

TERM OF COMMISSION: November Session of the November Adjourned Term

PLACE OF MEETING: Boone County Government Center Commission Chambers

PRESENT WERE: Presiding Commissioner Don Stamper
District I Commissioner Karen M. Miller
District II Commissioner Linda Vogt
County Counselor John Patton
Deputy County Clerk Melanie Stapleton

The regular meeting of the County Commission was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Commissioner Stamper.

SUBJECT: Local Law Enforcement Block Grant 1998/1999

Sheriff Ted Boehm stated that this grant was one that the Sheriff's department had been receiving for the past couple of years. He noted that the amount was the only thing that had changed.

Sheriff Boehm stated that this year the department would be receiving \$40,000. He stated that there was a match (fund) requirement of \$4,444. Sheriff Boehm noted that the department would use money from their federal forfeiture fund for the match.

Sheriff Boehm stated that their intent was to use the money to purchase a live MG fingerprint computer system. He stated that the next step in the grant process was to obtain the signature of approval of the Commission and then meet with a committee to review the equipment that the department would like to purchase with this money. Once the committee's approval is obtained, documentation would be sent the people in charge of the grant in Washington, D.C.

Commissioner Stamper asked if this money would be used for computerized, digitized fingerprinting.

Sheriff Ted Boehm stated that the department would like to obtain this system in order to do away with the fingerprint cards and ink. An individual's finger and hand would only have to be scanned in order to have a card printed and then check to see if the individual is wanted (for a crime).

Commissioner Stamper asked Sheriff Boehm to elaborate on the sheet of special considered conditions and the advisory board.

Sheriff Boehm stated that this board was a group that the department had to meet with next. He stated that the department had been meeting with the Kevin Crane, Prosecuting Attorney, Judge Asel, a school official, and someone from the community of Boone County, along with Law enforcement representatives. He stated that this meeting had been combined with the Columbia Police Department at the same time that this money is requested, therefore the CPD and Sheriff's Department both use this meeting to make their presentations to request the money for the grant.

Commissioner Stamper asked if there were any FTEs involved in this.

Sheriff Boehm stated that this was strictly for money for equipment.

Commissioner Vogt asked about the meetings that Sheriff Boehm had been attending.

Sheriff Boehm stated that he had to meet with these people once a year. He also noted that notes and minutes had to be taken during the meeting and then sent to Washington, D.C. in order to prove that the meetings did in fact take place. He stated that they were attempting to have the same people attend this year that attended last year's meeting.

Commissioner Vogt asked if the same person was used as an attendee to represent both categories D and E (D-local school system and E-local non-profit educational). Sheriff Boehm stated that they tried to get someone from the school system and someone from the community neighborhood watch groups.

Commissioner Miller asked if this system (fingerprinting) would put the County in the same position with the imaging mug-shot system of special fund purchasing a piece of equipment.

Sheriff Boehm stated that it did.

Commissioner Miller stated that she would like to have it stated for the record that upon Commission approval of this grant, it would be subject to whatever policy the group presents to the Commission and the Commission adopts. She stated that if the policy (to be adopted) states "when an item is purchased with Special Fund money, it will be replaced with Special Fund money," then the Sheriff's department would accept that policy.

Sheriff stated that before he even attempted to purchase the equipment, he would come before the Commission again.

Commissioner Miller stated that she wanted to have an understanding worked out up front.

Sheriff Boehm stated that he thought the policy had already been written.

Commissioner Miller stated that she knew that June Pitchford (Auditor) was working on one, but did not know if it had been drafted yet.

Commissioner Miller moved to authorize the Boone County Sheriff's Department to enter into the Local Law Enforcement Grant Program and to take the match money from Federal Forfeiture Funds with the understanding that when equipment needs to be replaced, it will be replaced under the County's adopted policy for Special Fund Purchases.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Stamper asked if he was authorized to sign it.

Commissioner Miller amended the motion to authorize the Presiding Commissioner to sign.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 545A-98**

SUBJECT: Out of County Housing for the month of September

Sheriff Boehm stated that for the month of October there was an average of 199 inmates and 67 per day out of the County. He stated this was up from 48 per day during the month of September. He stated that as of this day, there were 66 inmates being housed out of County and 129 within the County.

