

EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING

FEBRUARY 3, 2016

The East Bethel City Council met on February 3, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. for the City Council Work Meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Voss Ron Koller Tim Harrington
Brian Mundle

MEMBER ABSENT: Tom Ronning

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator
Mark Vierling, City Attorney

1.0 The February 3, 2016, City Council Work Meeting was called to order by Mayor Voss at
Call to Order 6:00 p.m.

2.0 **Harrington stated I'll make a motion to adopt tonight's agenda. Koller stated I'll**
Adopt **second.** Voss asked any discussion? All in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss asked any
Agenda opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

3.0 Davis presented the staff report, indicating Watershed Management Organizations
SRWMO (WMO's) were created by the Legislature in 1982. As a result of this legislation, all
JPA municipalities in the seven County m area were required to be part of this program. The
implementation of the establishment of the Organizations was finalized in 1985. The Board
or Water and Soil Resources (commonly known by the acronym BWSR) has oversight on
the Organizations and coordinates the water and soil resources planning and implementation
activities of WMO's through its various authorities for approval of local plans,
administration of State grants, contracts and easements, and other appropriate means.

All cities and townships within the Metro Area belong to either a WMO or a Watershed District. The distinction between the two is Watershed Districts have the power to independently levy for their budgets and WMO's budgets are dependent on approval and contribution of the member entities for their funding.

The Sunrise River Water Management Organization (SRWMO) is a joint powers special purpose unit of government composed of East Bethel, Linwood Township, Columbus, and Ham Lake to manage water resources. This Joint Powers Agreement is based upon hydrological boundaries of the watershed within each respective city. The Sunrise River WMO's boundaries do not extend into Isanti or Chisago Counties because watershed organizations are only required by law within metro area Counties.

The Sunrise River WMO does not have employees but works through cooperative efforts of the member cities and townships, or contracts with the Anoka Conservation District or other consultants for management services. The Sunrise River WMO is governed by a Joint Powers Agreement between the three cities and the township.

The Sunrise River WMO Board will be discussing the current status of the Organization's Joint Powers Agreement at their February 4, 2016, meeting. In the last year, there have been changes suggested by Ham Lake, and the WMO Board has identified other changes that may warrant consideration for a JPA amendment. The potential changes are summarized as follows:

3.0

1. Clarify the definition of operating and non-operating expenses – Currently, operating expenses are split even among the cities and non-operating expenses are split by formula. The JPA currently provides a loose description of ‘operating costs’ – ‘copies, postage, recording secretary fees, insurance and administrative fee charged to each community.’ Several questions may arise:
 - a. What does the “‘administrative fee’ include?
 - b. Should certain required, “lights on” tasks be added to the definition of operating expenses? As an example the following may arguably fit the mold of a basic operating expense:
 - i. Financial audit costs
 - ii. State reporting costs
 - iii. 10-year watershed plan cost
2. Consider splitting all expenses by formula – Ham Lake and Columbus have expressed interest in eliminating the ‘operating expenses’ category (expenses split equally). All expenses would be split by the formula based on the land area and market valuation. If this had been done for the 2016 budget it would have had the following impacts:
 - a. Linwood’s contribution increased by \$1,342.85
 - b. East Bethel contribution increased by \$497.61
 - c. Columbus contribution reduced by \$519.57
 - d. Ham Lake contribution reduced by \$1,320.89
3. Update market valuations – The formula for calculating each community’s percentage of non-operating expenses includes market valuation within the WMO. It has been more than five years since it has been updated. No update to the JPA is needed for this, but someone needs to do the GIS analysis to get the numbers.

Decisions on adjustments in determining cost allocations should be made as soon as possible if they are to be included in the 2017 Sunrise River WMO Budget.

This meeting tonight is to consider making recommendations to the City Council relating to the Sunrise River WMO that relate to the requests for defining Operating Costs and allocation of costs to the members.

Davis stated this issue is that Ham Lake and Columbus are requesting the SRWMO redefine ‘operating costs’ to be a more inclusive category and then base non-operating costs by formula. If you’ll look in your packet, Ham Lake only has a small portion around Coon Lake, which I’ve estimated is approximately about 1,800 acres, or about 8% of their land area in the Sunrise River WMO. Jamie Schurbon said that Columbus is interested in changing this too; however, Columbus’ area within the Sunrise River WMO is almost as much as ours. It’s approximately 30-33% of the City of Columbus. The portion of East Bethel that’s in the Sunrise River WMO is approximately 40% of our land area and all of Linwood Township is exclusive in the Sunrise River WMO.

