

**CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
December 10, 2002**

The Cache County Council convened in a regular session on 26 November 2002 in the Cache County Council Chamber at 120 North 100 West, Logan, Utah.

ATTENDANCE:

Chairman: C. Larry Anhder
Vice Chairman: Layne M. Beck
Council Members: Darrel Gibbons, John Hansen, H. Craig Petersen, Kathy Robison,
Cory Yeates
County Executive: M. Lynn Lemon
County Clerk: Jill N. Zollinger

The following individuals were also in attendance: Tony Baird, Kim Cheshire, Paul Cook, Lorene Greenhalgh, Joe Linton, Sheriff Lynn Nelson, David Nielsen, Evelyn Palmer, Pat Parker, Ray Robison, Sarah Ann Skanchy, Auditor Tamra Stones, Jim Smith, Attorney Scott Wyatt.
Media: Joe Rowley (Herald Journal)

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Anhder called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

INVOCATION:

The invocation was given by John Hansen.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chairman Anhder proposed that under item 11-a, a temporary Chair person be selected to conduct the County Council meeting to be held on January 14, 2003.

Executive Lemon requested the addition of the Value Engineering report and update on the Public Safety Complex for the Jail under 9-b.

There were no objections. The agenda was amended as stated.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of County Council Meeting for November 26, 2002, were reviewed, corrected, and approved. County Executive Lemon and Council member Robison gave their corrections to the Clerk.

Council member Robison moved to approve the minutes of November 26, 2002 as amended. Vice Chairman Beck seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.

County Council
December 10, 2002

REPORT OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE:

Executive Lemon presented a plaque, as a token of appreciation from Cache County to C. Larry Anhder for dedicated commitment and service on the Cache County Council from 1990 to 2002.

Chairman Anhder presented Layne M. Beck with a plaque, as a token of appreciation from Cache County for his commitment and service on the Cache County Council from 1994 to 2002.

(Temporary Extension)	<u>Appointments:</u>	Craig Petersen	Logan/Cache Airport Authority Board
		E. Gordon Kirby	County Road Special Service District Board
		Michael Parson	County Road Special Service District Board
		Stuart Howell	Sheriff's Merit Commission
		Bruce Obray	Citizens Advisory Board for Landfill Siting
		Bill Owen	Citizens Advisory Board for Landfill Siting
		Clair Christiansen	Citizens Advisory Board for Landfill Siting
		Kathleen Howell	County Grievance Committee
		Mark Teuscher	County Grievance Committee
		Dennis Larson	County Grievance Committee
		Mary Yancey	County Grievance Committee
		Dixie Bradley	County Grievance Committee
	Ted Hunter	County Grievance Committee	

Council member Yeates moved to approve the recommended appointments. Hansen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.

Warrants: The warrants for the period of 11-27-2002 to 12-05-2002 were given to the Clerk for filing.

Other Items:

1. RAPZ Tax - The County notified the State Tax Commission concerning the RAPZ tax. It will become effective April 1st, 2003.
2. Board of Health 2.5 Emission Regulations - The Board of Health passed some regulations on ways to control 2.5 emissions. A wood-burning stove with a catalytic converter could be started up to one hour before the regulated requirement to give it some time to heat up. In an emergency situation, a wood-burning stove could be burned if that was the only source of heat for a home. The first violation would be a warning; the second violation would be a "Class B" misdemeanor; and the third would be a "Class A" misdemeanor. The hope is that if the County is proactive, the EPA will look at this and give the County more time to come into compliance if there is a problem. The focus will be on education of the public and encouragement of compliance.

BUDGETARY MATTERS:

County Council
December 10, 2002

There were no budgetary matters brought forward.

THE COUNCIL MOVED INTO THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

TAX SETTLEMENT: HODGES

Executive Lemon explained that there was a misunderstanding with the proposed settlement. They were actually proposing to pay \$75.00 a month not just \$75.00 for the entire settlement in order to keep their property from going to a tax sale.

(See Attachment No. 1)

Council member Gibbons moved to approve the Hodges' tax settlement. Petersen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.

