

RECEIVED

JUL 11 2001

**LANCASTER COUNTY
BOARD**

**JOINT MEETING
LINCOLN BOARD OF EDUCATION
LINCOLN CITY COUNCIL
MAYOR
LANCASTER COUNTY BOARD**

Wednesday, July 18, 2001 – 4:30 p.m.

**Lincoln Public Schools District Offices
Board Room (E102)
5901 O Street**

AGENDA

1. Minutes of June 25, 2001 (attached)
2. Families First and Foremost (F3) – Sheryl Schrepf, County Juvenile Mental Health Director
3. New Juvenile Detention Facility – Dennis Banks, Juvenile Detention Center Director; Chris Beardslee, Sinclair Hille Architects
4. 21st Century Grant/Community Learning Center
5. School Board's Involvement in the Comprehensive Plan Process
6. Activities for Teens
7. Capital Costs on New Development
8. Superior Overpass
9. Sidewalks to be Added this Season as a Result of City's Recommended Walking Routes to Schools
10. Continuing Business
11. New Business
12. Future Meeting Date

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2001

LANCASTER COUNTY
BOARD

MINUTES

JOINT MEETING LINCOLN BOARD OF EDUCATION/ LINCOLN CITY COUNCIL MAYOR LANCASTER COUNTY BOARD

Wednesday, July 18, 2001
Lincoln Public Schools District Offices
5901 O Street, Lincoln, NE

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Board of Education:** Doug Evans-President, Kathy Danek, Lillie Larsen, Don Mayhew, Keith Prettyman, Ed Zimmer
City Council: Annette McRoy-Chair, John Camp, Jonathan Cook, Glenn Friendt, Coleen Seng, Terry Werner
Mayor Don Wesely
Lancaster County Board: Kathy Campbell-chair, Bernie Heier, Larry Hudkins, Ray Stevens, Bob Workman

Mr. Evans called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of the June 25, 2001, joint meeting of the Lincoln Board of Education, the Lincoln City Council, the Mayor, and the Lancaster County Commissioners were approved as distributed.

FAMILIES FIRST AND FOREMOST (F3)

Families First and Foremost executive director Sheryl Schrepf provided a handout of the F3 project, advising that the grant is funded through the U. S. Department of Health and Services to Lancaster County. Families First & Foremost is a project funded by a federal grant to establish a comprehensive system of care in Lancaster County of mental health and other support services. The intent is to organize a coordinated network to meet the complex and changing needs of children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbances, and their families. The project is in its third year of the six-year grant, which Lancaster County administers. The basic services are wrap-around. The project will begin school-based wrap-around this fall with care coordinators at school sites. The goal is to have kids with mental health needs be able to stay at home, be successful in school, and stay out of the juvenile justice system. School programs this fall will be at Clinton, Hartley and Huntington elementary schools, Culler and Dawes middle schools, and Northeast High School. Development of an assessment center, to be housed at the Lancaster County Detention Center, is also underway.

RECEIVED
Ms. Campbell recognized LPS director of student services Becky Wild for her help with the F3 project as the representative from the schools. She stated that without her determination, things might not have moved along as well in the coordination of the school system and this project. Ms. Campbell stated that the county is very proud of the project and the continuing fingers of it in the community.

Ms. Schrepf reported that staff has looked carefully at the disproportionate number of children of color who need the F3 services and, therefore, materials have been developed in other languages in order to reach more families.

In response to a question from Dr. Schoo, Ms. Schrepf reiterated that Families First & Foremost is funded by a six-year grant, and it is now ending its third year. It goes through 2004, but the plan is to work on sustainability as the project goes along. Staff is trying very hard not to start something that won't be sustained. Ms. Schrepf reported that there are only 67 of these grants in the United States, and two in Nebraska. The big issue is that there is money to do things differently, and they will learn what works and what won't work.

Mr. Friendt asked about the budget for the project. Ms. Schrepf advised that it is approximately \$1.2 million per year. Every year the match changes, and it is now in a one-on-one match. Mr. Friendt asked about the success measures, and Ms. Schrepf reported that the project's principle evaluator follows every family to discharge.