Davis stated so I guess the question that we need to discuss tonight, and maybe this is more for Brian’s information because he’ll be attending the meeting tomorrow night, if these issues come up is how do we want to proceed with these requests and these discussions.

Voss stated I remember from quite a while ago, we had these issues come up in the past about why there’s, you know, the equal charges and the shared charges. The Upper Rum is the same way, correct? Davis stated correct. The Upper Rum’s the same way and Ham Lake will have those same issues with the Upper Rum too because there’s only a small

portion, it doesn't show up real good on this map, but this area right here is the only portion of Ham Lake that's in the Upper Rum.

Koller stated well, all the different cities have the same number of people in the Watershed meetings. And, our insurance and stuff covers those. Well, the size of the City doesn't matter. You have two people here and they have to have insurance. So, that's, are we going to let them go uninsured?

Davis stated yes, and what Ham Lake originally requested was to be able to opt out of both the Sunrise and the Upper Rum and be exclusively in the Coon Creek Watershed District. In that case, it would increase Columbus' cost, East Bethel's cost, and Linwood's cost. And, the way it's figured, as you mentioned before Ron, is that the basic operating costs are split equally among the four members. The non-operating costs have a formula. It's based on the population within the Watershed District and of the market valuation. The issue with the market evaluation numbers haven't been done in five years.

Voss asked do we have a feel, at all, about other Watersheds and how they distribute their fees? Vierling advised that in terms of WMOs, this is fairly typical. That's what I've been seeing. Voss asked with the set operating cost? Vierling stated there are some that would probably go purely based on the weighted formula and that's not an uncommon weighted formula. But those that do then shift their voting power that way too. So, their representation and the votes at the Board level are all based on that weighted formula as well. But I think many of them perceive that as long as they're going to have equal vote at the table, that there are basic organizational costs just to be there. Given that, they're just going to divide it as is. Others have said, 'Fine, let's alter the voting power. If we're going to prorate it based upon the formula, then let's prorate the voting formula as well.'

Voss stated here's a third way of looking at it too, which would be hard to enumerate, but all four of these communities have different values at stake in terms of projects and the water quality. I mean, Coon Lake is the big part of it for us. Obviously, that's got higher value then. I shouldn't say 'value' but effective of projects whereas Columbus' watershed is probably at least 75% Carlos Avery and the rest isn't populated very much. So the water projects there aren't going to have as much affect and the portion of watershed in their community, than Linwood would or East Bethel.

Mundle asked so you'd be just suggesting to look at it as the most possible projects that would be capable? Voss stated no, I'm not suggesting a change. I'm just saying there's another way of looking at it. Mundle stated yeah, I'm not suggesting change but your way of looking at it would be just split the costs up by the potential projects that could be done. Is that what you're saying? Voss stated no. I'm just saying there's, and you know like Linwood and East Bethel have got the majority of the projects and also had the majority of impacted waters. You know, Ham Lake is really just a little on Coon Lake. But Columbus doesn't hardly have anything.

Koller stated yeah, Linwood has gotten a lot of projects in the last couple of years, the big carp barriers. Voss stated yeah, but they've got a lot of lakes too that have had a lot of problems. Koller stated Martin, Typoo, and Coon. Voss stated so it's kind of, we're all in it together kind of thing. I can see Ham Lake's point.

Davis stated, I'm sympathetic to their position. They've got just a small portion of the Watershed for both the Sunrise and the Upper Rum within their City. And probably 85% of

it's in the Coon Creek Watershed District. You know, just from a procedural standpoint, that means they have to have six people appointed to three different boards and I think they feel that's probably a little bit disproportional for them. But, again, even though I'm sympathetic, I don't want to do anything that's going to really increase our costs either.

Koller stated well, they do have a good chunk of Coon Lake. Davis stated yes, they do and if you look at that, Coon Lake is probably about a quarter in Ham Lake, a quarter in Columbus and half in East Bethel. That's why we've discussed before about problems or projects with Coon Lake, you know, unless it's a three-city project, if it's a water quality issue, we're not going to solve much unless everybody's on board.

Voss asked were you, Brian, were you at the last Board meeting? Mundle responded yes, I was. Voss asked what's the Board say about it? Is it just Ham Lake that's mentioning this? Koller stated it's just Ham Lake. Brian stated my understanding it is just Ham Lake and I believe, partly, because the clarification of the operating versus non-operating expenses is coming up because the 10-Year Plan that's coming up and that, of course, has a larger expense attributed towards it. So, where they're wondering, I can see if they can get the Plan put in under non-operating costs then they're portion of it would be a lot smaller than if it was tucked into the operating costs.

