



PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

WILL HOLD A PUBLIC WORK SESSION
IN THE COMMISSION CHAMBERS – ROOM 1400
OF THE UTAH COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
100 East Center Street, Provo, Utah
January 08, 2020 – 3:00 P.M.

Board members may participate electronically at will, with the anchor location as stated above

~COMMISSION WORK SESSION MINUTES~

Commissioner Ivie and Commissioner Lee in Attendance
Commissioner Ainge via Teleconference

PRAYER/READING/THOUGHT: N/A
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: N/A

WORK SESSION

COMMISSIONER IVIE - WELCOME TO THE WORK SESSION FOR THE UTAH COUNTY COMMISSION. THIS IS A NEW PRACTICE WE'VE INSTITUTED FOR THIS YEAR. EVERY OTHER WEDNESDAY WE'LL BE HOLDING A WORK SESSION IN THE AFTERNOON TO DISCUSS UPCOMING LEGISLATIVE ITEMS AND HAVE A MORE OPEN DIALOGUE AND HOPEFULLY IMPROVE THE TRANSPARENCY IN THE CONVERSATION AND MANY OF THE POLICY DECISIONS WE MAKE AS THE LEGISLATIVE BODY. ON TODAY'S AGENDA WE HAVE 12 ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION ON OUR WORK SESSION. WE'LL GO AHEAD AND START WITH REGULAR OR EXCUSE ME WITH WORK SESSION ITEM NUMBER ONE AND THIS IS A SUBDIVISION PLAT "A" FOR THE CHELSEA SUBDIVISION WILL GO AHEAD AND LOOK TO STAFF TO GIVE US A BRIEFING ON THIS.

1. APPROVE JAUSSI SUBDIVISION, PLAT "A," SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT

- Greg Robinson, Community Development

GREG ROBINSON, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – GOOD MORNING, AFTERNOON SORRY. I GUESS I'M THE SACRIFICIAL LAMB TODAY SINCE I'M THE FIRST ONE TO WANDER THROUGH THIS. SO, I JUST WANT, NORMALLY WE WOULD PUT MOST OF THESE ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE MADE YOU AWARE OF KIND OF THE SUBDIVISIONS THAT WERE COMING FORWARD JUST HAPPENS THAT WE HAD FIVE OF THEM KIND OF CAME UP AT THE SAME TIME. SO, FOR THE SORRY, GREG ROBINSON WITH

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, SORRY, THE JAUSSEI PLAT "A" SUBDIVISION, PLAT "A" IS A ONE LOT SUBDIVISION FOR FIVE AND A QUARTER ACRE PARCEL ROUGHLY. THERE IS ONE ITEM THAT ABOUT THIS SUBDIVISION THAT IS A LITTLE BIT UNIQUE THAT IS THERE IS PART OF IT THAT IS IN THE FLOODPLAIN. TO THAT THERE IS A NOTE ON THE PLAT THAT KIND OF DESIGNATES THAT AND ALSO SPECIFIES SOME REQUIREMENTS IF IT REMAINS, IF THEY BUILD IN THE FLOODPLAIN. SO OTHER THAN THAT, IT'S A PRETTY STRAIGHTFORWARD SUBDIVISION. THERE'S NOTHING REALLY OUT OF THE ORDINARY FROM THIS THAN ANY OTHER SUBDIVISIONS THAT WE NORMALLY DO. ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

COMMISSIONER IVIE – I DON'T HAVE ANY. OKAY, MAYBE TALK, GO AHEAD AND MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE THEN. CJC ARABIAN FARM SUBDIVISION.

2. APPROVE CJC ARABIAN FARM SUBDIVISION, PLAT "A," SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT

- Greg Robinson, Community Development

GREG ROBINSON - THIS IS SIMILAR THERE IS AGAIN THERE ISN'T A LOT OF, THERE ISN'T MUCH THAT IS TOO CONCERNING ABOUT THIS. IT IS A STRAIGHTFORWARD SUBDIVISION ALSO A 5 ACRE, 5 AND A QUARTER ACRE, ACTUALLY LITTLE MORE THAN FIVE AND A QUARTER ACRE PARCEL IN A RA-5 ZONE AND HAS FRONTAGE ON 9900 S IN THE BENJAMIN AREA.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – COMMISSIONERS? I DON'T SEE ANY QUESTIONS SO WE CAN GO AHEAD AND MOVE TO NUMBER THREE WHICH IS THE HUNTER SUBDIVISION.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - CAN I JUST ASK, SO IN ALL OF THESE, THIS IS SIMPLY, WE'VE GOT TO APPROVE IT BECAUSE WE APPROVED THE SUBDIVISION, BUT THESE ARE CLEARLY WITHIN THE RIGHTS OF THE PROPERTY OWNERS AND YOU DON'T SEE ANY ISSUES WITH IT.

GREG ROBINSON – YES, THESE ARE TYPICALLY, THESE ARE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES THAT WE WOULD NORMALLY JUST HAVE ON THE CONSENT AGENDA. AND WE PROBABLY WOULD APPRECIATE SOME DIRECTION FROM YOU IS IF YOU WOULD CONTINUE TO LIKE THIS OR WOULD LIKE TO SEE THESE ON THE WORK SESSIONS TO SEE THESE SUBDIVISIONS COME THROUGH OR IF IT'D BE BETTER POLICY TO KIND OF KEEP THEM ON THE CONSENT AGENDA GOING FORWARD.

