Community Services  
Committee Meeting  
October 22, 2013  

Members Present  
Mr. Snipes, Ms. Polk, Mr. Liehr, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Howard, Mr. Mulcahy, Mr. James, Mr. Enz, and Mr. LaGesse  

Members Absent  
Mr. Sirois and Mr. Reid  

In Attendance  
- Board Members  
  Mr. Bossert, Mr. Hess, and Ms. Webber  
- Department Heads  
  Roger Diercks, Dan Hendrickson, Bruce Clark, Gregg Murphy, Julie Boudreau, Lori Gadbois, and Mac Shoopman  
- Media  
  None  

1. Call to Order  
The meeting was called to order by the Committee Chairman, Mr. James, at 9:00 a.m.  
Quorum present.  

2. Public Comment  
- Lois Meyer commented on assessments and multipliers.  

3. Approval of minutes – September 24, 2013  
  A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. McConnell and seconded by Mr. Enz. Motion carried.  

4. County Clerk: Bruce Clark  
- Monthly Report  
The Committee reviewed the Monthly Reports.  
  
  A motion to accept the Monthly Report as presented was made by Mr. Liehr and seconded by Ms. Polk. Motion carried.  

- U.S. Department of State, Passport Services Acceptance Facility Review Report  
  Mr. Clark stated that the final report from the Department of State Passport Agency came last week. He showed the report to the committee up on the TVs. They met all the requirements and passed the yearly inspection with a 100%. They started doing passports in 1992 when they moved from the courthouse over to this building. It is a service; it is not a requirement that county clerks do passports. Over $70,000 was collected in passports in 2005, 2006, and 2007 which was before post offices got into the business of actively advertising for passports. It was also a time when passports were required for all travel. They have now leveled off to about $20,000 in revenue a year. He thanked his staff for the good work that they consistently have done in the process of passports. He thinks that the potential exists for increasing that revenue and going back up to some of the higher numbers that they have seen in the past with some advertising, possibly putting a banner on the side of the building or sending out some notices.
Mr. LaGesse asked how much it costs to get a passport from the county compared to the postal service.

Mr. Clark stated that there is no difference.

Mr. LaGesse asked if they had to charge by statute a minimum or maximum price.

Mr. Clark stated that they have to charge a $25 application fee, which is required.

Mr. Snipes asked if they can expedite passports.

Mr. Clark stated that they just process the applications; they do not issue the passports. They can do expedited passports and they also give direction to citizens that want to hand deliver it to Chicago.

- **Election Project**

  Mr. Clark stated that they are holding a mock election November 5, 2013, at area schools for the students to participate in. This will be their third time that they have conducted a student election for 7th and 8th graders. They generate an election where students go through the entire process of understanding how to register to vote, advertising, campaigning, and on November 5 all the students that are participating in this program, both in Kankakee and Iroquois Counties, will go to their polls at their schools and cast a ballot for a particular question and a county-wide question that is on their ballot. Dan Hendrickson has been the lead person in this election project, along with Greg Murphy, and they have done a great job.

  Mr. Hendrickson stated that this is one of the ways that they can do an outreach to those 7th and 8th grade students to get them acquainted with the electoral process and to get them to understand the process of registering to vote and casting a ballot. Prior to today, the students designed posters for DARE and the Regional Office of Education chose four of the best ones and the students will vote on which one of the posters they want to see throughout the county for the DARE program. That will be one of the county-wide questions that they will vote on so their vote will actually have some action. The schools will have some individual questions and some of them are based on the specific needs of the specific school. Kankakee has a question directed to their student council “What areas would you like to see them focus on during this school year?” Some of them have questions pertaining to cafeteria food, the format of the school year, etc. The questions are designed to give an impact to the students that are participating so that they can feel vested in the process. They have approximately 8 schools that are participating this time in Kankakee County and 4 or 5 in Iroquois County. They will be voting on the touch screen equipment just like they would at the polling place. They are going to deploy that equipment the day before the election just like on Election Day. Some schools will have actual election judges there to administer the process and some schools will have teachers. They will send their results to the Regional Office of Education’s website where they will post them so the students can see throughout the course of the day how the returns are coming in. It has been a successful project; this is the third time that they have done it. There has been great cooperation with the Regional Office of Education. They will be using 25 to 31 touch screen machines.
Mr. Clark stated that there is really no cost because they are just using the equipment that they already have. A side benefit is that their new staff has a chance to get familiar with the equipment. They also try to recruit from the teachers for election judges.

