

**Finance Commission
Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2019**

Roll Call/Announcements

The Finance Commission (FC) meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. Finance Director Miller called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Matt Harold, Edwin Hodder, John Murray, and Jack Reif

Commissioners Absent: Malcolm McRoberts

Staff Present: Finance Director Chris Miller

Finance Director Miller stated Ethics training is taking place on Wednesday, April 10th at 6:30 p.m. He noted the meeting is being recorded and will be able to be viewed on replay. The Commission is also invited to participate in the Rosefest Parade on June 24th at 6:00 p.m.

Receive Public Comments

There being no one present wishing to speak to the Commission on an item not on the agenda, Mr. Miller moved to the next agenda item.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Reif stated line 121 should be changed to: “Commissioner Bachhuber asked if the City ~~is~~ charges for facilities....”

Commissioner Reif stated line 128 should be changed to: “Commissioner Bachhuber asked if the other Municipalities and Government Agencies are pretty...”

Commissioner Reif moved, seconded by Commissioner Murray to approve the March 12, 2019 meeting minutes as amended. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Receive Finance Commission Recommendations Tracking Report

Commissioner Harrold stated he added some information to some of the recommendations based on the past couple of meetings with the Council. Both the joint meeting the Commission had on March 25th as well as the meeting prior to that with the vote on the Cash Carry Forward Fund. He stated 2017-8, which was the priority ranking recommendation, which is the first of the recommendations, he marked as closed because it has been incorporated into the Commission’s

latest Capital Investment Policy recommendation. 2018-2, Cash Reserve Fund on March 17th the City Council voted to approve the creation of that fund. He indicated it was accepted. He added recommendation 2019-1 which is the latest Capital Investment Policy recommendation presented to the City Council on March 25th and has been received and the Council has seemed to accept it verbally and are looking for some changes. This was marked for further development.

Commissioner Harrold asked Mr. Miller on the Cash Reserve Fund, splitting out the CIP, he was not sure what to mark that because he did not pick up if the split has happened or if it is still planning to happen in 2020 or still on the table.

Mr. Miller stated Ms. Schroeder asked in an email as well if the Council was going to formally approve that and he told her staff has not done that in a formal capacity yet, but staff has effectively done it.

Consider Selecting Chair, Vice-Chair, and Representative To The Ethics Commission

Finance Director Miller stated City Code Chapter 201.06 requires the Finance Commission to annually select a Chair, Vice Chair to perform ongoing duties; and a representative to serve on the City's Ethics Commission as needed. The Chair and Vice-Chair positions carry the same decision-making privileges as all other members, but they do have some additional administrative duties. He noted this item was tabled at the March meeting. He stated by separate motions, staff recommends the Commission select a Chair, Vice-Chair, and representative to the Ethics Commission for the period April 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020.

Commissioner Murray thought Commissioner McRoberts would be a good Chair, but he did not want to appoint him without his acceptance.

Commissioner Reif agreed that Commissioner McRoberts would be a good Chair of the Commission but without his approval he hated to vote him in and find out there was a problem.

Commissioner Harrold agreed but could see the Commission needing leadership. He asked if there was an opportunity to change midstream if a Commissioner was appointed and were wanting to resign to appoint a new one.

Mr. Miller stated he did not know if this was possible. The appointment was for one year, but he did not see any prevention of doing that if needed.

Commissioner Hodder thought it would be nice to have Commissioner McRoberts at the meeting to have a full discussion of this before a decision was made.

The Commission consensus was to table the appointment of the Chair until the next meeting in May.

Commissioner Reif moved, seconded by Commissioner Hodder to elect Commissioner Harold as Vice-Chair of the Finance Commission. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Commissioner Reif moved, seconded by Commissioner Hodder to elect Commissioner Murray as Representative on the Ethics Commission. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Review Recent City Council Directives and Joint City Council-Finance Commission Meeting

Finance Director Miller stated this item is to debrief about the Joint City Council-Finance Commission meeting that was held on March 25th and to discuss the directive the City Council put on the Finance Commission at the March 18th City Council meeting.

Mr. Miller reviewed the information with the Commission.

Capital Investment Policy:

Mr. Miller stated the Mayor would like to have the word “maintenance” in the policy changed to something else. He asked the Commission if the word carried a good connotation in the policy or is there a better word that could be substituted.

