

**Sioux Rivers Regional MHDS Governance Board**  
**Minutes**  
**December 5, 2017**

The Sioux Rivers Regional MHDS Governance Board met on Tuesday, December 5, 2017 at the Plymouth County Courthouse Annex Building, 215 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, Le Mars, Iowa.

1. Chairman Mark Loutsch welcomed attendees, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and introduced Board members to the group.

Members present: Mark Loutsch, Jeremy Taylor, Mark Sybesma, Dennis Wright, Don Kass, Keith Radig, Shane Walter, Mike Wood and Julie Albright.

Others present: Patty Erickson-Puttmann, Aaron Haverdink, Sharon Nieman, Dennis Butler, Nia Key, Dick Owens, Fitz Grant, Cindy Wilde, Diane Neri, Amy Lord, Katie Detloff, Paul Lundberg, Don Nore, Ben Shuberg, Mark Monson, Lori Bush, Kim Keleher, Brenda Erickson, Monti Molzen, Sheila Martin, Kathy Roberts, Jennifer McCabe, Kim Wilson, Dennis Morrice, Bev Zenor, Gary Turbes.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

- A. Motion by Jeremy Taylor, second by Don Kass to approve the Agenda of the December 5, 2017 Governance Board Meeting. Carried 3-0.

3. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 20, 2017 GOVERNANCE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

- A. Motion by Dennis Wright, second by Don Kass to approve the October 30, 2017 minutes as presented. Carried 2-1. Woodbury County (Taylor and Radig) opposed.

4. FISCAL AGENT REPORTS

- A. Dennis Butler presented to the Board the Fund 110 Reports (administrative funds) for Plymouth, Sioux and Woodbury counties and Regional Fund 720 Report.
  - I. As of October 31, 2017, the recap of all funds balances: Woodbury County \$999,281.28; Sioux County \$706,503.45; Plymouth County \$306,297.65. The Sioux Rivers Fund balance is \$2,905,182.30. The total of all Region funds is \$4,917,264.68.
  - II. The next Fiscal Agent report will reflect the payments that have been made by each county so the \$987,000 will be added in to the income in November. He added that the tax payments are imbedded in the balances so there will be a lot less balance on the next report when he shows the payments that have been paid out.
  - III. Dennis explained that on administrative expenses there was a misinterpretation of what was in the 28E. Sioux and Plymouth counties withheld their ensuing year expenses so in 2017 they withheld for 2018. Because of this their payments have no administrative expenses withheld because they already have it. That has been corrected and they are right where they should be now. The 28E that is recorded in the Auditors office will have to be amended because there was a different deal the Board approved where they would withhold the ensuing year. There was some twisted language and it was discovered because the question was asked why they have such large balances at the beginning of the year. This has now been corrected through the withholding of the payment.
  - IV. Shane Walter stated the Board decided it would hold 100% in the Spring for the ensuing fiscal year which they began to do in Plymouth and Sioux counties. In Woodbury County, it was done according to what they had approved erroneously because the wrong version of the 28E got approved. Shane reported that it was not a big deal and that we end up in the same place.
  - V. Jeremy Taylor asked as far as the adherence to the 28E, in this situation they had a couple of different ways of going about this (and he felt it was an honest mistake), what was the bottom line as far as Sioux and Plymouth and their adherence going forward to the 28E will be as it is currently written.

- VI. Dennis Butler answered yes it will be as it is currently written. He said that he thought that there would be a new 28E with the piece they did pass that did not get in the original 28E that was approved by all of the Boards.
- VII. Shane replied they have already deemed it appropriate for Plymouth and Sioux County to follow what the 28E says and withholding enough administrative funds to get through the first quarter.
- B. Motion by Mark Sybesma, second by Keith Radig to approve the Fiscal Agent reports as presented. Carried 3-0.

5. APPROVE REGIONAL SEPTEMBER MENTAL HEALTH EXPENDITURES

- A. Motion by Dennis Wright, second by Mark Sybesma to approve the Regional mental health expenditures for October 2017. Carried 3-0.

6. UPDATES: ADVISORY BOARD, WORK ALTERNATIVES, ASC, JAIL ALTERNATIVES, TRANSITIONAL HOUSING/BEDS COMMITTEE.

- A. Aaron Haverdink shared that the next Advisory Board meeting will be held on January 10<sup>th</sup>.
- B. Aaron reported that the Work Alternatives meeting will be held on December 19<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. at Hope Haven in Rock Valley. Aaron shared that anyone is welcome to come to the meeting.
- C. Katie Detloff reported on the Sioux Rivers Assessment and Stabilization Center.
  - I. For the month of October, they had 28 clients (16 male and 12 female). Average length of stay was 6.7 days.
  - II. They saw individuals with depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, substance abuse issues, paranoia, homeless, insomnia, self-harm and audio hallucinations.
  - III. They received referrals from Unity Point, Siouxland Mental Health, Mercy, the RTF, other therapists, Orange City Hospital, self-referrals and Plains Area.
  - IV. The average daily count is 4.7.
  - V. Dennis Wright asked if they are now able to bill Medicaid.
  - VI. Katie replied that they are now looking at February 1, 2018 before they will be able to bill Medicaid. She is waiting on MCOs to provide appropriate documentation as to what specifically they need from the Assessment Center in order to bill.
  - VII. Don Kass asked about the Food Bank and whether they will continue to provide food for the Assessment Center after they start billing Medicaid.
  - VIII. Katie stated that as of now because it is more a per diem rate the Food Bank will continue to provide food; it is when Medicaid starts asking for costs to be split between food, housing, lighting, etc., that it may become an issue with the Food Bank. They currently get the majority of their food from the Food Bank with the exception of things like bread and milk.
  - IX. Chair Mark Loutsch thanked Katie for the tour she gave to Don Kass and himself.
  - X. Don Kass commented he was very impressed with the facility.
- D. Nia Key reported on the Jail Alternatives Program. They are continuing to build the program.
  - I. Nia has begun to phase in intensive case management. The caseload is 10 to 15 individuals.
  - II. She began seeing people in the Woodbury County jail starting in September. She receives the jail list every day from Woodbury County Sheriff's office. She pulls the list from Plymouth and Sioux counties jails and if she has any questions she calls, adding that Plymouth and Sioux are more on an as needed basis for her to go out to those jails.
  - III. Nia reported that she had a visit from Woodbury County Chairman Ung. He came by to take a look at her office space and he asked her a few questions about the program and what they are doing. One of the questions he asked was if she goes into the jail every day to which she responded no, she does not go every day because of the fact she is in Woodbury County and she has access to their criminal information system.
  - IV. In order to meet the requirement of the Stepping Up Initiative of keeping track of data, she put in an application for The Projection and Strategy Model - Jail Tool. They were selected and now have free access for a full year and full technical assistance as well.
  - V. Nia held a meeting on October 31<sup>st</sup>. Over twenty people were in attendance including the new Sioux City Police Chief.
    - a) They discussed the sensitizing of the providers to effects of incarceration on treatment and risk management.
    - b) They talked a great deal about law enforcement deflection and preventive and interventive strategies they can use to reduce the number of arrests. They also talked about how they could better utilize

community partners such as the Sioux Rivers Assessment & Stabilization Center so the police have a place to divert individuals to as opposed to heavily relying on emergency rooms.

