



MINUTES OF THE ETHICS BOARD

**MONDAY, APRIL 30, 2018, 6:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

A. ROLL CALL.

Bill Vande Castle, Mark Olsen, Cordero Barkley, Patricia Kiewiz Excused: None

Others attending: Attorney James Kalny, Janet Angus

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by P. Kiewiz, seconded by Cordero Barkley to approve the agenda. Motion Carried.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Minutes of the February 21 and 28, 2018 meetings.

Attorney Kalyn stated a correction needed to be made in the February 28, 2018 minutes. On page 4, third paragraph down, it says noticed pleading and it should say notice pleading.

Moved by Mark Olsen, seconded by Patricia Kiewiz to adopt the minutes of the February 21, 2018 meeting. Motion carried.

Moved by Patricia Kiewiz, seconded by Cordero Barkley to adopt the minutes of the February 28, 2018 meeting. Motion carried.

D. CONSIDERATION OF CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT BY ALDER BARBARA DORFF.

Motion was made by Bill Vande Castle, seconded by Mark Olsen that in light of the recent election results and because of the specific provisions of the Code of Conduct related to elected officials, we move that these proceedings be concluded without a decision being made on the grounds of the board no longer has authority to exercise jurisdiction over Mr. Zima since he is no longer an elected official. Motion carried.

E. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Patricia Kiewiz, seconded by Cordero Barkley to adjourn at 6:41 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Kris Teske, City Clerk

Verbatim Minutes

- Alright, the clock on the wall says it's six o'clock, so we'll get started, this is the City of Green Bay Ethics Board, it is Monday, April 30th, 2018, and it's six p.m., we've got the agenda in front of us, first item on the agenda is roll call, so would you just go down the line here? Just state your name for the record, the microphone's up here, camera's back here, so go ahead.

- Sure, Mark Olsen.

- Cordero Barkley.

- Bill VandeCastl.

- Patty Kiewiz.

- We have roll call, like I said, you have the agenda in front of you. Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

- Motion to approve.

- Is there a second?

- I second.

- Any additions or modifications? Otherwise, all in favor signify by saying, "aye."

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed, motion carries, next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. We have a couple of them in front of us, are there any additions, corrections, or modifications to any of it? Mr. Kalny, I think you noted one before?

- Yes, for the February 28th minute on the fourth page, on the second full paragraph, starting with "All the rest and all the requests are written," you go down to the third line. It reads, "Attorney Kalny stated that this is a noticed pleading," it should be, "this is notice pleading." So the D should be crossed out and the word he should be crossed out.

- All right, let's go through, we'll do these one at a time. For the February 21st, are there any additions or corrections, otherwise, is there a motion to approve?

- Motion to approve.

- Is there a second?

- Second.

- Alright, motion and second, all in favor signify by saying, "aye."

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed, motion carries. Now for the February 28th meeting minutes, subject to the modification put forward by Attorney Kalny, are there any additional modifications or corrections, otherwise, is there a motion to approve?

- Motion to approve and commended.

- Now a motion, is there a second?

- I second.

- And we have a second, all in favor signify by saying, "aye."

- [All] Aye.

- Aye, any opposed, motion carries. Next item on the agenda is the consideration of code of conduct complaint by Alder Barbara Dorff. You have the documents in front of you that you received, I just want to confirm for the board members. Did all of you receive Attorney Kalny's opinion?

- Yes.

- Yes.

- Attorney Kalny is here, do any of you have any questions, or, any, or do you need any clarification on his opinion before we move any further, no?

- No.

- No, okay, Alder Dorff, did you get a copy of Attorney Kalny's opinion?

- Yeah, I have it here.

- Okay, any questions that you have regarding it?

- No.

- Mr. Zima, did you get a copy of that opinion?

- I did.

- And do you have any questions or clarifications on that opinion?

- I certainly have some objections, and some statements I'd like to make.

- Okay, and the way we're gonna proceed is that, we'll actually move to that next, so we'll give each of you the opportunity to address the board on Attorney Kalny's opinion, and the process going forward here. Then, at the end, we'll review that, and decide where we're going to go from here. Alder Dorff, anything that you would like to tell or address the board in moving forward with this at this point, please come up.

