

What do you see as the three largest issues facing Linn County and why?

From my discussions, the public is vocal on issues of excessive taxes and levies, data centers, power plants, and schools. Taxes are hurting cash strapped people to the point they are ready to move. Nearly half are concerned about data centers and their impacts especially water, power and land-use. There is large concern about health and location of power plants. Even though schools are not under county jurisdiction, spending priorities for schools are not transparent and trust is low.

The county is currently reviewing its comprehensive plan and future land use map. How would you assess the long-term planning and vision of the county and are there specific areas you think need more emphasis?

The recent Linn County data center and the natural gas power generating ordinances state these rely on the comprehensive plan, but the plan is out of date. There are currently few constraints to siting of power plants, transmission lines and substations regulated by the federal government and the state agencies who have eminent domain powers. I am supportive of comprehensive plan updates that allow reasonableness in land use decisions of where these facilities are proposed.

Linn County small particulate and nitrous oxide air quality limits are just below very conservative federal standards. These can negatively impact health. The comprehensive plan should address this with development proposals in planning.

The county is in the early stages of an 18-month moratorium on data center development in unincorporated areas. What are your thoughts on the moratorium and what information, if any, would you need before voting to lift it?

There is a rush of data center proposals in this state. The moratorium provides time to prepare for these proposals that can be urgent with significant risk and impacts. The moratorium provides time to further research the resources that data centers will need and additional environmental impacts. The 18-month moratorium provides time to do a cumulative county-wide water use, water quality impacts and aquifer review usable in proposal negotiations. Eighteen months allows time for the comprehensive plan to be updated. The plan allows more transparency and participation with the public on what the planning vision should be enabling responsible growth.

The moratorium should be lifted when we can provide a very concerned public with transparent information instead of hidden NDA agreements. Proposals must be

demonstrated as to how it is a net positive value to the community. Proposals should disclose items not requested in the ordinance including cooling systems, backup generator operation and specifications, infrasound risk and remediation, transmission line impacts, glycol recycling, wastewater treatment, and a construction schedule that maximizes use of local labor and avoids housing shortage problems that raise property assessments and taxes.

Alliant Energy has expressed interest in siting a natural gas plant in unincorporated Linn County. What are your thoughts on this proposal and what information would you need before voting to rezone land for the project?

Linn county needs dependable electrical power to provide a livable community and steady growth. However, the Morgan Valley Energy Center located on highway 30 is sited close to gas and upgraded electrical transmission lines based only on cost effectiveness to the utility. Fairfax or Atkins are within 2 miles from the proposed plant and would provide nothing but adverse health, livability and community growth impacts. Fairfax is being flanked by industrial development areas on both the south and north sides disrupting community livability and growth. There is no sense of concessions coming from Alliant to consider equipment to reduce health risks or to consider other locations if not legally compelled.

I would like to see Alliant justify this location compared to other less impactful alternative sites. Otherwise, I would like Alliant to consider concessions to the local communities particularly regarding better air quality regardless of regulatory thresholds.

In the county meeting discussing this power plant, the public was assured by the land broker that the details for plant cooling system, wastewater management, stormwater management and all project related information would be all revealed, quite late mind you, prior to the rezoning vote for the board of Supervisors which is the final approval. This is not being transparent.

Iowa's property tax overhaul is expected to impact county budgets. How would you address these impacts, and where would you prioritize cuts if necessary to balance the budget?

The first step is to evaluate and set budget priorities that may include strategies to preserve grant funding. As a supervisor, there are approaches that could be used

like zero based budgeting or to request recommendations from each department for reductions across the board.

What should the county's role be when it comes to addressing homelessness and how does that overlap with the county's ongoing homeless systems partnership with the city of Cedar Rapids? Do you think any changes are needed?

The county has been working with Cedar Rapids and use of community and non-profit organizations on the issue. The sheriff's department confirms that almost all of the homeless problem is in Cedar Rapids. Forty homeless people have been housed during the winter by the Willis Dady shelter on the SW side. Community efforts are available in helping with vulnerable women and children. A new "Commons on the 16th" is a 3-year pilot program with a leased 85-bed facility that is expected to take the remaining 51 known homeless citizens. There is an option to purchase the building after the lease agreement. I see no obvious need for changes.

There's been conversation about the number of supervisors (5 members vs 3 members). How many supervisors are necessary and why?

Five supervisors is typical for larger counties in Iowa. In 2007, the number of supervisors was changed to five and then reduced to three in 2017 to lower costs. Salaries have adjusted up to over \$143,000 in a few short years. If salaries could be reduced accordingly, five supervisors would provide better representation per capita. Previous supervisor Louie Zumbach reported in the Gazette in 2021 that the reduction from 5 to 3 in 2017 for cost savings sake was an obvious mistake that he could only see once he started on the job as supervisor. I am therefore inclined to think five may better represent our county.

If you're forced to cut the county's budget, where do you look for savings? Why?

Besides capital improvements where projects could be delayed, I believe with honest debate on priorities, efficiencies, and outsourcing, cost reduction could be achieved across most departments.