Mrs. Danek asked about statistics on money saved through the Families First & Foremost Program, as opposed to other services that might be needed by children as they become adults, without the help of this program. Ms. Schrepf advised that there are national figures available, but local statistics are just beginning to be gathered. She emphasized that there is already much money in the community being spent on similar-type services so these are not necessarily new dollars. The need is to look at what the funds are spent for. Ms. Campbell noted that if a child goes to the Juvenile Detention Center, the cost is \$160 per day. She added that there are currently four partners in the project—Lancaster County, Region 5 (a cluster of near-by counties), the State of Nebraska, and parents. They are trying to take existing tax dollars and use them in a new way. Ms. Campbell added that it is particularly helpful to have the State as a partner early on in the project.

Ms. Schrepf encouraged anyone wanting more information on Families First & Foremost to call her.

GUESTS IN AUDIENCE

Mr. Evans announced that elected officials from a Russian province were in the audience to observe the meeting of three public bodies. The group's guide introduced the visitors. Mrs. Seng reported that she previously received a call from the International Friendship Committee, asking what public meetings might be going on when the officials arrived, and she suggested that they might attend this meeting.

NEW JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY

Architect Liz Kuhlman presented drawings of the new Juvenile Detention Facility, which is currently underway on South 14th Street, between Highway 2 and Old Cheney Road, to the west of the Lincoln Mattress Company. She reviewed the outside layout of the facility, as well as the floor plan, and the plan for a future housing unit. The central core of the facility will be the educational function of the building.

Juvenile Detention Center director Dennis Banks advised that the new facility would be called the Lancaster County Juvenile Services Center. It will have three sections—a non-secured area, a secured area, and an assessment center—under one roof. It's felt that by having these three components under one roof, the facility will run more efficiently and be less costly. Mr. Banks reported that the new facility comprised much work over the last six years. He talked about the assessment center to be housed in the Juvenile Services Center, noting that law enforcement staff spend a great deal of time trying to find out what to do with juvenile offenders. The assessment center will help with this process. It will be staffed 24 hours per day, 7 days a week, so that law enforcement staff can get back out on the streets. Staff in the new facility will know how to determine mental health issues and what the best facility/treatment for the offenders will be. In the new facility, offenders will be classified according to their age, gender, and offense. Mr. Banks noted that the heart and soul of the building is the educational facility. He introduced educational coordinator Rich Krause and counselor/case manager Michelle Grummert. Mr. Banks reported that the new Juvenile Services Center would have 2,000 more square feet than the Douglas County facility. He added that this shows what staff thinks of the importance of education, and the need for a good education program. He pointed out the large classrooms, the life skills room, and the computer area, and advised that most of the teachers who teach at the Detention Center teach in their certificated areas. Mr. Banks reported that staff is happy with the new facility and feel it will meet their needs for a long time. He also reported that the facility has an expeditor who gets the kids out who don't need to be in the Detention Center, while his job is to detain them until the courts decide what to do with them.

Ms. Grummert advised that the new facility has been a very collaborative effort with the County, LPS, law enforcement, etc.

Mr. Banks stated that the tentative opening date of the new facility is January 11, 2002.

Mrs. Campbell advised that the County would have a tour of the facility when it's completed. She expressed appreciation to the city and the school system for their efforts on the new building.

Mr. Workman noted that Mr. Banks is running a jail, but he complimented him on a recent statement that he made, indicating that he is starting a program of customer service.

Mrs. Larsen asked about the ages of kids housed in the Detention Center. Mr. Banks responded that they are under 18, but they can be held until they are 19. They have had children as young as 9 in the facility. In response to another question from Mrs. Larsen, Mr. Banks indicated that they would be able to hold up to 80 kids at the new facility.

21ST CENTURY GRANT/COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER

Community Learning Center co-coordinator Cathie Petsch announced that LPS received a federal grant of \$2.2 million from the U. S. Department of Education for the Community Learning Center. The grant program began on June 1 and will run through May, 2004. As co-coordinator Lea Ann Johnson heard in a recent trip to Washington, D.C., Mrs. Petsch noted that this is not just a program, but a major structural shift based on society's needs. The goal of the project is to establish and operate Community Learning Centers that provide school-based, safe, supervised, integrated and inclusive after-school, weekend, and summer programs with significant expanded learning opportunities. Thirteen schools involved in these CLCs include Clinton, Riley, Pershing, Huntington, Hartley, Holmes, Hawthorne, Elliott, Saratoga, and West Lincoln elementary schools, and Culler, Goodrich, and Lefler middle schools. Mrs. Petsch talked about the objectives of the program:

To implement structured, coordinated, well-planned after-school academic activities that will increase the student achievement on state and local standards in reading and math as determined by standardized achievement tests.

