

NIABI ZOO OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES FROM AUGUST 29, 2016

PRESENT: Committee members . J. Taylor, J. Craver, L. Jackson, M. Byrne, W. Nelson.

ABSENT: T. Brahm, T. Jarrett.

ALSO PRESENT: D. Mielke, District twenty-two Commissioner; D. Meates, Assistant Zoo Director; various members of the Animal Handling staff; John Ferrell, Zoological Society President; various members of the Zoological Society, Scott Lohman.

Chairman Taylor called the meeting of the Niabi Zoo Oversight Committee to order at 5:00 PM on Monday, August 29, 2016, in the Education Room of the Administration Building at Niabi Zoo in Coal Valley, Illinois.

Roll was called:

L. Jackson, M. Byrne, J. Taylor, W. Nelson. (J. Craver arrived 5:01pm after roll was called.)

Total Present 5

T. Brahm, T. Jarrett.

Total Absent 2

Chairman Taylor stated that the purpose for this meeting is to further discuss the governance shift options that were set forth in the meeting on July 25, 2016. Mr. Brahm shared some concerns and frustrations through email as he could not be here tonight. Mr. Biddle was asked to share his opinion on where the Oversight Committee is at, and sum up the discussion that took place on July twenty-fifth.

Mr. Biddle stated that in his response to Mr. Brahm's concerns and frustrations he listed the many things that have been accomplished. The Oversight Committee has done some nice things and moved the zoo forward. Hiring Mr. Jackson was an important step in that process. Even back as far as October of 2014 a Public Private Partnership was discussed. It was defined as a partnership between the public and the private side. At least three key elements need to be in play in order for the public entity to engage the private side. Those elements are not in play. At least not in regards to moving forward on funding, leadership and a commitment from the funding side. In our experience with zoos across the country, you can talk all you want, but you won't be able to move the zoo forward to a private public partnership without all three of those elements in place. The funding from the public side is there. The other two elements are lacking. Strong leadership in the Society and a commitment from the private side for funding. I don't see the Commission entering into an agreement without seeing strong leadership in the Society and a commitment for funding.

Mr. Craver asked to confirm that that was a main component of the Strategic Update.

Mr. Biddle confirmed it was. These things were said in October of 2014, again in October of 2015, and I can only imagine that in October of 2016 people are going to be

asking where we're at. The answer will be the same. If you want a public private partnership, then these three things need to be in place. It hasn't happened yet. There's been a lot of talk, but no commitment from the private side. This community has got the ability to do it. If Niabi is to succeed, there needs to be funding from the private side to go with the funding already there from the public side. The goal of reaccreditation can only be reached with the help of both the Forest Preserve and the private side. I don't want to get to two months from now and be asked for another update in October. Doing an update every year does nothing. You need to act.

Mr. Byrne stated that he felt the Oversight Committee was on the right track, but the public needed to know that there is a commitment from this group to move to the Public Private Partnership. Believe that there is a feeling that we're not moving in that direction. As the advisory committee we need to say that that is where we're going. We need to be sure we're comfortable moving there, and if we're not then we need to decide why we're not.

Mr. Biddle stated that he agreed. A year ago that was the advice given, but the Public partner can't do anything about that. The Public partner can only wait for the private side. I believe the commitment is there, but who is the deal being made with?

Mr. Byrne asked if, as a committee, we're all moving to the Public Private Partnership.

Mr. Nelson stated that at the last meeting there had been a question on the legality of that option.

Mr. Byrne stated that other zoos in Illinois do it, so there shouldn't be an issue for Niabi to do it also.

Mr. Craver asked who the Oversight Committee intended to legally contract with.

Mr. Byrne stated that the committee would legally contract with a 501c3.

Mr. Craver stated that there is already a 501c3 entity; it's the Society. Unless the Oversight Committee is looking to create a completely new entity, we are waiting for movement from the 501c3 entity that already exists. We're being told that they need stronger leadership, and there's been no real movement on that front.

Mr. Byrne agreed that it would be best to use the current 501c3 entity. That's the easy way to do it. The Society is telling us that to get the money, we need to show that we're making concrete movement toward the Public Private Partnership. They're saying that the Oversight Committee is not showing that enough yet. That's what I'm hearing.

Mr. Craver and Mr. Jackson asked, from who?

Mr. Byrne answered that that's what he's hearing from the Society.

Mr. Jackson asked if it was from the Society, or from the donors to the Society.