Commissioner Harrold asked if in the Mayor’s mind the word “maintenance” brings up ongoing and preventative maintenance versus replacing an asset or doing a major repair.

Mr. Miller indicated that was correct.

Commissioner Harrold stated in “bridge speak” preservation has been used as a step above maintenance. Improvement could be another term that could be used to capture the essence of what the Commission is going for.

Commissioner Murray wondered if “betterments” would work.

Commissioner Harrold wondered if the word was removed entirely and worded as “Capital Improvements and Replacements” because improvements and Betterments are the same to him. He asked if there was a desire to have a word like that in the policy to capture the rehabilitation project.

Mr. Miller stated he did not think in this case it is a bad thing to strike the word entirely from the first sentence on line four and thought it would work. He stated on lines 56-59, where the word maintenance is used. He wondered if the word could be struck there as well. He stated the word maintenance could easily come out of that fund as well but the word in the fund context would probably need a substitute the way it is written.

Commissioner Harold stated he liked preservation as a substitute here.

Commissioner Reif stated he was not troubled by having the word maintenance in there but if the Council would like a different word then he liked the suggestion of preservation.

Commissioner Hodder stated the word preservation could be added to line four as well for continuity as well.

The Commission thought that will work.

Mr. Miller stated the word preservation can be a replacement for maintenance in the context of lines 56-59 and striking the word maintenance on line four altogether and remove it from the fund name.

Commissioner Harrold noted line 68 has maintenance in the sentence as well.

Mr. Miller thought that could be removed there as well.

Commissioner Hodder asked if line 56 would be changed as well to reflect timely preservation of all buildings.

Mr. Miller stated the entire paragraph would be changed.

Mr. Miller stated the Council also wanted the Commission to look at lines 13-16. He thought there was a desire to retain in some fashion what is being represented in this paragraph, the change this group had was to strike it all together because the Capital Investment Policy was going to be about directing new facilities and the reason why the Commission was going to strike it but some members of the Council thought that rather than strike it entirely, how can that be reworded so it did not lose some of the reference points that are contained in there.

Commissioner Hodder wondered what the Council would like to see in its place. He did not think there was much Council direction given.

Mr. Miller stated he did not get much direction and thought it was only one Councilmember's comment. He stated he could package it up as is and ask the Council to do the final wordsmithing on that piece.

Commissioner Harrold stated when he reads this section it seems to be directed more towards the twenty year Capital Improvement Plan that is discussed later on so he wondered if there was something that would designate that paragraph to the twenty year plan. He thought the twenty-year Capital Improvement Plan could be added in line thirteen to read "It is not the intent of the twenty-year Capital Improvement Plan ~~City Council~~ to fund major new facilities..." and keep the rest of the paragraph as is. To him that designates the paragraph as saying the twenty-year plan is intended for maintenance and the like and inherent in that is the major new facilities or other things that have been added to the investment policy should be funded separately. He thought that was getting back to the essence the Council was trying to capture but maybe that is changing the paragraph too much.

Mr. Miller suggested if the Commission felt that was a good solution to bring it forward to the Council and let them wordsmith it further or send it back with more direction.

Mr. Miller stated on lines 103-105, Capital Placement Guidelines that the Commission worked really hard on. The comments staff received on this from the Council is to have the Commission take a look at whether the Commission was comfortable to either combine the two guidelines and/or including the words replace to line 104.

Commissioner Harrold thought the Council wanted the Commission to add a replacement caveat somewhere in 4.2 because it really isn't the way it reads and goes back to maintenance. He suggested changing the sentence to state maintain or replace and captures what the Commission was going for with that guideline.

Commissioner Harold stated he did not want to combine the two guidelines and preferred to keep them separate. He thought the sticking point the Commission has kept running into is public safety always being construed as the public safety departments of Police and Fire and what the Commission was thinking was something that poses an immediate safety or health risk to the public.

Mr. Miller stated when he reads this it states public health and safety; it does not say public safety.

Commissioner Murray wondered if it could say safety risks.

Commissioner Reif asked if the sentence could read "projects necessary for public health and to alleviate safety risks", or something like that.

Commissioner Harrold stated it could read "projects necessary to address risks to public health and safety."

