Exhibit D

 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT RATINGS

RATING GUIDELINES

Committees were rated from one to six according to budget size and the influence of its decisions relative to direct expenses to Dodge County taxpayers. The Executive Committee was not included because positions are elected. The committee assignments of each Supervisor were rated and totaled along with the following considerations:

1) Three points were added if all three committee requests of a Supervisor were granted. 100% of committee requests granted to some but not all reveal extreme bias.

2) One point was subtracted if the Supervisor was assigned to a non-requested committee rated three or less. Being assigned to such a committee is not necessarily bad if you also have been assigned to a high rated committee. This has the greatest negative impact on those who were refused the higher rated committees which also reveals extreme bias.

3) Two points were subtracted if a Supervisor was not granted both of his/her first two requests and then appointed to a non-requested committee. Even if the non-requested committee is a higher rated committee, the fact that neither of the first two were granted reveals extreme bias.

4) Two points were added if the Supervisor was continuing as the Chairman of a committee from last session. The last session’s leadership was obviously very self-serving and had an influence on these positions which continues into the present session.

SUPERVISOR’S SCORED RATINGS OF ASSIGNED COMMITTEES

LEVEL 1, SCORES OF 0 to 4

Butler 2, Guckenberger 4, Houchin 4, Sheahan-Malloy 3, Siegmann 2

LEVEL 2, SCORES OF 5 to 6

Benter 6, Bischoff 5, Derr 6, Johnson 5, Klobuchar 5

LEVEL 3, SCORES OF 7 to 9

Bobholz 9, Boelk 9, Breselow 7,Burnett 8, Frievalt 8, Hedrick 8, Kaufeld 7, Kavazanjian 9, Kenevan 9, Krause 7, Yaroch 7

LEVEL 4, SCORES OF 10 to 12

Kuehl 11, Maly 11, Priesgen 10

LEVEL 5, SCORES 13 to 17

Caine 17, Conway 13, Greshay 13, Hilbert 13, Macheel 15, Schmidt 15, Steger 16

All Supervisors were scored under the parameters as listed above. Observe the huge spread between Level 1 and Level 5. Is this evidence of fair, balanced, and unbiased committee assignments? Obviously not. It is indisputable proof that committee assignments were built upon a personal agenda.

In addition, observe which Supervisors received the highest scores compared to who received the lowest. This is indisputable evidence that Dave Frohling strategically stacked certain committees with these specific individuals who share his opinions while burying difference of opinion elsewhere. So, how then are varied opinions represented at these committee meetings? We are told to trust committee decisions because these varied opinions are represented at and debated at the committee level. The evidence is overwhelming that someone is lying to you and taking you for a fool, and it is not just the Chairman.

Let’s look at this from another angle. Dave Frohling’s favorite Supervisors (those who scored 9 to 17) hold 3 positions on JPP, 3 positions on the Building Committee, 2 positions on the Highway Committee, 3 positions on the Finance Committee, and 5 positions on HR. Get a load of that stack in HR! In comparison, take a look how many of the Supervisors rated from 0 to 6 are in these 5 committees. There are only two in Finance and 0 in the rest.

If our committee membership structure is left standing in its present form I can only believe that our Chairman and those he consulted with about committee appointments had no intention of practicing the good sportsmanlike conduct which we like to think is the American way. There is no fairness, no courtesy, no working together to respect varied opinions to become united as promised in his letter. We are now being forced to express any difference of opinion on the Board floor.

Shall we all follow Dave’s example of the strong, fair leadership which he claims to epitomize and which he has shown us? Is this the attitude and behavior which you believe is proper? When contention arises on the Board floor whose fault really is it?

We have an opportunity coming yet to make positive changes to this situation. I encourage all to stand for what we all know is right at our May meeting when we will be asked to approve the committee assignments. The Supervisors who are in the lowest level of the ratings should be assigned at least one of their first two committee preferences in place of those Supervisors of those same committees who are in the highest level of the ratings.

This is a simple solution to make this new session a more enjoyable experience for all.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Siegmann