COMMISSIONER IVIE -TURN THE ONE OFF TO YOUR RIGHT BILL, SOMETIMES THAT HELPS.

COMMISSIONER LEE – I'LL SLIDE OVER HERE THEN. SO, FOR ME ON THESE, I DON'T MIND EITHER WAY BUT AS LONG AS I MEAN USUALLY, THEY'RE THE ONES THAT HAVE FOLLOWED THE PROCESS AND THEN YOU KNOW ACCORDING TO WHAT WE'VE SET UP, ALREADY PREVIOUSLY, IF THEY ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEM, THEY'RE PRETTY EASY, IT'S A PRETTY EASY CHECK OFF, BECAUSE

IT'S LIKE CHECKING THE BOX AND ALL WE'RE REALLY SAYING IS THE BOXES HAVE BEEN CHECKED, THEY'VE BEEN VERIFIED, SO THEREFORE THEY CAN GO AHEAD AND THAT'S HOW THAT'S HOW I USUALLY HAVE VIEWED THESE.

GREG ROBINSON - YEAH THAT'S VERY TRUE. THEY HAVE A PROCESS THAT THEY GO THROUGH AND UNLESS THEY MEET ALL THE REQUIREMENTS, WE DON'T BRING THESE TWO TO THE COMMISSION TO GET APPROVED SO UNLESS THERE, IF THERE ARE ISSUES, WE WOULDN'T BRING THEM TO COMMISSION MEETING. SO YEAH, THAT IS KIND OF THE CASE.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - AND FOR ME ON THESE LIKE FOR THIS TYPE OF A MEETING WHERE THERE IS COMMISSIONER LEE ECHOED IT, ONE WAY OR THE OTHER BUT I ACTUALLY WOULD PROBABLY BE FINE WITHOUT THEM IN THIS SESSION, UNLESS THERE IS A SPECIFIC ITEM WITHIN THE APPROVAL THAT WE MIGHT NEED TO DISCUSS, RIGHT?

GREG ROBINSON – YEAH

COMMISSIONER IVIE - I KNOW IF THERE'S SOME TYPE OF VARIANCE OR CHANGE OR YOU KNOW EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCE THAT MAKES THIS PARTICULAR ONE A LITTLE UNIQUE. IN THOSE INSTANCES, I THINK THEY'D BE GREAT FOR THIS MEETING BECAUSE THEN WE CAN DISCUSS THOSE.

GREG ROBINSON – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - ANY OF THOSE VARIANCES OR UNIQUE SITUATIONS THAT MIGHT ARISE WITH ONE OF THESE LIKE THE ROBERT STEVENS ONES COME TO MIND, RIGHT? WHERE WE'RE TRYING TO DEAL WITH SOME ROAD ISSUES OR SOMEBODY WANTS A PRIVATE ROAD OR YOU KNOW A ROUND-ABOUT OR SOME TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT ISSUE THAT WE NEED TO WORK THROUGH, THEN I THINK WOULD MAKE A TON OF SENSE FOR THEM TO COME HERE, BUT IF THEY'RE ROUTINE NO WORRIES AT ALL ON ANYTHING THEN I DON'T.

GREG ROBINSON - YEAH AND I THINK THAT WOULD IS KIND OF THE DIRECTION THAT WE WOULD PROBABLY LIKE TO GO AS WELL.

COMMISSIONER LEE - WE WOULD, ACTUALLY IF WE VOTED AGAINST THESE THERE, WOULD BE A CLAIM FOR TAKING AND THAT WOULD BE HARD FOR US TO GO THAT DOWN THAT PATH, RIGHT?

GREG ROBINSON – EXACTLY. ONCE THEY DO, THE STATE CODE IS PRETTY CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IF THEY DO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS AND THEY ARE, THEY SHOULD BE APPROVED. SO CORRECT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - I TEND TO HEAR OR AGREE WITH COMMISSIONER LEE AND COMMISSIONER IVIE ON THAT. I JUST AM KIND OF CURIOUS AS FOLLOW UP TO WHAT COMMISSIONER IVIE SAID. IS THERE A WAY THAT YOU COULD CLEARLY DESCRIBE, HOW WOULD YOU DELINEATE THAT STANDARD THAT THEY JUST INDICATED? THEN WE CAN BE ON THE SAME PAGE OF WHAT YOU KNOW HE'S KIND OF THING ABNORMAL OR BUT WHAT IS THE RIGHT

LANGUAGE TO DESCRIBE THOSE SUBDIVISIONS THAT WOULD COME INTO A MEETING LIKE THIS?

GREG ROBINSON - IF THERE ARE CONDITIONS, I THINK THAT THEY WOULD PROBABLY BE DIFFICULT FOR US TO MAKE THAT JUDGMENT. I THINK THAT MORE THAN LIKELY WE WOULD PROBABLY TRY AND PUT THOSE ISSUES IN OUR STAFF REPORT AS WELL AS PROBABLY COMMUNICATE WITH THE COMMISSION AS FAR AS WHETHER OR NOT THEY SHOULD PROBABLY HAVE FURTHER DISCUSSION. AND IF THERE IS FURTHER DISCUSSION, I THINK THAT COULD BE DONE EITHER IN THE REGULAR MEETING OR ALSO PULLED OFF AND PUT ONTO A WORK SESSION IF THERE ARE ITEMS THAT COME UP REGARDING THAT.

