

TERM OF COMMISSION: August Session of the August Adjourned Term

PLACE OF MEETING: Boone County Government Center Commission Chambers

PRESENT WERE: District I Commissioner Karen M. Miller
District II Commissioner Linda Vogt
Deputy County Clerk Melanie Stapleton

The meeting was called to order by the Acting-Presiding Commissioner Miller at 1:35pm. She stated that Commissioner Stamper was out of town this afternoon.

Subject: Agreement with University of MO for Contracting Services

Major O. J. Stone stated that this agreement is for providing security service at the MU home football games this season. He stated that the Sheriff’s Department was contracted to do this at the end of the last year season. He stated that the University was pleased with the service and wanted to continue the arrangement in a more formal manner.

Commissioner Vogt moved to approve an Agreement between the Boone County Sheriff’s Department and the Curators of the University of MO with terms as outlined for safety and security assistance during the MU home football games. And further authorize the Acting-Presiding Commission to sign the agreement.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 293-99**

Subject: Award bid 21-23JUN99 Photocopier/Facsimile Machine (s), Maintenance and Supplies

Beckie Jackson presented the bid award recommendation.

Commissioner Vogt moved to award bid 21-23JUN99 as follows:

FOR	TO
Photocopier #1 w/all Add Alternates	KOPI Inc, Gestetner 3235
Photocopier #2 w/all Add Alternates	KOPI Inc, Gestetner 3245
Photocopier #3 w/all Add Alternates	KOPI Inc, Gestetner 3235
Facsimile #1	Data Comm Inc.-Panafax UF885
Facsimile #2	Data Comm Inc.-Sharp FO2850

There is no award for facsimile #3 at this time.

Said bid is awarded per the attached recommendation of the Purchasing Department. It is further ordered that the Presiding Commissioner be hereby authorized to sign the contract documents.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 294-99**

Subject: Variance Considerations

Frank Abart stated that the Road & Bridge Advisory Committee met last week and debated two requests. He stated that the first request for variance had to do with Allstate Consultants in

regard to Texaco Drive. He stated that the request was for a driveway separation distance for a commercial access. He stated that the committee approved this request subject to the three conditions (1) The access be exit only from the property and (2) the access be signed as an "Exit Only" and (3) that pavement markings be provided by the developer to note right turn only.

Frank Abart stated that the second request had to do with TH & H Consultants in regard to New Town Subdivision. He stated that this was also approved by the committee with five conditions (1) allow a design speed of 30 MPH throughout the entire subdivision (2) allow variations in right-of-way widths (3) allow for placement of a 28 foot curb and gutter residential street instead of 33 foot (4) allow placement of a "round-about" for traffic control on NewTown Avenue (5) allow for deviations in horizontal requirements in the subdivision area designated for commercial development.

Commissioner Miller stated that the Public Works Department opposed one portion of this variance request.

Frank Abart stated that initially there was a proposal to put two 90° turns in this development. He stated that the PW Department opposed that for two reasons (1) difficulties in maintenance (2) concerns about traffic congestion. He stated that they reached agreement on this section of the variance request.

Commissioner Vogt moved to approve the Variance requests for Texaco Drive and New Town Subdivision as stated on the August 6, 1999 memorandum from the Public Works Director.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 2-0. Order 295-99

Subject: Budget revision for chain saw replacement

Frank Abart stated that this chain saw was damaged by another piece of equipment. He stated that because this is a Class 9 fixed item it has to have the approval of the County Commission in the form of a budget revision.

Commissioner Vogt moved to authorize a budget revision as follows:

AMOUNT	(to) ACCOUNT	(from) ACCOUNT
\$408	2040-92300 Replacement Machinery & Equipment	2040-86800 Emergency

Said revision is to cover replacement cost of a chain saw.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 296-99**

Subject: Budget Revision to increase Human Resources Advertising Account

Mark Stone stated that the County Commission approved a certain amount for the above named fund during the 1999 Budget process. He stated that due to the job marketing and the nature of the positions that the HR Department has had to recruit for, the account has almost been depleted. He stated that he is requesting an additional \$10,000 be transferred from the Emergency Funds to this account.

