

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 Skip Elkin  
Deputy County Clerk Shawna Victor  
County Counsel John Patton

Commissioner Elkin called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

**Subject: Auditor's Office – Delivery of FY 2002 Proposed Budget**

June Pitchford, Boone County Auditor, present on behalf of this item.

Mrs. Pitchford stated today is the statutory deadline for County Auditors to present their proposed budget to the County Commissions. The Commissioners received an executive summary and the final proposal will be complete next week. The proposed budget documents will be given to the Commission when completed and budget hearings are scheduled to begin the week of November 26, 2001.

The budget process is designed, legislatively, to allow elected official to identify and communicate their needs, to the budget officer and the County Commission. In doing so, these officials are identifying their long-range goals, immediate goals, and their needs for financing their office. As a result, these departmental goals drive the budget process more than long-range strategic intity wide goals. Certain countywide goals do emerge from this process.

The goals are listed on page ii of the executive summary as presented by the County Auditor. The first goal is to address the compensation plan for County employees. The cost of the implementation is about 6% of payroll in the general fund and about 5.3% of payroll countywide. Mrs. Pitchford is pleased that the County is able to implement at this level. Since the original implementation plan was compiled, there has been some turn over in the number of employees below the minimum and this is the reason that the cost will be a little bit more than originally recommended. The plan identified 96 employees below the minimum and there are currently 106 employees below the minimum. Also under the area of personnel is the comprehensive employee benefits at a reasonable cost to taxpayers. Last year, a 15% increase was budgeted. This year an increase of 12% is budgeted, with a budgetary impact of \$112,000.

Goals have been listed for the Public Works Road and Bridge System. It was noted that total appropriations of \$12.1 million were budgeted. Of the \$12.1 million, \$7.24 million

is allocated for maintenance; this is a slight increase from the past years. There are several bridge repair and design projects.

Another goal is in the Information Technology Department. The Commission will be addressing security issues for the computer system before the end of the year and then it is emphasized in next year's budget. The budget includes funding for an additional position in the IT Department to provide support because of the low ratio of support staff to computers. The budget also reflects moving the County e-mail off the main network. Funding is included for replacing old printers and personal computers. The investment in technology compared between the 2001 and 2002 budgets, there is a 23% reduction. In the 2001 budget there was an expensive upgrade to the AS400.

Mrs. Pitchford discussed items on page iv of the executive summary (Economic Conditions, Fiscal Assumptions, and Revenue and Expenditure Projections).

Revenues by Source – All Governmental Funds Combined on page v were discussed. This includes the general fund, all special revenue funds, debt service funds, and capital project funds. The property tax revenues assume no change in rates.

Commissioner Stamper asked Mrs. Pitchford what the cap was on the tax rate and general fund, currently it is 13%. Mrs. Pitchford stated she thought it was 33% before application of any sales tax roll back.

Mrs. Pitchford stated this chart illustrates the importance of having a healthy mix of revenues. Boone County is heavily dependent on sales tax, which is susceptible to economic fluctuations. She does not believe that the County will meet the 2001 sales tax budget estimate of 3%.

Twelve years worth of sales tax annual growth rates are presented on page vi.

The sales tax listed on page v includes the ½ cent sales tax for the general fund, ½ cent sales tax for the road and bridge operations, motor vehicle sales tax, and the 2% sales tax derived from local telephone service that goes into the E911 fund.

Only grants that have been approved by Commission are included in the intergovernmental revenues.

State reimbursements include daily prisoner housing per diem for prisoners held in the Boone County jail who are sentenced to the Missouri Department of Corrections and daily per diem for juveniles. State reimbursements are expected to continue with no changes in existing rates of reimbursements; however, certain payments received from the state such as the daily prisoner housing per diem are subject to legislative appropriation and could be reduced if the state's fiscal situation worsens significantly. The budget assumes no such reduction.

A full year of the Community Corrections program has been included in the budget. It has been funded since 1998 and is not subject to a grant term.