COMMISSIONER LEE - BECAUSE ONE OF THOSE CHECKBOXES WOULD HAVE TO BE LEFT BLANK OR QUESTIONED.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - OR QUESTIONED.

COMMISSIONER LEE - THAT'S WHERE IT WOULD DEFINITELY NEED TO PROBABLY COME HERE FIRST.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - THIS IS BRYCE ARMSTRONG WITH STAFF. JUST ECHOING GREG'S COMMENTS. THERE ARE, THERE WILL BE A FEW SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS THAT BY ORDINANCE REQUIRES A COMMISSION APPROVAL FOR SOME SORT OF EXCEPTION; THINK BACK TO BACK COUNTRY ESTATES AND THEY WERE ASKING FOR AN IRRIGATION EXCEPTION AND SO THOSE MIGHT BE ONES THAT WE COULD BRING IN THIS SETTING AND HAVE THAT DISCUSSION. I GUESS OUR DEFAULT POSITION WOULD BE PUT THEM ON IF THEY SEEM CLEAR TO US PUT THEM ON REGULAR SESSION AND THEN THERE'S ALWAYS OPPORTUNITY TO STILL DISCUSS AT REGULAR SESSION.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – DOES THAT KIND OF ANSWER YOUR QUESTION TANNER?

COMMISSIONER ANGE – YEAH, IT DOES. I'M JUST YOU KNOW, AS THIS IS NEW, I REALLY APPRECIATE YOU GUYS DOING THIS IN THIS WORK SESSION AND MAYBE BRYCE, I WOULD STILL JUST LOVE TO GET AND LIKE GREG SAID A HEADS UP. I THINK IT'S HELPFUL, BECAUSE SOMETIMES IT'S HARD JUST LOOKING AT THE AGENDA ITEM TO KNOW WHETHER THERE'S AN ISSUE OR NOT. SO, IF WE CAN JUST FIGURE OUT A GOOD PROCESS FOR COMMUNICATING HEY, THESE ARE THESE MEET ALL THE CHECKBOXES LIKE COMMISSIONER LEE IS SAYING AND WE GET THOSE ON THE NORMAL AGENDA, LET'S JUST SOME SOMEHOW AND MAYBE THERE'S A LITTLE BIT OF FOLLOW UP THAT YOU GUYS CAN COMMUNICATE WITH US, SO WE KNOW WHICH ONES ARE UNIQUE THAT WE HOLD OFF INTO A WORK SESSION LIKE THIS, WHICH SOUNDS LIKE IT'S GOING TO BE THE VAST MINORITY OF THEM.

GREG ROBINSON - WE WILL.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – OKAY, PERFECT. WE'LL LET YOU OFF THE HOOK ON THE REST OF THEM THEN.

GREG ROBINSON – THANK YOU.

3. APPROVE HUNTER SUBDIVISION, PLAT “F,” SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT

- Greg Robinson, Community Development

SEE DISCUSSION UNDER ITEM NUMBER 2.

4. APPROVE LITTLE ZION SUBDIVISION, PLAT “A,” SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT

- Greg Robinson, Community Development

SEE DISCUSSION UNDER ITEM NUMBER 2

5. APPROVE BAYVIEW SUBDIVISION, PLAT “A,” SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT

- Greg Robinson, Community Development

SEE DISCUSSION UNDER ITEM NUMBER 2

6. ADOPT A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSION CHAIR TO SIGN AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS FOR A PROJECT FOR THE EXTENSION OF PONY EXPRESS PARKWAY PHASE II

- Richard Nielson, Public Works Director

COMMISSIONER IVIE - ALRIGHT THAT WILL BRING THIS TO I BELIEVE RICHARD, RIGHT? THIS IS ABOUT ITEM NUMBER SIX IN OUR WORK SESSION AGENDA. IT'S ABOUT ADOPTING RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING COMMISSION CHAIR TO SIGN AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH SARATOGA SPRINGS FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE PONY EXPRESS PARKWAY PHASE TWO.

RICHARD NIELSON, DIRECTOR, PUBLIC WORKS - THIS IS LIKE SOME OF THE OTHERS YOU'VE SEEN WITH THE MAG FUNDING PROCESS. THERE ARE SEVERAL PROJECTS THAT ARE FUNDED THROUGH THE COUNTY SALES TAX DOLLARS. EACH OF THOSE PROJECTS NEED TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION WITH AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT. THIS IS ONE OF THOSE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENTS. THIS ONE, THE ONE THING THAT IS A LITTLE BIT NOW MAYBE OUT OF THE ORDINARY WITH IT, THEY ARE IN THE 2021 FUNDING YEAR. SARATOGA SPRINGS IS WANTING TO START ON THE WORK AND JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THEY HAVE THE AGREEMENT IN PLACE, SO THEY DO GET REIMBURSED WHEN THE TIME COMES, AND THE FUNDING IS AVAILABLE. SO, THIS IS A LITTLE BIT AHEAD OF WHEN YOU WOULD NORMALLY SEE THAT, BUT OTHER THAN THAT, IT'S JUST ONE OF THE NORMAL FUNDING AGREEMENTS. IT'S OUR STANDARD FORM THAT WE USE ON THOSE, SO I DON'T KNOW IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ON THIS ONE PARTICULARLY.

