

Board of Commissioners Meeting  
September 21, 2016

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

Commissioner Howard opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. and the pledge of allegiance was given with all three commissioners present.

**Public Comments and Concerns**

No comments were offered.

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

Office of Violence Against Women Grant Award

Catherine Falck, Sheriff's Dept. Office Manager, 1109 K Avenue, La Grande, stated that the county was awarded the OVW grant, which would begin October 1 and extend for three years. She is requesting acceptance of the grant from the commission. Commissioner McClure asked if this was a continuation of a current grant. Ms. Falck stated that it was not a direct continuation because their funding ended March 31.

Commissioner McClure asked how the loss of the City of Union's contract would affect Sheriff's Department personnel. Ms. Falck stated that the grant included increasing the Domestic Violence Deputy position from .5 FTE to .75 FTE. Open positions are not expected to be filled until more information is available from the City of Union.

**Commissioner Davidson moved approval of the OVW Grant Award. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Intergovernmental Agreement, Single Trip Permit Authorization

Doug Wright, Public Works Director, 10513 N. McAllister Rd, stated that this would be a continuation of an agreement between the county and the State. It establishes a relationship to authorize single trip permits. The county provides a list of roads and restrictions, as well as identifies names within the Public Works Department. Commissioner McClure stated that the county is able to control where loads are hauled.

**Commissioner McClure moved approval of the Intergovernmental Agreement 31514. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

U.S. Forest Service Rappel Base Lease

Mr. Wright stated that the Rappel Base Lease is a firm 15-year lease with the U.S. Forest Service. It establishes annual rent payments and how the building will be operated. The county will build the rappel base at the airport. This is the final offer; he feels this is a good offer and it's time to sign it and get the building going.

Commissioner Davidson requested more lease details in regards to costs and benefits. Mr. Wright stated that it would be a 13,100 square foot, two-story building. It will house up to 44 employees; 8 permanent employees and up to 36 seasonal employees with 82 parking spaces. It will also have

Type 1 and Type 2 helipads working in conjunction with the Rappel Base. About four acres will be set aside for the USFS to operate and include contract helicopters.

Commissioner McClure stated that the 15-year firm term lease means that the USFS would continue to lease the building from the county for 15 years or buy out the lease; the county then uses it as collateral to borrow money from the State and the lease payments cover the debt service. From the county's perspective, this is a good deal because the debt is paid at end of 15 years and an additional 15 years can be considered. The risk is minimal to the county. This lease agreement has been in the works since last November. The county's legal counsel reviewed the document and felt that there was nothing detrimental to the county. Commissioner McClure stated that the benefits of jobs created is important.

Mr. Wright stated that the USFS will set it up as a year-round training facility; substantially more people will be brought in for trainings. Buildings will include office space, conference rooms, exercise rooms, showers, a kitchen, and space for equipment and maintenance.

Commissioner Davidson stated that the employee numbers reported are government employees and do not include contractors. Four helipads are for the combined use of teams stationed at the airport and contractors that come in; those contractors will create a positive economic benefit. Mr. Wright agreed and added that there were up to 15 helicopter contractors last year and this year there were approximately three. Commissioner McClure agreed with Commissioner Davidson; although that secondary benefit is hard to quantify, it will be tremendous. Commissioner Davidson stated that the contractors wouldn't be here in the number and frequency without the rappel base.

**Commissioner McClure moved approval of U.S. Forest Service Rappel Base Lease 57-04H1-16-0070. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### Selection of Architect & Engineering Services for Rappel Base

Mr. Wright stated that the size of the building will require an Architect & Engineer contractor. The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was advertised in the Observer and posted on the county website; two proposals were received by the deadline:

1. Edward T. Luebben
2. Steele Associates Architects, LLC (Steele)

The proposals were reviewed by a committee utilizing the rating sheet in the RFQ document. The committee consisted of Administrative Officer Shelley Burgess, Planning Director Scott Hartell and Public Works Director Doug Wright. Each member independently evaluated and scored both proposals based on criteria included in the RFQ. Steele received the highest score from each committee member and the highest total composite score. The US Forest Service, a reference for Steele, was consulted. They satisfactorily verified the content of the proposal and stated that they were highly satisfied with Steele's professional approach and delivery of quality projects. Based on the outcome of the reviewing scoring process and quality of reference received for their work, Mr. Wright recommended awarding the A&E services contract for the Rappel Base to Steele Associates Architects, LLC.

