

Evergreen Fire District Board of Trustees Regular Meeting

Meeting Minutes
Regular Board Meeting of September 12, 2016

Board members present: *Jack Fallon, Shawn Baker, Dave Adams*

Board members absent: *Dave Edwards, John Foust*

District Staff/Employees: *Fire Chief Craig Williams, Fire Marshal Ben Covington*

Public Attendance: *(none)*

MEETING OF AUGUST 12, 2016 CALLED TO ORDER AT 4:25 P.M.

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE RECOGNIZED:

(none)

The District may not take action on any matter unless that matter is included on the Agenda and public comment has been allowed on that matter.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

(none)

At this time, public may comment on any public matter that is not on the Agenda of the Meeting and that is within the jurisdiction of the District.

ADOPT THE AGENDA:

Jack Fallon states there is no need to approve the agenda if it has been posted before a meeting because it cannot be changed in accordance with the open meeting law and public's right to participate .

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

FINANCIALS:

1. Discuss and Approve July & August Financials

Dave Adams has not reviewed the July & August Financials due to being out of town.

Dave Adams moves to defer approval of the July and August financials until the October meeting; seconded by Shawn Baker; motion approved unanimously.

PAST ITEMS/UPDATES:

1. Discuss and Approve July & August Meeting Minutes

Dave Adams moves to defer approval of the July and August meeting minutes until the October meeting; seconded by Shawn Baker; motion approved unanimously

2. Personnel Raise Discussion

Jack Fallon goes over a spreadsheet that shows that the Ambulance Fund has an increasing balance meaning that it has become healthier over the past 2 years. Current balance of August 31, 2016 is \$93,000.00. This item is to approve the actual pay raises retroactive to July 1st. Craig confirms that it should be retroactive for the calendar year as per a conversation he had with Jack Fallon prior to this meeting pending Board's approval.

Shawn Baker: Is this budgeted for all personnel or is this discretioned based on performance?

Craig: No performance this time. I just did it across the board for right now. It was budgeted at 10% for the Basics with the understanding that they are lower paid than the Paramedics at 4%. That is pretty much what we elected this round with the option of looking at it to make sure it is stable toward the tail-end of January or somewhere around there and then we can go forward with the additional. It's roughly \$.50 per person.

Jack: It has to be \$.50 per person. That's what we approved. We approved not a percentage but a specific dollar amount per person. Fifty cents.

Craig: But you also approved the Budget though.

Jack: Right. We also approved the budget so therefore there is no performance raise. The direction for raises was structured very tightly. There was no leeway.

Ben: I thought your discussion was that you were leaving it up to Craig based on what the Budget said. The administrative staff got the \$.50 raises but you were leaving the rest of it up to Craig.

Craig: I mean, regardless, right now everyone is at \$.50. However, within the budget and since the budget was approved, I wanted to fix the gap between the existing Officers and the staff and so they got an additional \$.25 above that to show the separation because they have more work and obviously more

responsibility but it's still within the budget. If you do the math on \$15.00 at 4% it is still within the \$.50 range and likewise with the Basics at 10%. A 10% raise for the Basics equals \$1.00.

Jack: Okay, page 6.

Dave Adams: What are you reading from Jack? (Shawn hands Dave the copy of the minutes).

Jack: The minutes that are on the website.

Jack: Dave, that's where you and I agreed on something.

Dave: I wouldn't say that, Jack.

Jack: We both voted "nay".

Dave: It was the lesser of two evils.

Jack: So I guess that is right. It was the discretion on 9428 since we passed 9428 as proposed.

Ben: I just have to ask; why are we moving something that has already been approved?

Craig: Based on my discussion with Jack, because it wasn't a raise that was in question. We already approved the budget and operationally we should be able to implement what's already been approved. He thought since it was approved as a full calendar year that probably we should have full disclosure to the Board to let them know that these raises did go into effect July 1 and that we are trying to retro them back and he anticipated that it would require a motion to do that.

Dave: I guess my question would be more 'Why haven't they?' The budget was approved. It should have been in effect through Stahlberg or whoever does the payroll.