Koller stated but, you know, even though they are a small portion of it, they have equal votes to everybody else. Voss stated well, they have equal vote and I think they also get a substantial benefit in the projects that go on around Coon Lake. We've got to remember that just because the boundary of Ham Lake and East Bethel go through Coon Lake, those Ham Lake residents use the whole lake. So, it benefits everybody. Same thing with Columbus residents. From a Plan standpoint, to me, I see a good argument to have a shared cost on that, non-proportional costs.

Davis stated keep in mind too that the southern portion of Coon Lake that's within the Ham Lake corporate limits is fairly densely populated. I think there's approximately 170 homes around that Hiawatha Beach area. And, they've had some issues with well and septic problems there in the past. In fact, the City actually hired a consultant about four years ago to look into the problem. Their major problem was not water quality issues with the Lake but it was water quality issues with groundwater polluting wells in that area. So, you know, at some point that will need to be addressed. It's going to have to be more regional that local to address those issues.

Voss stated well, let's break this in pieces. In terms of changing the funding formula, how does Council feel about that? We go to a completely, you know, splitting cost based on a formula? Or, leave it the way it is? Koller stated I think leaving it the way it is. Mundle stated yes. Voss stated that's where I sit on it too. And then there's an issue about what is administrative fees and what's not. Mundle stated what's operating costs and what's non-operating. They were going to, they didn't know how the project, or the plan cost, was done last time, where it was put. So, they're going to research that, look into it, but, whether it's operating or non-operating.

Voss asked isn't it almost like required discretionary in a way? Mundle answered it's required. Voss asked it's required as the operating and discretionary is the projects? Mundle answered yes and stated essentially my understanding of it is operating costs are what you need to 'keep the lights on,' essentially. They're must costs that are attributed towards it and the non-operating was like project costs.

SRWMO

JPA

Voss stated so the issue is, like audit is operating cost. This 10 Year Plan is operating costs. Mundle stated well, they put the, I'm trying to look up the budget, and they put the, where is it, the audit under non-operating administrative costs. If you look in 2016, Other Expenses. Voss stated I would say the legal, the financial audit, advertising bid for services, I mean, there's no dollars in that budget but to me those are, I would consider those operating expenses.

Mundle stated in 2017, ACD proposal, under operating expenses, they have Administrator, annual report to BWSR and member communities, annual financial report to State Auditor. Though that probably won't be the same as the financial audit. Then under non-operating, they have grants, monitoring, projects, website, etc. So I would agree with you that if this cost is needed in order for this organization to exist, then it should be operating. Koller stated I agree.

Davis stated as you can see from the budget, that would give some idea as to what their current definition of 'operating' versus 'non-operating' costs are. They currently have the financial audit under non-operating cost. Mundle stated yes. Voss stated and again, I think the legal and financial audit are required items. Davis agreed and stated they would be. Voss stated then they should be operating costs.

Mundle asked do you have any opinion on that Mark? Whether there'd be different definitions for different, um, I lost the word. Vierling asked different categories? Mundle stated yes for accounting purposes. Vierling stated I would agree. I think your budget is mandatory. You've got to do that. Your professional help, you've got to have that. I could see, I'm looking down the list, and you get into some grants and I could see where grant applications could be site specific where they might be applicable to certain areas and not to other areas, and that type of thing. But, generally, I would view that division between the mandatory and the discretionary. The mandatory, everybody's got to participate.

Voss stated maybe a way to look at it is, if you didn't do any projects, what are the things that you have to do to keep the organization running for the next year. The things that you have to do if you did no projects, and the audit's one of them. Koller stated yeah, the audit. The Watershed Plan Update is required by BWSR. We don't have a choice. Voss stated you could argue then the outcome of the Plan benefits different communities in different ways. The fact that you have to have a Plan makes it a requirement.

Mundle stated yes and so they are falling back on, Page 7 of the JPA, under where it defines operating costs. Voss stated I'm sorry, what page again? Mundle answered Page 7, the JPA, right up at the top, Operating Costs, where it states: 'Operating costs per the operating budget are defined as copies, postage, etc., etc.' And they state that because it does not specify it under this definition that it then doesn't fall under that definition of operating costs. So, but then I would question under, on Page 6, Item B, Operating Funds, it states, 'Expenditures may include administrative expenses, plan development costs, review expenses, capital improvement costs, and insurances.' So, would those items, would operating funds also be defined as operating costs?

