

Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget

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
Deputy County Clerk Melanie Stapleton

The meeting was called to order by the Presiding Commissioner at 9:30am.

Subject: Public Hearing on Budget Amendment for Stream Evaluation Study/Cooperative Study

Commissioner Stamper convened a public hearing on the budget amendment.

There was no one that wished to speak.

Commissioner Stamper closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller moved to authorize a budget amendment as follows:

Table with 2 columns: AMOUNT, (increasing) ACCOUNT. Row 1: \$10,000, 2090-71101

Said amendment is to fund the Stream Evaluation Study/Cooperative Study.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. Order 449-99

Subject: Public Hearing on Budget Amendment for VOCA Grant Renewal and Adjustment

Commissioner Stamper convened a public hearing on the budget amendment.

There was no one present that wished to speak.

Commissioner Stamper closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Vogt moved to authorize a budget amendment as follows:

Table with 3 columns: AMOUNT, (decreasing) ACCOUNT, (increasing) ACCOUNT. Rows include amounts like \$8,311, \$636, \$37, \$9,645, \$1,200, \$825, \$2,025 and account numbers like 1262-10100 Salaries & Wages, 1262-10200 FICA, etc.

Said amendment is for VOCA Grant Renewal and Adjustment.

*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 450-99**

**Subject: Award bid 40-27OCT99 Stab-Proof Protective Vests**

Marlene Ridgway presented the recommendation for the bid award.

Commissioner Miller moved to award bid 40-27OCT99 as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>TO</b>
Stab-proof Protective Vests	Law Enforcement Equipment

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 agreement.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Miller asked how the costs of these kinds of vests compares to bullet-proof vests.

Beckie Jackson stated that these vests cost a lot less than the bullet-proof vests. She stated that bullet-proof vests cost about \$600 apiece.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 450A-99**

**Subject: Budget revision to cover utility shortfall**

June Pitchford stated that the resources for the Utility Fund are derived from the square footage charge. She stated that at the outset of the 1999 budget, the amount that the County felt was appropriate was included. She stated that the amount was not sufficient for the Government Center due to a water line leakage.

Commissioner Stamper commented that the Facilities Maintenance has been working on that problem for some time. He stated that the problem was related to switch from copper pipes to plastic pipes.

June Pitchford stated that the money for the revision would be taken from the General Fund rather than adjusting the square footage charts.

Commissioner Stamper paused to welcome the Lincoln (Missouri) County Commission.

Commissioner Stamper moved to authorize a budget revision as follows:

<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>(decreasing) ACCOUNT</b>	<b>(increasing) ACCOUNT</b>
\$5,665		6210-48300 Water
\$8,500		6210-48200 Electricity
\$700		6213-48200 Electricity
\$14,165		6210-03913 OTI: General Fund
\$700		6213-03913 OTI: General Fund

*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

\$14,865	1123-86800 Emergency	
\$14,865		1190-83923 OTO: Internal Service Fund

Said revision is to cover utility shortfall.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 451-99**

**Subject: Declare all Boone County Offices closed on Friday, November 26 1999**

Commissioner Stamper stated that the County Commission typically adopts the holidays that are authorized by the Governor of the State of Missouri.

Commissioner Stamper moved to declare that all Boone County Offices will be closed on Friday, November 26<sup>th</sup> as authorized by Executive Order 90-09 from the Office of the Governor of the State of Missouri.

Commissioner Vogt seconded the motion.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed 3-0. **Order 452-99**

**Subject: Presentation of the Proposed 2000 Budget for Boone County**

Commissioner Stamper stated that the County Commission receives an annual report from the County Auditor regarding the proposed 2000 Budget. He stated that this reflects a tremendous amount of work on behalf of the Auditor’s Office. He stated that the process has become more streamlined and perfected due to the County Auditor’s efforts.

June Pitchford stated that her staff and the staff in other offices have aided in improving the process. She stated that she appreciated the contribution that those individuals made during this process.

June Pitchford stated that one of the most important responsibilities of any governing body is to establish its annual budget. She stated that the County’s budget process is governed strictly by State law. She noted for the public record that the County Auditor’s office adhered strictly to the State law in their preparation of the County budget. She stated that the deadline for delivering the budget to the County Commission was November 15<sup>th</sup>. She stated that the proposed budget was delivered on that date.

June Pitchford noted that there are special laws governing the Circuit Court’s budget. She stated that based on conversations she held with the County Commission, she did not request any reductions in the Circuit Court’s budget this year. She stated that to her knowledge, there were no outstanding areas of disagreement with the Circuit Court regarding their budget.