Craig: We just did it because we had a lot of calculations to do and we have had a lot of movement with personnel between the areas.

Shawn: I move to make the pay raises retroactive to July 1st.

Dave: I second it.

Jack: Okay, Shawn made the motion and I am going to add some words to it.

Dave: Why? You can't do that.

Jack: (continues) to make the pay raises retroactive on the next pay schedule or pay period, because we are in the middle of a pay period right now, on the next pay period...

Dave: No. They are effective now. You're just making it retroactive. You can't change what his (Shawn's) motion is. You can amend it or ask it be amended but you can't just change the wording, Jack. You can't. You can ask for an amendment to clarify but you can't just change the wording of a motion.

Jack: The motion needs to be clear for the administrations; what pay period it's going to be taken care of and to the date that it's effective.

Shawn: We owe them back pay from July 1st.

Jack: Right but we are instructing them from which pay period. When Craig and I were talking last week we were in a prior pay period and now we are stating the next pay period. We are in a current pay period but it can be done in the current pay period but retroactive to July 1st so we need to make sure the direction is there for what pay period it's going to be taken care of.

Shawn: They can do it in November. They shouldn't but...

Craig: I have already talked to Ashley about this and the checks will be cut for the next pay period.

Shawn: It's going to be back pay.

Craig: Yes; effective July 1st. Ashley said it would only take her 15 minutes to calculate.

Shawn Baker moves to approve the pay raises on the next pay period retroactive to July ; seconded by Dave Adams; motion approved unanimously

Jack: The reason, in my mind, for reviewing this is that on other boards that I am on we approve a budget that has raises in it but all of the raises come before the Board whether they are collective bargaining agreement raises or non collective bargaining agreement raises and it just seems like that is part of the process. You approve a budget then you also approve raises. To me it's more of a protective sort of thing for the administration and the Board and to build that support; to know that the support is there from the Board and that the Board is fully informed of when things happen.

Ben: I don't have a problem with it. I just thought we had already done this the last time we talked and didn't need to bring it up again.

Jack: It doesn't matter what level. The same thing happens at the City Council; you approve a budget and then you approve pay raises separately.

Craig: Jack is specific to pay raises so I will use the scenario of we approve to purchase a \$10,000.00 item for the station. The budget has been approved so I don't have to come back and get secondary approval if it's been approved in the budget. Is that right? Is that just for pay raises?

Jack: I'm going to say no because I know in all the other instances second approvals required for major purchases but routine purchases, no. Major purchases, yes. That is my familiarity in it and to me it's just an accepted...

Craig: I consider a major purchase a piece of equipment or we are going to go out and purchase a vehicle. Even though I know it's in the budget, I know I'm going to run that by the Board. I just want to make sure that let's say, our dishwasher breaks tomorrow, as an example, and it was approved in this year's budget, would I have to go and make contact each and wait for a meeting for approval?

Jack: I would have to say no because that is a replacement item.

Craig: Like turn outs. We had \$10,000.00 for turn outs. I don't have an expectation that now we have to bring that back before the Board for approval.

Jack: No.

Ben: But that's what he's saying is that you should, though.

Dave: MMHMM (in agreement with Ben). That's what you're saying (looking at Jack). We have approved a budget for 'this' for the year. You're saying, 'We have approved a budget for the fiscal year with these raises now come back and ask us again.'

Jack: But turnouts are an expected replacement item.

Dave: But if we have approved in a budget that we need a new smart board for the room, we've already proved the need. We said 'we need this' we think 'yeah, they need that'... we think this is about what it's going to cost, we approve the budget for it...that's the compartment of redundancy that we would have to come back and ask for something we've already gotten approval for. I mean, we've already approved the budget so to say no, we would have to go back and amend the budget saying that now it's not for the fiscal year it's for a budget approval for the start date of the raise otherwise our budget's not accurate.

Jack: I hear what you're saying. I am just going by what has been in practice in the other places I have been involved with.