Commissioner Miller moved to authorize a Budget revision as follows:

AMOUNT	(to) ACCOUNT	(from) ACCOUNT
\$10,400	1115-84300 Advertising	1123-86800 Emergency Fund

Said revision is to increase the funds in the Human Resources Advertising account.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Vogt asked if the Advertising budget for 2000 would need to be \$10,000.

Mark Stone stated that he did not foresee that it would be that much. He stated that he would recommend that the budget be brought back down to the standard amount.

Subject: Presentation on Town of Wilton by State Land Surveyor Norman Brown

Mike Flowers, State Land Surveyor stated that he and Norman Brown were present to discuss this matter. He stated that this issue goes back prior to his involvement in the matter. He stated that the State Land Survey Program has four mandates (things that can be done) by law. He stated that the first is the maintenance of the U. S. public land survey corners in the State of Missouri. He stated that Boone County and the State of Missouri had participated in the restoration and reestablishment of the public land corners. He stated that the program is also responsible for geodetic control or the establishment of a statewide network of high order survey markers and benchmarks used for mapping or engineering. The third mandate is the repository--the most comprehensive one in the State of Missouri--dating back to the original GLO surveys of 1850-1855, the plats, field notes and official records made by the County Surveyors in the 114 counties in Missouri. He stated that the repository contains approximately 1.5 million documents, which are provided to the public, land surveyor, or whomever. He stated that the repository also contains many private records from other government agencies. He stated that fourth, there is an administration section wherein they are responsible for and promulgate the standards for surveying practice in the State of Missouri.

Mike Flowers stated that the fourth mandate is the one that involves them in the issue that is being discussed today. He stated that over the years, they have accepted requests from State and local government agencies to look at issues related to surveying.

Mike Flowers stated that the first responsibility of a surveyor is to survey the record title of a piece of property. He stated that his office (as land surveyors or State land surveyors) is not able to adjudicate a property line. He stated that their staff could evaluate and give input (opinion) on where an issue can be resolved. He stated that this particular issue has been going on for a long time. He stated that there has not been much surveying done in this area, and therefore it becomes very difficult to establish (city) blocks, etc. He stated that much of surveying is an art, which requires professional judgement.

Mike Flowers stated that he and Norman Brown have been involved with a local surveyor who has been very helpful and cooperative on this issue. He introduced Norman Brown to make his presentation. He reiterated that under State law the Stand Land Surveyor's Office could not re-survey the town of Wilton. He stated that they are responsible for the public land corners, and can not survey someone's property or lot. He stated that they would provide all information that could precipitate a solution for the town of Wilton.

Norman Brown stated that the town of Wilton was originally platted and dedications made, with the slot (for the name) left blank on the plat. He stated that the name "Spencer" was placed in that blank and the plat was put in the County records. He stated that someone else platted a town called Wilton a little less than ½ a mile up the river. He stated, according to his understanding of the history of the area, that there was room for a depot in Spencer, however there was not room

for a depot in Wilton. He stated that soon the two towns grew together and took on the name of Wilton for the overall area. He stated that this town of Wilton was platted in 1892. He stated that there were not any surveys found within the town of Wilton that had been recorded, other than the original plat (which was not signed by a surveyor). He stated that the first recorded survey in the County records was done in 1944, when a surveyor plotted some lots in the most southerly portion of the town. He stated that in 1944, there was a survey that was done on lot 7 and 8 of Block 1 in the middle of the town. He stated that there was a survey done in 1952 that was not put on record until the 1990s (by Surveyor Heying). He stated that this survey included lots in the northeasterly part of town. He stated that the survey that Mr. Heying performed contained the findings of pins found on the 1952 survey. He stated that Mr. Heying's used those findings to reconstruct the entire town.

