

Board of Commissioners Meeting  
March 16, 2016

Present: Commissioner Steve McClure  
Commissioner Mark D. Davidson  
Commissioner Jack Howard

Chairman Howard opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. and the pledge of allegiance was given. All three commissioners were present.

**Public Comments**

Constituent Inquiry – City of La Grande, Library Funding Request

Commissioner Howard stated that the commission received a letter on March 4, 2016 from the City of La Grande requesting additional funding to be considered during the budget process for the Cook Memorial Library. Commissioner McClure stated that other cities had submitted similar requests. Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, stated that all cities in the county had submitted additional funding requests.

Margaret Mead requested and received a copy of the letter during the meeting.

Chamber of Commerce Public Comment

Bob Cavanaugh, 304 Main, La Grande, Union County Chamber Board Member, thanked the commission for looking at the issue. He stated that the letter was intended to be conveyed in a positive manner and they desire the commission's representation in the meetings.

Commissioner McClure stated that two to three years ago, the Chamber did not welcome the commission's participation on their board; the commission wanted to be involved because it was one of the largest contributors. He thinks the commission should have a member on the board.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the commission's participation is valuable and important; there are some regrets in looking at the history of the relationship. The Chamber has scheduled a strategic planning session to discuss the purpose and functionality of how it adds value to the community. They want to embrace the past and move forward in a way that is valuable to the local community. They desire the commissioners' participation on their board and understand that the commissioners are very busy.

Commissioner Davidson concurred with Commissioner McClure; Union County is the largest contributor without question. Formerly, the commission had an ex officio position on the board until the county requested to become a voting member. The Chamber is very valuable to the community and it needs to be an active team member in La Grande and throughout the county for economic development. The Chamber Board has done an excellent job of working cooperatively with other members; it is active and engaged. When

there are issues, they are worked through. He thinks the commission has an obligation to be engaged in the Chamber board due to the request to have a voting member.

Mr. Cavanaugh reiterated that having the commission's full spectrum of insight on the board is vital. The impact and contribution made by the commission is appreciated; it has helped sustain the organization. He stated that it is impressive that the commission would take the time to address this issue during their meeting. The Chamber is looking forward to the future with the commission.

#### Chamber of Commerce Public Comment

Mike Voss, 10703 ½ Walton Road, La Grande stated that he has had some experience working with the Chamber regarding various issues. He has come to commissioners in the past to express issues and found that one commissioner did nothing in response. He believes that ultimately the commissioners answer to the public. In his experience, there was one commissioner who listened whether he was right or wrong and took his concerns about the Chamber forward. He thinks the currently-appointed commissioner should remain a Chamber Board member to help the community. It made him feel good that someone was finally listening to him and others. He would like the current commission representative to remain the same.

Commissioner McClure concurred with Mr. Voss that the commissioners need to be responsive to the public.

#### Chamber of Commerce Public Comment

Kristin Dollarhide, 48687 McCarthy Bridge Rd, North Powder, Union County Chamber Executive Director, stated that the issue was not about the presence of the commission on the Chamber Board. The Chamber amended bylaws to include commission representation years ago and they are happy to have done so. The most recent concern was in regards to attendance of the appointed commissioner at the board meetings. They want the commission to be a part of the Chamber Board, give input, and attend events and activities.

Commissioner Howard asked about the Chamber's retreat. Ms. Dollarhide stated that it had been scheduled to take place on April 21.

#### B2H Public Comment

Irene Gilbert, 2310 Adams Avenue, stated that the advisory committee discovered the importance of the PUC's role in the B2H line late in the game; the EFSC accepts the PUC statement as a documentation of need for the line. If the commission is questioning the need for the line, then it is very important to submit comments of concern. She encouraged the commission to submit the documentation in a timely fashion so that it would be allowed in the record for the PUC's decision.

**Elected Official, Department Head & Employee Comments**

**Thief Valley Boat Dock Request For Proposals**

Sean Chambers, Union County Parks Coordinator, stated that bids were requested for boat dock replacement at Thief Valley Reservoir as the current system has failed and is not safe or functional. The replacement would be a similar design to the Wolf Creek Reservoir dock; it would be a self-leveling dock system that requires less maintenance.

