



Observer Reporting Form

Table with 4 columns: Feature Evaluated, Yes, No, Comments. Rows include: Meeting started on time?, All members present?, Members attentive?, Did members appear to have done their "homework?", Were members courteous to each other and the public?, Agenda sent/posted 72 hours before?, Agenda items clearly described what was to be discussed?, Adequate opportunity for public input?, Was there an appearance that some action items were discussed in closed rather than open session?, Was background information available to the public?, Facilities adequate? (room size, lighting, ventilation, speakers audible, accessible to handicapped)

Were any issues on the agenda relevant to LWV positions or programs?

Do you recommend League action on any of these issues?

Other Concerns:

- 1. There were three Health Department Grant contracts, totaling \$721,800, that required approval and the items were approved by consent with no discussion. I was especially intrigued by a grant for \$360K from the Robert Wood Foundation for the purpose of "providing children with easy access to places for physical activity and healthy foods." Wondering how that would be implemented and results measured...
2. I fail to see the purpose of two committees (finance and intergovernmental) having the same agenda items, approving most items by consent and referring all items on to CC with very little discussion and no recommendation - where they are then discussed in depth by the entire body. Do the committees make the CC any more efficient or allow for more in-depth discussion or public input?

Observer: Judy Barnette

Meeting: Knox County Commission/Finance Committee

Date: 12/07/09

Please submit completed forms to Observer Corps Committee Chair