

**State of Iowa
City Development Board
Meeting Minutes of July 13, 2022
Iowa Economic Development Authority
1963 Bell Avenue, Suite 200, Helmick Conference Room
Des Moines, Iowa**

Call to order 1:00 p.m.

Present

Dennis Plautz, Board Chairperson
Jim Halverson, Board Vice Chairperson*
Mari Bunney*
Chris McKee*

Absent

Mackenzie O'Hair

Others Present

Matt Rasmussen, Administrator, City Development Board
Betty Hessing, Administrative Assistant, City Development Board
Emily Willits, Iowa Department of Justice
Vicky Clinkscales, IT Department, IEDA
Logan Brundage, Attorney, Ahlers & Cooney, P.C.
Zeke McCartney, Reynolds + Kenline, P.C., Representing the City of Sageville*
Wayne Kenniker, Mayor, City of Sageville*
Maria Brownell, Ahlers & Cooney, P.C., Representing the City of Dubuque*
Crenna Brumwell, City Attorney, City of Dubuque*
Wally Wernimont, Planning Services Manager, City of Dubuque*
Marissa Payne, Guest*
Jason Laaker, Property Owner*
Jeff Wozencraft, City of Cedar Rapids*
Lori Judge, IDOT*
Anthony Volz, IDOT*
Nathan Aronson, IDOT*
Brendan Beeter, Legislative Services Agency, State of Iowa*
515-225-4517*
563-564-5996*

*Participated via Teams Webinar

Introduction by Chairperson, Dennis Plautz

Roll Call by Matt Rasmussen, Board Administrator

Dennis Plautz, Jim Halverson, Mari Bunney and Chris McKee were present.
Quorum was established.

Request for amendments to agenda

Motion by Jim Halverson
Motion I move to approve the agenda as presented.

Second Mari Bunney
Roll Call All ayes. Motion approved.

Consideration of June 8, 2022, Business Meeting Minutes

Motion by Jim Halverson
Motion I move the Business meeting minutes of June 8, 2022, be approved as printed and distributed.
Second Mari Bunney
Roll Call Chris McKee-Yes, Mari Bunney-Yes, Jim Halverson-Yes, Dennis Plautz-Abstained because he was not present at the June 8th meeting. Motion approved.

Old Business

UA22-20, UA22-21 (Parcels 1 & 2) & UA22-22 – Sageville

Chairperson Plautz stated that because those were considered at the last meeting and tabled, I am going to ask that Matt Rasmussen give a summary of those and where we are at with them.

Matt Rasmussen stated the City of Sageville had three separate non-contiguous annexation requests before the Board last month and I gave briefs on each. One of those, UA22-21, contained two different parcels, parcels 1 & 2. The owner had a sliver of land on the one side and a larger piece of ground on the other side. We are considering that as one annexation. So again, there are three separate actions. I reported to the Board that they did all appear to be complete and properly filed. Previous to the meeting, the City of Dubuque filed a Motion to Deny; before the meeting, Sageville filed a Response and Resistance to that Motion. The meeting was held; since the meeting, we received from Dubuque, a reply and additional information document that the Board has before them. There is also a letter from Mayor Kenniker from Sageville. There was a question about an action or two the Board took in 2005, so there are minutes from the July 13, 2005 City Development Board meeting and the August 17, 2005 meeting, which the Board was also provided. The Board was also provided with the Written Decision and Findings of Fact from a 2003 Sageville annexation. Matt Rasmussen stated he would be happy to answer any questions, but all three (UA22-20, UA22-21 & UA22-22) do appear to be complete and properly filed.

Chairperson Plautz stated that, for the record, although he was not at the last meeting, he did read all of the submissions to the Board and staff reports and he is prepared to participate and take action today with the other members of the Board.

Chairperson Plautz asked if there was anyone participating today, either from the Board or interested parties, that would like to provide an opening comment on what we are discussing today.

Wayne Kenniker, Mayor of Sageville, noted that on Case #UA22-21, Notice of Meeting, at the top of the legal description, it says North Liberty instead of

Sageville. Matt Rasmussen apologized for the typo and stated we will correct it.