Mr. Hendrickson stated that it exposes the teachers to the equipment and takes away some of the intimidation factor.

Mr. McConnell stated that he thinks it is a very good program, even if it would cost something. It is well worth it.

Mr. Clark stated that he appreciated that. He thinks that it is important for young people to become familiar with it and to start voting in the voting process.

Mr. Snipes stated that he would like to see it expand to Sophomores and Juniors because they are close to the voting age and he would also like to see a question posed to the students pertaining to the courthouse addition.

Mr. Clark stated that they do have Juniors and Seniors who have a 3.5 GPA or higher serve as election judges and get paid for doing that even though they are not 18 years old so there is some continuation of the education process in the high schools that they have had good success with. They have had 111 high school students over the last four years serve as election judges.

Mr. Enz stated that he would like to publicly and personally thank Mr. Clark for the job that he does. He gave him some assistance with some documentation from other counties which make it much simpler for him. He really appreciated it and wants everyone to know what a great job Mr. Clark does.

Ms. Polk asked if Lorenzo Smith School is participating in the mock election.

Mr. Clark stated that they are.

5. GIS – Roger Diercks
   - Quarterly Revenue Report

Mr. Mulcahy made a motion to accept the report and Mr. Enz seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

   - Department Staffing Discussion
Mr. Diercks stated that he sat down with Chairman Bossert a few weeks ago to talk about the GIS Department’s staffing and he asked him to update the committee on that conversation. He discussed with him the potential to add one full-time staff member. The GIS Department was at two full-time staff members up until about three years ago. Since then he has used interns which has worked well and has helped to get some of the basic work done. However, he finds that at times it would be good to have someone here on a permanent basis that can back him up and someone who is a little more familiar with the processes and systems that they use. He did put money in his proposed FY2014 budget for a GIS technician that would be hired
approximately halfway through the fiscal year, May or June. As a department that is funded out of a special fund entirely, the special fund would bear the cost of any health insurance, which is a policy that the county board has set. One thing that could be a factor is the Bellwether Cost Study. The GIS Recording Fee was a part of that study so they will have to see what comes back. There may be potential for the county board to adjust the recording fee based on that study. He is not asking for authorization to make a hire but he just wanted the committee to know that this is something that they are thinking about.

Mr. McConnell asked what the projected cost will be.

Mr. Diercks stated that the salary would probably fall in the $35,000 to $40,000 a year range. Benefits would probably be somewhere around $13,000 to $14,000 on top of that.

Mr. Snipes asked how many staff he currently has.

Mr. Diercks stated that he has one full-time and one part-time person who is going to be done at the end of November.

Mr. Snipes stated that if he was out of the office that would put that one person in charge of everything.

Mr. Diercks stated that his part-time position is an intern level position, a temporary type of position. That person really does not have a chance to become familiar with the work flows and systems that they use.

Mr. Howard asked how he was planning on advertising for this position.

Mr. Diercks stated that he would advertise locally and on professional websites in order to get the word out as widely as possible.

Mr. LaGesse asked what was coming from a special fund.

Mr. Diercks stated that the GIS fund is a special fund. It is not general fund money.

Mr. LaGesse stated that he knows that we are not in the position to hire.

Mr. Bossert stated that GIS is entirely funded by a special fund. There will be a sentiment to hold off as long as we can in light of the overall financial situation in the county but on the other hand if we are going to maintain our GIS system and do another fly-over and all the other things that are related to upgrading and maintaining what we have we probably need to think about how best to get that accomplished. If Mr. Diercks has some extra help and hires a technician, there are other departments that can certainly utilize some help with these GIS issues, such as, assessments and planning. These are things that they will need to discuss as they move forward but they wanted to bring this up and start thinking about this issue. He asked what Mr. Diercks balance was in the GIS fund.
Mr. Diercks stated that at the end of this fiscal year it is projected to be in the $450,000 to $500,000 range. They have been accumulating funds for a fly-over.

Mr. Bossert stated that they accumulate money and then spend it in one big chunk for a fly-over and then rebuild it. Technology is getting better and they will not be spending nearly as much money as they have in the past.

Mr. Diercks stated that the cost has come down for those types of projects.

Mr. James asked if it will be a total fly-over.

Mr. Diercks stated that it will be county-wide.

Mr. Bossert asked if the resolution is getting better.

Mr. Diercks stated that you have to pay for higher resolution. They do 6” pixel resolution which is what they have traditionally done. The next step up is 3” and sometimes you see that at municipal government level type of application but that gets quite expensive for an entire county.

