

Intergovernmental Cooperative Council Agenda  
Washburn University Student Union  
Vogel Room  
April 19, 2011  
7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

- 1.) Introductions (sign-in sheet)
- 2.) ICC Agreement - Action Item. Motion to approve as presented.
- 3.) Distribute/discuss lists from the membership of ways we collaborate with other taxing entities.

-How do we share efficiencies and collaborate?

**Other topics we may wish to research in more detail.**

- Any data or research on economic impact each organization has on the community? Dollars spent in Shawnee County with vendors. Payroll.
- What are the core services we provide?
- How are those services funded?
- Does the community realize the extent the core services will be reduced without additional taxes or fees? If not, how can we deliver the message?

**Other ideas and topics for next agenda?**

Meeting dates:

May 17, 2011

Sept. 20, 2011

Oct. 18, 2011

Nov. 15, 2011

Next organization to chair ICC – Topeka, USD 501

Intergovernmental Cooperative Council Minutes  
April 19, 2011  
Washburn University Student Union  
Vogel Room  
7:30 to 8:30 a.m.

Present: Dr. Brenda Dietrich (USD 437)  
Norton Bonaparte (City of Topeka)  
Mike Wilson (MTAA)  
Dr. Cynthia Hornberger (W.U.)  
Dr. Rob Balsters (Seaman)  
Dr. Ned Nusbaum (501)  
Steve Burkholder (501)  
Commissioner Ted Ensley (SN County)  
Commissioner Shelly Buhler (SN County)  
Rusty Doty (Shawnee Heights)  
Dr. Martin Stessman (Shawnee Heights)  
Michelle Henry (TSCPL)  
Bob Archer (City Councilman)  
Allyn Lockner – Community Member  
Dave Sterbenz – Tecumseh Township

The next meeting date is **May 17, 2011 in the Vogel Room @ 7:30 a.m.**

**Agreement:**

A draft of the revised ICC Agreement was distributed along with a list of members in the order they are to Chair the ICC. There was some discussion regarding the history of the membership fee. Originally, the fee was more than \$100/organization. It was collected in order to compensate the chairing organization for clerical support to keep track of the minutes, manage the collection of the fees, develop the agenda, cover the cost of mailings, etc. A revenue surplus was realized in the late 90's and the membership fee was reduced to \$100/member because establishing a reserve was never the intent and a higher membership fee was not necessary to cover expenses. The chair now donates any clerical duties (primarily arranging the meeting space and collecting fees) and there are few mailings.

Of concern to the group was the fact that the County Commissioners discussed the fee at their meeting and took no action on the membership agreement. The obstacle appeared to be the fee and the belief that it was just for breakfast. The fee is more than breakfast; it is the membership dues as outlined in the agreement. It was the general consensus that if the County and City do not support the ICC, then the ICC would serve no viable purpose and should be disbanded. The group in attendance believed the organization, as it is now functioning, has merit. The conversations are purposeful. The value of the ICC is more than the formal meetings we have each month; it is also the informal discussions and "accidental" conversations that promote networking and collaboration. The ICC gives us a good return for a very small investment.

Commissioner Buhler was willing to take the agreement back to the Commission. The membership tabled approving the agreement until the meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Discussion Items:**

Lists were distributed from several member organizations detailing how we each collaborate with other taxing entities and how we promote efficiencies and a sharing of services.

The question was asked...**What do we do with these lists?** It was suggested we might want to use space on the Heartland Visioning web-site to show the public how we save tax dollars through collaboration and to give specific examples of how we share services. If we did not have a collaborative arrangement, how would that impact our organization's expenses?

An example of some significant collaboration would be the **potential consolidation of the Parks and Rec. Departments between the city and county.**

Several suggestions were made regarding how and what we communicate to or with the public.

- Cost out the savings...is it reduced costs to the consumer? Are we delivering the same or similar services at lower costs?
- Improving efficiencies of services....With collaboration we are not duplicating services. Are we enhancing services? Have we improved in terms of quantity or quality?
- A **written report** would be beneficial that had specific instances where we reduced costs or improved services
  - Relationship building....show the web of relationships among all entities
  - Could we quantify results?....Assign a value?
  - Describe how the ICC facilitates the conversation and efficiencies (need examples)
  - Some will be measureable through obvious cost savings
    - Could we use the concept of the **Value Calculator** as a model to help with quantifying costs and return on investment?

We will contact TSCPL to ask for some more information on the Value Calculator.

The last meeting of the ICC prior to summer break will be Tuesday, May 17<sup>th</sup> in the Vogel Room.