THE COUNCIL ADJOURNED FROM THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

VALUE ENGINEERING REPORT AND UPDATE ON THE PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY OF THE JAIL: SHERIFF LYNN NELSON

Sheriff Nelson expressed his appreciation to the Council and to Executive Lemon for their support of the jail project. He felt that it had been a focal point of a lot of frustrations at this level, the employee level and probably at the public level too.

Nelson recently spent time with some Council members and Executive Lemon discussing the funding issues of the building and of staffing, etc. Some of the comments from the Council requested that Nelson address some of the staffing issues tonight so that the public was more aware.

NELSON: As we have reviewed and gone through this designing process, we have a plan in place that will solve funding issues and will make a building that will last longer than what we started with a year ago. I think that was a real key direction that I at least perceived from the Council, to make it a design and cost-effective building and an efficient building.

Part of that process has been alterations we have made in our current jail. By adding beds to our jail, we have saved probably close to \$700,000.00 in next year's budget.

I appreciate the Council moving ahead with hiring new staff for the Jail. The frustrations never seem to end. We just get people hired and currently we have six people out on medical injuries. We just never can seem to get to the point where you can run the operation and have all the people there that we need. I just say that so that you know the staffing that has come on board is helping us to make ends meet.

The cost of the building is important and we have kept our goal in mind of trying to design a building within that budget. It hasn't quite worked out that way but we still, I think, have developed a building that is extremely cost effective and more importantly is more efficient so

County Council
December 10, 2002

that we can run our staff. Even though there are some slight increases, we are increasing the number of inmates we are going to house in that facility. Almost five times as many inmates will be capable of being housed there. That is a huge increase of what we are doing. Staffing is not increasing five times that number; so, if you think of it, it shows the efficiency.

In an overview, the project has grown. We have expanded the number of beds from what was originally presented to the Council, which got this project off the ground, of 206 to now 300 beds. The square footage has increased to more than 8,000 sq. ft. When we looked at the project, both on the jail side and the administration side, we had two unfinished third floors. I know that was a point of confusion. It was for me; it was for Executive Lemon; and I know it had to be for each of you as to what the project entailed. We have gone back and tried to look at the documents that were presented along the way and they showed that they were unfinished.

One of the ideas we looked at in the jail pod was to make the pod efficient in a sense of inmate movement. Every time you move an inmate from one location to another, it simply takes a lot of manpower and time to get that accomplished. The original design called for virtually all of the inmates at some time during the day moving from the first two floor areas to the third floor area up a flight of steps, which when evaluated became manpower intensive, trying to move groups of inmates up and down a flight of stairs. As we looked at that design, we said: "That's not a very efficient use of manpower; it's not a very efficient use of space." It didn't make a lot of sense. So, as we looked at using the space on the third floor and changing that from some unfinished space and training areas, we were going to use up space and we were going to create dorms there. We could go from 206 beds to the 360-bed jail site. With 200 beds I was afraid that I would have come back here in 18 months saying: "It's time to build another pod." The 360 beds will probably extend us hopefully to the 8- to 10-year range. Those are not pleasing numbers; I know that. All I can do is a guess on what we are seeing currently. That could change dramatically in the next few years. It's something that we have no control over but I think this definitely more than doubles the time frame of the life of that pod until it is full.

We anticipate the cost of this redesign and expansion to be about \$1.75 Million to accomplish the changes in the jail pod. While that is not a pleasing number, I think the change actually produces an ability of the jail to be a revenue source and cover funding and cover employee costs as the inmate numbers grow, etc.; with the 206 beds there was no ability to gain any type of revenue off the jail pod at that stage. Even as we progressed along and looked at the 240 bed potential designs that didn't give us much more help in that sense. With the 360, we virtually have somewhere around 100 beds that are available. Even our own inmates are available for contracting out if we want to do that or as work-release comes in, it will be expanded in that direction too. At least that creates revenue that is available for many functions including paying down the original bond payment.

Questions/Answers:

Craig Petersen: Are the numbers that you are presenting to us today the same numbers that we were being presented when Lynn and I met with you on Thursday?

Lynn Nelson: I believe so.

County Council December 10, 2002

Petersen: I just would like to review the number of beds because I need to really understand this. In terms of the original proposal, we talked about 206 and we are talking now about 240. Now the number 206 is the number you would have on the first two floors and then you would add 154 on the third floor but initially we were talking about the initial configuration of 240-bed jail.