Mr. Byrne stated that he assumed that it was coming from the donors. They want some assurance that the shift to the full PPP will happen, and that politics is going to be kept out of it, and do what's best for the zoo.

Mr. Ferrell felt that shifting some of the responsibilities to the Oversight Committee would help show the commitment to make the full shift to PPP. That would help the Society add some strong, connected people to the Society board. We've asked some strong candidates, but they don't want to be a part of the transition.

Mr. Craver pointed out that once some of the responsibilities shift, so then does some of the liability. The managing entity of the zoo, whether it's a new entity or the Society, will have to be licensed and bonded.

Mr. Ferrell felt that a partial shift would show enough progress to garner donor support.

Mr. Craver pointed out that only doing a partial shift might prove more difficult from a legal perspective.

Mr. Ferrell stated that the Society had spoken to a lot of people with a lot of capacity, and they say that seeing a partial shift would gain their interest and willingness to invest.

Mr. Craver asked how the risk of operating the zoo would be shared in that case.

Mr. Ferrell did not have an answer, but stated that the Oversight Committee was created to figure out how to do this. Just shifting over responsibility of those five or six things that were discussed in the July 25th meeting would give the Society enough to approach these people again.

Mr. Craver stated that it would not be in the Forest Preserve's best interest to enter into a management agreement, which is a contract for running a zoo, with an entity that was not licensed, bonded and insured. Mr. Craver then asked Mr. Nelson in all his years running the Rock Island Parks, did he ever enter into a legal contract with an agency or entity that wasn't licensed, bonded and insured?

Mr. Nelson answered that he had not.

Mr. Craver went on to say that that is why this Oversight Committee was specifically created as an advisory committee. Yes, to a certain extent, there is going to have to be some kind of a shift. If there is a management agreement, then that has to be with a legal entity. If only half the responsibilities are shifted, then how is half the risk calculated and taken on? The legal opinion has been requested, and we're waiting on that. We're looking for similar agreements in Illinois. Some of the agreements being suggested as ones to look at are Milwaukee, Ohio and Texas. Milwaukee isn't Illinois, Ohio isn't Illinois, and Texas isn't Illinois.

Mr. Ferrell asked Mr. Biddle about the hybrid model that was discussed at the July 25th meeting, and how that would work.

Mr. Biddle stated that, considering everything that Mr. Craver brought up, that it may not be optimal in Illinois to do the hybrid model. An example outside of Illinois would be Miami. Miami is going to a hybrid model with a county facility, and I know that's another difference because here is dealing with a Forest Preserve and not a County, but they formed a group of seven called The Oversight to assume the initial management agreement. There is an actual agreement for the operations of the zoo outside the county parameters. Those Oversight members are made up of their foundation and of the county leadership. They don't call it a Society out there, they call it a foundation.

Mr. Ferrell stated that early on it was pointed out about the lack of leadership in the Society, and I thought the Oversight Committee was supposed to be that leadership. Don't understand why there couldn't be four or five things that were shifted to the Oversight Committee as a hybrid model to start to show the transition. I don't think that the Society is asking for a shift into the Society, because we know we need to improve and strengthen the Society.

Mr. Biddle stated that he wasn't sure why if it could be done in Miami, it couldn't be done here. Though I realize that they are in two different states, and the laws of those states will differ. It may be necessary to try a couple different models to find what will work best before the Society improves itself and is able to prove that it can provide the funding and resources to manage.

Mr. Ferrell stated that the Society has asked six or seven high capacity people to join, and they all said the same thing. That they have no interest in being down in the weeds. They aren't convinced that it's going to shift. Also spoken with a fortune 100 company, and they want an update on the shift. In my eyes a positive shift would be the hybrid model. That shift would gain confidence from the community and allow some of the Society Members to rotate out. When you're talking about high capacity people they want certain things. It's a little like putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. Craver stated that that was part of the issue. The Society has no money. How are you going to fund some of the shared risk?

Mr. Ferrell stated that the Society does insure itself, and asked what amount of money are we talking here?

Mr. Biddle stated that he saw where the zoo was and where it is going. A year ago it was recommended that the zoo shift, and the commission said it was receptive. There's always a stepping off point, and it will take a leap of faith. Is the Society was saying that there aren't even five leaders in the community that have a passion for the zoo and are willing to help the zoo reach its goals. It's worked in every other community, but if this is a trust issue then I can't help you there.

