



**City of Madison
Proceedings - Final
BOARD OF WATER
COMMISSIONERS**

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Tuesday, May 15, 2007

4:30 PM

119 E. Olin Avenue

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Present: Lauren Chare, Priscilla B. Mather, George E. Meyer, Jonathan H. Standridge, Gregory W. Harrington and Thomas Schlenker

PUBLIC COMMENT

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes of the April 17, 2007 meeting.

Minutes were approved with two corrections, changing the name of Greg Harrington to George Meyer on page 6, at the end of Item 12 and the beginning of Item 13.

Jon Standridge said he would like to compliment Wendy on the completeness and thoroughness of the minutes from the April meeting, saying she captured the flavor and content for historic purposes, and with the scrutiny we are getting lately, they are great minutes.

George Meyer said in regard to Item 20, their time could better be used by discussion on what we need and should have in place before the performance evaluation of the general manager is discussed at the next meeting or a meeting after that so we're prepared to do the evaluation. George said having Item 20 put on the agenda was his way of starting the process. Secondly he said, he thinks we are going to hear some discussion from the Mayor's Office on the role of the Mayor. That will be a good time for discussion. He was not intending to make a motion to go into closed session. Jon said we can still talk about the process of the General Manager's review.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

2. April Water Quality Report.

Greg Harrington asked Joe Grande what triggers the sampling for manganese. Joe said it's customer requests, people who have had a colored water event. A couple are in response to the Mayor's Office having been contacted when the Mayor was campaigning on Mohican Pass. Joe said we did service line flushing and then collected samples right after the flushing and again a week later.

3. May Staffing Report.

George asked Dave about the Staffing Report, saying one of the positions has

had a role in terms of chain of command regarding the chlorine situation. He asked if that was the Water Supply Engineer. Dave said it was. George said he knows the recruitment process wasn't successful and is ongoing and asked what the current status is. Dave said we've gone out for applications three times now. The first time was right before the holidays, which may have had some influence on the lack of applicants, and we didn't receive any the first time we went out. All have been nationwide searches. The second time we received a number of applications and interviewed three candidates, none of whom were selected for the position. Then we posted the position "Open Until Filled"; and we received one application and we are evaluating if we'll interview that individual. Dave said he talked with George Meyer and with an individual George suggested. That person was not interested but said he would pass it along to people he knows. Dave also had discussion today with Larry Nelson, which may lead to some help in trying to get someone to fill the position. The discussion was about getting someone on an interim basis. Within the next few days we will be having more discussions about that and may be coming up with a proposal. Jon said he noticed our vacancy rate is at 10 out of 116, saying that is pushing 10% and seems high, asking if that is normal. Jon asked what our real goal is. Dave said we've got a number of vacancies and we are working through the list. Our goal is to fill positions, that most are in the distribution system, and Dan Rodefeld is working very hard to get these filled. Part of the problem is that as we fill positions, in almost all cases we are filling them with people already working for the Utility so that creates more vacancies. We've recently filled four positions in Distribution that created four more vacancies. Jon said so the goal is to get as close to zero as possible? Dave said it is. Jon asked if Dave is doing any creative recruiting for the Water Supply Engineer such as going to AWWA young professionals group or a professor to see if we can get any new graduates. Greg said he's passed the word among students but that particular position is probably something you'd want a higher level person, but there's the Engineer 1 position that might be more suitable for a student coming out of school. Jon said the young professionals group includes a lot of engineers and a large group of women professionals, which is an issue right now and that might be a good contact. Al said we're advertising on the AWWA website and on WWA. Jon said what he's talking about is more creative one on one, get some names and actually call people and ask them to apply. Jon said the best people at the State Lab often met at national meetings and through personal recruitment rather than through advertising. Lauren said, knowing the delicacies of state hiring, can we do that? Dave said we can recruit for people to apply. Lauren said we're promoting from within which has a positive effect on staff members, and asked if over the years we're having a dearth of applicants or is it steady? Dave said for the Engineer position, it's been less than normal. Al said its typical number would be 8 to 10. Jon said the communications team suggested we hire a communication specialist and asked where we stand on that. Lauren said we're going to be discussing that.

4. Operations Report.
5. Engineering Report.
6. Customer Service Report.

Jon said on capital projects, we're a quarter of the way into the year and we've spent about 4% of the money, and asked if it's because this work is seasonal. Robin said for the most part, yes. They got started a little later. Percy said there's

a lag time for the bills to come through also. Jon said to Joe that the Board asked for more detail occasionally such as how many samples were taken, 340 this month, and then there's the column that says 0 violations, but we really aren't required to do chlorine testing so zero doesn't tell him much. He said he'd like a snapshot of the samples and asked if Joe could do it now off the cuff. Joe said the ones at the well are typically .25 or higher coming out of the well or the reservoir and going into the distribution system. Regarding the samples taken at our sample locations, results vary among the 15 sites on the west side and the 14 sites on the east side. They vary based on the site and how far away from the well they are. Joe said they may be as low as .06 or .08. At Hawks Landing, it's typical because it's such a long draw. Schools are typically around .2, .24, .25. Joe said he could develop a report for the Board next month for samples collected in April. Jon said just for a rough idea; he thinks we have a stated goal of .14 in the distribution system. Joe that he thought it was .1. Jon asked what percentage would be below that. Joe said of the 600 samples that were taken, he'd say it was probably less than 5 or 10 samples.

Percy asked Ken Key about the customer information survey that was going to be sent out and if it was random. Ken said yes, it was random with residential customers. The mailing went out last Thursday and Monday he received 95 back and today 87; 1,100 were mailed.

Jon asked Al for the Engineering Report that was to be available at the meeting. Al then distributed it.

Greg asked Robin Piper the status of the long-term loan, saying it looked like it would be paid off this month and it goes into the PILOT Fund. Robin said the City paid us for outstanding tax roll receivables and we applied the \$627,000 against the short-term loan. \$588,000 is still outstanding and will be paid in the future. He said one option would be if we could sell the Main Street building, we'd have additional cash to pay that portion of it back. There is no set date for it to be paid back to the City.