Nelson: The initial configuration a-year-ago was the one that Joe presented at 8.8 Million and it contained 206 beds. When we got to the point where Sahara came on board, the design had evolved to the point of 240 beds.

Anhder: At what cost?

Gibbons: The design that we approved with respect to the bond was a 240-bed facility.

Nelson: Yes

Petersen: So you are really talking about expanding 120 beds. The original approval was 240-beds at 9.9 Million dollars. All of those costs that weren't included?

Nelson: Right. The administration building when it was first designed originally and brought to you was 73,000 sq. ft. At the time Sahara came on board it went somewhere around 99,000 sq. ft.

Petersen: That's the total complex, isn't it?

Nelson: Yes. Now apparently the entire complex is close to 108,000sq.ft. Those expansions mainly deal with two areas: **1)** The design of the 1st floor was about 34ft. longer than other two floors. As we talked through the discussions with Adult Probation and Parole and with the Highway Patrol, it was determined that the space they were interested in renting would be the entire third floor area. We had our Emergency Operation Center located up there in those designs. So, the question became "Do we create space that can be rented and if we do so, where do we move the Emergency Operation Center? It was determined to expand the second floor, to the same length as the first floor which created about 4000 square feet. As we talked about the jail design, in the meantime that was going on and the finishing of the third floor of the jail pods. We said: "Okay, if we take the training room areas out of that third floor, where do we then create training rooms. **2)** That's where the second expansion thought came in to expand the third floor to match the other two floors. It will make it virtually a square building, which created another 4,000 sq. ft., the other thing that was added on to that building was an elevator on that side of the building. It would access those floors for all of the personnel moving up and down in that area and (for) transporting inmates, people that were under arrest who were not put in jail, etc., up the back side versus up through the public entrance.

Lynn Lemon: Sheriff, would the inmates be using part of the administration building?

Nelson: No, not the inmates, I meant the prisoners that were being transported, etc. For the inmates, the elevator available to them is directly on the other side of the building so they can move laundry carts, food carts and all of that sort of thing up from the first floor to the third floor. As we looked at the cost of the redesign and expansion and the finishing of the third floor, the cost projections came in at 1.35 Million for all of that.

Currently, Lynn (Lemon) is working with the State Adult Probation and Parole and the Highway Patrol. It's under one entity; DFCM, is their initials. They have faxed us a contract and I think, Lynn (Lemon)is negotiating with them now trying to finalize the square footage needed.

In review, the Design Team evaluated the buildings as it started and as it has gone through the process. We think we have a building that has all of the space finished, which was a decision of: "Do you finish it now or do you finish it some time in the future?" "What's the cost difference between doing it now as versus doing it in the future?" It makes the space now usable and it produces revenue also. Now you have revenue that can be produce on both the jail side and on the administrative side of the buildings. Those various revenues are enough to cover the cost of those expansions.

That is kind of the gist of where the project is at this point. I think we can build virtually a building if you don't want to do those expansions and finish those areas. We could still be pretty close to the ball park of what we bonded for. I guess in my opinion. It doesn't give us any ability to create any revenues, especially on the jail side. We'll be back finishing that floor off immediately anyway. I don't perceive that any of these change the Tax increase. I think that for the most part, the inmates will be paying. Probably as we look at the revenues, you could virtually assume that the inmates could pay for all of this. In addition, you would have revenue from the State too.

Craig Petersen: I want is to take you back on the numbers again, Lynn, to make sure that this makes sense. As we spoke the other day on the additional 8,000 square feet of rental space, which was \$835,000.00. The additional space for training rooms was \$703,000.00. If that is true then the Administration addition comes to 1.53 Million.

Lynn Nelson: I just have the original numbers from Sahara that they gave to us the other day.

Petersen: The other questions on the jail: I understood that the third floor was to add additional beds of \$1.08 million.

Nelson: It could have been. The numbers I was given were what I said; I think we presented them the other day. The total cost changed to the pod was the \$1.75 million.

Nelson: Sahara, you have those numbers. Right?

Sahara Inc. Representative: Yes, I'll distribute them.

(See Attachment No. 2)

Anhder: How many beds did we bond for?

Nelson: Two-hundred and forty.