Ben: I guess I understand what you are saying to a point. Let's say for a computer or something new that we need and we budget \$10,000.00 for it and we realize it's \$7,000.00. I can see presenting it at the Board Meeting and saying this is what we are doing. I'm not sure the approval process is necessary. It's like 'Hey, this is what we are doing are there any objections to it?'

Shawn: Looking at some of the purchases for the last couple of years, you came to us for approval on the ice machine but didn't feel like you needed to come to us for approval on getting the ejectors in 831; both cost about \$4,000.00. So, to me, it seems like they are fairly major purchases that are also budgeted for. I guess I'd just like an update when we look at financials; maybe just a cover sheet saying this month we bought this, this and this.

Craig: More of an update vs. approval?

Shawn: Yeah.

Craig: We all realize (inaudible) is \$10,000.00 and we know we have to replace that or the wheels aren't rolling on the vehicles and we're not making any money. I do get that part of it.

Shawn: But I do think that we do expect that there is going to be a \$1,500.00 bill for fuel from (inaudible) so you don't have to highlight that; just those targeted items. Then it's in the back of our minds too so that when we're working on the budget for the next year we will be thinking about some of those big ticket items and that's why there's those expense lines on the budget.

NEW ITEMS/UPDATES:

1. 7204/9428 Due From/ To Discussion

Craig: Does everyone understand the background on this? Did everyone get a chance Don Davies...

Shawn: Yes.

Craig: Okay, so at least we are on somewhat of a page here. I did include this copy in your packet as well. It's very minor. I also included something that Ashley sent me this morning that I asked her to do. I had her and Kristi, who are fully aware of what the issue is and what the problems are in this final decision process. So I did ask them to provide me with a statement and their best opinion of what they felt it would cost to research all of this into infinity, actually. So if you would just take a second and read that...I will let you guys digest that for a second and like I said I would have given you a chance to read it sooner but I just got it. (Attendees review what Craig handed out)

Craig: So the main issue at hand is Don Davies, although he had all the data, he didn't necessarily have the data to show the years that 9428 was paying some of the utilities and things of that nature. He didn't have that because that was either in previous audits or it wasn't something that fell under his purview. He's aware of that and he knows that that exists. However, he is concerned in talking to him because he said whatever new data is found; he then has to report that and as he moves forward with these numbers, he said that will have an impact on his audit which would require him to re audit he said, in all fairness. He can't just take that at face value, insert those numbers and then bring all of this forward from previous fiscal years without having to do an audit. So, on top of what they calculate, he said, 'You are going to incur the cost of me having to redevelop this.'

Shawn: Which is not a service to the tax payer because we are spending money on a couple of accountants trying to be exactly right, but...

Craig: Correct. So, I have talked to Jack about this and I just wanted to get my point of view in that I believe, and it's the Board's discretion, but I am of the utmost opinion that we forego that. We know that there is money owed from 9428 to 7204. What that number is, I think the Board is just going to have to elect to decide whatever. In terms of repaying it though, I am comfortable allowing the last two previous EMS mill levies that are in 7204 to help assist in off setting that. It's not to the penny but within \$6,000.00 of what Don Davies original was and which we know would have been reduced a little bit less but yet we don't want to incur all the research. I'm okay with it since we are doing okay financially in 9428. It's my opinion that we just allow that to remain in 7204 and then, at the Board's discretion, it could be transferred into CIP to help with an initial payment or a down on an engine. Now, I normally wouldn't do this. I'd be jumping up and down if we weren't doing well in 9428 but we felt steady; we were able to offer raises this year and we do have another EMS mill levy that will be coming up here in a couple of months. But, it is an option. I don't know what another option there would be. I suppose the Board could choose to do an extended repayment of small partial amounts throughout fiscal years but we would have to stay on top of the tracking and it wouldn't benefit that initial of what we know we need for an engine and we needed an engine yesterday. So, I guess that is my opinion but it's ultimately the Board's decision. Do they want to move forward with all of this research? I think it's going to cost more than what they actually find.