By the end of the third year of program implementation, juvenile crime rates will have been reduced by at least 30 percent among the CLC schools.

Community service providers will develop a system in each center that integrates all the services while maximizing the benefits for all participants.

Family literacy opportunities will be provided so parents can increase their involvement in their children's learning and development.

Participating students will be introduced to various cultural and recreational activities to enhance their understanding of the global society in which they live.

Senior citizens, parents, and members of the neighborhoods will learn to access the Internet and receive an e-mail account for their personal use.

Senior citizens, parents and members of the communities will access the school library media center for themselves and students they support in learning activities.

Dr. Schoo advised that there are already Community Learning Centers going on, as the Lincoln Public Schools Foundation is doing them in a number of locations in the school district. He noted that this is another coordinated effort of the schools and agencies in the community. Dr. Schoo stated that LPS is pleased to be a part of it, noting that this grant is very similar to the Families First & Foremost grant. The expectation is that there will be sustainable sources of funds to continue this kind of a program in the future. Dr. Schoo stated that there is a need for before and after-school learning, care for children, and additional learning opportunities for adults in the community. He added, however, that in light of the way school districts are funded in Nebraska, CLCs are beyond the school district's specific responsibility, but it makes sense for schools to be used as community centers. This grant provides funding to put some models together and for everyone to review them and find other ways to use these resources. It's a matter of reallocating, ultimately, beyond the city of Lincoln, and possibly to the state. Dr. Schoo reported that he and Mayor Wesely have talked about these possibilities, as well as the LPS Foundation, and its chair Bill Johnston, being very interested. Everyone is committed to finding ways to make this work, but Dr. Schoo emphasized that he doesn't anticipate finding the money for it in the school budget.

LPS Foundation public engagement director Jeff Cole stated that the foundation is very excited about moving to this next phase and the foundation is happy to play any role it can.

Mr. Camp asked how sustained funding would evolve from this project? Dr. Schoo reported that the schools, City, and County staff have reviewed models in other states, where local officials have gone to the State Department of Social Services for allocated resources to use in a particular way. He talked about Missouri's Caring Communities project where the Department of Social Services and the Department of Education put funds into the project and a local non-profit organization oversees it.

Mrs. Seng asked if this began as a project of the Lincoln Public Schools Foundation? Dr. Schoo responded that the 21st Century grant was submitted by LPS. However, not in isolation, 17-20 partners—schools and other agencies—are involved in projects, and the foundation also had representatives there. He added that the foundation started something earlier, but it is hoped that it will all be together in the future.

Mr. Werner asked is there is some duplication in the 21st Century grant and the Families First & Foremost grant? Dr. Schoo replied that there is not, adding that there is tracking, however, so that the 21st Century grant doesn't duplicate services. He noted that the F3 project is serving a very limited population in need of mental health services, while the 21st Century grant is not limited to that population.

Mrs. Campbell noted that the 21st Century grant is much more educational-oriented than the projects of the LPS Foundation. Dr. Schoo stated that this is one of the reasons why the school district has Mrs. Petsch and Ms. Johnson coordinating the Community Learning Centers—to make those links.

Ms. McRoy stated that all of this helps answer questions from the community about the use of school buildings for other purposes, and she indicated that it sounds exciting.

Mrs. Danek talked about the networking with other schools that Pershing Elementary School, through the Community Learning Center. She reported that some of the objectives listed in the materials today have already been met, and advised that high school students tutored at Pershing.

Regarding use of schools for other purposes, Mr. Evans noted that the schools' facilities are already been used heavily. LPS assistant to the superintendent Dave Myers reported that last year there were 70,000 hours of community use of LPS facilities.

Mr. Mayhew asked about a marketing plan for what services would be offered by the Community Learning Centers. Mrs. Petsch advised that this is on the list of things to do, and Mr. Evans suggested that this would be a good report for the next joint meeting agenda.