Commissioner Davidson stated that of the two proposals, Steele seemed to have designed multiple buildings for the USFS, including some that were for the same type of base; this must have been a

large factor in the outcome of reviewing and comparing the two proposals. Mr. Wright agreed and added that he called the reference provided by Steele. He asked the USFS how they would approach and deliver this project. The USFS are very happy with what they have received and feel the team is very confident and understand the USFS process. They have attained LEED certificates, related to green energy. Steele Associates Architects, LLC is confident in their proposal and dealing with the USFS.

Commissioner Howard asked about the project's timeline. Mr. Wright stated that it would begin as soon as the A&E contract is approved. Mrs. Burgess stated that the lease agreement would be returned to the USFS; when they sign it then the county's timeline would begin to accomplish some of the goals outlined in the RFQ. If the recommendation is approved to select this A&E firm, then the county would quickly negotiate a contract with them.

Commissioner Davidson asked if there were any concerns knowing that Steele is not the firm that designed the preliminary plan. Mr. Wright stated that he asked them the same question and they didn't see it as a problem. Commissioner Davidson stated it would be a normal course of business in this type of project, but it is good to confirm that with them.

Commissioner McClure stated that it's important to understand that this project will not be design-build. The A&E will set up a set of plans and specifications and the county will put it out for bid. A design-build was used on the courthouse. This needs to be a bid job; it will be open to any contractor that wants to submit a bid so the county will get the best price. The county is able to do this project as a hard bid because the USFS provided enough specifications that it could be developed that way.

**Commissioner McClure moved approval of the selection of Steele Associates Architects, LLC as the Architect & Engineer for the Rappel Case as presented in the proposal. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

### **Consent Agenda**

**Commissioner Davidson moved approval of the Consent Agenda, which included minutes from the August 18 Board of Commissioners Meeting and Claims Journals for September 7, 8, 14, and 15. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

### **Administrative Matters**

#### **Application for Oregon Special Public Works Fund Loan**

Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, requested authorization to apply for a loan from the State of Oregon to construct the Rappel Base in the amount of \$4 million. This is the maximum that would have to be borrowed; the county is working with an estimated budget since the building isn't completely designed and construction bids have not yet been completed. If approved, only funds needed would be borrowed; she expects it to be less than \$4 million. The current interest rate is 3.3%. Payments would be made annually; the USFS would be paying rent before the county's first loan payment would be due. The revenue from the USFS lease agreement will be \$320,175 for each of the first 15 years; that could be adjusted if the tenant improvement costs are more or less

after design and bids. It would also affect the amount the county would borrow, so that is not a risk. The shell cost is set firm, so the county will know the maximum amount when it goes out for construction bids. There is a guaranteed funding source to service the debt. The USFS lease is a 15-year firm term lease so even if they decide not to continue operations at the airport, they are obligated to pay the county for the full 15 years.

Commissioner McClure stated that the Fire Cache building has been done on the same basis; the county borrowed \$2.1 million from the State and received lease payments from the Federal government to service the debt. It has been very successful. Commissioner Davidson stated that it's a very common model that is widely used.

**Commissioner McClure moved approval of the application for Oregon Special Public Works Fund Loan in the amount of up to \$4 million. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### Selection of Consulting Engineer of Record

Mrs. Burgess stated that the county has an Engineer of Record for consulting services since the county does not employ an engineer. A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is released every five years. The current contract with Anderson Perry & Associates, Inc. expires at the end of October. The (RFQ) was published on the county website and in The Observer; it was also picked up by the Daily Journal of Commerce Plan Center, a newspaper that distributes opportunities within the industry. Several phone calls and emails were received expressing interest, but Anderson Perry & Associates, Inc. (AP) submitted the only proposal by the deadline. AP meet all of the qualifications and they have a strong history with the county. Mr. Wright submitted a letter recommending the selection of Anderson Perry & Associates, Inc. for the Consulting Engineer of Record for Union County. This contract would set up an arrangement for AP to serve in that capacity and fees are negotiated on a per-project basis.

Commissioner McClure stated that Union County does not have its own engineer like a lot of bigger counties do; this contract is a way to have an engineer available on a regular basis. The State of Oregon has a similar arrangement that the county follows as a model. It has worked very well for the county and allows work to be done timely.