Mr. Miller wondered what if the Commission took out the word public, would that eliminate people trying to say public safety.

Commissioner Harrold stated he worried a little bit about risk in that you can potentially construe risk in a lot of places. There are varying degrees of risk.

Commissioner Murray stated it comes down to a judgement call.

Mr. Miller thought an alternative to that is to put in an apostrophe s and say "for the public's health and safety or to meet legal mandates..."

Mr. Miller stated the final thought from the Councilmembers was in regard to the Fiscal Note, Exhibit A. He stated the Commission included some example templates that identified some major categories and impossible metrics and when the Commission talked about creating these sample metrics and sample categories, it was just that. The Commission discussed that it would

vary depending on the project and initiative and that these were just examples. The comments made at the meeting was that perhaps there could be more examples of possible metrics or categories included. The Council would like the Commission to expand the sample fiscal notes or sample fiscal reviews into laying them out there so people get a better idea of what are some of the things that could be included.

Commissioner Harrold asked if the templates were supposed to be a part of the actual policy document or just available by the City. He thought it could be messy.

Mr. Miller stated the way he structured it these were done as exhibits. It was not intended to be all inclusive and he thought it might be challenging to try to get something into a template form that is all inclusive. He thought the concern he heard from the Council is that these are good examples, but more examples should be listed. He stated from a staff perspective that when he looks at the templates the message is pretty clear as to what staff should be preparing and will vary from project to initiative and the Council's own interest in what is important to track and what is important to review is what is going to drive what is actually put in the template.

Commissioner Hodder thought the intent was to not lock into a one size fits all template because all of the items are pretty unique depending on the metrics.

Commissioner Murray stated after the Joint Council meeting he took the initiative to talk to one of the Councilmembers that made that point and indicated a one size all template would probably be pretty unwieldy and the purpose of accounting is to categorize and summarize and get it down to where only a few numbers are looked at in order to make it understandable and that would sort of defeat that.

Commissioner Harrold stated he could see the benefit of a few things that are always listed, and he thought that was already identified at the top of the example. From his experience with templates before a lot of them are done, it is hard to decide what would be good and not good to include in them. He would almost think that the City should try it without a template for a year and see how it goes.

Commissioner Harrold wondered if Mr. Miller would be preparing these types of documents in the Department or would there be another person preparing them.

Mr. Miller stated it was the later and the idea is to create some templates that can be used but ultimately, he thought it should be staff that does the write up and he could review them to make sure the math is correct. He stated he really wants the Departments to communicate what the metrics are and what the look back features are and what the fiscal categories are.

Commissioner Harrold thought the template would be better served as an internal template that the City would use as it develops these and he did not know if it would necessarily need to be memorialized within the policy. If the Council feels strongly that there should be more examples in the policy, then that is something the Commission could think about.

Commissioner Murray thought the Commission should let it ride and see how things develop and tweak it as it goes along.

Commissioner Hodder thought the departments would be able to decide what the matrix should be. He did not think the Commission could create a template that would fit and coincide with every department.

Commissioner Harrold agreed and thought it would be best to grow the template organically.

Mr. Miller stated he would communicate this to the City Council. He thought he had the direction of changes from the Commission and would share it with the City Council for final review.

Commissioner Hodder stated in regard to the template, on the front end, when doing due diligence that there be some kind of template to work with and then when the Commission does the look back the Commission can compare apples to apples. It would be important that the due diligence looks similar to the look back matrix.

Commissioner Harrold thought that was pretty well laid out in the policy when it discusses this. If he were doing a look back, he would like to see financially how the upfront costs look to what was actually spent and also ongoing expenses. He thought those were two things that are laid out pretty well in the policy that can be followed.

Mr. Miller stated regarding the direction the Council gave the Commission on March 18th, there were two items. One was to talk about the Cash Reserve Target Levels for the Parks and Recreation Fund. He reviewed the Recreation Fund cash flow analysis chart for 2017 to 2018 with the Commission. He stated the Council is asking the Finance Commission and Parks and Recreation Commission to review the information and make additional recommendations.

Commissioner Harrold stated he could not find in previous minutes whether the Commission decided to leave this fund alone or if it was overlooked. He agreed, on face value, that it seems odd to only have one fund with a very fixed target. He could not remember if it could have been that the funding sources were more consistent because a lot of the range is due to variability in funding. Looking at this funding it does not look that consistent throughout the year.