Percy said flushing numbers seem higher than normal and asked if it was a good number. Al said our stated goal is to get the entire system, 840 miles, completed. We are two or three weeks behind that. He said we've been flushing since the last week of March, approximately eight weeks. Percy said she sees that we're switching the Burke Utility District over to the Madison Water Utility. Al said we switched it over at 6 a.m. this morning with no problems. Percy asked about their billing. Ken said they just received a quarterly billing, which they are on. Today we read the meters for our own system, not for billing. They will continue on quarterly billing through 2007. Percy asked who will handle the quarterly billing, and Ken said for the first time they will but we'll do it after that. They'll switch to two times per year in 2008. Jon asked how much it will increase our water sales. Ken said there are less than 100 customers so not significantly. George Meyer made a motion to accept all of the informational reports. Greg Harrington seconded; unanimously passed.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

7. Fund Balance Report.
8. Capital Project Statement.

ADMINISTRATION

9. Update on Mayor's 10-point Water Quality Initiative.

Dave said under Item 2, Water Quality, the manganese report is complete and Joe will be presenting it at this meeting. Under Customer Service Standards, you heard from Ken that they mailed the survey and are receiving returns. The Customer Satisfaction Card is underway with a design team working on it. We have the long awaited External Communication Plan that the subcommittee put together that will be presented at this meeting. Dave said they had Well 3 meeting and Well 10 meetings this past month. The meetings were very positive and good information was exchanged both ways, customer and Utility. Regarding the Collaborative Relationships with neighboring utilities, our third meeting is scheduled for May 30 to discuss groundwater management issues. Dave said he's working closely with a statewide group that is putting together a statewide mutual aid response network for utilities. The report from the Steering Committee is a good example of Internal Communication work that is being done. A steering team has been established to address internal communication and will be meeting soon.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

10. Approval of 2007 External Communications Plan (Communications Subcommittee).

Dave said the intent of this is to present it at this meeting and approve it at the next meeting. Lauren said that is correct; it's a lengthy document and you may have some questions. It's also a document that is constantly in change. Some team members are present to talk about it and answer questions. Everyone received it via email last week, and Lauren asked if they had a chance to read it. Lauren said the genesis of the plan was that we understood there was an external communications issue, and another team is working on the internal one. We did use a consultant from EMA for probably the first 75 to 80% of the plan, and then much like the other groups, we went out on our own to complete it. The group is composed of citizens representing the troublesome well areas mostly, and some people from the staff and Board members. They looked at things that happen with water that people want to know about and those were dubbed as triggers. When things happen, who needs to know about them, and how would they like to know about them. We discussed a simple way to develop criteria for what's important and what's not, and how it gets to people. We used that to develop a matrix. It is a word table and indicates what some triggers are and marks who needs to know about them, and how do we communicate with them. Some of the things are obviously underway. For example, when a public meeting is going to be held we send postcards to people. When we have meetings like this, we've now invited Channel 12 to be part of it. The goal of each activity is to let people know something is different, something is coming, something has happened in a way that's timely and cost effective. In the real world we'd telephone everyone who wanted to know about something, but we realize that we have limitations with technology and limitations with the severity of the issue. Lauren said you can look at the matrix and see how many things are of interest to people and we see how many ways there are to communicate with people; this is a big job. For most organizations, it's a one-person job, and for many it's an entire department of people. Lauren said what she'd like everyone to think about is, who is going to do that communication. Right now we rely on a lot of people to do it and Joe probably does 90% of it. We also have people who answer phones 24 hours a day, so we have people doing it on an ad hoc daily basis. On occasion we'll have news releases that need to go out. Lauren said Dr. Schlenker's department gets involved sometimes, and on occasion, George Twigg of the Mayor's Office gets

involved. There are a lot of people who need to be taking care of this and doing it correctly. Lauren said this is another one of those areas where we can't afford to fail. We've made the effort and it's important that we follow through on all of the things we committed ourselves to do.

Lauren asked Board members to pay attention to the first page where it says, "We recommend a dedicated communications person." There are many ways to get that-sometimes you will craft it out of several different positions within an agency. Sometimes you will hire an individual to do it. Sometimes you'll contract to do something special. For instance if you do a public service announcement or if we wanted to do an ad campaign on TV and radio, she would not expect Wendy to be the voice of the Water Utility. You'd hire outside expertise to do that. Lauren thinks we should be somewhat creative about it. There is a need here for someone to focus on communication, making sure that we follow the plan that we have done, making sure that as things change over time, we continue to monitor the plan so it still makes sense for people. Technology will change and one of the things we talked about was using the reverse 911 system whereby we call out to people saying here is something you really need to know about, usually something with severe health implications. The plan would have to be modified for communication changes as more people get their news from their cell phones than they do from the newspaper on the front porch. Are they getting news from both places? How can we take advantage of this and technology? Lauren would like the Board's comments to share with the committee because they spent many hours figuring out who and what needs to be told and how should it get to people. There are a lot of dedicated people who worked on this, and we're kind of an external design team. She thinks there is probably still a year's worth of work to put into this plan.

Lynn Williamson, subcommittee member, hopes everyone can see this and whatever we produce should be out in the public. It is important for external communication to be in good shape. This has to be a living document. There is probably a good year's worth of work to put into a communication plan. Lynn said it has been an interesting experience and she thinks if the public could see the work that has been done and comment on it, it would be great.

Lauren said one of the key factors of this is, if you work for the Water Utility, you are a spokesperson for the Water Utility so it's important that everyone else have as much access. That person's job is to share as much internally as externally so we can all become accurate spokespeople. We need to make sure that everyone has the same accurate information. George said that person would also have responsibility in terms of internal communication. Lauren said we aren't suggesting something as tired and old as an employee newsletter, but how would employees want to know. It's important to celebrate successes and maybe this communications person, if you've got 20 design teams working away, helps get your message out to the rest of the organization. She said sometimes it's basic things like logistics. Joe gets a request for a public meeting and someone has to find the room, make the phone call, make sure the battery in the computer works, the power point is up to snuff and handouts are available for everyone.