Zeke McCartney, attorney representing the City of Sageville, stated he had a couple reactions to the document that Dubuque filed recently. I think there are some misunderstandings on what the issues really are here. First of all, many of the factors that Dubuque points to, are factors that are involved in an 80/20 or involuntary annexation application or more often a situation where multiple cities are applying for annexation over the same territory. That is not the case here—this is a 100% voluntary annexation attempt. Secondly, regarding the Mediacom issue, the City of Dubuque is correct. Legally speaking, Mediacom can provide service to residents in Sageville or out of Sageville, but that is not practically speaking the situation here. Practically speaking, Mediacom has indicated to the specific applicants here, that they will not provide service or at least high-speed internet service to those individuals while they remain outside the City of Sageville. Conversely, Mediacom has iterated to those individuals that if they are annexed by Sageville, they will then be provided high-speed internet access. I have some of those individuals here participating if you would like to hear from them. Thirdly, I just want to be clear that the City of Dubuque has no interest in the area that is being discussed today. First of all, the Schmitt and Ehrlich applications, that are actually close to Dubuque, have property that is already within Sageville and property that is outside of Sageville. Due to a 2016 agreement between Sageville and Dubuque, Dubuque is precluded from ever trying to attempt to annex any property already within Sageville. Thus, practically speaking, if Dubuque were to try to annex these properties, that would result in a singular property being within Sageville and essentially a portion of a driveway, being within Dubuque, which is practically speaking and rationally nonsense. In fact, at the first meeting, Dubuque admitted that they have no interest in any of the properties being discussed. The third application has to do with properties that are well north of Dubuque. Some are just outside of the two-mile radius; some are just inside the two-mile radius. Again, Dubuque has acknowledged that they have no interest in these particular areas. Why Dubuque is involved at all, is beyond me. The point is, this should be considered a 100% voluntary annexation attempt with no other interested parties, which based on the Board's history, tends to be a pretty seamless process. I know there has been some discussion about the 2005 annexation attempts by Sageville, but those were different for a couple reasons. Mainly, the property at issue—that property was in dispute between Dubuque and Sageville. Again, that is not the case here; the case here is a simple issue of a 100% voluntary annexation attempt and it should be treated as such.

Zeke McCartney asked Jason Laaker, property owner, if he has had discussions with Mediacom and while you currently remain outside of Sageville, will they provide you high-speed internet access? Jason Laaker replied that he has talked to Mediacom and he cannot get internet access being outside of Sageville. Mr. McCartney asked Mr. Laaker that if he were to be annexed into Sageville, could he get internet access and Mr. Laaker replied that he could then. Mr. McCartney stated that this should not be viewed as some sort of large ideological debate between Sageville and Dubuque. This is simply a couple current county residents that want to be part of Sageville which would improve the lives of those specific residents. That is why they have all voluntarily applied to be annexed and it should be treated as such. Thank you.

Wally Wernimont, Planning Services Manager for the City of Dubuque, stated that he believed you have reviewed all the documents that has been submitted on behalf of the City of Dubuque. We would like to make sure the process is being followed with regards to a 100% voluntary annexation in an urbanized area. There is a process that goes before the City Development Board—that is why we are having this—it is a public hearing. At the meeting, I did indicate that we were not interested in annexation of those properties at this time. However, in the future, as the City of Dubuque has grown to the north and we have pre-annexation agreements for Wildflower Subdivision and are currently servicing water to the north to the area, and as we do planned and managed growth for annexations, we do have interest in those areas, just currently not at this time because we can't provide direct annexation areas to it for connectivity. In addition, if you follow The Code, in the past Sageville annexations, we have opposed those annexations and the Board has upheld those annexations because the City of Sageville is still providing a rural level of services and with the request before you here, they will continue to provide a rural level of services and what I mean by that, is the county is providing quite a bit of their services currently. They do not have any municipal services that they are extending and the Code requires that substantial services need to be provided and the request before you today is a request for Mediacom connection. In addition, we feel that with approval of the annexation, the property tax level for those residents will actually be reduced because the City of Sageville does not provide a tax rate—to pay city taxes, so those residents will be taxed at a lower rate and still be receiving those county level services. In the past, that has been the debate with the previous annexations the Board has upheld with regards to not approving these voluntary annexations. Thank you.

Chairperson Plautz stated he had a couple questions. First, if the City of Sageville does not levy a tax, how do they pay for any administrative expenses they have. Along with that, if they do not have a street maintenance program, does the county maintain the roads inside of Sageville? I am curious how you fund municipal services.