Ms. Engels stated that she started in December, and she was one of those people who were willing to take that leap of faith. There was a meeting at the Chamber with many business leaders there, and I heard many times that it wasn't worth it to take that leap

of faith. Felt that it was more difficult than what Mr. Biddle was seeing from the Quad Cities perspective.

Mr. Biddle stated that that information had to be used to make the decision of how to proceed. If that information is a true picture and it's like salmon swimming upstream, then maybe it's something that can't be forced.

Mr. Ferrell and Ms. Engels felt that if there was a shift to a hybrid model to show that the shift is going to happen, then it would work.

Mr. Biddle asked Mr. Ferrell based on the people you've talked to, what do they need in order to say, ~~don't~~ ~~with~~ ~~you~~. If we know that the structure works, we're saying there's something in the Quad Cities that's prohibiting people from taking that step off. I still don't know what it is. If we're saying that the Public Private Partnership is the direction, I can tell you it's going to come down to people and money as it always does. It doesn't have to be a lot of money, but it has to come back to where the zoo is moving forward.

Mr. Ferrell stated that the two pieces of leadership and funding were in place. I thought that the leadership would be coming from the Oversight Committee. What happens if six months from now we have two of the three pieces in place and we go to the District to make the full shift and it doesn't happen? I think that the believability is what's lacking. People don't believe that the shift will happen.

Mr. Craver stated that it came back to waiting for the legal opinion, drafting an agreement and, as discussed last time, the Oversight Committee having that discussion with the Commission. Starting to engage in that conversation of what the parameters are going to be. I understand what Mr. Ferrell is saying, and I think there is a willingness for a shift. Though a full shift with all the employees would be a very tall task.

Mr. Ferrell stated that he didn't feel that shifting the employees over was necessary. I sent an email to Mr. Taylor stating the Society's feelings on some things. One of the first things I said was that we need to communicate to the community where the zoo is at in this process. Honestly, I don't feel that some of this is my responsibility. I've learned quickly where my place is, and what I'm supposed to be doing. This Committee was put together to draft this idea. Mr. Biddle is here to consult. I'm telling you what the Society needs to get people with capacity, and it's up to you to draft this. That's what the Society needs.

Mr. Byrne asked Mr. Biddle if there's any reason that the plan couldn't be developed. A 90 day plan was spoken of, but stating that by a certain time next year a shift to a full Public Private Partnership will happen.

Mr. Biddle reiterated that the plan is good, but it comes down to having the right people in place. The agreement won't take long to draft. Deciding on the structure of the agreement is the hard part. It all comes back to having the right people. There are examples that you can look at, and those agreements are pretty straight forward. The Commission is going to have to look at the people on the other side of the table and

say, yes, I have confidence in you. That includes liability and all those other things that we discussed. Because once they turn it over to you, they don't want it back.

Mr. Ferrell stated that the Oversight Committee had never met with the Forest Preserve Committee or Commission, and felt that it was important to meet and get them to commit to handing over the reins when certain criteria were met.

Mr. Byrne asked why the Oversight Committee couldn't just run the zoo as an advisory committee for right now while the management agreement is being drafted. Right now the Oversight Committee is charged with making recommendations on some things to the Forest Preserve Committee, but why not transfer all of the responsibilities, like the budget, over to the Oversight Committee? That could go on for six months while the management agreement is being drafted.

Mr. Nelson asked what exactly is it that the Society feels they need answers for, or directions for, in order to raise any money.

Mr. Ferrell stated that a little bit of money could be raised now, but not the big dollars. No one wants to give to the District.

Mr. Nelson asked if donors had donated to the Society in the past.

Mr. Ferrell answered yes. Anything that's donated comes through the Society.

Mr. Nelson asked to confirm that that is why the Society exists, to support the zoo.

Mr. Ferrell confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Nelson stated that for whatever reason, and I'm taking what I'm hearing from these conversations, there is a discomfort from the Society and/or the donors of things that they feel need to be happening or direction that needs to be coming from the District or the Oversight Committee. What are those things?

Mr. Jackson stated that he was very interested in that answer as well. I've been hearing people state very broadly that they're looking for this Public Private Partnership. What I would like to hear is concrete specifics. What is it that people are upset about? If we're going to address the specific things that people don't trust, then we need to know what exactly those things are.