Hospital Lease Revenue reflects the changes in the lease agreement that were signed and made retroactive to January 1, 2001. The revised lease agreement calls for the payment of \$1.35 million to the County, adjusted annually for the consumer price index. This revenue accounts for 7.5% of revenue in the general fund.

Charges for service, interest and other revenues reflects a 10% increase due to the effort to precisely estimate the commission revenues in the assessment and general funds. New fees that went into effect July 1, 2001 collected in the Records Office also effect this.

One of the more significant changes in this being recommended to the Commission is an adjustment in building fees. These fees have not been adjusted for 10 years. The proposed fee structure Mrs. Pitchford and Stan Shawver, Director of Planning and Building Inspections, would consider structural complexity when establishing the fees. March 1, 2002 is the proposed date for implementation of the new fees.

The Expenditures by Functions – All Governmental Funds Combined table is on page viii of the executive summary. Mrs. Pitchford noted in the general fund, the 3% amount has been included (\$570,000) and this is being financed from fund balance. She is not taking it out of current revenues. This is an appropriate approach, in her opinion, because the emergency funds should only be used for those emergency items that cannot be foreseen in developing the annual budget. In 2001, the County has not spent very much in the emergency appropriation and would expect that to be the case for 2002. It will be important for the Commissioners to review requests from the emergency fund during fiscal year 2002.

Mrs. Pitchford is projecting the County will spend 92% to 95% of the appropriations. For fiscal year 2002, many officials have attempted to reallocate funds to help finance some of the County's highest priorities. If the County is successful in reducing turnover and increasing retention, she is expecting that the County will have fewer unspent dollars in the salary budget. It is projected for 2002 that the county will spend about 97% to 98% of appropriations.

The County share of the operating cost for Joint Communications increased significantly in 2002. This budget does not include any additional full-time employees in the Sheriff's Department. In a discussion with Sheriff Ted Boehm, Mrs. Pitchford stated the Sheriff feels that implementation of the pay plan is a higher priority at this point. In addition, some work needs to be done with the Judicial Law Enforcement Task Force recommendations.

There is a significant increase in the area of Community Health and Welfare. This a

reflection of certain intergovernmental charges that have never before been charged to the County.

Debt Services expenditures are essentially unchanged.

The 2002 budget does not include appropriations from any capital improvement projects because there are no projects of that magnitude at this time.

Commissioner Stamper asked Mrs. Pitchford if an agreement is made with the City of Columbia on the health facility, acquisitions and modifications, the budget would need to be amended. This agreement may be reached before the beginning of 2002. Mrs. Pitchford stated she has not included estimated revenue from the proceeds of the sale from the Boone Retirement Center. She did not have an opportunity to confirm with the Commission on where the County is in the process. This could be included as a revision by the Commission to this budget.

Commissioner Stamper stated on page xi of the executive summary, under designations, the \$690,000 that has been identified, this is not the amount set aside for the health department, this is the use tax. Mrs. Pitchford stated the \$750,000 set aside for the health department is set aside in the hospital profit sharing fund.

The County continues to maintain healthy fund balances in most of its funds, the only exception is the Road and Bridge Fund. In 2001 and 2002, the County is making progress toward stabilizing that fund and building a minimum fund balance.

Mrs. Pitchford explained the differences between reservations and designations of fund balance and the unreserved and undesignated. These are listed on page xi of the executive summary.

Long-term debt consists of the special obligation bonds for the Boone County Government Center building and the general obligation debt that has been issued pursuant to the Neighborhood Improvement District program. There are no taxes levied for the County's long-term debt. All together, debt services is about 3% of the total budget.

Mrs. Pitchford acknowledged the work that Karen Fredrick and Sue Lake have done with this budget.

The funds statements are organized as follows:

- All Governmental funds combined
- The general fund
- A summary for all special revenue funds combined
- Combining schedule for debt service funds
- Capital project funds

Mrs. Pitchford reviewed the proposed implementation of the position classification and pay plan.

The Consultants recommendations were received in September and work began shortly thereafter on the Consultant's proposed recommendations. All elected officials and department heads agreed that they would like to make a request for their respective office for implementation.