**Commissioner McClure moved approval of the selection of Anderson Perry & Associates, Inc. as the Consulting Engineer of Record. Commissioner Davidson seconded.**

Commissioner Howard asked if the contract was a five-year term. Mrs. Burgess stated that the contract was a three-year term and allows for a two-year renewal. Commissioner Howard liked the fact that there is no retainer involved.

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

Commissioner Davidson asked Commissioner Howard to explain why he abstained. Commissioner Howard stated that sometimes it is to be a contrarian. Commissioner Davidson asked if he was voting no. Commissioner Howard stated that it was an interesting question and thought it would be

counted as a 'no' vote under Roberts Rules of Order. He stated that he would not rule on it from the chair.

Court Order 2016-31, Appointment to BOPTA

Mrs. Burgess stated that this court order would appoint a pool of candidates to serve on the Board of Property Tax Appeals. Jack Howard was designated as the Commission representative, Steve Oliver is an active member and is interested in continuing to serve, and Charlie Gillis was selected by the County Clerk to serve for 2016.

**Commissioner McClure moved approval of Court Order 2016-31. Commissioner Davidson seconded.**

**Roll Call: Commissioner Davidson, yes. Commissioner McClure, yes. Commissioner Howard, abstained. Motion carried.**

Wolf Depredation Grant Recommendation

Mrs. Burgess stated that the county received a \$5,000 grant from the Wolf Depredation Compensation and Financial Assistance Program through the Oregon Department of Agriculture. Funds are to be used to provide funding for producers who make an effort to reduce wolf-livestock interaction. The county has a wolf depredation plan that was developed by a committee. The committee met and reviewed an application from Sue Muncy requesting \$400 for an Akbash guard dog in the Summerville area. The individual is a producer of angora goats; the guard dog is used to prevent predation on livestock. ODF&W and the committee recommend approving the grant.

Commissioner Davidson stated that ODF&W indicated that Mrs. Muncy's location is very close to the Mt. Emily pack's area of known wolf activity, qualifying her for the funding. The committee was unanimous in their recommendation.

**Commissioner Davidson moved approval of \$400 Wolf Depredation grant funds to Sue Muncy. Commissioner McClure seconded.**

Commissioner McClure stated that he has photographs of wolves in the same area. Commissioner Davidson added that there was also an unconfirmed predation in that area, but it can be difficult for ODF&W to confirm wolf kills.

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

Commissioner Howard recessed the meeting until 10:00 a.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING: Good Road Legalization**

Scott Hartell, Planning Director, 1001 Fourth Street, La Grande, provided some background information and history on the Legalization of Good Road. In September 2014, the Planning Department received a request to vacate a portion of Good Road. On September 16, 2014, the Board of Commissioners held a public hearing on the petition request. It was discovered that

the original portion of Good Road requested to be vacated was not where it was originally built; the commission determined that it would need to be legalized before vacated.

Mr. Hartell stated that the request for Legalization was initiated by Boyd Follett with the Elgin Cemetery District. Notices have been made in accordance with ORS 368.206. The statute requirements somewhat set this up to spend a lot of money prior to a determination of accepting or denying the Legalization; Mr. Hartell is trying to reduce that burden. If the commissioners decide to move forward, then a tentative decision could be made and a survey could be scheduled. If the commission decides to move forward, the end result would be a court order making it legal, a survey and a road report. He stated that Mr. Follett has requested that the commission make a tentative decision or table it pending a tour of the property for future consideration. Mr. Hartell requested a date-certain meeting.

Commissioner McClure stated that the location of the power poles is part of the problem; he asked how that would be addressed if the portion is vacated. Mr. Hartell stated that the county has the ability to vacate and retain an easement for utilities.

Commissioner Howard clarified that the commission is only considering the Legalization of Good Road.

Mr. Hartell stated that the survey will cost approximately \$3,000, and would not have a prepared court order until a decision to move forward was made. Mrs. Burgess stated that the commission could not take any formal action until the survey is completed. Commissioner Howard stated that legalization seems to make sense in this case regardless of decisions made to vacate it. Mrs. Burgess clarified that once the road is legalized then the vacation petition would be a separate decision and action; Mr. Hartell agreed. Commissioner McClure stated that the county would not want to pay for the survey if the process wouldn't be completed.