COMMISSIONER LEE - I'VE GOT A COUPLE QUESTIONS ON THESE TWO. THIS ONE'S FOR \$3,618,135 AND THE NEXT ONE IS FOR \$2,000,000. I MEAN THEY'RE SIMILAR IN THE SENSE THEY ARE TRYING TO DO THINGS BEFORE 2021,

RICHARD NIELSON – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER LEE – WHEN THAT FUNDING COMES IN. AND IT HAS ON THE LINE ITEM AS AN EXPENSE AND SO MY CONFUSION COMES IN THAT I'M ASSUMING THAT SARATOGA SPRINGS AND THEN THE OTHER PROJECT WAS SPRINGVILLE CITY'S, THAT THEY'RE FOOTING THAT BILL, BUT IT HAS OUR ACCOUNTS TIED TO IT.

RICHARD NIELSON - THAT'S WHERE WE PAY THE MONEY OUT OF, THE 2218 OR THE THIRD QUARTER CENT MONIES, THAT'S THE ACCOUNT NUMBER THAT'S ON THERE.

COMMISSIONER LEE - BUT WE WOULDN'T BE PAYING THAT UNTIL 2021?

RICHARD NIELSON – CORRECT.

COMMISSIONER LEE – OKAY, THAT MAKES, WHEN I SAW THAT IN THERE I WAS WONDERING IF WE WERE, WHO WAS RUNNING THAT.

RICHARD NIELSON – YEAH, THESE ARE BOTH REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENTS SO THAT THE CITY ACTUALLY HAS TO EXPEND THE FUNDS AND THEN TURN IN A REQUEST TO THE COUNTY FOR REIMBURSEMENT. THEN THAT GOES THROUGH OUR PROCESS TO REVIEW THEN IT GOES THE AUDITORS' OFFICE AND THEN FOR PAYMENT FROM THERE.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO THE OTHER THING AS I LOOKED DOWN THROUGH THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ON IT AND KNOWING KIND OF THE MAG PROCESS WITH IT, THERE IS A POTENTIAL INTO THE FUTURE IF WE'RE EXPENDING FUNDS THAT WE HAVEN'T EVEN COLLECTED YET IN WHICH THERE IS SAFETY NETS THAT ARE BUILT INTO THE MAG PROCESS, WHERE IT SAYS THAT IF WE DON'T COLLECT THAT MONEY THAT THESE PROJECTS CAN BE PUT ON HOLD.

RICHARD NIELSON – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER LEE - AND SO IT GIVES ME A LITTLE PAUSE TO THINK THAT WE'RE SPENDING, WELL WE'RE NOT SPENDING MONEY, THEY'RE SPENDING MONEY. SO, ARE YOU COMFORTABLE THEN WITH THEM, ARE THEY COMFORTABLE WITH SIGNING AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT THAT SAYS THEY'RE GOING TO SPEND MONEY, BUT THEY MAY NOT GET FULLY REIMBURSED? AND DOES THIS CONTRACT KIND OF REFLECT THAT?

RICHARD NIELSON - I HONESTLY DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S A SECTION IN HERE THAT WOULD CONTEMPLATE THAT OR NOT, I'D HAVE TO GO THROUGH AND SEE.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - COMMISSIONER LEE, I HAD THE EXACT SAME LINE OF QUESTIONING SO I'M GLAD YOU'RE THERE ASKING THAT, BECAUSE RICHARD, WHEN I LOOK AT THIS I WASN'T, IT KIND OF SEEMS MORE LIKE THE STANDARD AGREEMENT THAT WE DO.

RICHARD NIELSON – IT IS THE STANDARD AGREEMENT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - BUT NOT THE REIMBURSEMENT, NOT THE EARLY REIMBURSEMENT STANDARD BUT JUST NORMAL HOW WE WOULD FUND THE PROJECT. AND I WOULD EXPECT, IF I WERE A CITY, I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS A WAY TO YOU KNOW BASICALLY TAKE ON SOME OF THE RISK AND YOU WANT THE PROJECT DONE EARLIER SO YOU USE SOME CITY FUNDS, BUT IF THEY'RE GOING TO MAKE THE DECISION TO DO THAT, THEN I THINK THE CONTRACT SHOULD ABSOLUTELY REFLECT COMMISSIONER LEE'S POINT, THAT IT DOESN'T CHANGE ANY OF THE RISKS FOR THE TIMING MECHANISMS ON THE COUNTY FUNDS. THEY'RE TAKING ALL THE RISK UNTIL THE MONEY FINALLY COMES THROUGH AND IS APPROVED THROUGH THE MAG PROCESS AND IT BASICALLY IF THE COUNTY AND MAG ARE TREATED THE SAME THEN GREAT.

RICHARD NIELSON – YES.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - THEY ARE DECIDING TO SPEND IT EARLY.