Davis answered in this case, that's some other language that needs to be cleaned up. It's confusing. I think operating "funds" refer to non-operating costs. Because that's why they give you a specific formula for figuring that allocation. It does say operating costs within that and then operating funds. But I think in this case they're referring to that, in my

opinion, as non-operating costs. That's what that section covers and that's one that really needs to be clarified in the JPA so there's no confusion.

Voss stated I see a battle, welcome to the Fire Department. Mundle stated just my luck. Voss stated my rose colored glasses say forget about the cost. What's right, do what's the right thing. Obviously, there's effects on different communities in how this is done. Linwood is going to be the one that's going to be affected the most. That's a big chunk for Linwood Township. Davis stated yes, and Linwood pays more than any other City. They probably pay about 50% of the whole operating budget. We pay, roughly, probably, 25%, Columbus 15%, and Ham Lake 5%.

Voss asked so do we want to give Brian some direction to bring back to Sunrise on the Council's perspective? Davis stated yeah, I just think we want to discuss that and then we'll have this on the agenda of the Council Meeting where, if we want to give official direction, we can do that then. Or, if we want to give him some verbal direction now, that's fine too.

Voss asked is Sunrise looking at changing this language about what's operating cost and what's not? Or, is it something we brought up? Davis stated no, it's actually something that Jamie Schurbon proposed and I think maybe they discussed at the meeting to amend the JPA to address these issues.

Mundle stated a little bit. Mostly it was brought up by e-mail that you sent out that, where some of these items here 1, 2, and 3, were more brought out. At the meeting it was discussed, where the work plan goes and briefly it was brought up of Ham Lake's displeasure of paying so much. Davis stated then it will probably be a very, a main topic of the conversation, I assume, at the meeting tomorrow night. Or, one of them.

Voss stated I know it's tough to change the JPA for any reason because there's always going to be someone who doesn't want it changed. Mundle stated and all four communities have to agree to it. Voss stated yup, they've all got to sign it. So, to get some of these operating, or non-operating expenses into operating expenses, it would be tough to get all four to agree. It would be tough for all four to be in agreement, make it all non-operating.

Davis stated and from just a very basic conversation I've had with Linwood is they're not in favor of changing the formula whatsoever. Voss stated and I think that's the message we're going to give Brian to send back. It's just whether these other changes are made too. It is a board so, I mean, it's just our view on.

Davis stated and you know a compromise may be to introduce and specifically define additions to what operating costs are. What is one or two things now, like the financial audit and the legal fees. I think one of the big questions are the 10 Year Plan, which is going to be a fairly expensive item. And, that right now is defined as a non-operating expense so that it's allocated by a formula. To me, if that was moved over into the operating costs where it is then split equally, that would be something I'm sure, especially Ham Lake would be against.

Voss stated well, they're not going to want either. Voss asked so are we 'clear as mud?'

Mundle stated pretty much a 'big no' and to the rest, maybe we'll talk about it. Voss stated yes but I don't know if it's a 'big no' it's just we don't see the basis for changing this. And,

SRWMO

JPA

it's up to the Board to come up with something. It's good they're doing this now. Voss asked so is there anything else on this item? Or, have we got it covered? Alright, what's next?

**4.0
Coon Lake
Beach Clean
Up Day**

Davis presented the staff report, indicating prior to 2009 the Coon Lake Beach Community Center paid for the dumpsters for Coon Lake Beach Clean Up Day. Due to financial constraints that began in 2009, the Community Center requested the City to pay for the trash collection for this portion of this event. The City has paid for two to three 40-yard roll off dumpsters at a cost of \$1,300 to \$2,000 per year for this activity since that time. This cost is not eligible for reimbursement from our County Recycle Grant and is paid from our General Fund.

This event, which is held the first Saturday in May, provides recycling collection only for scrap metal and batteries, and provides dumpsters for the disposal of non-recyclable items, excluding mattresses and large pieces of furniture. The City's Spring and Fall Recycle Day do not accept non-recyclables.

The advantages of continuance of this service are:

1. Trash collection, as part of this event, could eliminate indiscriminate dumping and may aid in the clean up and general appearance of the neighborhood.

The disadvantages are:

1. This could be a precedence that other neighborhoods in the City may request.

This item is open for discussion to see if we have any interest in continuing this or provide some direction to staff as to how we want to proceed with that for 2017.