Mr. Ferrell stated that two years ago the Society paid for a study to be done because there was frustration that we couldn't raise the funds that were asked for. At the time we only used family dollars. There are around twenty-five families in the Quad Cities that are a part of the giving pool. Going down a different route would mean going after corporations to do continuous funding. The Society couldn't get them to come around because they didn't want to fund a Forest Preserve or a governmental entity. The study showed that they wanted to give to a private entity, not a governmental entity. There is no trust in the County Board, and the Forest Preserve Commission members are the same people as the County Board. There has been misuse of funds in the past, and

whether or not that has crossed into the District is not important. It is perceived that it has. Perception becomes reality. If anyone wants to see the study, we can provide a copy.

Ms. Engels agreed that the study would probably help in giving specifics, and that addressing specific issues would probably help.

Mr. Jackson stated that Society members have talked with some people, and that he would like to speak to those people directly also. Maybe some of the information they are going on is old.

Ms. Engels felt that some of those people are pretty in-tune to what is going on with the zoo.

Mr. Jackson stated that in his experience no one is really in-tune with what is going on at the zoo, so I would like to take a look at those names.

Mr. Nelson stated that he understood and was very familiar with that mentality towards government. That is why there is a park foundation, specifically to raise funds to better our parks, because donors don't want to give directly to a public entity. However, those foundations/society groups exist totally to support those agencies. That is their whole purpose. I assume that the Society is the same, they are here to help provide the best possible zoo for the Quad Cities. Like it or not, there is an albatross that comes with being a public entity. However, that shouldn't stop us from figuring out the good things to do. There are some things that, like it or not, a government has to deal with, such as unions among many other small things. The Oversight Committee may not want to deal with those issues on a daily basis, but they may be very excited to be a part of the five or ten year plan and how do we generate revenue and how do we make those things a reality. We are hearing all these pieces and parts, but it is not adding up to ~~we are~~ for the zoo. Right now I am hearing everything but the zoo. The last few meetings I have been listening, and all there seems to be is this distrust. I understand how it happens, but we need to figure out how to work together to help the zoo. There is no bad guy, there is only coming together and deciding how we are going to help the zoo, and by extension the Forest Preserve. Because they aren't the same entity as the County, and they have been working hard to change the perception that the District has had too. I think we all owe that to each other.

Mr. Biddle stated that there seemed to be desire and need to move forward. I am very interested in hearing more about the loaned Deere Executive that Mr. Jarrett talked about in the meeting on July 25th. Perhaps we are talking to the wrong people. Maybe someone outside is needed. Someone who has some pull and trust with the community to go and speak with donors with you. Deere has shown support and the willingness to be supportive. The right story has to be out there instead of the misconception that appears to be out there currently, and Mr. Jackson needs to be included with that story.

Mr. Jackson stated that it is impossible to combat the wrong story if he doesn't know what the wrong story is.

Mr. Biddle stated that this comes down to confidence. People need to be able to say, ~~we~~ we got confidence that the Commission is going to do the right thing. I have confidence that Mr. Jackson is going to do the right thing. That starts here. ~~we~~ we said this from day one, people give to people. We have to instill that confidence in people.

Mr. Lohman interjected on what he thought Deere wanted, history, what he felt was best and what everyone's job is.

Mr. Jackson stated that he did not completely disagree with Mr. Lohman's statement, but did disagree with parts of it. Everyone seems to have blinders on when it comes to the Public Private Partnership. There's a lot of talk about big multi-million dollar exhibits that we need to be working on, but the zoo will be open tomorrow. Between now and whenever that multi-million dollar exhibit is built we have a zoo to run, and we still need to raise money to do that. There are a lot of little things that can be done to improve the zoo and visitor experience for the community. That's where the focus should be, and in the meantime we can work on that plan. It's not all about big exhibits.

Mr. Lohman stated that he agreed, and that's why we need the plan to gain the trust.

Mr. Jackson stated that someone has got to give a specific list of reasons as to why there is distrust in the Commission and the zoo. Hearing "nobody trusts us," "nobody likes us" is not helpful. I can't fix a broad statement. I need specifics in order to address the concerns and garner trust.

Mr. Nelson agreed, and stated that he's heard the same broad statements with no specific issues given.

Mr. Lohman stated that, historically, the zoo has gone through peaks and valleys. Currently the zoo is in a valley. So people are saying they won't fund it anymore until there's a plan. They want a plan in writing. They don't want to build it back up just to see it go back down in three years. No one trusts the Forest Preserve Commission.