Mrs. Pitchford used the recommendations from each elected official and department head and her own recommendations; she was able to determine the funding capacity for fiscal year 2002. Her proposal would cost about 6% of payroll in the general fund and about 5.3% of payroll countywide. About 45% of the cost of the plan is the result of the adjustments to bring employees up to the minimum, the balance would be for in-range adjustments.

The budget that Mrs. Pitchford is proposing to the Commission include no provision for salary increases, such as COLA or Merit, beyond the amounts included for implementation of the pay plan. This should be viewed as a one-time occurrence, with subsequent year's budget's including affordable Merit allocations. The implementation that is being proposed is similar to Option 1 of the Consultant's recommendations.

There is no compensation increases included for Court employees because the Court chose not to participate in this plan.

Mrs. Pitchford has outlined her rationale for the proposed implementation.

Mrs. Pitchford is proposing that each elected official and department director be allowed to award the entire pool of dollars as they determine is most appropriate subject to two parameters:

- All salaries below the minimum should be brought up to the minimum, and
- No salary increases should be award to employees whose salaries currently exceed the maximum of the applicable range.

Commissioner Stamper stated the outcome of this is a little different then the approach that the Commissioner discussed with the elected officials when they generated the information. Some elected officials generated reallocations based on what they thought they could maximize out of their entity to go back into the reallocation and to adopting some level of the recommended pay plan. To his understand, the funds that were reallocated would only go to support implementation. This pool of money was only used for implementation countywide.

Mrs. Pitchford stated for the most part, this was true. She has made other recommendations to the Commission besides those voluntarily turned into her.

Commissioner Miller stated this was a huge undertaking for All County government. Once the information was received from each department and tried to see if there was a common thread in implementation. When there was no common thread, Mrs. Pitchford reverted back to the recommendation from the Consultant and tried to mirror that recommendation.

Mrs. Pitchford received a request from an office, to take employees that have only been with the County for a few months to mid-point. Other offices were trying to be conservative with their request in placing long-term, tenured employees well below the mid-point. It would be unproductive for Mrs. Pitchford to simply take those requests and then tell departments that only half of their request could be met.

Now the budget is on the Commissions desk, if anyone has a recommendation to the Commission for their consideration, they should do so.

Mrs. Pitchford stated she would not have given the Commission a budget that she did not believe was a good budget. She believes that this proposal is financially fiscally responsible, it follows the recommendation of the Consultant, and it implements a new pay plan, which is long overdue for the County.

Commissioner Stamper thanked Mrs. Pitchford for her hard work. The Commission has organized a series of budget hearings, requesting that all departments have a budget hearing. Budget hearings begin the Monday, November 26, 2001.

Commissioner Stamper excused himself from the meeting and asked Commissioner Elkin to be acting Presiding Commissioner for the remainder of the meeting.

**Subject: Purchasing Department**

Melinda Bobbitt, Purchasing Department Director, present on behalf of these items.

**A. Second Reading and Award of Bid 46-02OCT01 (Rock and Chip Products Term and Supply)**

Melinda Bobbitt stated this is a second reading to award bid 46-02OCT01 for rock and chip seal term and supply. After Public Works and Purchasing completed a bid evaluations, the recommendation is to Cemex Inc (Southdown Quarry) for rock products area 2, 3, FOB Destination and FOB Plant, for chip seal products area 1, 2, 3, FOB Destination and FOB Plant, and to Mid-Missouri Limestone (Riggs Quarry) for rock products area 1, FOB Destination and FOB Plant. These awards were based upon the vendor submitting the lowest and best bid meeting the minimum specifications.

Commissioner Miller moved to award bid 46-02OCT01 for Rock and Chip Seal Products

to the following:

- Cemex Inc (Southdown Quarry) for Rock Products – Area 2, Area 3, FOB Destination and FOB Plant. For Chip Seal – Area 1, Area 2, Area 3, FOB Destination and FOB Plant, and to
- Mid-Missouri Limestone (Riggs Quarry) for Rock Products – Area 1, FOB Destination and FOB Plant.