Three proposals were received:

- |                                 |              |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Wellens Farewell             | \$87,120.00  |
| 2. Jeff Carter Construction     | \$90,022.00  |
| 3. Ton Ayers General Contractor | \$135,852.50 |

Mr. Chambers recommended awarding the bid proposal for the Thief Valley dock replacement to Wellens Farewell in the amount of \$87,120.00.

Commissioner Davidson asked if sufficient funds were budgeted and available for the dock replacement. Mr. Chambers stated that the Oregon State Marine Board created the project and estimated the cost at \$155,000; Union County Parks received a grant from Oregon State Marine Board for \$116,250 in addition to a grant from ODF&W for \$20,250. The remaining \$18,500 would come from the Union County Parks Department budget.

Commissioner McClure asked how the new dock would be different from the old one. Mr. Chambers explained that the existing ramp would be used and a concrete rail system parallel to the ramp would be installed. The current dock has metal piers that were not properly installed; when ice shifts, the piers get bent. The old dock system was left in place through the winter and built-up ice compromised its integrity. The new dock system would be removed during off-seasons.

**Commissioner Davidson moved approval of the Parks Department's recommendation to award the bid for the Thief Valley dock replacement to Wellens Farewell in the amount of \$87,120.00. Commissioner McClure seconded.**

Commissioner Howard asked how long the last dock system worked; Mr. Chambers stated that it had been in operation since the early 1990's. Commissioner Howard asked if the new system would be cheaper. Mr. Chambers was unsure how much a pier-built dock system would cost; he is following the guidance and advice of the Oregon State Marine Board. Commissioner Howard asked why the bid amounts varied so much; Mr. Chambers guessed that some companies may be trying to make more money or had higher expenses.

**Roll Call: Commissioner Davidson, yes. Commissioner McClure, yes. Commissioner Howard, yes. Motion passed unanimously.**

Request to Amend Resolution 2005-11 - Buffalo Peak Employee Benefit

Burr Betts, Buffalo Peak Golf Course Superintendent, 110 Genie Lane, Cove, stated that he had requested a change in policy that was largely unknown in regards to the cost of employees' use of golf carts. In his research about leadership, he learned that employees who feel valued become more committed to their jobs; having free cart use at the golf course would help that. He requested the commission to consider changing the policy regarding cart use for employees.

Commissioner McClure asked who wrote the original resolution. Mrs. Burgess stated that it was authored by the county's legal counsel, Brandon Eyre. There are some provisions in the resolution that were specifically worded due to IRS codes and the taxability of employee benefits. A great deal of research was completed before the resolution was drafted because the county needs to be careful when providing benefits to employees due to the taxability of those benefits. The golf play is identified as a no cost benefit because it is interpreted that it doesn't cost the county more money for employees to play on the course. She believes the carts were excluded at that time because they were not considered a no cost benefit.

Commissioner McClure asked how the county would deal with the taxes if employees received free cart use. Mrs. Burgess stated that if the commission wanted to change the resolution then the county would need to get an interpretation to see if it could be considered a no cost benefit. If not, the county would have to track and tax the cart usage. The taxable value of cart use would need to be determined and the county would track the number of times the carts were used; only employees who used the carts would be taxed for their use. It is unfortunate, but the tax codes are very specific and the county complies with those laws.

Commissioner McClure stated that counties are subject to audits by the IRS; the county tries to be sensitive to this type of issue, but the county needs to make sure it is handled properly. He agrees with Mr. Betts that the current policy doesn't seem to make sense for employees and the commission should take a look at it. Mrs. Burgess believes the commission has the authority to change the policy, but the county would need to make employees aware that free golf cart use might be a taxable employee benefit.

Commissioner Davidson asked if there was a minimum threshold; Mrs. Burgess suggested that the county's auditors could review that. Commissioner Davidson stated that it had been a long time since the policy had been reviewed and it would be worth looking into. He added that Mr. Betts makes a good case and he is open to the idea.

Commissioner Howard stated that free cart use would be an appropriate incentive for golf course employees. He believes there is a consensus to move forward.

Mr. Betts stated that having a PGA Pro on staff requires that he maintain his skill level and the golf cart benefit is an important benefit for that position. Mrs. Burgess stated that there is a different approach when cart use is a requirement of the job.