Mr. Snipes stated that he knows that Mr. Diercks is stretched and at some point in time he is due the necessary help of at least one person. He thinks that the benefit to the county outweighs that particular cost.

Mr. Enz asked if he has ever considered approaching Kankakee or Bradley to see if they would be willing to pay a little more to boost the resolution, at least in the urban areas.

Mr. Diercks stated that he has had that discussion with several of the municipalities and they all indicated that it was just not going to be feasible for them to do that. One even indicated that they did not see a need for that.

6. Assessor – John Mac Shoopman
   • Monthly Report

   Mr. Snipes made a motion to approve the report and Mr. Liehr seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Mr. Shoopman stated that they have submitted their tentative abstract to the Department of Revenue and they are presently reviewing it along with their equalization re-class report. That keys the publication for the assessment changes and the equalization factor that they published for non-farm and that is the starting date for the formal appeals process where people can appeal to the Board of Review. They have had two Board of Review sessions and they have two new appointees to the Board of Review this year, which are Mark Kaner from Bourbonnais and Joe Kane from St. Anne. Steve Cote is the carry-over Board of Review member and he has been appointed as the Chair of the Board of Review. They are looking at some appeals and they had their organizational meeting Thursday and their next meeting is this coming Thursday.
Mr. Shoopman stated that he would like to address the concerns of the assessors about the differences in the publication which contained their equalization factor for the non-farm properties. The way that they understand that is that that particular factor is applied to the aggregate non-farm. It is intended to bring the aggregate of the non-farm to the 331/3, such that, in that publication it speaks to the taxpayer, whether they be a residential, commercial, or industrial, that they would divide their assessed value by the 331/3 that are factored. When applied it brings that medium level to 331/3. The notices that they send to the individual taxpayers will not agree with the aggregate equalization factor published. If they are correctly applying the sales data that they utilize to arrive at that factor, he believes it is entirely inappropriate to apply the aggregate factor indiscriminately to other properties.

Mr. Shoopman stated that in 2010 there was some improper classification within the code and as of today they have corrected 1255 parcels redirecting those to a residential classification which now do include factors based on the sales ratio studies that they utilize to arrive at those factors. All the counties in the state submitted a compliance form that addressed how the counties were bringing their farm assessment effort into compliance. There was nothing new in the code, it was just that Revenue recognized that there were so many variances in how farmland was being assessed. Part of the compliance process involved is what is known as “definition of primary use”. It was to isolate those properties that were by definition farmland from those that were not. This county went through this process and they did make some changes and they submitted those changes to Revenue. Out of the 2006 farm parcels that contain a residential component there are a certain number of those that are inappropriately classified based on the primary use definition required for that classification. They are working on that but have not completed it as of yet. When they pull the residential classes that are not by definition included in that as farmland, those will then be in the residential class and will also have a factor applied which is based on the sales ratio study for that class of property. The remainder part of those will then be farmland parcels which will contain the four components of a farm which are farm land, farm buildings, home site, and residence. Those will not appear in a ratio study because they are in the farm section of the abstract. They will require a separate study on those parcels to determine whether or not the factors derived from residential sales are applicable. Other than that, the township should just reassess them. There are not so many that that could not be done on a continuing basis. They will know soon how many out of those 2006 parcels they intend to move to the residential class. Then they will receive the equalization factor derived from the sale ratio study where now they do not. He thinks that this issue is somewhat of a carry-over from something that was addressed in 2005 and 2006 that they are coming back to and revisiting.

Mr. Snipes stated that he believes that the township assessors are responsible for assessing the land, whether it is residential or farmland, in their area.

Mr. Shoopman stated that they do not assess the farmland. It is a formulated assessment which they apply. It is a mixed use category and it is very difficult. There is value and use for the farmland which will also contain farm buildings and then there is a home site and residence that is to be treated for equalization purposes like an urban property. They can be factored but they do not appear in the ratio study so the sales you are receiving are from urban property. Are they applicable to the farmland component for the residence and the home site? That needs to be determined.
Mr. Snipes stated that individual can appeal through the appeal process if they have any concerns.

Mr. Shoopman stated that they can.

Mr. Howard thanked Mr. Shoopman for his commitment to attend the meeting that they set up in Hopkins Park/Pembroke regarding the issues and concerns that property owners have with their tax assessment. Some of the property owners there feel that they have been over assessed. He also is asking if Mr. Boyd could also be there to answer any legal questions that they might have.

