

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

The Honorable Board of Franklin County Commissioners met on the above date. Present for the meeting were Bob Koch, Chairman; Rick Miller, Chair Pro Tem; and Neva J. Corkrum, Member; and Mary Withers, Clerk to the Board. Fred Bowen, County Administrator, was absent due to illness.

### **LOBBYIST**

Lobbyist Jim Potts talked with the Board by speaker phone about current legislative issues.

### **OFFICE BUSINESS**

Secretary Patricia Shults met with the Board.

#### Consent Agenda

**Motion** – Mrs. Corkrum: I move for approval of the February 25, 2008, consent agenda as follows:

1. Approval of **Resolution 2008-075** for destruction of a black office chair, Serial Number SO 48596 1, as identified on the *Franklin County Storage – Salvage* form received from the Prosecutor's Office, in conjunction with RCW 36.32.210 (inventory).
2. Approval of **joint Resolution 2008-076** in the matter of the request for signature from the Boards of Benton and Franklin County Commissioners on the Fee for Services Contract between the Juvenile Justice Center and the City of Benton City to provide the Graffiti Abatement Program (GAP) for a term commencing February 5, 2008, and terminating on December 31, 2008. (Exhibit 1: Information sheet.)
3. Approval of **Resolution 2008-077** for purchases as identified on the letter from the Trial Court Improvement Fund Authorization Committee for expenditures totaling \$14,926.78, utilizing funds from the Miscellaneous Trial Court Improvement Fund, Number 128-000-001, line item 594.12.60.0000 (Capital Expenditures).
4. Approval of **Out-of-State Travel Request** for Tim Waters to attend the Crop Diagnostics Workshop in Hermiston, Oregon, February 26, 2008, at a cost of \$35 for registration. (Exhibit 2)

Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor.

#### Vouchers/Warrants

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

**Motion** – Mr. Miller: I move for approval of payment of the following vouchers/warrants: Current Expense warrants 61782 through 61807 for \$44,176.19; Jail Commissary warrants 2437 through 2441 for \$4626.76; Current Expense warrants 61808 through 61819 for \$14,215.15; Auditor O&M warrants 465 through 474 for \$14,207.66; FC Unemployment warrant 101 for \$6827.35; FC RV Facility warrants 422 through 426 for \$5385.57; Emergency Management warrant 9313 for \$1038.50; Affordable Housing Fund warrants 4 and 5 for \$91,750.40; Ending Homelessness Fund warrant 12 for \$12,426.00; Auditor O&M warrant 475 for \$200.00; Current Expense warrants 61820 through 61830 for \$2032.10; Current Expense warrant 61831 for \$1234.33; DOC Building Inspection warrants 63 and 64 for \$119.37; Boating Safety warrants 416 through 418 for \$199.91; Sheriff's Narcotic Trust warrants 252 and 253 for \$443.99; Law Library warrants 1065 and 1066 for \$5039.18; Veteran's Assistance warrants 1385 through 1395 for \$1700.00; and Current Expense warrant 61832 for \$1500.00; for a total amount of \$207,112.46. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 3)

**PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson and Assistant Director Greg Wendt and Planner Jeremy Underwood met with the Board. Present in audience: Roger Wright.  
Hearing Examiner Contract

Mr. MacPherson asked for approval of a renewed contract with the Benton-Franklin Council of Governments for them to provide hearing examiner services through their consultant Michael Corcoran. The contract would be for two years. If there are no hearings, there are no charges. Mr. MacPherson answered the Board's questions about hearing procedures.

**Motion** – Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the contract for professional services between Franklin County and Benton-Franklin Council of Governments for a land use hearing examiner. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-078.

Notification Procedure

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Mr. MacPherson said one of the contentions from the public regarding Planning Commission matters is that the mailing isn't wide enough. The Planning Commission has asked the Planning Department to post property with a big sign saying there is land use action pending and including contact information. The Planning Department would like to start posting the signs. Then there will be no excuse for people not knowing about it. The Board asked if the fee will be passed on to the applicant. Mr. MacPherson said there really is no fee, just the cost of having the signs created. The County Public Works sign shop employees will make parts of the signs which can be used over and over again. They include a post that will be driven into the ground. It will be yellow and black with a yellow background. They won't be blowing over in the wind. The signs cost just over \$50 per sign for a total of a little more than \$550. He described how the signs will be placed. Mr. MacPherson asked for approval to spend money from the Growth Management budget which allows expenditure of the funds. He described the signs. They will be built solidly but not too large for smaller properties.

The Board thinks it's a good idea. A resolution will be prepared for authorization to expend the money. The Board gave **consensus approval** to order the signs.

Public Meeting: CUP 2008-01, a Conditional Use Permit by the Pasco School District to expand the site area for the McLoughlin Middle School by approximately 4.87 acres. The land is zoned Residential Suburban 20,000 (RS-20).

Public Meeting convened at 9:32 am. Present: Commissioners Koch, Corkrum and Miller; Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson; Assistant Director Greg Wendt; Planner Jeremy Underwood; and Clerk to the Board Mary Withers. Present in audience: Roger Wright.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the information on the Action Summary (Exhibit 4).

Mr. MacPherson showed a copy of the aerials with parcel overlay on the screen. He said the property the school district wants to add is currently undeveloped, in sagebrush. It will allow expansion of the athletic fields including providing an area for a full-size soccer field. The school district has reached a sales agreement with the owner to purchase the property. No one in the audience was in opposition to this at the Planning

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Commission meeting but there was quite a discussion on parking. When there are baseball and softball events, a lot of people park on Argent Road and Road 88 to access and view the events. There was a question whether the parking lot was full or they just parked there for convenience and closeness. The Planning Commission required 50 additional parking spaces be provided somewhere on the campus facility but not necessarily all in one place. Mr. Wendt said it is Condition #11. The Planning Commission did not want it to have access onto Argent Road. Mr. MacPherson said the school district's staff and an architect will put together a parking plan. They would be hard-surfaced parking areas.

Mr. Koch asked about the parking formula. Mr. MacPherson said it's broken down in the Zoning Ordinance per use. He said the Planning Commission wanted to have whichever is greater. We didn't have the parking formula in front of us during the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Wendt said the only other condition was for fencing, curbs, gutters and sidewalks consistent with the rest of the development there. These are addressed in Conditions 3 through 5.

**Motion** – Mr. Miller: I move that we grant approval to Conditional Use Permit Application CUP 2008-01 subject to the six findings of fact and eleven conditions. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-079.

Public Meeting: Subdivision SUB 2008-01, a Preliminary Plat application by RGW Enterprises (c/o Stan Stinson) to subdivide approximately 20 acres into thirteen single-family residential lots. The property is zoned Rural Community-1 (RC-1).

Public Meeting convened at 9:44 am. Present: Commissioners Koch, Corkrum and Miller; Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson; Assistant Director Greg Wendt; Planner Jeremy Underwood; and Clerk to the Board Mary Withers. Present in audience: Roger Wright.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the information on the Action Summary (Exhibit 5).

Mr. MacPherson showed a copy of an aerial photo with parcel overlay on the screen. He indicated where other subdivisions are located in close proximity such as

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Quail Bluff and Pheasant Run to the south. He said the proposed subdivision would have 13 lots. There is a large gully that has affected lot configuration.

The majority of the engineering work has been done. Any of the lots that have excessive slope will also have to have geotechnical engineering for structures if they fall within the 15% or greater slope. Mr. MacPherson showed a map of the preliminary plat with elevations included. He asked Mr. Wright to talk to the Board about the project.

Roger Wright of RGW Enterprises, 3100 George Washington Way, Richland, spoke. He said there is a big gully, which we called a hollow. We're concerned if there was a large snowfall on frozen ground, there might be a wash through the gully. So we've built a series of several small dams (berms) two or three feet high. On the back side we will install drywells so we can get the water into the black sand, where it percolates just fine. If there is any water that can't get in, the gullies will back up a couple of feet of water so we can slow it down and we won't get erosion. Geotechnical engineers have looked at this area and evaluated and made sure they are large enough to take all the water.