#### Fund Exchange Agreement #31243

Doug Wright, Union County Public Works Director, presented an annual Fund Exchange Agreement between ODOT and Union County, trading \$277,380 in federal funds in exchange for \$260,373.20 in state funds. This would allow the completion of various projects within the county. Commissioner Davidson stated that the federal regulations would be more costly. Mr. Wright stated exchanging the funds at six cents on the dollar is a good deal because federal funds require 10.27% match. **Commissioner McClure moved approval of Agreement #31243. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### B2H Update - Union Co. Planning Department

Scott Hartell, Union County Planning Director, 1001 Fourth Street. La Grande, stated that the subcommittee had been working on the needs issue for the B2H line. That subcommittee approached him and Mr. Taylor to get on the agenda on an emergency basis so that they could potentially take information that they developed to a March 24 Oregon Public Utility Commission (PUC) meeting in reviewing the acknowledgement of the Idaho Power (IP) 2015 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). Mr. Hartell contacted Oregon PUC staff requesting information about the opportunity to submit public comment; they indicated that it would be very unusual for them to accept public comment after requiring IP to hold twelve public comment meetings. They would not know if new comments would be accepted until staff reports and recommendations were developed. He contacted them again after staff reports were developed and was told that they would not accept public comments at the March 24 meeting. He added that since he learned the information just a day prior and there had not yet been an opportunity to share the information with the advisory committee, Ted Taylor was available to provide an update for the needs issue for the B2H project to the commission. He felt this information was needed for the next proceedings. If PUC staff is correct in the information they provided him, then the PUC commission adopts the IRP and the needs issue for the NEPA process and EFSC process has been addressed and met.

Ted Taylor, B2H Advisory Committee Chair, 305 Scorpio, La Grande, stated that the full committee met with all seven members present on March 14. The subcommittee report at that point had gone through four drafts. It is still a work in progress so the full committee did not officially accept their report, but they did review it and looked principally at the conclusions that the subcommittee reached. From those conclusions and after much discussion, the full committee came up with a list of thirteen findings.

Mr. Taylor added that if the PUC acknowledges Idaho Power's IRP, this will be the third consecutive plan that they have acknowledged; he thinks that the chances of them ever changing their minds is very limited. In the PUC's acknowledgment of the 2013 IRP, they

indicated that IP should continue with their planning study; that is the staff recommendation for the current plan. The Energy Facility Siting Council (EFSC) relies on the PUC to determine the need based on their acknowledgement of the IRP; this is required every two years. In reviewing the staff report he received just a day prior, he learned that initially the staff had many of the same comments that the advisory committee had. After IP submitted their 2015 IRP, the PUC staff, Citizens Utility Board, and members of the public made comment last fall. IP then replied to those comments and more comments were received from the PUC staff, Citizens Utility Board, and members of the public. A final reply from Idaho Power (IP) was submitted on February 19. The advisory committee does not have access to those comments and replies. In his best judgment of the staff report, he understands that the staff is satisfied with IP proceeding with the B2H project. They do not address the construction because it is out of the four-year IRP planning window; that detail would be expected in 2017. The committee believes it would be appropriate to send their findings to the PUC because even though they are not accepting public comment at the March 24 meeting, they might consider the advisory committee's comments and refer them to the staff. It appears to him that the staff has been satisfied with IP's responses because their recommendation is to acknowledge the IRP without conditions.

Commissioner Howard stated that acknowledgement is different than acceptance. When PUC acknowledges, they are not accepting the findings. The staff almost rejected guideline four. He asked if Mr. Hartell had contacted Idaho Power; he replied yes. Commissioner Howard asked if there was a nuance in terms of what PUC was doing in terms of the portfolio that was acknowledged; it seems to him that it was the clearest indication that guideline four was not met; he thinks that is the need assessment.

Mr. Taylor stated that his understanding of the staff report is that they want IP to do a more comprehensive comparative analysis of risks. They have quantitative and qualitative risks and they apply to both the supply and demand sides. The staff accepted the preferred portfolio and recommended additional analysis of risks and benefits in the 2017 IRP. He wanted to point out that even though it says acknowledge, the EFSC standards for need says that if the PUC acknowledges the IRP, then the need has been established.

Mr. Taylor stated that the advisory committee would like the commission to send their findings forward to the PUC, as well as to neighboring counties and the Governor's Office of Energy.