SCHOOL BOARD'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROCESS/CAPITAL COSTS ON NEW DEVELOPMENT

Steve Henrichsen, City/County Planning Department, talked about the joint planning between the Planning Department, Parks & Recreation, and the school district's site planning. He provided copies of "Planning 101 – An Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan" and the proposed 2025 Comprehensive Plan "Assumptions for the Futures." He pointed out on the map the proposed "Futures" areas, as well as future school sites, and reviewed the general description of the "Futures":

Future A – Includes approximately 18 square miles of additional area to the city by the year 2025. It channels ten percent of the new dwelling units into new multi-family redevelopment in older portions of Lincoln. Newer areas develop at densities of five dwelling units per acre, compared to three to four dwelling units per acre found in Futures B and C. Beyond the year 2025, additional urban expansion occurs to the west, southwest, and east. Most development outside of Lincoln is directed to all of the incorporated small towns, though some acreage residential development occurs in the areas already identified. Longer-term acreage residences occur mostly to the west and south near Denton, Roca, and Hickman.

Future B – The Lincoln city limits expand by 30 square miles by the year 2025, with most of this growth toward the east (Stevens Creek) with some development in other growth areas already identified in the current Comprehensive Plan to the south, north, and west. Development occurs at typical suburban densities with all of the new dwelling units located in suburban areas. Long-term growth continues to east and south, with growth beyond the year 2050 (Tier III) significantly expanding along Salt Creek to the south. Some small towns to the

east and south grow (Waverly, Roca, Hickman, Bennet, and Panama), while others have stagnant populations. Substantial acreage development occurs to the eastern and southern edges of the county in areas far outside of the potential Lincoln service limits. A greater percentage of development outside of Lincoln would happen on acreages than in small towns in this future.

Future C – The Lincoln city limits expand by 30 square miles (by 2025) in several directions around the city. In the long term, the “multi-direction” growth pattern continues, with significant growth to the southwest, west, north, east, and south. Most small towns have stagnant populations. Almost all development outside of Lincoln would happen on acreages, rather than in small towns in this future. Some acreage subdivisions cluster in the long term to the southwest and east. Many other acreages are scattered throughout the county. The scattered acreages range from “very low density” of one dwelling unit per 60 to 80 acres to the north, to “low density” of 1 dwelling unit per 40 to 60 acres in the south.

Mr. Henrichsen noted that there are ten future school sites within the future service limits of the city. Those sites include: north of the Interstate west of North 27th Street; east of North 84th and Leighton streets; Vintage Heights; South 84th Street and Old Cheney Road; and South 56th Street and Yankee Hill Road. The Planning Department works with LPS on future infrastructure. LPS boundaries automatically expand as the city expands.

LPS associate superintendent for business Cliff Dale talked about the co-development work done by the City and the school district, noting the mapping capacity of the City and the school district. He stated that some LPS sites were purchased in the 1960s, and he talked about a small window of opportunity, when LB1114 passed, to lease-purchase some sites from the district’s Building Fund. Those sites were exempt from the current restriction of the Building Fund. At that time, LPS made certain that the future services areas would be in place and worked to acquire the sites. The two new high schools were a part of this acquisition. Those sites had to be sewerable quickly and they had to be in the city limits and, preferably, not in residential areas. Dr. Dale complimented the Planning Department for its involvement in helping LPS in these efforts. He reported that the school board now has a Planning Committee to continue this work for the district.

City Parks and Recreation director Lynn Johnson talked about the 15 locations in the city where park and school sites adjoin, adding that there are three joint community centers. He stated that in a perfect school/park concept, the school/park site is the center of the neighborhood, accessible by trail, and offering many programs from this building, operated by a variety of agencies. In the future, the City hopes to work with the school district to acquire sites together. This concept has been shared with the Parks & Rec Advisory Board. Mr. Johnson noted that in many cities, the city departments and the schools do not even talk, but he added that he feels the community can go a long way in a short amount of time because of the cooperation of the City and the schools.

Mrs. Campbell reported that the County and the City are looking at the concept of a park trust, and suggested that this might be a good topic for a future joint agenda. She talked about the need to look beyond the boundaries of the city and to also partner with the Natural Resource District.

Mrs. Seng noted that prior to her term on the City Council, she remembers reading in the newspaper of the schools and the city not getting along. She stated that she thinks the joint meetings really help everyone to understand the total scope of what needs to be done.

