The Honorable Board of Franklin County Commissioners met on the above date. Present for the meeting were Neva J. Corkrum, Chair Pro Tem; and Rick Miller, Member; Fred Bowen, County Administrator; and Patricia L. Shults, Clerk Pro Tem to the Board. Bob Koch, Chairman, was absent attending an Invasive Species Council meeting in Seattle, Washington.

OFFICE BUSINESS

Indigent Defense Coordinator Ray Gonzales introduced his secretary, Judy

Paxton, to the Board. Present in the audience: Linda Edmiston.

Consent Agenda

<u>Motion</u> - Mr. Miller: I move we accept the consent agenda for August 20, 2007, and to authorize the Chairman to sign upon his return for those listed:

- 1. Approval of **joint Resolution 2007-433** in the matter of the request for signature from the Chairman of the Boards of Benton and Franklin County Commissioners on the Professional Service Agreement for legal representation of indigent individuals in Benton and Franklin Counties Superior Court, Juvenile Division, between the Juvenile Justice Center and Laurie L. Magan, for criminal defense and chemical dependency disposition alternative (CDDA), with said agreement effective through December 31, 2009. (Exhibit 1: Information sheet.)
- 2. Approval of **joint Resolution 2007-434** in the matter of the request for signature from the Chairman of the Boards of Benton and Franklin County Commissioners on the Professional Service Agreement for legal representation of indigent individuals in Benton and Franklin Counties Superior Court, Juvenile Division, between the Juvenile Justice Center and Michael J. Morgan, for criminal defense, with said agreement effective through December 31, 2009. (Exhibit 2: Information sheet.)
- 3. Approval of **joint Resolution 2007-435** in the matter of the request for signature from the Chairman of the Boards of Benton and Franklin County Commissioners on the Professional Service Agreement for legal representation of indigent individuals in Benton and Franklin Counties Superior Court, Juvenile Division, between the Juvenile Justice Center and Karyn K. Oldfield, for criminal defense and drug court defense, with said agreement effective through December 31, 2009. (Exhibit 3: Information sheet.)

Second by Commissioner Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor.

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson and Assistant Director Greg Wendt met with the Board. Present in the audience: Dan Voss, Linda Edmiston and Keith Middleton.

Public Hearing: SP 2007-19 for an application by Voss Farms LTD Partnership (Dan Voss) to short plat approximately 165.04 acres into two lots. As proposed, Lot #1 is approximately 162.72 acres in size and Lot #2 is approximately 2.32 acres in size. The property is located in the Agricultural Production 20 (AP-20) Zoning District.

Public Hearing convened at 9:15 am. Present: Commissioners Corkrum and Miller; Planning Director Jerrod MacPherson; Assistant Director Greg Wendt; County Administrator Fred Bowen, and Pro Tem Clerk to the Board Patricia Shults. Present in audience: Dan Voss, Linda Edmiston, and Keith Middleton.

Mr. Wendt reviewed the information on the Action Summary (Exhibit 4). The Planning Department is recommending preliminary approval subject to the seven findings of fact and seven conditions as shown in the staff report.

Mr. MacPherson showed an aerial photograph with parcel and aerial overlays. He believes the Voss's are separating a corner to build a single family home. He indicated they had a discussion about the right of way for East Foster Wells Road. It is within the Federal project boundaries but is not part of the irrigation block.

Mr. Voss stated it was originally going to be proposed Block 172, if the second half of the irrigation project went in, which it never did.

Mr. MacPherson said it was a unique situation. United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and South Columbia Basin Irrigation District (SCBID) have to sign off on the plat if it doesn't involve any project facilities. The parcel number listed in the Treasurer's Certificate is incorrect. Minor corrections need to take place on the plat from the surveyor. Our fire code official, due to lack of fire protection, is requesting increased setbacks for any proposed structures and is requesting that language be placed on the plat. The Public Works Department has indicated the closure notes submitted are adequate. Public Works also requested a 30-foot corridor adjacent to the west line of proposed

Lot #2 be labeled as a 30-foot access easement for Piekarski Road. Lots 1 and 2 are both subject to park dedication fees of \$50.00 when any home is built on either lot. They have the standard one-year approval.