Shawn: I guess I am mostly concerned about the fact that we need an engine because it's not directly related to this but because the money (inaudible) with the back taxes came out real quick; I feel like we should put the engine off and put the money back as quickly as possible and try to get our accounting straight and then move forward and be done.

Craig: Yeah, they don't even know what month and not even necessarily what

year that would have been. It was Kristi's recollection that right after the financial issues there was a lot of utility bills and things of that nature that were being paid and split from both accounts and just trying to go back and track that...I don't know where you would start. You would literally have to go line item by line item in QuickBooks from those previous years.

Shawn: What did you think about it, Jack?

Jack: Yes, it makes sense.

Shawn: It doesn't make perfect sense but it makes...

Craig: It's the most logical to me...

Jack: Whether it's \$50,000.00 or \$60,000.00 one way or the other...to me, the selfish side of me says we need to get money into 7250 in order to help buy an engine and this type of an arrangement would be the easiest way to get \$50,000.00 into 7250 to help towards purchasing an engine and to me that's the most critical part on the selfish side.

Dave: My question is then; If we are looking at the \$51,935.00 or whatever it is then the \$12,000.00 that's remaining owed? Forgiven? Lost in the wash?

Jack: Oh, between \$63,000.00 and the \$51,000.00?

Dave: Yeah.

Jack: If I was going to be selfish I would say 'Let's still collect the \$12,000.00 so that we can have it in the CIP for an engine purchase.' But, that's up for everybody to decide here. That \$12,000.00 doesn't have to be paid right now. It can be paid after January.

Shawn: I kind of don't want us to be selfish but I think we seem to do what we can look at the taxpayers in the eye and tell them what we do is right and what we did with the best information at the time. It has to make sense in regard to the engine but I don't want that to be tied to it.

Jack: The document that Don Davies put together has the \$63,000.00 and that takes into account two fiscal years. It does not take into account 2013, 2012, or 2011 which are critical years that would change this. It could balance the budget out where there is nothing owed at all or it could go the other way and say that 7204 owes \$63,000.00. We don't know for sure but it could do that.

Shawn: But going back that far, I feel like would ensure incurring costs for our tax payers and we're just making two accountants rich.

Jack: Right. It's only going to serve internal accounting. It's not going to serve...there's no fraud or anything like that and I guess that's where the selfish side of me says 'If we go with Don Davies document then there's \$63,000.00 and that's money that could go into 7250 for an engine purchase.

Shawn: And, it happens to be a pretty good number that doesn't completely wipe out the ambulance fund and cause issues...

Jack: Correct. It won't affect the balance of the ambulance fund because the \$50,000.00 that's already in 7204 and whatever balance we agreed to then could be paid at a future point in time.

Shawn: I move to make the recollection amount \$63,285.00.

Ben: (looking at Shawn) So, you're saying the \$51,000.00 is not enough now...?

Dave: No he's saying the full amount.

Ben: So, how's that going to be paid? I missed that part of it.

Craig: That part wasn't discussed.

Shawn: 'How' is less critical with regards to reconciliation amounts; we are taking \$57,000.00 that would be (inaudible) would have (inaudible) and not he's not going to and the ambulance would still owe the other \$6,000.00.

Dave: They'd bill \$11,363.00, according to the numbers. Do you (looking at Craig) have an opinion on the operational side?

Craig: My operational opinion would be that since we know that it is less than \$63,000.00 in all fairness, we call it a wash. We can do the \$50,000.00 but since we know it is less than Don Davies \$63,000.00, I think we can all agree that it is less.

Shawn: Is that going to be something Don's going to have another finding and say it still doesn't match by that amount?

Craig: No, because Don is of the opinion the Board can elect to just say 'Since there wasn't any fraud; there's no indication of that' the Board can choose whatever they want to do. In fact, the Board could have chose not to even do a repayment.

Shawn: Okay, I rescind my motion then.

Jack: It's not necessary due to the lack of a second.

Shawn Baker moves to approve the recollection amount of \$63,285.00; motion is not seconded. Motion does not pass.