*Overall Goals*

June Pitchford stated that she wanted to acquaint the County Commission with the overall goals and objectives of the budget, identify the key underlined budget assumptions and financial trends, and review the budget highlights.

---

*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

June Pitchford directed the County Commission to the table of contents. She stated that the first section contained the Auditor's budget message, general information about the County, an organizational chart, a chart of budgetary responsibility, a description of systems, a budget chart, and a glossary.

June Pitchford stated that the second part of the Budget Message contained aggregate information and revenue/expenditure summaries. She stated that this is the part of the budget that demonstrates that the County's funds will be solvent. She stated that this is also the part of the budget where major trends in revenue and expenditures are identified and tenure histories are examined. She noted that she also included information for all funds combined, the general fund, and a new section regarding the Public Works Department. She stated that Capital Expenditures & Summaries was a new section added as a result of comments received from the GFOA program that the County participates in. She stated that there is also a new section that identifies the major capital initiatives from 1994-present. She stated that there was also summary information on the capital expenditures (historic and those in 2000 budget). She stated the budget includes a history by functional area and expenditure-type.

*Personnel*

June Pitchford stated that the Personnel section contains charts of the FTE positions in the current budget and a history of those positions. She stated that the charts would be somewhat skewed due to House Bill 971, which resulted in a reduction of Juvenile employees (40 employees taken over by the State Of MO). She stated that her preliminary analysis of the financial impact of that legislation amounted to about a \$600,000-700,000 reduction in law enforcement and judicial expenditures by the County. She stated that the County experienced that savings over a two-year period.

*Long Term Debt*

June Pitchford stated that section D included information on the County's long-term debt. She stated that the County does not have a lot of outstanding debt. She noted that the County has a special obligation debt for the Government Center. She stated that all other debt is related to Neighborhood Improvement Districts.

June Pitchford stated that in the area of itemized, departmental funds, she tried to provide additional information as needed. She gave the example of the Corrections budget. She stated that page 305 contained the mission statement and highlights. She stated that she also included the 1999 historical information in the proposed 2000 budget.

June Pitchford stated that the strategic, planning objectives were provided by various departments. She stated that they tried to include updates from the 1999 objectives. She stated that one should be able to see a connection between the objectives for the coming year and how that will impact the budget. She stated that the County is making progress in some strategic areas, however she noted that there is always room for improvement.

June Pitchford stated that page 308 contains the FTE history for Corrections and page 309 contains the organizational chart. She stated that these sources provide helpful information in understanding how various County offices are structured, how they deploy their FTEs, how key resources are being used, and where the staff is placed (operation).

*Graphs*

June Pitchford stated that the next few pages in the Corrections section contain graphical information to explain what the County has been experiencing in this particular budget. She stated that similar information could be found for other large budgets like Planning and Building Inspection, Circuit Court, or the Information Technology. She stated that this kind of information was not put in the budget for small, fairly stable budgets.

*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

June Pitchford stated that the other pages for each department include line-item appropriations and notes as submitted by each office. She stated that supplemental requests are also included at the end of the section for each office/department.

June Pitchford stated that she would bring any relevant information regarding the supplemental requests (besides the actual request) forward during the hearing because in some instances there has been a lot of correspondence, schedules, etc to support the request.

June Pitchford stated that she wanted to take the County Commission through a couple of key areas in the budget message. She stated that on page 5, she identified the overarching budgetary goals that she tried to address with respect to Public Works. She stated that this area (Public Works) accounts for approximately half of the County's spending. She stated that this section also outlines what the County is attempting to do with the Jail overcrowding issue, on the technology front, and what is being done to maintain competitiveness in the marketplace with respect to employees.

June Pitchford also noted that the upcoming year is an election year and therefore a significant amount of resources is allocated to election costs.

June Pitchford stated that page seven contains significant assumptions that she wanted to make the County Commission aware of. She stated that the chart on the bottom of the page identifies (for all governmental funds combined) where the money will come from and how this compares to previous years. She stated that a "1" is missing on the sales tax item, under the first two columns. She noted that those figures should read 16 million instead of 6 million and 17 million instead of 7 million. She stated all the grand totals and percentages were fine.

June Pitchford stated that the property tax shows a little bit of an increased growth in assessed value. She stated that she included a 3% growth rate assumption for sales tax. She stated that intergovernmental revenues are down (explanation on page 10). She stated that the Child Advocacy Center data (\$1/4 million) skews things because the money is noted in the 1999 budget however it is not noted in the 2000 budget. She stated that the 2000 budget would be amended as soon as the money for the Child Advocacy money is received.