Commissioner Elkin seconded the motion.

There was no discussion or public comment.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 521-2001**

### **B. First Reading of Verizon Phone Service Agreement**

Melinda Bobbitt stated Paul Palecek, Corporate Account Manager for Verizon, wanted the County to sign an agreement. The current agreement is still with GTE and runs through August 31, 2003. Verizon is requesting the County sign an agreement showing Verizon is the current provider. This will not change the rate of \$8.80 per line, nor the terms and conditions of the original agreement. The contract term will run through August 31, 2003. Verizon is the only local telephone provider for Boone County and has attached a sole source form for Commission approval.

Commissioner Miller stated this makes sense because this is also done with cable companies.

There was no further discussion.

Commissioner Elkin stated this is a first reading and requested the Deputy County Clerk to schedule this for a second reading at the next available meeting with an appropriate order for approval.

Commissioner Miller requested to hold a meeting on Wednesday, November 21 to take care of matters that are on a timeline.

### **Subject: Public Works**

David Mink, Public Works Director, and John Watkins, Project Development Manager, present on behalf of these items.

David Mink stated recently Commission approved a new Right-of-Way Acquisition policy. The department has two projects that are currently under design. There are three change orders to bring these projects into compliance with the new Right-of-Way policy.

**A. First Reading of Change Order for Hatton Chapel Road Project**

John Watkins stated this change order is to increase the current design standards to a 66-foot Right-of-Way, which would meet the current CATSO plan. This change order is for \$3,200.00.

Commissioner Elkin stated this makes sense because it was in the CATSO plan.

**B. First Reading of two Change Orders for Rolling Hills**

John Watkins stated the first change order for Rolling Hills is to increase the current Right-of-Way to 100 feet. Change order number two for Rolling Hills, if change order number one is approved, is a design change to shift the road alignment due to the increase of the Right-of-Way. Change order number one is for a total of \$9,020.00 and change order number two is for a total of \$4,960.00.

Commissioner Miller stated this would be consistent with the recently adopted Right-of-Way policy, which gave direction to follow the CATSO plan.

Commissioner Elkin requested the Deputy County Clerk to schedule these items for a second reading at the next available meeting with appropriate orders for approval.

**Subject: Information Technology**

**A. Second Reading and Approval of Request to Reinstate the Programmer/Analyst Title**

Commissioner Miller stated this is the position that was underfilled and now there is a position available, the department would like to reorganize the department. This is consistent with the recommendation of the pay plan for reorganization.

Commissioner Miller moved to approve the request from the Information Technology Department to reinstate the Programmer/Analyst Title.

Commissioner Elkin seconded the motion.

There was no discussion or public comment.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 522-2001**

**B. Second Reading and Approval of Request to extend Administrative Authority to Purchase laptop computers, personal computers, and peripherals from Cooperative Contracts**



Commissioner Miller stated this is the third year that the department is requesting the ability of the department to purchase these products from State contract, in an as needed basis. This is efficient and is cost effective for the County. There are three cooperative contracts, two are national, and the other is state. The Purchasing Department is in agreement that this is the best way for the County to go.

Commissioner Elkin stated he spoke with Melinda Bobbitt about this and she told him that there could be up to two hundred bids, from across the nation, for these items.

Commissioner Miller stated it is hard to know if someone has the support to be able to fulfill the bid. Many times John Patton, County Counsel, has had to help the County get out of contracts because people were not able to meet the contract that was signed. This is the best solution as fast as technology moves.

Commissioner Miller moved to approve the request from the Information Technology Department for Administrative Authority to purchase laptop computers, personal computers, peripherals and printers from cooperative contracts for the fiscal year 2002.

Commissioner Elkin seconded the motion.

There was no discussion or public comment.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 523-2001**

### **C. Second Reading and Approval of Request for equipment purchase for Recorder Management System**

Commissioner Miller stated the Director and staff of the Information Technology Department, the Recorder, and the Consultant have met several times to review the different proposed ways to meet the needs of the Recorders Office. They have come to terms with the best way to move forward with this project. The equipment needed has been outlined.

