



City of Madison

Meeting Minutes - Final

BOARD OF WATER COMMISSIONERS

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

Tuesday, July 10, 2007

4:30 PM

119 E. Olin Avenue

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Present: Lauren Cnare, Priscilla B. Mather, Jonathan H. Standridge and Gregory W. Harrington

Excused: George E. Meyer and Thomas Schlenker

PUBLIC COMMENT

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes of meeting of June 19 meeting.

Greg Harrington stated on page 10, item 19, that after the sentence "we want clarification on contaminants that affect human health" he said "The first thing that should be done is to develop implementation of the groundwater rule." On page 11, item 21, where it says "we saw a median value of 4.2" it should read "0.12." Jon Standridge moved approval, Lauren Cnare seconded, unanimously passed.

CHANGES/APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Minutes of May 15, 2007 were approved. Motion by Greg Harrington, second by George Meyer; unanimously approved.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

2. June Water Quality Report.

Greg Harrington asked Joe Grande if the complaints on discolored water are primarily occurring when the system is being flushed or if it is prior to the system being flushed. Joe said it's a combination of both. Lauren asked how the complainants were responded to. Joe said we respond when they call and explain what is occurring.

3. June Staffing Report.

Jon said we've been running about 10% down on our budgeted allocations and asked if that is intentional. He said we're down 11 people out of 114. Dave said no, there are positions we're having difficulty filling and there are a lot of positions filled from internal candidates, which then creates another vacancy. Dan Rodefled has been working with HR to get the positions filled as soon as possible.

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

Ken Key presented a report on the customer information survey that was mailed in May to 1,000 residential customers. Highlights: Customer satisfaction was quite high in the area of utility employees entering homes for meter exchanges. Asked about the value they are receiving in water and sewer compared to other necessities, high. In terms of whether it's a good buy, many didn't know or had no opinion. Ken said we need to educate on the value of water. AWWA has a campaign called "Only Tap Water Delivers" and one of the messages is to elevate the value of water service in the mind of consumers. Ken said on the frequency of billing, 74% said they would like to stay with semi-annually.

Tap water was used by 84% of the customers. When asked about the frequency of discolored water, 152 said never, 127 once a year, 14 people said once a month and 6 said once a week, which means the average customer has discolored water less than one day a year.

On overall performance of the utility, Ken said 82% said good to excellent and only 2% rated poor, so again we got good marks. Rating the quality of Madison's drinking water, 24% say excellent, 54% say good, 19% said fair and 3% say poor. Jon said it appears employees entering homes have a favorable rating and to pass on to those workers that they are doing a good job.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

7. Fund Balance Report.
8. Capital Project Report.
9. 2008 Capital Budget submission.

Robin presented the first edition, A, that was submitted to the Comptroller's Office. It includes everything in the Master Plan that should be done next year. The budget was due June 25. Al prepared a spreadsheet and then he was on vacation, so Robin put Al's numbers in and submitted it. It has since been revised and that is the B version. We went from almost \$21 million down to around \$18 million. The next step is for the Comptroller's Office to make their recommendations and then it goes to the Capital Improvements Review Committee meeting next week. Jon asked what it was last year and the year before. Robin said last year the approved budget was \$16,400,000. Al stated the budget includes \$5.3 million for pipeline installation.

ADMINISTRATION REPORT

10. Update on Mayor's 10-point Water Quality Initiative and Water Utility Standards.

Dave said everything is progressing.

OLD BUSINESS

11. Consideration of the dates of future board meetings.

Percy said the second Tuesday is not going to work for board meetings. Dave said some of our reporting to the board has been monthly reports and Robin and Joe compile their information at the end of the month. They wouldn't be able to have that information ready for the agenda on the second Tuesday. Dave said another problem is that anything referred to the Water Board by the Common Council from their meeting on the first Tuesday of the month, couldn't be put on the water board agenda if it were the second Tuesday of the month because the board wants the agenda on Wednesday of that week. A different day of the week was discussed but wasn't feasible. It was decided to start the meetings at 4:00 p.m. rather than 4:30 p.m. on the third Tuesdays and see if that works. Jon Standridge made a motion to this effect. Greg Harrington seconded; unanimously passed.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

12. Ordinances

06737

Amending Section 13.06(2) of the Madison General Ordinances to clarify regulations for water meter pits and to establish abatement procedures for water meter pit hazards.