June Pitchford stated that (on page 9) she included a 1¢ increase in property tax, which would be needed to fund services if the sales tax performs at a rate of 3%. She stated that if the sales tax performs better than 3%, the 1¢ increase would not be needed. She stated that the Road & Bridge property tax levy remained at 5¢. She stated that the budget also assumes a 3% growth rate in assessed valuation. She stated that assessed valuation has actually grown a little faster than that, however an adjustment had to be made for reassessment years.

June Pitchford stated that in the sales tax section, there are colored charts and that outline the almost 12% growth. She stated that every governmental level is experiencing this type of growth.

June Pitchford stated that there was no real change in current revenues. She stated that she did not budget anything for Healthcare ProfitShare (because she has no way of predicting what that will be), however the fixed lease payment was included in the General Fund. She noted that in the Charges for Services section and Interest & Other Revenues section there was a decrease in the Sheriff's fees. She also noted that the last of the three-year funding for the GIS project was included in the 1999 Budget due to the late start in spending of the money. She noted that the 2000 budget reflects the last year of expenditures for that project. She stated that this accounts for a significant decrease of about \$150,000 in the overall budget. She noted however that all the payments for the GIS project have been received.

June Pitchford stated that the Current Revenues category is driven by the Forfeiture receipts, which are unpredictable. She stated that the 1999 Budget also includes the \$100,000 prepaid rent from Reality House. She stated that there is not anything similar to this in the 2000 Budget. She stated that all of these factors together explain the overall 1% decline in revenues.

---

*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

June Pitchford encouraged the County Commission to use fiscal year 2000 to look seriously at the issues that have been raised with Stephanie Browning and the Health Department. She stated that she did not include anything in the budget that suggested that this area is being modified because she felt that it should be given careful study first.

June Pitchford stated that one of the key assumptions in this budget is that actual spending occurs at a rate of about 94% of appropriations. She stated that this should be kept in mind as requests come forward during the year to reallocate unspent amounts.

June Pitchford stated that the overall, spending is down due to the fact that there would not be any spending in capital projects funds in fiscal year 2000. She stated that spending in Law Enforcement and Judicial is also down, despite the increased costs at the Jail.

June Pitchford stated that some of the key changes in policy and administration include an additional staff member in the Collector's Office, increased staff for the mail room, a full-year's impact of the County's 401 retirement match program, and an additional Programmer for the Information Technology Department.

June Pitchford stated that there have been elevated budgets for Public Works in 1998 and 1999. She stated that the 2000 budget reflects the last of the spending of the accumulated money. She noted however that the spending is lower than it has been the previous two years.

June Pitchford stated that the functional area of Community Health & Welfare has been impacted by very unique expenditures like the one-time spending of the Healthcare ProfitShare funds and the Child Advocacy Grant.

*General Fund*

June Pitchford stated that in looking at the General Fund, in the early 90s there was a fairly significant spread (noted in the budget on page B-15). She stated that this money has funded a majority of the capital expenditures.

Commissioner Stamper noted that the General Fund money funded those capital expenditures without a significant tax increase of any kind.

June Pitchford agreed with Commissioner Stamper's statement. She stated that the County has also spent almost as much as it has accumulated. She stated that from this point forward, the General Revenue budget would not provide for an accumulation of any additional resources or the transfer of any significant amounts to capital project funds. She stated that if the key assumption (for the General Fund) holds true, the County will spend about 94% of what it has accumulated.

June Pitchford stated that in 1993, the revenues came in at 108% of the budget, which suggested that the County was budgeting too conservatively. She stated that in 1999, the predictions were on target. She stated that therefore the County is doing a better job of predicting those revenues, however it would not be able to count on a windfall at the end of the year.

*Capital Planning*

June Pitchford stated that on page 15 there is a discussion of capital planning. She stated that the County does not have a formal process for capital planning. She stated that she receives a recommendation every year from the GFOA that the County seriously consider establishing a capital planning process. She stated that there is also a section (immediately following the discussion of capital planning) that discusses the County's policies on fund balance.

June Pitchford stated the Governmental Accounting Standards Board is, in her opinion, overhauling the County's financial statements. She stated that the overhaul is being driven by

*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

Wall Street analysts who want governmental, financial statements to look more like business, financial statements. She stated that this would result in the preparation of two statements: a entity-wide set of financial statement (similar to businesses) where all of the County's debt is booked as a liability in the General Fund and the more traditional set of financial statements. She stated that she does not believe that this will impact the budgeting process. She noted however that it would impact the financial reporting process.