Commissioner Davidson asked if Mr. Taylor's understanding was that the PUC had only three options to respond to the plan: deny, reject, or acknowledge. Mr. Taylor stated that yes, that was his understanding. Mr. Taylor added that the PUC is very clear that acknowledging the IRP does not constitute a rule making or rate setting; it is just their way of participating in the planning process. By acknowledging the plan, they are basically giving a thumbs up; exceptions, conditions, and recommendations are noted. The staff

recommendation for this plan does not have any exceptions or conditions. The B2H seems to be unchallenged by the PUC.

Commissioner Davidson stated that it appeared to him that in the staff recommendation of the twelve items, only item four had recommendations. Those included implementation planning for section 111(d), recommending a waiver of the 2015 IRP update and continuing the evaluation in the 2017 IRP. Mr. Taylor agreed and added that a lot of folks think IP is not doing a good job with conservation; he thinks the staff initially believed that, but they have since said IP is doing better. Commissioner Davidson stated that it appears that there has been some ongoing dialogue in the process and IP has satisfied at least some of their concerns. Mr. Taylor thinks IP has satisfied all of the PUC's concerns because they are not in the staff report and there are no negative conditions. He doesn't know how much concern the staff still has, but they may be planning to take another hard look in 2017. Commissioner Howard stated that there is a docket of information that they are relying on to get some type of precedent for solar storage or construction.

Commissioner McClure asked for further explanation of the B2H transmission line's ownership; his understanding was that ownership was split as IP 23%, PacifiCorp 54%, and BPA 23%. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hartell stated that was their understanding as well. Commissioner McClure stated that it is confusing because IP is the applicant and their needs are considered, but where is PacifiCorp in this? He doesn't know if it would do any good, but he has no problem sending the advisory committee's viewpoints to the PUC.

Commissioner Davidson asked if the advisory committee's findings came from conclusions of the subcommittee's work. Mr. Taylor stated that most or almost all of the conclusions came from the subcommittee. Commissioner Davidson asked if the advisory committee had reviewed the complete report. Mr. Taylor stated no; some of the members reviewed version three; some had reviewed version two; only one person reviewed version four, which was sent from the subcommittee chair, George Mead, at 2:45 p.m. on March 14. Mr. Taylor stated that he determined that it was too late to send that version to the advisory committee because most would not have had the opportunity to see it before the 6:30 p.m. meeting. The committee started to rely on version three, which most had read, then tried to look at the most current draft, version four.

Mr. Taylor stated that the committee's discussion was in reference to version four, and it became clear to him and some of the members that some of the supporting information from the subcommittee was confusing. He acknowledged that although the information may have been accurate, the use of different fonts, italics, and underlining made it hard to read. He added that most of the committee members were not familiar with the terms noted; there was a lot of discussion about megawatt gain, excess capacity, and unmet need. In the paragraphs, there was a lot of information about megawatts with some in bold type and others that were not, making it difficult to follow. The committee could not support the findings with a definitive statement about unmet need or excess capacity. The committee did generally agree that the findings were appropriate and that IP's IRP was

deficient in not considering enough conservation. Some of the tables in the IRP were reviewed by the committee; the committee was concerned that IP just didn't do a thorough job, especially in not evaluating the distributed generation, energy conservation, and impacts of the plant closures. PUC staff had some of the same concerns, but some of the committee's concerns were outside the planning window, such as when Boardman plant closes in 2020. IP is not required to include it. The advisory committee did not officially receive the report, but it is scheduled for the next agenda on March 31. The committee took the main conclusions out of the report and approved them after reframing them as findings.

Commissioner Howard clarified that there was a subcommittee report that had five versions and everyone had version three before the March 14 meeting; Mr. Taylor agreed. Commissioner Howard asked if conclusions from version three of the report were incorporated into the final findings; Mr. Taylor stated no. Commissioner Howard asked if the committee voted seven to zero in favor of the 13 findings that Mr. Taylor was presenting; Mr. Taylor stated yes. Mr. Taylor added that the full committee agreed to the final findings that were written with language that was close to the precise wording in the subcommittee's report; he is confident that they are accurate.