Mr. Jackson felt that with the people in this room, once improvements start, you won't see back sliding. The small changes that we make in the coming months and years will get rid of the idea that we can't handle managing the zoo.

Mr. Lohman stated that people have seen improvement, and then there will be an election. Then there are new people in charge at the Forest Preserve. Those people will do what they want, and things start sliding again. The distrust isn't related to the employees, it's related to the Forest Preserve Commission.

Mr. Jackson stated that that's why Mr. Biddle has mentioned improving and changing the employment agreement between the District and the zoo director to take the Commission out of certain decisions. That's a good first step to keep those valleys from coming.

Mr. Lohman stated that until the community sees that work, they won't believe it. The community thinks that the next group of people will change that agreement.

Mr. Ferrell stated that an example of this is that the Forest Preserve President that was here before Mr. Ballard wanted to make the zoo free to Rock Island County residents. That didn't happen, and the President before that didn't really take an interest in the zoo. Those are the things that were tough to manage in the past. The constant shifting of opinions and goals. That is the history that the zoo is fighting.

Mr. Nelson stated that this was the first tangible thing that he had heard that needed addressed. You want a plan, but if we don't know what exactly is making people upset then it's hard to gain back their support.

Mr. Lohman felt that the community needs to see the short-term plans too.

Mr. Jackson stated that the best advertisement for change that we can give the community is to show them. When the zoo opens next year and they see the new tortoises and the giant octopus, that will be evidence for the commitment to change and to improvement. We don't have to publicize that right now.

Mr. Lohman felt that it did need to be publicized to the donor community. If we're asking for dollars now, then they will want to know what it's for.

Mr. Jackson stated that he felt showing donors and the community what we can do with the limited funds available will be the best way to show the donors that the zoo can be trusted.

Mr. Lohman stated that you're asking for money now.

Mr. Jackson stated that the zoo is asking for money that's already there. I want to show them the cool things we can do with what we have, and then ask for more support.

Mr. Biddle stated that it sounded like this conversation was starting to repeat itself.

Mr. Jackson agreed, and added that of all the meetings that he had attended, this meeting has been the most productive because people are actually saying what they're thinking. That's fantastic.

Mr. Nelson stated that these candid discussions are going to help us get where we need to go.

Mr. Biddle reiterated that, while you can have plans for everything, if there are not people who are willing to take that leap of faith then the plans won't do any good. You can have a plan, but there has to be people behind it to make the plan work.

Mr. Jackson pointed out that the zoo does have plans. There are the plans for the rhino exhibit. There are the plans for the lion exhibit, which probably need to be redone now. It's not that there aren't plans.

Mr. Craver stated that the Case for Support should probably have the 2017 year on it instead of the 2016 year, because 2016 is just about done. Can also include that at this time the Oversight Committee will be engaging the Forest Preserve Commission with a management agreement. The Case for Support is what we need to sell the zoo. It will be an evolving document as goals are met and new ones are added. The Case for Support is your plan as well as a master plan, and a site plan and whatever long-term range plans they're looking for.

Mr. Ferrell asked if the elections in November would affect the decisions that are being made now and in the next two months.

Mr. Craver stated that the operations and plan are still place, and will be in place after the elections. We've been stalled because of waiting for a director. Will a ninety day assessment be ready for the next meeting?

Mr. Jackson stated that the first three drafts of the ninety day assessment are already completed, and the document will be ready for the next committee meeting.

Chairman Taylor asked if Mr. Biddle could send a copy of the revised Case for Support when that's ready.

Mr. Biddle stated that he could.

Mr. Lohman felt that the Case for Support was not detailed enough for donors, and stated that big donors want a business plan to back up the Case for Support.

Mr. Jackson stated that no donor has ever asked for a business plan before they give to a zoo. No corporate donor that I've worked with has ever asked for a business plan.

Mr. Craver stated that we can also fall back on the last few years. The zoo has been working within its budget. It's proven that the zoo can work within a budget. The Commission will also want to see small commitments that will show that this group can fund and put some dollars in year in and year out. That is what the Case for Support is for; it is starting to build that trust. Trust has to be reestablished on both sides.

Mr. Byrne stated that Lincoln Park shifted governance about twenty years ago, can we see those documents? It's up to this group to figure out how we get to the goals we've set.

Mr. Biddle stated that he could probably get that document, but we'd want to make sure that's it's the right model.