Mrs. Corkrum asked three times if anyone in the audience would like to speak in opposition of the short plat. There was no response.

Mrs. Corkrum asked three times if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor.

Dan Voss introduced himself, providing his address as 1280 Voss Road, Pasco. He stated he is in favor of the short plat.

There were no further responses in favor.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if they were in the new proposed fire district.

Mr. MacPherson stated they were located in Fire District #3, but due to the lack of water on site the Fire Official desired to have that language on the plat so if there is a fire on the structure they can isolate it to one structure.

<u>Motion</u> – Mr. Miller: I move we grant preliminary approval of Short Plat 2007-19 subject to the seven findings of fact and seven conditions of approval. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2007-436.

Final Approval for Short Plat SP 2007-14, Ray and Vanae Knight

Mr. MacPherson stated he would like to obtain the Chairman's signature on three final short plats.

<u>Motion</u> – Mr. Miller: I move for final approval for Short Plat 2007-14 for Ray and Vanae Knight. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2007-437.

Final Approval for Short Plat SP 2007-15, Ray and Vanae Knight

<u>Motion</u> – Mr. Miller: I move for final approval of Short Plat 2007-15 for Ray and Vanae Knight. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2007-438. Final Approval for Short Plat SP 2007-18, Clyde Enterprises, LLC

<u>Motion</u> – Mr. Miller: I move for final approval of Short Plat 2007-18 for Clyde Enterprises, LLC. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2007-439.

TRAC

TRAC Manager Troy Woody met with the Board.

Weekend Events

Mrs. Corkrum asked how the weekend event was. Mr. Woody stated the dance and rodeo went well. They had 3,500 to 4,000 attend. He hasn't seen the bar sales yet but they should be fairly solid, just from observing them.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if they had any noise problems with the City of Pasco. Mr. Woody stated they haven't had a single noise complaint since the first dance when he first started. It's as simple as keeping the doors closed.

Retreat Agenda

Mr. Woody discussed the retreat scheduled for August 30, 2007, at Anthony's Banquet and Event Center. The TRAC management team, Dave Beach from the Advisory Board, Fred Bowen and Neva Corkrum will be the participants. He wants to make sure everyone is on the same page of where they're at and plan to do some basic organizational chart analysis. He expects to brainstorm for the major portion of the day. He wants to break out of the paradigms. If they could totally change the business model, how would they do it? What can we and can't we do? He's been through a number of these in the past and has never come out of one that you don't get a couple really good ideas when you get that good of a mix of people. When the retreat is finished, he will finalize some notes and a to-do list and bring it back to the full Board.

Recessed at 9:56 am.

Reconvened at 10:18 am.

COURTHOUSE SECURITY

Mr. Bowen asked the Board if they were interested in pursuing someone to write our security policy.

Mrs. Corkrum indicated that former Franklin County Clerk Beverly Finke brought in an expert one time that went through security in the Courthouse and made suggestions. That's when the idea for only having one entrance came up. She thought he was a former state patrolman. Mr. Bowen thought he was a U.S. Marshal. The U.S. Marshal was the one that gave him the idea for the perimeter fencing.

PUBLIC WORKS

Assistant Public Works Director Guy Walters met with the Board. County Road Project – CRP 597/Mound Road and Highway 124 Intersection Upgrade

Mr. Walters stated the gravel intersection on Mound Road and Highway 124 will have two applications of bituminous surface treatments about 150 feet back, so the blade man doesn't have to get out in the middle of the highway to turn around. They found out this is actually in Adams County. It's kind of an abandoned highway. Mr. Fife talked with Adams County and they are happy we're doing it. We hope to be reimbursed. <u>Motion</u> – Mr. Miller: I move we pass a resolution initiating a county road project designated as CRP 597 / Mound Road and Highway 124 Intersection upgrade. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor. This is Resolution 2007-440.

Vouchers

<u>Motion</u> – Mr. Miller: I move that we sign for the vouches as listed for Solid Waste Fund, County Road Fund and Motor Vehicle Fund. (Solid Waste Funds for a total of \$3,319.14; County Road Fund for a total of \$160,589.42; and Motor Vehicle & Public Equipment Fund for a total of \$41,953.18.) Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 5)

New policy

Mr. Walters indicated they had a break-in last week in a couple of their vehicles. There appeared to be gas missing. The Public Works Director developed a new general policy for their Policy and Procedure Manual as far as when gates should be locked. The Road Department works on a four-ten basis; our survey crew and some inspectors work Fridays. When they leave the yard, usually the gate is wide open all day long. Under the

new policy they will instruct everyone to keep the gate closed at all times when the shop is not open.