#### B2H Public Comment

Irene Gilbert, 2310 Adams Avenue, La Grande, stated that Jim Kreider spoke with PUC staff who encouraged the subcommittee to submit comments because they would be considered. She stated that the Citizens Utilities Board requested copies of their concerns and said that as interveners they would consider bringing those concerns forward. She stated that the statutes do not identify the PUC decision as a justification for need and that it will end up in a court battle. Having documentation in the record is important, especially since Federal energy regulatory rules are not being followed by the PUC in some of the decisions they are making. An example is that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission says that the expense to the customers' needs to be distributed in an equitable manner based on the benefits of the line. The federal regulations take precedence over state rules; it is impossible to justify the expense to Oregon energy users of this line given the impact of ownership of the line by IP and PacifiCorp. She stated that the BPA has not committed to having any involvement in the line. The document has not indicated how much Oregon citizens would be paying for the line. The B2H line was not included in the 2006-2008 or 2010 approved IRPs; addendums were submitted in 2010 to include it in the plans. She stated that a lot of questions about the B2H line still remain.

Mr. Taylor stated that finding #8 in the advisory committee's letter is in regards to costs and benefits to citizens and customers in Oregon. He does not know if they are required to assess that in each state or just by project.

Margaret Mead, 57744 Foothill Rd, La Grande, asked if the commission would read the advisory committee's thirteen findings for the public's benefit. Mr. Taylor read the advisory committee's thirteen findings.

Commissioner Howard stated that the commission should discuss writing a cover letter to accompany the advisory committee's letter. He respected the committee's right to say things as they come out, but he would like the committee to come to a conclusion as opposed to questioning the process in the letter.

Commissioner Davidson stated that the basis of his earlier question about the report was whether it had been reviewed in its final form and adopted. He is uncomfortable endorsing findings without supporting evidence. He thinks the best course of action would be to have Mr. Hartell draft a cover letter, or prepare one for the chair's signature, and forward the recommendation. His preference would be to have communications from the committee come in the form of recommendations instead of motions. Mr. Taylor stated that the committee would do that in the future.

Mr. Taylor offered to rephrase the letter in the form of recommendation for the commission. Commissioner Howard stated that he would be hesitant to ask the committee to do that because it has to be consistent with its own purpose, mission, and identity. The commission wants the committee to be an independent body. It is important that all the commissioners are getting the same consistent messages. Commissioner Davidson agreed and would not have the committee change anything because it was what the committee voted to approve.

Commissioner McClure asked about the Gateway West transmission line. Mr. Taylor stated that it was another Idaho transmission line not yet under construction, but is proposed to run from Wyoming through Idaho. Commissioner McClure asked if it converts coal power to electricity for Idaho. Mr. Taylor said he did not know.

Commissioner Howard stated that Commissioner Davidson suggested sending the advisory committee's findings with a cover letter from the Union County Planning Department.

Commissioner McClure wanted further explanation of Commissioner Davidson's objections to the format of the committee's letter. Commissioner Davidson stated that motions were indicated in the letter, but motions would be used to take an action or approve an item. He suggested that a recommendation would be more appropriate.

Commissioner McClure stated that Mr. Taylor did a good job and it was a difficult subject. He is not sure sending their findings will make any difference, but it is immaterial and it needs to move forward. He stated that he still has questions about PacifiCorp ownership and what that means. He stated that he asked IP directly why they were taking the heat over the project when they are a minority owner; their response was a question about who would he rather deal with.

**Ordinance 2016-01, Regulating Burning Outside City Limits, Second Reading**

Mrs. Burgess stated that the first reading of Ordinance 2016-01 was by title only on March 2. A public hearing was called and the first reading was approved. There was no testimony or direction for changes.

Commissioner Howard suggested to waive the full reading of Ordinance 2016-01 and to read it by title only. Commissioner McClure and Commissioner Davidson agreed. Mrs. Burgess read Ordinance 2016-01 by title only. **Commissioner McClure moved approval of Ordinance 2016-01. Commissioner Davidson seconded.**

Commissioner Howard asked when county ordinances would take effect. Mrs. Burgess stated that county ordinances take effect immediately unless otherwise specified.

**Roll call: Commissioner Davidson, yes. Commissioner McClure, yes. Commissioner Howard, yes. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Consent Agenda**

**Commissioner Davidson moved approval of the Consent Agenda, including Meeting Minutes from February 3 and February 17 and Claims Journals for February 18, February 25, March 9, and March 10. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Administrative Matters**

**4-H & Extension Service District / Dept. of Agriculture Space Lease Amendment**

Mrs. Burgess stated that the commissioners would be acting in their capacity as the Board of Directors for the 4-H & Extension Service District as they consider this lease agreement and the following agreement.