#### Good Road Legalization Public Comment

George Mead, 57744 Foothill, La Grande, asked if the county has to go through these two steps, who benefits from the process when the county is paying for it, and why wouldn't the petitioner carry the burden of paying for the survey. Mr. Hartell stated that the benefactor of the petition request is the Cemetery District; they would acquire a 30-foot right-of-way of more usable land for the Cemetery District.

#### Good Road Legalization Public Comment

Boyd Follett, 71109 Follett Road, Elgin, Elgin Cemetery District Chairman, stated that he serves with two other directors, Dennis Cross and Shirley Kirk. The Board oversees a number of cemeteries in the district, including the Highland Cemetery on Good Road. There is an abandoned county roadway on the west side of the cemetery that they had discussed having deeded to the Cemetery District. It would allow the addition of a circular driveway and prevent vehicles from backing out onto the grassy areas of the cemetery. It would also allow off-street parking, which has been a problem for the elderly attending funerals. They are petitioning to have the abandoned roadway vacated and propose that the Cemetery District receive the east half of the abandoned roadway north of adjacent property owner, Jaylene Witherspoon, who

would receive a portion of the east half of the right-of-way on the south end. The other adjacent property owner is Gilbert Weatherspoon and he would receive the west half of the abandoned roadway. The Planning Department staff has indicated that the county would need to legalize their present use of Good Road before vacating the abandoned right-of-way. Bagett, Griffith, & Blackman estimated a cost of \$2,500 to \$3,000 to monument, describe and prepare a map survey for the legalization, which would then give the county legal access to the existing Good Road route. He has talked to the adjacent property owners and they have no objections as long as it is of no cost to them. He has also talked with OTEC personnel about their easement down the center of the abandoned roadway; the OTEC easement would remain and would serve as a boundary between the east and west ownership of the abandoned roadway. There were no objections from OTEC personnel. When the District explained that they wanted to create a circular driveway, OTEC felt it would enhance access to their power lines.

Commissioner Howard asked Mr. Mead if Mr. Follett's statement helped with his questions. Mr. Mead stated that it didn't answer the question.

Commissioner McClure stated that in response to Mr. Mead's questions, the county didn't build the road where it was supposed to be built and essentially trespassed on private property. During the time that the road was built, roads were built around problems, such as a hill on this property. However, the description of the right-of-way wasn't changed to reflect it. There are a lot of those situations in the county and they normally aren't addressed unless someone brings it up as an issue. If the county addresses it, then it has to be done according to law, which requires a survey. The county is responsible for it because the county did not build the road where it was supposed to go and the county is trespassing on someone else's property. Instead of replacing the road, it is legalized as it has been in used for a number of years. The county is in the wrong and this is a way to correct it.

#### Good Road Legalization Discussion

Commissioner Howard asked if Mr. Hartell recommended a specific action or if the commission needed to make that decision on their own. Mr. Hartell stated that he would provide as much information about the facts and the process, but the commissioners need to make that decision. Commissioner Howard stated that he was concerned about notification requirements if a court order is considered at the next meeting. Mr. Hartell stated that if this topic is scheduled time-certain during the current meeting, then no further notification would be required. Mrs. Burgess stated that the action needed at the current meeting is authorization to proceed with the survey at an approximate cost of \$2,500 to \$3,000; Mr. Hartell agreed that was correct. Mrs. Burgess stated that if approval is made, then time would be allowed to schedule a second meeting to consider a court order after the survey has been completed. Commissioner McClure stated that the hearing was still open and invited Mr. Mead to continue the conversation if he would like.

#### Good Road Legalization Public Comment

Mr. Mead stated that a lot of roads become legal because they're used over a long period of time. If the county put the road in the wrong place and now someone doesn't like the road where it is and would benefit from vacating it, then why don't they pay for it. Instead of saying

the county made a mistake generations ago, suddenly now the county is the responsible agent for paying those costs. But if the county doesn't want to do that, then what is the result of the decision saying no? While it is a good guy thing to do, it will cost the county money. Apparently the land owners think that as long as it can be done without cost to them, it's wonderful. There is a benefit the owners accrue by the county paying for it.

Commissioner Howard stated that adjacent property owners have said they don't particularly want to see it change if it's going to cost them any money. One way to look at it is the county insures provision for when there is a risk, and you have to straighten out a public service. The property owners are happy to leave it the way it is, especially in terms of the cost.