Mr. Byrne stated that ultimately this group needs to figure out how to get to a PPP, and what the move will look like.

Mr. Biddle stated that, going back to Mr. Craver's comment, when I responded to Mr. Brahms' email of his frustrations and concerns I stated what three elements need to be in play. Not all three have to be complete; I said they had to be in play. The amount in

the Case for Support is \$1.7 million, and that amount can be whatever amount you want, but you have to show a willingness to do something. You talk about confidence, there's not going to magically be confidence. We could go around and around, but ultimately, you have the Case for Support, you have need, you have a zoo director, you have direction. You don't have all the ~~ts~~ dotted, but people do and donors do take a leap of faith. However, they're only going to give if they look at the director and the board in the eyes and believe that you believe in this cause. I have to believe that people in the Quad Cities are like the people who live in the other cities that we've worked in. Maybe that amount is just \$300,000.00, maybe it's \$30,000.00. Pick an amount and go after it. I can get the documents for you, but what it all comes down to is people. You're not going to have all the answers and all the plans, but I believe that with Mr. Jackson in place and the commitment of the Oversight Committee and some of the good things that you've done that you are in the ballpark to step forward. You might have to reset your expectations, but you have the elements to do something.

Chairman Taylor thanked Mr. Biddle for his input and expertise, and asked Mr. Ferrell if there was any Society business he wished to discuss.

Mr. Ferrell stated that everything had been discussed during the course of the meeting.

Mr. Nelson summarized that Mr. Jackson was putting together a short-term plan of things that need to be done that will start to generate additional visitation and income for the zoo. The Oversight Committee will be working with him and will be making overtures to the Forest Preserve Commission to explain what it is we're doing, and why we're going in those particular directions. The next step with that seems to be an issue of taking a look at the long-term of what we want to do. That's the rhino exhibit and others, but also getting input from the Society, input from staff and from the Oversight Committee. Through that we develop the long-term plan. The idea from that being that we all come together and start to build that trust and confidence in the Society to where they feel confident to go out and raise funds. I see this as that step, step, step process to build that trust on both sides. The Society needs to see some separation of the day to day operations and the politics of the Commission. That is starting to happen with putting the zoo director in charge of the day to day management. The Commission needs to see willingness and ability from the Society to raise funds. I see some melding that seems to be going on, so that seems like the logical progression that we're heading towards. Ultimately, that will help decide what this Public Private Partnership is.

Mr. Jackson stated that a better and broader place to start, which has begun with the senior staff, is Mission Planning. What is the Niabi Zoo? What do we want to be? Who do we want to be? It has started with the senior staff, then it will move to include the rest of the staff, which would also include the Oversight Committee. Then we would also include the Society. Perhaps working on what this institution is and what it can be is a good first step to building back that relationship between the zoo and the Society.

Mr. Nelson agreed.

Chairman Taylor asked if anyone else had more to add.

No one had anything additional.

Chairman Taylor asked Mr. Jackson if there was information to share regarding the tree that fell on the train tunnel.

Mr. Jackson stated that on the twenty-fifth a large tree fell on the train tunnel. It has been cleared away, and an engineer has come out to inspect it and the tracks. The support structure and tracks look good. The train should be back up and running in the next couple of days.

Chairman Taylor asked Mr. Lohman if, since he had filled out the public speaking form, he had anything to add.

Mr. Lohman spoke about a time that the Society looked into applying to the Kresge Foundation, and that foundation wanted to look at how sustainable the entity was and the financials.

Mr. Jackson stated that the Commission is a governmental entity. If someone wants to look at our books, they can look at our books. Concentration needs to be on the small things. Let's get to next spring.

Mr. Lohman then expressed frustration with communication and the meetings of the Society and the Oversight Committee not being coordinated.

Chairman Taylor stated that coordinating meetings had been discussed. The issue for the Oversight Committee is that we've got to pick a day and time to meet, and need to keep it consistent. We need to pick a regular meeting schedule and stick with it so nothing gets in the way. I am frustrated with our attendance. We don't have everyone at the table to make these decisions, and hopefully setting a concrete schedule will help with that.

Mr. Jackson stated that it was clear that history weighed very heavily on this group, and we've got to figure out a way to get past that.

Chairman Taylor stated that the next meeting was September 13th at 5:00pm, and called the meeting adjourned.

Adjourned at 6:32 PM.

Submitted by:
Cassie Sullivan
Forest Preserve Administrative Assistant