We've shown all the easements around the wells. We've specifically put the wells in locations that will accommodate a septic system on the site. There is one possible change here. The Health Department is interested in having us take a look between these two wells here (indicated) on the slope so that would provide one area for a septic system on top.

Mr. MacPherson said these are the 13 lots proposed by the applicant. He pointed out the Pheasant Run Subdivision. There is an existing road that the new development will be tied into. It will run to the north and connect up to another subdivision for which we have received the start of an application. He showed on the screen where a half road would be required. Pelican Point Subdivision will build the other half of the road.

Mr. MacPherson pointed out that Lots 1 and 13 will have internal access off of Court B but also back up to Dent Road. Any time we have double frontage lots, we require some form of barrier or fencing. Typically it's a solid six-foot-high estate-type fence. We worked with the applicant and developed some language that there will be a

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

condition for these two lots that there will be a six-foot-high solid estate-type fence that will prevent access onto Dent Road and will really define these lots as being internal lots and having access off of Court B.

Lot 13 has triple frontage. New road A has frontage here (indicated), Dent Road, and also access off the cul-de-sac. That's the same with Lot 12. We worked with the applicant and developed language that a solid estate-type fence be located along the north lot lines of Lots 12 and 13 but the height will be from four to six feet at the discretion of the applicant. Mrs. Corkrum asked will they have a view? Mr. MacPherson showed the lot plan on the screen. If we have a four-foot fence, it will maintain some view potential for Lots 1 and 2 and take away the tunnel effect. Any other lot in the development has the ability to have a four-foot fence in their front yard. Mr. MacPherson showed the elevation drawing again. Mr. Wright said the ground drops off quite a bit so even if we had a six-foot fence, Lots 1 and 2 will still have a decent view. Mr. MacPherson said we had originally put in the application description in conjunction with the applicant a requirement for a six-foot-high vinyl fence. The Planning Commission did not want to limit to a vinyl fence so they said estate-type fence. The fence will require a fencing permit from the Planning Department and be reviewed.

Another additional requirement was required because previous developments to the south prompted a discussion of fire protection. The Planning Commission said we're putting a lot of people in this area without a lot of fire protection. They asked that the next subdivision application that comes forward address that issue. We worked with the applicant and Fire District 3 and came up with a proposal after review of other local jurisdictions. We will require an 18,000-gallon reservoir capable of providing 500 gallons a minute for 30 minutes. The internal portions of the subdivision will be built to city standards – city water lines and city fire hydrant placement. The reason is it's pending to become part of the City of Pasco's urban growth boundary so at some point in the future, that will aid in the transition from a stand-alone system that they can just connect into the city water line as it comes by and there won't be any need for tearing up the internal portions because it will already meet city standards.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

He asked Mr. Wright to talk about the fire protection system. Mr. Wright said the map shows three existing phases that are either platted or completed and one on the north that shows there is another one coming in shortly in the 80 acres. We're assuming the next phase will also require fire protection so we have planned in the northeast corner of that new plat Tract A that will have a reservoir. That will become a landscaping, utility and signage tract and be developed into a private park for the residents, with a buried reservoir. Our intention is to put a pumping system there that will provide water until the City of Pasco gets out there. There will be an emergency generator backup. It will be a manual system in that if there's a fire, the fire department can push a button and they will have pressure to the hydrants. Our intention is that both Pelican Point, the future plat, and Goose Hollow would be coming off of a common reservoir. Then there will be a series of fire hydrants. He showed on the map the general line of fire hydrants. They will be standard fire hydrants, standard 8-inch line as required by the City of Pasco. In addition we will stub out at two locations into Dent Road so when the city does eventually come by with a water line, they can connect to that and the need for the reservoir will go away. Since the reservoir is buried, they wouldn't have to change anything on the site.

Where are we going to come up with the water? During the irrigation season we have a pump located about a half mile to the east that provides irrigation to all these areas. During the irrigation season, we can fill the reservoir with irrigation water. If there were a fire in the winter that depleted the reservoir, the lot that is right next to Tract A -- we have an agreement with the lot owner that allows us to fill that reservoir from his well. We'll have to fill it over four days to make sure we don't exceed 5000 gallons a day. That seems reasonable because the likelihood of there being two fires within four days apart in the wintertime seems like a relatively low risk.

Mr. MacPherson said also at the Planning Commission hearing you mentioned further east that there's a filter on that? Mr. Wright said yes. Some people were concerned about the quality of that water. At that pond to the east -- it's near Byers Road -- we have a pumping station that is very finely filtered because we don't want

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

contamination going into people's yards and into their drinking systems. The water going into that reservoir will be very, very clean. It goes through less than an eighth inch screen. I don't think we need to be concerned about contaminants of that water. Then when it does become connected to the City of Pasco, it will still just be a fire protection system. At the location where we connect, there will be a double-check valve that won't allow this water (indicated) to go back into the city system. However, if for some reason they want to connect it to their domestic system and put these people on city water in the future, we could still decontaminate that line with chlorine and turn it into a domestic water system.

Mrs. Corkrum said a lot of planning went into this. Mr. MacPherson said yes. He said we've been working closely with Mr. Wright on these issues. It's nice to work with RGW. They're very forward-thinking.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the conditions of approval on the Action Summary.

**Motion** – Mrs. Corkrum: I move that we grant approval for subdivision application SUB 2008-01 subject to the six findings of fact and eight conditions. Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-080.

**Recessed** at 10:05 am.

**Reconvened** at 10:15 am.

**PUBLIC WORKS**

Engineer Tim Fife and HDR Engineering employee Phil Merrell met with the Board. Present in audience: At least 14 people, including those listed on the sign-in book: Steve Cooper, Scott English, Kim English, Monti Cooper, Rhea and Whitey Schroeder, Karen Easterday, Sylvia Halverson, Cody Easterday, Gail Tuttle, Joel Tuttle, and Shannon McDaniel (Exhibit 6).

**R170 Presentation**

Mr. Fife said we're here to present where we're at with R170 and go through some of the alignment issues at the north and south end that were brought up at the original hearing as far as addressing property impacts. He asked Phil Merrell to start the presentation.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

(Clerk's Note: As the meeting progressed, audience members interrupted many times with comments. It was not possible to identify all of the speakers and document what was said by each one.)

Mr. Merrell gave a presentation about the R170 project which included the background information, public involvement program review, final route selection public hearing held on April 11, 2007, establishment of the new road, and several different alignments. He said a compromise on the north end of the project avoids the possible taking of property of a home and lines up with Sagehill Road, which was important to the rest of the community. The middle section of the project overlies the existing irrigation canal right of way. In order to make this alignment work, the existing irrigation canal is being put into a pipeline. On the south end, again from public comments, an alternative was developed and selected.

Mr. Merrell gave brief information about the funding status review.

Regarding the update on the pipeline project, he said we stopped work on the roadway project in order to get the pipeline built this year. If funding becomes available this year for the roadway project, it could go out to bid. We got the pipeline out to bid and got very good bids, 28% under estimate. The project included a pipeline and a culvert for a future road crossing at Klamath but that culvert at Klamath has been eliminated from the construction contract at this time, just until we get the Klamath intersection sorted out, what we're going to do there. Construction is proceeding on schedule and we don't see any difficulties or problems in meeting the schedule and getting it back into service so that the irrigation district can have their water deliveries on time.

Mr. Merrell showed a drawing of the pipeline route on the screen. We worked with adjacent property owners to get the roadway designed. He showed photographs of the pipeline project on the screen. The project is moving along very well.

Road project update: The preliminary design is complete with the exceptions that we are here to discuss. Now we're in the process of contacting property owners. Our need to get this done is centered around a right-of-way plan that we have to submit to get

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Federal approval for. You can't use the Federal grant money that's available for right-of-way negotiations or for purchase of property until you have that right-of-way plan approved. So it's an essential step right now in continuing the project moving forward. Design-wise, we're on schedule to complete in July. It's just a question of whether the right-of-way discussions will proceed and how they will go as to whether or not the project will be ready at that time.