Greg said his first impression is that the plan goes way above and beyond what is required of utilities, and he thinks that is what we want out of this. He said he was glad to see the notation about this document being for guidance. He's guessing that there are several years of trial and error. He's guessing things will be sent out and people will say they don't need to hear that. There will be other things that don't go out that they'll want to hear about. Greg said he's never seen a document like this produced by other utilities and asked if EMA provided guidance as to what other utilities have done with these types of external

communication plans. Lauren said she remembers having a discussion with them about whether other utilities have communication/outreach people and some do. Jon said he thinks Grant said that was a combination of things that they have done for other communities. Lauren said MG&E has a bunch of people doing this. Greg said one suggestion to add is to do a comparison to see what other utilities are doing. Lauren said that is a great idea. Greg said there is a column in the matrix that addresses reporting of all test results. His question is what is the vision on that? From the informational reports we got, in the current month alone we saw 373 coliform tests, 673 chlorine tests and 434 fluoride tests. Is the intent to submit every single one of those thousands out to those placed on the matrix, or is that something that we're trying to leave to someone's judgment, or what's the concept there? Jon asked if Greg looked at the X's on the document-website, email list serve, Water Board, internal and external newsletters, and utility staff. Lauren said part of looking at realistic expectations is can you really live up to what you hope to do. She said from her perspective, these data are already gathered somewhere. They are essentially public and we're trying to make them a little more accessible to the public. For example, they are on Legistar but who knows Legistar unless you are on a board or commission or an employee. She said we're trying to drive people to our website, very much like Amazon.com does because that will become the repository of information. If they have a question, people should check there first. She said she doesn't think it's unreasonable for us to do that. She knows the word "all" makes people kind of twitchy, because "all" is hard to live up to, but she thinks for at least awhile, the more we can put out for people to look at, the better. She thinks it does two things: lets people know that we're vigilant about the water supply, and lets them know we have a routine for doing what we should be doing.

Jon said we talked about that drill down concept on the web page and Joe's been pretty successful in putting those together. You go to the level you want and if you want more, you can go deeper. When you're done, you quit. You don't have to look at the rest of it.

11. Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute Amendment No. 1 to the Professional Services Agreement with EMA, Inc. to facilitate and conduct a utility-wide, participatory self-assessment of organizational issues, communication, work practices and technology, identify opportunities for improvement and implement recommendations.

Sponsors: Common Council By Request

Rerefer to the BOARD OF WATER COMMISSIONERS Dave said the initial contract with EMA was for the first phase of the strategic plan, which was to do the assessment process with all of the employees and then put together the strategic plan, which the Board approved a couple of meetings ago. Dave said at that time he thinks there was discussion on how far we'd go with that contract, that the Board wanted to see what EMA came up with before moving forward. The Board has approved the plan and we've started part of the implementation process, but this contract amendment would be to actually implement the strategic plan and move forward with it. It's really the bulk of the strategic plan. The contract is for \$300,000, which we have budgeted for. George asked what the time frame is for the contract and if this will carry us through the process. Dave said this is a one-year and goes through the orientation process for 2007. If we want to continue and Dave said we would want to continue, we would ask that the contract be renewed. Jon said so the \$300,000 is for nine months worth of work? Dave said yes, 10 months, and we've got some things that we've already started. Jon asked how much we've spent with EMA, \$50,000? Robin said to this point we've been billed and spent about \$50,000. Jon asked if there's any work they've already done that they are going to bill us for. Robin said there is as they've been working with the SCADA people, so we will get a bill for the external communication portion of their implementation of what is considered Phase 2. Jon asked if this is part of the \$300,000. Robin said yes, it is; what we've included here is everything they've either done up to this point or expect to do the rest of this year. Jon asked how much has been done beyond the \$50,000. Robin said he thinks the last he remembers seeing from Craig is about \$50,000 above the \$50,000. Jon said if we don't approve this, we won't pay the \$50,000? Dave said no, we asked them to move ahead so we'll be obligated to pay that as we asked them to move forward with the communication plan and the design of the SCADA system. Normally they would have waited until the next phase but we had to get those things going. George asked what the necessity is for approving the contract at this meeting, or can it be approved next month. Percy said that just delays it. George said we have the resolution in a very brief summary sheet here, saying he has two areas of concern. One is we've done about \$100,000 of work with EMA and that's been pretty intensive work, and we have double the amount in the next ten months. It seems like an awful lot of effort in the next ten months. George said he worked a different system, the State system, and he admits it wasn't perfect, but they could never start work under a contract until it was signed. Even if we renewed a contract, the contractor couldn't start doing that work until after there was a formal approval. He said it seems strange to start the contract when you are already doing the work and asked if that is a normal practice here. Dave said essentially what happened is, they did the \$50,000 of the contract they were asked to do. Then we got moving in some of these areas where we felt an urgency to put together a communications plan, an urgency to do the SCADA upgrades, so we asked them to go ahead and do that. Dave said if the Board were not to approve the implementation of the strategic plan, then we would pay them under a work order or purchase order for the work that they did, but we did ask them to do a certain amount of work. That work would have been included, if we'd have wanted to wait, until the contract was signed. If the contract isn't approved, we'd pay them under a purchase order and end our relationship with them. If we do move forward with the contract, we'll just roll it into that contract. George asked what else will be done for that money. Dave said he recently got a scope of work from them and he can distribute that to the Board members.

Jon said the actual documents we got from EMA summarized what the issues were that we suspected were going on and what needed to be done. One of the

observations he made from their presentation is that they had a whole lot of expertise in operations, and they were really expecting, as in other utilities, to find operation issues that they could really dig into and have expertise in fixing. As it turned out, they didn't find many operation problems. The big-ticket items were leadership and communication. Jon asked how we know that EMA is the best company out there to help us with those issues. There are a lot of consultants who specialize in those areas. There are other consultant companies who deal just in communications. Jon said every other thing we do, we put out for bids, so once we had the strategic plan in place, why didn't we put this out on bid. Why did we just assume that EMA is our go-to group? Dave said EMA has the background and they've taken us this far. They have all the information and background on what our needs are with respect to the strategic plan. Dave said his feeling is that they are by far the best-qualified and positioned to move forward with the implementation phase. If we go out for bids, we're talking about not getting the process started until the end of the year. Percy said she recalls it was August of last year when we started, and it was very clear there were communication issues that needed to be addressed. She said we delayed bringing people on board. Dave's recommendation was to go with EMA and then there was a Board action to do a selection, and Jon and the rest of the Board chose EMA. They seem to do a good job, and when you keep a contract like this for \$50,000, there is no doubt in her mind that its kind of a loss leader, that you do an assessment and you don't just drop that once you've completed the assessment document. You need to continue to move through the implementation, because that's where the rubber hits the road. That is what needs to happen, institutional change. Percy said it seems reasonable then that we have EMA follow through since we've started a relationship and they've done an assessment process. Greg said his recollection is that EMA proposed a two-part project, one for \$50,000 and another that would be for \$300,000 after that. If we can get a scope of work document, and maybe a refresher on that history of what they proposed, we can make the decision. Jon asked how long the scope of work is that EMA gave him; is it substantial? Dave said it's five or six pages. Jon asked if it includes who is going to work for us and how many hours that would include? Dave said he doesn't know if it got into that detail.