- The only thing I would like to say is that, if you decide that Attorney Kalny's opinion is the way you want to go, I have no objection to that. I think I stated before that my main goal was to ensure that the bad behaviors ended, and the electorate made that decision for us, and the behaviors will not be going on any more, so I don't have a need to continue with this process, if that's what you decide.

- So just for clarification, you're, in my understanding, you're not withdrawing your complaint, you're just allowing the board to make its determination as to how to proceed.

- Yes, I would want to honor the wishes of the board.

- Okay, very good, so Mr. Zima, any information you want to provide to the board or statements regarding policy.

- One thing I'd like to, just to clarify something for Mr. Kalny there is, um, his opinion. On page six he says the electorate removed me from office, the electorate did not remove me from office, the majority simply elected someone. People are removed from office through recall petitions and things like that. These are honest elections, and everybody has a right to, when I, in my life, I've always said that, really, there's no winners and losers, there's just smaller victories. Some people have a smaller victory than others. So this insinuation that the public removed me is, it's really atrocious, I'd like it stricken from the record, it doesn't dignify the election process in any shape, form, or manner.

- I think it's a point well noted, anything further?

- Yeah, I think the case needs to move forward. The present council, and future candidates and councils need to know what the case decides is or isn't appropriate conduct. Under the code, what's acceptable, what's not acceptable? For one, you know I'm not here to argue, I don't plan on running for office again. This case is out hanging up here. I mean that accusations and complaints, in my opinion, can not be left unreviewed, undecided, this puts a chilling precedent that accusations and complaints can be loosely tossed about before an election to achieve a negative election result, whether or not the accusations or complaints were actually valid. I think the fact that this isn't being acted upon potentially puts a chilling effect on our present council. Ms. Dorff says I can't say all the things that I said. I think I can say all that I've said. So, where does the truth lie? What is, maybe truth is too strong a word, but, what's acceptable and what's not acceptable? You know, I personally would like to be cleared from all these allegations, you know? This is a great, of great public importance. What are people's freedoms of speech all about? Does a committee such as yours, or an active accuser such as Ms. Dorff, or the common council, really have a right to tell people what words they can choose to use? Whether they can criticize or not criticize? I think it's chilling, I personally want this to go forward, I think it has, whether you have the ability to impose any penalty sanction, I think is beside the point, I think this needs to be decided, I think you need to hear the complaints, you

need to hear what I have to say about it, and I think the council needs to hear it, because I do not want future councils or anybody to be blocked from saying what they think they need to say, and I think there are occasions, I mean, we had a case where the alderman poked somebody in the chest and used foul language. I've never been accused of using foul language here. So I think we should move forward. There's this question of how can you oppose something? Well, I think that discipline can be recommended. You don't think these things should be said or whatever it is, and pass it on to the council. But of course, since I am out of office, the result of that would be staid, that's all, you can't do anything to a person who's not there, so you stay it. But that doesn't mean a person doesn't have the right to his day in court, so to speak. This is supposed to be some kind of due process approach, and whether or not I'm in office is beside the point. I think you should move forward. I also have a right to appeal the decision to a higher body, so, regardless of what you recommend and the council chooses to say is true or not true, if I want to spend the money, I can appeal that to a higher authority. Now, you're denying me my due process. I'm supposed to sit here and take what I think are totally false allegations by someone who I consider, I can say what, she's a puppet of the mayor, well, she can call me whatever she wants to call me, it doesn't matter, but I'm here to request that this move forward. I want you to evaluate my behaviors, because I think they're totally appropriate under the circumstances, maybe you folks won't. That's what you're all about, right? So I think we should proceed, I'm ready, willing, and able to defend myself. I'm happy to hear Ms. Dorff's complaints, and to hear your decision about them. But no one should go here left out accused. What does this do, this means that people can just make accusations and drop them? You can smear people without giving them a chance to defend themselves, not good, thank you.

- All right, Mr. Kalny, any thoughts, oh, I'm sorry?