Mayor Wayne Kenniker replied they do have a city street that is maintained by the City—Leiser Lane. In fact, it has been resurfaced in the last five years and continues to be maintained with both snow removal and treatment. We do have six sources of income, which includes local option sales tax; road use tax; we have a small cable T.V. franchise; we have return on investments; we have a liquor license and permits; and we have twenty-one acres of tillable property that we lease out for cropland. Chairperson Plautz thanked Mayor Kenniker and asked him about other services that are contracted—like fire protection—are those contracted with the City or with individuals? Mayor Kenniker replied that the City of Sageville pays for the fire protection through the volunteer Fire Department at Sherrill. So, the properties in question are not provided fire protection by a government entity, but rather by the individuals themselves and so when these properties become part of Sageville, their fire protection will be part of Sageville service. Chairperson Plautz asked if they pay for it from the same sources of cash and some of it, per incident, would be billed to a property owner? Mayor Kenniker stated that it would not be billed to a property owner and he was not sure what he meant by “per incident”. Chairperson Plautz stated

let us say they had to use the Sherrill Fire Department, would they pay a fee to Sherrill or to the City of Sageville, after they put a fire out? Mayor Kenniker stated he cannot speak for Sherrill; if they provide medical and there is transportation, Sherrill charges the person being served directly and that does not go through Sageville. Zeke McCartney stated that fire services are all billed to Sageville as a whole; there is no specific invoices to individuals. There may be EMS charges, but that is not through the fire department. Chairperson Plautz asked if all those expenses are paid out of the funds you described earlier and Mr. McCartney replied that was correct.

Chairperson Plautz stated that he and Jim Halverson were on the Board on previous Sageville annexations and what he has gleaned from reading the minutes and everything else—to me, it comes down to a couple things. First, it seems that in Sageville, with services handled the way they are, and with the irregular boundaries the way they are, a City like Sageville could not reoccur today. Sageville was incorporated in 1940 and you have a population of 95 currently, which is down from a high of 400 or 500. The Iowa Code has changed so you could not create a new city without having more services and more departments—something well beyond a rural subdivision. Secondly, in the end, it should come down to presumption of validity, which can include level of services and in regard to presumption of validity, one thing that should be considered is what is different, if anything, from 2003 and 2005. That is being posed as a question to anyone participating today, including our Board members. That is the best I can summarize and paraphrase what I gleaned in what I read today. I have concern that we not be inconsistent with prior precedent and that is why I bring-up the question—what is different today than it was then? With that, I would like to go back to the Board and hear what some of the Board members are thinking.

Jim Halverson stated he thinks Chairperson Plautz's succinct comments and/or observations are very on-task. They reflect my sentiments. Having served on this Board for a considerable number of years, I have always been one who puts a great deal of stock in the concept of "presumption of validity" for voluntary applications and clearly this one would fulfill that. Having said that though, I think there are expectations by way of being an incorporated city—levying taxes, providing benefits now previously enjoyed—and I will tell you that over twenty years, I think that is the first time I have started thinking about factors that would trigger consideration of involuntary criteria. I think this is a situation where I am not sure that in receiving internet service is really sufficient rationale to justify approving an annexation of this type and that seems to be the largest underlying consideration. I have gone through prior meeting minutes from prior actions and I do have some real misgivings about moving forward or approving an annexation of this type in light of past decisions, as well as the justification that the City has presented on approving this.

Mari Bunney stated she went back and forth on this for some time after our last meeting and she has much of the same feelings you two have laid out, except where I really differ, is the importance of internet. As a parent with three young kids, who had to be on-line to be able to be in school last year, internet is more important than about any other service we get. So, that is a major change from 2005 and now. I know that technically the City is not providing that, so we can't

say that is something a City is going to provide by being annexed, but it still to me is a huge factor and I relate to the frustration of not being able to get quality internet service and issues with Mediacom, which is neither here nor there, but I do empathize and after thinking about it for a month, I am leaning more towards the opposite way than you two are. I do not know what that looks like since I am the new board member. I know it provides inconsistency in our decisions, but I do think things have changed and that is a major factor of what has and I do not know what else is different from 2005 and now—I would have to ask you guys. Also, the property owner where part of their property is in the City and part is not, was that the same situation as back then? Again, empathizing with the property owners, having my property in one city on one side and then eventually having the other side being annexed and being in a different city. I am just thinking pragmatically and common sense wise; that sounds terrible. I know that is not legal, but I am just saying common sense.

Chairperson Plautz stated he has gone back and forth at least six or eight times on this annexation. It is an unusual situation. It is a different annexation due to the fact that you have dual jurisdictional properties involved. I agree with what you say on that. On the other side with Mediacom, clearly with what The Code says, it is not a municipal utility. Just for the record, I do not think internet is a municipal utility.