RICHARD NIELSON - THAT IS CORRECT. THEY ARE TREATED THE SAME WHETHER TO COUNTY FUNDED PROJECT OR A MAG FUNDED. SECTION 8C ON PAGE 5 DOWN THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE IS FUNDING AVAILABILITY. IT TALKS ABOUT THAT THEY WILL NOT BE REIMBURSED UNTIL THE FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE NOW EITHER TO MAG OR TO THE COUNTY, WHICHEVER IS THE APPROPRIATE ENTITY AT THAT POINT, AND THE REIMBURSEMENT WILL BE MADE UPON RECEIPT OF THAT FUNDING TO THE COUNTY OR TO UDOT THROUGH THE MAG MONEY THAT GETS PAID THERE BECAUSE THAT IS STATE MONEY THAT'S PAID OUT THROUGH THE MAG SIDE OF THIS AGREEMENT, SO EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE SETTING THIS UP SO THEY CAN DO THE WORK AHEAD OF TIME, IT'S SO THAT THEY HAVE A COMFORT LEVEL THAT WHEN THE FUNDING IS AVAILABLE THEY WILL BE REIMBURSED BUT THERE'S NOT A GUARANTEE THAT IF THAT FUNDING GOES AWAY FOR SOME REASON OR WE JUST SIMPLY DON'T COLLECT THE AMOUNT OF FUNDS THAT ARE ANTICIPATED THEN THOSE FUNDS GET REDUCED.

COMMISSIONER LEE - I MEAN I WOULD JUST MAYBE MAKE SURE THAT THAT'S CLEAR THROUGH THE WHOLE THING.

RICHARD NIELSON - OKAY AND I'LL TOUCH BASE WITH THE

COMMISSIONER LEE - INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT.

RICHARD NIELSON - ATTORNEYS' OFFICE MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE GOOD ON THAT AND WE'VE GOT THE LANGUAGE IN HERE THAT NEEDS TO BE TO SATISFY THAT.

COMMISSIONER LEE - I JUST DON'T WANT THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT TO BE ASSUMED THAT THAT MONEY WAS COMING NO MATTER WHAT. THAT'S NOT OUR RISK.

RICHARD NIELSON – YES.

DANENE JACKSON, FINANCIAL OFFICER – DO YOU MIND IF I MAKE A COMMENT? TO THE OTHER THING THAT I WOULD PROBABLY RECOMMEND IS THAT THE FUNDING SOURCE BE SPECIFICALLY DEFINED IN THE CONTRACT. AS FAR AS I CAN SEE RIGHT NOW THE ONLY THING IT TALKS ABOUT IS THE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX FUNDS. THE COUNTY RECEIVES SEVERAL DIFFERENT TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX FUNDS, AT LEAST THREE THAT I KNOW OF, AND SO I THINK IT WOULD HELP TO CLEARLY DELINEATE WHICH SALES TAX FUNDS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, AND THAT THE CITY HAS RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAKING SURE THEY'RE COMPLIANT WITH ANY RULES OR GUIDANCE REGARDING THE SPENDING OF THOSE FUNDS.

RICHARD NIELSON – I KNOW WHEN THIS STANDARD FORM AGREEMENT WAS PUT TOGETHER AND THAT WAS ACTUALLY TALKED ABOUT AT THAT POINT BECAUSE THERE ARE THE DIFFERENT FUNDS AND TO GIVE THE FLEXIBILITY OF WHERE THOSE FUNDS CAN BE MOVED AROUND IF NEED BE, THERE'S SOME THAT HAVE MORE RESTRICTIONS LIKE THE QUARTER MONIES AND THINGS LIKE THAT, THAT THOSE, IT GAVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO NOT HAVE IT CLEARLY LAID OUT AS THIS IS IN THIS FUND OR THAT FUND AND TO HAVE A STANDARD AGREEMENT. THAT WAS WHAT WE LOOKED AT A COUPLE YEARS AGO WHEN THESE STANDARD AGREEMENTS WERE WRITTEN, AND WE CAN CERTAINLY ADDRESS THAT AND LOOK AT THAT AS WELL.

DANENE JACKSON – YEAH, BECAUSE I THINK JUST GOING ALONG WITH THE DISCUSSION IF THERE HAPPENED, I THINK THAT THIS IS TALKING ABOUT THE THIRD QUARTER SINCE IT'S THE ASSUMPTION THAT IT'S COMING FROM, BUT IF THAT FUNDING SOURCE WASN'T AVAILABLE AND THAT'S NOT CLEARLY DELINEATED WITH THE COUNTY THEN BE ONLINE FOR USING THE FOURTH QUARTER CENT SALES TAX.

RICHARD NIELSON - I DON'T THINK SO BECAUSE OF HOW THE MAG APPROVAL IS DONE AND THE DELINEATION THAT'S DONE ON THE MAG SIDE OF IT, THIS IS PAID FROM THIRD QUARTER, FOURTH QUARTER, QUARTER PRESERVATION, THAT SORT OF THING, THEY DELINEATE ALL OF THAT ON THE SPREADSHEET WITH THE COMMISSION APPROVES PRIOR TO THESE AGREEMENTS.

DANENE JACKSON - SO THEN I PROBABLY COULD BE MORE SPECIFIC IN THE CONTRACT.

RICHARD NIELSON - IT COULD BE.

COMMISSIONER LEE – I'D JUST TAKE A PEEK AT THAT, MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE COVERED ON IT.

RICHARD NIELSON – WE CAN DO THAT.

COMMISSIONER LEE - I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH EXPENDING THEIR MONEY AND HAVING AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT, WITH THEY'RE TAKING ALL THE RISK WITH IT.

RICHARD NIELSON – YUP. ANY QUESTIONS ON THE SPRINGVILLE CITY? SIMILAR SITUATION?

COMMISSIONER IVIE – KIND OF THE SAME I KNOW THE SAME.