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Harrington, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Joe Stein said there is a problem with owner maintenance of meter pits. This ordinance allows that if they don't meet all of the requirements, we can upgrade the meter pits to the current standard at the owner's expense. Joe said it is a safety issue. Ken said it's a problem getting the pits pumped out and we've had to do it several times. Ken said there are around 50 meter pits in the city, and letters will be mailed to the owners regarding this issue. Lauren Cnare made a motion to approve the resolution. Greg Harrington seconded; unanimously passed.

The motion passed by acclamation.

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

06836

Amending Sections 13.01, 13.02, and 13.03 of the Madison General Ordinances to restructure the Board of Water Commissioners in compliance with state statutes and to add two additional voting members.

Attachments: Mike May Memo WU Sec. 66.0805 Stats.pdf, 06836 Admendment.pdf, 06836 Registration Stmt.pdf

Rerefer to Common Council Organizational Committee.

RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO REREFER - REPORT OF OFFICER to the BOARD OF WATER COMMISSIONERS Attorney Michael May said one of the changes he made was that at least one but not more than two of the board members would be alderpersons. The changes to the ordinance are to maintain the relationship between the Board of Water Commissioners, the general manager, the mayor and the Common Council and to move it on to a level that is more legally defensible if someone asked questions about who has the authority for what. Jon said he understands that there would be a shared responsibility for the governing of the Water Utility by the Mayor, the council and the water board. If we follow the state statutes, which we've sort of adopted, the board is solely responsible for the water utility. Attorney May said the mayor and council would appoint water board members. Their role would be to appoint the commissioners and make some changes in the ordinance to tell you how you operate but only within what State law allows. That alternative is a strong commission form of managing the utility. That is not what is being proposed. Jon said the Mayor sponsored this so he'd like this view Okayed and get the State Statute out of the picture. Attorney May said he thinks the Mayor is doing what the council tried to do in the past, clean it up so there are no questions. If you have that independent commission, the Mayor would feel his power was taken away. Jon said some citizens are promoting the idea that the citizens board is the way to really have public representation, that sharing it is giving away some of the responsibility that the board has and there are strong arguments for that. Jon said he is still on the fence. He thinks it would have been useful to have requested another ordinance drafted by Attorney May that would reflect the other view, where we really adopt the State Statute and fix the Ordinance. Let us read what it would look like to have an autonomous board. Jon thinks we should refer this item and request a version B of what it would actually look like with a citizen's board and make a comparison.

Lauren said she doesn't know that would be helpful. Perhaps they could be given an example of, under one ordinance, the board would do one thing and the other form of governing would give us this outcome. Attorney May said if you went strictly with the State Stat, the Council and Mayor would not be involved in the hiring of the utility manager. The Commission may appoint and establish the compensation for the manager so the Mayor and Council would have no say in that either, nor would they be involved in any discipline of the manager. This commission would be involved in hiring and setting the rates of pay for the employees and would not be ruled by the City's rules and HR Department. The BWC would in most cases, by its decision, be able to enter into contracts on behalf of the City as long as Utility funds were being used and not general funds. There would have to be changes in how budgeting is done. Those are a few of the ways that a strong board operates. Attorney May said he doesn't think this would get strong support from the Mayor or the Council.

Lauren asked how many strong boards there are in Wisconsin. May said it's relatively common for municipalities that own electric utilities. Some of the water utilities are under the Board of Public Works. Dave said he suspects many operate the way we do, with the combination of authority operating it. Lauren said we'd have to hire an HR professional for the Water Utility. We'd have to meet daily, and that is a huge responsibility. Dave said he'd imagine we'd have to negotiate our own union contracts. Attorney May said it wouldn't be a citywide contract so those are the things you'd run in to. You would have to meet more often because of the additional responsibilities. Lauren asked how board members would be appointed and May said that would remain the same. You could get into problems with how many alders you want on the board. Lauren asked how this board would protect itself legally if they made a poor contract

with an employee. Attorney May said they could use the City Attorney or hire their own attorney.

Jon said with the concept the board can be regulated by ordinance, couldn't an ordinance be passed where the board would delegate some responsibilities back to the Council/City such as union negotiations or HR responsibilities. Attorney May said ultimately the responsibility lies with this board. You would have to tell City HR that you want them to negotiate the same deal as other city employees get. Attorney May said if the purpose in setting up that strong commission is to get independence from the Council and some of the politicking that goes on. If you start delegating it back to the City, you're going to have to look at if you are defeating your purpose.