E. The Transitional Housing/Bed Committee has not met.

## 7. NPI QUARTERLY UPDATE

- A. Jolie Corder was not at the meeting. Shane told the Board that Jolie's NPI Report was in the meeting packet. The report shows an update on what the funds given to NPI by the Governance Board have been used for.
- B. Jeremy Taylor told Chairman Loutsch that he had questions regarding the report that Shane might possibly answer.
  - I. Jeremy stated the initial grant request was for \$350,000 and it was \$275,000 that was allocated. Jolie Corder's report references \$250,000 allocated and not the \$275,000. He asked if she did not receive the full grant. It was reported by Patty Erickson-Puttmann that Jolie did receive the full \$275,000. Shane determined that it was a discrepancy on the report that was not caught before being presented to the Board.
  - II. Jeremy said with initial request they were going to have quarterly reports on July 1<sup>st</sup>, October 1<sup>st</sup> and January 1<sup>st</sup> with statements of revenue. He said the whole thing was predicated upon being able to sustain and this is the first report the Board is receiving.
  - III. Shane reported that they will refine the reports from this point forward. What Shane asked Jolie to provide today was just a summary so they would know where NPI is at and that subsequent reports will have more detail.
  - IV. Jeremy stated that this was seven months ago (April 19, 2017) and so far, there has been \$91,000 that has been expended. He asked if there had been no revenue in the last 7 months that has been received when approximately not even half the money that has been spent.
    - a) Patty Erickson-Puttmann shared her thoughts that it might have to do with the training of new staff and get their certification before they meet the licensing process before those services can begin to be billed for. The WRAP Program (Wellness Recovery Action Plan) requires certain training and certification.
    - b) Kathy Roberts shared a point of information regarding the WRAP Program. She brought to the Board's attention that she has been a trained facilitator since 2009, so there are other places in Siouxland that are offering it.
    - c) Jeremy Taylor asked Kathy if that information was shared to clarify the statement on NPI's report that states there is no one in the city that is offering the program and that is not the case.
    - d) Kathy responded yes that is not the case.
    - e) Jeremy asked that it be recorded in the minutes that he is concerned at this point that seven months later 40% of the funds have been expended and there is no revenue that has been accounted.
    - f) Shane Walter said that Jolie has been visited with and understands the expectations and they will expect a quarterly report on April 1 with more detail particularly about unexpended funds.
    - g) Chairman Mark Loutsch said that he would like to receive a report in January if possible. Shane stated he would ask for that.
    - h) Patty asked if there was a report format that they are going to expect from all of the providers.
    - i) Keith Radig stated that this was a unique expenditure and that is why they requested the reports.
    - j) Patty asked if he had input on a form that he would like to see so that when they receive that information they are not asking for more.
    - k) Mark Loutsch stated that he did not believe so, adding if there has not been any revenue generated he would like to see a projection.
    - l) Jeremy Taylor stated that the motion that was passed included July 1<sup>st</sup>, October 1<sup>st</sup>, January 1<sup>st</sup> and April 1<sup>st</sup> and this is the first such report that they have received and it also referenced revenue. He added that they didn't want to make the expenditure and then have to be in the same position a year from now. They wanted something that was sustainable and came to a good compromise.
    - m) Mark Sybesma asked when the money was distributed to NPI.
    - n) Dennis Butler replied that NPI was given a check for \$275,000 on April 19, 2017 and that all the money was given up front.
    - o) Don Kass responded that moving forward that practice has got to stop.
    - p) Jeremy Taylor concurred with Don.

## 8. PLAINS AREA MHC BUILDING PROPOSAL UPDATE

- A. Kim Keleher reported that back in April of 2017 they were approved for \$275,000 to purchase a building and remodel. They have gone back and forth with purchasing a building, putting up a Morton building and now they are back to purchasing a building. The building is located downtown and used to be an old pharmacy. They have been working with Life Skills because they also need space. Plains Area intends to purchase the building and they will remodel it and half the space will be rented by Life Skills for their Day Hab Program. They have an offer on the table and they are waiting to counter offer until after this meeting to make sure everything is okay.
- I. Kim reported that they did receive the full \$275,000. They did cut a check back to the Region for \$75,000 which had not been expended. They are hoping that they can still access that money for remodeling once they get to that phase.
  - II. Jeremy Taylor asked Kim if they intend on spending the full \$275,000.
  - III. Kim replied yes.
  - IV. Jeremy clarified the \$75,000 was reverted to the Region and then Plains is going to request for it back and ask what where the circumstances for doing that.
  - V. Kim stated because they purchased the building for \$200,000 and had the \$75,000 left over but then they realized it was going to be closer to a half a million dollars to remodel the existing building they are in and put on an addition. They realized that was a bad option and then they found the building downtown, with is perfect for both Plains Area and Life Skills. So the \$75,000 was not expended and when she talked to Don Kass and Shane Walter they requested that they pay that back because they had not spent it.
  - VI. Jeremy clarified that we approved by motion of the Board that \$275,000 so that is allowable to be spent at this point and asked if that was agreed on.
  - VII. Kim Keleher stated they had a request to returned the \$75,000 and they complied; now they are hoping to request it again so that they can use it for the remodel.
  - VIII. Chairman Loutsch said they will pay out as they see bills for it.
  - IX. Jeremy Taylor said he is appreciative of that process and he wanted to make sure that he understands it correctly that Plains Area is authorized to spend up to \$75,000 and everyone is on the same page.
  - X. Don Kass stated that that is correct.
  - XI. Kim said they would reinvoice for that money when they expend it.
- B. Don Kass told the Board he wanted to clarify that Plymouth County had for quite some time (and have since done away with) a project called Local Option Sales Tax Grants in which worthwhile community projects would ask past Boards of Supervisors for grants and the Boards would allocate certain amounts of dollars towards the grant process. The process took place and the monies were only expended when entities which applied showed up with an invoice showing that they had spent the money that they had applied for. Don added that is how these types of transactions need to take place. He gave the example: Bad things happen to good people every day; if the Region gives Entity XYZ \$200,000 to do something with it and they don't it right away and then XYZ goes bankrupt, that \$200,000 can be frozen in their accounts and the Region's money could end up with their money being frozen in someone else's account, which is one example the bad things that can happen when you don't follow the given process.
- I. Kim Keleher shared that all providers, just as Patty had been alluding to as well, would appreciate some procedures in place so that they (the providers) know the process on how to do things.
  - II. Don Kass agreed.
  - III. Patty Erickson-Puttmann shared that on the Provider Improvement Grants that the Region has done in the past, it's done exactly how they are talking about now and always has been. The providers must submit documentation on the expenditures before they are ever reimbursed for anything. Adding that it is being done in one area; but in these areas where providers have had special projects and show up before the Board with a request, that process has not been used.
  - IV. Don Kass added that he was under the assumption that all requests followed that procedure.
  - V. CEO Shane Walter said because there was no direction given from the Board as to how those funds should be handled, so in lieu of that, they honored the invoice. Shane said the procedure will be fixed for the future.
  - VI. Keith Radig asked if it would take action by the Board to request an expenditure be returned.
  - VII. Shane stated that would be on the Board to decide how to handle that. He asked the Board for direction on how they want to handle it.