A typical roadway cross section drawing was shown on the screen. The road would have two 17' lanes with a six-foot paved shoulder on each side and a one-foot gravel shoulder beyond that to support the pavement. The drawing applies for all the main arterial roadway.

A man in the audience asked the width of the present Klamath Road. Mr. Fife said approximately 26'.

Mr. Merrell said the cross section is designed to the current roadway standards for this class of road. The standards have evolved over the years. Whenever there is a construction project, you design to the standards that are in effect at that time. I would imagine that when Road 170 was constructed that it met the standards of those days. Cars and uses and travel speeds have changed significantly since then and the standards have evolved also.

Mr. Merrell showed the map labeled "Preliminary" on the screen. He said this is the preliminary design which is the conceptual design we started with. The project is aligned this way (indicated) to avoid a taking of this house here (indicated) and also to line up with Sagehill Road, which was a high priority during the public comment period that we received.

A woman in the audience asked who preferred that route? You? Mr. Koch said it was brought up in the public discussions. Mr. Merrell said the preferred route was recommended through the design study report which was based on the engineering analysis and the public comments. That was the preferred route that was proposed and discussed here at the public hearing.

(There were lots of audience comments objecting to the preferred route.)

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

A woman asked where are the surveys? Mr. Merrell said they're in the design report that I gave you a copy of. He said in the back there is a summary of the comments that were received. There were other comments received also.

A man and woman questioned why are you building a particular section through their field. They would like to just leave 170 alone. The man said I was in both meetings, at Basin City and here, and no one agreed with your picture there, no one. Everybody opposed that. They said 170 should go straight through. I don't know where you're coming up with that.

There were many comments from the audience. Mr. Merrell asked to take the comments one at a time in order to be more productive. Mr. Koch invited Mr. English to speak.

Scott English said I attended both meetings as well as a lot of my fellow community members. I own the property on the corner of Klamath and 170 along with my wife. I expressly came to the meeting that we had in the courthouse last time to show and I pointed on the map specifically that at that point I was told it was a feasibility study. I expressly told the commission at that time that the route that cut around the top of my pump station was not feasible from my standpoint at all and that I was very concerned about how that would value that house on the corner, as well as what it would do to my farm property. I did not own that property at that time. I was in the process of purchasing that property. I made that clear to the commission at that time and it would be in the minutes that I expressed those concerns. Mr. Schalich also expressed his concern at that time for the second route that cut up into his property and made that corner. We both expressed our concern about that needing to be a 50 mile an hour corner and thought that maybe a variance would apply to reduce the speed on that corner because I did say that I understood that we needed forward progress and we needed a road but I also thought we could make a variance on the speed of that corner to allow for maybe a movement of that pump station and a little less engineering required on that curve.

Mr. English said no one came and contacted me and discussed this. My mother-in-law is in the crowd today. She can tell you whether or not anybody came and

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

talked to them, who were the landowners at that time. We were also told that Cody Easterday was the representative. He's in the crowd today and he can tell you what he agreed to at that time. But I feel like the reports coming back to the commission is this is what the community wanted and I don't think anybody came out there and talked to the community and really has ever come back to us as a community and say, "This is the preferred route that we would like to do. How do you feel about it as a community?" because nobody that we've talked to, our friends and neighbors and people that live out there, are aware of the master plan. Nobody. I think it's time that we have another meeting out in Basin City and I think the commissioners need to drive out there and look and see what's going on. Mr. Miller's been the only one that we've been able to get to come out there and look at it. And when we showed him that after you make this 50 mile an hour curve, we've got to go across a bridge on Klamath Road that two trucks cannot pass each other today. There's no way they're going to pass each other at 50 miles per hour.

There's a road coming in and going out on both ends of this project that doesn't support this \$5 million three-mile stretch. So I don't think the community has been brought up to speed. I think there needs to be a meeting where we unveil the plan, so to speak.

Mr. Merrell said if we could wait until we've gone through the presentation, it might answer some of the questions ahead of time. Mr. Koch asked the audience members to wait to comment. Mr. Koch asked Mr. Merrell to finish his presentation.

A woman asked before you get off the north end -- Mr. Merrell said we're going to spend some more time discussing it. The woman asked why don't you just leave that road straight? Why don't you just move the stop signs? It would save a whole lot of money. Why are you going to rebuild R170? (There were other audience comments.) The woman asked why can't Sagehill just go straight across?

Mr. Koch asked Mr. Merrell to finish his presentation.

Mr. Merrell showed drawings on the screen. He said this (indicated) is a through road now and that was again a concern discussed at meetings. Having an intersection that

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

comes in at an angle is not a desirable safety feature. When we have intersections that come in at a steep angle, one side or the other – (Mr. Merrell was interrupted by audience comments.)

Mr. Merrell proceeded with his presentation, showing several alignment drawings and giving a brief history of what led to each subsequent alignment drawing. There were frequent audience comments.

He first reviewed the design at Sagehill and R170 area.

He showed the Klamath intersection preliminary alignment in accordance with the route plan. It has a single curve, which is the best practice. This is where we started with the design. There is a straight road along the existing Road 170 and a straight road along Klamath except the end has a little curve. The desirable highway design is a single curve that bridges between the two. That was our starting point. It's the starting point that we take out to meet with the local landowners to talk to them. This wasn't cast in stone as you'll see as we go through here. This was the starting point for our discussions.

Mr. Merrell pointed out aspects of the first alignment in the drawing on the screen. He pointed out a landmark fence post.

He said we had an on-site meeting with the English family. The landowner was opposed to the alignment because it affected their pasture and their farm operation and moved the road closer to their house on the pasture side and they suggested a left-turn lane onto west Klamath and had concerns that the alignment affected their property only and that it wasn't being shared with other property owners, just solely on them, and also that they would rather leave the road as it is to slow traffic down.

So we prepared a second alignment. It uses much less pasture. It keeps clear of that identified landmark fence post. The discussion we had about the fence post was without a commitment that they would rather not have the road but if the road had to come in through there that if it would avoid that fence post that that would be more or less acceptable, again, without a commitment, and the first preference being no roadway going through there.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

This alignment shifted the roadway to the west and it moved the road significantly further away from the house. We also did add the turning lane onto west Klamath as they were suggesting, added another curve, increased the project length by about 950 feet which would raise the cost. This alignment was strongly opposed by the landowner to the west, Mr. Schalich, who was just up here to speak earlier.

Mr. Merrell showed the second alignment drawing on the screen. He said it still follows the center line along west Klamath. It's still a straight shot along through there. He pointed out the landmark post. He said what we've done is slid the curve along this way (indicated) so it affects this property on this side more (indicated). From the south to the north, it starts out in a curve to the left. There is an existing under drain that is owned by the Bureau of Reclamation that had to be identified and located. The alignment does miss it with just adequate clearance. We shifted it much further west there. The edge of the traveled way would now be 164 feet away from the front of the house. He showed the landmark fence post that we have been able to avoid. The pump station in this alternate would be required to be relocated. The existing siphon would also have to be replaced or some accommodation would have to be made for that. The road has a good 90 degree angle, which is something that's desirable, and also a left-turn pocket added for traffic coming up Road 170 and turning onto Klamath. This would be the through traffic route for Klamath and come down the hill here (indicated) and have a runout at the bottom before having to stop down here (indicated) at the edge of the pavement. The old Road 170 in effect becomes just a driveway that goes back in to property owned by WT. He doesn't think an access would be built to it. It is not significant.