Alder Sayta Rhodes-Conway for District 12 asked Attorney May if the board were to move to a strong commission and redelegate some duties back to City departments, is there some arrangement in terms of paying for the portion of HR work that gets done by the City, or would there need to be such an arrangement? Attorney May said if the Utility wanted to use the balance of City employees that would be a question that would have to be reviewed. She said she is very much in favor of this proposal, with all due respect to the Board. Water was one of the top three issues that came up when she was campaigning and continues to come up. At this time she thinks the council has little that can be done so she is looking for ways we can strengthen the connection between the Board and the Utility and the Common Council in terms of accountability and the flow of information. She asked if there are ways that alders can get the word out on some of the initiatives. She thinks we should add numbers to the Board to get more expertise on the board and avoid quorum problems. She would support appointing another alder to the board. She supports the language that is before you tonight.

Jon said regarding the shared responsibility between the Mayor, Council and the Board, if the Board wants to pay the manager X number of dollars, do you have to reach a consensus or does the Mayor win? May said on the new ordinance it is made clear that the manager is subject to being filled in accordance with the rates of pay that other managers are. This board can weigh in but ultimately it is approved in a contract by the Common Council who sets the rate of pay - that is how it works under the current ordinance.

Dr. Schlenker said last week at the Council there was quite a debate over the consulting contract. A point that was brought up had to do with the City's sole source contracting policy. Attorney May said under the existing ordinance, one question with regard to EMA is, does it have to be approved if the Water Board has approved it. We don't know if the Water Board has this authority. The Utility would be subject to state laws regarding bidding, but not clear if it would go through the Board of Public Works. You have to look very closely at areas to see what power the Council has. Attorney May said this document would make it clear that the Council has to approve contracts. He drafted it to take the existing practice and codify it in a way that made it more legally defensible. He said let's get this cleaned up and then look at it again at another date. Jon said Tom called it his proposal and he is still on the fence here. He wants to think clearly about what we're doing. The proposal is very clear but we need to air the proposal for a strong board. In the future we could go that direction if we want. Attorney May said he'd be happy to draft an ordinance as to what it would look like, but clear this up first. Percy asked if adoption of the proposal will change how the Utility does its contracting. Attorney May said he doesn't think so. It makes it clear that the same rules that require departments to come to the Council for approval, but not always.

Dave said he thinks this is a matter for the Water Board - the policy board

should make the decision and the Board should make that decision. He agrees with Attorney May about recreating the way we operate now. He often looks at the working in the State Statutes and the Ordinances in trying to figure out which to go with. Dave said he thinks its a matter for the Board to decide Percy said over time we have moved closer to working with the city including HR and financial and it's working well. This is a legal cleanup for the process we are already using. She doesn't know that we'd provide benefit to the water customers if we were to establish independence and it would just lead to some sort of conflict. Lauren said there is huge benefit from collaboration, that the average citizen thinks we're a city organization. She says we are too big of a business entity to go it alone. She would like to hear from employees on this also. She would be comfortable proceeding as usual. She hasn't heard from anyone saying they want a strong board. She asked Robin what he thought of this. Robin said we already have service level agreements with the City. When they do things for us, we are charged for it. He doesn't think there would be a lot of difference financially from this. Greg asked if it would be possible for the City to pass ordinances to dip into our money. Robin said that already can happen, that we are protected somewhat by the PSC. Sanja said Dean Brassler assured her that that wouldn't happen.

Greg said he'd like to see it referred to the next meeting. He'd like to see some legal interpretation of the PSC Stats that allow for it--what part of the Stats actually say that. He'd like to see what an ordinance would look like with a strong board option. Greg moved that we refer this issue to the next meeting and ask Attorney May draft an ordinance looking at the strong board option and provide us with an analysis with the PSC statute that requires separation of Utility finances from the City General Fund. Jon Standridge seconded; unanimously passed.

CORRESPONDENCE AND SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

13. Strategic Plan Steering Committee Update

Joe Stein and Janet Czerwonka gave an update on the Steering Committee and design team activities. The steering committee applied for the Gold Award from AMWA for competitive achievement. AMWA (Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies) is a definitive voice for the largest public owned water utilities in the country. Joe reported four new design teams have been formed: Water Conservation headed by Glenn Puntney, Workforce Flexibility headed by himself, Standard Operating Procedures with Dan Rodefled as lead person, and the fourth team is the Work Practice team headed by Lori Kief.