- VIII. Keith Radig added if they designate that money as a Board and then change the scope, they should probably request the money officially back as a Board. He agreed just giving the provider a check is part of the problem, but they did not do that in all cases on that one motion. He stated Siouxland Mental Health did not get a check, when plans changed they essentially were told they needed to come back for Board approval adding that they were treating two different providers differently.
- IX. Don Kass stated the difference being that Plains Area is in Plymouth County and Plymouth County has not left the Region.
- X. Keith Radig stated that the 28E Agreement says that they have to continue to use the expenditures as they planned them as long as we are a Region.
- XI. Jeremy Taylor added that the \$75,000 was issued on June 28<sup>th</sup> and the \$675,000 check was never issued.
- XII. Shane Walter pointed out that the initial approval on the Friendship House was predicated on a viable project coming back to the Board and that has yet to happen until now. Adding they could not expend those dollars until they had the project demonstrated by ability. When it came back, it was nearly \$200,000 more than what was agreed that the Region would have available.
- XIII. Keith added that part of the reason it took so long is that they were complying with all the requests too.
- XIV. Chairman Mark Loutsch stated that he does not feel the Board needs to request the \$75,000 back if they already have it.
- XV. Shane Walter stated that they do have the money back.
- XVI. Don Kass expressed his appreciation for Plains Area's cooperation.
- XVII. Kim Keleher asked that a motion be made by the Board to assure her that once they submit invoices for that \$75,000 that it will be reallocated back to Plains Area Mental Health Center.
- XVIII. Jeremy Taylor stated that he would like to make the motion that \$75,000 in Plymouth County be allocated as they had previously passed.
- XIX. Don Kass stated unfortunately that is not on the Agenda.
- XX. The Board agreed that they will make sure Kim Keleher receives the \$75,000 once she presents the invoice.

9. APPROVAL OF WILLIAMS & COMPANY (PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2017 AUDIT) INVOICE: \$3,050.00

- A. Motion by Dennis Wright, second by Keith Radig to approve the Williams & Company invoice totally \$3,050.00. Carried 3-0.

10. APPROVAL OF THE FY17 ANNUAL REPORT

- A. Shane stated that the FY17 Annual Report has been sent and needs to be approved.
  - I. The Board went through each section and discussed the Report.
- B. Motion by Mark Sybesma, second by Keith Radig to approve the FY17 Annual Report. Carried 3-0.

11. APPROVAL OF INVOICE (\$3,410.95) FROM MIDWEST ALARM TO CORRECT ISSUES RELATED TO THE RECENT FIRE MARSHAL'S INSPECTION AT THE ASSESSMENT & STABILIZATION CENTER.

- A. Motion by Jeremy Taylor, second by Dennis Wright to approve payment of the invoice from Midwest Alarm in the amount of \$3,410.95. Carried 3-0.

12. DISCUSSION: HOW TO PROCEED WITH PROVIDER NEGOTIATIONS AND BUDGETING FOR FY18.

- A. CEO Shane Walter asked the Board for direction on how they are to proceed since Woodbury County has opted to withdraw from the Region effective July 1, 2018. While Woodbury County has not received the formal okay to join the Rolling Hills Region, it is out there and Sioux Rivers at some point soon are going to need to budget for FY19 and decide on rates for providers they have responsibility for. If Woodbury County does follow through and they do in fact leave Sioux Rivers Region we will be negotiating rate for providers in Plymouth and Sioux counties. Otherwise at this point in time, through June 30<sup>th</sup>, they have responsibility for providers in Woodbury County as a Region. He questioned whether they should sit down and negotiate rates with those providers that they may or may not be able to honor. He again asked for direction on how to proceed with that whole process. He added he feels a sense of obligation to the providers in Woodbury County and they have the obligation of doing the best that they can for them while they are still a Region, but he can't negotiate rates that begin in July that he would have no control over unless they are still a Region.