The other thing that was just discussed was services. We certainly would not approve of a new city with this level of services. On the other hand, and I am going to ask Emily Willits, I do not think that presumption of validity involves any level of services on a voluntary annexation. It deals more with the desires of the residents than the necessary allowable level or non-allowable level of services. Can you comment on that, Emily? Emily Willits replied that she thought that was an accurate statement. 368.6 of The Code says, “It is the intent of the general assembly to provide an annexation approval procedure which gives due consideration to the wishes of the residents” It also talks about the interests of residents of all territories affected. The services provisions are in the involuntary portions of The Code. Your Administrative Rules do allow you to consider those involuntary factors, should you choose to do so. That is how those services considerations come in.

Chairperson Plautz stated that in reading the minutes, we talked about the City having done a Comprehensive Plan and then I read some other correspondence saying no one could locate it. What is the status of this Comprehensive Planning? I also read comments from the Mayor saying it is a new day and time and we are doing things differently. We have had elections and we want to mitigate some of these things like irregular boundaries and providing more quality services for our residents and so on. Now I have gone full circle to what has changed from 2003 to 2005 and that could also be part of what is changing. I would like your comments on that.

Mayor Kenniker replied that as far as what has changed since 2003 and 2005, there has been some substantial changes. We have a new face to the City Council—two new Councilmembers were elected in 2019 and me as a new Mayor. Unfortunately, we were off to a start with COVID in our situation, which limited us to what we could do. We are trying to become more engaged and

trying to be more meaningful as a city, but it is hard when we keep getting things that prevent us from doing that. COVID was one of those. You mentioned our population shrinking. The reason Sageville lost as much of its population as they did was due to flooding. One of the trailer courts and some of the houses around that were FEMA buyouts. Obviously with less people, it becomes increasingly difficult to find people who want to be engaged, but we do have some now and we have others who would like to become more involved. So, beyond the internet, these folks have lived right at the edge of Sageville and have mentioned multiple times that they would like to become a part of Sageville. As far as the taxes are concerned, it does not make sense for a new Council to come in and start collecting taxes. You probably would not get re-elected so it would be a pretty short term. It makes sense to manage the funds you already have and then develop a Comprehensive Plan. We did codify our City Ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan is a working document right now for us. That is something we want to do—we want to be more like a city and serve our citizens as such and it would certainly help to have some folks that want to be engaged. I certainly understand that Sageville would not be able to incorporate in today's world, but that is one of those things that was done in the past, but we have to work to develop the City of Sageville to be the best city it can be. I think more engaged citizens and time would allow Sageville to do that.

Chairperson Plautz stated you would like to do a Comp Plan, but is anyone working on a Comp Plan now? Mayor Kenniker replied they have copies of other cities Comprehensive Plans and we are trying to massage that to fit Sageville. We do not have full-time staff; even our City Clerk is part-time. Chairperson Plautz asked if they were working on it internally and Mayor Kenniker stated that was correct.

Zeke McCartney stated that in terms of what is different from 2002—at that time Sageville was not taking care of its own roads. It does have an agreement in-place to do that now. They also did not have a contract in-place regarding the Fire Department--again, that is in-place now. Thirdly, regarding the Fire Department, Sageville has platted out to build a satellite Fire Department facility that will also be a City Council Hall, so to speak. Ground has now been broken on that project. That are some differences from 2002.

Chairperson Plautz thanked Mr. McCartney and then asked if Board members had more thoughts. Again, this is a very unique situation for us. Jim Halverson stated that when we talk about fundamentals of a city adopting a zoning ordinance, in Iowa, cities are required to have a Comprehensive Plan in-place before a zoning ordinance can be adopted. There are expectations that are established to even function as a city. Even aside from the pandemic, there was roughly 15 to 17 years following the 2005 annexation application in which similar sentiments were reflected at the time, but apparently not much was done to address those discrepancies. There is an expectation of what the purpose and function of a city is. There are certain things that one would expect to correspond with that. If I did earlier state that there is a relationship between the presumption of validity and the involuntary criteria, I did not mean to suggest that—they are clearly very separate items. At the same time, I would suggest those criteria are still very valid to consider. I personally have a difficult time perpetuating what I would characterize as something that is really more of a

rural subdivision than it is a functioning city. Chairperson Plautz stated he would agree with Jim Halverson—that is why this is a difficult one. Jim Halverson stated the presumption of validity usually carries the day, and that is where I would agree with Mr. McCartney. They are fairly proforma. However, there is a history in this case. I acknowledge that internet service is very important; I definitely could not survive without it workwise, but I do know there are technological alternatives out there. I also do not want to treat internet service as a municipal service, which is the only thing we can consider in this arrangement.