Mrs. Corkrum asked who would be out there on the weekend. Mr. Walters indicated they allow people to bring their personal cars in for oil changes as long as they keep everything locked up. The other problem is the Sheriff's Department because they all have keys. They plan to send a memo to them, too, to inform them of the new policy.

Mr. Walters gave the Board a copy of the draft policy for their review. If they don't have any problems with it, they will ask the Board to adopt it for placement in their policy manual.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if the policy would come with a resolution for adoption. Mr. Walters thought it would.

<u>R-170</u>

Mr. Walters notified the Board that R-170 was closed this morning. They thought they had three inches of asphalt but he was notified it's more like six inches of rock and asphalt that they can't scrape off.

PROSECUTOR

Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor Ryan Verhulp met with the Board.

Mr. Verhulp did not have anything to discuss with the Board. He did send a memo to Information Services regarding the bidding irregularity with the request for proposals for the x-ray scanning equipment, how one bid did not have sales tax and shipping costs.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if we were going to award the bid today. Mr. Bowen indicated he is going to ask to have it extended to August 29th. Mr. Bowen told Mr. Verhulp they did check into that irregularity and it did include shipping but it did not include sales tax. They're still looking into it. He asked Information Services personnel to contact the company that sent the proposal and explain to us in writing why sales tax was not put in, so we're not just taking it for granted. He doesn't know if they found out their bid was considerably lower, so if they just say they didn't have sales tax in there and now they want to add it, they jump another \$2,000, when in fact the original bid did have

sales tax. He doesn't know that and wants something in writing so they don't just add \$2,000 to the bid. The Request for Proposal (RFP) states you need sales tax and shipping. Why did they do shipping and not sales tax? The experts that looked over the bid determined that the lowest one was actually the better piece of equipment. He asked them (the experts) to look at serviceability of the equipment because you might have the finest piece of equipment in town, but if you have no way of repairing it, it's no longer the finest piece of equipment.

Mr. Verhulp stated he didn't know that shipping was included, as it wasn't referenced as he looked through the bid. Mrs. Corkrum asked if that was just verbal. Mr. Bowen indicated it was according to the consultant's report. The consultant stated that shipping was included but sales tax was not.

Mr. Bowen stated it's kind of a complicated piece of equipment. He was speaking to the security officer for Benton County and maintenance is an important factor. If you don't have a maintenance contractor on site quickly, it may be down for a number of days. The equipment comes out of Vancouver, Washington. We don't know how long it would take them to repair it if it goes down.

Mrs. Corkrum wondered why we were having so much trouble with our bids lately. Mr. Verhulp stated he referenced that Yakima County in their RFPs state something to the effect that if there is a failure to reference everything in the price, then the bid is out, absolutely disqualified. That's the easiest way to take care of irregularities. Mrs. Corkrum stated that is what we should do. Mr. Bowen suggested we develop a bid sheet for them to check items off to ensure the bid is complete. Mrs. Corkrum asked should that be a policy? Mr. Verhulp indicated it wouldn't be bad to have a policy. <u>Security System RFP</u>

Mr. Bowen mentioned to Mr. Verhulp that he had a draft RFP for the security system ready to send for review. He will forward it to the committee, requesting comments and changes. There are some insurance issues he wants Mr. Verhulp to look at. Any recommendations will be appreciated.

Mrs. Corkrum asked Mr. Bowen to work with Mr. Verhulp regarding the security badges the county is going to have. Mr. Bowen stated that the Information Services Director made a recommendation that we hire a consultant to write our security policy.

Mrs. Corkrum stated that staff at Emergency Management taking the pictures indicated to Mr. Koch all the different irregularities that are happening, as different offices want different things on the badges. If it's for our security system, everyone should have the same swipe card and have the same identification badge. Mr. Bowen agrees. It's ridiculous that we can't have something uniform for Franklin County. Mr. Miller and Mr. Verhulp agreed.