*Discussion:*

- I. Mark Sybesma: We would not have the authority to do that.
- II. Shane Walter: Right, I can't make those kinds of decisions on behalf of Woodbury going forward or with the Rolling Hills Region and obligate to that. I guess we could engage in the process and hope that they will honor what we've done.
- III. Chairman Loutsch: Has anything been talked about or discussed as far as what is upcoming for Woodbury County providers.
- IV. Jeremy Taylor: Well, beyond Rolling Hills looking at potentially putting a budget together with Woodbury County included, as well as a budget without Woodbury County included, and that was publicly discussed as they look to whether or not they accept Woodbury County.
- V. Shane Walter: So maybe our approach could be similar to that, two budgets essentially.
- VI. Jeremy Taylor: I realize that that creates a lot more work and that is what they had a little bit of heartburn over, understandably, but they also want to look ahead as to what would be a viable option, which I think certainly is, or they would not have the prospect of creating a budget with Woodbury County.
- VII. Shane Walter: Well they need to if they are going to, in fact, accept you into their Region they've got to plan properly because we have to do that now.
- VIII. Patty Erickson-Puttmann: So then that would allow others to plan on what services may or may not be cut by Rolling Hills with this budget done.
- IX. Mark Loutsch: That is what I was thinking.
- X. Patty Erickson-Puttmann: She is going to have to show what services would be cut, so we will finally have that answer.
- XI. Shane Walter: We may need to meet with Dawn Mentzer so we will be able to talk about that prospect and what that may look like.
- XII. Mark Loutsch: So we know everything we are going to do if they take over.
- XIII. Shane Walter: Again, I feel an obligation to the providers in Woodbury that is what I've been tasked with doing the last several years and I want to continue to do that as long as I can or should be, but we have some obvious realities that we need to deal with.
- XIV. Jeremy Taylor: I could not agree more that through June 30<sup>th</sup> we have to fulfill our obligations, and so beyond that, obviously some of today's actions are to get us off of dead center so that Woodbury can plan July 1<sup>st</sup> and beyond and there would be some hope that there would be resolution to some of those so we can provide for our providers and do so in a way that would be best. That is where I think we would come from it.
- XV. Dennis Wright: So we need two budgets is that what we are saying here?
- XVI. Shane Walter: I don't know. What I am saying is I need some direction here because at this point I am not able to go forward.
- XVII. Chair Mark Loutsch: What is the scenario if Rolling Hills does not accept you guys, where that would leave you?
- XVIII. Jeremy Taylor: Well, it will leave us not a part of the Region as of June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- XIX. Don Kass: That depends.
- XX. Mark Loutsch: And everything we do today also that we contribute money to and do may get cut from a Region or Woodbury County has to stay on the loan or don't have enough money and those programs could also fail.
- XXI. Jeremy Taylor: They could and I know sometimes it is advantageous to say what will be cut by Rolling Hills, but we don't necessarily accept that line of thinking, obviously, or we would not advocate otherwise. But we will take care of Woodbury County and rest assured through June 30<sup>th</sup> we will operate as a Region.
- XXII. Mark Sybesma: That's not the point here. We are looking at beyond that.
- XXIII. Mark Loutsch: Yes
- XXIV. Mark Sybesma: We need to be able to look beyond that as far setting the rates for the providers so they can plan as well. If we set rates or recommend setting rates will Rolling Hills honor that? That is the question.
- XXV. Shane Walter: Yes, it is the question, because that is what we are talking about is FY19.
- XXVI. Jeremy Taylor: To be honest, if the concern is Woodbury County, the best thing would be to look at how to mediate withdrawal in such a way to make that clear because I believe that once that is clear, Rolling Hills will be able to make a decision. Beyond that, if the concern is Woodbury County, you obviously know it is Woodbury County's desire to go eastward.

- XXVII. Mark Sybesma: So you would suggest that we set a budget without Woodbury County involved. Is that what you are suggesting?
- XXVIII. Jeremy Taylor: If Sioux and Plymouth think it is viable per 331.389 to exist as a region beyond June 30<sup>th</sup> ....
- XXIX. Mark Loutsch: We have to for a while anyway
- XXX. Don Kass: Well beyond June 30<sup>th</sup> because the date for anything else has already passed.
- XXXI. Jeremy Taylor: But that's been a choice.
- XXXII. Don Kass: Your choice.
- XXXIII. Jeremy Taylor: It's been known since October so unless you have approached other Regions...
- XXXIV. Don Kass: Even in the best-case scenario that date has passed Jeremy.
- XXXV. Jeremy Taylor: But what I am saying is that I think that DHS will look at the fact that the date has passed because there has been waiting and there has been one scenario, which is to keep Woodbury County.
- XXXVI. Mark Loutsch: Jan Heikes told us to be patient and wait. That is what I have been advised. I don't think we need to look for a place until we need to.
- XXXVII. Shane Walter: It's not like we have had months to figure out this.
- XXXVIII. Patty Erickson- Puttmann: So, then we are just back to going forward as they have in the past?
- XXXIX. Don Kass: How difficult it would be for everybody to just assume a freeze of rates.
- XL. Sharon Nieman: I think the bigger issue is that everyone has to certify their budgets by March 15, 2018. How is Plymouth and Sioux or Woodbury going to look at certifying those budgets and it doesn't matter where anybody goes, we have to answer to the State auditor by March 15<sup>th</sup> with the budget. No matter what happens, we have to have those budgets done. Even if we end up doing two budgets, we are going to need to pick one and submit it to the State.
- XLI. Shane Walter: I guess with your statement, Jeremy, that regardless Woodbury County will be out of the Region come July then it does not make sense to proceed with two budgets.
- XLII. Jeremy Taylor: I wouldn't think so.
- XLIII. Shane Walter: Sure doesn't.
- XLIV. Dennis Butler: In our case, March 15<sup>th</sup> is the deadline to certify but we have to publish two weeks ahead of that and you have to get it in the papers a week prior so their final date to put a tax asking is February 21<sup>st</sup>. So, we are under a gun somewhat to get this done.
- XLV. Mark Sybesma: It's is not really that complicated because it is basically what are you going to tax.
- XLVI. Dennis Butler: I agree, you could put a high number in and then you can always reduce it at the public hearing.
- XLVII. Mark Sybesma: From the providers standpoint, they have to do their budgets as well and they need to know how much money they are going to get. We can be worry about the ones in Sioux and Plymouth counties and you can worry about the ones in Woodbury County. That's the way it goes.
- XLVIII. Jeremy Taylor: Can I just ask one somewhat related question? Has either Plymouth or Sioux approached either of the adjacent contiguous regions to ask.....Maybe this is for Supervisor Kass as well, as you alluded to being past a deadline and November 25<sup>th</sup>, normally is the typical deadline in 28E agreements, has either Plymouth or Sioux asked either of the adjacent contiguous counties.....
- XLIX. Mark Sybesma: That is up to us and whether or not we have or have not is really irrelevant.
- L. Don Kass: It is irrelevant to Woodbury County's interest.
- LI. Jeremy Taylor: I think it can be discerned by a FOIA request, but you would think that if you are going to argue that you are past the deadline so there is nothing that we could do, that would be to your providers and your public that you would want to disclose in transparency. It's a pretty basic question.
- LII. Mark Sybesma: We will disclose it at the proper time and it is not now.
- LIII. Chairman Loutsch: As of right now we are still a region until someone tells us differently.
- LIV. Don Kass: There have been no dissolutions taking place and I want to reassure our providers that we are not going leave you as orphans.
- LV. Chairman Loutsch: We are still a region and after June 30<sup>th</sup> too because we are already set up as a region.
- LVI. Jeremy Taylor: A two-county region.
- LVII. Chairman Loutsch: Well it was three and still is three.
- LVIII. Dennis Wright: What are you going to do Shane?
- LIX. Shane Walter: I will visit with our providers and will put a budget together and present it when it makes sense. We have to look at going forward.