Harrington asked would they be up to splitting the cost? Half and half? Is there anything ever brought up about that? Davis stated that's a possibility that could be proposed to the Community Center. We haven't had any conversations with them in regard to alternatives to this. I just wanted to bring this to your attention and see what the feelings of the Council were and how you want us to approach this.

Mundle stated the reason that in prior to 2009, the reason why the City took it over was because the Community Center couldn't afford it in 2009. Correct? Davis answered that's correct. Mundle asked do we know anything about if they could afford it now? Davis stated I'm sure they'll say, 'no.' But, I don't know exactly what their financial situation is.

Koller stated back in 2009 was right in the middle of the low end of everything. Voss stated it was also when pull tabs started doing downhill, which is a lot of their income. Pull tab laws changed right about then. Davis stated yes, we do know their proceeds, their gambling proceeds, are not very much. They derive most of their income from dock rentals and then from the little fund raising events they do at the Center, their breakfasts and dinners and things of that nature.

Davis stated my concern is that there may be some other neighborhoods, let's say Castle Towers, says, 'We'd like for you to do a Clean Up Day up here and provide us with a dumpster.' Koller stated or Village Green. Davis stated yes.

4.0 Voss stated the alternative is to start doing this same action at, on Recycle Day at the Ice

Arena. Right? I mean, why should Coon Lake Beach's Recycle Day be any different? The idea of having Recycle Day for Coon Lake Beach is good because they are kind of physically separated from the rest of the City and then it's kind of a community of its own so having a separate Recycle Day. But, why we collect trash there and not other places of the City.

Davis stated yes, and the problem with the Recycle Day alone at Coon Lake Beach is there's such a low population base that it serves. We're not able to offer the same collection items as we do at the City Recycle event. Currently, like I said, we have a dumpster that we take scrap metal and the Lion's Club is there and collects batteries. So those are the only things we do. They wouldn't generate enough interest for us to do the appliance collection and the tire collection and the bicycles and the things we do at the City wide event.

Voss asked when is the Beach Clean Up Day? Davis answered the first Saturday in May. Voss stated we already provide milfoil and pondweed dumpsters for the beach, correct? Davis answered correct. Voss stated so we're still doing that. Davis stated one at the beach and one at the Recycle Center. But the expense for that is very little because we actually collect that material ourselves and then the disposal of it is through burning.

Mundle stated well, like Tim suggested, maybe we approach them with discussion about taking half the cost because if we at least did that, we'd still be helping. But if we want to set a precedent about anything, then if other communities approach us and if they're serious about it, then we say, 'Okay, we put up half the cost. You have to put up the other half.' Harrington stated that would make sense. Mundle stated that at least puts them 'in the game.'

Voss stated Jack, you make a good point about it eliminates indiscriminate dumping but I've got to think that the vast majority of people that use this day to dispose of materials in the dumpsters as trash aren't going to be the type of folks that, 'Well if a dumpster's not there I'm going to throw it in my neighbor's yard.' You know, I just can't see that. Because people are going to get rid of stuff. They're not going to hold onto it for a whole year anyway. They'll just throw it on the side of the road. Davis stated, it usually ends up on low volume traffic roads like Klondike Drive. Koller stated and 209th.

Davis stated no, I mean the value of does it prevent indiscriminate dumping, it could but the amount it does is probably not a great deal. We have had instances there where we know that some people actually save up all kinds of stuff and wait for this day to happen and then dump it. Generally, what we wind up taking is construction materials, scrap stuff from pole sheds, buildings, they've torn down. They actually have at least one and sometimes two people with a four-wheeler and a trailer behind it that drives through the neighborhoods and picks stuff up and brings it down there to dispose of. It has some value but it does have a pretty significant cost too.

Harrington asked what did they do? Two dumpsters last year for garbage? Or, was it three? Davis stated last year it was two but we were right at the edge of having to get a third one. Harrington stated like I said, I know people over there that save stuff just for that day. Mundle stated that's good. Voss stated I save stuff for recycling. Harrington stated yeah, I know for recycling but I mean for trash. They save their trash for that day. Voss stated yes.

4.0
Coon Lake
Beach Clean
Up Day

Koller stated I suppose you get a lot of people who aren't even on the Beach. Davis stated not really. I think most of them are pretty well local people that utilize it. Now you know, at the City Recycle Day, we probably get several that are non-residents but we kind of encourage that because it increases our tonnage and helps us meet our recycle goals. But, at the Beach, I would say that probably 95% of the users are locals.