Mr. Miller stated he did not look at the minutes from the August meeting from 2018. He stated in 2017 the low got as far as eleven percent and got as high as thirty-four percent. If looking at a minimum target level the fund hit eleven percent. It stated the level is quite a bit higher in 2018 mostly because there was a much larger cash reserve carry forward going into the year so in 2018 the low point was around twenty percent.

Commissioner Harrold asked what minimum percentage of the budget gets the staff nervous.

Mr. Miller stated he would think it would be around ten percent. He was not sure he would advocate for anything less than ten percent because there are still some vulnerabilities when it

comes to sustaining operations. If a Recession were to hit or an economic slow-down were to happen the Parks and Recreation Department will be affected by it. A lot of things the City does will be affected by an economic slowdown. He stated the charts are showing reality so he was not sure that he would go below ten percent but if the Commission was thinking about a range, which is the floor of what the City has in some of the other funds, the floor was ten percent.

Commissioner Harrold asked if ten percent was at the end of the year.

Mr. Miller indicated ten percent would be at the funds worst or lowest point.

Commissioner Harrold stated using that as a metric the Commission would not want to lower the low of the target at twenty-five percent.

Commissioner Murray asked if the weather affected the income a lot.

Mr. Miller stated it could because some of the park programming is outside, including some rentals. Those things can be rescheduled though.

Commissioner Murray thought ten percent looked reasonable.

Mr. Miller stated if the beginning of the year balance is low though and there is an economic downturn the cash balance could fall below the ten percent low target. Part of it is being mindful of some of the vulnerabilities the City has to the economic realities that can come up when it is not expected. He stated if it is a range, he would not advocate for anything less than ten percent.

Commissioner Murray thought ten percent seemed reasonable.

Mr. Miller thought twenty-five percent on the high end could be the right amount because history has shown that seems to work and has generally been sufficient over the last few years to get the Parks and Recreation Department through the low period.

Commissioner Hodder wondered if the Commission should make the range from ten percent to twenty-five percent, but then would the Commission need to have a conversation between Park and Recreation Commission.

Mr. Miller stated the Park and Recreation Commission will be having the same conversation. He thought it might make sense to have a joint conversation when both Commissions feel comfortable with a decision.

Commissioner Harrold did not think the Commission would want to set the low target at ten percent with having seen an eighteen percent drop in the history. He thought the low would need to be set at least twenty percent. The idea is as the City does the cash carryforward process that if the target was set at ten percent as the low end of the range and were at eleven percent going into 2020 the City would determine the fund to be fine and not to touch it. If that were the case

in 2016 going into 2017 the fund would have gone negative through the year and he did not think the Commission wanted to set the targets at that level.

Mr. Miller stated now that the excess funds are being moved out of the fund this fund should not exceed thirty-four percent as a high anymore, in theory. If twenty-five is as high as it gets the fund could burn through fifteen percent pretty quick.

Commissioner Harrold thought a minimum of at least twenty percent is what the Commission would want to see. He thought ten percent seems low. He thought having a range of twenty-thirty percent range might be reasonable with the bulk of funding in June with some more in November/December.

Commissioner Murray asked if the Commission moved some cash balance around from the end of 2018.

Mr. Miller indicated the City did move funds out of the various balances. He reviewed what the City Council decided to do with the excess reserves.

Commissioner Murray stated it would be nice to know the Park and Recreation Commission thoughts before the Finance Commission makes a final recommendation to the City Council. He stated looking at all the numbers and barring the City Council moving money around, he thought this fund could get by with a low target of ten percent.

Commissioner Hodder felt that if the low target was set at ten percent the Council would have to move money around, especially if the fund started at ten percent at the beginning of the year and it dipped down throughout the year.

Mr. Miller stated if the fund started at ten percent at the beginning of the year in either 2017 or 2018 the fund would have gone into a negative cash position. He stated this is just a two-year history and does not mean that every year would behave in that manner. He stated the Park and Recreation Commission does burn through cash and does have some cash consistency in what is brought in, but Parks and Recreation is still half funded out of property taxes and the property tax collection only comes in twice a year. There needs to be a sufficient amount of cash flow to carry this fund for the first four or five months of the year.