Norman Brown stated that when he arrived on the scene about a year and a half ago, he was shown a pin and a pipe (both part of the 1944 survey). He stated that the another survey was performed in this area when the Missouri Highway Department built Hwy M. He stated that this survey was apparently performed and those monuments set before 1934. He stated that a person that may have worked on this survey accompanied him to the site and dug up some of the old right-of-way markers along Rte M. He stated that one of those markers was on the 1944 survey. He stated that on the 1994 survey, this marker is shown as being ten feet south of First Street. He stated that the marker is also shown as being 71 feet south of the corner of lot 27 in Block 1. He stated that those markers give two positions on the south lines of those blocks that date back a considerable length of time. He stated that he used those two points to reconstruct the town. He stated that he extended a line across the northwest that would incorporate lots 13-24. He stated that he found another pin (bumper jack) on the corner of lot 8 and 9 on the corner Block 1. He stated that he was shown another pin (piece of iron) on the corner of lot 4 in Block 1. He stated that he was not sure where this pin came from and that there is no survey record of it. He stated that the set of highway plans showed that the point of intersection of the highway tangents (portion that runs down Locust St and come north out of town) as being on the property line for Block 2. He stated that there were also pins found on the survey performed in 1952.

Norman Brown stated that the problem with these surveys was that they did not show angles. He stated that the original town was described as having started at a 40-acre corner going across to the center of the section, down 1316 feet to the corner of town. He stated that the bearings or the direction of the lines for the town were shown as being at right angles. He stated that they found several pins on the 1952 survey that were not placed at right angles to each other. He stated that if all of those pins found in Block 2 (1952) were used to reconstruct that part of town, the lines that run northwest and southeast would not be at 90° to the lines that run southwest and northeast. He stated that if the pipe (1944), highway information, bumper jack were used, then those lines that run northwest and southeast would not be perpendicular or at 90° to the centerline of the highway. He stated that his drawing illustrated a reconstruction of the town using all of the pins that were found. He stated that he did not make any judgement regarding the pins (and how good or adequate they were to use). He stated that if a town plat were reconstructed using that information, the distance of those blocks (from the south line of Block 1 up to the north line of the south half) would not be 140 feet, but rather 141.5 feet. He stated that the next half block would be 143.9 feet rather than 140 feet. He stated that Block 2 (the south half of the block) would be 144.2 feet instead of 140 feet. He stated that the pins that the surveyor put in (1952) were 140 feet apart just like the original plat shows. He stated however that those pins were not 90° to each other.

Norman Brown stated that the State Land Surveyor's Office is not able monument and survey on the ground of the town of Wilton. He stated however that if all of the information that was found, including the highway markers, pins from 1944, and pipe from 1952 were utilized, it would match up with ancient tree lines (occupation lines). He stated that if the surveyors working in that area were to use all of those pins, then there would be a little bit of overlap of the west side of this town. He stated that there would also be difference of opinion on where the fence is located at the north side of town. He stated that the town of Wilton could be reconstructed using all of the information that he presented today and the lines would fall very close to where they were or have been since 1892.

Norman Brown stated that if he did not have a dimension for an alleyway(or evidence that showed otherwise), then it would have been considered to be 20 feet wide. He stated that if he

did not have something that changed the dimension of the street, then the north side of Block 1 would be considered parallel to the south side of Block 1. He stated that the streets are generally the record dimension (140 feet) of a street. He stated that he would have made every lot in town 140 feet, but he had pins that showed otherwise. He stated that by using all of the information available, the property lines and occupation lines could be made to agree with each other.

Norman Brown stated that there might be other pins (in this area) that could be utilized to define other points. He stated that if another pin was found in this area, then it would make distances shown on his plat vary a little.

Commissioner Miller asked David Piest, Public Works if he had any questions for Mr. Flowers or Mr. Brown.

David Piest suggested to Mr. Brown that the County might have some evidence concerning Locust Street (as a result of an outside research project done 5 years).

Commissioner Miller asked if any of the surveyors present had questions or comments.

Steve Heying, land surveyor from Columbia stated that he performed the survey work that started the controversy in the town of Wilton. He stated that he was the first person to do any survey work in this town since 1952. He stated that his job in a 1994 survey (for a person that owned land on three of the four sides) was to establish the outside of town, not to divide and quarter up lots within the town. He stated that under this premise, the boundaries were more important than the lots within the town. He stated that the evidence that he tried to use was the evidence that went back to the 1892 original town plat of Wilton. He presented some illustrations for the Commission to view.