Lauren said she would not be adverse to EMA coming back and do their presentation so we could ask questions. She said she doesn't have any issues with EMA, saying she and Jon had a chance to work rather intimately with one of their staff people, who has since left, and they did a good job. One thing she is hesitant about doing is, it takes a long time to develop trustful relationships and you've already got an EMA staff person working with the design team. Lauren said she doesn't want to spend time starting over again. She also said that she doesn't get what we're getting for \$300,000. She would also like to ask them if, after this \$300,000, do we do a rediagnosis. Lauren said are we looking at \$300,000 a year forever and ever? Percy said we discussed maybe periodic assessments to see how we're doing, every five years or so. Jon said we spent a lot of time identifying that we wanted a communications expert and that was Grant, and Grant left the company, so as part of that scope of work, he'd like to see the credentials of the person who is going to do that aspect of it. Dave said okay. Percy said what she is hearing is that the Board would like to see the scope of work, staff involved and a timeline of specifically what they'll be doing. Lauren said she'd like a new proposal as with a proposal you see the allocation of staff and who is spending what time with whom. She said she'd like to know if we're done at \$300,000, that we could hire three fulltime people to sit here and hold our hand. Quite frankly, that is a lot of money.

Jon Standridge made a motion to refer this item to the June meeting. George

Meyer seconded; unanimously passed.

The Board wants to see a new proposal from EMA Inc. before approving this resolution.

12. Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute a Professional Services Agreement with _____ for the preparation of drawings and specifications, bidding, construction administration, and the startup for a three-million per day iron and manganese removal filter and associated buildings and equipment for Unit Well 29 (AD 3).

Sponsors: Lauren Cnare and Common Council By Request

The name of the company will be provided by Alder Cnare at the 6/5/07 Common Council Meeting.

A motion was made by Meyer, seconded by Harrington, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Jon asked if there is a blank there because we are going to put it out for bids. Al said a Request for Proposal is out and due back May 23. We will then make a selection. Jon said so it's being bid. Al said he doesn't like the word "bid" because we take the most qualified firm, not necessarily the low bidder. George Meyer made a motion to approve the resolution. Greg Harrington seconded; unanimously passed. The motion passed by acclamation.

CORRESPONDENCE AND SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

13. Update on resolution requesting increase in number of commissioners on the Board of Water Commissioners.

Janet Piriano of the Mayor's Office stated that the Mayor wants the Board to go from five commissioners to seven. She said we have strong experts on the board and maybe we should add a customer or a public relations expert. She said the addition of Dr. Schlenker has been an important addition. The Mayor believes we need broader expertise on the board. Janet said the Mayor doesn't feel strongly either way about adding another alder, but he's not opposed to putting another alder on the board. He wanted Janet to ask the Board what kind of expertise they would like on the board. Greg said he agrees with Jon and would like to see someone with financial expertise on the board. Lauren would advocate for a person with a background in organizational development. Jon thinks we limit the pool if we say it has to be an alder. Jon said he understands that any alder can come to our meetings in the same capacity that Tom does, an ex officio who can participate in our meetings any time they want, so it makes more sense to Jon to not have it be an alder. Janet said it can be left open-ended. Dave said he should point out with respect to alders, their term is two years and the other board members have five-year terms. Greg said he thought State Statutes says that the term of board members has to be the same as the number on the board, so it would go to seven-year terms. Greg said before all this interest was generated about the Water Utility, we had a tremendously hard time getting people to serve on the board. If we ever get over this hurdle, will we still have the same interest down the road? George asked if Janet wants a sense of how this board feels about the issue. Janet said absolutely. This board works very hard and has gone through some very turbulent times, and she thinks it is okay for us to exercise our prerogative about how we'd like to continue to commit to this institution.

Janet said adding broader experts would be good. We have water quality and hydrology so maybe adding a customer or public relations expert would be good.

The Mayor thinks having Dr. Schlenker on the Board has been a tremendous contribution to the Board. Janet said two members is a negative quorum so no two members can ever confer. The Mayor believes in open meeting laws. Mr. Meyer should be able to call the chair of the Water Board and have a discussion about what might be on the agenda, and right now you can't do that. If a board member is not present at a meeting, they should be able to contact another board member for an update, and presently that is prohibited. Janet said for those two reasons, the Mayor would like to introduce a resolution to increase the Board from 5 to 7 members. George Meyer said he worked for a 7-member board and knows that they talk to each other because they come in with different levels of expertise. George said he is not an engineer and values Greg's opinion as an engineer. When the Mayor nominated him to the Board, he had to quickly set up meetings with board members to get up to speed on the issues, before he was confirmed and couldn't talk to them. He doesn't think it can do anything but improve the board, and Percy agreed. Greg asked the downside of this increase and Janet said she doesn't see one. She noted that Alder Konkel has a different resolution to have the CCOC report back to the Council on this issue.

George said he moves that this board go on record supporting this expansion from five to seven members. Lauren Cnare seconded; unanimously passed.

14. Discussion of establishing subcommittees in support of the five Board priorities.

At the special meeting of March 8, the Board identified five major focus areas for the coming year:

1. Master planning and infrastructure
2. Community group involvement and communications
3. Water conservation
4. Contaminants that affect human health
5. Culture change and internal communications at the Water Utility

(The Board may set up subcommittees for any of the focus areas.

Subcommittees would include at least one board member as well as a Water Utility staff and members of the public. Updates on these focus areas will be given at the monthly meeting.)

The summary can be found in the minutes of the special meeting of March 8, 2007. Percy said with the exception of water conservation and the contaminants that affect human health, there has been a lot of activity going on. Greg asked how we formed the communication committee; how were the members recruited? He said he'd be interested in one and four. Lauren said Lynn Williamson was always with us, and we tried to find people that represented areas with wells that had issues. The Well 3 meeting helped bring Dan Melton forward, and Jon knew Carl from their work place and recruited him. She said it was offered to others and some joined for a while but then had different commitments. It was informal. There was no attendance requirement. Lauren said she'd recommend, because she's not a real formal person, when you do form these committees, because perhaps we're bringing people in who don't have as much passion for the subject at hand, that she'd rely on Wendy or someone to create structure for those meetings. Percy said the first thing to do is to put together a charge so we understand what the product is. Lauren said that is a good idea. Greg said he's interested in helping out with Items 1 and 4, so how do we make that happen? Percy said with a five-member board, how much time do we have to take this on. Jon is still uncomfortable with some of this, like the communication thing was sort of a board initiative and Lauren headed it up and did a bang-up job, but it's really a Water Utility issue. Jon said in hindsight, he'd like to see, if we're going to have board involvement, that there would be a Water Utility design team put