Commissioner Hodder thought that would be the reason to raise the low target up. He thought Commissioner Harrold was correct in his comment.

The Commission reviewed the funding charts for the two years.

Mr. Miller asked the Commission if this item needed to be reviewed further and brought back to the next meeting and if so, would there be anything the Commission needed in order to make a recommendation.

Commissioner Murray asked if it would show the Commission anything if the history went back another year or two.

Mr. Miller stated it could. He stated he would package 2015 and 2016 together for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Murray stated on the chart showing operating funds, he would like a couple more columns added in to show the transfer and then to have a total column.

Mr. Miller stated the chart in the packet is showing what the Council saw before any action was taken but understood what Commissioner Murray was saying. He stated the next time the Council reviews the history it will show the balance of the funds and where the money was transferred to/from along with new total balances.

Mr. Miller stated the City Council wanted to ask the Finance Commission to take a look again at the Operating Fund Reserve Policy. He stated the Finance Commission last reviewed this in 2017 and the Council wanted the Commission to look at whether or not the new process of establishing a Cash Reserve Fund, sweeping access funds, out of these funds should be further memorialized somehow in this policy.

Mr. Miller reviewed the policy with the Commission and highlighted a couple of spots where something could be inserted. He reviewed the implementation of the policy with the Commission.

Commissioner Harrold thought the last paragraph in the implementation should be reworded because the way it reads to him is basically if funds are out of their target range to adjust the levy to bring it back in and that is not exactly how the Commission is recommending moving forward. He thought a good portion of the wording could be kept and basically add that if the funds are above the targeted goals the Council will move those funds into the Cash Carryforward Fund and if funds are below the targeted goals the Council will move excess funds from the Cash Carryforward back into the deficient funds or adjust the levy or make appropriate budget or tax levy adjustments.

Mr. Miller stated doing the latter where the fund drops below and moving the money back from the Cash Carryforward Reserve fund into those operating funds, that strategy only works if the City does not spend that money.

Commissioner Hodder stated if the money is spent then the City will need to look at the levy and other strategies to get back into balance.

Mr. Miller asked if any of the Commissioners would like to wordsmith the paragraph for the Commission to review in May.

Commissioner Hodder thought what Commissioner Harrold stated previously was a good start.

Commissioner Harrold stated keeping a similar structure he was thinking the paragraph could read “If aggregate unrestricted reserves in the tax-supported operating funds are above targeted goals, the Council is advised to move excess funds into the Cash Carryforward Fund.” He thought this would need to be expanded upon more. He wondered if it should be written out and then reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. Miller stated that could work but did not think there was anything wrong with spending some time during the meeting working on wording. But the Commission could spend some time reflecting on what should be stated and discuss at a following meeting as well.

Commissioner Murray asked if Commissioner Harrold was ok with the wording of lines one and two of the paragraph.

Commissioner Harrold stated he thought what the Commission is recommending with this fund is the plan is more formal than what is stated. He stated the Council needs to figure out what to do to get the funds back in to scope. He stated the Commission is stating it has recommended a more formalized process that happens every time a fund is out of range and do not need to come up with a new plan every time. He stated that is where he would remove “create a plan” and substitute what the plan is.

Commissioner Murray stated the City plan works pretty well as long as some funds are in surplus but if everything is negative then there may be an issue.

Commissioner Harrold stated that is where what he stated previously would come into effect, if negative the City would need to bring it back into the target either through using excess funds that are already in the Cash Carryforward Fund or, keeping the final couple lines of the paragraph making appropriate budget or tax levy adjustments because if the City does not have any excess funds there may be no other way to do it but to adjust the budget tax levy. He did not think it would be that different than what is written now in the paragraph. He would like to see the language formalized in the policy to show it works.

Commissioner Murray wondered if some language could be added after goals about supported funds outside of the range that cannot be supported by reserve funds then the Council has to create a goal plan, raise the levy, reduce the budget or something like that.

Commissioner Harrold thought the first line of the paragraph could include the mechanisms of the Cash Carryforward Fund and if there is nothing there then move to plan B or plan C.

Commissioner Hodder stated he would like to see an example of how it would work but he thought this was a good first step.