Sheriff stated that there was substantial increase in October. He stated that through October 31, 1998 the department spent \$32,000 just in overtime wages alone to transport the inmates.

Commissioner Miller stated that therefore, this was not a true reflection of the out of County housing costs.

Sheriff Boehm stated that it was not.

Commissioner Miller moved to authorize a Budget Revision as follows:

AMOUNT FROM	ACCOUNT FROM
\$54,000	\$1123-86800 Emergency Funds
AMOUNT TO	ACCOUNT TO
\$54,000	1255-71100 Outside Services

Said revision is to cover the out of County housing expenses incurred during the month of September.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 545-98**

SUBJECT: HUD Reimbursement Requisitions for Section 8 Housing-Anita Sanderson

Anita Sanderson, Finance Manager for Human Development Corporation stated that each year her organization prepared a budget and then prepared housing requisitions. She stated that the requisitions were the tools that brought money into the County to pay for the payments that are made to landlords for Section 8 Housing program.

Anita Sanderson stated that there were Section 8 requisitions for the Commission to sign order to draw the money from HUD.

Commissioner Vogt asked if Anita Sanderson was here to request \$2,412,318.00 for an entire year with the average monthly housing assistance being \$281.51.

Anita Sanderson stated that this was correct.

Commissioner Vogt stated for the record that unit of months under the lease to date was 5,078.

Commissioner Vogt moved to authorize a request for payment of annual contributions from the federal government to the Human Development Corporation for Section 8 Housing and authorize the Presiding Commissioner to sign the necessary documents.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 545B-98**

Commissioner Miller told the Sheriff that the Jail Bid award would not be scheduled until the following Wednesday.

Commissioner Vogt asked Sheriff Boehm about a letter (written by the Sheriff's department) requesting an opinion (from the residents of El Chapparal) on whether or not to install speed bumps in the El Chapparal Subdivision. Commissioner Vogt stated that the County did not normally install speed bumps on the streets.

Sheriff Boehm stated that in a meeting about a month or so ago, some El Chapparal residents wanted to know if there was possibility of the installation of speed bumps in their area. He stated that the residents were concerned about there not being any sidewalks in the subdivision, amount of children present, and the traffic violations.

Sheriff Boehm stated that he spoke with Public Works, Road & Bridge, and the Fire districts about the installation of speed bumps. He stated that none of these entities seemed to have a problem with the idea.

Sheriff Boehm stated that at this point he decided that he should talk with the residents of the El Chapparal Subdivision to see how they felt about the idea.

Commissioner Vogt asked if the Sheriff did this before he spoke with the Commission.

Sheriff Boehm stated that he felt he had taken care of that when he spoke with the Public Works department. He stated that he thought that if there were a policy concerning the speed bumps, then the Public Works department would know about it. Sheriff Boehm also noted that the letter made it very clear that there were no plans for this project yet, however that this was only an attempt to get an idea of the interest.

Commissioner Vogt stated that it would have helped her a lot if she had any idea that this was going on.

Sheriff Boehm stated that if he had any idea that Commissioner Vogt would be receiving calls he would have notified the Commission.

Commissioner Vogt stated that she did speak with Frank Abart, Director of Public Works who stated that he would be happy to help law enforcement any way he could. She also noted however, that speed bumps were not traditionally installed because of their danger to emergency management and the snowplows.

Sheriff Boehm stated that these were the items of discussion when he spoke with ambulance, fire, and hospital persons.

Commissioner Vogt asked what the emergency management people had to say about the speed bumps.

Sheriff Boehm stated that they did not have a problem with this.

Commissioner Stamper stated that something like this would set a precedent therefore the Commission needed to be at the table of discussion of the idea before it went very far.

Commissioner Vogt stated that there were some strong opinions about law enforcement and speeding in the El Chapparral Subdivision and that the Commission and law enforcement did need to find ways to work together to serve this population.