Anhder: It says 206.

County Council December 10, 2002

Nelson: Well, there is some misunderstanding. Sahara believes that it was 206 and it's 240 or 206; I'm not sure. I don't know if anybody knows.

Anhder: We are building a 10-Million-dollar Jail and we don't know what we are doing?

Lemon: When we did the bond, it was 240 beds.

Petersen: The confusion is that it says it was 240 when we bonded it but now we have configured it. In that same space where we were to have 240, You now have 206 but then you are adding 154 in the third floor.

Lemon: Is that right Sheriff?

Nelson: No, it isn't. On the first and second floors, we have 168 beds now. On the top floor there are 192. I don't know where he got those other numbers.

Lemon: I think what happened is that when it was initially designed, part of the first floor were cells and part of the first floor were dorms. (It was) the same way with the second floor. That's why we had 240 beds.

Nelson: Right.

Lemon: The way it's configured now (is) the first and second floors are all cells. So, that could make the difference.

Nelson: Right. So, there was a cost increase to change those dorms from dorms to cells.

Anhder: Who made that decision?

Nelson: I did; I guess or the Design Team did.

Anhder: Does that bother anybody? You know that changes the scope for which the Council thought they were building and have gone into debt to do. The difference between 240 and 206 is a rather significant change.

Nelson: Say that again.

Anhder: The Council thought we were building in the neighborhood of 240 beds and to change it to 206.

Nelson: We didn't change it to 206. We have always gone up.

Cory Yeates: I think what he is trying to say is that we thought we were going to be getting 240 and we went to the cell configuration because of the purchase we got on these precast cells. It dropped from 240 to 168 and the way we were going to raise that number was by finishing the third floor to bring on an additional 192 beds. What Larry is saying is that it dropped from 240 to 168 without Council input on that.

Nelson: It is still possible to create a dorm on the first floor and bring the number to 235, somewhere in that neighborhood.

Anhder: Sheriff, I'm sorry to ask this question: do you know what you want?

Nelson: Yes.

Anhder: In a twenty-minute presentation, the numbers fly around rather freely; I am not sure that anybody knows what is going on!

Nelson: I understand. Trust me; I have been through the same frustration and so have Lynn (Lemon), the Jail Committee and everybody.

Anhder: So, if no increase is approved, we will build a jail with 206 beds if we don't go to the 360.

Nelson: No, I think we can still build a jail in a 240-bed range if you chose to do so.

Petersen: On the sheet you just handed out to us, the total cost is basically \$13,100,000.00. In Thursdays meeting the number was \$14,340,000.00.

Lemon: The difference is that we don't have all of the architect fees in there; we don't have the land costs. The numbers that I had in Thursdays meeting were \$835,000.00 in architect fees and \$400,000.00 in land cost

Anhder: Do these add to these numbers we were just given?

Lemon: We would need to add to those numbers.

Darrel Gibbons: I think, unfortunately, there are several areas where there have been misunderstandings, confusion and lack of communication. I think it would have been nice to have the Design Team come to the Council with a proposal to change the second and first floors prior to changing it. That was not done. It has been changed significantly. However, I would have to go on record as saying that as I look at the proposal with respect to the change, it is a good proposal. I think we are going to get a facility that is going to be far more beneficial than what we had at the time that we went to bid. The unfortunate thing is that changing from that proposal to this proposal has increased the cost of the jail by 3.1 million dollars approximately. What the Sheriff is saying to us is that he is satisfied that there are revenue sources that will more than cover the cost of the additional three Million dollars. Is that correct?

Nelson: It is.

Gibbons: I wish that I could be as comfortable. That was my concern, Sheriff, and I expressed it the last time we met.

Nelson: There are two revenue sources: **1)** Currently we are running about 20 or 25 work-release inmates. Work release is the most popular program.

Anhder: Do you have anything to present to the Council so that we could see that?