RICHARD NIELSON – YUP. I THINK MAYBE JUST A QUESTION ON INTERLOCAL AGREEMENTS IN GENERAL, IS THAT SOMETHING THAT YOU'D LIKE TO SEE THEM ON A REGULAR BASIS ON THE WORK SESSION OR WHAT'S YOUR THOUGHTS ON THOSE? I'M AN ANTICIPATING THEY WOULD BE A STANDARD REVIEW HERE AT A WORK SESSION. IS THAT A GOOD ASSUMPTION?

COMMISSIONER IVIE – I WOULD THINK SO.

RICHARD NIELSON – THANK YOU.

7. ADOPT A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSION CHAIR TO SIGN AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH SPRINGVILLE CITY FOR A PROJECT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 1200 WEST – PHASE 2, 40 SOUTH TO 550 NORTH

- Richard Nielson, Public Works Director

SEE DISCUSSION UNDER ITEM NUMBER 6.

8. WORK SESSION RELATED TO PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL UTAH COUNTY ZONE MAP FROM THE RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURAL (RA-5) ZONE TO THE MINING AND GRAZING (M&G-1) ZONE FOR APPROXIMATELY 186 ACRES IN SECTION 35, T6S R3W, FAIRFIELD AREA

- Bryce Armstrong, Community Development

COMMISSIONER IVIE – PERFECT. THANK YOU, RICHARD. ALRIGHT WE'LL GO AHEAD AND NOW MOVE TO WORK SESSION ITEM NUMBER EIGHT. THIS IS RELATED TO A PROPOSED ORDINANCE CHANGE ON THE COUNTY MAP FROM RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE TO THE MINING AND GRAZING ZONE FOR 186 ACRES. BRYCE.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - BRYCE ARMSTRONG COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. AS COMMISSIONER IVIE STATED, THIS IS AN APPLICATION FOR A ZONE MAP AMENDMENT. THIS WAS SUBMITTED BY AN APPLICANT JDH FAIRFIELD LLC WHO HAS AN INTEREST IN SOME PROPERTY OUT IN THE WESTERN REACHES OF THE COUNTY, WEST OF FAIRFIELD JUST OFF OF HWY 73. THE PARCEL IS CURRENTLY 300 PLUS ACRES AND IT'S ABOUT HALF A LITTLE MORE THAN HALF IS IN THE RA 5 ZONE AND THE REMAINDER IS IN THE MINING AND GRAZING ZONE, SHOULD BE SOME MAPS THAT HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN YOUR AGENDA BACK UP. KIND OF A SIMPLE REQUEST. THE APPLICANT HAS DESIRES TO UTILIZE THE PROPERTY I BELIEVE FOR MINING TYPE USES, WHICH ARE NOT ALLOWED IN THE RA 5 ZONE. AND IF YOU RECALL

LAST YEAR, WE WENT THROUGH A TEXT AMENDMENT THAT KIND OF DELINEATED THE RULES RELATED TO A PARCEL THAT IS DIVIDED BY TWO ZONES AND WE HAD SOME MINIMUM THRESHOLDS. THIS WOULD EXCEED THAT, SO THE MOST RESTRICTIVE ZONING WOULD BE HELD IN EFFECT WHICH WILL BE THE RA 5 ZONE WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW MINING AND GRAZING. SO THAT'S WHAT HAS NECESSITATED THIS REQUEST BY THE APPLICANT. STAFF HAS LOOKED AT THE APPLICATION AND FEELS THAT THIS IS PROBABLY THE MOST APPROPRIATE ZONING DESIGNATION AS IT RELATES TO THE AREA. THE GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATES THIS AREA AS AN AGRICULTURAL / WATERSHED DESIGNATION WHICH INCLUDES BOTH THE MINING GRAZING AND THE RA 5 ZONE SO THAT DOES NOT REQUIRE A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT. AGAIN, THIS IS SOMETHING THAT IN LOOKING AT THE HISTORY OF THIS, FAIRFIELD, MOST OF FAIRFIELD WAS ALSO ZONED RA 5 PRIOR TO ITS INCORPORATION 10-15 YEARS AGO AND I THINK THIS IS JUST A REMNANT ISLAND THAT WAS LEFT AFTER THAT INCORPORATION. THAT'S WHY WE HAVE THAT RA 5 OUT THERE. THERE SEEMS TO BE NO IRRIGATED AGRICULTURAL USE OUT THERE WHICH IS KIND OF CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE OF THE RA 5 ZONE. THIS PROPERTY IS ADJACENT TO FAIRFIELD CITY OR TOWN, BUT IT IS NOT WITHIN ITS ANNEXATION POLICY DECLARATION. WE DID SEND A NOTIFICATION TO FAIRFIELD CITY. SO THAT'S JUST KIND OF THE BASICS.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO THE QUESTION HE DIDN'T ADDRESS, I READ IN THERE, THERE WAS A DIVISION?

BRYCE ARMSTRONG – YES.