Sheriff Boehm stated that he did not hear anything negative from ambulance, fire, or Road & Bridge about the speed bumps.

SUBJECT: Presentation of the 1999 Budget-June Pitchford, Auditor

Introduction

June Pitchford gave a couple of overall comments about the budget. She stated that the Missouri State Statutes require that counties adopt a balanced budget meaning that the resources on hand combined with current operating revenues for the ensuing fiscal year must be sufficient to cover planned expenditures. She stated that this requirement had been met with the budget she was presenting.

June Pitchford noted that the State law also imposes certain governmental functions on counties and allows the counties to engage in some discretionary functions. She noted that this budget provides funding for the County to address all of its statutory required, governmental functions and it continues funding in the discretionary areas that were added over the course of the last several decades.

June Pitchford stated that the County administers over 30 different funds and there were approximately 100 budgets that had to be reviewed.

June Pitchford stated that the introductory section of the budget held most of the aggregated information.

June Pitchford stated that Section B of the budget was the heart of the financial information. She stated that the budget summaries demonstrated the primary objective of adopting solvent,

balanced budgets. She stated that she had included charts, graphs, FTE schedules, outstanding debts, etc. She stated that Section C held some demographic information.

June Pitchford stated that the first section, Itemized General fund budgets included all of those that were supported by General Revenue budget. She stated that Itemized Special Revenue budgets displayed a listing of all special revenue funds, the statutory section that governs it, and a brief description of the activities in the fund.

June Pitchford stated that the Budget Message, first section provided an overview of the organization and structure, and interesting information for other users of the document who are not familiar with the County.

Overarching Objectives

June Pitchford called attention to the overarching objectives she had adhered to in the preparation of the budget. She stated that they were as follows:

- (1) The budget will provide adequate maintenance of the capital plans and equipment and for their orderly replacement.
- (2) The County will avoid balancing current expenditures at the expense of meeting future year's expenses.
- (3) The County will give the highest priority to the use of one-time revenues to the funding of capital assets or as non-recurring expenditures, and realistic revenue projections will reflect conservative assumptions, available fund balances will be maintained at levels that will provide adequate operating reserves should the County experience an economic downturn.

She also noted that this budget significantly depleted the Public Works fund balances and the Road & Bridge funds. She stated that this was necessary to accomplish all of the work that was planned for the ensuing year. She also stated a minimum level of reserves needed to be restored to this fund in the year 2000 budget.

June Pitchford stated that if this budget were adopted as presented the undesignated, unreserved fund balance in the General Fund would be 2.3 million or approximately 14% of the annual expenditure budget. She stated that there was about 2.2 million that was reserved and designated.

Goals

Public Works

June Pitchford also discussed the broad goals that she had observed in developing the budget. She stated in Public Works, the goals were to complete the projects Proposition 1 and 2 which would include a budgetary impact of 15 million for maintenance design, construction, improvements to cities, and special road district. She noted that this accounted for approximately half of all County spending.

June Pitchford also stated that another goal was to increase the secured detention space of the jail in order to eliminate out of County prisoner housing costs. She stated that this budget included increases for personnel appropriations to provide the additional staffing required by the current jail renovation. She also noted food and supplies had been increased to accommodate the increased capacity.

Technology

June Pitchford stated that the goals regarding technology were to upgrade and replace computer technology in order to provide necessary operating capacity. She stated that among the most significant budgetary impacts included upgrades to the AS400, continuation of the Countywide upgraded workstations, and various impacts in the Courthouse including equipping another courtroom for video arraignment.

She also noted that there was no dollar amount provided for Y2K compliance. However, June Pitchford did note that potential computer software and other technology problems needed to be identified that are related to the Y2K date change and implement corrective procedures. She stated that the County had modified internally developed software. She stated that the County Commission had appointed a task force to look at the issues surrounding the Y2K compliance. She stated that she did not have any budgetary estimates at this time.

Commissioner Miller stated that he had received an idea of what the Y2K compliance would cost with an estimate for the heating and air in the Boone County Government Center of \$8,000.