Mr. Verhulp indicated the Board may need some other standard policies that would apply to all the employees, as he anticipates having issues with employees. Elected and designated officials will have access at different points but he expects the challenge of preventing other employees from accessing at those points. There will need to be a clear policy setting forth guidelines to all the employees: you can only come through point "A" and that's it.

Mrs. Corkrum stated she knows the Prosecutor's Office has attorneys that come in on the weekend to work and they need to have some kind of a system for entry. Mr. Bowen stated all we are trying to do at best is to keep weapons from coming into the grounds. The security measures are for the domestic trials. Mrs. Corkrum stated the worst case she knows about was in California, in which an off-duty sheriff's deputy was going through a divorce and they were having a heated argument over child custody and they didn't check him. They had security but they didn't check him because he was a police officer and he was going to court. He shot his estranged wife and the judge. That was 10 to 15 years ago. That always sticks in her mind. If you're going to have security you need to have it for everybody.

Mr. Verhulp stated if you're using a security consultant they will be able to uniquely address that through a particular policy, meaning if it's a law enforcement officer who is off duty and he's coming to court, then there may be parameters on if they can bring weapons into the Courthouse.

Mr. Bowen indicated he will be writing another RFP. Mrs. Corkrum stated that takes the politics out of the situation.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

County Administrator Fred Bowen met with the Board.

Bid Award: X-Ray Scanning Equipment and Walk-Thru Metal Detection

Mr. Bowen recommends the bid award be extended to August 29, 2007, as staff is still going through the proposals. There are some unanswered questions.

Mr. Miller indicated he would be gone on that date. Mr. Bowen stated it would be four to six weeks out before equipment is received and at best we will be opening that security system up by the first of next year.

<u>Motion</u> – Mr. Miller: Mrs. Chairman, I move that we continue the bid award for security system metal detection equipment and x-ray scanning equipment till September 5, 2007. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor

District Court

Mr. Bowen indicated he received a letters by email from Terrie Yonts and Kelly Martin in District Court. He asked the Board to take a minute to review.

Mrs. Corkrum asked why can't a deputy sheriff be here during working hours? Mr. Bowen stated if you're willing to hire another deputy to be here full time then the Sheriff would be willing to rotate to have someone here. He would rotate them to where they would not be consistent. It would be similar to what is happening at the airport. He indicated it was urgent to Ms. Yonts, so he told her to call J&J Security for this particular time, this coming Wednesday, August 22, 2007. These are limited commissioned officers. He told her he wanted to talk it over with the Board for future commitments because it would increase our budget.

He told the Board what he was up against in putting out the request for proposal for security screeners. The screeners will be noncommissioned, they have no arresting authority, they have no more rights than a civilian or private citizen, they are not to carry weapons, they are not to detain, they are just there to do screening.

We currently have J&J Security in Superior Court during the trials, but District Court does not have bailiffs. Superior Court does have bailiffs and they are armed. District Court does not have that same privilege. Up until a week or so ago, Judge Roach found out that the jailors are only there to protect the prisoners. They are not there to protect the judge. Now they're asking to have a limited commissioned officer in their courtrooms at certain times due to certain trials that are going on.

Back to the security RFP, he's considering hiring a full-time security manager, controlled by the Commissioners.

Ms. Connie Curiel joined the audience.

Mr. Bowen continued, stating that a full-time security manager would be a limited commissioned officer. But they may need to have another limited commissioned officer that is the one that monitors the cameras and also roving through the Courthouse, going to the courtrooms. This is not saying the manager can't do this. These are just questions that are coming up.

Mrs. Corkrum asked could we eliminate J&J Security then? Mr. Bowen indicated we could or we put a limited officer in the RFP and they would have to supply one if one was sick or on vacation. But we would still have our own, which would be a full-time position. These are obstacles that he's up against. He thought they could eliminate J&J Security once they put security out front but everyone involved says they still need security in the courtrooms.

Mrs. Corkrum stated they have bailiffs. Mr. Bowen said Superior Court does. District Court does not. His question to the Board is are you willing to provide District Court with J&J Security at this particular time to carry them through the end of the year while he does this whole security process? It will impact the budget by \$200,000 to \$250,000 a year.