Mr. Merrell said since we talked with Mr. Schalich and he was strongly opposed to that, we tried to look to the north and see what the effects would be if we shifted this just to the north. Mr. Merrell showed a third alignment design and list. In order to shift it to the north and not affect Mr. Schalich's property to the west, it would move the road on top of that buried South Columbia Basin Irrigation District (SCBID) pipeline, it would require removing a row of trees and take a significant amount of property from the north side also. That option was opposed by the irrigation district and by the north landowner.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

The north landowner family talked it over and they were most opposed to having to relocate the existing pipeline that was there. They were opposed to taking out the trees but they were willing to discuss that as a possibility. They were strongly opposed to moving the pipeline because of the cost and because of the effects on their farming operation there. This alignment also requires an additional curve. He showed the curves on the screen. It shortens the project by 120 feet. We stay within our right-of-way on one curve. We're still missing the fence post. The pump station would have to move. Some accommodation has to be made to the under crossing. The row of trees would be gone. The buried pipeline is right underneath the roadway and that was unacceptable to the irrigation district and the landowner both. At the far end, there is a curve to get the straight road curved away from the existing road (indicated).

Mr. Merrell said since then we've been working on the best compromise that we feel we can come up with in this area. He showed the fourth alignment drawing on the screen. It affects the northern property owner less than the third alignment drawing. It doesn't require removing the pipeline. It does require removal of the trees, however, although a few could be saved. It affects the western property owner less than Alignment 2 but it still does affect their property and it affects the first property owner less than Alignment 1 but we're still avoiding that fence post, staying outside of the fence post. This alignment also contains three curves. It is about 320 feet longer than Alignment 1 design. He showed the curves. The pump station would have to be relocated. The fill line is around five feet away from the center of the buried pipeline. While that's not desirable to the irrigation district, they have indicated they are willing to work with us on that. We can probably come to a solution on it.

Mr. Merrell gave a summary of the process we've gone through and some of the conclusions we've come to using slides on the screen. This is a major arterial. The design standards that we're required to go to require a 50 mile an hour curve for this class of road and the funding that's needed to construct the project requires meeting those design standards. Most accidents on an open road situation happen on curves and of those accidents that happen on curves, most of them happen on curves that are signed. So

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

having a curve that's lower than the speed limit is a safety hazard. It's a potential accident site. There's a reason why those are avoided.

Leaving the existing road as it is right now is a technique that's called traffic calming. That's where you definitely put in something that causes the traffic to slow down. It's a physical situation that forces the traffic to slow down. It's appropriate and effective in an urban situation. It's neither safe nor appropriate on an open highway out in a rural setting.

Mr. Merrell said we've developed four alignments trying to balance between the safety and the property impacts and we have listened to the concerns of the owners. We have been doing our best to try to accommodate them but at this time it doesn't appear there is an alignment that will meet your responsibility to provide the safety and meet the design standards that we need and at the same time not have property impacts.

Mr. Merrell said we appreciate the open discussions and willingness of the property owners to meet with us and raise their concerns. They have been very frank and forthcoming with their concerns. All of the alignments have impacts to property owners. There just isn't a way to not do that and still improve the road. Putting in a lesser standard curve would jeopardize the eligibility for Federal and/or state funding, not just for that curve but for the entire project.

At this time unless there is another alternative we can come up with, our recommendation is Alignment #4 which is the best balance that we can see between safety and property impacts. We've been consistent through here in our criteria that we started out with at the very beginning of this process, looking at the safety to the traveling public, impacts to the residents, the costs, and traffic flow improvements if possible.

Mr. Koch opened the meeting to discussion at the table for a maximum of three minutes with 15 minutes left.

Dick Schalich has the property on the west of the intersection at Klamath which I think will be impacted the most. What he is telling us is we have to design our road to Washington, D.C., standards. Otherwise, we don't get the money. This is our road. What do those bureaucrats in D.C. know about what we want? Get off the kick of that.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

The whole clue to this thing is to get rid of the 50 mile an hour curve because all options are bad and let's look at a 35 mile an hour curve. Now, he says it can't happen. We have 35 mile an hour up by the Boys Ranch on Sagehill. It's been there as long as I know.

Mrs. Corkrum said she doesn't think the 35 mile zone is because of the road design. It's because of children in the area. Mr. Schalich said it doesn't matter. It's a 35 mile an hour zone. Mrs. Corkrum said she knows but it's not because of the road design. That's a straight shot.

Mr. Schalich asked what's the reason on Sagehill? Why do they have 35 mile an hour at Sagehill and Radar Hill, at the top? Mr. Merrell said he thinks there are existing roads that were built to a lower standard in the old days. He is not familiar with the road Mr. Schalich is talking about. Mr. Merrell said in the county there are curves that are lower than 50 miles an hour. Mr. Schalich said that's what we need here. The whole problem is the speed of the curve.

Mr. Merrell said there are two things to be aware of on the curves, when you see a sign "curve" out there. One is that it may be a lower class of road; it may not be a main arterial like this one is. That affects -- Legally, the county is liable.

Mr. Schalich asked what determines what classification this road is? Mr. Merrell said these are Federal functional classifications that have been established --

Mr. Schalich asked out in the country here is Federal function -- they're going to be involved in this? You said this is a major arterial. What makes it a major arterial? Mr. Merrell said the amount of traffic, the through traffic --

Mr. Schalich asked what's the amount of traffic?

Mr. Merrell said there's 1100 vehicles a day that go up and down there.

Mr. Schalich asked how do you know?

Mr. Merrell said traffic counts.

Mr. Schalich asked when? Mr. Fife said before the slide. (There were audience comments.) Mr. Schalich said because I talked with him (indicated) and he don't have a clue about it and I mentioned that in Basin City and he pooh-poohed it about taking the surveys on the traffic. What is the basis then? You said 1100?

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Mr. Merrell said we've known that there are 1100 vehicles a day. Mr. Koch asked Mr. Schalich and others in the audience to let Mr. Merrell finish his statement.

Mr. Merrell said honestly I don't know the traffic on west Klamath and that's what I told you. I've always known and even in the hearing at Basin City knew that there were 1100 vehicles a day on this one (indicated). Mr. Schalich began speaking. Mr. Koch asked Mr. Schalich to wait to speak. Mr. Schalich said you keep jumping at me. Why don't you have the guts to come out there and look at what's going on? Neither one of you have been out there. Everybody's impacted with this for how long and you don't even have the guts to come out and look at it. Mr. Koch said I think I have. Mrs. Corkrum said I have, too. Mr. Schalich said he was told you didn't come out. Mrs. Corkrum said I didn't come out to talk to individuals but I have been out in that area. I certainly have.

Steve Cooper said my wife and I own the property on Sagehill and 170 and I've never since the beginning been in agreement on you guys curving that intersection over on me and then kind of curving it back. I met some engineers from the start of this and complained from the beginning. I gave you guys some property four or five or six years ago to put in a turn lane off of 170 onto Sagehill. You just keep creeping and creeping and creeping. Now you tell me it's not going to take much of my property but I've never seen this design with the turn lane. Before it was just an intersection.

Mr. Merrell said I think I can answer your question. When the county built the Sagehill Road project they acquired this corner from you, this diagonal (indicated). The road is outside of there. This is a cut line here (indicated) and just because we are at the stage of design we are at now, as the design proceeds that cut line will go away. There will be no roadway on your property, zero, none.

Mr. Cooper said but by the time you start adding right-of-ways, by the time you move the phone line, it's already there. That's going to come out on my property. Mr. Merrell said no. Mr. Cooper said you can't build the road right over the phone line. Mr. Merrell said not unless you make a deal with the phone company. It's up to the phone companies to accommodate our road, not our road to accommodate them.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Mr. Cooper said when you make this road wider, your right-of-way is going to get wider. Mr. Merrell said no. Mr. Cooper said it has to. You're consuming your right-of-way to build the road now and you're just going to make the right-of-way farther out on me.

Mr. Merrell said no. He said actually this right-of-way that was acquired there is the right-of-way that's already been acquired and no property will be acquired from you. Am I clear on that? No property will be acquired from you or needed from you. Mr. Cooper asked you're sure on that? Mr. Merrell said yes. Mr. Cooper asked and you're not going to make the right-of-way bigger through there? Mr. Merrell said no. Mr. Fife said it will be bigger but not on your property. Mr. Merrell said it's already 80 feet on Sagehill. That was already widened when they did the Sagehill Road project. Mr. Merrell showed Mr. Cooper's right-of-way on the screen and the edge of the roadway. He said we've discussed this already. If necessary we'll put curb and gutter around that corner to make sure that trucks don't travel onto your property. We're not going to acquire any property from you.