Dave: Shawn, I guess my opinion is that if for whatever reason the 7204 still has EMS money in it...\$51,932.00 in it and I'm a little confused why we still have EMS money in that account from a year and a half ago...I guess, since it's already in there it hasn't been moved...I would think that we leave that money there to clear up the difference and at that point call it a wash. Would that satisfy Don Davies issue?

Craig: He doesn't have an issue. He's going by his numbers with the understanding he is fully aware of, since he didn't do the audit in the previous years there is the other inclination. His only concern is if the Board elected to do the research then he wants to be notified because then he has to start the other audit to get those numbers right.

Ben: His opinion is that we use the money for both so what's really the point?

Craig: But he does recognize you should and he's like 'Whatever the Board wants to do.'

Dave: Craig is the 51 a correct number?

Jack: No, it's \$51, 932.00, \$27,502.00 in December and \$24,430.00 in June.

Dave: So, after discussion and looking at Don Davies information, my motion would be that the Board chooses the payment of \$51,932.00 from the EMS money which is still in 7204 to remain in 7204 to close this chapter.

Dave Adams moves to make the recollection payment amount \$51,932 from EMS money to remain in 7204 account; seconded by Shawn Baker.

Jack: In conversation that Craig and I had, we need to be concerned about whether EMS audits us and I think your motion might cover it but I was writing stuff down and I will say that 'Dave moves to resolve 7204/9428 due from/due to amount of \$63,295.00 be paid by 9428 as shown in Don Davies review of financials. This will be addressed by a 7204 transfer of the December 2015 and June 2016 EMS mill levy distributions. The Board has determined this will resolve past fund transfers for payroll liabilities. Do you think that's going to cover any...maybe we need to develop a motion and come back in October based on this guidance so that we can make sure we are satisfying...

Craig: So, when our fire district refused EMSMLU, and I signed for it...it says up front and stated in bold print...that EMS money is to be used solely for EMS operations and equipment. I am aware of previous audits throughout the county where they went in and audited to make sure the fire districts are actually using

those EMS monies for that. My concern, although I am more than willing to do this, is that I want a level of protection or an understanding of the Board that there could be an audit at some point and I want to make sure that it's above board and solvent in the use of those funds.

Jack: This protects both the Fire Chief and the Board. So, what we should do is develop a motion based on the guidance of \$51,932.00 to satisfy the notes from Don Davies of \$63,295.00 and that the December and June payments will satisfy that and there is no longer any past due to or due from amounts and that we acknowledge this is going to take care of past payroll liability payments.

Shawn: I think that says too much. That's basically saying we know our math is off but we are proceeding anyway. I think Dave's motion swings right into the net.

Dave: I'm wondering if we are right back to 'We can't change a motion.' You can't reword it. If you don't like the way it is worded then you can ask for something different.

Jack: We have to figure out if that motion is going to satisfy any future liability we may have. They may come back and say 'You're liable for \$51,932.00 to pay back to the EMS budget.'

Shawn: It would have been really helpful had either of you said that before we proposed a couple of motions. You might say 'I'd entertain a motion to state this or...'

Jack: I'm trying to recall all of the discussions that we have and yes...

Craig: I guess I'm comfortable with it with the understanding that ...that's why I wanted...well, I'm just going to say it... that's why I wanted the balance to be a wash; so that we wouldn't continue to do this and have one account going into another account and then another future EMS mill levy would have the \$11,000.00 and that, like Dave said, at midnight when the next one comes in it can get transferred into 9428 where it actually does belong. I mean, it satisfies a number of things there. That is my thinking.

Ben: You want my opinion?

Craig: Shoot.

Ben: Just transfer the money. They can vote next month to have 9428 pay 7204 \$51,000.00. That way all of the financials are there...

Craig: But it's already in 7204.

Ben: I know but if you guys want to be up and up about it then you have

reasoning for transferring from 9428 because it has to go into 9428 and then you have reasoning for transferring it back based on 9428 owes 7204. It's the long way around it but...