Janet said the Internal Communications and Customer Feedback teams were formed and are active. The steering committee has oversight of the design teams. She said it was budgeted for EMA to lend their expertise to the work practices and workforce flexibility teams. They are currently on hold until the status of the EMA contract is known. Janet gave updates on the steering team and the design teams. Joe said the steering team has been dealing regularly with council members and mayor's representatives to discuss the entire process; it's an ongoing procedure. Some board members have said they would only support EMA until the end of 2007. Joe said the utility would not be able to effectively continue the strategic plan without the expertise and guidance of EMA. Janet agreed with this. She said the committees are still in the development stages and still need EMA's assistance. Janet said if the \$300,000 needed to be used to correct or repair a problem at a unit well, it would be approved without question because a well is a necessary asset. Eighty to 90% of the Water Utility budget is

for employees and labor; the work with EMA should be viewed as an improvement in our most valuable assets, our employees. These improvements could be expected to create more efficiency and cost savings. Joe said previous attempts to try to deal with the Utility's problems failed; in the short time EMA has worked with us, the employees have seen improvements.

Janet said it is set up for that after the initial learning process, EMA will phase out of assisting us in facilitating. We are holding meetings on our own and using the tools they gave us. Eventually they hope to move out all together and come back in five years to see how we are doing. Jon asked if EMA has connected them with any local resources. Janet said we intend to use those but at this point, with things on hold and some teams just getting started, we haven't availed ourselves of them. We do have notes on places to contact. Jon said EMA is bringing this new style of management to the Utility, and he is 100% behind that as it needs to happen, and we need to keep moving down that road. Lauren asked if people are being trained to train other employees. Janet said this has always been a three to five year plan. EMA trained the initial steering team and we then took the items that were the most important to the employees, categorized them and formed design teams. Each design team has a steering committee member on it. Janet said if we're cut off at the very first stage, we're not going to be able to accomplish anything and it will all be negative news again about the Water Utility. She said she doesn't think it's fair that we might not have a chance to continue what we've started as we've put a lot of time, effort and hard work into this. Lauren said she thinks it's a one-year juncture and after \$300,000, we need to look at that again. Lauren said she does support this, but she thinks it's important for employees to say it is important and is making a difference. Percy also suggested calling your alder. Ken Key said there have been many efforts for improvement in the past but none have continued past the initial push. You need the expertise, especially with water utilities, to move this thing ahead.

NEXT MEETING DATE

14. Approval of August meeting date.

ADJOURNMENT

06908

Attachments: 3.Staff Rpt 7-10-07.pdf, 5.Eng Rpt 7-10-07.pdf, 6.Custmr Serv Rpt 7-10-07.pdf, 10.10-pt WQ Inity 7-10-07.pdf, 12. 06737 Mtr Pits 7-10-07.pdf

Attachments

ADDENDUM

15. Discussion on the Common Council discussion of the \$300,000 EMA contract at the July 3 Council meeting.

Dave said George Meyer asked that this be on the agenda. Unfortunately, George was not at this board meeting. Dave was not at the Council meeting as he was on a scheduled vacation and out of state. Joe Grande and Robin Piper attended the meeting to represent the Water Utility and did a good job in responding to questions.

Dave distributed a memo with a summary of the areas that came up at the

Common Council meeting. One was Sole Source Contracting and the other the expenses committed to EMA prior to this contract being executed. Dave said the bottom line on the contracting is that Attorney May said we did not execute a sole source contract, and after reviewing it, he came to the same conclusion. The resolution said that he and the Mayor's Office did propose a sole source contract for this on June 6, 2006. EMA is considered the premiere company for these types of things for water utilities in the country. We suggested hiring them to get moving forward. The Board rejected this and wanted this to go through the open competitive process, which we did. A selection team was made up of two board members, himself, staff member Joe Stein with Jim McCormick as an alternate, and a representative of the Mayor's Office, Janet Piraino. We went through a rigorous competitive process. We put out an RFP and received five proposals and narrowed it down to two, which we interviewed, and the selection team unanimously selected EMA.