(See Attachment No. 3)

Nelson: Yes. A work-release program is the most popular program that exists with Adult Probation and Parole and the Courts. We charge \$20.00 a day for inmates to get out and work. That money is paid up front before they are allowed to get out to work. It is a very reliable resource of money. Tamra, off the top of my head, I think we bring in about (Auditor Tamra Stones filled in the amount of.) \$97,000.00 currently in revenue. When we open the facility or within the first year, I anticipate that our numbers are going to reach somewhere between 150 and 200 inmates. So, to increase work release from 20 to maybe 40 more inmates on work release, I think it's a safe bet. Adult Probation and Patrol, as I have talked to them, are extremely comfortable with recommending at least

County Council December 10, 2002

that many more people to be on work release. I think every time the Courts send someone over, they want them to be on work release because work release allow inmates to leave the facility and go out and maintain their jobs, to be able to take care of their family and pay restitution, all of that sort of thing. It helps them. If they do straight time, then they run the risk of losing their job and not being able to support the family and not being able to Pay their restitution and all of that.

Lemon: Sheriff, on this work-release, this is a net figure, right? You've taken out what you think are the costs in food and meals and those types of things out of this because the number we looked at earlier was 208 or whatever.

Nelson: Right. It was based on \$5200.00 a year. These numbers are based on \$3,800.00.

Lemon: So, this is a net amount that you think you will derive after paying your expenses for work release.

Nelson: Right. As additional employees are brought on to manage additional inmates, it even covers the expense of bringing those new people on. I have to admit; I'm not a CPA. I'm not an analyst; I'm a cop. I've been put in this position and so you take what you get here, I guess, and you get what you pay for. I think the revenues there on the work-release are conservative. I would only expect that those numbers would increase if anything. **2)** (With) the Administration building, we are looking at prices per foot. I think you get up into the \$8.50 to \$9.00 a-square-foot range. That pays for the entire side of the agreement.

Anhder: Is that the price range you are talking about?

Lemon: Yes. They (those who will rent space) want it for less than that. They want it for the absolute minimum but we are not going to agree to that. We will end up either there or a little higher than that.

Nelson: I stuck with those top two issues because there are several other funding sources out there but they are less reliable. (In) renting out beds, I think the State in our discussions is going to be more than willing to provide us with somewhere in the neighborhood of 36 State inmates. Whether there is more available or not, that is hard to guess. That's a year away and that's why it is a little more negative. (In) **Southern Idaho**, four counties are trying to build a regional jail to share. They have not been very successful in that. They basically are in the same boat as we are turning inmates lose. There have been some preliminary discussions with them of renting beds. The potential of the chance of that happening is very good. So, that's additional revenue. The fourth one is "**Pay for stay.**" That is being addressed in the State Legislature of making inmates pay for part of their stay in the jail. That will also produce somewhere between \$100,000.00 and maybe up to \$200,000.00 in revenue a year. That's still out there and unknown so that is why I haven't addressed it.

Lemon: I guess the reason that I wanted to add this to the agenda tonight is that we need to give some direction as far as what we want to do. I realize that this is a frustrating process. It has been frustrating for the Sheriff because he didn't know some of these numbers, much before we knew the numbers. We can talk about all of the reasons that it ended up the way that it did or that we are where we are right now, but part of the problem was that we thought that when we went to bond and I think most of you thought that we were getting the third completed. We thought that was part of that package that we bid on. It was not part of that. I said all along; it probably makes more sense for us to finish the third floor of the jail now than it does to come back and finish it at a later date. As I have worked through these numbers, as frustration as it may be, we have all had a degree of frustration. I still think that we are getting a very good deal. We were naive to think that we could build a facility for \$99.00 a sq. ft. It started out for \$120.00 a square foot. When we thought we were getting the additional third floor and the additional third floor of the administration building, it went down to \$99 a square foot. If you look at most jails, that sheet that I saw showed most jails at \$160, \$180 or \$140 a square foot. Even with this change, this ends up with \$120-\$122 a square foot. So, even as frustrating as in might be, I think it is in the best interest of the County to make a decision, move forward and do this.

Gibbons: I think we need to have some understanding though in the process that the Council is in the loop to get approval of some things. The first and second floors are not what they were by the original bid. We can't change that.

Nelson: We can to some degree, but it's limited.

Gibbons: Based on what the Sheriff is suggesting as possible revenue sources, those changes on the first and second floors are to our advantage because they secure areas that will allow us to contract those beds.

Lemon: (They are a) long-term to our advantage.