June Pitchford stated that page 18 contains the budget notes which outline the increases in employee health insurance and dental insurance. She noted that inflationary adjustments were included, however there was no significant change in the benefit package for the employees in this budget.

June Pitchford stated that the budget highlights are noted on page 20.

Commissioner Stamper asked if there would be any significant changes in the budget for the Records Center.

June Pitchford stated that she spoke with County Clerk Wendy S. Noren about this matter. She stated that she and Wendy agreed that it would be helpful to discuss the Records Center with the other elected officials after the beginning of the new year. She stated that the elected officials (users of the Records Center) would be able to provide helpful information about the demands that are placed on the facility and what is needed, etc.

Commissioner Stamper asked if there was a pool of unallocated funds that could address the supplemental requests that would be discussed during the budget hearings.

June Pitchford stated that there is no specific fund to address that. She noted that there is \$500,000 in Emergency Fund and \$20,000 in the Contingency Fund.

June Pitchford stated that the 2000 proposed budget included a 2% employee merit increase and a 2% increase for COLA. She stated the increases would cost \$356,000. She stated that she assumed a 90% participation rate for the County Retirement Match program.

Commissioner Stamper stated that the budget hearings on the proposed 2000 Budget are scheduled for December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup>. He stated that a copy of the date and times are available for the public.

The County Commission thanked June Pitchford for the presentation and for the effort that goes into the production of the County budget.

Commissioner Stamper stated that he had a discussion with Pat Lensmeyer about taxation and shrinking revenues earlier this month. He stated that she sent him a brochure for an upcoming conference sponsored by the NASBA regarding Internet taxation. He stated that he felt it would be important for the County to send someone (or a couple of people) to that conference in order to establish a position on that subject.

Commissioner Miller stated that she sent a copy of the NACo newsletter to the other members of the County Commission. She stated that the newsletter addressed the fact that NACo is positioning counties to follow the Association of Governors recommendation for an Internet sales tax and the goal of that tax.

There was an opportunity provided for public comment regarding the presentation of the proposed 2000 budget. There was no one present that wished to comment.

**Commissioner Reports**

*Commissioner Stamper*

Commissioner Stamper stated that he would be attending a Farm Bureau meeting this evening. He reminded the Commission that they would be discussing the revisions to the Nuisance Ordinance and the draft of the Vicious Dog portion of the Animal Ordinance at that meeting.

Commissioner Stamper stated that he would also be attending the Boone County Regional Sewer District meeting this evening.

Commissioner Stamper stated that he and Wendy S. Noren visited yesterday regarding the upcoming 2000 census. He stated that in the past a coalition has been formed (for the census) between the County Commission and the mayors. He stated that he is considering asking the mayors of the Boone County cities to form a coalition with the County Commission for the 2000 census.

Commissioner Stamper asked Commissioner Miller if all of the warning sirens have been installed.

Commissioner Miller stated that she spoke with Ken Hines of the Boone County Fire Protection District regarding the installation of a warning siren at a site on Scott Blvd. She stated that this is the only site that is outstanding.

Commissioner Stamper asked Commissioner Miller to speak with Ken Hines about giving a presentation to the County Commission regarding the warning sirens.

Commissioner Miller stated that she would request that Ken Hines give a presentation to the County Commission.

Commissioner Stamper stated that he had a conversation with Commissioner Vogt regarding the fact that an updated report is due in early December to the Certificate of Need representatives.

Commissioner Stamper asked that a meeting be set up with a lobbyist (and the other elected officials) to address the League of Women Voters' desire to aid the County with the impact fee legislation that the County has submitted. He stated that he would prefer that the meeting be set for early December.

Commissioner Stamper stated that he received a call from a constituent on Gibb Rd. He stated that the project is being completed in two phases and the constituent would probably not be happy about that fact. He stated that he would discuss the project further with the constituent.

*Commissioner Vogt*

Commissioner Vogt reported that she has been holding discussions with Mr. Secol (**I will get first name and spelling from Commissioner Vogt**) and Gordon Burnam-owner of Haystack Acres about paving the roads in Haystack Acres. She stated that Gordon Burnam is looking into the matter and has an engineer investigating the possibility of paving those roads at County standards. She stated that she requested that Gordon Burnam talk with the Public Works Department to find out what the exact standards are for paving the roads. She stated that Gordon Burnam agreed to do that.

*Commissioner Miller*

Commissioner Miller stated that she was approached by a landowner on Rolling Hills Rd. She stated that City of Columbia has paved one end of the road, the State of Missouri has paved the other end and there is a remaining 750' that was left unpaved. She stated that the landowner has a trailer park next to the unpaved section. She stated that the landowner wanted to know if there was anything that he and the County could do together to connect the paved portions.