Mr. Cooper said we have a nice intersection there right now. I don't understand why you guys just can't leave it the way it is and do nothing. It's a nice intersection already. It lines up with the bridge nice and everything.

Mr. Merrell said as a designer, I tell you there are standards that we have to meet. I'll be frank with you: Some of these standards have been designed in courts through liability and through people driving off a road and suing agencies like the county and the state and the cities. So I'm not going to defend the standards 100%. I do think these are safety issues that we talked about, especially the curves through here (indicated), but all of these standards have been developed over time. They're just a fact that we have to deal with. There are some standards that you just can't get around.

Mr. Cooper asked have you guys measured the traffic flow now on 170? There's a lot of people using alternate routes now.

Mr. Fife asked what part of 170, the south end beyond where the slide is? Mr. Cooper said yes. He doesn't think there's as much traffic as before the slide.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Mr. Fife said I agree with you. Mr. Cooper asked is there enough traffic there now to warrant doing anything? Mr. Fife said it's still a major collector. You still get a lot of people using the detour route. The detour route is falling apart because of all the truck traffic on it. We need to do something and we need to do it as quickly as possible.

Mr. Merrell said the direction I was given from the county is to put the road back to the functionality that it had before: through traffic, highway speed curves as much as possible. That's what we've done here. Although the road is wider, this functionally is no different than what was there before except the improvement at the corner of Sagehill.

Whitey Schroeder asked are you telling me that if you move that intersection back and leave it where it was that you can't complete this curve down here (indicated)? I've got two problems here. One, you're taking part of my property that I don't think is necessary. Another, you're spending a lot of money there. Part of that probably comes from me, too, and all these people (Mr. Merrell said "and myself") to rebuild a road that is no longer a road; it's closed. If you leave that intersection where it is (indicated), the old 170 will not have to rebuild any of that. I was told before you can't get a safe curve in there. You mean that curve is that much safer just because you change that intersection and move it 40 feet?

Mr. Merrell said I'm not sure I'm clear completely on what all your concerns are.

Mr. Schroeder said part of my concern to the left is taking part of my property (indicated). The other concern is that you would not have to take it. You can leave that intersection right where it is and start your curve (indicated). Mr. Fife asked for clarification of where Mr. Schroeder's property is. Mr. Schroeder responded.

Mr. Schroeder said you're rebuilding road there that does not have to be rebuilt, both from the bridge coming this way and going that way (indicated) which is no longer a road; it's closed.

Mr. Merrell said the issue is safety. Mr. Schroeder said that's what I asked. Is that curve that much more safe just because you moved the intersection 40 feet?

Mr. Merrell asked if you're talking about the curve on your property (indicated)?

Mr. Schroeder showed the curve he meant. Mr. Merrell asked if your question is that

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

curve safer because this curve is here (indicated)? Mr. Schroeder said no. Forget that curve. Leave this curve right down here (indicated) and move the intersection back up where it was. Then you won't need the curve on the left or the curve on the right. In response to Mr. Merrell's question, Mr. Schroeder clarified his idea. Mr. Merrell used the screen to show his response. He showed Fairway Road and curve (to avoid purchasing this house) and then as tight as we can, we curve back around this way (indicated). Trying to fit this curve and this curve together is difficult.

A woman said to come straight across R170. She said you're going to redo almost from our mailbox at our house. You're taking our pasture. Mr. Merrell said the separation between the curves isn't too much. There has to be a certain separation between them. It's real difficult to do because you have a super elevation going one way and then a transition over to a super elevation going the other way. You can't just change like that instantly from one to the other.

A man in the audience said when you get by Martinez' house, start the curve back to the left a little quicker. Don't wait till you get halfway to the corner. Mr. Merrell said they're not really crazy about us taking their property either. (There were many audience comments.) A man in the audience suggested putting a new double wide for Martinez' on Fairway on a cul-de-sac someplace -- he'd probably look forward to that -- and then you could run the road straight through there without any curve at all. Mr. Merrell said that wasn't the sentiment that was expressed to us when we met with them on-site. Mr. Merrell said we can look at this again and we could have further discussions with the Martinez family. There's a point when you take enough of the property that with the right-of-way laws we have, you're basically required to acquire the entire property.

Mr. Schroeder said they're probably not real anxious to have that road go through their property and you could certainly buy them a new double wide and locate it a lot cheaper than rebuild all the road by the intersection.

Mr. Merrell said we could have a further discussion if necessary, if the Board wishes. Mr. Koch said okay.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Scott English asked Mr. Merrell to put the overall project map on the screen with the south end in particular. Mr. English said it's important as commissioners that you remember this is who you represent (indicated). That's why you're elected. That's why you're here. It's the people that came today that have put people in office. One thing we failed to point out is once we've complied with the 50 mile per hour deal, which in my opinion like Richard says really seems to be the point -- If we could ask for a variance to make that 35 miles per hour, it's way less of an impact for the people that use and live out there on this property. But that seems to be falling on deaf ears.

The other thing is once we roll around here at 50 miles per hour there is a bridge (indicated). That is a bridge that if you would drive out there and look at it, two trucks cannot meet each other on that bridge today. But we've had no discussion about that bridge in the project at all. Nobody's brought it up. It's nothing we're going to apply for Federal money for. Mr. Merrell has told me that himself. It becomes a safety issue for you guys (pointed at commissioners) and then it becomes tax dollars for everybody sitting here to do something about that bridge. Yet we haven't brought that up in the project. And that bridge cannot be hit by two semis at 50 miles an hour. They cannot pass each other on that bridge at that speed. They can't pass each other on that bridge today. One has to wait for the other to cross that bridge. I don't see where if we're going to make this a super highway for three-point whatever miles it is, how we can ignore that bridge; that bridge has to be part of that equation. Does that make sense to anyone besides me? (Clapping from audience)

Mr. Fife said we have looked at it. You brought that up out there.

Mr. English said the other thing I'm talking about is if we go further south (indicated) and we start talking about coming down the Ringold canyon there where 170 meets with Ringold Road, there are lots of curves that do not make sense when you have to make this (indicated) 50 miles an hour. I understand those are all part of the rules of applying for the Federal money. But there are also things called variances that we can apply for. Why can't we make that a 35 mile an hour curve? The road supporting it coming from the south has several curves that would warrant that same speed. We've got

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

a bridge down here that you can't cross at 50 miles per hour. So what's wrong with asking for funding and a 35 mile an hour variance so the people that have this and this and this (indicated) can live with it?

Mr. Fife said we did look at the bridges. That bridge is 28 feet wide and has 27.6' clear between guardrails. We have a number of bridges that are much narrower than that that are on roads that have a lot more traffic. He gave an example of a bridge on Taylor Flats Road that is 22 feet wide and has 4000 vehicles. It does create a pucker factor for semis and other vehicles as they come across that you do have to slow down there. The bridge on Klamath is a sufficient width that two semis can pass.

Mr. English reminded the commission you are working for the people that use the road. I own nine semi trucks with hay trailers that cross that bridge 100 times a day. I'm very familiar with what it takes to get across that bridge. He pointed to a man in the audience who owns 60 or 70 trucks that go across the bridge 100 times a day. He asked the man would you care to meet one of my trucks on that bridge? Not in the least. You've got to wait. But now we're building a highway where you can go even faster.

Mrs. English said the fog lines are crumbling off the side of Ringold Hill in at least three different places, which I understand the county doesn't have the money to fix it. But we're creating a road that's creating more traffic to go up this hill. It can barely sustain the traffic that's on it now. I just think that there has to be a reasonable --

Mr. English said the main plan from Road 68 going that way, it does not meet -- that's not the preferred route. If you look at the terrain and what they talked about a master plan between Othello and Road 68, there would be a better overall route.