Steve Heying stated that the man that signed the original, 1892 plat, signed it as an engineer and a surveyor. He stated that the registration law (for surveying) did not start until 1957. He stated that he was led to believe that the man that signed the 1892 plat had some ability to measure and put vectors on the ground (and therefore did so). He stated that his job then, was to reproduce that. He stated that he felt it was important to hold the 90° lots since there were bearings all around the town. He stated that he was in common (within 1') with the assemblage of data of where the north corner was set up as a diamond. He stated that there was not much difference with the line up and down on the northeast side of town. He stated that the assemblage of the surveyors' work that was done subsequent to the highway right-of-way, twists the town to make the lots longer and also off of the 90° angles as well. He stated that he did have a problem with these differences. He stated that one of the problems that he had was that the lines of occupation around the town were also different (by about 11 and ½ feet). He stated that the difference in the bearings, which gives direction to the lines, was about 2°.

Steve Heying stated that he felt his job was to do the best job possible of reproducing the 1892 plat on the ground. He stated that the survey that he performed largely involved a hill to the southeast where this piece of ground goes along the south side of Wilton. He stated that he felt that he already had a good grasp on the lines inside the town of Wilton. He stated that the evidence that he used was the north end of the north survey because it matched the fences on either side of the north corner, and the direction of 90° because it fit the fences going down on the hill to the northwest side of Cedar. He stated that he also used Mr. Hazel's deed on the southeast side of Wilton, which is an exception to the deed (of the property for which this survey was being performed) done in 1919. He stated that this deed was very important because it was done prior to the highway right-of-way.

Steve Heying stated that he did not actually find the deeds that gave the right-of-way to the Missouri Highway Department. He stated that he was "a little bothered when it did not say that they intended to have this hit on those lots down there; for about the 250 feet that we are trying hold as being the lots that went up (lot 8 in Block 1 and lots 25 and 26 in Block 1)." (Commissioner Miller I listened to this portion of his testimony about 15 times and could not summarize or clarify it, so I decided to quote him word for word—do you have a better suggestion?) He stated that this was the point of contention. He stated that he was having trouble with the fact "that they got that on the lot lines, when on the north side of lot 8, it runs off the lot lines." He stated that "on all the way through lot 2 it has nothing to do with the lot lines

and where it goes around the corner to First Street, it has nothing to do with the right-of-way or lot lines there either.” He stated that in fact “it encroaches in the front yard of what I surveyed.” He stated that “with the record distances, the encroachment was not down there.” He stated that this is another reason that he believed “that the 140’ lot depths, 20’ alleys, and 60’ streets all were correct.” He stated that he did have in his possession, the surveys performed by Byron Huett (County Surveyor) previous to registration—however he did not believe that they were executed correctly. He stated that Mr. Huett started his survey at the highway and went both ways, rather than starting at the side of town or the outside of town. He stated that Mr. Huett set the south corner of his survey from the highway right-of way.

Steve Heying showed the Commission an illustration of what the town should (as he believed) looked like in whole. He stated that there was “a jog in the right-of-way south of the lot line between 5,6, and 7 to where it shrunk down,” and on the set of plans he read that as a taper instead of a jog down. He stated that on his survey, the fence is seven feet off due to a pin that he found. Steve Heying demonstrated for the Commission the results of his survey and the points that differed from Mr. Brown’s survey.

Steve Heying stated that he had problems with the highway right-of-way fitting over lot lines in the southern part of the town. He stated that since his job (putting deed record title on the ground) was best served by putting deed record distance and direction on the ground as well. He stated that (according to his drawing) when it came time to either find or set Mr. Hazel’s deed lines, there was only one location that it could be, physically, due to the topography. He stated that if the outside of the town swung to the west by even 1°, it would move the fence out by 11’ into the swamp. He stated that it would also move all of Mr. Hazel’s deed further west and create more of a problem [for the town]. He stated that he believed that he had the deed in the right place, putting the southeast side of Wilton in the right place, and (which he thought) put the outside of Wilton in the right place. He stated however, that he had no idea what happened inside the town.