- Briefly, Janet Angus, I'm an attorney. Green Bay City, and I'm here with Guy Zima today. I think you really need to consider what he's just said to you, I believe that Alder Dorff's complaints all arose out of statements that were made at meetings, now, Alderman Zima was not an employee of the city of Green Bay at the time of the meeting, and he had the right to say, in open debate at the meetings, what he thought, what he felt, what he felt was important to his constituents in representing his constituents. He has that right, it's freedom of speech. You will quell debate at the council level if you allow complaints to come forward in this manner. He didn't swear at anybody, I don't think there were any accusations in there that he assaulted anybody, that he touched anybody, that he did anything inappropriate other than discussed and debated issues that were in front of a committee, or that were in front of a common council. Now, I had some procedural problems with the complaint that was filed, because you couldn't really tell what was filed. There was no date stamp, there was no time stamp. To go through three or four hours of meetings to determine what was said and the context it was said. It just seemed to be a lot of work, almost unimaginable, some of those meetings were seven, eight hours, they were very long. Going forward, I think that you as a committee, depending on what you decide to do, but overall, may want to look at that, so that other people are not subjected to complaints that are drafted in this manner, and the burdensome duty of going through all of those meetings, 'cause we don't have written records of all of them, they're not done verbatim, so you do have to go through each and every recording. I think Alder Zima would like to go through all of those at a hearing, and determine what is appropriate speech and what isn't, according to you. Free speech is free speech, and like I said, he was not an employee, he has a first amendment right to debate at meetings, it's a chilling effect on the council to not allow debate to occur. One of the debates, I think, that was referenced, was regarding the Gentleman's Club in Green Bay. If you're going to debate a gentleman's club, it's not going to be very nice. Some of the things that are going to come up may not be particularly appropriate, but consider the source, so I

think that every allegation has to be gone through, and he has the right to have those allegations gone through, because this really slandered him. Have you read the news media reports? There was an ethics complaint filed against Alder Zima, almost as if he did something wrong before you even heard his, had had the hearing, and another procedural issue was, I think he received this brief that Attorney Kalny did late Friday afternoon, that's the first time I saw it, so there was one day in order to review this, to respond. The hearing was February 28th, it took that long to draft this, but Alder Zima had one day, maybe a day and a half, to really go over it, decide what to say here today at this hearing, that seems to be unjust, also. At least give someone the benefit of having five days of notice. There was no recall, he didn't, technically, he may have lost the election, but he wasn't recalled, he wasn't recalled out of office, so I think that needs to also be corrected in the record. There is one more thing, there is a fine that could be imposed on Alders of about \$500. So while you can't find sanctions for him, because he's not in office any longer, I guess you can fine him, but he really wants his day before you to go through this process, and to clear his name, and if he comes back in another year, or two years, if he runs for something else, is this going to haunt him, is he going to end up back in front of you, I mean, I think one allegation in Ms. Dorff's complaint was handwritten in, occurred in 2004, I don't think there was a code of conduct until, what, two years ago, three years ago? So, you can't, how can you allow that to happen in the complaint that are filed against people? It seems to me that, if this may have even been, if this had been in a court of law it may have even been thrown out on a motion to dismiss, so I think you really have to look at what you're doing here, and realize how you affect, and how this complaint affected someone who was in public office for how many years, I think that's all I have, thank you.

- Let me just ask you a question. What's your position, in looking at this, what's your position with respect to the fact the code of conduct under this complaint is addressed toward an elected official, whereas we sit here today, Mr. Zima is no longer an elected official for the city of Green Bay. So what's your response, or what's your argument to the fact that we still have some jurisdiction over this? Since he's no longer an elected official.

- He may wish to run again.

- That's true, but, I mean, what about today?

- Well, today he's no longer an elected official, he was voted out of office, and the complaint is pending. So my understanding, the brief that I wrote, I know he's no longer an elected official in Green Bay, I haven't briefed that, I haven't had an opportunity to look at that, but I think in the brief it says that a court may consider it a moot issue if one of the following conditions is met. One, has great public importance. I just told you I thought it did. So did Alder Zima, or Guy Zima. It has great public importance. What about future debate, what are the parameters of debate at the council meeting, I mean, does that mean I could go and sit in the peanut gallery at the council table, and if I don't like what somebody says, I find it offensive, I can come here, and because they've chosen the wrong words we can file a complaint, you may have a lot of complaints coming through this office, this committee. A lot of complaints, you know, I mean, we could go on and on about things that have happened in office in the last year, and the ethical considerations of our mayor, for instance, it's sad what happens in office sometimes, and when you call people out on the carpet, and you say, "You know, you did something wrong," or you don't like what's happening and you're there representing your district, do you have to be so careful in what you say? I mean, swearing and things like that aren't really appropriate, but, you know, you do have the right of freedom of speech to debate issues, so I do think it's part of great public importance, that statutes constitutionalities involved, we're