Dave: It is the appropriate paper...wait, just leaving it there and just making a motion for it you have no paper trail of anything and if it's not written down it didn't happen.

Shawn: If it didn't get written down then it definitely didn't happen. So, we'd have to make it happen first.

Dave: That brings up huge concerns as to why is the Fall 2015 distribution still in 7204? It was never 7204's money. It just got put in there and never changed or moved over along with the Spring of 2016.

Craig: You know why it goes in there, right?

Dave: No.

Craig: Since we have an enterprise fund that is controlled by the County it is wired automatically into 7204 which is a County controlled account.

Dave: So why isn't it transferred the next month by a motion?

Craig and Ben: It's a standing motion.

Craig: The Spring allocation...

Dave: That's what I'm asking...why. If I have \$51,000.00 of my money in someone else's account; that's an issue for me. If I have \$50.00 in someone else's account that they owe me? That's an issue.

Jack: The primary reason why it wasn't transferred is because we didn't know if 7204 owed 9428 money or if 9428 owed 7204 money.

Dave: But it doesn't matter. If the money comes...

Jack: The more we understood what the issue was...my thought was that the money shouldn't be transferred until we knew what the issue was or until we knew how it was going to be resolved. Now that we have a resolution now we can decide what to do with it.

Dave: But there's nothing to decide. If Craig's statement is correct and the money is ear-marked that it's for EMS stuff it should go from 7204 to 9428..imm...I mean boom; it's here. You're payment's arrived and put in your other account.

Craig: That's why we had difficulty with the budget. We had to show on both ...we're showing it 7204 with a transfer into 9428 but still remains in 7204 pending Jack and the Board's decision on what we're going to do. It was confusing doing the budget too. It was in 9428 but we had to show it in 7204... and so it's...

Shawn: We still have motion on the table. I really like Ben's suggestion.

Dave: I do too.

Jack: All in favor of the motion?

Shawn: Nay

Jack: Second?

Dave: Nay

Jack: Dave's motion does not pass.

Dave Adam's motion doesn't pass after discussion.

Jack: What action are we going to take?

Ben: There isn't any because it's already a standing...the order is already...

Craig: There is already a standing motion that that gets transferred.

Dave: So why hasn't it been done?

Jack: That's what I'm asking. The action now is administrative where the \$51,932.00 is going to be transferred from 7204 to 9428.

Dave: Repeat that.

Jack: That being \$51,932.00 (inaudible) December 2015 and June 2016 EMS distribution will be transferred to 9428 from 7204.

Dave: When?

Ben: Tomorrow.

Craig: We can have it tomorrow.

Dave: Okay... so that makes that motion...

Jack: According to what everybody's saying there doesn't need to be a motion.

Dave: So we just ignored the motion for a year and a half?

Craig: Pending the investigation into what owes what.

Jack: There was a procedure that we were going through to find ...

Dave: Jack, if it's not yours you can't hold on to it.

Jack: Yes, yes you can, Dave. The Board is responsible for the money. We can do whatever we want with the money.

Dave: Very good, carry on.

Jack: Okay, so next month; what is going to happen? What is going to happen next month based on our discussions today?

Ben: This way we don't actually have to stick to the \$51 blah blah blah. We can just start right up.

Jack: So what is our action going to be a month from now?

Dave: Hard to say.

Ben: What question is this to...the whole thing? The \$51,932.00? Or to...

Craig: To the total or do we wash like we were originally...

Jack: If we are going to make a motion we have to have some direction on what the motion should say so that we can have all of the liabilities covered in the motion and we don't have to try and create it at the meeting. So, if we can try and understand simply the dollar amount that we're talking about and the direction then we can make sure the motion is ready for the meeting. What I'm hearing is that the \$51,932.00 should be paid from 9428 to 7204 to satisfy any and all past due to/due from amounts as a result of payroll liabilities that occurred between 7204 and 9428. Is that what I'm hearing?

Shawn: I just did not get that exact number. \$75,011 is the number

Dave: Davies used \$63,295.00.