- LX. Don Kass: As per Dennis' suggestion, if we have to submit a high figure and reduce it at some point in the future, use that as your fallback position and do the best you can.
- LXI. Shane Walter: It would be helpful to our process to know what happens with Rolling Hills and they will make a decision at some point. They have a meeting coming up on December 20<sup>th</sup>. They may not make a decision.
- LXII. Don Kass: I had a member of Rolling Hills call me and I told the member it is time for Rolling Hills to decide. He said if they are going to take Woodbury County then take Woodbury County and don't wait for us, because if you don't take them, DHS may say you are taking Woodbury County, in which case everything goes back to what it was before, so there is no point us making any decision until Rolling Hills makes a decision.
- LXIII. Jeremy Taylor: If that is truly their desire to make a good decision, I would think it would be incumbent on the sitting members of Sioux Rivers to at least say here is what the percentage of funds that you would be leaving with and here would be the answer on the Crisis Center. Those two things and then I think they would make that cut.
- LXIV. Shane Walter: We have already made an agreement Jeremy on those percentages. We already talked with your auditor and your financial auditor. We've talked about percentages and we have an agreement, so in the end it will be whatever we end up with.
- LXV. Dennis Butler: That is the 61%, 21% and 18%.
- LXVI. Chairman Loutsch: That was done by Pat Gill, Dennis Butler and Aaron Haverdink.
- LXVII. Shane Walter: We don't have the exact dollars.
- LXVIII. Jeremy Taylor: I don't expect you to have the exact dollars and I think that is fair and I think we have all come to the 61% of unexpended funds.
- LXIX. Shane Walter: When unexpended funds are determined, we have an agreement there. So that is pretty clear.
- LXX. Jeremy Taylor: I think the only other thing that would be the disposition of the Crisis & Stabilization Center.
- LXXI. Shane Walter: At this point it belongs to the Region and if we are allowed to continue as a Region even for a period of time then it stays with the Region and that is clear in our 28E. Now again, it is out of our control to some degree, that will be up to the legislature or DHS to make that determination.
- LXXII. Jeremy Taylor: The only other question would be that we believe that the Tri View Building that is deeded in Woodbury County's name belongs to Woodbury County.
- LXXIII. Dennis Wright: Absolutely.
- LXXIV. Chairman Loutsch: That's what the original fight was a year and a half ago and we gave up on the fight a long time ago.
- LXXV. Dennis Butler: Going back to what Don said, if we are not accepted in Rolling Hills we could potentially be placed back in Sioux Rivers. That is why I think you almost have to do two budgets so you are prepared either way.
- LXXVI. Shane Walter: We've got some time yet and I've already begun putting some things together.
- LXXVII. Jeremy Taylor: I think it is premature to do anything right now because I think the next three or four weeks may determine that and we don't know if DHS is going to assign us one way and two counties another or assign us all back in or assign all three, we just don't know. I don't want to make a lot of extra work.
- LXXVIII. Shane Walter: I agree with that. Obviously, we have already looked at numbers and we are looking at services that we will provide as a region one way or the other and those are things we are doing throughout the year.
- LXXIX. Mark Loutsch: The budget is probably easier to go with the region as it stands now versus a new budget.
- LXXX. Shane Walter: That is effectively what you do anyway when you do a budget. You look at what you've done and what you want to do and you reconcile those two things.

### 13. FRIENDSHIP HOUSE PEER SUPPORT/DROP-IN CENTER BUILDING PROPOSAL

- A. Kathy Roberts: This is all about the same thing we looked at in April, the \$675,000. As we talked last month about the building we were looking at, we did make an offer contingent upon receiving funding. Unfortunately, I got a statement from the seller in writing. They had another offer and they were not interested in considering our offer because they didn't trust that the Sioux Rivers Region would follow through on the funding. I was pretty disappointed by that. The seller is out of Des Moines so it is whatever they are hearing in the media, however I have a little sense of relief hearing you say, Shane, that you have a sense of responsibility to Woodbury



and that you are not going to leave us as orphans and we are still a region until June. We are going to go back to our original plan of adding on to our building. We were discussing the \$180,000 overage. We have looked at ways to bring that down. Some pretty simple things, like keeping our big-ticket items such as our air conditioners and furnaces; those kinds of things will stay in place. We will do less refurbishing in our existing building. Unfortunately, we will have to keep some of our ugly furniture and we are all right with that. If there is any overage above the \$675,000, Siouxland Mental Health said that they would take care of that. I guess I am questioning what you said a bit ago about having a viable plan does that mean we just invoice the Region?