COMMISSIONER LEE – AND THAT IT LACKED GOING THROUGH THAT CORRECT PROCESS.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG – YEAH.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO COULD YOU ADDRESS THAT A LITTLE BIT TOO AND SOME OF THE CONCERNS THAT GO WITH IT? I'M ASSUMING THERE'S SOME CONCERNS THAT HAD HAPPENED, AND IT SEEMS LIKE THERE WAS HESITANCY TO MOVE FORWARD WITH IT UNTIL SOME OF THIS GETS CLARIFIED.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG - WELL YOU'RE RIGHT, THERE IS AN ISSUE RELATED TO THE PARCEL. SO, WHEN THIS WAS SUBMITTED THE APPLICANT WENT THROUGH A ZONE CLEARANCE TO SEE WHAT THE STATUS WAS AND FOUND OUT IT WAS BIASECTED BY THE ZONING AND SO THEY SUBMITTED HIS APPLICATION. SUBSEQUENT TO THAT THEY, I DON'T KNOW IF THE APPLICANT IS HERE, HE COULD SPEAK TO THAT. I THINK UNKNOWINGLY DEEDED THE PROPERTY TO REFLECT OWNERSHIP NOT AWARE OF THE SUBDIVISION REQUIREMENTS TO DEED PROPERTY OR DIVIDE PROPERTY AND SO THAT PROBLEM EXISTS, WHETHER OR NOT ZONE CHANGE ZONE MAP AMENDMENT GOES FORWARD AS KIND OF A SEPARATE ISSUE. WE BROUGHT IT UP POINTING THAT OUT AT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JUST TO MAKE THE APPLICANT AWARE EVEN THOUGH OUR RECOMMENDATION IS THIS WOULD STILL BE THE SAME THAT ISSUE WOULD NEED TO BE ADDRESSED PRIOR TO ANY PERMITS BEING ISSUED ON THE PROPERTY, WHETHER IT STAYED IN ITS CURRENT ZONING

DESIGNATION OR WAS CHANGED TO THE MINING AND GRAZING. AND WHAT I UNDERSTAND...

COMMISSIONER LEE - WE COULD GO AHEAD AND YES AND CHANGE THE ZONE ON IT BUT ANY PERMITS FOR THE USE WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES THAT WOULD BE NEEDED AND NECESSARY ON THAT DIVISION.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG – YES, CORRECT. AND I THINK THE APPLICANTS INDICATED THEY'RE GOING TO PROBABLY WORK WITH THE OWNER AND GET THAT RECOMBINED. IT'S PROBABLY SIMPLEST BECAUSE SUBDIVISION WOULD INVOLVE ADDING ROADS, THEY DON'T HAVE DIRECT ACCESS FRONTAGE ON A ROAD. I DON'T THINK THEY HAVE ANY RESIDENTIAL DESIRES; THEY WANT TO USE IT FOR MINING SO THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE ADMINISTRATIVE BEFORE THEY CHANGE.

COMMISSIONER LEE - IT WOULDN'T CHANGE US DOING ANYTHING, I MEAN IT JUST GO BACK TO THEM DOING THAT, GOING THROUGH THAT PROCESS. I THOUGHT WHEN I WAS READING DOWN THROUGH IT, I WAS THINKING THAT MAYBE IT WOULD HOLD UP THE CHANGE OF THE ZONING, YOU KNOW? THAT'S HOW I KIND OF READ IT.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG – YEAH, THAT PROBABLY WASN'T AS CLEAR AS IT COULD HAVE BEEN, BUT NO, WE STILL WOULD HAVE A MECHANISM TO MAKE SURE THAT'S VERIFIED BEFORE WE ISSUED A PERMIT. SO, I SHOULD NOTE THIS WAS SUBJECT TO A PUBLIC HEARING AS REQUIRED BY STATE LAW. IT WAS HELD AT THE PLANNING COMMISSION IN DECEMBER AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED APPROVAL. I DO BELIEVE THE APPLICANT IS HERE AND CAN ANSWER ANY OTHER ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS IF YOU HAVE ANY THOSE.

COMMISSIONER LEE – THOSE WERE MY QUESTIONS.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – DO YOU HAVE ANY INPUT? WOULD YOU LIKE TO SPEAK? I DON'T KNOW THAT WE HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR YOU BUT.

JASON RICHARDS - JUST REAL QUICK JASON RICHARDS FOR JDH FAIRFIELD, EXACTLY AS HE SAID, THE PLAN IS TO RECOMBINE THOSE. WHAT HAPPENED IS WE ARE PURCHASING IN KIND OF TAKEDOWN SITUATION AND WE DIDN'T RECOGNIZE THAT BY DOING A METES AND BOUNDS IT WAS GOING TO THROW OFF ALL THE PERMITS SO WE'RE JUST GOING TO GO AHEAD AND RECONSTRUCT THAT CONTRACT IN A DIFFERENT WAY SO THAT WE'RE NOT IN ANY VIOLATION OF THE RULES SO, SHOULD BE EASY ENOUGH TO RECANDO AND WE APPRECIATE YOU GUYS CONSIDERING IT. SO THANK YOU.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - THANK YOU.

COMMISSIONER LEE - YOU KNOW I JUST HAD A THOUGHT THOUGH, IF THE ZONING CHANGES AND THEN THEY'RE RECONSTRUCTING, IS THE RECONSTRUCTION GOING TO HAPPEN BEFORE THE ZONING CHANGE OR WOULD YOU DO IT AFTER?

JASON RICHARDS - IN TERMS OF THE CONTRACT?

COMMISSIONER LEE – WITH THE UNDERLYING ZONING CHANGE, WILL IT CAUSE PROBLEMS YOU WANT TO GO IN A DIFFERENT DIRECTION, OR DO YOU WANT EVERYTHING TO BE IN THAT MINING AND GRAZING ZONE?