Chairperson Plautz stated that from the perspective of what we are supposed to be doing here is not what we would be promoting and I say that only because of irregular boundaries and lack of municipal services and things like that. At the same time, I am trying to reconcile in my head somehow, the presumption of validity when it is the property owners requesting it; there is currently not an alternative for that property; and the fact that these properties are divided into two jurisdictions. One thing that would make a difference to me would be if these were just individual properties and they were not properties that would be split by two different jurisdictions having authority over them.

Matt Rasmussen told Jason Laaker that he can be heard now. Mr. Laaker stated this is a prime example of what we have to deal with—with the internet that we currently have which is very horrible. For the people to sit there and say they do not think this is good reasoning for us to annex in, is pretty ridiculous. What we experienced last year with the COVID and in-home schooling—I have a 13-year-old, a 9-year-old and 7-year-old, and we did not exceed because we did not have good internet. We ran out of data; there were times when the kids could not interact with the teachers with the in-home school thing. For these people on a Board to sit and talk about stuff that happened in the past—we are in 2022. We are trying to grow as a community and internet is huge for us. I had one company come-in and they flew a drone up and they said we cannot get internet because we are in a valley. I wanted to say that I think it is very important that we do get internet.

Chairperson Plautz responded that no one is saying that it is about internet; it is about what The Code says, adopted by the Legislature, which we have a responsibility for and we are wrestling with what under The Code is the best solution to a very difficult problem that has been created over time. I would take exception to the statement that we are sitting here like a bunch of bureaucrats making our own rules. That is not what is going on here.

Chris McKee stated that it seems to her that the City of Sageville is trying to move forward and develop this Comprehensive Plan. Have they ever discussed possibly putting services in the City in the future in this Comprehensive Plan? Mayor Kenniker replied that is certainly something that is on the table. Again, the feasibility of doing that with the geographics that we are faced with—we cannot solve some of the problems that were created in the past. We are trying to work the best we can with what we have been given for the last two years. I say the last two years because that is when things actually changed. It takes time to do some of these things. Again, we have some people who are motivated and 2½ years of being Mayor is not a lot of time to have a full

understanding of everything that needs to happen within a city. We went through a change of a City Clerk not more than a year ago. There are a lot of dynamics that we are trying very hard to work through. We are not trying to pull anything here; we have some people that are interested beyond being interested in the community. They also have a desire because of their geographics and the lack of good internet to become part of Sageville and they have asked for us to annex them in. That is what we want to do—annex them in and have them become part of the community and then continue to work on some of the things that make this a legitimate city.

Chairperson Plautz asked if anyone else had any comments. Wally Wernimont, Planning Services Manager for the City of Dubuque, wanted to speak to the multi-jurisdictional question that you were raising. Currently, properties are in multi-jurisdictions—one portion is in the county and one is in the City of Sageville. What is the difference? Dubuque County has a Comp Plan, a Subdivision Ordinance and a Zoning Ordinance. These are things Sageville does not have so by approving of the annexation requests, they are actually losing those services that are being provided by the county, to a municipality that does not provide those services.

Chris McKee asked if the county has weighed-in on losing this territory to the City of Sageville. Zeke McCartney stated that obviously the county has not raised any specific objections and I will also note that the county has actually worked with us. One of the parcels that is in consideration here is actually a county parcel and that parcel is only for keeping everything contiguous. The county is well aware of this and is not objecting, but is helping facilitate these applications.

Chris McKee stated that it seems to her that the City of Sageville is working towards trying to make a better community by increasing the territory, by including these annexations. As a large supporter of smaller rural communities, you cannot grow if you are stuck and then you die out. As far as the way things have been done in the past, I think the absolute most dangerous phrase in history is, “We’ve always done it that way”. The City cannot grow if we keep putting the same issues on them over-and-over again. It sounds like the City is trying to do this Comp Plan and work towards progress.

Chairperson Plautz asked if there were any other comments.

Wally Wernimont, Planning Services Manager for the City of Dubuque, stated with regards to the county, there was a parcel that was annexed into the City of Sageville and that parcel is actually outside our 2-mile jurisdiction with the City of Dubuque. We were not notified of that request nor are we required to be notified of that request. In addition, there is the Scherff property that is located outside our 2-mile jurisdiction review. Those could be 100% voluntary annexations outside of an urbanized area, but I would say just because the county approved a portion of land that is along the right-of-way, I would not say they are in total agreement to the request.