Gibbons: I agree with what they propose; I just wished that you had understood that we needed to be kept in the loop. Probably we were amiss in not communicating that to your group as well.

Petersen: There has got to be another understanding too. If we approve this, the additional cost is 3.1 Million dollars. In terms of the bond it means about 3.4 Million dollars. Debt service on that will be \$262,000.00. We will be obligating the County to another \$262,000.00. You made the argument, Sheriff, that the revenue you think we will generate will cover that. There are some good prospects there but they are all to some degree speculative.

Anhder: Many of them are revenues you would have had anyway.

Petersen: I guess the one thing that I want to make sure of is that I don't want to be put in the position of having to come back to the citizens of Cache County and asking to raise their property taxes because of this decision. Because if we approve this decision it seems to me like we are approving this with the understanding that you can generate the revenues to cover it. If that is not true, it seems to me like the Sheriff's Office ought to assume some of the risk on that.

Anhder: Let me comment to that. This has been brought to us in a very hurried fashion; it wasn't even on our agenda. It's obvious to me that mistakes were made on the previous one because the design of our initial jail has changed rather dramatically. Would it behoove you to wait for a couple of more weeks to bring this back to a final action so that you and others on the Design Team, the Executive and members of the Council understand completely from top to bottom what it is we are buying now? That the changes have been made in the design and that we don't anticipate other design changes so that we pretty much know in some detail what to expect?

Nelson: Certainly, I don't have a problem with that.

Cory Yeates: We're talking five weeks before we meet again.

County Council
December 10, 2002

Gibbons: A week ago we talked about steel.

Contractor: Yes. We have gone ahead. They had to get the mill price and they have purchased the steel.

Beck: (The purchased) structural steel for the third floor.

Anhder: It sounds like somebody is making decisions for us, doesn't it!

Gibbons: Most of that will be utilized anyway.

Lemon: Long-term; we are either going to do this now or going to do it down the road. I think that we should have the steel there regardless whether it's done now or whether it's done later.

Beck: One thing to keep in mind as well is Davis County right now is building a 400-bed jail. And that is an expansion to an existing Jail. It is going to cost them \$25,000,000.00 just to do the expansion of 400 beds. I don't know what we did to our contractors to get a better deal out of this but I think we are getting a better deal out of this than what Davis County is obviously getting for their 400-bed expansion of their existing jail.

Gibbons: I don't think we are disagreeing with that at all. I guess we need to be in the loop more Sheriff, than we have.

Nelson: I agree. I think that was something that was lacking in this. I'm not sure whose fault that is that the Council wasn't involved.

Gibbons: Maybe one of the members of the Council should be put on the Design Team.

Yeates: That recommendation has been made.

Nelson: I don't think; I have ever felt that we didn't want you there. I think it was just the opposite. We wished we had 10 times the support and interest in the project as we did.

Lemon: I have been as frustrated or more so than anybody has about this. We were literally talking about this in mid Summer thinking that we were going to get this larger facility for 11 Million dollars. I think it is only recently that the Sheriff and Joe (Linton), and even Sahara to some degree has said that we can't build what you think you are going to get for that amount of money. We can't do it the way you want to do it. Part of the problem is we have given them a charge and we have said: "We want you to build the most operationally efficient jail you can. We don't want you to cut corners on construction so that we then have to pay for this over 20 years as far as operations are concerned. It has only been a few weeks that we really have known these numbers; so, it hasn't been that there has been a blatant effort not to let us know. If you remember, we had them on several other agendas and they just weren't ready at that point. So, as quick as we could, we tried to bring it to you.

Nelson: I think we have been fairly effective of keeping Lynn up to speed on at least the design issues and where we were leaning and where we were going. It kept coming back to: "Okay and what is that going to cost." "We'll get it; we get it figured out." There have been some complications along the way that's delayed that number.

Peterson: A while back, when we were talking about this, the Council approved a different type of an approach to going about building the Jail, the "Construction Manager" approach. I guess on the one hand you might argue that it's brought in a low-cost jail maybe, not to say that we couldn't have done it with another approach. But on the other hand it certainly contributed to where we are now because we didn't simply have a design to bid out. I am still concerned about that approach.

Gibbons: Even though I have some feeling to agree that we would have been better off with a "Traditional Bid," had we had a traditional bid, we may not have been able to make some of those changes, which I think as I looked at the overall project, are going to be vastly beneficial to the County.