Commissioner McClure stated that the benefit would be realized by the Cemetery District, which is a public entity; the county would be providing a reasonable benefit to them. He assumes the property owners would continue to use it as they have been, which wouldn't matter either way. The commission wouldn't even be talking about this except that the district had a problem with their circulation inside the cemetery. He feels that it is reasonable for the county to take it into consideration and provide for that public benefit. Mr. Mead stated that he heard that the property owners think it is a great idea to get rid of the road, but they didn't want to pay for it. Commissioner McClure stated that the property owners did not petition for the change and he doesn't think they care because the road isn't being used and it was an easement only. State law says that if the county abandons an easement, it goes back to the owner that donated it to the county.

Commissioner Davidson stated that this was the second time it was brought to the commission, both times by the Cemetery District. The property owners are not pushing this issue. He thinks the commission should tour the property with Public Works and the Planning Department, meet the property owners and the applicant, as well as look at other maintenance issues on Good Road.

**Commissioner McClure moved to continue the discussion at the next meeting and make a decision after a tour of the property. Commissioner Davidson seconded.**

Commissioner McClure stated that if it was arbitrary, the county would be more reluctant to pay for the survey, but this is a special case and not very common. Commissioner Davidson estimated that there have only been three or four road legalizations in the last eight years. Commissioner McClure stated that the county could negotiate sharing the cost with the Cemetery District, but they are a small district that is trying to maintain a public interest with a limited budget.

Commissioner Howard stated that the discussion would continue on October 5 at 10:00 a.m. A tour of the property was scheduled for October 3 at 9:30 a.m.

#### Good Road Legalization Public Comment

Gilbert Weatherspoon, 72124 Good Road, Elgin, stated that at the last hearing, he stated that he already had a right of way through his property for the power company. He wondered why the county would have to go through OTEC to get it. He gave the book and page number of its

recording to the previous Planning Director. Commissioner McClure stated that they would check that out. Mr. Weatherspoon stated that his assumption would be that the right-of-way would be passed onto other power companies.

Mr. Hartell stated that he had Mr. Weatherspoon's deed on file with the references he talked about. Mr. Weatherspoon's property includes 100 feet on the south end of the right-of-way where Pacific Power & Light had an easement that transferred to other companies through the years. From the start of the south end, going up about 100 feet and full length of it, there is no easement.

Mr. Weatherspoon stated that in reference to an earlier question about who benefits from the change, the county benefitted when the road was built, not the property owners. He stated that his property value does not amount to a whole lot and the county dug out a big pit on the north end. The Cemetery District will benefit from the change. One of the property owners donated land to the Cemetery District, which is probably equal to a quarter or third of that land.

Commissioner Howard recessed the meeting for an Executive Session to be held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h).

#### **Discussion of Animal Shelter Services**

Mrs. Burgess provided a staff update regarding the status of negotiations between Union County and the Blue Mt. Humane Association (BMHA). The most recent contract expired on June 27, 2015; an extension through December 2015 was approved to continue negotiations. Commissioner McClure agreed to serve as the lead for the county and John Brinlee was identified as the lead for BMHA. Several meetings were held, which included Commissioner McClure, Shelley Burgess, John Brinlee and two additional BMHA members. Due to BMHA's initial financial request amounting to more than the county representatives felt could be provided, Commissioner McClure contacted cities, counties, and nonprofits in the eastern Oregon region to learn how animal shelter services were provided and funded. Information was collected and provided to the BMHA representatives in the hope of assisting them in their review of funding options. Negotiations continued and county representatives thought progress was being made and a tentative agreement might be reached. No agreement was reached by the end of December and the BMHA board representation changed. The county representatives felt there was still hope of reaching an agreement. The county agreed to pay BMHA for animals impounded by the Union County Animal Control officers beginning in January, 2016 on a per-animal basis. Negotiations began again with Mr. Brinlee and new BMHA board members; after several productive meetings, it was felt that a tentative agreement was very close. County representatives were notified in August that several BMHA board members had left and no agreement had been reached. Commissioner McClure agreed to allow until September 6 for BMHA board reorganization and to meet again to reach an agreement. Since September 6, efforts to contact the BMHA representative to determine the BMHA board status and schedule a meeting have been unsuccessful. It is the opinion of the county representatives that negotiations have reached an impasse. Mrs. Burgess requested direction from the commission on how they would like to proceed in this matter.