Voss stated this is already budgeted for this year, right? Davis stated we don't have it budgeted in a specific category. It's just paid for from the Roads Budget... Voss asked it's considered when we put together the budget? Davis answered that's correct. Voss stated it would be kind of hard, three months before this is going to happen, to say we're not going to do it.

Mundle asked would you just suggest paying it for this year and then with the knowledge of a full year in advance? Voss stated well, have the discussion with the Community Center and say, 'Let's have a discussion of eliminating or asking to share the cost with the Community Center.' Because, when it comes up to it, the City's providing a trash service. Davis agreed.

Harrington stated that or cut them down to one dumpster and say, 'When one dumpster is full, you're done.' Voss stated that would be pretty tough to do. Koller stated they'll dump it alongside. Harrington stated I know. Voss stated or you could tell the Community Center that too. Talk about this going down to one dumpster and ask if they want to pay for a second dumpster.

Davis stated I'll just set up a meeting with Kathy Paavola and we'll discuss possibilities and throw out these options. They may have another idea too that we could bring back and discuss. But, I just wanted to bring this up. It's been discussed in the past. I just wanted to make sure that everybody's aware of it and if there's a change that needs to be made, that we can start thinking about it.

5.0
Booster Day

Davis stated I spoke with Denise Lachinski yesterday. I'm not sure what Denise has done to-date for Booster Day. I assume she'd been working on certain things but we haven't had a Booster Day meeting this year. She did say that she would be calling a Booster Day meeting in February, this month. There was a little thing in the Senior newsletter. I don't know of anyone saw it but the seniors had made a statement there would be no Booster Day for 2017. So, that's not accurate but we'll find out more where we are in the progress of the planning for the event, hopefully, in the next two weeks and I'll report that back to you. I just wanted to give you an update that there hasn't been a lot from the Committee that's gone on since the event was held in the summer. But, hopefully, we'll find out some more when they have the meeting this month and see where we're going from there for Booster Day 2018.

Voss stated okay. Harrington asked but you're still going to have a golf tournament and the Fire Department said they're still going to have their dance and everything.

Davis stated yes and I think one of the main concerns of the seniors was that their silent auction and their breakfast and their bingo and all that is their larger fund raiser for the year for generating funds for their organization. So, we'll find out where we're going with that. And probably, at some point, we're going to have to sit down and have a serious discussion about Booster Day. You know, hopefully it can be done by volunteers and continued

operating as a separate event from the City. But, there may be, in a year or two, where we may have to decide what our participation is going to be and if we want to be more active or inactive or stay the same with that event.

Voss stated so it's a challenge, especially for that event, to get volunteers and have them commit. For the longest time, the same volunteers were doing things. The seniors, they're having that same problem internally. Davis stated it is and I want to 'tip my hat' to Denise. I think she's done a great job and it's all been volunteer and she'd done a lot of work. But, you know, with everyone in that position, everyone has a 'shelf life' and an 'expiration date' on it. Hopefully, she's not to that point but if she's getting there or nearing that, then we need to start finding, maybe, someone else that might be interested in doing that.

Davis stated we've discussed this with the Chamber in hopes, maybe, that they might take a more active role in it or maybe even want to coordinate the event. So, we'll keep bringing that up to them and see what their interest is. But, again, I think Denise has done a fantastic job and before her, Barb Kushner did a tremendous job too. It's a lot of work and a lot of organization and it's a thankless task. I'm just grateful that we've had those people here to help us and, hopefully, we can have them continue in that same capacity. But it's something that we may need to address at some point in the future.

Mundle asked would she be interested in having a booth at the Spring Town Hall looking for volunteers? Davis stated we could certainly bring that up. That would be a good place to do that. The Committee people, there's probably really about, as you well know, seven or eight people that do the bulk of the work for Booster Day. So, they've worked well together and all of them have been kind of wondering what's going on too. So it would be good to be able to tell them. But, we can have Denise there for Booster Day at the Town Hall Meeting and give her a booth and anyone that wants to volunteer to help we'll try to enlist their services. Mundle stated it will at least get the word out.

Voss asked anything else? Davis responded that's it. Voss asked anything anyone wants to add?

**6.0
Adjourn**

Harrington stated I'll make a motion to adjourn. Mundle stated I'll second. Voss asked any discussion? All in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss asked any opposed? Hearing none motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Submitted by:
Carla Wirth
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.