Craig: It's in your packet.

Dave: Very bottom line...balance owed from 7204 to 9428 is \$63,295.00

Shawn: Where'd the \$75,011.00 come from?

Dave: I don't know where that came from.

Jack: That was from the single year audit for 2015. The \$63,295.00 is a 2 year balance of 2014 and 2015.

Dave: I would say that, in my opinion Shawn and Jack, that if the 9428 made a \$50,000.00 repayment to 7204 for back taxes coverage it would clear up any outstanding debt between the two accounts? Does that make sense for the next time?

Jack: Or we could leave the dollar amount blank and decide at that point and time.

Shawn: We can say and this part of the discussion doesn't need in the minutes; since we have other unrecorded liabilities...

Craig: Payroll liabilities?

Shawn: Not necessarily payroll...but utilities...

Dave: Buildings...

Shawn: Accounted for...maybe we can reduce that sixty-three thousand fifty some to fifty thousand.

Ben: As well, we should probably look at doing a motion for transferring the fifty thousand...if that's the ultimate idea of it.

Dave: I concur.

Jack: Okay. Well, I have to leave and there are still some things on the agenda.

Craig: Well, can we do a quick motion so we can do that?

Ben: I don't think there is a motion right now.

Jack: There was some direction given in order to be able to write up a motion.

Dave: Jack doesn't like how things get worded so he's going to write it up.

Craig: Ok. So we're still in limbo then until October.

Ben: We're in limbo anyway.

Jack: Well, we're only in limbo the dollar...maybe were not in limbo for the

dollar amount but we'll see.

Ben: Tomorrow we know that we're transferring the EMS mill levies; the fifty-one nine...not tomorrow...

Craig: That's gotta remain in 9428...the fifty-one nine thirty-two until October and then we revisit and I hope to God...

Shawn: Is there any reason we couldn't move fifty thousand right now?

Craig: Well that's what I was asking. I don't know why we couldn't.

Jack: Well, do we need to be concerned about the language that's in it?

Craig: I'm not sure. I see what Shawn's saying...do you want to give too much or do you want to keep it vague? I don't know. I don't have a...

Shawn: For the lack of not knowing any better, I think we're just going to relax eloquence and still be potentially wrong. So I think we're almost better off having fewer words and just say 'Best we can figure out, we're about \$50,000.00 difference.

Ben: I have a question though. I mean it's not like we can't afford \$63,000.00

Shawn: And it matches the paper work.

Ben: And it matches paperwork..

Shawn: We're not making any judgment calls.

Craig: But it's up to the Board...

Shawn: To the best of his opinion and based on the information he had to look at...it's the number he came to.

Craig: That extends the whole issue of now we have this still remaining balance in 9428 and then we're going to revisit this....

Shawn: But we won't have a remaining balance in 9428; that's the transfer.

Craig: The \$11,000.00. We're going to revisit this again in another month.

Jack: We can just say 'That balance is due before the end of the current fiscal year.'

Ben: What I'm saying is...we're going to transfer this \$51,000.00 tomorrow,

okay? It's not like the ambulance account can't afford ...wait a minute, what am I talking about...oh. Yeah. No, that's wrong.

Craig: That's why I was trying to check you there.

Jack: Would it be easier...December 2016, June 2017 EMS mill levy distributions, maybe...

Craig, Dave: Maybe.

Jack: I've got to get going. I don't know if anybody's interested in attending the Fire Trustees Meeting in Fairmont Hot Springs but the information is all there for you.

Jack: I guess we have to adjourn. So meeting is adjourned at 5:17 P.M.

The President of the Board of Trustees, as presiding officer of any meeting of the Board of Trustees, may close the meeting during the time the discussion relates to a matter of individual privacy; and, then, if, and only if, the presiding officer determines that the demands of individual privacy clearly exceed the merits of public disclosure. The right of individual privacy may be waived by the individual about whom the discussion pertains; and, in that event, the meeting must be open.

Submitted by: _____
Secretary

Signed by: _____
Jack Fallon- Chairman