Mr. Merrell said a dilemma that funding agencies and jurisdictions have is that there's never enough money to fix an entire road and you end up fixing it piece by piece. What is here is an opportunity to fix this piece of it. At some time the piece through Ringold will get to a point where it's eligible for funding and it will get improved but to leave the whole thing --

Mrs. English we've never ever one time said bag the project, although you took it upon yourself to tell everybody that's what we wanted. We have never said that. We

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

have said we would work with you from the very beginning. All we've asked is that maybe there are a few other options. I found that a little bit disheartening that you would stand up there and twice say that we didn't want the road to happen because we did not say that. Mr. Merrell said no, we just talked about this intersection here (indicated), not about the whole project. I'm sorry if you took that impression. It was not about the whole project. It was just about this intersection.

Mr. English said twice you showed on a deal where we were against anything; we wanted to leave it the way it was. That is completely untrue. I told those guys when they came out that I would be very reasonable on ground procurement and I could probably live with just letting you have a certain portion at the end of the horse pasture if I could get the speed reduced on the corner to where I didn't have to move my pivot.

Mr. Koch said I wouldn't have any problem working with the Federal government if there is any option of even doing that and getting financing.

Mr. English asked is there an option?

Mrs. English asked if it costs less than \$5 million is anyone affected other than HDR? Mr. Koch said we have to just see if it's an option to start with. Mr. Merrell said we don't get paid by percentage. It doesn't affect us, no matter how much it costs. It doesn't affect us one way or the other. The audience asked Mr. Merrell to go to work. Mr. Merrell said I'm a registered engineer and there are standards I have to meet.

Cody Easterday asked and there's no way you could go to 35? Do you know that? Because if you're a registered engineer you should know it. Mr. Merrell said there are times, like the road that goes up Klamath Hill there, that's a different road. It's a different class of road and they were successful. It's also what's considered a mountainous hill so in a mountainous terrain on a lower class of road, you can go to a lower design speed. That's what happened up there.

Cody Easterday said he thinks the issue is the public is viewing it as this road has many issues all the way through. Why are we doing this 50 mile an hour corner? Has anyone driven on Highway 170 and gone to Highway 17? (Mr. Koch said yes.) Cody Easterday said there are two corners there that are 25 miles an hour. Mr. Merrell said but

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

they're not new corners, are they? Cody Easterday said no, they're old, but all this is old. He said to look at the perspective of what you're doing here. Look at what's happening. Look at the money you're spending on this.

A woman said you're going to have a brand new road that very few people will use.

Mrs. Corkrum said I want to make a comment about rules and regulations that cities, counties and state have to abide by. Those roads in the rural north Franklin County were built in the late 1940s and in the 1950s. We didn't have semis as huge as we have now. Those roads were not built for the kind of equipment that's on those roads. So as we build new roads, we have to follow the designs at the time they're rebuilt. You're talking about going further down Road 170 where it's much narrower. We know that. But as you get funding and you fix a portion of a road, you have to follow what's in place now. I remodeled my house a few years ago. My basement windows were the little tiny ones. When I wanted to put a bedroom downstairs I had to make these great big windows or I couldn't have remodeled my house. So what was okay for when my house was built in the 1960s is not okay today. It's the same way with road design. I serve on the counties Risk Pool. We have \$25 million worth of coverage but the biggest lawsuits throughout the state, 28 counties, is on road design, and I'm telling you we have had not one lawsuit in Franklin County.

Mrs. Corkrum said I understand it's impacting you. Maybe we should just leave it as is and not build it because I don't think we're going to be successful in getting Federal funds to do this. We got Federal funds to move the irrigation ditch which I think is going to benefit everybody. I don't know what we can do.

Mrs. English asked who is going to Washington, D.C., to try to get the money? Mr. Koch, Mr. Miller and the county administrator are going back for a conference the first week of March. Mr. Koch said if it's feasible at all, we're taking information back with us for R170 and for Juniper Dunes. Mrs. English asked do you apply for the money based off of what HDR gives you or based on what the community wants? If he gives

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

that to you and then you get the money, does that mean it's a done deal? Mr. Koch said no. Mrs. English asked what steps are taken?

Mr. Koch said what he understands is that the Federal money is available to highway standards. I don't know if there's a variance. I don't know how to answer that right now.

Mr. Fife said there is a deviation process and he would be more than welcome to go through it but it's not likely it will be approved.

Mr. Koch said I don't have a problem trying for it if it's something that's even feasible but if the Feds don't give us any money, we can't carry on any further.

Cody Easterday asked if Federal funds would pay 100% of the road construction or is the county going to have to come up with some money? Mr. Fife said with rare exception, there's always a match on Federal funds of about 16%.

Mrs. English asked when Ringold Road needs to be fixed, will it be all county money? Mr. Fife said no, we typically don't do a whole lot of construction without grant funding or a loan. Mrs. English said the point is we're creating more traffic so you won't have a choice but to have to fix it and then it will be our responsibility to fix it. (There was other audience comment.)

Mr. Fife asked are you anticipating traffic being at a much higher rate once we're done than it was before the slide? Mrs. English said I don't know. Mr. Fife is not anticipating that. (There was other audience comment.) Mr. Fife asked what's going to make it different than before the slide when they were using R170 as a through route? Mrs. English said I'm asking you. She thinks Mr. Fife should be able to tell us what the traffic flow is. Mr. Fife said I'm not anticipating much greater than the 1100 before. He is asking is there something I'm not aware of he should be made aware of that it will be greater than that?

Mrs. English said when I talked to you earlier about traffic going up the hill, you really didn't know how much traffic went up the hill. Mr. Fife said not at that time. Mrs. English said you've never stripped the road to see how much traffic goes up the road. Mr. Fife said we have; I just have not looked at that.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Mr. English talked about the design of the curve in the alternate 1. When you consider the amount of traffic going back up that hill, especially truck traffic, it's a difficult corner. Mrs. English said then you indicated there wasn't enough traffic on the whole road that if it all turned that it warranted a turn lane. Well, now you said you'd go ahead and put in a turn lane but it's hard for us to listen to someone say it doesn't even warrant a turn lane, yet it warrants that project?

Mr. Merrell said you'll probably hardly ever see any argument from funding agencies about adding safety features. It's when you don't meet the standards.

Joel Tuttle said you added one of the most dangerous things right there (indicated). Mr. Merrell asked a dangerous safety feature? Joel Tuttle said he was born and raised in the country and traveled the road every day of his life. He said he has farmed Wyatt's place, Schalich's place, and the unit on top. He said he has been stepped on 100 times when you guys did the road up the hill. You wouldn't listen to us about anything. I'm coming to this corner (indicated). Every one of us in this room has driven a semi. We have come through that intersection and had to dodge traffic on 170 the way it used to be and cut on Klamath to save our own hide. You've taken that out now. Now you're going to end up landing in Scott's field and you're going to be dead. That is a terrible corner from a safety standpoint.

Cody Easterday said Joel's exactly right. He said if you do a study on the truck traffic coming down that road, I can give you a list of trucks that come down there every day that are mine. When I met with you, Phil, the first time and talked, one thing we discussed -- and all the designs were very preliminary at that stage, when I was representing Mom and Dad on the property -- about moving the pump station and what it would take to move the pump station and if \_\_\_\_ (inaudible), I wasn't opposed to moving the pump station if it had to be done, although I didn't see -- any of these routes were drawn in very roughly and didn't realize they were going to come in the direction they came in. But one of the things I discussed with you was of utmost importance coming off that hill with those trucks coming down, you have to have a big area for the trucks to slow down and stop. You're going to have more accidents on that corner

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

blowing that stop sign than you do leaving it alone as it is today. He asked do you know how many trucks come down that hill? It has to make sense to us here. (There were many audience comments.)

Mr. Merrell asked for clarification. Cody Easterday said I agree with Joel, that the amount of truck traffic that comes down Klamath Hill, which during harvest can be hundreds of trucks a day, loaded trucks, and we're talking about safety issues with this 50 mile an hour corner and we're talking about the trucks coming down a steep grade and with a very, very short area that's flat to get stopped for that stop sign without blowing through it. That's the question. (There was audience comment.)

