Board needs to develop what their priorities are going to be for that. Rettig said the Board does not have a priority or a work session scheduled for it, but they are putting the funding in place.

Sullivan said in terms of the budget, it sounds like the Board is OK with all of the Strategic Goals. He has realized that his Strategic Goal IV is potentially really heavy on department head evaluations. In a lot of the goals, the measurement of achieving the goal is through department head evaluations. Sullivan asked Stutsman if she is the Supervisor on the Evaluation Committee. Stutsman confirmed. Sullivan said a lot of these items on the form really need to be part of the evaluation process if the Board is going to do it. If the Board wants to judge department heads on their public relations, there is nowhere on the form to do that. Best practices is another item that is not on the form either. Stutsman said developing goals and a Strategic Plan is also missing from the form. Sullivan agreed. He said the measurement for almost every single one of his goals, such as determining acceptable levels of service and levels of staffing, is determined by if the department head did it and if the Board evaluated them on it. When the Evaluation Committee gets back together again, he needs to talk to them about incorporating the things the Board has discussed.

Johnson said that is a good point. The Board started keeping a list because he thought this need was going to show up in other areas, and it does not. The employee evaluation form already has something about green initiatives. Sullivan said the budget is already a big part of the evaluation. Rettig said the evaluation form does have a couple things regarding setting goals for the department. It is a good point to take the department head evaluation and the Strategic Plan and hold them side by side to see what is missing. Stutsman agreed. Johnson said he thinks the Board needs a discussion about the department head evaluations so there is consistency regarding liaisons. Sullivan said there may be a need to have a checklist of some sort. Johnson confirmed. Rettig said the checklist should ask if the department head is up to date on their own evaluations. Johnson confirmed.

Johnson said the Board's first goal in that area is strengthening the website content and covering that in evaluations. Sullivan agreed. The Board almost needs a report from Yoder, similar to what they receive from Budget Coordinator Rich Claiborne, that says if a certain department head sends Yoder information. Johnson said the Board can also look at the department's webpage as a part of the department head's evaluation. In fairness the department head should know that and that it can be started at anytime.

Rettig clarified that the Board started this evaluation in July 1, 2010. Stutsman confirmed. Rettig said if the Board is going to mess around with the form and redo it, then they need to because they have been using it for six months and all the Supervisors have their own personal opinions about what is happening. Stutsman said Human Resources Coordinator Dana Stafford will call an Evaluations Committee meeting. She said Stafford has asked for input from people a couple of times regarding requested

changes to the form. If the Supervisors have things they want changed, they need to make sure to send that information to Stafford and the Evaluations Committee.

Johnson said he has been giving Stafford feedback every month. He said that he and Stafford now have a version ready for the Board only, with numbered lines. Sullivan asked why the version was for the Board only. Neuzil said the Board is the only department to match up a number when they put their chart together. Johnson said he thinks the next version is going to have a column with the numbers, but for now Stafford went through and numbered the items. Ultimately everybody might have one. Neuzil said Stafford did not want to make any changes unless it was with the Committee that recommended it so she made a special version.

Neuzil said in regards to budgeting for Strategic Priority II(B)(1), develop and follow a comprehensive Five Year Road and Trail Plan, he is confused on how much funding the Board put away. He thought he asked if there was any money for the Capital Improvement Plan and was told no. Rettig said the money the Board had previously put away was not protected in the budget two years ago. The levy was lowered and then zeroed that out. Neuzil said OK. Rettig said it is her understanding that the Capital Improvement Plan for Secondary Roads is at zero. Neuzil said OK. He asked if the Board does not put any funding in trails anymore. Rettig said \$175,000. Neuzil asked if that comes out of the General Fund. Sullivan and Rettig confirmed. Neuzil said if the Board is going to ask Secondary Roads to upgrade dirt or gravel surfaces and/or eliminate certain public roads, then it is going to cost money. He asked if the Board is putting in any funding specifically for that purpose other than siphoning off. He does not think they are. Rettig said the Board is putting \$470,000 away for maintenance, but the Board has not directed what they would spend it on or what their priorities would be. The Board could say they want \$100,000 of it to be for Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) and upgrading a road, but they want the other \$370,000 to be for the maintenance of the roads the County already has. Neuzil asked if that is enough. He said all he heard was the need for more gravel, more mowing, and more crowning.

Stutsman said it seems like the Board needs a plan and that is not what they have. Sullivan said he thinks the big issue is that the Board asked County Engineer Greg Parker to include those items in the Five Year Road Plan to prioritize them along with the paved items. Neuzil said right, but Parker had said those are maintenance projects that are not eligible and do not have to be in the State Five Year Road Plan. Sullivan said right. The Board probably should consider whether they want to start funding again this year. Because Secondary Roads has things programmed out, they will not do a maintenance project this year anyway and Parker already knows that. Neuzil said right. Sullivan said the question is if the Board wants to put a maintenance project in year three and year four of the Five Year Road Plan. If so, then the Board has to start funding it. Neuzil agreed. He said it sounded like that money was going to be used for something else. Rettig said right, for maintenance rather than actual upgrades. The question is if the Board should put money in Capital Improvements that will be a CIP for Secondary Roads. She said the Board started that years ago and it was then all zeroed out.

