<div align="center">

MINUTES
CITY COUNTY COMMON
TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2011

</div>

Present: Deb Schorr, Chair; Adam Hornung, Vice Chair (8:22 a.m.); Mayor Chris Beutler; Jon Camp; Jonathan Cook; Doug Emery; Jayne Snyder; John Spatz; Bernie Heier; Larry Hudkins (8:24 a.m.); Jane Raybould; and Brent Smoyer

Absent: Gene Carroll

Others: Steve Henderson, Chief Information Officer; Jeff McReynolds, GIS Program Manager; Dennis Meyer, Budget and Fiscal Officer; Mark Koller, Personnel Director

Chair Schorr called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. and announced the location of the Open Meetings Act.

1. **Approval of Common Meeting Minutes of February 8, 2011.**
   Spatz moved to approve the Common Meeting minutes of February 8, 2011, seconded by Emery. Schorr, Hornung, Beutler, Camp, Cook, Emery, Snyder, Spatz, Heier, Hudkins and Raybould voting aye. Smoyer abstained; Carroll absent. Approved 11-0.

2. **2011/2012 Projected Budget from Information Services--Steve Henderson, Information Services**
   Schorr stated the County Board met with I.T. and requested additional information for this Board.

   Henderson stated in 2010 Information Services developed rates for this year, with increases occurring. A large change was Lincoln Electric, our largest main frame customer, moving their main frame services to an internal processing facility. Needed to re-distribute the LES revenue with remaining customers.

   LES was the largest main frame customer, County Treasurer next, then 3/4 city units. Remaining customers consume a small share. Looked to restructure the Treasurer's payment so they wouldn't bear LES' departure all in one year, and positioned for 3 years, and this is acceptable to the Treasurer and us.

   Henderson added another item is Geographic Information Services. Heard GIS may need an additional person to accomplish services and concluded we could provide support, and not hire an additional FTE. But, this caused higher expenses for some receiving GIS benefits.

   With I.S. agreeing to offer more GIS services discussed GIS customer base cash flow. Do have the GIS Administrative Team, made up of 6/7 organizations. Looking at alternative ways to recover funding for GIS services. Then employees salaries.

   Raybould stated IS looks to garner revenue, but does almost compare to her company's IT department of 9 full time people, and 2,200 employees. Here IT has 36 employees, but similar functions in ways. The County's GIS system is superior but we need to manage costs. What are 3 strategic initiatives being worked on?

   Henderson said first the main frame. Looked at ways to use with current equipment, or alternative sources. May decide these services are no longer appropriate. Second is staff and think of restructuring, slightly reducing. People may retire and would not refill positions.

   Thirdly, took comments to heart on comparisons and providing services. Gathering information from communities/counties. After validation of data the information can be used as you make your decisions.

Camp asked what savings would be realized on the main frame? Are there alternative storage needs? Henderson said it would not be the main frame entire cost as we would move to an alternative, and need solutions for customers. Camp asked on staff decreases, your average person is paid $100,000 plus. Henderson said they may have a retirement, and depending on the main frame, 1 or 2 staff.

Camp asked if we could outsource? They would deal with ups and downs. Henderson replied again the main frame. If we do not provide will not need support or contractual staff. Another is not having employees provide support, but do on a contractual basis.

Camp asked, when is enough - enough? Henderson replied he thinks this is a policy decision, City and County deciding how much more GIS service. Not just a technical decision, but IT would participate in the decision.

Raybould said the County has their contract in September. Know of the IS Committee, but is an IS Task Force needed for alternatives and to expedite? We need concrete items you'll pursue, or change courses, or getting processes off the mainframe. What is the timeline? Have you had interviews with outside providers?

Henderson replied they discussed mainframe service with outside providers and are pursuing with the state. Will give an exact date hopefully this summer, certainly fall. Gathering information and looked at CIR comparable cities/counties. Verifying data for accuracy. Should have ready in a week or two.

Raybould asked if this Board/Body could give a deadline, so we can have the information? Heier stated no action, with Schorr adding this Board can give general direction but not to take a vote and mandate information be provided by a certain date.

Mayor Beutler asked for an increase estimate. Henderson said LES not totally withdrawing, we do printing work, not mainframe, about $325,000. GIS services being prepared, and reassignment of 1½ individuals about $85,000. All 40% County and 60% City. Then salaries, rent, software maintenance/licensing. $35,000/40,000 was new equipment/software increases.

Mayor Beutler asked for the total. Henderson said overall $747,000. LES about $200,000; salaries, software, rent and maintenance; and the third category. Schorr added she has a copy of what Henderson provided and will circulate.

Hudkins asked if the $200,000 salary increase is based on comparability, or previous contracts? Have you considered reduction of force? Henderson replied largely on contracts, and working towards a 97% budget, part would be a reduction of force if necessary.

Schorr said they discussed with department directors/elected officials, who were concerned about increases over which they had no control. Needed to hear concerns on risk management, salaries, several categories. We're doing due diligence towards elected officials and department directors.