Mrs. Corkrum stated something has to give regarding the budget. Mrs. Corkrum asked why is it coming up now? Mr. Bowen said it is going to be interesting to add a quarter million to the budget, especially when the Planners need help, Information

Services needs help, and the Prosecuting Attorney's Office needs help. So this budget process is going to be interesting.

It became a concern when the judge realized the bailiff was there to protect the prisoners and not the judge. Mr. Miller asked what the difference was. If he (the bailiff) is there, he's going to protect whoever. If the prisoner is going to attack the judge, he's still going to be there. Mr. Bowen didn't think they were worried about the prisoners attacking the judge. They're worried about someone else in the courtroom. The bailiff will gather the prisoner and take them out of the courtroom if an outburst occurs.

Mrs. Corkrum asked how many outbursts have we had? Mr. Bowen stated, other than someone throwing a chair around in the last couple of years, he couldn't think of any. Mrs. Corkrum stated that was many years ago and that's the only incident she knows of. Mr. Bowen understands where she's coming from. He's not the one asking for this, he's relaying the message. Mr. Miller thinks Mr. Koch should have some input into this. Mrs. Corkrum thinks we need to discuss this further. Mr. Bowen will bring this back to the Board.

AUDITOR

Connie Curiel met with the Board, representing the Auditor's Office for the award of bid for the Recording Office.

Bid Award: Franklin County Document Recording System

Mrs. Corkrum asked if this was the only proposal they received (from Aptitude Solutions). Ms. Curiel indicated it was. Mrs. Corkrum asked if this was going to do the job that they wanted it to do. Ms. Curiel stated yes.

Mr. Miller asked what the anticipated price was. Ms. Curiel stated they gave them a very good price. They gave them quite a few discounts for being the first county in the state to purchase the software.

Mrs. Corkrum asked how this was going to be paid for. Ms. Curiel stated that was to be determined. They (Aptitude Solutions) agreed to do whatever we need to do as far as payments. Ms. Lenhart had spoken to them about a certain percentage when we implement and then another percentage in a year.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if it would come from the Auditor's O&M budget. Ms. Curiel stated yes, that was in their budget request during the budget workshop for the 2007 budget. They requested \$203,000 but this is coming in quite a bit less. She mentioned that the price does not include the hardware. The hardware is to be purchased through the Information Services (IS) Department.

Mrs. Corkrum asked what that fee would be. Ms. Curiel did not know yet. They had the specifications, which were given to IS. When they get the contract signed they will know exactly what they need.

Mr. Bowen asked will the Auditor's O&M pick up the cost of hardware? Ms. Curiel indicated it was all included in the request. They came before the Board last year in the budget process. Mr. Bowen indicated he remembered they came through and that budget was approved, but funds were not identified. He thought there was a \$60,000 to \$70,000 shortfall which was expected to be picked up by Current Expense.

Mrs. Corkrum stated if this is paid for in increments, will there be enough money in the O&M Fund for the next year? Ms. Curiel thought that was what Ms. Lenhart had proposed.

Mr. Bowen asked if the Auditor's O&M Committee understood that, because they came back and they were saying it's in the budget and the commissioners need to make up the difference. He told the committee that it wasn't budgeted and the commissioners have not committed to make up the difference.

Mrs. Corkrum indicated the Board did approve what the other offices wanted for this year. The committee was going to forgo any other requests until this project was paid for, as she understood it.

Ms. Curiel indicated they could go back to the vendor and tell him how much they can afford to pay this year. They haven't signed a contract yet. Mr. Bowen said he was just cautioning the Board because he remembers there was a significant shortfall that had to be picked up by Current Expense. Mr. Bowen and the Board reviewed the 2007 O&M Budget. Mr. Bowen stated the total budget is almost \$300,000. Mrs. Corkrum stated it

says "resources to be provided, \$109,000." Mr. Bowen wanted to know, what resources are they talking about? Budget expenditures were discussed further.

Ms. Curiel reiterated the company is willing to negotiate payments. Mrs. Corkrum asked Ms. Curiel to obtain from the Treasurer's Office exactly how much is in the fund. Mrs. Corkrum indicated to Mr. Bowen that she thought they needed to go forward with this. Mr. Bowen reiterated his concern, that it commits the county to come up with the \$80,000 shortfall. Another concern he had is if they are going to set up payments and it's going to take 100% of the Auditor's O&M funds over a certain period of time, is that the understanding of the committee, because they have the belief those funds need to be shared for preservation.