Commissioner Miller moved to approve the request from the Information Technology Department for the authorization for the Recorder's Office to proceed with the purchase of equipment for their new Records Management system.

Commissioner Elkin seconded the motion.

Bettie Johnson, Boone County Recorder of Deeds, stated there was a lot of collective input between the department and the consultant on what the options were and what kind of issues would result from that.

Commissioner Miller stated it meets the needs of everyone who accesses the records of the Recorders Office.

There was no further discussion and no public comment.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 525-2001**

**D. First Reading of Contract with Consultant David Mudd for Recorder's Management System**

Commissioner Miller stated she just got a copy of the contract to Mrs. Johnson this morning. With only a brief review, Mrs. Johnson thought for the most part there were no problems and would be getting a copy to the consultant for his review.

John Patton, County Counsel, stated there should be an attachment to the contract, for the documentation standards.

Commissioner Miller stated the contract would also need to include a copy of the scope of work. She informed Mrs. Johnson that there would be a Commission meeting on Wednesday, November 21, in order to give the consultant time to meet the needs of the January 1, 2002 deadline of documentation standardization.

Commissioner Elkin stated this is a first reading and requested the Deputy County Clerk to schedule this for a second reading at the next available meeting with an appropriate order for approval.

Commissioner Miller requested that the Information Technology staff be included in the discussion of the accounting process with the County Treasurer and Auditor.

**Subject: Second Reading and Approval of Request for Applicants for Monitoring Committee (Recommendation by Judicial Law Enforcement Task Force)**

Commissioner Elkin stated the Commission received a letter from Gary Oxenhandler, chair of the Judicial Law Enforcement Task Force, with recommendation for the standing oversight committee. He recommends the subcommittee chairs, David Griggs, Rusty Antel, Michael Lyman, and in addition, Dr. Bruce Horwitz to be on the committee. Mr. Oxenhandler also recommends three other members for one-year terms. This is to start the implementation of the oversight committee.

Commissioner Miller moved to accept the recommendation as presented by the chair of the Judicial Law Enforcement Task Force Committee to appoint David Griggs, Rusty Antel, Michael Lyman, and Dr. Bruce Horwitz to the oversight committee, with Mr. Antel as the Chair. It is further authorized for the staff to post the open positions for the remaining three members of the committee.

Commissioner Elkin seconded the motion.

There was no discussion or public comment.

The motion passed 2-0. **Order 524-2001**

**Subject: I-70 Improvement Study Web Site**

Commissioner Elkin stated the first tier Environmental Impact Study was finalized and is now available at <http://www.I70study.org>.

**Commissioner Reports**

*Commissioner Stamper*

None to report at this time

*Commissioner Miller*

None to report at this time

*Commissioner Elkin*

*Old Boonslick Trail Tour*

Commissioner Elkin stated he, David Sapp, and a lady from the Historical Society took a tour of the Old Boonslick Trail, which Don Sanders granted the County an easement. They discussed how the Historical Society can help create a plan to develop the trail as a historic sight.

*Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management*

Commissioner Elkin stated they met on November 14. They are working on district grants and there were some changes on requirements and stipulations of the grants.

Commissioner Miller and Commissioner Elkin discussed how a neighborhood could apply for a grant to hold a neighborhood clean up day.

*South Route K Sewer Neighborhood Improvement District*

Commissioner Elkin stated there was a meeting on November 14. Bill Watkins, City of Columbia, gave a presentation on what it would take for them to get City Sewer. The City did have a program, which capped these NID's that were within the city at \$5,000. This

program is still in existence, but there is not much money available, as it was done through a bonding issue.

There was no public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Attest:

---

Wendy S. Noren  
Clerk of the County Commission

---

Don Stamper  
Presiding Commissioner

---

Karen M. Miller  
District I Commissioner

---

Skip Elkin  
District II Commissioner