talking about free speech, is this a chilling effect? Is this conduct code of conduct, is it a chilling code, I don't know. I mean, decision is needed to guide the trial courts, well, that's not applicable, I guess. I don't know, I mean, I haven't looked at that, I haven't had time to look at the fact that he's not in public office, I think he deserves to have his day here if he wants that, if he wants to go ahead with the hearing. You may find that he didn't do anything wrong, in which case, the news media is not going to be able to say, "Oh, look what Alderman Zima didn't while he was here." So, Zima, do you have anything you want to say regarding that?

- Simple fairness.

- Simple fairness, you know, unfortunately, I was out of the country when this matter came up on February 28th, otherwise we would have proceeded with the hearing at that point in time, but I was out of the country on a trip that I had been planning for a very long time. You know, it's unfortunate, because if it could have been handled at that point, who knows? Maybe the election results would have been different, because maybe you would have said, you know, it's free speech, and you have the right to say what you want at a meeting. Like I said, it's just a chilling, I think it's a chilling effect, so, anything else? Thank you.

- Anybody from the board have any questions?

- No.

- Mr. Kalny, anything you want to add to what's been said so far, to advise the board?

- I do want to address the notion that Mr. Zima could be fined, because under, that is true, that's a remedy that's available as a sanction, but the only way to enforce that sanction is a removal from office, so the fact that Mr. Zima's no longer in office renders that sanction unavailable. Basically, I think that's the problem here. Whatever, you could find everything that Ms. Dorff said was true, and you would not be able to do anything about it as far as any type of sanction be turned out. You'd really be rendering what's called an advisory opinion. You'd be saying, you wouldn't be reaching the controversy. Whatever you did regarding the controversy would have no practical effect, and that's why I raise the issue that it might be brief, now, I have to concede the issue of whether this is of great public importance and you need to address it, it's something that's important. But as far as this matter being moot, and you no longer being, having jurisdiction or being competent to proceed, is another way you could look at this. You just don't have any authority to enforce anything at this point in time. The point of the complaint was to correct conduct if there had been a problem.

- It's also to determine a standard, is it not, Mr. Kalny?

- Well, actually, Mr. Zima, if I may respond?

- Certainly.

- If the board, it's to determine whether the specific allegations and the complaint as alleged, taking into consideration your specific conduct violating the code of conduct. It's not to make a broad, sweeping determination of what is a violation of the code of conduct. It's not to be a constitutional determination. This board doesn't have that authority. You would have found facts and made conclusions of law as to whether what Ms. Dorff alleged actually constitutes a violation of these rules.

That's as far as you go, and then the board, and then, of course, how do you correct that conduct? Then the council would have reviewed that. They would review your recommendation, to determine whether the sanction was appropriate under the code, the way the code's written, it doesn't seem as that you maintain any authority over it.

- Any further questions from the board?

- I have one more question.

- Yes?

- So if you rule that this issue's moot, will then you strike the complaint totally, and remove it from Alder Zima's record as though it didn't happen, since he hasn't had his day in court, I mean, is, you haven't ruled on it. This should not go along and haunt him if he wants to run again, as if he did something wrong, because it hasn't been determined. I mean, if you're going to strike the entire complaint. But you really, I was preventing, the next time someone's up for reelection and someone doesn't like that individual, and the three months before the election, or two months before the election, knowing full well that the timing may not get through prior to the election, of coming in and making similar allegations against Alderman A or B or C or D. I'm not meaning any interests regarding this at all, but I think it's a timing issue. If you're going to guarantee that these matters are heard prior to elections, so that they don't influence elections, maybe that's something else that this board should look at, because these allegations were chilling.

- Ms. Dorff?

- Hi, we would just like to remind everyone that I was ready twice to present, and I was within the 45 day timeline, and it was not I that delayed any of these proceedings. So I just wanted that to be out in public, thank you.

- That's understood, understood.

- If I may, with regard to striking the entire complaint, unfortunately, it is a public record, so it is there. To that extent, there's a record here of accusations that has not been addressed.