Mr. Merrell said let me drive this truck down here and right about there (indicated) it starts to flatten out and you have to get stopped by about here (indicated). Now this is going to go on out and you don't have to get stopped until you're right here (indicated).

Gale Tuttle said I've lived there 35 years. I farm that ground (indicated) and live a half mile below that hill. I know what traffic is up and down that road every day. The trucks come off the hill and lose their brakes. Their brakes soften up. They don't need to make a curve. They need to go straight down.

Mr. Merrell referred to the design.

Gale Tuttle said I know what traffic goes up and down our road every day. That is dangerous. The trucks come off the hill and lose their brakes. It's going to take someone's life. I've lived there 35 years. Everyone I know has put a semi out in the middle of that intersection at least once.

Cody Easterday said we're trying to say that people who live there say that has been a very, very dangerous intersection. It's safer now than it's ever been because there's no traffic going to the north.

(There was extensive audience comment.)

A man said to put a stop sign on 170 going north and the problem will be fixed.

Mr. Merrell said this road right here (indicated) is going away. A man said don't take it away. Leave it and put a stop sign on it.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Joel Tuttle said we are the people driving these roads. We don't want to die because you build us a new road. We know how to use the one that we've got and it's working and of the 1100 vehicles a day, how many of those vehicles are coming from our farms producing income that is a tax base to you? They're not traffic from another county.

Mr. Merrell said the road won't be touched until after it gets to Road 170. (There were audience comments.)

Cody Easterday said he doesn't think you understand. He said they're trying to say that you're selling the 50 mile an hour corner to us, which we realize has to be done for Federal funds, and you're selling it from a safety issue, saying we're making the community safer. The community is sitting here saying this is a very dangerous intersection prior to the slide because you had to come to a complete stop with loaded trucks. Now they're saying that the truck traffic doesn't stop there now because the road is closed going to the north so the traffic goes through. It's a lot safer now than it was. But you're going back to putting a complete stop sign and basically no outlet.

Mr. English said it's actually safer if you could come off the hill and not stop and the other traffic stop.

Cody Easterday said if we're talking about safety, we've got to look at everything. You guys are missing the boat on the truck traffic up and down that road during harvest. It's massive.

Mr. English said it's not just a matter of having a flat spot to stop. It's the two miles before you get there. He gave an example of a brake failure.

(There was extensive discussion in the audience.)

Mr. Merrell said what you're saying is you would rather see Klamath be the through road and Road 170 be the stop condition. Audience members said yes.

Mrs. English said then you wouldn't have to have R170 be a 35 mile an hour road. (There were audience comments.)

Mr. Merrell said if it would please the board, we can do a traffic study. The Board said yes. Mr. Koch said I can see your point of way more trucks coming off the hill than

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

coming out of Ringold. A comment was made that the amount of loaded traffic coming off the hill is bigger than loaded traffic going up.

(There were many audience comments.)

Mr. Merrell said honestly he thinks there is a bigger segment of the public than is here today.

Mr. English said there's lots that we called who couldn't attend today. They didn't even know what the plan really was. I don't think we've ever come back to the community and said this is what we think is best and let the community contribute and say yes, I think you're right, or no, I don't think so.

Mrs. Corkrum said we had the public hearing and we picked the routes at the public hearing. Now I'm hearing that there's a possibility of tweaking what we've done here but I think we need to check with our legal counsel and see if we can rescind that public hearing -- I've never heard of such a thing -- and have a new one. Mr. Fife said we can just have another public hearing. (There was much audience comment.)

Mrs. Corkrum said if we can open up for another public hearing, I'd be willing to do that but I'm not sure it's legal. Mr. Fife said we can check on that and do that. We did hear Mr. English at that public hearing and we told him at that time and that's what we're attempting to do now is that those were schematics and we're trying to work out the details to minimize the details to the maximum extent practical. That's what we're attempting to do. If you want to have a public hearing on what we come up with, ultimately the preferred alignment, we can do that. That's just an additional hearing to what you've already adopted. You chose the route in a schematic phase. This is the details as far as how it all comes together.

Mrs. Corkrum asked Mr. Fife, you're going to work with the group and try to work with the parameters of what the Federal government requires? Mr. Fife said we will check with them and at that time, if you want to have a public hearing, we can have a public hearing on it.

Mr. Merrell said the question of changing Klamath to be the through street -- maybe I don't recall it -- but I really don't recall ever hearing that particular question

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

before. This is the first time that I've heard that. This is what we presented at the public hearing and that's what we have proceeded with since then. If you want us to go back and look at that, the question of whether or not that should be the through street, we can do that. Mr. Koch said I think we need to. Mr. Merrell said we can gather more data on that and bring that data forward. It's just a different question than what has been asked so far. I don't think that we can answer it without looking at it and getting the numbers put together and looking at the design constraints. I agree that is a bad corner there. There's no question. It's a different class of road. It really is a different question. It's almost a different project.

Mr. Schalich said we had two meetings on this entire proposal. Everybody I know objected to what they proposed at Sagehill and 170. That was unanimous. What do we get at this meeting? We get the same thing that everybody objected to. Everybody I know objected to a 50 mile an hour curve. There are reasons why we can modify that 50 mile an hour curve because we have an intersection coming down the hill. We have a reason to present to these bureaucrats why we need a slower curve. But as far as I know, at both meetings we objected to a 50 mile an hour curve. That seemed like it was going over okay. Now what do we get? We get the 50 mile an hour curve. We objected to these things in two meetings and we were ignored. Mr. Schalich said you can easily get a variance there because of the intersection coming off that hill. You can present that to the bureaucrats and say we've got a problem there or if you want make Klamath straight through and just put a stop sign for the Road 170 or a little curve or something. But there's reason to not have a 50 mile an hour curve.

Mr. English said I concur with that, in that when I stood up in the last public hearing and talked about the feasibility of alternate route 1, I was told by these gentlemen right here that we were in a feasibility stage of that project and now I'm being told that we're asking to rescind the decision that was made at that public hearing. What decision was made? We were in a feasibility stage of the project.

(Mrs. Corkrum tried to talk.)

Mr. English said now we're being told that that's the route we picked.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Mrs. Corkrum said I guess I stand to be corrected. We picked the schematics of the route but the details were going to be worked out.

A woman asked who picked them? Mrs. Corkrum said the Commissioners. We voted for it at the public hearing, that this was the route that it was going to be.

Mr. English said you failed to hear the public telling you they didn't like that route.

Mrs. Corkrum asked where do you want to put it? Mr. English said I agree we need to relook at that corner and the amount of traffic.

Mrs. Corkrum said no matter where we put a road it's going to impact someone. It's just like "not in my backyard."

Mr. English said we can ask for a variance. Mrs. Corkrum said that's what they're going to work with you on. It isn't set in stone. We haven't gotten Federal funding.

Joel Tuttle said he thinks the general consensus here is as the public which did elect you, we're kind of asking you to stand up for us. That's the feeling I'm getting. We don't do your job. We don't know what it entails. We're asking you to stand up for us and take what we say to the bank. Help us out here.

Mrs. Corkrum said that's why we're listening to you today.

Mr. Koch said that's what we're trying to do, is work this out. If the engineers can come up with straight through, I'm with you, it makes more sense for the truck traffic.

Cody Easterday said the other corner is an issue too. The landowners are here. They've never seen that drawing.

Mr. Schroeder said he has two maps at home that show the intersection does not have to be moved and yet I look at this up there (indicated) and you're telling me it has to be moved. Mr. Merrell said it would have been the maps in this same report so after the meeting you can point them out to me.