*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

Commissioner Miller stated that she spoke with Frank Abart about the matter. She stated that Frank Abart felt that it would be reasonable if the County Public Works Department supplied the manpower while the landowner paid for the materials. She stated that she wanted to receive input from the County Commission before speaking with the landowner again. She stated that it would cost the landowner approximately \$8,000.

Commissioner Stamper asked if the County would eventually pave this section of road.

Commissioner Miller stated that the County would eventually pave the road, however this could be a way to speed up the process and allow the landowner to help with cost of paving (while satisfying his tenants).

Commissioner Stamper stated that he felt that the County would eventually get to that section of road. He stated however that he would be open to accepting private incentive from the landowner if the landowner wanted to have the section of road moved up on the priority list.

Commissioner Vogt agreed with Commissioner Stamper's statement. She stated that her only hesitation is that she would not want to take the Public Works staff away from the other duties that have been prioritized in order to work on this section of road.

Commissioner Miller stated that Public Works Director Frank Abart planned to complete the projects identified by the County first, and then work on this section of road whenever time permitted.

Commissioner Miller reported that she needed to discuss a consultant services agreement for imaging in the Information Technology Department. She stated that most estimates for the work that needed to be performed were in the \$130,000-400,000 range. She stated however that there is an individual available to work on the problem that was previously employed by the County. She stated that the IT Department would like to hire that individual, however she would like to get some idea from June Pitchford as to where the matter of imaging stood in the proposed 2000 budget and the plans for imaging.

June Pitchford stated that she spoke with the Information Technology and the other three departments that are involved in imaging. She stated that Information Technology Director Bob Ormiston does not have enough information available at this time to support this kind of request. She stated that she commented to Bob Ormiston and the other elected officials that she did not feel that it would be appropriate to speculate on that number and place it in the budget.

June Pitchford stated that there are comments in the Information Technology Department budget and the Recorder of Deeds Office budget that state that as soon as a solution is determined, the request will be brought to the County Commission. She stated that most of the cost would likely come out of the Records Preservation Fund and the Assessment Fund. She stated that there are other applications for the imaging system in other offices (besides those two), therefore she did not know if some of the cost would have to come out of the General Fund.

Commissioner Miller stated that she needed approval to enter into the Consultant Services Agreement. She stated that part of the thought process for entering into this agreement was that if the County could find a way to convert those files (that are normally imaged) without having to spend \$130,000-400,000, then the County would be able to evaluate what direction to take and what options are available. She stated that at present if the files cannot be converted, then the files have to be upgraded within the Lanier system. She stated that Lanier has been less than helpful in problem solving.

Commissioner Miller stated that there is an individual that the Information Technology Department would like to establish a Consultant Services Agreement with. She stated that he came to the department for a day to evaluate whether or not he could address the need. She stated that the individual feels that he can help the situation. She stated that this agreement would be the

*Introduction of the proposed 2000 Budget*

same as those with other consultants.

Commissioner Stamper asked what the anticipated budget for the agreement would be.

June Pitchford stated that Bob Ormiston would probably have to address that question. She asked if the consultant could give an estimate of the cost for his service based on the one-day evaluation that he performed.

Commissioner Miller stated that the agreement could be adopted with a limit and then amend the limit as needed. She stated that she did not have a real idea of the cost.

Commissioner Vogt asked how long the agreement would be good for.

Commissioner Miller stated that she was not sure about the time period for the agreement.

June Pitchford stated that the County Commission could approve the agreement subject to its approval and certification by the County Auditor’s Office. She also requested that the County Commission approve the use of Emergency Funds for the agreement (if needed).

Commissioner Stamper moved to approve a Consultant Services Agreement between the County of Boone and David Mudd herein referred to as “consultant” as outlined in the draft agreement. It is further ordered that the Presiding Commissioner be hereby authorized to sign said agreement pending its certification by the Auditor’s Office. The funds for said agreement would be taken from the Emergency Fund as needed.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

There was no discussion. The motion passed 3-0. **Order 452A-99**

Commissioner Miller reported that the grant for the visioning process was submitted yesterday to Boone Electric Cooperative. She stated that BEC requested that a meeting be set up with the chair of the visioning committee in order to brief them (BEC) on the visioning process.

There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50am.

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don Stamper  
Presiding Commissioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Wendy S. Noren  
Clerk of the County Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Karen M. Miller  
District I Commissioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Vogt  
District II Commissioner