Commissioner Miller thanked him for his presentation.

Commissioner Miller stated that she wanted to clarify what happened today. She stated that the State Land Surveyor’s Office felt that their job was to identify any points that they could find from past surveys without drawing lines of individual lots. She stated that the State Land Surveyor’s Office found as much information as possible. She stated that the question that she had was: where would Mr. Heying’s survey put the situation of Mr. Hazel’s property if they were to follow the points found by Mr. Norman? She wanted to know if this would truly move the town of Wilton to where Mr. Hazel’s property is shifted and who would make that final determination?

Steve Heying stated that if the contention is that the latest evidence is the best evidence instead of the oldest evidence, then somehow it needed to be put on the ground for everyone to use. He stated that underneath the maintenance of land corners that other corners subsequent to section corners and township corners, and even the outside of the town can be set by the State. He stated that a plat needed to be filed and recorded with the County. He stated that he needed some sort of judgement to go on the ground for future use.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Brown or Mr. Flowers to respond to Mr. Heying’s statement.

Mike Flowers stated that he would only speak to the issue of what the State Land Surveyor’s Office could or could not do. He stated that he has an investigation file for this matter with a number of 813. He stated that their office receives a lot of these kinds of requests. He stated that in cases of public land corners, the State Land Surveyor’s Office does have the authority to make decision on establishments. He stated however, that the State Land Surveyor’s Office does not survey private property. He stated that they would cooperate with the local surveyors, however the only way that the property lines could be adjudicated was to go through the court. He stated that if they went to court, the decision might only speak to one or two of the property lines. He stated that the State Land Surveyor’s Office was trying to come up with an overall solution that best fit the situation.

Commissioner Miller asked any other surveyors that had questions to come forward so that Mr. Brown could answer all of the questions at the same time.

Gene Basinger, land surveyor with offices at 300 St. James St stated that he was not present to question anyone as far as the correctness of their surveys. He stated that he would like to have Mr. Heying produce a survey and record it for future use by other surveyors. He stated that the State Land Surveyor's Office had spent a lot of time and taxpayers money, and therefore all of the evidence (including the satellite survey information) should be recorded as well. He stated that the attorneys in this area do not recognized non-recorded survey documents.

Commissioner Miller asked Norman Brown to address the impact on the Hazel property and also the request made by Mr. Basinger to record the evidence presented by the State Land Surveyor's Office.

Norman Brown stated that he did not know what this would do to the Hazel property. He stated that he did not retrace those deeds and could not find the markings that were adjacent to the town boundary that marked that property. He stated that he did not know how the evidence he presented would affect the survey conducted for Mr. Hazel. He stated that what he had been most interested in was how the internal part of the town fit together, because what seemed to cause all of the trouble in the first place was that properties were not where they were supposed to be. He stated if people were to use the survey, performed by Mr. Heying, then all of the other property lines would be off as well.

Commissioner Miller asked if it was possible for the State Land Surveyor's Office to establish the land corners of the town so that all surveyors would be able to use the same set of corners for their individual lot surveys. She asked if it was possible to get the preliminary work recorded in Boone County.

Norman Brown stated that the information that he presented would not be recordable unless it was signed and sealed by the registered land surveyor in charge of it.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Brown was the registered land survey in charge of this evidence.

Norman Brown stated that he was. He stated that he was not willing to record this evidence in its present form as preliminary data. He stated that he would not be willing to sign and seal the documents presented until he had an opportunity to go back and check the position of a lot of the pins that were used. He stated that if the information was strengthened then he would have no problem signing and sealing it.

Steve Heying stated that there was a statement made about him recording his 1994 survey work. He stated that he had several of his irons pulled by some of the owners (of properties). He stated that two of his irons were going to be pulled by MoDOT. He stated that the work that he did was gone.

Mike Flowers stated that they would provide geographic information on the satellite surveys. He stated that with some additional verification, they would put together a report of the files that have the coordinates of all the data represented as found corners on their sketch. He stated however that they would not record this information in a survey record book because it does not meet the requirements.

Commissioner Miller asked then if the land corners were the responsibility of the State Land Surveyor's Office.