together for all five of these where one or two or whatever number of board members would participate in it, that it's not the board doing this, it's the Utility doing it. The board member would be a champion and a participant but not the driving force. The Utility is the driving force on this. Greg said the overall objective was to get the board involved in these in these so he doesn't see a problem with a Board member running that. Jon said he does, that he'd like to see the Utility get ownership, which is important. This committee did a lot of good work but there's going to be a huge step in getting it into the Utility's culture, and if they were involved since day one it would be easier. Greg said these were things we said we wanted to do as a board so if it's someone from the board or from the Utility is fine. Jon said he doesn't see a problem but the Water Utility should be in charge. Percy said some of them seem more appropriate for the Water Utility. For example, contaminants that affect human health. Dave said we would pull the Health Department into that. He said the design teams are going to draw in expertise from the outside, that that is part of the whole system. The design team needs expertise from outside the Utility. He said whether or not the board members want to participate on a design team or have the design teams report to the board member that might be a way to keep contact. Jon asked if this would work, that we'd request design teams be set up by X date, and any board members willing to participate in those, and could we do that tonight? Maybe the steering committee can make some suggestions on setting up the committees and who should be on it. Greg said we should bring it back to the next board meeting, and they can tell us what they'd like to do and board members can volunteer if they'd like to participate. George said he agrees with that.

Percy said we'll hear about it next month.

15. Report on SOP and Sensor System Installation - Al Larson.

Al said they got together with Jack Giesenhoff of EMA who is a SCADA person. We met with several rounders and operators and went through all the various scenarios with the chlorine system. What happens with chlorine systems is that they will vary and it's just the nature of the equipment. As the day goes on, the chlorine residuals will go down. The question came up as to how far we should go up and how far we should go down. Al said we discussed it and put together a Standard Operating Procedure. It says if we hit a level of .14 milligrams per liter, the pump will be shut down and we'll investigate if it is giving accurate information. We will fix the problem, retest the water and put it back online. Al said one issue is fire and public safety, and if that is an issue, we will not shut the pump off. The second one is that with the chemistry of chlorine, it dissipates over time and if the well has been off for a significant portion of time and we turn it back on, there will be a low level reading that is just inherent to the way it operates.

Al said there are several recommendations.

Short Term Recommendations (within the next few weeks) are:

1. Increase low chlorine residual alarms for well site to 0.16 mg/L within the SCADA HMI.
2. Provide refresher training and test Rounder's competency on proper portable chlorine residual analysis procedure and maintenance of the equipment.
3. Investigate use of existing RTUs to automatically stop booster pumps on high or low chlorine reading at the chlorine analyzers.
4. Train rounders on chlorine analyzer routine maintenance and calibration.
5. Fix bug in spreadsheet used to determine alarm for low chlorine use.

Al said the rounders visit each facility daily, so if we give them training on how

to maintain these instruments, we'd be confident to know that they have been looked at and potentially calibrated on a daily basis. Al said the SCADA system has certain levels that set off the alarm. George asked about the new system and Al said they have to rely on what the system is saying it will be automatic, so it's not up to them to decide if that is a good number or not.

Long Term Recommendations:

1. As part of the new SCADA system, automatically stop booster pumps when chlorine levels are not within desired range.
2. Add a second chlorine residual analyzer at each unit well site closer to the feed point, either in the feed pipe to the reservoir, or within the reservoir itself.
3. Add chlorine gas flow meter or at least a signal indicating that chlorine is being fed or not. Use these signals for SCADA monitoring.
4. As part of the new SCADA system, replace the manual chlorinator feed with a motorized feed valve controlled via the SCADA system with constant feedback.

16. Update by Strategic Plan Steering Committee.

Lori Kief, Administrative Clerk at the Operations Center and Jim Green, Rounder and sometimes Op 2 work, were present to let the Board know what they have accomplished so far. Lori said the Strategic Plan Assessment Team created the Steering Committee. The Assessment Team was the larger group who conducted employee interviews initially. The interviews were conducted to gather information and identify areas to focus on for the strategic plan. The Steering Committee consists of 10 Water Utility employees. Denise O'Berry of EMA has been facilitating the Steering Committee meetings. There are three members from management on the team-Robin Piper, Dan Rodefled and Dave Denig-Chakroff. The other members who come from different divisions of the Utility are Lori and Jim, Janet Czerwonka, Joe Stein, Don Russell, Jeff Thompson and Glen Puntney.

Jim said on March 20, the Assessment Team held a workshop with management and that is where the strategies important to the process were developed.

Strategy 1: Communications

Strategy 2: Workforce Flexibility.

Strategy 3: Computerized Maintenance Management system (CMMS)

Strategy 4: Information Technology (IT) Planning

Strategy 5: Standard Operating Procedures (SOP)

Jim said the Steering Committee met for the first time on April 5. Team ground rules were established. The Steering Committee will define design teams to work on implementing the goals and priorities defined in the strategic plan process.

Lori said the committee met on April 24 with Denise of EMA in more of an observer role, as compared to the first meeting where she was in an advisory role. Two design teams were formed. One was created to gain customer feedback and create a customer contact card for collecting feedback on interactions where Utility employees are providing service. They are also to develop procedures for responding to those returned cards. The committee consists of Rick Marx from the Meter Shop, Joe Grande, Water Quality Manager, Torrie McCormick from the distribution system and Royce Lockner from the flushing crew.

Jim said the second team chartered was the Internal Communications Design Team. Robin Piper is steering this committee, which consists of Jim McCormick, Peggy Wischhoff, Rene Puzach, Joe Grande, Wendy Fitch, Jack Henderson, Jim Creeron and Anne Wuethrich. The employees we've approached about this are looking forward to getting started, and work should begin within a couple of

weeks.

Jim said the next team that was formed before we started was the SCADA team. Dan Rodefeld is a member of that team and will report back to the Steering Team and provide that team with focus. For the SCADA team a group was also formed to address chlorine issues at wells and develop written Standard Operating Procedures for responding to high and low chlorine levels. Lori said one of the major accomplishments, or what they call a quick win, is that as a result of a recommendation from the Strategic Planning Assessment Team, department managers and unit supervisors have assumed all hiring and discipline, and the Water Utility uses City Human Resources and Labor Relations for as many services as possible, and assigns other HR responsibilities to direct supervisors, rather than having a separate position in the Water Utility for that. Lori said we are getting positive feedback throughout the organization on this change. Their next task is to assign additional design teams.