- Again, any comments from the board? Any discussion, again, I want to make this clear, I'm one member of this body, you all know I'm an attorney and I sort these things for a living. I don't want that to sway anybody here. You all make up your own minds as to how you think this ought to go forward, and we'll entertain a motion here in a moment, I would just say, from my perspective as a member of the board, that my concern is that we are here under the city of Green Bay code of conduct, not under the ethics, the city's ethics board. Code of Conduct is a document, it's a code, it's specifically established by the city council for us to operate under, to my knowledge, there is no background state statute that this is based on, as there is with the code of ethics. This is simply a, I shouldn't say simply, because it's not simple, but this is a document and a code created by the council for direction to council members. That's the point I struggle with. I understand the concerns, and I think the concerns that were brought up by Mr. Zima and Ms. Angus are well noted, and they are a concern. But the concern for me is that the code of conduct, as I asked before, is related to elected officials. We sit here today dealing with a situation where we no longer have an elected official that we are apparently authorized to proceed against. So my concern is, quite frankly, I'll state my

position, I don't believe we have the authority to dismiss the complaint. That's why I asked Ms. Dorff before if she is withdrawing it, she said no. I don't think we have the authority to dismiss the complaint, I also don't think we have the authority to proceed, because again, Mr. Zima's no longer an elected official, I don't think we have the ability to do anything, I understand his concerns, and as I said, they are very well noted. They are concerns that I think everybody who has come before this board have raised in one form or another in the past. But I think we are stuck on the point that the city council has given us a document that limits our authority to dealing with concerns regarding elected officials, and my position is, my concern is, that we no longer have an elected official, so I struggle to see how we can proceed. So that's my two cents' worth, any other board members?

- I came to the same conclusion reading through this, and once the election results were known, we no longer have a council member before us, we have a private citizen, and I can't make that decision, in reviewing the information, that we have any reason to proceed, because it's not within, jurisdiction isn't the right word, but it's not within our venue to move forward any longer, and I agree, I appreciate Mr. Zima and this council's concerns, but I don't see where we can take any action based on what you've said to us.

- And I agree totally, I mean, this document is what we have to abide by, and I struggled with that same piece after the election results and how that was going to come into play now that Alder Zima is no longer an Alderperson. I struggle with that too, I don't see where we have the right, or within our means to continue on. However, with the comments that they both have raised, and you know, that really, him having the opportunity of being heard, and these allegations out there, I understand where that's a concern, without a doubt, I'm not sure how that can be reflected somewhere along the line of why this did not move on any further, just because, obviously, with the document that we have we don't have the right to continue on. However, if this is something he chooses to run for office somewhere down the road, I understand his concerns with that, with it being out, so I'm not sure that's, maybe for Attorney Kelnly to respond as to how that can be addressed or how, or whatever, but I do not think we have the right to move on, either.

- All right.

- I would just like to add something. and I'm going to repeat myself a little bit, but I think it is of great public concern. If you want to take the word great out of it, take that out of it, it's of public concern. Your opinion, and the council's opinion on what the allegations were I think are important, even if they cannot implement some kind of sanction. I think it's important to all due process that you have this, and I think the public wants to hear what you think about it, and what the council must think about it, Ms. Dorff doesn't want to withdraw her charges, I do not want to run from them. I want to move forward, so what's the problem? I think if you proceed, under that it's a public concern of whether these type of things are something admissible, because I'll tell you right now, if this stuff can stand, you're gonna have, you're gonna potentially have hundreds of cases before you, because I'll tell you, I've been mistreated by our own mayor much more egregiously than Ms. Dorff is accusing me of. So I'm gonna start bringing them forward, and everybody who's at a committee meeting that says something that somebody else doesn't like, to you, I think it's wrong because I'm not using foul language, I'm not physically taking force. I use a pretty broad view of what people have the right to, and it's their duty as an elected officials to put their opinion forward as strongly as they want to. I've heard a lot of things I didn't like. I can call them mush mouth, I can call them all kinds of things if I want, and they can say the same about me. I think this must be resolved. I think you folks running from it, taking an easy way out, and I don't think this is, should be viewed that way, it should be

viewed as, hey, we're gonna review what it is, we're gonna give our opinion about it, and the council can have their opinion thereafter, whether there are sanctions or not. This needs to be reviewed, otherwise, this is going to lead to a lot a lot of trouble.

- Well, I take exception to the comment you made about running from something, and I take that personally, we are not running from something, we are talking about whether or not this committee has jurisdiction, or right to go forward, it has nothing to do about ducking responsibility, and I don't want that on the record.