June Pitchford noted that the budget did not include specific appropriations, however she did state that the emergency appropriations should be sufficient to address moderate modifications because a good portion of it would not have to be spent on out of County housing in 1999. She stated that in the event that significant modifications were required the County Commission would need to open up the budget free up funding for such a project.

Personnel

June Pitchford stated that the primary goal in personnel was to provide competitive compensation and benefits to reduce turnover and enable the County to attract and retain a skilled workforce. She stated that the budgetary impact included an appropriation to fund a range adjustment recommended by the range classification committee for Deputy-sheriff positions and an appropriation to fund a small increase in retirement benefits as recommended by the committee.

June Pitchford also stated that there had been discussions regarding strategic and long-range planning for the County. She stated that the planning process would aid greatly in the developing of budgetary goals and in the shaping of a budget consistent to those goals. She stated that she wanted to encourage the planning and applaud the Commission for recognizing the need for such planning.

Revenue Categories

Property Tax

June Pitchford stated that this budget included a 13¢ per one hundred dollar assessed valuation for the General Fund, and a 5¢ per one hundred dollar assessed valuation for Road & Bridge for property tax. She noted that this reflected a 1¢ increase in the levy that was necessary to help balance the budget and accommodate the increased costs of the Jail renovation project.

June Pitchford noted that even with this increase, it would still be necessary for the County to use some of its reserves. She did state however that she felt that this was fiscally prudent because she could see some relief on the horizon in 1999.

June Pitchford noted that she was not proposing any property tax levies for debt service.

Sales Tax

June Pitchford stated that she expected continued growth in this area. She stated that looking at the schedule it appeared that there was a decline projected. She explained this however by noting that her budget estimate for 1998 was a little too optimistic. She further noted that there were other revenues that would cover that projection.

Intergovernmental Revenues

June Pitchford stated that the County received a number of grants both State and federal, State reimbursements, and State contracts. She noted that this budget included all grants that had been awarded to the County for the upcoming year, but did not include any potential grants or ones that were subject to annual renewal. She stated that her policy for potential grants or renewals was to amend the budget.

June Pitchford stated that the overall decrease in this category could be attributed to three factors:

- (1) Reduced federal and state reimbursements for grants.
- (2) Reduced reimbursements pertaining to juvenile employees (when the State assumes reimbursements to those employees on July 1, the County will lose that money) and per diems for housing other juveniles will also be reduced.
- (3) The method used to budget for the revenues associated with the Child Advocacy Center and Community Connections, all of the costs associated with these two facilities are fully paid by the State.

June Pitchford stated that another significant source of intergovernmental revenues was County and Road Trust funds. She noted that she had assumed a 15% growth rate in that area.

June Pitchford stated that Commissioner Stamper was aware that she had assumed that Hancock refund would not impact any of the other funds for Road & Bridge. She stated that this budget did not assume that the County would experience a loss of any of that revenue.

Hospital Lease Revenue

June Pitchford stated that the annual payment to the County was \$1,350,000 and would continue until 2002.

Charges for Services, Interest, and Other revenues

June stated that according to the schedule there would be a 7% decrease in this category between 1998 and 1999 that was due to two factors.

- (1) Legislation passed that and enacted that affected Sheriff's fees that consolidated these fees and eliminated a lot of the individual fees which resulted in an overall deduction for the County of about \$30,000 a year.
- (2) The 1998 budget assumed a high level of revenue for direct dial-up fees and it did not materialize.

June Pitchford also stated that since Federal Forfeiture funds could not be predicted, they were not included in the 1999 budget. She stated if the figures were received, the budget would be amended.

June Pitchford stated that most of the revenue comes from sales taxes, 12% from intergovernmental, 9% from property taxes, and the balance is then made up by charges for services, interest, and other revenues.

How the money is spent (includes all governmental funds)

Figures available in the actual budget

June Pitchford stated that she tried to provide an analysis of the variation in spending between the 1998 and 1999 budgets in the budget message. She noted that there was a big decrease in health/welfare (for 1999) that could be attributed to the significant appropriations of 1998 in ProfitShare to communities.