*Discussion:*

- I. Shane Walter: I think what that means is that you probably need to come back with those specific plans, details as to what you plan to do.
- II. Chairman Loutsch: Or as it is expended...
- III. Shane Walter: It's not my decision. It is this Board decision.
- IV. Mark Loutsch: So this all happen since we visited?
- V. Kathy Roberts: Yes.
- VI. Dennis Wright: Did you guys go down there?
- VII. Don Kass and Mark Loutsch: Yes, we went.
- VIII. Shane Walter: What you presented last month was a far different animal.
- IX. Kathy Roberts: So we are just going right back to that original plan.
- X. Sheila Martin: That was approved in April.
- XI. Mark Loutsch: I have some of the same concerns as I have mentioned. Sioux Rivers funds the Friendship House about \$140,000 per year plus some peer support. Is that correct?
- XII. Sheila Martin: For Friendship House it is about \$150,000 and they spend about \$190,000. So Siouxland Mental Health funds about \$40,000.
- XIII. Mark Loutsch: My concern is if Woodbury County goes to Rolling Hills and they discontinue funding you how are you going to be viable?
- XIV. Sheila Martin: Whether we go to Rolling Hills or not, that is not the issue. The issue is that we are a part of Sioux Rivers Region today. And you said that right now and you said you are not going to orphan our Woodbury County providers.
- XV. Don Kass: I was specific to Woodbury, Plymouth & Sioux.
- XVI. Sheila Martin: We are going back to the original in April which is the \$675,000 and we just want to know how to invoice the Region the same way as what you did with Plains Area Mental Health.
- XVII. Bev Zenor: I am Bev Zenor I am the incoming vice-chair at Siouxland Mental Health and a new comer to this meeting. I just have to say I listened to the Plymouth discussion about refunding the money and hoping to get it back and I understand that. We are presenting staying with the original plan, you have seen that and we are not asking for more money. I am unclear as an observer and as a tax payer and a vice-chair of an organization that serves people, how does that fit?
- XVIII. Don Kass: My suggestion is if Woodbury County is intent to leave and if they are sincere in their insistence that Friendship House get these monies, my suggestion is that they put their money where their resolutions are and find a way to fund Friendship House, i.e., Siouxland Mental Health the monies they demand from the Region, since they are not going to be a part of the Region by their intent, and get you the money that way so that 100% of the money comes out of 100% of Woodbury County's coffers. They have chosen to leave.
- XIX. Sheila Martin: Okay, but there has been a motion that has been approved by this Board.
- XX. Don Kass: But they have chosen to leave.
- XXI. Sheila Martin: But we are still a part of Sioux Rivers Region.
- XXII. Jeremy Taylor: The reason that I wanted to make the motion for Plymouth County was to demonstrate that Woodbury County will spend more money than Plymouth County in Plymouth County. Why? Because that is what this Board made a motion to do. Not to rescind the money back, not to say we are spending the majority, let's call it 61%, of your building project in Plymouth County. It's not going to be successful; you all know this. It's unfortunate but it is the way that they are going to proceed through June 30<sup>th</sup> and it is one of the many reasons that Woodbury County has chosen to withdraw. So it's not going to happen. You were at \$675,000 and you came in with \$870,000 and they said come back to \$675,000 and we'll fund the building.
- XXIII. Dennis Wright: You guys said that too.

- XXIV. Keith Radig: Absolutely.
- XXV. Jeremy Taylor: Absolutely.
- XXVI. Dennis Wright: Don't put that all on us, you guys said the same thing.
- XXVII. Jeremy Taylor: I'm absolutely with you. I only meant it changes, things change. We do things as a board, we pass motions, they don't always work out like that. That is just the reality until June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- XXVIII. Don Kass: And if in the meantime, Rolling Hills chooses not to take Woodbury County, and DHS says go back to your sandbox and work it out, I will most certainly consider making sure that the commitment that was made in April, before Woodbury County chose to leave, is fulfilled. In the meantime, Woodbury County could pass a resolution finding a way to finance this one way or another from Woodbury County's funds, based on the fact the Woodbury County made a unilateral decision that comes with certain consequences.
- XXIX. Keith Radig: You are still legally bound by the 28E agreement that says you are required to expend funds that were planned. This was planned on April 25, 2017, it was a single motion \$675,000 for the cost of the Friendship House Building (not specifying the building they are at, not specifying how they do the project) and \$275,000 for Plains Area Drop- In Center (that was specified) and if you are going to tell them to come back with only \$200,000 and give you back \$75,000 well it needs a motion to rescind that. Just like there should be a motion to rescind this motion. So if you are going to do it legally, you have got to do it legally because right now you are breaking the law.
- XXX. Mark Sybesma and Don Kass: I don't think so.,
- XXXI. Keith Radig: You are actually breaking the 28E, absolutely. Let that be in the news media right there you can play that all you want. You are breaking the 28E.
- XXXII. Don Kass: Let it make it to the news media that Woodbury County has not taken my suggestion to put their money where their resolutions are and follow through to the consequences of their decision.
- XXXIII. Keith Radig: Okay, then give us the money back from the mental health levy because we can't use it from the General Fund.
- XXXIV. Don Kass: There will be a dissolution of funds once Rolling Hills takes you, if they decide to take you. In the meantime, we don't know that.
- XXXV. Jeremy Taylor: At this this point it makes sense to make a motion because it is on for action.

- B. Jeremy Taylor made a motion to expend the \$675,000 from the Region to Siouxland Mental Health Center's Friendship House as previously passed, second by Keith Radig.

*Discussion:*

- I. Mark Sybesma: Can I make a motion to amend the motion?
- II. Dennis Wright: Pat Gill do you have any thoughts on this?
- III. Pat Gill: No, I just thought there was a procedural question there about an amendment.
- IV. Mark Sybesma: I asked if he wanted to make an amendment.
- V. Mark Sybesma: This motion was on the table though, do we need to have a motion to take it off the table?
- VI. Don Kass: We'll just adjudicate it.
- VII. Jeremy Taylor: We would appreciate the vote.

Don Kass called the question. Chairman Loutsch announced question has been called and stated all in favor of the \$675,000 for the Friendship House say yes. Woodbury County: Taylor – Yes; Radig – Yes Sioux County: Sybesma – No; Wright – No Plymouth County: Kass - No; Loutsch – No. Motion Failed 2-1.

**14. APPROVAL OF INVOICE FROM CMBA ARCHITECTS FOR SERVICES RELATED TO FRIENDSHIP HOUSE RENOVATION.**

- A. CEO Shane Walter explained to the Board that the actual total of the invoice is \$10,723.07 (Not the \$6,994 that was listed on the Agenda).
- B. Motion by Dennis Wright, second by Keith Radig to approve payment of the invoice from CMBA Architects in the amount of \$10,723.07. Carried 3-0.