Dave said the resolution that went to the board and the council following that process was a resolution authorizing the Mayor and the Clerk to execute a professional services agreement with EMA Inc. to facilitate and conduct a Utility-wide participatory self-assessment of the organization issues. The resolution authorized the implementation of the strategic plan. However, at that time, we had an authorized budget for strategic planning for \$50,000 so we couldn't contract for the implementation because the proposal accepted by the board had \$50,000 of what it would cost to do the assessment and the strategic plan, and they also estimated \$300,000 to \$500,000 for the implementation phase.

He said we are now coming back to the board and the council with an amendment to that contract. Going back and reading through the documents, he can see why the council felt they didn't have enough information. In retrospect, the resolution could have contained more information, more background information and a clearer description of the process we are going through and what we anticipated in terms of Phase 1 Strategic Plan, Phase 2 The Implementation, and followed through with the anticipated cost of each.

Dave said both he and Attorney May will be putting out reports to the Common Council and hopefully that issue will be resolved. With respect to the expenses that were committed, pretty much the same questions came up at the Council meeting as came up at the board meeting on May 15, which caused the board to refer it to the June meeting. Dave is going to put out a report to the Common Council and he hopes this issue will be resolved. The expenses were discussed at the June meeting and he thinks the board had their questions answered as to why those funds were committed and used for. Dave said 60% of the cost has been expended toward the \$300,000 and are things that weren't part of EMA's initial proposal. Those items were workflow mapping workshop, mandated by the investigation report of the Well 29 incident (\$8,577), external communications plan-the board at the November 28 passed a motion to form a subcommittee and that subcommittee asked that EMA be involved in the formation of a plan (\$18,076), the SCADA system preliminary design-became a high priority and asked EMA to help with the technical aspects of that project (\$19,056), facilitation of the Water Board special meeting to develop mission statement and set priorities for the coming year-at it's January meeting, the board asked staff to arrange for a facilitator from EMA for its special meeting in March (\$2,287), leadership workshop-the board stressed the importance of leadership training for Utility top management staff; EMA arranged for a workshop (\$3,812), and chlorine standard operating procedures-after several incidents at wells, EMA assisted in developing an SOP (\$5,504).

Summary: Tasks outside the EMA proposal: \$57,312. Tasks within the EMA

proposal: \$42,343. Task project management/administration/direct expenses: \$15,136. Total: \$114,791.

Jon said the board approved the \$50,000 after the bid process to have EMA do that work. He expected the board would get a report in December, which we received in February. He expected to see a proposal from EMA for the implementation of the strategic plan that we should have received in December. We would have had another chance to approve spending more money. In the January meeting, the question came up that we had Grant McGinnis facilitating our communications meeting. Jon said he asked how we were paying for this. There wasn't a clear answer. He thought we were spending extra funds to do some of these extra things. We expected to get a proposal in January and didn't get it until May and at the point we'd already been doing a lot of the stuff. Jon said he expressed concern at that time. For the record, he wants to say that was his understanding of what he thought we were going to get and we got something substantially different.

Percy asked if we want to send a message to the City Council about the importance of the approval of the contract. Lauren said she understands at the last meeting, the board voted to approve going forward with the things pertaining to the \$300,000. If the board approved it, we need to go defend it. She said a plan without implementation does not do anything. People are concerned about money being spent without public oversight. She thinks there should be some whereas clauses that reminds people that the money was in the budget and it was approved. In the interest in clarity and working together, it's important that people know. We need to account for \$300,000 and what we anticipate getting from that, and do a continuing accounting.

Jon said he voted no, he didn't support it. He wanted to make it clear that it's not that he's not supporting going forward, but he's not sure we're getting the best bang for our buck with EMA. He doesn't like the fact they missed deadlines. He has other experts telling me we have local people who are better and cheaper. Percy said we had a committee that said EMA was the most qualified. Jon said in January we need to have a real serious discussion. Percy said this was discussed, that without implementation, it's an empty promise, to raise people's expectations and then not continue. Jon said we need to do it and do it right; we need strong leadership behind it. January 1st we need a real serious discussion on how we're going to keep moving with this process and what will be best for the Water Utility. Lauren said the way the contract was written did give us a fall back. There was a confluence of emergency factors and we had the relationship and had people who knew what had to be done in a timely fashion; that is why we went forward with EMA. Lauren said she thinks how we fell apart as a board was that we should have had a blow-by-blow accounting from EMA. She said she doesn't know if the Common Council needs to know as often but she thinks projects need to be proposed and approved before we go forward.