June Pitchford also noted that in the capital outlay, about 3 million of that total was accounted for in the JJC renovation project, Jail project, and Salt storage facility. Therefore the 1999 level has fallen back to replacement needs.

Commissioner Vogt asked if the \$985,000 was what could normally be expected in a yearly budget for replacement needs.

June Pitchford stated that overall it would be expected to be a bit higher. She stated that there have been substantial expenditures for replacement in the last decade. She did note however that she expected the County to move to an overall lower level for capital funding.

Long-term Debt

June Pitchford stated that the County had just over 4 million in long-term debt outstanding.

June Pitchford went over a few of the major items that resulting in a lot of spending such as the Jail Renovation project, El Chapparal NID, etc.

June Pitchford stated that there was a reflection of a one and a half percent increase for raises, two percent for merit raises, and funding for an increase in County Retirement. She also noted that the budget included 4-yr funding for disability insurance and any changes in salaries for elected officials.

June Pitchford also noted that the budget included an emergency appropriation of \$550,000 (which was the required amount) and \$20,000 for contingency funding.

Finally, June Pitchford pointed out a list of significant items that were not included in the budget. She stated that she received requests exceeding 2.1 million. She stated that she included about \$600,000 of them in the budget.

June Pitchford stated that the County's spending was down by 10% in intergovernmental fund as a result of completion of several capital projects. She also noted that the savings on juvenile legislation had been applied toward the increased cost of the correctional facility.

Commissioner Stamper asked if there were any questions for the Auditor.

Commissioner Vogt asked about the December 31, 1998 target date for the adoption. She wanted to know if there was any particular reason why this date (and not an earlier one) had been selected.

June Pitchford stated that there was no particular reason for this date, she had wanted to make sure that it was adopted by the end of the year. She stated that the date could be adjusted. She did state that legally, the budget did not have to be adopted until January 31 in the year a Presiding Commissioner is elected.

June Pitchford pointed out that there was a mission statement, budget highlights, objective identified by that elected official or department head, progress on previous years, performance measures, and personnel details compared across three years for each office. June Pitchford stated that any supplemental requests would have followed this printout. Commissioner Stamper thanked June Pitchford for her effort in preparing the budget and accepted the proposed 1999 budget presented by the Auditor as a draft budget.

Commissioner Stamper noted that further review of the budget, including work sessions and budget hearings would follow.

Subject: Variance Consideration for Liberty Woods

Frank Abart stated that there was a variance requested to meet a chip/seal requirement. He stated that present length was 960' and it need to be changed to 1000' to meet the requirement.

Frank Abart stated that the department had no objection to this request.

Commissioner Stamper moved approve a Variance request for the residents of Liberty Woods Court to change its length from 960 feet to 1000 feet to meet the required length for a chip/seal private pay policy.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Miller asked if the residents were going to pay for the paving themselves.

Frank Abart stated that this question was one that needed further discussion. He stated that he thought that maybe the residents wanted to pay for the chip/seal and perhaps leave the costs above and beyond that for the paving to the County. He stated that he did not know about this for sure.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 546-98**

Subject: Appointment to Boone County Mental Health Board

Commissioner Stamper stated that this was an agenda non-time item.

Commissioner Stamper moved to appoint Bernard Beitman to the Boone County Mental Health Board for a term starting November 17, 1998 and ending February 28, 2002.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Vogt stated that the Board was very happy to appoint Dr. Beitman and that he would be filling two months of an existing term and then assume a normal term.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 547-98**

Commissioner Reports

There were no Commissioner' Reports.

Commissioner Miller moved to authorize a closed session immediately following the regular scheduled meeting on Tuesday, November 17, 1998 as authorized by Section 610.021 (2) RSMo. to discuss the leasing, purchase, or sale of real estate by a public governmental body where public knowledge of the transaction might adversely affect legal consideration therefor.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 548-98**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55a.m.

Attest:

Don Stamper
Presiding Commissioner

Wendy S. Noren
Clerk of the County Commission

Karen M. Miller
District I Commissioner

Linda Vogt
District II Commissioner