Mr. Shoopman stated that they would ask that any of the Pembroke property owners that feel that they are over-assessed to come to the Board of Review with their appeal. The application is online. The rules and regulations are also online or they can come to the county to get an appeal form filled out.

Mr. Howard asked if he will be there Saturday.

Mr. Shoopman stated that he would be willing to address the issues of assessment and how they would hope to improve upon that. It is the township that provides for the assessment. His office facilitates that as far as a clearing house; they do the equalization, exemptions, supply abstracts, etc.

Mr. Howard asked where the funding comes from to pay the township assessor.

Mr. Shoopman stated that other than a multi-township which is a separate taxing body the individual township assessors are paid through the township levy.

Mr. Bossert stated that assessment is a function of the township government and it is a part of the township general fund activity to fund the Office of the Assessor as well as the assessor’s salary. It is entirely up to the township to see that it gets done.

Mr. Enz stated that he a township official and he knows that all the townships, with the exception of Norton, had their books in by July 30 which gives the Supervisor of Assessments from August to September to get the figures right. Why didn’t he get the figures right to start with instead of having one published and one not published which ultimately put a huge burden on the local assessors, his included, because since those figures were put out they have been swamped with people coming in asking questions. He thinks that as the Supervisor of Assessments he should have gotten the numbers right.

Mr. Shoopman stated that he believes that the numbers are correct.

Mr. Enz asked why he got two different numbers.
Mr. Shoopman stated that the one in the paper is an aggregate applied against all non-farm values and the one that came in the mail is specific to your classification of property for your township.

Mr. Enz asked why they could not have been the same.

Mr. Shoopman stated that the only way that they would be the same is if he applied that aggregate factor to all classifications indiscriminately and that is improper to do. We should stop doing that.

Mr. Enz stated that if he has a farm with a house on it and it is a residence and next door in town is someone with a residence they are not getting equally assessed.

Mr. Shoopman stated that they are equally assessed if the assessor has equally assessed them. Application of equalization factors does not correct assessment. It just simply levels the playing field from township to township and jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Mr. Enz asked if there is anything that they can do next year to change this so the numbers are not different.

Mr. Shoopman stated that they are talking about how that might be approved upon. Maybe they could state in the preamble to refer to your notice for your classification equalization specific to your parcel. What do they do? Do they publish the whole equalization section which is two pages for each township or do they put that online, although, he is not sure if everyone has access to the Internet. One of the issues that we have is our property parcel numbers that are used to identify each property owner parcel number does not contain part of the ID that would coincide with the abstract classification for that parcel. You would have to be able to access that to know which category you belonged in.

Mr. Enz asked if that equalization factor was applied to commercial.

Mr. Shoopman stated that commercial entails a wide range of possible property types. In order to apply equalization to commercial there has to be individual studies on those sales. He thinks it is more prudent to reassess them every four years.

Mr. Enz asked if it says in the statutes that they have to publish them in the paper and send out individual notices.

Mr. Shoopman stated that it does.

Mr. Enz stated that he would like to see next year the numbers be the same. By having the different numbers the county is pushing a burden onto the townships because they are having people walk in through their door steadily asking for clarification.

Mr. LaGesse asked if there a disclaimer in the publication that says that what you receive in the mail might be different than these because of your classification.
Mr. Shoopman stated that there is not.

Mr. LaGesse asked if there shouldn’t be something in there so when people get these things they don’t go crazy.

Mr. Shoopman stated that he thinks that maybe they could add that. The statute calls for them to publish the preamble and he thinks they could add something like that to it.

Mr. LaGesse stated that he understands people’s frustration. It is misleading unless there is a way to inform the people that there is going to be a difference.

Mr. Shoopman stated that what the taxpayers want to know is what their value is on their property and that is on the notice that they get in the mail. Mr. Shoopman asked what he suggested be done.

Mr. LaGesse stated that anything that would make people understand that the figures in the paper may not apply to them individually.

Mr. Bossert stated that this is the year when all but one township where the published equalization factor resulted in a higher number than what the notice that went to the owner so he does not quite understand why the residents are so up in arms.

Mr. Enz stated that people don’t understand it. How do they know which one that they are actually going to get charged? The one that they send in the mail or the one that is in the paper.

Mr. Bossert stated that the calculated assessment number that was in the paper for that individual property, the dollar amount, should have matched the number that came on the piece of paper.