- In rebuttal to what that just said, if I was an elected official, could you bring a complaint against me for using those terms?

- I'm not gonna answer that, I'm not gonna debate.

- You're not gonna answer?

- No, I'm not gonna debate something like that. That's not why we're here.

- Under the, again, going back to the code of conduct itself, we're not here to necessarily render advisory opinions to people about what they can or can't say, we're here to address complaints that have been brought before us. Again, I'm gonna repeat myself as well. We are subject to the rules that have been provided to us by the city council under the code of conduct. That's the rules that this complaint was brought under, and those are the rules we're bound by. So I, you know, as I said, we're not here to give advisory opinions, we're only here to hear the evidence that's presented under that code of conduct.

- I just have a question, maybe this is more for Attorney Kelnly, assuming that the board decides that, it takes action that we do not feel that we have the right to continue on with this. I'm assuming, would this be in public record, this just reflects that, due to him no longer being an elected official, the board does not determine, or does not decide that we can continue on. I'm assuming that's just all that goes record. Just to the fact of just addressing what Guy Zima had brought up to the fact that he does not get to respond to some of this and those types of things. If he did want to run for office somewhere down the road, whatever capacity that may be, this just looks like, from the public perspective, just null and void, we could not take action because he was no longer an elected official. Am I correct?

- I think the answer to that would be yes.

- Okay.

- This record would be part of the public record.

- Sure.

- Another thing, though, that I think is important is, this body is still a body that reports to the council. So I think, what you're going to be making today, regardless of where you want to go, is a recommendation, and I think that is subject to review. So I don't think it's over here.

- So based on what you, okay, so based on that, so if we decided we could not move on, you're saying that when this goes to the city council, that they still could do something at the city council level, is that what I'm hearing?
- They ultimately are the ones that are going to be interpreting their own orders. If they say we're sending it back to you and say.
- Okay.
- Or if you say you're going to go forward, we just go forward, but we would have to put some finalization on this, if you're saying we're not going forward, that has to be reported.
- There has to be a report back to the city council.
- I mean, you've always done that, even when you've made decisions.
- Thank you.
- Any other questions from the board?
- None from me.
- From hearing the comments, my consensus is that the concern is not to go forward. I would, I'll take the laboring order here and actually make the motion. I would recommend that we report back to city council that, in light of the recent election results, and because of the specific provisions of the code of conduct related to elected officials, that we move that these proceedings be concluded without a decision being made under the problem that the board no longer has authority to exercise jurisdiction over Mr. Zima, since he is no longer an elected official. That's my motion, and I, don't ask me to read it back, read it off the top of my head.
- Are you asking for a second?
- I am asking for a second.
- So ruled.
- We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion, comments, by any of the board members, I'm hearing none. All in favor, signify by saying, "aye."
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed, motion carries, I will.
- Mr. Chairman?
- Yes?
- I brought up an item earlier that I'd like you to address. Mr. Kalny wrote in his report to you that I

was removed from office, that is totally inaccurate. I would like it stricken from the record.

- It is a matter of record, Mr. Kalny's opinion is in the file as a matter of record, but so too are your comments that we pardon this record. So I don't think we have the authority to change anything, but it is in the record, just like Ms. Dorff's complaint is in the record, and your response denying the allegations to her complaint are in the record. That's where it sits.

- If I put something false into the record, although it's not false because I'm not in office anymore.

- But the sanction that could've been applied against you would have been called "removal from office." That's what the reference was too. I recognize your exception to the way it comes across, and I have no qualms about changing that portion of the opinion, to say he is no longer in office, as opposed to removed, it was not my intent to sleight anyone.

- So noted.

- So will we show on the record that opinion letter will be corrected?

- Again, the intent was to reflect the fact that it's removal of office.

- Okay, you'll share that with Mr. Zima as well?

- Sure, everybody will get a copy of that. It is part of the record.

- Okay, all right, next item on the agenda is adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion, is there a second?

- Second.

- Motion is second, all in favor signify by saying, "aye."

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed, motion carries, we are adjourned. Thank you all very much, thank you for your time board members, parties.

- I have one all ready to go.

- Okay, just have them contact me, and I'll work on.

- I'm Janet Angus, I thought I'd introduce.