Dave said we agree with that and it has been a subject of discussion with the strategic plan steering committee. There was a strong feeling in the meeting today that the steering committee needs to take ownership of the project but also the cost of the project and to make sure we have an accounting for where we are at. Dave suggested that part of the update to the board be what's been spent, for what, where are we now on an every other month basis. The steering committee is willing to take that on. Percy said it's difficult to put on pause once the enthusiasm is generated and people are ready to go. She said the culture has been created over years, decades, and it's not going to change by the end of 2007, so she cautions having some patience and giving this time to work.

Jon asked Dave what his plan is if the Council does not approve this. Dave

said we don't have a Plan B. Jon said that's not okay, he wants to know what the plan is. Dave said if the Council doesn't approve it, we'd have to meet as a steering committee to see what we think we can do without the assistance of EMA. There would be a serious stall in our SCADA design development-there would be implications. We'd have to analyze it to see where we'd go from here. Dave said the biggest barrier to doing this piece-meal would be the loss of credibility from the standpoint of employees. They are feeling like they are involved in this process and that it is moving forward. There are still those who are not buying into it but there are more and more who are. If this fell apart at this point, it would be difficult to get them enthused again as their biggest perception is that these programs last a little while and then go nowhere.

Jon said the literature shows that organizations that have success with this, the single most important factor is strong leadership committed to the change. Jon said to Dave that this is a real opportunity for him to make this happen. As a board member, he has every expectation that Dave will vigorously and successfully lead the change to the management style of the Utility. Dave said he has the same expectation. Percy said we can't expect management to make improvements without providing the resources to do it.

Dave said he sent EMA an email the morning after the Council meeting saying any work for the Madison Water Utility should cease and desist, that they would not be paid for any work they did for us from July 3 until the contract is executed. They understand that clearly. Lauren asked if there is value in their coming on their own time to defend the work they've done for us. Dave said we have enough information, that it's clear what needs to be done and he thinks it's better coming from the employees.

Lauren proposed adding some whereas clauses to the resolution. Janet Piraino was consulted on this and said she'd find out if that could be done. Lauren said she moved that we add additional "whereas" clauses incorporating the information provided by Dave this evening, to more thoroughly illustrate the history of how we got to this point. Dave said maybe the resolution should include authorization for us to work something out to incorporate the keys things into this. Jon asked if we'd want to include that in January we discussed how we were paying for the current activities. Lauren said the whereas might say something to the effect "discussions regarding additional contract expenditures were initiated at the board meeting on January 9"... Jon said "concerns were raised about the expenditure of the money prior to the contract being signed." He said the minutes don't have that real clear but the discussion was there. Jon said we were aware this was going on. Jon said it was never clear if this was extra money or part of the \$300,000. A couple of times we thought it could go either way. Dave said it still could. For 60% of these costs weren't part of the original proposal and could have been separate work orders. Robin said the current proposal before us includes those side trips so we're still talking about \$300,000 tops with EMA this year. He said the steering team wants to have more control over expenditures going forward. We're going to use as much of our own resources as we can.

Jon said the Council should know that we expressed that concern in January, how we were paying for current activities prior to the contract being signed, and it wasn't properly addressed until May when it was aired adequately. Jon said we were expressed that concern, it wasn't properly addressed in the following months up until May, and then it was aired adequately. Lauren said this is a resolution we want to pass and we want this money allocated. If we send mixed messages, it doesn't build a supportive case. Lauren said the other option is for someone from the board to come and say yes, we've reached the point where the

board approved spending this \$300,000, and someone explain what happened in the past months.

Lauren said we have a motion to clarify this to include relevant material in this resolution under "whereas." Jon said he hasn't studied that enough to second the motion or vote for it. Greg asked if Dave's memo is too long for council members to read through and Lauren said no, people will read it with great interest. Greg asked if it's part of the legal records if it appears in our minutes or in the council's; it is. Greg said he amends the resolution saying the whereas would simply be a reference to this document, the memo. He thinks if you add a bunch of whereas statements, there won't have an opportunity to review them. Dave suggested a motion to direct staff to talk to the City Attorney's staff about if it is possible to do that. Lauren said she seconds Greg's motion. Unanimously passed.

At 7:05 p.m. Greg Harrington made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Lauren Cnare seconded; unanimously passed.