Mike Flowers stated that neither the Block corners nor the town corners were their responsibility.

Commissioner Miller asked any citizens (of Wilton) to come forward if they wished to make comments. She stated that everyone should understand now that this issue could not be decided by Mr. Brown or Mr. Heying, but only by a court of law.

Norman Brown stated that he did not know if a court of law would even hear this evidence. He stated that it would require a lot more work and probably another survey to be allowable in the Circuit Court.

Paul Reeder, 1607 E Fox Hollow Rd stated that his father paid to have a surveyor (Mr. Heying) perform a survey on his property. He stated that Commissioner Miller came out to his property with the Sheriff's Department and told his father to go ahead and put his fence up.

Commissioner Miller stated that Mr. Reader followed the survey that he was given and if there was a problem with that, then that is a civil issue.

Paul Reeder asked if the survey would stand and if people who wanted to challenge it should take it to court.

Commissioner Vogt stated that if any property owners disagreed with the survey, then they needed to take the issue to the Circuit Court.

William Duvall (of Wilton) stated that this whole situation began with one fence being moved. He stated that he did not feel that it was a justifiable expense (for him to pay for a survey) when he was not even the one involved in the original dispute. He stated that he has now lost 12 and ½ feet of his property (against the road). He wanted to know how those not originally involved in the dispute could now be given the burden of proof. He wanted to know if he was going to be able to stick with what he was told when he originally sold his property or lose the property.

Commissioner Vogt stated that William Duvall was the only person that could decide if that was a justifiable expense.

William Duvall stated that he thought that the reason that the State Land Surveyor's Office became involved in this was to see if Mr. Heying's survey was correct.

Commissioner Vogt stated that the State Land Surveyor's Office was only trying to identify the bordering markers of the town. She stated that the government could not spend public money to do private survey work.

Norman Brown stated that his purpose in going to the town was to find markers placed by previous surveyors. He stated that the surveyors in 1944 and 1952 put markers in and people lived with those markers for many years.

William Duvall stated that he purchased 125' by 70' and how it is 11 and ½ feet shorter. He wanted to know if there was a County Surveyor who could come in and survey this town. He asked if the burden was going to be placed all of the other individuals (of the town) over one fence line that was moved. He asked if he was going to be made to spend \$4,000-5,000 on this.

Commissioner Vogt stated that the County Commission does not have the right to spend everyone's money to buy Mr. Duvall a survey.

William Duvall also stated that they also did not have the right to move one man's fence and throw off everyone else's property lines, and make everyone else spend that kind of money.

Paula Basinger stated that Paul Reeder is her father. She stated that his property originally belonged to her grandfather and he moved his fence line over in order to avoid a dip on a hill. She stated that one does not lose property by moving a fence line over. She stated that you can not necessarily use fence lines to determine boundaries.

Paul Reeder stated that he believed that there is a solution to this situation if the County would consider it. He stated that the streets in Wilton are County streets (maintained by the County), and therefore he did not see why the County Commission could not order a survey of the streets of Wilton and monument those streets. He stated that this would aid all surveyors in the future and decrease the costs of surveys in the town.

Commissioner Miller stated that she would add this suggestion to the list.

Clifton Duvall (of Wilton) stated that the original plat was performed in 1892 and for 100 years there was no problem. He stated that now one fence line has been moved and it messed up everyone in the whole town. He stated that it made sense to him for this one fence line not to have to effect the entire town.

Bernice Hyde (of Wilton) stated that Mr. Heying did survey work for her and told her that the northwest corner of the survey is 18 feet into her pasture. She stated that she had lived there all of her life (her grandfather purchased the property in 1904). She stated that the fence might have been moved a little, but it was not moved 18 feet. She stated therefore, that some of the stakes are in the wrong place.

William Duvall asked the County Commission if there was anything such thing as a “use law” regarding property.

Commissioner Miller stated that she had heard of this law, however she is not an attorney and could not speak to or define that law.

Commissioner Miller closed the discussion on this matter. She stated that she would speak further with Mr. Brown to see what he felt could be a solution to his problem (if there was one). She stated that she would try to respond in writing to those people that asked questions after the Commission has had try to absorb the issue.