Mrs. Corkrum stated the funds are for the preservation of legal documents that are required to be recorded. She knows that there was a department head that was upset because they didn't get a piece of the pie. That is when the Auditor O&M Committee was established. But the fund really is for the Auditor. History shows that the Mylar's also had to be recorded. Every survey has to be filed with Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and people at one time used inferior ink. That's why the Board has to sign with black permanent markers, because they were fading out. So it's a state law that everybody had to use the same material for short plats and surveys. Then the fund was established for preserving Auditor's records.

Ms. Curiel presented the Board with a copy from the Treasurer's Office showing how much was in the fund. Mrs. Corkrum stated there was \$157,000 available. Mr. Bowen indicated there was \$300,000 in expenditures all together. Mrs. Corkrum stated that if they make payments in increments it should be all right. They almost have to commit because what they have now is not adequate.

Mr. Miller stated this was just the software. We still need hardware. Mrs. Corkrum stated they didn't know the cost of hardware yet. Ms. Curiel stated they would use existing hardware if it was still good. They will go out to bid through the state contract. She said Ms. Lenhart thought it was cheaper to obtain through the state contract and the Information Services Director concurred.

Mr. Miller asked if the \$157,000 was meant to buy just the software. Ms. Curiel stated what was originally in the budget was \$203,000 for software and hardware. Mr. Miller asked if they had spent that \$203,000 yet. Ms. Curiel stated they had not.

Mrs. Corkrum indicated they wanted to spend \$137,000 of the \$203,000 allocated. Ms. Curiel stated the \$203,000 was the estimate they received from Eagle, now Tyler Technology. Mr. Miller said, then after you spend the \$137,000 you should have \$60,000 left for hardware. But no one knows if it will be more than that. But it is something we need to do.

Ms. Curiel stated that Tyler Technology is going into new software and they don't know how long they can support what we have now, plus it isn't meeting our needs. We need to move forward.

Mr. Bowen asked if it made her nervous to be the first in the state to use Aptitude Solutions. Ms. Curiel stated no, they did their homework. They checked all the references and they went to see the software demo twice. They had heard such bad references from Tyler Technology. Eagle was bought out by Tyler Technology and all the new software they've implemented in different counties in the state is having nothing but problems. After doing our homework, personnel called different references in Colorado and Florida and all the other states currently using this company (Aptitude Solutions) and they absolutely love it. After seeing the software demo she thinks it is going to be very cost effective with the electronic recording they want to do.

Mr. Bowen stated he did not know how many computers they were talking about but computers are only about \$1,500 now, so if you're talking 10 computers that's \$15,000. Ms. Curiel stated they did not need that many computers. What they would do is take their current computers and move them over to the public works stations if they can. Mrs. Corkrum asked how many public works stations they had. Do you have three? Ms. Curiel confirmed they had three computers and two public works stations for the public to come in to access records. Mr. Miller asked, so you just need your normal Dell computer, nothing special, right? Ms. Curiel indicated yes. She stated actually they are scanners. Mrs. Corkrum asked will you be able to use your present printer? Ms. Curiel

indicated they had scanning up front and they will be able to use scanners that are cheaper and hopefully printers that are cheaper. They need to keep one high-volume printer. Their printer is old and is starting to have some problems. And it's the only printer in Recording. That's why Ms. Lenhart wanted to go to the state bid to find good prices.

Mrs. Corkrum asked Mr. Miller if he wanted to postpone this until later. Mr. Miller stated he wished he could get more idea on the hardware. Mr. Bowen stated he wanted to know what funds are identified before the Board moves forward. Ms. Curiel asked if the Board wanted her to call Ms. Lenhart to come speak to the Board, as she was at the Annex. There was continued discussion regarding expenditure items listed in the budget.

Mrs. Corkrum asked if it would harm anything if they came back on September 5th so they could get some more answers. Ms. Curiel stated it would just delay the process. Mr. Miller stated they needed more information before they went forward.