Chairperson Plautz thanked Mr. Wernimont and asked for further comments. He went back to the Board for discussion and a vote.

UA22-20
Sageville
Motion by
Motion

Chris McKee

I move to take from the table UA22-20 and find it as being complete and properly filed and in the public interest and that it be approved.

Second

Mari Bunney

Chairperson Plautz stated it appears as though his vote might be instrumental here. As I said before, what the development pattern has been with Sageville, I do not think it necessarily meets our mission; if we were in a perfect world, we could dictate what the Legislature charged us with. However, clearly, I voted to object similar, but not identical proposals in the past—I am very uncomfortable with this, but I do think there are several things that have changed prior to 2003 and 2005. I cannot disagree with what Jim Halverson is saying either. It is just a tough call, but I think I am going to vote in support of the motion. In several ways it is very difficult for me, but there is a level that allows me to do this.

Roll Call

Chris McKee-Yes, Mari Bunney-Yes, Jim Halverson-No, Dennis Plautz-Yes. Motion approved.

UA22-21
Parcels 1 & 2
Sageville
Motion by
Motion

Chris McKee

I move to take from the table UA22-21, Parcels 1 & 2, and find them to be complete and properly filed and in the public interest and that they be approved.

Second
Roll Call

Mari Bunney

Chris McKee-Yes, Mari Bunney-Yes, Jim Halverson-No, Dennis Plautz-Yes. Motion approved.

UA22-22
Sageville
Motion by
Motion

Chris McKee

I move to take from the table UA22-22 and find it as being complete and properly filed and in the public interest and that it be approved.

Second
Roll Call

Mari Bunney

Chris McKee-Yes, Mari Bunney-Yes, Jim Halverson-No, Dennis Plautz-Yes. Motion approved.

New Business
NC22-23
Cedar Rapids

Matt Rasmussen reported this is an 80/20 voluntary annexation consisting of 40.2 total acres with 39.21 being consenting and .71 acres being non-consenting. The City of Cedar Rapids received an application from Midwest Development Company and the City of Cedar Rapids (titleholder) for property generally located east of 80th

Street SW, west of Rockhurst Drive SW and north of 16th Avenue SW.

The Future Land Use Map designation for the property is Urban Low Density, which would be suitable for a number of residential uses. The City of Cedar Rapids believes that the annexation area provides for orderly growth and does not create irregular boundaries. The area to be annexed is immediately adjacent to the existing corporate limits. The addition of the non-consenting property creates more regular boundaries. The application was reviewed by all City Departments. No concerns with municipal services were raised. The site is adjacent to the City limits and therefore near existing service areas for all city services. Cedar Rapids does not have a current annexation agreement with the City of Fairfax. County right-of-way is included in this annexation—the adjacent half-width of 16th Avenue SW. The City has an existing 28E Agreement with Linn County to maintain 16th Avenue SW adjacent to the proposed annexation.

Matt Rasmussen stated this annexation appears to be complete and properly filed.

Jeff Wozencraft, Community Development Department for the City of Cedar Rapids, was present via Teams to answer questions of Board members. No questions were asked.

Motion by
Motion

Jim Halverson

I move the Board finds NC22-23 as complete and properly filed and that a date for a public hearing be scheduled.

Second
Roll Call

Chris McKee

All ayes. Motion approved.

A public hearing was tentatively scheduled for 2:00 p.m. on August 10, 2022. Mari Bunney will not be present at the August 10, 2022 meeting. Matt Rasmussen stated we will need all four to vote aye for the Cedar Rapids annexation to be approved. Jeff Wozencraft stated he is comfortable to go ahead with public hearing in August, but he will let Matt Rasmussen know for sure within the next week if the City wants to go ahead with public hearing in August or wait until September meeting.

Staff Reports

Matt Rasmussen stated we will have at least six annexation petitions for the August 10th agenda.

**Future Meeting/
Public Hearing**

August 10, 2022, at 1:00 p.m., City Development Board Business Meeting at IEDA, 1963 Bell Ave., Suite 200, Helmick Conference Room, Des Moines or via Teams Webinar.

August 10, 2022, at 2:00 p.m., Cedar Rapids (NC22-23)
Public Hearing at IEDA, 1963 Bell Ave., Suite 200,
Helmick Conference Room, Des Moines or via Teams
Webinar. (Mr. Wozencraft contacted CDB staff on July
14th and said he wanted to go ahead with public hearing.)

Adjourn 2:07 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Betty Hessing, Administrative Assistant