Commissioner Murray thought the paragraph could read as “If the aggregate unrestricted reserves in the tax-supported operating funds are outside of targeted goals and Cash Carryforward Fund is exhausted, the Council is advised to create plan to get reserves into targeted goal ranges by committing reserve funds...”

Commissioner Harrold stated the way it is written is that it goes both ways basically. If there is excess, it could either be committed or reduce the levy or if not enough make budget changes or adjust the levy.

Mr. Miller stated this was designed to be all encompassing in either direction. It does have some examples of how to get there but is not necessarily a mandate that this is how the City is going to get there. He thought what he was hearing from some of the Commission is to mandate how to get there or at least connect the dots on how to get there.

Commissioner Harrold thought the first part of the third line of the paragraph could be captured in the discussion about what to do with the Cash Carryforward funds. He stated there was not anything the Commission recommended that dictates where the excess money goes in the City. He thought at this point it felt it appropriate to state if the City were to change the policy to incorporate the Cash Carryforward Fund then that same language applies to that fund for when there is excess money in there.

Commissioner Hodder thought the policy needed to show both sides because right now it is not shown.

Mr. Miller stated he would take a stab at re-writing the paragraph for Commission review at the May meeting. He stated there is a tangent to this of having something back to the Cash Reserve Cash Carryforward fund itself. What is to be done with those monies once there in the Cash Carryforward fund? He thought the Council might be looking for some guidance on that as well and what is decided as a mechanism to fix things might predicate what the Commission decides how the fund should be used. If the fund is spent, it is no longer available as a solution.

Commissioner Harrold stated there is also the conversation that was brought up about memorializing the transfers in and out as well.

Mr. Miller stated the plan for staff is to record both transfers in and out as best as can be done but he thought it will get challenging unless the funds are memorialized by Council at some point.

Commissioner Harrold did not think the City would want to designate which funds the money came out of if removed from the Carry Carryforward fund because once the money if removed from a fund then it is no longer that funds money.

Mr. Miller thought that was what the Finance Commission's intention was, but he heard from some Councilmembers that there should be a record of which fund the money being spent is from.

Commissioner Hodder asked if this gets to the issue of the City's reliance on reserves for a number of years. Is the Council looking for what the City can do with those monies?

Mr. Miller thought at some point the Council is going to want to entertain some type of policy discussion on that. He did not know if the Council is ready to come up with a formalized priority list on how the money will be spent. If the Commission has some guidance on that he could relay it to the Council.

Commissioner Harrold stated some general guidance for what the funds purpose is would be beneficial to put in the policy. He thought guidance would be warranted.

Identify Discussion Items for Future Meetings

Finance Director Miller stated the next agenda would include discussions on 2020-2039 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) review #1 of 2. He noted the appointment of Chair needs to be revisited along with the last two items of the Cash Reserve for Park and Recreation, the target levels and continue the discussion on changing some of the language in the policy.

Mr. Miller stated Commissioner Murray has previously indicated there should be a discussion on potential investment options for the City.

Commissioner Murray thought he would be ready to go forward with discussion on that at the May meeting.

Mr. Miller stated Commissioner Hodder brought up an idea of getting more familiar with how the City uses TIF and its business subsidy policy.

Commissioner Hodder asked if the EDA has had a discussion on that subject.

Mr. Miller stated there was discussion regarding this at the EDA on March 18th. The EDA did an overview of TIF and the status of all of the City's TIF Districts, what is generating and how the money is being used. It did not get into the broader business subsidy policy that the Council approved in 2014. If that is something the Finance Commission, as a group, wants to spend some time getting to know better that can be scheduled for a future agenda item as well.

Commissioner Hodder stated he was not thinking about the broader policy, he was thinking about the TIF because of a number of projects had come up and there was some discussion in public comments about the TIF. He wanted to get some idea as far as what the scope is and what the Districts are and how they work.

Mr. Miller stated there was a nice package that summarized some of that, if not all, that was before the EDA and City Council on March 18th and he could repurpose that information into an agenda item. He would suggest having someone from the Community Development Department lead a presentation to the Commission at a future meeting.

Commissioner Hodder stated one of the discussions the Commission had when the Commission first started was in regard to the Pavement Improvement Fund and he would like to have an update on that fund.

Mr. Miller stated that will come forward with the CIP discussion.

Adjourn

Commissioner Harrold made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Murray to adjourn. The **motion passed unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.