Commissioner Miller thanked everyone for coming.

Subject: Budget Revision on replacement fax machine

Commissioner Vogt moved to authorize a budget revision as follows:

AMOUNT	(to) ACCOUNT	(from) ACCOUNT
\$995	1241-92300 Replacement Machinery & Equipment	1241-91100 Office Furniture

Said revision is to cover the cost of a replacement fax machine.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 2-0. Order 299-99

Subject: Outsource Contract for Network Support

Bob Ormiston stated that he was present to request that the Information Technology Department be authorized to enter into an agreement for the outsource services of two, technical assistants. He stated that the IT Department recently accepted the resignation of its PC Communication Analyst/Network Manager. He stated that the department is concerned that the County will be exposed to network failure if action is not taken to prevent that occurrence.

Bob Ormiston stated that one of the reasons for the outsource is that the current firewall is not Y2K compliant. He stated that work must be done make it Y2K compliant. He stated that even if the vacant position were to be filled within the next couple of weeks, that individual would not be familiar with the County’s systems. He stated that the outsource technical assistants (being from a company that is already familiar with the County’s network system) could help familiarize the person in that position with the County’s system in a reasonable period of time.

Bob Ormiston stated that he is requesting an agreement for two individuals from the Integrated Solutions Group. He stated that one of the individuals would be a Workplace Specialist who

would work 40 hours per week at the rate of pay of \$25/hr. He stated that the Workplace Specialist would work for the remainder of the year and the first, six months of next year. He stated that the second individual would be a Systems Engineer who would work everyday for the next 12 weeks, and then work four hours per week for an additional seven weeks. He stated that the total cost for these services would be a total cost of \$44,760.

Bob Ormiston stated that this would require a budget revision, however the department had determined that there would be a \$65,411.35 surplus in the Salaries & Wages Account that could be transferred to cover the cost of this agreement.

Commissioner Vogt stated that the County Commission met with Bob Ormiston to discuss this matter. She stated that she was in support of this agreement.

Commissioner Vogt moved to authorize a budget revision as follows:

AMOUNT	(to) ACCOUNT	(from) ACCOUNT
\$37,000	1170-71101 Professional Services	1170-10100 Salaries & Wages

Said revision is to cover the cost of the IT Department's outsource contract with Integrated Solutions.

Commissioner Vogt further moved to approve the request to enter into an agreement, for a period of six months, with Integrated Solutions Group to supply a Workstation Specialist at the rate of \$25/hr and a Systems Engineer at the rate of pay of \$35/hr for a total contract price of \$44,760 of which an estimated \$36,780 will be incurred in the 1999 fiscal year and the remainder incurred in fiscal year 2000 and authorize the Presiding Commissioner to sign the agreement.

Commissioner Miller seconded both motions.

There was no discussion.

The motions passed 2-0. **Order 298-99 and Order 298A-99.**

Subject: Budget Revision for Senior Meals Program

Commissioner Vogt moved to authorize a Budget revision as follows:

AMOUNT	(to) ACCOUNT	(from) ACCOUNT
\$15,000	1420-86630 Social Services: Elderly Support Services	
\$2,520		1420-86664 Social Services: Congregate Meals
\$12,480		1420-86635 Social Services: Home Delivered Meals

Said revision is to re-appropriate funds for congregate and home-delivered meals to the Boone County Council on Aging in order to implement Senior Meals at Senior Centers in Boone County.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 300-99**

Subject: Appointment to Boone County Library Board

Commissioner Miller moved to reappoint Patricia Powell to a 4-yr term on the Boone County Library Board to expire on June 30, 2003.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 301-99**

Commissioner Miller tabled the Report on Boone County Regional Sewer District Activities and City of Columbia Annexations until Commissioner Stamper could be present to discuss them.

Commissioner Reports

Commissioner reports were tabled until the following meeting.

There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Attest:

Don Stamper
Presiding Commissioner

Wendy S. Noren
Clerk of the County Commission

Karen M. Miller
District I Commissioner

Linda Vogt
District II Commissioner