Mr. Cook stated that this has been a good presentation, adding that there may have been a few missed opportunities to co-locate rec centers with elementary schools. Regarding the integration with the Comprehensive Plan, he indicated that he wouldn't hamstring the school system with sites, but he questioned what type of ongoing coordination could be done regarding potential school sites? He asked if it would make sense to have the school district make amendments to the Comprehensive Plan as its priorities change? Mr. Henrichsen reported that as the City has added areas to the Comprehensive Plan, Planning staff has sent the information to LPS staff for their review. As a part of the annual review of the Comprehensive Plan, ten school sites have been added. Staff talks to the developers and property owners regarding the need for school sites, park sites, trails, etc.

In response to a question from Mrs. Campbell about the school district's criteria for looking beyond the city limits for school sites, Dr. Dale advised that the school district no longer has the resources to purchase future sites because of the legislative lid on the Building Fund. He reported that staff is trying to work, legislatively, to get some of the flexibility back for use of that fund. Dr. Dale requested the City's and the County's help in working with the State Legislature to free up the Building Fund. He noted that Lincoln is the only district that expands with the city and it is the only district that is growing in enrollment and area. He added that the district does try to look out as far as possible for future sites.

Mr. Henrichsen announced that there would be five public meetings on August 29 and 30 on the proposed "Futures" in the Comprehensive Plan and the assumptions for each. The meetings will be held in school buildings. He noted that the city limit today is approximately 76 square miles. A growth rate of 1.5 percent would add 100,00 people over the next five years.

Mr. Friendt asked if there were more considerations than Futures A, B and C? Mr. Henrichsen advised that there were originally nine Futures, but three were selected for the community to evaluate. A "D" future might combine the best of all of these at some point, and then Planning staff would move forward with much more detail.

Mrs. Larsen asked about Walton's location on the map of future service areas. Mr. Henrichsen advised that Walton is an unincorporated community, but it is within all three of the Futures alternatives.

In response to a question from Mr. Hudkins about the presumptions for acreage sizes, Mr. Henrichsen reported that staff looked at the densest acreages being to the north and the smaller acreages in the other tiers, depending on what is trying to be accomplished. There is also an effort to try to preserve saline wetland.

Mr. Workman asked if the city's growth automatically means that the school district also takes over in the growth area? Dr. Schoo advised that under current law, the school district expands into any property that the city annexes.

Mrs. Campbell noted that in the past the Comprehensive Plan had only one level of acreages, while the new proposal has three levels.

Mr. Mayhew asked if the proposed Comprehensive Plan information is available on a website, and Mr. Henrichsen advised that it is available on the city's website.

In looking at the proposed different densities, Mr. Cook noted that it is currently a huge issue to have a school within walking distance. He questioned how large the schools would be and where they would be placed, and noted that these are questions that need to be dealt with.

Mr. Evans noted that it used to be that the school district had money to budget for capital expenditures. He added, however, that the Legislature has taken that away.

ACTIVITIES FOR TEENS

Mrs. Danek talked about a recent forum at Park Middle School where students asked why there is nothing for kids to do in Lincoln. She asked for students to put into writing the things that they were interested in, and discovered that it's not that Lincoln doesn't have things for kids to do, but that they don't know how to find out about them, and that they are also concentrated in certain neighborhoods. Mrs. Danek indicated that there is a need to get the information out to students.

Dr. Schoo suggested that a website could be developed at the Information Technology High School Focus Program to list County and City services that are available to kids. Mr. Johnson advised that the City currently uses a newsprint flyer to announce activities, but they would be interested in looking at tools to expand dissemination of opportunities available.

Mayor Wesely asked about dances available during the summer for teens. Mr. Johnson reported that one of the biggest things during the summer is Splash Nights at the swimming pools.

Mrs. Danek provided examples of things that kids asked for, including a job fair for teens. Mr. Johnson reported that this was recently done for the first time, and it was very successful. Other things asked for included age-appropriate teen dance clubs and lock-ins at Star City Shores.

Mr. Evans suggested that Mrs. Danek, Mr. Johnson, and Information Technology administrator Dennis Van Horn serve as an ad hoc committee to provide information on activities available to teens. He also suggested that Youth Leadership Lincoln be a part of the process.