Petersen: My feeling is that if we had gone with the traditional bid, we might have spent enough time trying to think it through.

Gibbons: That's correct, but I'm willing to make the motion that we go ahead and approve the proposed change to the jail tonight (and) that we allow them to go ahead and proceed with what they propose. I think that even the Bond Council was comfortable with their revenue strength projections with regard to financing a traditional (bond).

Petersen: What the Bond Council was comfortable with the fact that it ultimately relies on the sales-tax revenue of the County. That's what he was saying.

Gibbons: I think we need to move ahead.

Council member Gibbons moved to approve the proposed increase both in physical structure of the Jail and the cost to accommodate the increase. That we designate the Council Chairman or Vice Chairman to be part of the Design Team, so that the Council and the Executive are always represented as we go through the process. Yeates seconded the motion.

Council member Petersen amended the motion to include that the expectation of the Council is that the additional costs would be covered by revenues generated from the Jail administration. Gibbons accepted the amendment to his motion. The vote on the motion with amendment was 6 "yes" 1 "no." Petersen voted no.

PUBLIC HEARING: OPEN 2002 BUDGET

County Council
December 10, 2002

Chairman Anhder opened the public hearing and turned the discussion to the County Auditor, Tamra Stones to outline the proposed changes to the 2002 Budget.

(See Attachment No. 4)

<u>Gen Fund Revenue</u> increase	\$91,470.00
<u>Fund 20-Municipal Services</u>	\$46,653.00
<u>Travel Council</u> additional	\$472.00
<u>Senior Citizens</u>	\$3,000.00
<u>Restaurant Tax</u>	\$25,000.00
<u>Airport</u> (more of a housekeeping issue) A 2-year budget had been budgeted for A Federal active grant and most of that expense was incurred in that 2001 year; so, it was proposed to adjust that the actual expense only reflects spending in the year of 2002. (This is a reduction.)	
<u>Fund 76</u> (for NPIC revenues - additional money appropriated)	\$2,758.00
<u>Public Safety:</u>	
<u>Building and Jail Capital Projects:</u> Appropriated	\$81,000.00
<u>Land issues for the Jail:</u> Additional spending fo \$20, 750.00for tests pertaining to the groundwater problems and issues of that nature. . .	\$25,000.00
<u>Furnishings and Equipment</u> (transfer was requested to)	\$13,850.00
(Most of this is the cost of storing the \$4,000.00 worth of Herman- Miller desks that were purchased	

Ms. Stones stated that the last page was for the Bond Issue and the cost of the issuance of the bonds to do the Jail upgrade that were just approved.

Chairman Anhder asked public comment on the proposed adjustments to the budget.

There were no public comments made.

Council member Yeates moved to close the public hearing. The motion was properly seconded. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 2002-38: ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2002 BUDGET

(See Attachment No. 4)

Council member Yeates moved to waive the rules and adopt the Res. No. 2002-38.

Gibbons seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.

ELECTION FOR TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL:

Chairman Anhder suggested electing a temporary Chairman to fill the vacancy of the Chairman seat since both the Chair and Vice Chair positions would be vacated. This temporary official would serve until such time as the new Chairman for the year was voted upon by the members

County Council
December 10, 2002

of the new Council.

Council member Gibbons nominated Council member Petersen to serve as temporary Chairman. Hansen seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. Yeates moved to waive the rules and accept by acclamation Craig Petersen as Temporary Chair. Hansen seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS:

A "Swearing in Ceremony" for all Newly Elected Officials would be held January 6, 2003 at 12:00 p.m. in the County Council Chamber.

Layne Beck expressed his appreciation for serving with his fellow council members. He felt that even though the council members didn't always agree when all decisions were made, the amicability was there.

Chairman Anhder gave his departing thoughts as he related his pleasure of working on the Council. He felt that pending any personal relationships among the Council members that the Council always enjoyed very good rapport. He was highly complimentary of the employees of the County and wished them well.

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS:

There were no Council member Reports.

ADJOURNMENT:

Council meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

ATTEST: Jill N. Zollinger
County Clerk

APPROVAL: H. Craig Petersen
Acting Chairman