Stutsman said she wants to put money in the fund, but she is not going to tax for something when the Board does not have a clue what they are going to do. Neuzil said the point is that sometime within the next week or two, the Board is going to have that plan in their hands. He said it is his understanding that that plan includes some of those upgrades to those roads without any funding. The question was if the Board wants to fund anything for the FY12 budget. Sullivan agreed. Rettig said the Board has two work sessions scheduled for February 3, 2011, and February 16, 2011, and if Parker is doing what the Board is asking by February 16, 2011, then they will have that plan. Neuzil said it sounds like some of those projects are not even ones the Board would bid out, they would be done internally.

Harney said he has a real problem with building more liability when the County cannot maintain what they already have unless a good cause can be shown with traffic counts or otherwise. Neuzil said the Board has already talked about that. Stutsman said the Board is talking about upgrading roads. Neuzil said the Board is talking about a dirt road that is down by Dane Road.

Rettig said she knows something that the Board did not put in the budget. The Board had pledged to chip seal Half Moon Avenue in order to get the grant from Resource Enhancement and Protection. Neuzil asked if the grant was \$10,000. Rettig said that was the matching part of the grant and the Board said they would go ahead and upgrade the road in order to get the \$500,000 grant. Stutsman asked how much. Rettig said she does not know the answer to that. Neuzil said he thought it was around \$10,000. Rettig said the Board would have to get that number from Parker. Sullivan said his intent was that money was not coming out of Parker's budget. Rettig said the Board would take it from the Trails money that they have been saving up. Sullivan agreed. Neuzil said that one is okay. Rettig said the money is from the trails CIP money the Board has been saving up so they do not need to say that in the budget.

Stutsman asked Neuzil if he has a number regarding what he would want to put into CIPs. Neuzil said he does not. The question is if the Board wants to impact the Rural Levy anymore because if they want to take more money, then the Rural Levy is going to have to go up more. Rettig said the Board is already doing the maximum transfer from the General Basic Fund. Neuzil said this is the only way the Board could come up with additional funding. Sullivan said within the budget the Board could say that Parker set aside \$50,000. Neuzil said that is fine, but that just means there is less money than what the Board had originally thought. Rettig said the Board had found \$60,000. The budget went from \$405,000 to \$473,000. The Board could say that this additional \$68,000 is for CIPs, not maintenance. Neuzil asked if that would give them enough money for the project. Rettig said it would give them a start.

Sullivan said he thought the most expensive of those four projects was Observatory Avenue, which was only going to be around \$110,000. Rettig said that in two years the Board would have it funded if they take that increase of \$68,000 and put it in CIPs. Sullivan said yes, in two years the Board could do it. Neuzil said the Board will decide that in February regarding their priorities. It sounded like changing that dirt road to

gravel by Dane Road was going to be pretty high on the priority list. He does not know what that costs. The Board needs to keep the levy and make sure they give some direction to start putting some funds away again. Neuzil said if the Rural Basic Fund does not move any more, he does not know where the Board is going to come up with a lot of this funding. The County has a huge Mahaffey Bridge Road project coming up that is going to take everything. Sullivan said that is a really good point. He has talked to people who live on Observatory Avenue and people who lived on Gable Avenue. Both groups of people were so happy when those roads made the list and were crushed when the project became less of a priority after the flooding of 2008. Sullivan said it is still something the Board should keep on their radar. Neuzil said the Board will in February 2011.

Neuzil said this is the opportunity to tell Claiborne if the Board is interested in taxing more than what they are talking about now. Harney said he is not interested because the taxes are already going to go up over 5%. Neuzil said Harney added 0.8% if one owns a farm plus 0.4% for the land, and it all adds up to be over 5%. He does not think it works like that. Sullivan said Harney would have to average those amounts. Stutsman said she is not interested in taxing more at this point.

Rettig said she thinks the Board can start making progress on it unless they are just going to pay \$110,000 for one project this year, which they could. She clarified that Sullivan said the most expensive project was \$110,000. Sullivan said that was a couple of years ago so the cost of doing it now is probably higher. Neuzil said the Board can decide this later. The question today was if the Board should add any additional funding in the budget to address their Strategic Priorities and the answer is to leave it where it is and find a way to get some of those projects done. Harney said his concern is if Parker can show him that it is not going to be as much as he thinks it is going to be. Stutsman said she wants to know Parker is going to do it. She does not want to put money into it if Parker is not going to do it.