Mr. Merrell said let me just point out one thing. We did go through a public process. We got input from a lot of different people. It wasn't unanimous. The majority of it was to adopt this process. I know you disagree with that but that was the majority of

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

what we heard was this alignment was the best alignment. So we proceeded with that. Part of the process as we explained at the hearing and now was we get to the point where we have these conceptual lines here. Before we start talking with property owners, we do some of the design work to see how that conceptual alignment actually fits out there, because these are just lines on a picture. They're not designs. Then we go out and meet with the property owners. That's just what we have done. Since then we've gone back to the drawing board. We've got four different versions of that corner that we've tried to find something here. So we have been making an effort, trying to find something that meets both the professional standards that we have to meet, the county's liability concerns, and your concerns. We're trying to find that solution. We really are. I don't know that it can be found. But we're trying. We have done what we said we're going to do. We've gone to the property owners. We haven't met with you, Mr. Schroeder, yet but we've been tied up on the south end if you can understand that. We just started with them because the crossing was on their property.

A woman said they're taking our whole pasture on that side.

Mr. Merrell said virtually the only property owners we've talked to yet have been the Englishes, the Wyatts and Mr. Schroeder. We're starting that process. I told you we dropped everything to work on the pipeline process. Now we're starting that process and meeting with property owners. It just started on the south end first. It doesn't have anything to do with the importance of your property. It's just that that's where we encountered this first. So we are going to get to everybody. We're doing what we said we're going to do. We're bringing back the preliminary design now, the real design now for you to look at, not just a line on a piece of paper. We're following that process. I know it's a very emotional issue when it comes to people's personal property. We are trying to work with you to the best of our ability and we'll continue to do that.

You've brought us some ideas here today that with the Board's permission we'll continue to explore. Maybe there's things that we can find that will change things. There are new ideas like making Klamath straight. That's never come up before. We really didn't spend the money to look at that because it costs money. Anytime you do that, it

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

costs money. We've been trying to balance getting this project done the most efficiently as possible and meeting people's needs.

A woman made comments about the project. Mr. Merrell said I would be glad to meet with you when we're done here.

**PROSECUTOR**

Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor Ryan Verhulp met with the Board.

New Waste Annual Request

Elaine Dietrich from Basin Disposal was also present. Present in audience: Rick Rochleau, Rosie Rumsey, Tiffany Coffland, and Daniele Carlson.

Mr. Verhulp said New Waste has submitted their list of actual costs incurred for the year in its post closure services. New Waste incurred some additional expenses this year related to the post closure. It's really kind of a matter of argument how much the increase in expenses were. Essentially the increase in expenses was up to a 36% increase. We're a beneficiary of the trust so I have to point out the increase both to Ms. Dietrich and Department of Ecology because the Washington Administrative Code says any time there is more than a 5% increase in expenses there needs to be a new agreement put in place. This is the first year I know of that we have had a more than 5% increase.

Mr. Verhulp told the Board about contacts he has made to try to determine if a new agreement needs to be put in place.

He has verified that New Waste incurred the costs. He asked for approval of release of the funds. As beneficiary of the trust, we want to make sure there are enough funds to get us through. There are funds available. Mr. Verhulp said the Health Department has approved the expenses. Since they have approved it, he thinks we're bound to rely upon that and recommend it. He asked for approval of a resolution and letter to Baker Boyer Bank authorizing release of the funds.

Mr. Miller asked where the income comes from for the trust. Mr. Verhulp explained his understanding of the process. The funds were put into trust in years past and have been maintained.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

Ms. Dietrich said there was a closure account and then a post closure account. The closure account is no longer in existence. The post closure account has roughly \$500,000 in it still. Baker Boyer Bank has been very good about investing it.

In response to Mr. Koch's question, Mr. Verhulp said we're in the preliminary stages about the possible need for a new agreement.

**Motion** – Mrs. Corkrum: I move we approve a letter to Baker Boyer National Bank regarding New Waste Landfill post closure trust in the amount of \$45,401.38. Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-081. (Exhibit 7)

Mr. Verhulp thanked Ms. Dietrich for attending today and for providing him with documentation that he needed.

**Executive Session** at 12:01 pm based on RCW 42.30.110(1)(i) expected to last 10 minutes for two matters. (Those in the audience left the room.)

**Open Session** at 12:11 pm.

**TREASURER**

Treasurer Tiffany Coffland, Administrative Assistant Daniele Carlson and Human Resources Director Rosie H. Rumsey met with the Board.

**Classification Review**

Ms. Coffland asked for approval to bring in an employee at Step 2 on the new salary schedule because she feels her qualifications and background will warrant that placement. The request will not need any more money from the Treasurer's budget.

Mrs. Corkrum asked about steps and grade levels. Ms. Coffland and Ms. Rumsey explained the reasoning for the placement level. Mrs. Corkrum does not want to mix the current salary schedule with the Hay Group schedule that may be approved soon by the unions. She said the current union salary schedule is what should be used.

Ms. Coffland said the employee would be placed at Grade 36 at the step of salary that would bring her up to the Grade 14 Step 2 at the time the new salary schedule comes into play. It's a \$3000 a year increase. Mrs. Corkrum said she understands Ms. Coffland's feelings about the qualifications and background but she thinks the increase is too much to begin with. Ms. Coffland said the contract says go up a grade and

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

one step over. Mrs. Corkrum said a six-month grace period could be used before the higher salary.

After discussion, Ms. Coffland recommends approval for the employee to come in at Grade 36 and be placed at the step so if/when the Hay Group study is adopted she would be at a Grade 14, Step 2. It would not mean any more money to the Treasurer's budget. The request will have to be re-clarified and reviewed again by the Classification Committee. The Board gave **consensus approval**.

Treasurer Department Update

Tax statements were mailed out on February 15. The Treasurer's Office is using a new post office box that is working very well.

Ms. Coffland would like to send a notice to the media so taxpayers are made aware of the new security and can choose to mail in tax payments instead of coming to the courthouse.

Ms. Coffland would like to send notices to title companies and taxing districts as well regarding the new security system as well.

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

County Administrator's Secretary Bridgette Scott and Security Director Rick Rochleau met with the Board.

Out-of-State Travel

**Motion** – Mr. Miller: I move that we approve out-of-state travel request for Fred Bowen for Washington, D.C., February 29 through March 5. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 8)

Basin City Planning-Only Grant

Ms. Scott said a public hearing is necessary to close out the grant process. It is being scheduled.

Security

Mr. Rochleau gave an update on the Security Department work. The security screening is scheduled to begin March 3. Mrs. Corkrum would like to have a press

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

conference a few days before the screening begins with the commissioners involved. She has told the press that there would be a press conference and they would be invited.

Olympia Security has their screeners hired and is doing their training this week. Gates have been tested and are functioning.

Mr. Rochleau has been working on security policies.

Mr. Verhulp is preparing a resolution that expands the area of the weapons-free zone to include the perimeter of the building and fencing, not just the building.

**PUBLIC WORKS**

Contract: Sierra Electric, Inc. – CRP 596/R170 Landslide Area Phase I Canal Relocation Electrical Work

**Motion** – Mrs. Corkrum: I move for approval regarding contract between Franklin County Public Works and Sierra Electric, Inc., CRP 596/R170 Landslide Area Phase 1 Canal Relocation Electrical Work. Second by Mr. Miller. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-082. (Exhibit 9: Bid comparison)

Contract: Copenhaver Construction, CRP 592 / Gravel Road Paving Upgrades Group 3, Crestloch Road, Cypress Drive, Fir Road and Everett Road

**Motion** – Mr. Miller: I move for approval of contract between Franklin County Public Works and Copenhaver Construction, CRP 592/ Gravel Road Paving Upgrades Group 3, Crestloch Road, Cypress Drive, Fir Road and Everett Road. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2008-083. (Exhibit 10: Bid comparison)

**Recessed** at 1:07 pm. until Tuesday, February 26, 2008.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 49  
FRANKLIN COUNTY  
Commissioners' Proceeding for February 25, 2008

There being further business, the Franklin County Board of Commissioners meeting was recessed until Tuesday, February 26, 2008.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
FRANKLIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

---

Chairman

---

Chairman Pro Tem

---

Member

Attest:

---

Clerk to the Board

Approved and signed March 12, 2008.