Camp asked what is IS's overall budget? Henderson replied the billing proposed for fiscal '11-'12 is about $6.1 million. Camp asked if it includes all outsourcing? Henderson said it did.

3. **GIS Future Funding Options: -- Dennis Meyer, Budget and Fiscal Officer; Jeff McReynolds, GIS Program Manager**
   Schorr said the Commissioners saw a $85,000 increase without doing anything much different. Meyer stated the County Board has budget discussions at each staff meeting. Did focus on GIS and talked to McReynolds

and Henderson, along with two elected officials using GIS. Discussed issues versus future options.

McReynolds said departments with GIS interests has grown. Departments used GIS and wanted to share data. This created the GIS Admen Team/7 different City, County agencies, LES, and LPSNRD, to formulate direction and plan. They needed a point person, and this position created. Since then GIS has done both departmental and joint projects, with the group being the primary stakeholders. Now looking to share costs.

McReynolds stated they were asked to do a GIS budget, making a cyclical effort to move forward with GIS data costs, hardware and software as more agencies are interested in doing projects related to GIS. Now trying to share costs, and defining who pays what percentage.

Also heard discussion that we're happy with the level of GIS information, and not going further, to possibly cut costs. An issue discussed is delaying aerial projects, extending 3, 4, or 5 years. Another option in our initial budget presentation is to evenly spread out or look for outside agencies.

Schorr added part of the struggle is many agencies use GIS. The original 7 are footing the current bill and possibly the increased half time technical person to address the projects backlog. One of the 7 members resigned, saying they weren't receive value for their dollar. Now only 6 funding agencies.

Raybould asked how GIS differs from Google? McReynolds replied the Google information provided through USGS, and USGS's participation with us. Raybould heard cost savings options. McReynolds mentioned the timeframe for updated aerial images delayed to 4/5 years. But many who use GIS feel it loses usefulness 2/3 years out. Another is adding more partners, possibly schools. We joined efforts to partner on a regional basis, a larger area at a lower cost. Schorr asked if GIS would investigate different funding more fairly allocating costs to the many users opposed to as it is now? McReynolds replied it is being investigated.

Cook asked who are the 6 partners? Reply was the county engineer, the assessor recently backed out, planning, building & safety, public works, LES and LPSNRD. Hudkins asked what percentage was for the assessor? McReynolds said his focus is an enterprise effort as opposed to a departmental effort. The assessor's office data supplied is high. Each department updates and maintains, the usage is used and shared.

Camp asked when is it enough? How do we evaluate? McReynolds said one way is taking data and making more usable. We can get to a point but there is always the next thing.

Hornung asked how are you determining the allocation without the assessor's office? McReynolds replied as GIS program manager his job is to look at the enterprise, not only one department. Hornung stated you're allocated to all 7, what would be the assessor's allocation of your cost? Reply was 1/7.

Schorr asked if there is general consensus to mediate other ways to allocate the cost out? Yes.

4. **Broadcasting of Common Meetings – Commissioner Schorr**
   Schorr stated an optional item is televising Common meetings. When using the Chambers we have one technical person at $40/hour, but when meeting in this room need a camera operator and another person. A two person project at $40/person/hour. Is there value in spending $80 to televise each meeting? Snyder asked how often is the meeting repeated on Channel 5, other than live? Cameraperson Beranek stated on Saturdays. Cook added also is video on demand. Camp thought from a transparency standpoint accountability is important and to air. Would like to see us continue to broadcast.

Spatz thought good to know the cost with Smoyer adding it is about transparency. Spatz stated the City's pre-

councils televised but not the Directors or Organizational meetings. After discussion Schorr stated it would be kept in the budget for the coming year.

5. **Health Insurance RFP – Commissioner Raybould**
    Raybould distributed the County's summary of current health insurance saying they are trying to be pro-active in looking for health insurance savings. The County hasn't had their Health Insurance bid out for possibly 6 years. The City is with Coventry. We requested the County go for an RFP. The County policy is a generous health insurance but as we struggle to find shared cost savings this is an alternative.

    Koller stated always good to have vendors review. Believe we've done an RFP for health insurance every three years. This gives us an opportunity to combine for both City and County to put out an RFP. Will ask for presentations, either a combined City-County, or City and County separate, which we have now.

    Raybould stated the County has fantastic participation. We have 890 employees and 873 are on our health insurance. The policy is generous, a single person's contribution is zero. We crunched numbers and if we could move this category to a $50 contribution it would provide a savings to the County of about $250,000/year. In other categories if increased modestly it would bring additional savings.

    Discussion on deductibles and other program savings. Snyder stated we've analyzed before, not just the premium but deductible and limitations, can't just look at one product. Snyder led discussion on the savings account, and if the City and County combine should get a better deal. She explained some of her business insurance for her employees and the advantages.

    Koller stated any change would have to be negotiated. We will try to come up with the best health plan. Further discussion on health plans, a possible internal clinic, the need for more data, and combining City and County offices.

    Chair Schorr adjourned the meeting at 9:20 a.m.