Mrs. Burgess stated that this amendment was for an agreement between the State of Oregon and the 4-H & Extension Service District; it is a 6 month extension of the original lease at the Ag Services building for the Oregon Department of Agriculture. The lease is for 140 square feet of office space at a rate of \$184 per month; the agreement was recommended by Carole Smith, Extension Staff Chair. **Commissioner Davidson moved approval. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

**4-H & Extension Service District / Tri-County Weed CWMA Space Lease**

Mrs. Burgess stated that this was a new lease agreement for office space at the Ag Services building between the Tri-County Cooperative Weed Management Area and the 4-H & Extension Service District. This agreement includes 138 square feet of office space to be leased November 11, 2015 - November 11, 2017; it would increase to 172 square feet effective Dec 1, 2015 - November 11, 2017 at \$15.30 per square foot per year. The agreement was recommended by Carole Smith, Extension Staff Chair. **Commissioner**

**McClure moved approval. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Court Order 2016-12, Appointment to the Weed Control Board

Mrs. Burgess stated that the commissioners were returning to their official capacity of Union County Board of Commissioners.

Mrs. Burgess stated that there was a current position available on the Weed Control Board representing the Cove area; Colby Johnson submitted an application. His term would be effective immediately and would expire December 31, 2019. **Commissioner Davidson moved approval. Commissioner McClure seconded.**

Commissioner Howard asked how many members were on the Weed Control Board. Mrs. Burgess did not have that information available.

**Roll call: Commissioner Davidson, yes. Commissioner McClure, yes. Commissioner Howard, yes. Motion carried unanimously.**

Court Order 2016-13, Appointment to the Health & Human Services Advisory Committee

Mrs. Burgess stated that there was a position open for a representative of the Grande Ronde Hospital; GRH's Patient-Centered Care Programs Manager Tammy Winde submitted an application. Her term would begin immediately and would expire December 31, 2019. **Commissioner Davidson moved approval. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Transient Tax Discretionary Fund Advisory Committee Recommendation

Mrs. Burgess stated that the Transient Tax Discretionary Fund Advisory Committee received and reviewed an application from Friends of the Joseph Branch on March 11; their recommendation was to fund the application in the amount of \$2,500 with funding to be focused on local signs, advertisements in *Trains* magazine, and other marketing with the exception of the Portland area.

Commissioner Davidson stated that the application would fund new signage in Elgin at the train depot and at the rail yard in Minam; the applicant wanted to expand advertising efforts in different markets. The committee did not approve the full funding request and recommended focusing on closer markets including Lewiston, Clarkston, and Moscow. Portland and Vancouver were not included because consumers would have to drive by the Mt. Hood Railroad operations. The committee agreed it would be better to focus on closer markets that did not have the same opportunities and would be more likely to attract customers. *Trains* magazine is a train enthusiasts magazine with broad distribution across the country; train enthusiasts use it to locate and plan excursion train opportunities and trips.

Commissioner Howard asked how many signs would be included. Commissioner Davidson stated that there would be additional signs at Elgin and Minam to provide directions to visitors.

**Commissioner McClure moved approval of \$2,500 to Friends of the Joseph Branch from the Transient Tax Discretionary Fund. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Union County Chamber of Commerce Board Appointment

Commissioner Howard stated that the Union County Chamber of Commerce Board meets from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m.; it is the worst time for him because he needs to get his kids to school. He asked if another commissioner would be interested in attending those meetings. He added that their retreat was scheduled for April 21, which would be important to attend.

Commissioner Davidson stated that they had this conversation three times previously while discussing assignments. He stated that previous discussions included combining appointments for the Union County Chamber of Commerce Board, Tourism Promotion Committee, and Blue Mountain Conference Center Board; he asked Commissioner Howard if he wanted him to take all three. Commissioner Howard asked if he could; Commissioner Davidson stated that he would.

Commissioner Howard stated that he thought that they may be making a mistake and asked Commissioner McClure if he was sure that he did not want the appointments. Commissioner McClure stated that Commissioner Davidson had been on those committees in the past. Commissioner Howard stated that the commission would go with the new appointment of Commissioner Davidson to the Union County Chamber of Commerce Board, Tourism Promotion Committee, and Blue Mountain Conference Center Board.

**Next Meeting and Location**

April 6 at 9:00 a.m. in the Joseph Annex building.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lorcinda Johnston  
Sr. Dept. Specialist II