*Discussion:*

- I. Pat Gill: Can I ask for a point of clarification on the motion that you did prior to that. As far as the Fiscal Agent and what the folks from the Friendship House were discussing invoicing if they proceeded. Is it the understanding that the motion that you just made and voted down, is that then the prior motion is still in effect, the way it sits now, when I read through the minutes, is that those folks could still proceed to spend some of that money, the \$675,000.
- II. Keith Radig: It's never been rescinded.
- III. Pat Gill: It's never been rescinded. For the Fiscal Agent, we've talked about a process of where you were invoicing before and I'd like clarification as to what....
- IV. Mark Loutsch: Don Kass' statement was that if we are still a region down the road he would work on considering funding the Friendship House.
- V. Don Kass: That's right, if we are still a region down the road.
- VI. Pat Gill: But you have not taken any official action on that. What you have done so far is that there is a motion that was successful to spend \$675,000 and you have not taken any action on that, but they brought back different proposals to you and some of those were rejected from my understanding. But the original motion is still out there and the risk that you are running is that they can continue, they could invoice and they can incur a contract based on that motion that was made.
- VII. Don Kass: I believe these services that were rendered were before Woodbury County chose to leave. I know where you are going and perhaps we should take action at next month, Mark, to clarify our position on this.
- VIII. Jeremy Taylor: But up until that point they could invoice until this Board acts and I appreciate that give us \$75,000 or don't do this, but that is not how a governing body passes motions and legally acts. So just because it has been said, and you correct me if I am wrong Pat, the Auditors position is the Board has not rescinded. To be done properly, it should have been put on the Agenda.
- IX. Pat Gill: We are strictly administrative; you folks submit a claim to us, we pay it. If anyone had any question, we would go back to the minutes and say that you approved that expenditure at that time. So that is still there. I read through the minutes, there were some proposals that were brought forward as far as what they can do. They asked for additional funds and that was rejected. But the original motion is one that is still there and those folks could incur expenses based on what was in your minutes that you approved.
- X. Shane Walter: I believe that the original motion was for them to come back with a viable project. The original motion was that we had a million dollars to divide up to spend on our campus.
- XI. Keith Radig: You can read it. It is right there highlighted in green.
- XII. Jeremy Taylor: That is why we approve the minutes because if we don't, then people can say well I said this and I said that.
- XIII. Shane Walter: Well we have had conversations and several conversations...
- XIV. Keith Radig: Well conversations don't change the law.
- XV. Pat Gill: I am not on one side or the other here, but I am just trying to tell you that what we need to look at.
- XVI. Don Kass: We'll have to consider rescinding the motion at the next meeting.
- XVII. Mark Sybesma: Yes
- XVIII. Jeremy Taylor: But I just want to make sure to clarify, because you can't take action today because it is not listed on the Agenda.
- XIX. Pat Gill: You can take action today.
- XX. Jeremy Taylor: They can take action to deny the...
- XXI. Pat Gill: The proposal is on the Agenda for the Friendship House. You can go back to that; procedurally you can do that. All I am asking for is clarification because that way it was left is we don't know whether we should...
- XXII. Mark Sybesma: We'll clarify it. We'll probably call.....
- XXIII. Shane Walter: You can do it right now.
- XXIV. Pat Gill: Yes you can

- C(1). Mark Sybesma made the motion that they disallow any invoices pertaining to the \$675,000 that was mentioned in the April 25, 2017 minutes effective today, December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017. Second by Don Kass.

*Discussion:*

- I. Keith Radig: Do they have to legally rescind the whole motion or can they go through and hand pick?
- II. Pat Gill: As long as it is clear to you folks what this Board is doing.
- III. Keith Radig: Okay
- IV. Mark Loutsch: So that would be \$600,000.....
- V. Keith Radig: Well it would be \$664,276.93 after the expenditure.
- VI. Jeremy Taylor: We just spent some of that.....
- VII. Shane Walter: And the \$5,000 that they spent for earnest money.
- VIII. Sheila Martin: So you are going to fund one provider and not the other?
- IX. Mark Sybesma: Yes.
- X. Sheila Martin: In the same motion?
- XI. Don Kass: Yes, because one is not going to be a part of our region soon.
- XII. Sheila Martin: We are still a Region until June 30<sup>th</sup>. I am acting under the meeting minutes of April 25, 2017 as a legal binding contract.
- XIII. Mark Sybesma: I call the vote.
- XIV. Mark Loutsch: Okay.

- C(2). Mark Sybesma amended his motion to read: I make a motion that pertains to the motion of April that any monies not expended of the \$675,000 that were approved at that time be not advanced on this project and that dollar amount appears to come to \$659,276.93. Don Kass seconded the motion. Motion Carried 2-1.  
(Woodbury County – opposed)

15. BUDGET/LEVY/FUND BALANCE SPREADSHEETS WITH PROJECTIONS FOR FY19 & BEYOND.

- A. Shane Walter: The bottom line is that they agreed on the percentage. What we may or may not have for a fund balance depends on a number of things. One would be the expenditure of the \$675,000 that would impact that obviously. There are some other expenditures listed that if made would impact. There are different scenarios that may or may not come to fruition in terms of the fund balance and what they'll end up with at the end of the fiscal year. Then there are some projections on potential levies going forward depending on whether we are together as a region beyond June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- B. Dennis Butler pointed out which spreadsheet was his and which one was Shane's. Dennis Butler: We should really just probably just go to the end of the year because we are not going to be together and we'll figure out the split. But my assumptions, we know what the beginning balances are, we know what monies are coming in, that's a given. Then we get down to the difference of \$75,000 which I did not have in my hands at the moment so I can add that \$75,000 to the cash balance at the bottom of the page. In going through expenditures, and I always assume if you budget it, you are going to spend it. In the past, we have had budgets throughout the county that they don't spend it, then why budget it. So, Shane and I both agreed on this, the \$4,955,000. I put in the Friendship house of \$675,000; he has \$670,000 which the \$5,000 difference is that one bill. The one-time projects we budgeted \$1,000,000 and he had \$500,000. With his \$500,000 we have to add \$500,000 more to the ending balance. So, the \$1,353,402 on my sheet here would have to be raised by \$75,000, by the \$675,000 plus the \$500,000 for one-time projects we won't do. So now we are up to about 2.6 million that we divide up at the end of the year as of today. That number could be higher if you don't spend the full \$4.9 million, we won't know that until the end of the year. It won't be higher unless you amend your budget, but otherwise that would be the low end. So, we are really coming in at \$2,603,000 at the end of the year, that way we'd split, if that's the number or whatever the number is (61% Woodbury, 21% Sioux, 18% Plymouth). So that would change my split down below here too; it would go up for everybody.
  - I. Shane Walter: So the end result is that....
  - II. Dennis Butler: It almost doubles, basically.
  - III. Shane Walter: You expect that that would be the split? You did the math on that so you certainly have an idea then going forward what you are going to be taking away from the Region.

- IV. Dennis Butler: The only other thing that might affect us too is if the Crisis Center gets some money because I've assumed no Crisis Center income. We've have heard from another crisis center that they don't plan on anything until February or March and they will be lucky to even get it going then because there is nothing going on.
- V. Shane Walter: We don't have any income projected for the coming year. We are anticipating some for next year.
- VI. Dennis Butler: Right, you have no income for the coming year. So, it will just be gravy money coming in that will add to the split.
- VII. Shane Walter: Yes. If we are able to bill this coming February or March, that will be money that we had not planned on receiving.
- VIII. Dennis Butler: And I don't know where the million we had planned on, where Shane had \$500,000.
- IX. Aaron Haverdink: That is what I would like to address. The difference is the \$300,000 is what we project to spend. We always pay on June 30 for the next fiscal year's Employment Grant. That would substantially be different obviously with different providers involved. And then the \$200,000 for provider improvement grants which they may or may not offer this year. So that is where the \$500,000 comes out.
- X. Shane Walter: The bottom line is there will be some things that may or may not happen, dollars that may be expended or not. I think your worst-case scenario looks like what Dennis Butler has provided there.
- XI. Dennis Butler: Worst case is that we would have about 2.6 million to split up.
- XII. Shane Walter: So we are just trying to make our best guesses at where we will be. Again, it will be affected by what we choose to do going forward.