Ms. Curiel left to get the telephone number for Ms. Lenhart at the annex. Mr. Bowen called Chief Accountant Tom Westerman and asked him questions regarding the Auditor O&M budget and what was discussed during the budget workshops. He asked him to join the meeting.

Ms. Curiel returned and Mr. Westerman joined the meeting.

A conference call was made to Ms. Lenhart for clarification. Mr. Bowen asked Ms. Lenhart about the \$80,000 shortfall as he remembered it. Ms. Lenhart stated they have approximately \$158,000 in the fund to date. \$145,000 or whatever the contract amount is (\$137,259.54) is only going to be paid out at 50% at the time of installation and the remainder will be paid out over the next two years. It was about \$4,500 a month. So that will be paid out over the next two years, unless, depending upon what the committee says in terms of other projects. If she can get it paid off sooner, she wants to, because of interest and things like that. But she doesn't want to run the committee short in terms of other projects they may have. No one has said anything to her about anything special. But she always has a hold out for the Clerk's Office because it seems like they're always coming forward with a need. The need is never really small. It seems to her it's pretty

significant, so she always wants to hold out \$50,000 in that fund at all times. She indicated to Mr. Bowen that this money is always allocated priority to the Auditor's project. Mr. Bowen was not disputing that. He thought there was a significant shortfall that needed to be picked up by Current Expense. Ms. Lenhart stated that Current Expense was not going to have to pay anything because there is money there to cover it. Here again, at \$158,000, plus they generate about \$1,200 a month from the Auditor's dollar fees that is kept. There's just not a reason that she can see at this point with the different maintenance agreements we've mostly already paid. In fact, she thinks they are all already paid, aren't they Ms. Curiel? Ms. Curiel stated they were. Ms. Lenhart stated they usually pay them in January, for the Clerk and the Auditor. We're going to pay out about \$70,000 at the time of installation and then about \$5,000 a month. And remember we're still generating money plus they get their big lump at the end of July or first of August. She thinks it was about \$70,000 to \$80,000. So next July they will get that amount of money. So she will not come to the Board in a couple of weeks and say she made a mistake.

Mrs. Corkrum stated what prompted this is that they were looking at the budget and it says Auditor's Recording System Hardware/Software of \$201,882. Then there is another figure for Machinery and Equipment for \$89,000. Is that \$89,000 something different? Ms. Lenhart said no. She has IS Director Kevin Scott getting prices for her right now since we're buying our own equipment. Mr. Scott has not gotten back to her yet and there is no big push yet because they haven't signed the contract. But Mr. Scott said they would be able to do this for \$30,000 for the new equipment (hardware) with them buying off the state bid. It could go up but even then she still has a built-in backup if needed. If she ends up approaching \$50,000 it will worry her a little bit but she won't come to Current Expense for it. She would cut back another year.

Ms. Lenhart stated the public stations are very bad, but when they free up their recording system stations that the staff is using now, they will use them for the public. They will be very prudent about buying the equipment. She has \$30,000 in her mind for the equipment. She doesn't see them having to pay a whole lot more. They will need to

buy three servers. They used to be expensive but they're not expensive any more. So maybe the \$89,000 was something the Clerk wanted but he knows the recording system needs to come first. If they don't have the money, they're not spending the money, and she definitely wants to keep \$50,000 in there because a year ago County Clerk Mike Killian had to buy a reader for microfilm. That wasn't something he planned on. The reader burned out. That's why we keep a reserve, not because we have to but you need to have a reserve in case of unanticipated who knows what.

Mrs. Corkrum asked Mr. Bowen if he was satisfied. Mr. Bowen indicated he was. Ms. Lenhart promised she wouldn't be coming to them for money, not for recording anyway, maybe for accounting but not recording.

The Board thanked Ms. Lenhart.

<u>Motion</u>: Mr. Miller: I move that we accept the Franklin County document recording system bid at \$137,259.55, grand total. Second by Mrs. Corkrum. 2:0 vote in favor. (Exhibit 6)

Adjourned 11:44 am.

There being no further business, the Franklin County Board of Commissioners meeting was adjourned until August 27, 2007.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FRANKLIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Chairman

Chairman Pro Tem

Member

Attest:

Clerk to the Board

Approved and signed August 29, 2007.