Mr. Enz stated that he has had a lot of people come in his office as has at least two assessors.

Mr. Bossert stated that he is not sure how it is every totally solved. If they go to work and publish every equalization factor across all classes for every township it would be a huge amount of data and it would totally confuse everybody.

Mr. Enz stated that maybe they put a warning in the paper when they are published.

Mr. Bossert stated that he would invite the Chairman and Mr. Shoopman to sit down with him and representatives of the assessors in order to talk this through, along with anyone on this committee who would like to join them.

Mr. Enz stated agrees with Mr. Bossert. He thinks that there needs to be more cooperation between the assessors and the Supervisor of Assessments.

Mr. Bossert stated that another issue that he would like to bring up in terms of the assessment process is the need for improved automation at the township level to handle data and to have
better capabilities of transmitting and analyzing data at the county level across township lines. There are a number of townships that are very well automated and have good database systems in place but a number of them do not. Is part of the solution for Pembroke Township that it needs to invest in a good database program to where there is continuity if an assessor changes? That needs to happen and yet it cost money and the county is in no position to invest on behalf of everybody. This is a whole other discussion that needs to take place.

Mr. Enz stated that that is why the idea to have a meeting with the assessors is so necessary and it may take more than one meeting.

Mr. LaGesse stated that he wouldn’t mind seeing where they could have some kind of meeting of the full board to go over the whole process.

7. Recorder: Lori Gadbois
   - Monthly Report
     The Committee reviewed the Monthly Reports.

     A motion to accept the Monthly Reports was made by Mr. Enz and seconded by Mr. Mulcahy. Motion carried.

Ms. Gadbois stated that they had their meeting with the Department of Revenue and they have agreed and are willing to propose a statutory change on behalf of their statute in terms of the recording stamp and the state and county stamp so they are now gearing up for that. Hopefully, they will see a nice change with how the revenue stamps are affixed to a recording document which will help save some money because it costs money every time that she has to leave with the machine to get it refilled.

Mr. Enz asked how her lis pendens compare to last September.

Ms. Gadbois stated that last September they were at 58 and they are at 34 now. They had 22 deeds yesterday. Unfortunately, they had a foreclosure come in for a whole subdivision which was 35 individual foreclosures.

Mr. Enz asked if they are getting better at recording the foreclosures.

Ms. Gadbois stated that it was the assignments that have been the issue of the recording process and it really has picked up. These bigger banks and mortgage companies are getting better at recording the assignments so that when they do file foreclosure they will have their paper trail and there is no more questions by the judges.

Mr. Enz stated that he had a foreclosure and two years later it was still showing up in the person’s name that it was foreclosed on and that really creates a problem.

Ms. Gadbois stated the foreclosed properties that are abandoned are still a big problem in all communities.
Mr. Enz stated that she had talked about the Sheriff’s sale keeping money out and recording it. Did that ever happen?

Ms. Gadbois stated that that is not working yet. That is a statutory thing also.

Mr. Bossert stated that Ms. Gadbois’ office has been nicely rearranged and updated.

Mr. Gadbois stated that they are going to work on a little day of recognition for all of the hard work that went into the second floor project between the conference room and her office. She is still working on a few things but overall the staff love it and are happy and the people that come in are pleasantly surprised and impressed. The searchers that come in are extremely pleased with what is made available to them now.

8. Animal Control: Julie Boudreau
   - Monthly Report
     Mr. McConnell made a motion to accept the report and Ms. Polk seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Ms. Boudreau stated that things are staying pretty much the same as far as the report goes. They are up a little bit on the registrations coming in. They have been trying to stay on top of those animal hospitals to get that revenue submitted in a timely manner. The bites for the month are up as well for the year. They have had a lot of wildlife which is driving that number considerably. She is happy to see that more bites are impounded at home rather than in-house which is telling them that these animals are current on their shots and able to do quarantine at their home.

Ms. Boudreau stated that the euthanasias are up but when you look at the wildlife number that number is driving the euthanasias number.

Mr. Bossert asked Ms. Boudreau to clarify how they deal with wildlife. Does she not deal with wildlife unless it is in the home?

Ms. Boudreau stated that if they are in your living quarters they can come and try to remove them but they do not go into closets, fireplaces, basements, crawl spaces, garages, attics, etc. and they really do not have the license to remove them from the property unless it is something that they think that they are sending to the state for testing. If they go into someone’s house to remove a squirrel that has gotten in there and is creating mayhem they have to be released no more than 100 yards from that home on that property. They can’t take them across the street and let them go on someone else’s property. People get discouraged when they call and want something removed and they refer them to the Department of Natural Resources and the private licensed individuals in the area. Private people usually charge for their services but they are very effective and usually very fair and they have the license through DNR to remove the animal.