Jim said they've put up sign up sheets in both locations for employees who would like to serve on a design team. Jim asked how often the Board would like updates from the Steering Committee. Lauren said it is good to know people are joining teams. She thought what information Lori and Jim provided was very good. Lauren said she's interested in their timeline. She would also like feedback in what their peers are thinking. George said he thought every two months for an update would be sufficient. Lauren said they could go first on the agenda.

Greg asked why they are presenting at this time. Lori said they took turns running the meetings and we have five meetings scheduled, the second and fourth Tuesdays. Greg asked if Denise will always attend. Lori said she won't be here every time. Jim said he thinks she'll be at every meeting until we are all chartered. Dave said the idea with respect to Denise is that she's been coming to every meeting, getting the Steering Committee going, and then she says she'll eventually phase herself out of the process. As the Steering Committee gets better at running their meetings, they won't need her. Greg asked if there has been opposition to this. Jim said no, that we're getting great support from our supervisors, no negative feedback.

Lori said the individual design teams will have a longer stay. Internal communications that Robin is setting up could go on for a long time. She said one issue is communication between Olin Avenue and the Operations Center, employee management, customer feedback, and day-to-day updates so this team will have a big scope. She said we'd like to see everyone on a team, that they are trying to find a good cross section. The Steering Committee is approaching some people and asked for volunteers.

George said in regards to customer return cards, will they come back in a year for an update. Greg said you are giving us updates now, are you also giving staff the updates? Jim said the Operations Center update meeting is tomorrow morning and Olin Avenue's is Thursday morning. Lori said we'd like to do some training on use of the customer feedback card, how to use them and when it's appropriate to use them. Robin said after each meeting, we have a take-back message that we are supposed to go out and talk to 10 or 12 employees individually and let them know what happened with the Steering Committee, so that we're communicating after each meeting. He said we're going to give this larger presentation in the next two days and let people ask questions of everyone. Lori said not everyone is on email, so we want to make sure the message gets out. Dave said all of the agendas and minutes for the Steering Committee and the design teams will be put into notebooks located in the lunchrooms at the two buildings. Jon thanked them for coming to talk to the Board, and he likes the idea

that you share the leadership of these teams. He asked if they've had any formal training on how run a successful meeting or facilitation, and if there is going to be any. Lori said at the first meeting, Denise of EMA told us how to run the meetings, but no, we haven't been formally trained. Jon asked if they now feel empowered to make changes, or empowered to make the suggestion to someone at a higher level who will decide for sure. Lori said she feels like they have ownership of that, that they will bring it to the Steering Committee for approval. Jon asked if it's more fun to work under this environment than it was before. He said that's one of the things he sees from team-based management, that people are enthused to come to work. Jim said he personally is pretty enthused because he's getting the support of the people around him and management. Lori said people are looking forward to participating; they are seeing small changes already, and it should be fun. Percy said the Board has set a cultural change as a priority, and will plan to hear from the Steering Committee again in July, September and November.

17. Update on status of disposal of 523 E. Main Street property.

Don Marx, Real Estate Manager for the City Office of Real Estate Development and the newly created Economic Development, was present to update the Board on the property at 523 E. Main Street. The City's surplus property disposal policy is that when an agency decides a piece of property is surplus, it sends a letter to the head of the Economic & Community Development Organization. At that time, the director will receive the memo and will send a memo to all interested people to see if they want the property. If they do, we just transfer it to them. Assuming no other agency wants it, which is the case with the E. Main property; no one wanted this property.

Don said the next step in the process is, if it's decided that it's in the best interest of the City, in this case the Water Utility, to sell it to an abutting property owner, then we can do that in a direct sale if they are interested. If that doesn't happen, the Mayor appoints a selection of criteria committee made up of Alders, neighborhood reps, and a rep from the Mayor's Office, and any other individuals the Mayor would like on the committee. The committee comes up with an idea of what the neighborhood wants to do with the land. They send them to the Council for approval. The Council looks at it and if approves, says to issue the RFP for the property. Don said they thought it was in the City's best interest to sell it to an abutting property owner. In this case, the abutting property owner is Bob Worm who owns several rental houses, an vacant lot, a rental lot and the Come Back Inn and Essen Haus and parking lot. For some reason, developments never happened; the market got soft. The most recent proposal was to convert the building to offices but an agreement on purchase price couldn't be reached. There was an offer that was well below asking price and it was rejected. The property should go for \$70 per square foot. If it goes out for bids, we are free to reject bids. George said the neighborhood might be more favorable to the proposal for an office building. Don said yes, it would keep the outside of the building as is, and convert the inside for office use. George for a difference of \$250,000, we might end up close to where we are now. Don said it is unknown what the bids would come in for, and said he believes we can get more than \$400,000 for the property. Dave said he thought the difference was between his offer and the lowest possible accepted offer. He thought he was offering one-third of the appraised value. Don said he was at \$400,000 and we were asking \$1 million and we came down to \$750,000. George asked what appraisals we had, based on current configuration of the building. George asked if the proposals we had were based on the current configuration of the building. Don

said yes, we had use as an office building. Lauren asked if Don is making a recommendation as a real estate professional that we move this a step up in the process. Don says we need to take the next step and put together a proposal for that. He knows there is another developer out there interested. George Meyer made a motion to proceed with this. Lauren Cnare seconded; unanimously passed.

18. 2006 Manganese Monitoring Report - Draft.

Joe said this report is in draft form and he would like to submit the final report at the June meeting. He said manganese has been at the forefront of Water Utility issues for a while. The Utility has taken some action in minimizing operation of wells with higher levels of manganese, instituted unidirectional flushing to try to address some of the concerns, and doing an intensive sampling program last year.

Joe recognized the contributors to this report: John Hausbeck from Health, Doug DeMaster, Judy Moran, Anglinia Washington, Eric Halvorson, Gordon Heingartner and Glenn Hyland, a chemist at the Public Health Department. Dave, Al and Dr. Schlenker were also very involved in this process.

The objectives of the study were to determine the manganese concentrations in water arriving at customer taps, identify the geographic extent of elevated manganese levels, and evaluate the effectiveness of unidirectional flushing in reducing manganese levels.

Joe said they collected samples at 5% to 10% of the properties in the problem well areas, and in the other areas 1%. Methods used were that properties were randomly selected, with a higher frequency in problem well areas. Sample types were pre-flush, post-flush, post-flush 30, quality control and resamples. Most samples were taken from exterior hose bibs. Analysis was done at Environmental Testing Lab. The post-flush samples were collected approximately one week after flushing and post-flush. Thirty samples were collected about one month after flushing. Quality control are duplicate samples that we were requested that we collect of the testing lab. Resamples were collected at homes or business in which the initial sample exceeded 300 ppb.

Joe said about 73% of the samples were less than 20 ppb. It was just a little over 91% who had less than 50 ppb, which is the aesthetic level. Between 50 to 150 was 7%, less than 1% is 150 to 300, and less than 1% is greater than 300 ppb. George asked about the higher readings. Joe said most were unoccupied homes or homes where they are vacant; one example is the owner had moved into a nursing home so the water hadn't been used. In many cases, there are situations where the water hasn't been used for a long period of time, unoccupied buildings or homes. Joe said he thinks they need to go out and flush the day prior to the sample being taken to alleviate some of that uncertainty. We want to be able to say the water has been used in the last 24 hours, that we flushed it. Jon said what he sees is that the manganese is intermittent, it comes and goes, and you can almost guaranty if you have it one day, the next day you won't. We show less than 1% of the time we're getting a hit. He said at his house he gets cloudy water two to three times a year. Another conclusion is that .6% of the time any house in the city could have manganese in the water. Joe said it's hard to pin a number on that based on the data we have. Part of the survey that is going out is trying to get that information from people-what is the frequency that they have discolored water. The preliminary results have been that it is once a year or never, and when Joe goes out to the neighborhood associations, he's also taken a survey that gives the option of once a year, often or never, and it's really hard to get a handle on that. It really depends on geographic areas, which well serves that. There are

still questions about the age of the water main, the materials, size-there are still a lot of unanswered questions about that. Jon said this 13 number; it's something about pipes dissolving, something happening from stagnant water in house's distribution system. It wasn't that that high level was in the water main. Is that the other conclusion? Joe said he thinks it is a contributing factor.

George asked if someone is having a problem with water, does he test other places in the area. Joe said if someone has discolored water and he can't say it's flushing or a main break and he collects a sample, and the water is clear - almost every time he goes out the water is clear. Joe said he thinks it points to how important the flushing program is. Jon said can we get Dr. Schlenker to say, even if you drink this water one or two times a year, is the health risk nonexistent? Dr. Schlenker said his response is yes. Dave said in the normal situation where you are running your water daily, you would not have those problems. Jon said this .6 is twice a year, and Ken is saying it's once or never for most people. Dave said we do know when we're flushing or there is a main break, or some disturbance in the main that can stir things up, you will get discolored water. Dr. Schlenker has always said when you see discolored water you shouldn't drink it. Joe said Al asked if all 13 samples collected from the troubled well areas. He said 8 of them were in the three 8, 10 and 29 areas. The other ones, he has explanations for all of them.

Joe showed a graphic that takes a closer look at the four problem well areas. It showed that 85% of the samples collected in the Well 10 area were less than 20 ppb and an additional 10% were between 20 and 49 ppb. Less than 5% exceeded the aesthetic unit. Looking at well areas 3, 8 and 29, they all have relatively higher incidents of samples reflected in the 50 to 149 ppb range, and those ranged from 9 to 15%, compared to 2% in the well 10 area and 3.5% in the other area. Joe said the other comparison we should look at are Well 3 and 8 areas, at much higher frequency of samples that were in the 20 to 49 ppb range, showing it's about 45% in the well 3 area and 31% in the well 8 area, and around 10% in the other well areas. Joe said 3, 8 and 29 areas are significantly higher, and well 10 is lower. He thinks the reason for that is that well 10 was not operating very frequently. These homes are probably getting water from Well 12 or 20 and have very low levels of manganese contributing to that.

Joe said if you look at the entire east side, there are three samples collected that exceeded 50 ppb. Only one of them was higher than 149 ppb, the one east of 194, and was from a home in which I got a call from the property owner, the day after I collected the sample, who was in Colorado. The home was unoccupied for three months. We resampled and there was less than 10 ppb. It was at 306 ppm and follow up samples came in at 6 ppb, 2 ppb and 1 ppb. So almost the entire east and north side of town, we don't see high levels of manganese anywhere.

Joe said a greater part of the city do not show high levels of manganese.

Joe showed the pre and post-flushing of the Well 10 area. There is a statistically significant difference between the pre samples and the post samples. The post samples include one week and one month post flush samples, and there is an approximately 35% decrease in the average manganese concentration for all of those samples. We did see a significant difference in the Well 10 area following flushing.

Joe recommends identifying 100-200 locations for long-term monitoring. Collected water samples over a time series extending to 12 months following flushing. Flush sample taps one day prior to sampling. Re-sample any residential tap with >100 ppb manganese. Investigate factors that may influence manganese levels at residential taps: pipe attributes (age, diameter, material), hydrant flushing turbidity, and other variables.

Other recommendations are: to the extent possible, minimize operation of wells that exceed 50 ppb manganese or investigate the feasibility of treatment to reduce manganese. Continue with unidirectional flushing of water mains to remove accumulated manganese sediment. Test well samples for manganese on a monthly basis. Develop a program that monitors turbidity and triggers flushing of water mains to limit water quality complaints. Establish water quality benchmarks for manganese, iron, and turbidity at wells and residential taps.

19. Report on Well 3 Public Meeting.

Joe said April 19 we had another public meeting, the East Isthmus Water Drinking Water Series meeting. It was put on by the city and the neighborhood associations. Guest speakers were Ken Bradbury WI Geographical and National History Survey and Joe Demorrett of City Engineering. It was an informational meeting. We did make the proposal to abandon Well 3 at that meeting. Ken talked about general hydrology and things that we want to consider as we move forward with siting a new well on the isthmus. Joe talked about landfills and potential contaminant sources. Someone from the Planning Department talked about projected development and what effect that might have on water supply. The analysis that AI reported about Black & Veatch's study suggesting that we can abandon Well 3 and still have capacity. We also introduced Steve Gaffield and the Montgomery project team who will be working on the Well 3 replacement study. Joe was a little disappointed in the turn out for the meeting. There was a very good discussion from highly educated people, so it was a productive meeting. We wrapped it up with questions and answers and we were there until almost 9 p.m.

Joe said we also had the Well 10 meeting on May 3. It had much better attendance, with about 60 neighborhood people there. Lynn Williamson made a big effort to get people to attend the meeting. John Hausbeck was there, he and Dave, and Doug DeMaster, an Engineer with the Water Utility. We had a discussion on what is the operation plan for Well 10, emergency conditions when the well might need to put water into the system, and how to notify people. Joe said we got some tough health related questions as there is still a lot of concern over manganese exposure and what impact will be.

AI stated that we need to resolve the Well 3 abandonment issue. If the board decided to abandon the well, and that is the staff recommendation with significant contingencies. The most significant contingency says that we have to commit to the infrastructure improvement program over the next five years, which could be a significant outlay of funds, in order to continue to build on supplying water to that area. AI said we need action by the board to authorize us to start the process of abandoning Well 3. George asked if they could put together a background document of some sort. AI said the layout is in our Master Plan, a series of improvements that are required to change. By abandoning Well 3, that puts more pressure on us to make sure that we do the improvements itemized in the Master Plan. Jon said it would be nice to have some sort of document because he has a vague feeling of what the long-term impacts would be. He'd like to see a spreadsheet saying how many dollars, what specific things are we committing to by doing this. AI said he is talking about our approved Master Plan. Jon asked him to pull the stuff from the plan out so we can see how you reached your conclusion. George said he'd like to see what you are doing, why you are doing it. Percy said the time line with Well 3 has moved up. Jon said it's turned off now, so he'd like the information to abandon the well. AI said he doesn't think we can go beyond June and still hope to get it done by the end of the year. AI said we need to make a decision in June. If you are more

comfortable making the decision in June, we can produce the information that is requested. Jon said he is surprised that it's not on this agenda, that he would have spent the time getting ready for it if he thought we were going to vote on it. Jon said he's not ready to make a decision on the long-term effects until he sees more information. Jon wants to know more about the contingencies. Al said if we go ahead and abandon the well, we just have to make sure we complete the capital improvements that are outlined in our master plan. Jon said what will the rate increases be, to get all of that work done. We don't have the nuts and bolts of how. George said the value of it and we need to get the money issue out there as to what we're asking for regarding money for the infrastructure. Percy thinks the public will be concerned that we are wavering about Well 3. George said he'll vote for it; he just wants more information. Dave said we'll wait until June on this issue and get more information so everyone feels more comfortable about abandoning Well 3. The study shows that we won't need to start it up. Al said when it comes to budget time and we need to raise our capital budget \$1 million for example, in order to complete a project, that would need to happen, whereas if we had Well 3 available, maybe we could delay that project for a year. Al said he'll pull the information from the Master Plan and put it in a single document so you can see it in table form, and how much money we're talking about. Percy said that will change our projected spending. Al said there is before the Master Plan spending and after the Master Plan spending. Al said the hydraulic analysis has shown is if we can do what's in the Master Plan, we can go ahead and abandon Well 3. The Master Plan said that it would be abandoned in 2012, but what they are saying is, based on hydraulics, we can go ahead and abandon it right now, and we need to continue on the course of doing the facility improvements outlined in the Master Plan.

20. Review of General Manager's Performance.

Percy said we normally review the General Manager's performance in closed session, George said he asked that this be put on the agenda to get it before the Board, to get the process rolling. His intention was not to go into closed session at this meeting. He knows there is a contract situation and wants to know how all of that ties together, what objectives the Board has, including that or in addition to that. We need to have the process of how we'd conduct the closed session, He said there is also the issue about who does what in terms of the State Statutes vs. the local Ordinances, and how they tie together if they do. Percy said in the past, we had a time line of when the Board would do the evaluation. Dave said normally he put together a document that had a calendar year list of accomplishments. There was an evaluation tool we used for many years. Dave recalls the last time he had an evaluation, there was a lot of discussion on the accuracy of that tool. He would like to know what the evaluation criteria are. Since then there are the Utility Standards put in, so those are the contractual standards that he is being measured against. Those certainly need to be evaluated. George asked when the last evaluation was. Dave said there wasn't one last year so it was in 2005. George believes in annual evaluations. He thinks we should have one and should coordinate it with the Mayor's office. He would like to start the process.

Janet Piraino said we should clean up the technical issue. We need to make sure the State Statutes, the Ordinances and the Contract are consistent with each other and reflect current practices. She said as we're adding two new members to the Board, it may be an opportune time to take care of the technical glitch as well. Dave said there was an analysis by Attorney May who did write up a memo about the issues to presented it to the Board. He said it does make sense to do

this at this time. George said he thinks the evaluation is important in terms of responsibility and accountability and it needs to be clarified. If changes are made, it needs to be clear what the interactions are between the Board, Dave, and the Mayor. Janet asked that this be put on early in the agenda if Attorney Mike May is going to attend. Janet said she would ask him to update the memo. Percy said the contract renewal date would be helpful also.

Roger Allen was present and said he is looking at the employment agreement with Mr. Denig-Chakroff dated July 10, 2006. Dave said that was when it was signed, but he thinks it was retro to March 24. Percy said there is a point that there needs to be notification of non-renewal. Jon asked if that is the 10-point plan that we all received reports on, or is this a different document. Janet said this is the actual contract between Dave and the City. Dave said he has copies of his contract that he can give the Board. Janet said during the time this contract was being renewed, she worked with Dave and the Mayor putting together the benchmarks on it. Roger said it is highly unusual that a department head's contract doesn't go before a body like this. Percy said his contract is directed by the City. Janet said she would be happy to ask Mike May to put the triggers in a time line. Roger said the last contract was signed by the Board president at the Mayor's Office. Janet said she will send Board members a copy of the contract. Dave said he can do that, too. He will send it out electronically. George said just finding out the relationship and having Mike May here at the June meeting will be a step forward in where we go after that. Percy said it is up to the Board to think about how to connect Dave's evaluation. Jon said the last time we discussed this, it seemed like we were moving from this Statute that says the Board is supposed to do this, and in practice, we work with the Mayor. Everyone weighed in on this and it was a joint effort. If we're going to move to something that's going to take us off that Statute and we're not really in control, the Mayor's in control-it's more like the current DNR system. So we're going from the old system to the new and we'd better think through that clearly. George said that is one reason he asked what the ramifications are from doing this. Jon said we'll find out for sure in June.

APPROVAL OF NEXT MEETING DATE

21. Approval of the next regular meeting date of June 19, 2007.

Lauren Cnare will not be at the June meeting. Jon said he'd like to have an ending time to the Board meetings so we could get out of here earlier. Discussion was held on changing the date of the meetings. At this time it was decided to leave the meetings as scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:53 p.m. Jon Standridge made a motion to adjourn the meeting. George Meyer seconded; unanimously passed.