Commissioner Howard commended Commissioner McClure for his efforts to reach an agreement.

Commissioner McClure thinks the commission needs to move this forward to the meeting on October 5. This would let the public know that the county is considering another avenue and invite them to tell the commission what they think. Then the commission can make a decision about how to proceed. There is a lot of interest in the community about this issue and as long as there have been negotiations, people have been patient but patience is running out. He thinks the commission needs to let people talk about it. Although this issue was on the current meeting's agenda, he would feel more comfortable if it was addressed when everyone knows it is scheduled. The discussion needs to take place as a community.

Commissioner Davidson stated that it was unfortunate that efforts made by Commissioner McClure and Mrs. Burgess haven't come to a successful conclusion. He agreed the topic should be placed on the October 5 agenda, consider options, take public input, then move forward in an appropriate manner after those options have been considered and have heard thoughts from the public. A lot of time has been spent trying to work out the next step; due to a number of reasons that has not worked out.

Commissioner Howard stated that it is commendable seeing the board in action on these tough issues. This board has approached this problem with solid openness and a determination to help a serious problem with the best resolution it can. Good faith has marked this board's effort to resolve this problem. He welcomes the opportunity to have public discussion on October 5 to continue that discussion in good faith on behalf of the citizens of Union County.

Commissioner McClure stated that as in good faith, he will not talk about negotiation details. He thinks John Brinlee has the interest of the animals at heart, and he never felt otherwise. They just couldn't get the financing to work. He didn't want to imply that this was a criticism of BMHA or Mr. Brinlee; he knows the effort that they make and doesn't want this to appear that he is vindictive or angry. He just doesn't think they are getting anywhere and the county needs to look at options.

Commissioner Howard asked the board if there were any objections to hearing public comments on animal sheltering services. There were no objections.

#### Animal Shelter Services Public Comment

Margaret Mead, 57744 Foothill Rd, La Grande, asked the commission to reconsider the October 5 meeting time. There may be a lot of people who cannot come at 9:00 a.m. due to employment; an evening meeting would provide more opportunities. People could submit a statement by email or letter, but a lot of times it is beneficial for everyone when people can be at the meeting in person. It would give the citizens more opportunity to participate.

Commissioner Howard stated that this was a developing process. Commissioner McClure stated that they would take Ms. Mead's request under consideration when the agenda is made.

Animal Shelter Services Public Comment

Donna Beverage, 1598 N. Cove Street, Union, asked who owned the property where the BMHA is located. Commissioner Howard stated that at this point, the commission wants to get all the information that they can. It is a great question, but there is no easy answer. There is not a determinable answer that is suitable for public presentation. He stated that he was not speaking for the board. Commissioner McClure stated that Commissioner Howard's response was a fine answer. Commissioner Davidson stated that the simple and clear answer is that the county's legal counsel advised them that the county doesn't have a strong case to make a claim on that property.

Animal Shelter Services Public Comment

Connie Voelz, 62102 Fruitdale, La Grande, stated that she heard the commission say that they may consider other animal sheltering options or stay with BMHA. She asked if an information packet would be made available that would give various options so everyone would know the starting point. If she comes to the meeting without any prior information, then she is coming into it blind. Commissioner Howard stated that it would be more of a listening opportunity for everyone to hear those options; the commission is going into it blind, too. It is unchartered territory. In fairness, there will be a certain number of options that could be developed, but it would be speculation to say what they might be. To make any commitments or put them in writing is probably not the best practice. Ms. Voelz stated that she wasn't requesting something that firm. She agreed that Mr. Brinlee loves animals and will spend a lot of time and do a tremendous amount of work to care for them. However, when she asks for financial information, it is not available. She didn't know how to move forward without knowing where the county is.

Commissioner McClure stated that the county's financial information could be provided, but not BMHA information since they are private nonprofit. If anyone wants to see what has been budgeted or spent, a request could be made. He is also willing to sit down and talk to her individually. Commissioner Howard suggested that she approach BMHA and ask for that information. Commissioner McClure stated that several people have come in and talked to him, and he encourages that. He knows he needs to listen to the community on this issue because there are a lot of different opinions. It needs to be an open and frank conversation.

Next Meeting and Location

The next meeting is scheduled to take place on October 5 at 9:00 a.m.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lorcinda Johnston  
Sr. Dept. Specialist II