SUPERIOR OVERPASS

Manager of city traffic operations Scott Opfer provided a map of potential pedestrian overpasses for the North 20th and Superior area for Campbell Elementary School, as prepared by Olsson Associates. He advised that the big issue has to do with ADA standards, which require a five-percent minimum grade. Mr. Opfer reviewed the two concepts provided:

An overpass to the west, which would utilize the open space around the trailer court. This would be a winding structure at a cost of approximately \$1.8 million, minus the right-of-way purchase.

An overpass located to utilize the school ground, which would be a ramp to the southwest of the school. The cost for this would be approximately \$1 million, minus the right-of-way purchase.

Mr. Opfer noted that overpasses are not only expensive, but that students do not always use them. He reported on underpasses that are planned as a part of a road project in the Pine Lake Road area, and he also reminded those present of the bridge over North 48th Street just north of Vine Street and the overpasses near Star City Shores. Mr. Opfer stated that the City loves overpasses when they are doable, but noted that Omaha has not put in one for the past 15 years. He reported that traffic signals work very well, acknowledging that there are accidents, but the city average is 200 per year. He added that in the city of Lincoln, most accidents don't happen at signalized locations. Mr. Opfer advised that a school or pedestrian signal costs approximately \$60,000, and the money is spent when warranted. Federal requirements provide for a full signal at an intersection, or a signal moved at least 100 feet away from an intersection. Mr. Opfer reported that the current signals near Campbell work fairly well.

Regarding the comment that Omaha has not put in an overpass for 15 years, Mr. Friendt asked if the overpasses do not get used? Mr. Opfer reported that that is correct, and added that there is also costly maintenance on them.

Mrs. Danek suggested, as the development continues in the Bicentennial Estates area, that there be consideration given to putting a pedestrian light to the east of North 20th and Superior. She expressed concern that students wouldn't go all the way to North 20th Street as there is more development to the north of this area. Mr. Opfer

responded that it is felt that most students would come down North 20th Street, as there are no sidewalk connections elsewhere. He added that the City works hard to minimize signals, as they are sometimes a false sense of security. They try to put signals in where drivers expect them to be.

Mrs. Campbell asked if there are additional bike underpasses planned around the city, and Mr. Opfer answered that there are. Mrs. Campbell requested that the school district be updated on those.

Ms. McRoy asked if there is a way that red lights can be set to stay on longer at times when kids need more opportunity to cross? Mr. Opfer reported that this is already being done—the lights are all red for a second or two, and the walk light doesn't change until there is a green light. However, drivers become accustomed to that and know that there is extra time to get through an intersection. Mr. Opfer emphasized that the need is to get people to follow the traffic control devices and kids need to know the proper way to cross streets.

Mrs. Larsen indicated that she thinks one of the most effective light arrangements is the flashing light, warning that there is a stop ahead. Mr. Opfer agreed, and added that they have gone to this preceding 25-mile-per-hour speed limits in some cases because those are hard to enforce. The City is in the process of putting up more of the prepare-to-stop signals.

SIDEWALKS TO BE ADDED THIS SEASON AS A RESULT OF CITY'S RECOMMENDED WALKING ROUTES TO SCHOOLS

Mr. Opfer reported that the City has no current plan to add any sidewalks. He indicated that only one school, Roper Elementary School, is effected by lack of sidewalks due to elimination of busing. In that case, the residential property is too far west to get sidewalks in to the school. In most other areas, there are no sidewalk issues, although there may be some gaps in sidewalks in the Campbell area, which will fill in as construction continues.

Mrs. Larsen noted that West A Street is a major issue to Roper Elementary School, and that there is a need to concentrate on connecting the existing sidewalks, as this is an issue for children who live both north and south of Roper. Mr. Opfer reported that the City has an order for sidewalks along Coddington, which will take place over the next year. The most concern is from the Timber Ridge area, but he stated that he doesn't feel children from that area will walk to Roper. Mr. Opfer also reported that kids could get to Coddington and South streets through internal neighborhood sidewalks.

Mr. Hudkins indicated that he believes that Roper principal Dan Navratil has some valid concerns about sidewalks to Roper.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

There were no continuing business items discussed at this portion of the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

There were no new business items discussed at this portion of the meeting.

FUTURE MEETING DATE

Mr. Evans suggested that school board, city council, and county board members provide agenda items for the next joint meeting to their respective chairs. He indicated that the three chairs would decide on a future meeting date for the three groups.

ADJOURNMENT OF JOINT MEETING

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:13 p.m.