Mr. LaGesse stated that if you have an older home or if you have vents on your roof you should check those screens. He had a squirrel get through the screen and get into his attic.
Luckily, he called the man from Papineau and he caught the squirrel in no time at all which turned out to be a female squirrel that was pregnant.

Ms. Boudreau stated that he is very good and he is also a good resource as to what to check for and how to prevent animals from getting in your house.

Mr. LaGesse stated that he built him a cage over the vent that squirrels cannot possibly get in.

Mr. Enz stated that the paper stated that there was a 500 lb. wild boar shot and killed in Pembroke.

Ms. Boudreau stated that she does not doubt it but here office was not apprised of it. They talk about those wild boars and hogs coming up from the south. She does not know if they have reached our area yet.

Mr. Enz stated that that article stated that within three generations a livestock boar can become a wild boar. Has she had calls from out there?

Ms. Boudreau stated that she has not recently. Generally, it is for livestock type pigs that have gotten loose from somewhere. This year they have dealt with horses and cattle more than anything else.

- **Animal Control Building Update**

  Mr. Bossert stated that he is getting some agreement from among the board and is hoping for support from this committee that they move ahead on putting together some plans on an Animal Control Facility. They have looked over the existing building thoroughly and have come to the conclusion, along with their architect firm that is helping us on the courthouse, that the existing building is probably beyond the scope of trying to do repairs on it. It is not that old of a building and yet it has probably not been used for what it was designed for. It has taken on a lot of moisture in the walls and there is a real danger that it could fall over in a wind storm. If they make the assumption that they need to move forward with just a complete rebuild, they probably need to start thinking about that and how many square feet it is going to require. Their veterinarian in charge there has thought thru what makes sense in terms of capacity and cage requirements and in turn what size of building makes sense. He doesn’t think that we want to get too carried away on a building and yet they want something that is adequate for our current needs and the nearby future. They did get a cost estimate back from a couple of the local contractors. The thought at this point is to just use the existing site and build next door. There is sufficient room there, although, they may have to get a few feet of the neighbor’s property. They also have an animal organization, BARK, that is supportive and is chartered and organized to support the County Animal Control Department. They have some money that was raised at some point and he feels like they are just waiting for a project to be talked about and they could get organized and help us out with some fundraising. If we work this right and get some good support we may be able to get this accomplished without going outside the Animal Control Fund and not have to utilize general fund revenue. It is a project that has been lingering for a long time and they would certainly like to move forward on it.

Mr. Enz asked if Mr. Bossert is talking about a Butler type farm building.
Mr. Bossert stated that they are trying to look at whatever avenue that makes sense in an economical manner, whether it is a Butler or a FBI building. They have to design it to withstand moisture. It would be a farm building for the most part but there would have to be office area and staff quarters.

Mr. Enz asked if there is any other available property adjacent to that.

Mr. Bossert stated that they have had some informal discussion with one of the neighbors.

Mr. Enz asked it this is something that they can run through the Public Building Commission. He is not sure the money that they have is going to be enough.

Mr. Bossert stated that they may not but they may partner with a companion organization that can help us to get this accomplished.

Mr. McConnell stated that he wanted to encourage them to move forward. He had been out there and it needs to get done.

Ms. Boudreau stated she does appreciate the committee’s and board’s efforts to seriously look into this and she really hopes that this can be accomplished this spring. The Department of Ag was in last week to do an inspection and they realize that most agencies are on a shoestring budget and she told them that they had some bright hopes for some new things so he is looking forward to maybe at next year’s inspection to be inspecting a new facility. BARK has some good plans for this year for some fundraising. She does not know if it would be the committee’s desire to bring any type of rough draft next month.

Mr. Bossert stated that they will discuss that as he is not for sure if they are ready for that. He will keep the committee apprised of what is going on with the project.

9. Other Business
   • Review of Bellwether Cost Study Activity
     Mr. Bossert stated that he has not received the final report back yet.

10. Old Business
     None

11. New Business

12. Adjournment
    A motion was made by Mr. LaGesse and seconded by Mr. Mulcahy to adjourn the meeting at 10:28 a.m. Motion carried.

Stan James, Committee Chairman
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator