

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

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

JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER (JJC)

JJC Director Sharon Paradis met with the Board. Mr. Bowen was absent on other county business.

Request to fill position

Ms. Paradis asked for approval to fill the confidential secretary position because of a retirement. The Board asked Ms. Paradis to get further information from Mr. Bowen.

OFFICE BUSINESS

Present in audience: Steve Spink, Dave Greeno, and John and Anita Farrell.

Proposed resolution regarding jail and court facilities

Mr. Peck has prepared a proposed resolution regarding expansion of the county jail facilities and given a copy to the other Board members. He said the resolution sets forth that we agree it is an important issue, a priority, and that we agree we should be actively looking for funds to try to solve the problem. It does not commit us to any particular course of action but does reassure me that if I'm looking for that funding, I have the support of the other Board members.

Motion – Mr. Peck: I'm going to move that we approve what is currently a draft resolution and this is Franklin County Board of Commissioners consensus on the responsibility to pursue options to fund renovation and expansion of existing county jail and court facilities. Second by Mr. Koch. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2009-110.

Tri-City Herald Reporter Joe Chapman joined the audience.

Vouchers

Motion – Mr. Koch: I move for approval of vouchers as listed: Jail Commissary warrants 14312 through 14317 for \$5,653.13; Current Expense warrants 14318 through 14366 for \$136,507.82; DOC Building Inspection warrant 14442 for \$122,200.47; Reet

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Technology warrant 14443 for \$5,944.59; Trial Court Improvement warrant 14444 for \$337.00; and Current Expense warrants 14445 through 14478 for \$13,571.54; for a total amount of \$284,214.55. Second by Mr. Peck. 3:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 1)

Sharon Paradis joined the audience.

Minutes

Motion – Mr. Koch: I move to approve Commissioners Proceedings for March 9, 2009. Commissioner Miller was absent. Second by Mr. Peck. 2:0 vote in favor.

JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER (JJC)

JJC Director Sharon Paradis reported to the Board that County Administrator Fred Bowen gave approval for her to fill the secretarial position. The Board also **gave approval**.

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson and Planner Jeremy Underwood met with the Board.

Closed Record Public Hearing: Subdivision SUB 2009-01, an appeal of the Franklin County Planning Commission's recommendation of approval for an application by Big Sky Developers. The appeal was filed by John Farrell. SUB 2009-01 is a land use application to subdivide approximately 9.42 acres into 14 single-family residential lots. The north half of the property is zoned Medium Density Residential (R-2) while the south half of the property is zoned Residential Suburban-20,000 (RS-20). Both zoning designations allow half acre residential lots.

Closed Record Public Hearing convened at 9:15 am. Present: Commissioners Miller, Koch and Peck; Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson; Assistant Director Greg Wendt; Planner Jeremy Underwood; and Clerk to the Board Mary Withers. Present in audience: John and Anita Farrell, Steve Spink of Spink Engineering, Dave Greeno and Brad Seabaugh of Big Sky Developers, Joe Chapman and Tim Fife.

Mr. Miller explained the Closed Record Public Hearing process.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the information on the Action Summary (Exhibit 2).

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Mr. MacPherson showed a copy of a 2007 aerial photograph with parcel overlay on the screen. He showed a copy of the zoning map.

County Administrator Fred Bowen joined the meeting.

Mr. MacPherson showed a copy of the plat that was submitted by the applicant on the screen.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the Conditions of Approval. Mr. Wendt said Mr. Farrell is the appellant and his argument is included in the paperwork. The Planning Commission recommended approval with six Findings of Fact and 10 Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Miller asked the appellant or appellant representative to present the appeal argument based upon the record from the Planning Commission open record hearing.

John Farrell, 5313 West Court, Pasco. I am the appellant of this. With Mr. Miller's permission, Mr. Farrell gave the Board copies of paperwork that he said has already been included.

Mr. Farrell said the first thing I'd like to bring up is that it was pretty misleading on the initial discussion about this, what us as the neighborhood have complained about. He asked Mr. MacPherson to bring up the aerial picture. Mr. Farrell said we weren't excited about the zone change primarily because of the opportunity of having R2 zoning in there. It was previously commercial. If you notice what I've said is they actually have said that the property to the north are half acre lots or smaller but you'll see that everything to the north of the proposed subdivision is at least .99 acre. Mr. Farrell pointed out sizes of lots to the north. The lots to the west are .43 acres but oriented in a way that the 165 feet runs this way (indicated) so it gives it a real expansive look instead of some others that he pointed out.

Mr. Farrell said they talked about wanting to make sure it was consistent. When the information was given it said they're all half acre or smaller but you can readily see these are not half acre or smaller. That's what we're talking about being consistent, is making sure that as you drive down Court Street you're going to be looking at open and expansive pieces of property instead of back yards or side yards which really will detract from the look of Franklin County.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Mr. Farrell said when you drive down Court Street, all of these properties do have access off of Court Street. I know that's a concern. It's been discouraged for access for safety but I can tell you that there's not any more accidents along Court Street than other streets. Of all of these properties that surround this -- 13 actually touch it -- nine of them are larger than .9 of an acre. So that's what we're talking about being consistent and customary. That's 70%. Out of the 49 which received notifications, 27 of them are larger than half acre. That's majority. That's 55%. That is normal; that is customary.

Mr. Farrell said we're not against the subdivision but we would like to see these front lots have a face view of Court Street just like everything else along Court Street has. That's normal and customary. He pointed out his subdivision of seven lots on the screen to give an example of how it was buffered.

Mr. Farrell said I went out and by record we got 12 notifications, first of the zone change opposition and then of the subdivision opposition once we saw the plat map. I did that in just a couple hours. I got 12 homeowners to sign that or to say that they were in opposition. If I would have spent any more time on that, I could have got 30 or more. Again, that's the majority. That's not minority.

Mr. Farrell said we want to make sure our voice is heard, that it stays consistent and even as the record shows. He referred to some other nearby developments. He wants Court Street to look open and expansive. He said it seemed like it was on the issue that they were misled that they were half acres or smaller but most of the talk at the Planning Commission hearing ended up being about fencing on Court Street: How are we going to hide the back yards and side yards of this development? I don't think that should be an issue of what we should hide. We would like to put our best foot forward in Franklin County and have it look just like the rest of Court Street.

Mr. Farrell said that's really all we're asking for is consideration of what's normal and customary. He does not want the Commissioners to be misled like the Planning Commission was misled.

Mr. Miller asked the opponent or representative to present their appeal argument based on the record from the Planning Commission open record hearing.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Steve Spink, 1422 Hunt Avenue in Richland. First of all, obviously we're meeting all the requirements of the current zoning. The access onto Court Street is pretty typical to minimize access onto major arterials. That's a requirement we understand and we're meeting that. That's about all I have to say. We're meeting the requirements of the current zoning right now. That's it.

Dave Greeno, 12406 Eagle Reach Court, Pasco. When we started this plat with Big Sky Developers, my partner Brad Seabaugh and myself, we wanted to do what was offered by the county. When we put forth our plan, they didn't want us to have any access off of Court Street period, end of discussion, for their reasons. We were fine with that and that's what we wanted to do. We don't want to have access off of Court Street. We're going to put an estate-style fence up.

Mr. Greeno said John Farrell was talking about making precedence in the county. The most recent plat that was done is my plat of Lamb Estates, Roads 62 and 64, which is designed the exact same way. You've got Cascade on Road 59 that the county approved and it's done the exact same way as we're proposing this. They look sharp, it's appealing, and it's in the regs. It's what the zoning calls for. It's what we're supposed to do. I'm a little bit confused here. We've got a neighbor that wants it done his way. This is my plat. We're going to do it the way the county says we can do it and that's the bottom line. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Miller asked the commissioners to discuss any necessary questions or comments. Mr. Koch said I have none at this point. I have read through the appeal packet. Mr. Peck said he had no questions.

Mr. MacPherson said he has a point of clarification. He said Mr. Farrell spoke of the lot sizes in the immediate vicinity and referenced a misleading statement in the Staff Report talking about to the north and the statement reads, "The adjoining lots to the immediate west are a half acre size or smaller," so I'm not sure what the misleading statement is about half acre lots to the north. We were specifically referring to the immediate development to the west.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Mr. Peck asked to see the zoning map again. Mr. MacPherson showed it on the screen. Mr. Peck asked is the intent of the zoning plan to mix office, commercial and residential as opposed to eventually having a continuous commercial strip down the main arterial? Mr. MacPherson said the City of Pasco has their comprehensive plan use map, land use map, that we're to comply with, and they have commercial nodes at the intersections. This particular node of the comprehensive plan designation at Road 52 and Court basically has a designation right here (indicated) that says it can be either mixed residential or commercial.

Mr. Peck asked when the R2 zone was put in place. Mr. Wendt said in 2008. Mr. MacPherson said it was done for this specific property (indicated).

Mr. Peck asked about the property immediately north of Mr. Farrell's. Mr. Farrell said he thinks it was rezoned in 2001.

Mr. Peck said Mr. Farrell was talking about the properties facing Court so that you didn't have back yards and side yards. He asked Mr. Farrell is it the issue of the appearance or the access to Court? Mr. Farrell said just so you don't see the backyard look or the side yard look. If the houses face Court Street, you would have what is normal and customary along Court Street.

Mr. Peck said even without the immediate access to Court, it's just the visual appearance of the facing. He asked was that an option that was considered? Mr. MacPherson said there you're getting into specific home designs and we're just reviewing the plat. We've never gone that path before. Lot #2 would not work.

Mr. Peck said if there's common ground between the developer and the adjoining landowners on three of those lots, everybody could be satisfied.

Steve Spink said the access onto Court Street I believe is a safety issue. You don't want to have people backing out.

Mr. Peck clarified what I was asking was without changing the access that exists as drawn, could we eliminate the compound style fence along Court Street and ask that those three northernmost lots have those developments face Court Street to give an appearance consistent with the properties to the west, save you potentially the cost of the

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

fencing, maintain the look of the neighborhood, and still maintain safety and access to Court Street?

Mr. Spink said I don't know for sure. There may be planning and building requirements that might prohibit.

Mr. Peck said it sounds like the answer is it could but you're not in a position to commit without looking at it closer and talking to the Planning Department?

Mr. Spink said that's correct.

Mr. MacPherson gave an example of a problem that could occur. Mr. Wendt gave an example of a fencing problem that could occur.

Mr. Spink said that would be pretty contrary to your normal practices with development.

Mr. Koch asked are we supposed to have the front door at the access to the property? Mr. MacPherson is not sure if it's tied to the front door or the access point.

Mr. Peck said I'm not a planner. I'm not trying to be. I'm trying to find common ground where we can satisfy the largest number of people. I guess instinctively I've got to believe we're smart enough to figure out how to do this.

Mr. MacPherson said it would entail a redesign.

Mr. Peck invited Mr. Farrell to speak. Mr. Farrell said now's the time to do this, to change the plat. That's what we've been trying to do since zoning issues was to get the plat consistent with what's going on in this area. We fought the zoning, we fought the plat, and now we're appealing it, and the issue is still the same. We're not against development. We just want it consistent with what's been happening on Court Street. It needs to be changed a bit. Maybe there is access granted. Again, you've got access all the way down Court Street and I don't see that that's a real issue. Maybe there's a joint access given a couple of those lots. Two of those lots could have side access into them. Now is the time to do it, before this is approved and then everybody around there suffers from the decision that's made.

Mr. Peck said he is interested to know if at least the three northernmost lots could have development standards that gave the appearance at least that those properties looked

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

outward to Court Street and not the monument or compound style fence, if that would satisfy all your concerns. He would be interested in hearing from the developers if that's something that could be achieved. The orientation of those homes is anything but consistent in that area. They face every which way. I do have a concern about traffic entries onto Court Street as the population increases and as the area naturally fills in.

Brad Seabaugh, 6718 Ranch Road in West Richland, spoke. He asked Mr. MacPherson to show a slide on the screen. He said, Mr. Peck, I appreciate your trying to be diplomatic. When we approached this, we made a decision to buy this piece based on what the zoning requirements were. He said in this area, pretty much everyone is going to pull up to the front of their home. He said he doesn't see any feasible way to orient these homes onto Court Street. The zoning won't allow us to have any access onto Court Street and I think it's going to really cripple our subdivision if we have to have people pointing out onto Court Street yet all their parking and all their access points are going to be in the rear of their homes. It's going to disrupt the yard and their family area. There would be other complications about selling the lots. It would be a complete hodgepodge and we would really oppose it.

Mr. Peck said I would argue we're talking three, not all the lots, first off. Secondly, the assumption that you have to put the parking in the back is just an assumption. Even not being an architect I could draw side access. He gave an example. He said I think what you're really telling us is we would reduce your flexibility in siting those three homes.

Mr. Seabaugh said I think it would affect at least five of the lots directly because you'd have neighbor issues that would be involved. I just think it would be a compromise that we would strictly oppose and we would have to completely go back and revisit the plat as a whole. We've already got so many things done on it. I can appreciate the neighborhood but I don't think we're detracting from the neighborhood. I just don't agree with that argument.

Mr. Koch said we also have two homes east and west of that property that are accessed off of collector roads, not off Court Street.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Mr. MacPherson said Road 52 and Road 54 are access points.

Mr. Peck asked Mr. Miller and Mr. Koch if they have any thoughts on facing to Court Street; is that a reasonable compromise?

Mr. Miller said this is a tough situation because the area is changing and the way things are being built now has changed. He said I don't really have any comments. I think we've got some regulations and we've got zoning. I think we better look at that.

Mr. Koch said also going up and down Court Street, there are other areas that have fencing along Court Street. It's there for a lifetime. The fencing doesn't go away even if the vinyl were colored. I just think, again for safety's sake, most of those homes were built before Court Street got very busy.

Mr. Peck said I'm agreeing we ought not to have access directly on Court Street. All I'm suggesting is that it's reasonable to consider looking at those three northern lots and asking the developer to forgo the expensive compound fence which is a cost savings and have those three northernmost homes simply oriented to face Court Street with side access. He gave examples.

Mr. Peck said I understand not wanting to put additional restrictions on a developer. He does not want to make it less interesting to develop in Pasco or Franklin County or more costly or anything else, but if you eliminate the fence there is a significant cost savings.

Mr. MacPherson thinks homeowners on the lots will want to have a fence, particularly if they have children.

Dave Greeno said I thought we were coming with no new testimony. This was never even brought up, switching the houses around. I won't be able to sell the lots. That took my market from this (indicated) which is already diminishing down to this (indicated). We'll see. We'll be back here. No one said switch your houses around. They said do one acres.

Now we're saying switch the houses back on the lots. Lot 2, that doesn't work. I'm just confused how that's all unraveling that way. I'd like a little bit of -- I mean, not

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

supposed to bring any new testimony, any new things into this thing, all of a sudden it's switch your house around backwards.

Mr. Miller said this is discussion of the commissioners, not new testimony. It is discussion and questions being asked. He thinks the main purpose of Mr. Peck's discussion was to see if there is any way we could work and make common ground and if you're saying no, it's impossible, then that would be the answer. Mr. Greeno said absolutely. We've been approved. We've already been approved and we're ready to move forward.

Mr. Peck said decisions are made based on the record and we're required to do that. We can't factor in new testimony and new information but we do have full authority to ask questions and seek new information and look for common ground and if all the parties had said that's a great idea, we can do that, we don't need this appeal, then that was the hope. But what I'm hearing you say is not only no but heck no.

Mr. Greeno said yes. Even if that was discussed, that would have to go back to the county and see if it's even legal. It's going to wind up being fenced anyway if that was a recommendation.

Mr. Wendt said to clarify, the Board does have the flexibility through the closed record public hearing to make modifications to the Planning Commission's recommendations.

Mr. Farrell asked isn't this an appeal? Mr. Miller said yes. Mr. Farrell said so what are we appealing? Mr. Miller said the development. Mr. Farrell said so all of this is relevant. Mr. Miller said yes. Mr. Wendt said absolutely. Mr. Farrell said I'm sorry he's confused but this is an appeal process and we're appealing the whole subdivision, which means there's a potential that he may have to change his look in order to satisfy taxpayers and neighbors. I would assume that's what an appeal process does unless we're just doing this for fun.

Mr. Wendt said Commissioner Peck brought up whether or not changing access points and moving houses to front Court Street would affect the county rules. Two things come to mind: The county subdivision ordinance discourages double-frontage lots so the

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

way to mitigate that potential impact is with fencing. The second is whether or not the access points out onto an arterial when there are other options available to the developer and whether that would be in compliance with Franklin County design standards.

Mr. Peck said I wouldn't confuse access with facing. Those are two different things. Mr. Wendt said okay.

Mr. Peck said for the most part he does not see fencing on the two properties to the west that face Court Street. Mr. MacPherson said there is chain link fencing on some corner properties. Mrs. Farrell said there is no fencing there at all.

Mr. Peck said the repeated suggestion that facing those northern properties onto Court would result in those people putting fencing there may or may not be true. Certainly the adjoining neighbors haven't felt the need to do that. Mr. MacPherson said they have the ability to put those fences on.

Mr. Miller asked if there are any questions for Tim Fife. Mr. Koch said he has his questions answered.

Mr. Farrell said it says "it's discouraged." Does that mean no?

Tim Fife said the answer to that question is when practical and in this case it is practical to have your access off of other access roads or other streets. Court Street is an urban principal arterial and as such we want to discourage any access, but if a lot only faces that direction and its only access is Court Street, we can't keep it from getting access to a county road. Therefore, it is allowed from time to time. A lot of this at least to the west was done quite some time ago before Court Street became as vibrant as it is now. It's a safety issue and a capacity issue which work hand in hand. So it's a long-range planning type thing. By allowing access by these three lots onto Court Street, is there capacity to do that right now? Yes. But in the long range it will affect the ability of the road to function as it's designed to function.

Mr. Peck said the answer to Mr. Farrell's question is, it's desired but not mandatory. Mr. Fife said right.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Mr. MacPherson said under ASHTO and design standards, local collector and access roads are encouraged to be utilized if available. The last resort is if they're not there, then you allow the access to arterials.

Mr. Fife said if there are options available to get your access elsewhere, that's what you should be doing.

Mr. Miller asked if there was any more discussion from the Commissioners. There was no response.

Motion – Mr. Koch: Chairman, I would make a motion to deny the appeal request with three Planning Department Responses/Findings as described in Franklin County Action Summary. Further, the Board of Commissioners reaffirms the Planning Commission's positive recommendation and approves Subdivision Application SUB 2009-01 subject to the six findings of fact and 10 conditions. Second by Mr. Peck. 2:1 vote in favor. Yea: Mr. Koch and Mr. Miller. Nay: Mr. Peck. This is Resolution 2009-109.

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson met with the Board. Present in audience: Tim Fife and Joe Chapman.

February Building Report

The February Building Report was reviewed.

Recessed at 10:06 am.

Reconvened at 10:18 am.

PUBLIC WORKS

Engineer Tim Fife met with the Board.

Bid Award: 2009 Emulsified Asphalt

Two bids were received by the Public Works Department. Mr. Fife described the process that was used to evaluate the bids.

Motion – Mr. Koch: I would move that we accept the 2009 emulsified asphalt bid award to Idaho Asphalt for the bottom line of \$1,516,846.80. Second by Mr. Peck. 3:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 3)

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Bid Award: 2009 Bituminous Surface Treatment Aggregate

Mr. Fife recommended awarding the bid to three separate companies in the amounts shown. He explained how different companies deliver to different locations. Each bidder has been consulted. Each bidder is willing to honor their bid price for a portion of the total amount.

Motion – Mr. Peck: I would move approval of 2009 BST aggregate bid award. Second by Mr. Koch. 3:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 4)

Franklin County Association of Wheat Growers Letter

Mr. Fife said he has no qualms about having a committee involved in weed control. He gave the Board a copy of minutes taken at a meeting of the group that asked for the committee to be formed (Exhibit 5).

Mr. Fife will prepare by-laws for review and approval by the Board. The Board will appoint committee members. The by-laws will make it clear that the committee is an advisory group, not a governing group.

The people have asked to cover the area of the county east of Highway 395. Mr. Peck asked if the same issues exist county-wide. Mr. Fife said yes. Mr. Peck said he feels the committee should cover the entire county.

Road 100 Extension

Mr. Miller said there is interest from some people about not wanting Road 100 Extension to go through using the presently selected route. Mr. Fife said the people we heard that were against it going that way either live or own property in that direction as it was approved. They will see a significant increase in traffic once the road is built. If we went through a process to change the route, we would put the funds in jeopardy, perhaps even having to repay them. We're replacing existing routes that are classified now with this new route. That is how the funding was obtained. The change the people want does not replace an existing route so it probably would not be funded.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

PROSECUTOR

Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor Ryan Verhulp met with the Board.

Qwest Agreement for Dispatch and Information Services

Mr. Verhulp received a contract for review yesterday that he was told needed to be approved immediately by the Board in order to remain qualified for reimbursement funds from the state for the 911 program. He apprised the Board of the issues involved.

Qwest provides our Positron public safety system for the 911 Dispatch Center, providing equipment and software. In 2005 we entered into an agreement with Qwest for them to upgrade some of the equipment. At that time, a resolution was approved that allowed the purchase from Qwest and upgrade of services, stating it was a sole source provider situation where you did not have to go out for bid and could purchase without having to go out for bid.

Now Dispatch wants to upgrade another portion of the Positron public safety system, the rack-mounted telephone consoles that dispatchers use to answer 911 calls. The consoles can only be purchased from Qwest because they are the only ones that interface with the system.

Mr. Verhulp said the Board would have to find that Qwest is a sole source supplier. There are several terms in the agreement that need to be changed before Mr. Verhulp could approve the legal form of the agreement.

In 2005 Mr. Verhulp asked Information Services Director Kevin Scott to get a letter from Qwest certifying that their upgraded equipment was only available through them, was only manufactured by them, and was the lowest price offered for this equipment, which essentially safeguards the county at the time the state auditor looks at it. We don't have a current letter at this time to support any finding that you might make that this is a sole source application.

Mr. Koch said we've asked Mr. Verhulp to sign anything the Board is going to sign and if Mr. Verhulp is not comfortable signing it, I'm not either. We've tried to get past the knee-jerk decision making.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Mr. Verhulp said he has entered hand-written revisions to the agreement and the Board could approve that form but of course ultimately Qwest may not approve that form. The second issue is the sole source supply matter.

Recessed at 10:57 am.

Reconvened at 11:01 am.

Dispatch Superintendent Ed Bush and Information Services employee Dan Werr joined the meeting. Present in audience: Eric Hsu.

Mr. Bush said he asked Information Services to work on technical issues of the equipment. He was told a purchase order was needed last Friday. It was a surprise to him. There is no other provider. The grant amount had been \$120,000 but is now around \$90,000.

Mr. Verhulp suggested that the Board could move to sign a revised form of the agreement contingent on receipt of certification letter from Qwest and authorizing the chairman to sign that.

Mr. Koch said I could agree to that with that stipulation.

Motion - Mr. Peck: So moved. Second by Mr. Koch. 3:0 vote in favor. Resolution Number 2009-111 was assigned. (Clerk's Note: Resolution 2009-111 was signed on March 25, 2009, after finalized information was received from Mr. Verhulp.)

OFFICE OF PUBLIC DEFENSE

Indigent Defense Coordinator Eric Hsu met with the Board. Present in audience: Tom Westerman and Robin Stanco.

Executive Session at 11:13 am regarding contract negotiations based on RCW 42.30.140(4) expected to last 10 minutes. Mr. Westerman and Ms. Stanco left the meeting.

Executive Session continued at 11:23 expected to last 10 minutes. Those waiting outside the meeting were notified.

Executive Session continued at 11:33 expected to last 5 minutes. Those waiting outside the meeting were notified.

Open Session at 11:39 am.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

County Administrator Fred Bowen met with the Board. Also present: Tom Westerman and Robin Stanco.

Dispatch: Qwest Agreement

Dispatch Superintendent Ed Bush joined the meeting. He told the Board that the people in the state offices who need to provide information are not available for several days. His suggestion is to wait until Monday so he can bring the appropriate paperwork to the Board. Mr. Miller said the commissioners have indicated a desire to approve pending receipt of a sole source document. We're ready to move forward but we're waiting on them.

Change Order #1 to Professional Services Contract between Franklin County and Accent Business Services, Inc.

Chief Accountant Tom Westerman and Accountant Robin Stanco met with the Board.

Mr. Westerman explained the process that has been occurring to analyze three accounting software requests for proposals. The committee would like to add a fourth proposal using the help of Accent Business Services at a cost of \$2700.

Mr. Bowen said the \$2700 cost is probably well worth it for the size of the project. Mr. Koch agreed.

Motion - Mr. Koch: Chairman, I would move for approval of a resolution, Change Order #1 to Professional Service Contract between Franklin County and Accent Business Services, Inc., for financial software selection, contract negotiation and implementation support services in a revised amount not to exceed \$66,490. Second by Mr. Peck. 3:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2009-112.

Award Request for Statements of Qualifications: Eltopia Water System Project

Harms Engineering was the only firm that responded. Mr. Bowen recommended approval of award letter to Harms Engineering.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

Motion – Mr. Peck: I move we approve the award request for statement of qualifications for the Eltopia Water System Project. Second by Mr. Koch. 3:0 vote in favor.

(Exhibit 5)

CTED Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Interagency Data Sharing Agreement

The Human Services (HS) Department has sent a letter asking that we allow them to manage the HMIS grant and have the money flow through HS. The Community Action Committee (CAC) is also requesting approval to manage the grant. It's a two-year grant for \$20,000 each year. It is to upgrade the computer system and make the data bases consistent across the state of Washington.

Mr. Bowen said Franklin County currently contracts with CAC for two other homeless housing programs (2060 and 2163). He believes Franklin County should be overseeing these contracts more closely. He recommended that we assign the HS Department to manage the HMIS funds and monitor the two contracts with CAC so we will have a direct contact in-house. He thinks it's more responsible for the county to manage the funds this way. He is not suggesting we break the contracts with CAC. All he is doing is suggesting that we appoint HS to monitor the contract and make sure CAC is in compliance. He is not saying they are not in compliance. The CAC contracts would not change. We would ask HS to monitor and report back to the board. The new HMIS funds would be funneled through HS and we would let them manage the HMIS funds for us.

Mr. Bowen said the HMIS administration fee would remain in the Human Services Department instead of being paid to CAC so we would be paying ourselves to have them handle the contracts.

The Board **gave approval** to have Human Services do the contract management for HMIS and monitor two existing CAC contracts.

Recessed at 12:17 pm.

Reconvened at 12:20 pm.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

For clarification, Mr. Bowen asked the Board are you willing to allow Human Services Manager Carrie Huie Pascua to monitor the existing contracts with CAC? Monitor means oversee the use of the funds and make sure everything is in compliance with the contracts we have in place. Mr. Peck asked does that extend to her having direction over how and when and where the funds are used? Mr. Bowen said no. Mr. Peck said it's auditing for how and when and where the funds are used. Mr. Bowen said correct. The Board had **unanimous consensus agreement** to have Human Services Director Carrie Huie Pascua monitor the existing contracts with CAC.

Mr. Bowen has had application from two different agencies, one being our own Human Services and the other being CAC, to manage and distribute the \$20,000 a year for the next two years of HMIS funds. Mr. Bowen's recommendation is to keep it in-house with our own HS department and allow them to manage and disburse the funds. The Board had **unanimous consensus agreement** to have Human Services manage the HMIS funds.

Board of Health Finance Committee

The Board of Health By-Laws require that a County Commissioner be appointed to the Finance Committee. Mr. Bowen can be an alternate if the Board chooses.

Mr. Koch would like to remain on the Finance Committee.

Motion – Mr. Peck: I move that we appoint Commissioner Koch as our representative to the Franklin County Board of Health Finance Committee with the understanding that that service is -- as it is whenever a commissioner is appointed to a commission or board -- that they are there representing the Franklin County Board of Commissioners' interests, and that County Administrator Bowen be the alternate to Mr. Koch. Second by Mr. Koch. 3:0 vote in favor.

Refinancing TRAC Bonds

If TRAC bonds are refinanced, there is a possibility of saving the county more than \$100,000. It wasn't until just recently, January 1, 2009, that the bonds were callable. We can move forward and find a better interest rate now if we so choose to refinance.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

The bond people will draft a document at no cost to the county. If the rates continue to drop, they will hold onto the paperwork and have it ready at the time the county decides to go forward.

Motion – Mr. Peck: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we authorize the County Administrator to consult with our bond counsel and request them to prepare bond refinancing documents and to hold said documents until the Board of Commissioners gives approval to move forward with refinancing of the TRAC bonds. Second by Mr. Koch. 3:0 vote in favor.

Suggestion Award: Vehicle Rental

The Board reviewed a suggestion letter for using rental vehicles instead of being reimbursed for use of personal vehicles. Mr. Miller said he has some concerns about the additional costs for a rental car if it is used extra days than originally planned. Mr. Koch said a phone call can be made to find out.

Mr. Peck said there are more considerations than just cost. He would want to see the travel policy and suggestion program before making a decision.

Mr. Bowen will do more research.

VOUCHERS/WARRANTS

Motion – Mr. Koch: I move approval of payment of Motor Vehicle Fund payroll for \$11,718.92; and County Road Fund payroll for \$78,036.29. Second by Mr. Peck. 3:0 vote in favor.

Adjourned at 12:41 pm.

COMMISSIONERS RECORD 50
FRANKLIN COUNTY
Commissioners' Proceeding for March 18, 2009

There being no further business, the Franklin County Board of Commissioners meeting was adjourned until March 23, 2009.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FRANKLIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Chairman

Chairman Pro Tem

Member

Attest:

Clerk to the Board

Approved and signed March 23, 2009.