#### 16. RESOLUTION TO MEDIATE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOODBURY COUNTY AND SIOUX RIVERS.

- A. Chairman Loutsch: We have talked about some of this already. Until we know what is going to become of Woodbury County, if you would want to mediate our differences and stay a region I would be all up for that and I think the rest of the Board would work to make that work at that time. I believe you want to mediate properties, is that correct?

#### *Discussion:*

- I. Jeremy Taylor: Right. The original intent of the resolution was to have a clear discernment on funds, which I appreciate we are all in agreement on that, it would just be on the Crisis Center and if there are any issues where this would be the appropriate vehicle than that would be the resolution.
- II. Mark Loutsch: As of now I don't believe there is anything. The Crisis Center is under the 28E. We are agreeing on the cash and the Tri View Building.
- III. Keith Radig: There would be the 61% of the funds expended on the Crisis Center.
- IV. Shane Walter: The 28E says that the monies and the property expended on behalf of the Region will stay with the Region. We had an opinion rendered from our Regional Attorney, Mr. Lundberg, and he agrees with that, informally.
- V. Jeremy Taylor: My only question, and I agree generally with that statement, however and it sort of rolls into the next item, and that's whether or not (and trust me if we were in a six-county region this would not be a discussion, but we are not) the prospects of success are there or even a viable legal avenue. The only reason I raise the question is this would be the first two-county region and you would be operating a nearly million-dollar expense outside of your geographical area.
- VI. Shane Walter: We access services outside of our geographical area all the time. We pay for services at Cherokee Mental Health Institute, we provide funding for services at a lot of places outside of the Region, so this certainly would not be the first time.
- VII. Mark Sybesma: Obviously you would like to have the services. I would think that there would be a way to work together on this, I'm not sure how, but I would be open to that.
- VIII. Shane Walter: We are willing to work with Woodbury County and Rolling Hills to allow utilization of that facility.
- IX. Mark Sybesma: I don't think we will be selling or anything like that.
- X. Shane Walter: Our stance has been that the 28E is clear on that.
- XI. Mark Sybesma: I think you guys could use the services and we could utilize it as well.
- XII. Mark Loutsch: We contract with other counties already who utilize the services.

- XIII. Dennis Wright: We have no desire to stay a two-county region forever.
- XIV. Shane Walter: We know what the Code says. We know we can't.
- XV. Jeremy Taylor: I just want to make this clear too. I know that these are some of the repercussions, but we don't have a desire to not see you move forward. Well if we were a four-county region.....
- XVI. Mark Loutsch: Well, if we dissolve it would be easier for you too.
- XVII. Shane Walter: We are hoping to remedy that part at the end of the fiscal year Jeremy. We are certainly seeking some legislative relief so we know what we need to do. So at this point it's a moot point until we get some resolution or answers regarding that. Our intention would be to continue as a region, as Sioux Rivers, until such time we are told we can't be.
- XVIII. Dennis Wright: If a county joins us or we join another region, we need to sort it out.
- XIX. Shane Walter: Exactly. That will be a decision for these Board members to make.
- XX. Jeremy Taylor: So Mr. Chair, just to clarify, the will of the Board most likely would be to approve mediation if it were for reconciliation or going forward but that would not be necessarily or even seen as necessary for issues because it is clear on the withdrawal provisions.
- XXI. Mark Loutsch: If that is where you stand yet, but if you guys have a change of heart we will mediate and do what needs to be done.
- XXII. Don Kass: Absolutely.
- XXIII. Mark Loutsch: That is 100% there and we've offered that a long time ago too.
- XXIV. Mark Loutsch: We will not take any action on Agenda Item #16.

#### 17. DISCUSSION: NEED FOR LEGAL OPINION FROM REGIONAL ATTORNEY

- A. Because the item had already been discussed some Board members felt it should not be acted on.

##### *Discussion:*

- I. Jeremy Taylor: I'm sorry, did we not see #17.
- II. Chairman Loutsch: We have talked about it already.
- III. Mark Sybesma: I don't think we need that.
- IV. Jeremy Taylor: The only reason I brought that up was because that was Rick Shults' suggestion and I wanted to make sure that we put it forward and I had not seen if we had. And I may have stepped over my bounds, I apologize for that, I did not realize it was up to the Chair or CEO to request the legal opinion. I emailed directly to Mr. Lundberg and cc'd Chairman Loutsch and the CEO. So, I didn't know forthcoming to weigh in on that.
- V. Shane Walter: I had a conversation with Rick Shults and others from DHS. We had a good conversation about that and we informed them about what our intentions are going forward and they were very respectful of that and offered some advice and we are going to seek some legal remedy with the legislature as to what we can do regarding going forward as a region.
- VI. Jeremy Taylor: So essentially you would need a legislative fix in order to be able to....
- VII. Shane Walter: Maybe
- VIII. Don Kass: That may not be necessary.
- IX. Shane Walter: We are not looking to fix the whole Code obviously. Just for some temporary relief.

#### 18. GENERAL DISCUSSION:

- A. Chairman Loutsch asked if they needed to hold another Governance Board Meeting in December.

##### *Discussion:*

- I. Mark Sybesma: It's your call. I don't think so but if you think we do we can certainly have one towards the end of the month.
- II. Shane Walter: We typically meet early in the month in January because it is the new year and we appoint new officers and fiscal agent.
- III. Mark Loutsch: Will we need to do a fiscal agent change at that time Dennis?
- IV. Shane Walter: What we could do is we could change fiscal agents with an effective date of July 1, which will be cleaner and make more sense. Provided we don't have a whole different scenario to consider by then.

- V. Dennis Butler: Is there any way we can change the meeting day from Tuesday to a Monday or Wednesday because we have our budget sessions we start at 2:00 in the afternoon.
- VI. Keith Radig: I would have a much harder time. Thursdays would be better.

B. It was decided by the Board that the next Governance Board meeting will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 11, 2018.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.



Julie Albright, Secretary  
Sioux Rivers Regional MHDS Governance Board

Approved by Governance Board: 1.11.18