Rettig asked what the name of the road below the subdivision is. Stutsman said Osage Road. Rettig said she thinks there have been some very good arguments about farmers taking their combines through the development because they have no other way. That is a problem. Harney said that is going to be an expensive upgrade because the road has to be totally re-graded. Rettig said right, but Neuzil's point is that the County would not do it this year; they would start putting money aside for 2012 or 2013. Neuzil said the Board has to prioritize which project comes first. Sullivan said he likes the idea of telling Secondary Roads to set the \$68,000 aside towards these CIPs. Neuzil said the Board should get a project picked off. Stutsman said or scheduled. Rettig said the Board should figure out which project they want, which year they are going to do it, and how much money they need. Sullivan said the key is that the Board wants to have the project in the Five Year Road Plan and it will just say local funds.

Neuzil said that is what happened when the Board finally started to save up these dollars. The Board had about \$500,000 saved and then they had to prioritize a flood over those projects. Now the question is if the Board wants to start trying to do this again.

There could be some cost savings into the elimination of certain public roads. He would assume that is why the majority of the Board wants to go down that path, but he is not interested. There should be some cost savings there because there is less work to do. Rettig said she does not think it saves any money. Stutsman said not a great amount. Rettig said it saves gas and diesel fuel. Neuzil asked why they would do it then. Sullivan said it will show up on the maintenance budget, but not in a single year. It is something that will be gained over time.

Rettig said the Board put money in the budget to build sheds, but did not put any income in to sell the old sheds. She asked if the Board sells the old sheds and amends that into the budget, if they can spend that on Secondary Roads because it was originally Secondary Road's money. She clarified that it would not bump up against the Board's maximum transfer. Sullivan said no. Rettig said the Board now has their pot of money to do some of these projects because if the County builds the new sheds and sells the old ones, they can roll that into the CIP. She said the Board would plug the money right back into a road and would find the money to do a major project. Neuzil said it would be great if the County would actually do one of these roads within the next two years. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said the Board can take the \$68,000 and the sale of the two sheds, and the Board can fund one of these roads. Neuzil said the Board started thinking about this in 2006.

Sullivan said it would be really interesting to know the last time the County actually upgraded a road. The chip sealing of Dingleberry Road is about as close as it gets. Stutsman said the County has just done maintenance. Rettig said the ideal way is to roll that money into a single project or two projects. Neuzil said Oakdale Boulevard was probably the only one on the list. Stutsman said at one time the Board considered paving one mile of road per year. Neuzil said he is not going to do any of this with the way the Rural Basic Levy is right now. Rettig said she is comfortable with taking this \$68,000 and preliminarily saying that the Board is going to take the money from the sale of the two other sheds and put in a CIP for Secondary Roads. She thinks that gets the Board a long way down the road. Neuzil said he thinks that is a good strategy.

Sullivan said he thinks there is no income budgeted because Secondary Roads is not going to assume that they will have a sale in that fiscal year. Neuzil said right now Secondary Roads just has a lead going with that piece of property. Sullivan agreed. Someone cannot technically move into a shed until it is completely built. Once they have moved they can start thinking about selling, so the Board is really talking about this project being completed in the next fiscal year. Rettig said that will create a pot of money that can get the Board a long way. Sullivan agreed.

Harney said Parker always has overruns and he is not sure if Parker has his salt storage included in the building. Stutsman said she thinks Parker did because his budget was very inclusive. Rettig said that was a long way to get to the point that the Board is comfortable with where they are.

Johnson said the next step that ties right into that is the meeting scheduled for February 3, 2011, to discuss the Five Year Road Plan which will continue on to the meeting scheduled for February 16, 2011. Neuzil clarified that the meeting scheduled for February 16, 2011, is also going to be with Secondary Roads. Johnson said yes, in the afternoon. He said the Board has a Strategic Planning Meeting in the morning and a Work Session with Secondary Roads in the afternoon. There are a lot of other Secondary Roads issues to go on that agenda, but the liaisons can work with Parker on those two action plans to decide how much they want included. Johnson said he understands that there is a separate requirement of the State, but somehow the Board is going to work in the additional goals they have in the plan. He clarified that the liaisons are going to work with Parker on that. Sullivan said yes, the biggest issue is that the State does not care if the County takes a dirt road to gravel, but if Parker shows it on the Five Year Plan then it helps in terms of planning construction and what Secondary Roads can actually manage. Neuzil confirmed. He thinks there are almost two plans Parker is going to need to have; the State plan and his own internal one. Johnson asked if Parker knows that. Sullivan said Parker will after the liaison meeting. Johnson said the Board will work on the staffing levels and the span of control with Shramek at a meeting scheduled for February 4, 2011. The Board will work on grants at a meeting scheduled for the morning of February 16, 2011. Stutsman thanked Johnson for keeping the Board organized and on track.

Adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Attest: Tom Slockett, Auditor
By Courtney Fisher, Recording Secretary