JASON RICHARDS - WE DO WANT EVERYTHING TO BE IN THE MINING AND GRAZING, YEAH. WE ACTUALLY THAT'S WHAT WE APPLIED FOR. YEAH SO, WE WANT IT THAT WAY AND THE REASON IS, THE PART THAT WE'RE PLANNING ON MINING ISN'T ACTUALLY IN THE RA 5 BUT JUST THE WHOLE PARCEL HAS TO BE ONE UNIFIED ZONE SO WE'RE HERE TO JUST MAKE SURE WE'RE IN COMPLIANCE, THAT'S ALL.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - THANK YOU.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - WHAT WILL BE THE MINING USE HERE?

JASON RICHARDS - THE MINING USE THERE WILL PROBABLY BE JUST AN AGGREGATE PIT FOR SOME OF THE DIFFERENT PROJECTS THAT ARE HAPPENING OUT IN THAT AREA. THIS IS A GREAT SPOT TO BE. IT'S NOT THROUGH ANY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS AND ALL THAT AND IT'S ABLE TO FOR US TO BE YOU KNOW PART OF AND HELP WITH ALL THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT'S GOING TO BE HAPPENING OUT IN AN AREA AND IT'S NOT GOING THROUGH SOME OF THE RESIDENTIAL AREAS WHERE SOME OF THE OTHER AGGREGATE PITS THAT ARE IN THAT AREA REQUIRE A LOT OF YOU KNOW COMING INTO CONTACT WITH THE GENERAL PUBLIC WHICH IS WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO AVOID WITH THOSE KIND OF OPERATIONS.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG - SO THIS IS THE FOLLOW UP TO THAT. THIS IS BRYCE AGAIN. ASSUMING THAT THE ZONE MAP CHANGE IS APPROVED, THEN THE APPLICANT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE MINING AND GRAZING ZONING, IT WOULD HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS FOR THAT MINING OPERATION, MEANING THE ORDINANCE THAT WE HAVE IN EFFECT. SO, WE WORK WITH THEM THROUGH THAT ONCE THAT ZONING'S IN PLACE. THE OTHER ITEM QUESTION I HAD IS AND I BELIEVE THIS MAY HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED IN DEPARTMENT HEAD BUT AS I UNDERSTAND THIS WOULD THEN AUTOMATICALLY MOVE FORWARD TO THE NEXT AVAILABLE COMMISSION AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – CORRECT.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG - AND THAT WOULD HAPPEN INDEPENDENT OF STAFF DOING THAT?

COMMISSIONER LEE - I THINK THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION. I THINK IT WILL BE AVAILABLE TO BE ON THERE AND THEN THE COMMISSIONER JUST NEEDS TO CHECK OFF ON IT.

BRYCE ARMSTRONG - SO I DON'T NEED TO MAKE A NEW REQUEST?

COMMISSIONER IVIE – EZRA, WOULD YOU LIKE TO CLARIFY?

COMMISSIONER AINGE - I JUST GOT A NOTE FROM MY UNDERSTANDING AND ANYONE IN THE ROOM CAN SPEAK UP IS THAT AT THE END OF THIS MEETING, WE CAN MAKE A MOTION. WE COULD DO IT ONE BY ONE, BUT THERE'S NO NEED. AGAIN, LIKE SO FAR, I THINK EVERYTHING, WE WOULD JUST LIKE IT TO BE A CONSENT AGENDA. IF THE MEETING HAD ENDED RIGHT NOW, WE COULD SAY JUST MOVE THAT ITEMS ONE THROUGH NINE ARE CONTINUED ON CONSENT FOR THE NEXT MEETINGS' AGENDA AND THAT WAY WILL HAPPEN AUTOMATICALLY AND NO ONE NEEDS TO RESUBMIT THEIR AGENDA ITEMS.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – OKAY

BRYCE ARMSTRONG – OKAY, GREAT. ONE NOTE ON THIS ITEM I IDENTIFIED IT AS A WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ITEM SO THE LANGUAGE WILL NEED TO BE CHANGED TO APPROVE OR DENY THEM THE ORDINANCE AND I CAN KIND OF WORK WITH THEM.

COMMISSIONER LEE - THE ONLY QUESTION I HAVE ON THAT AND IT'LL BE A DAVE QUESTION. WORK SESSIONS WE DON'T MAKE ANY DECISIONS. IS THAT A DECISION OR IS THAT NOT A DECISION?

DAVE SHAWCROFT – IT IS NOT.

COMMISSIONER LEE - THAT IS NOT. OKAY. ALRIGHT.

9. APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE AN ICA WITH PLEASANT GROVE CITY FOR SUBSTANCE MISUSE PREVENTION AND COMMUNITIES THAT CARE PREVENTION MODEL

- Heather Lewis, Department of Drug and Alcohol Prevention and Treatment

COMMISSIONER IVIE – OKAY, WE’LL GO TO NUMBER NINE. THIS IS TO APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE AN ICA WITH PLEASANT GROVE CITY FOR SUBSTANCE MISUSE PREVENTION AND COMMUNITIES THAT CARE PREVENTION MODEL. HEATHER.

HEATHER LEWIS, DDAPT - HEATHER LEWIS WITH THE UTAH COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL PREVENTION AND TREATMENT. AND I'M NOT SURE I THINK THERE WAS A QUESTION ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THERE WAS ENOUGH FUNDING IN THE BUDGET LINE TO DO THIS AND WE'VE MOVED IT AND SO IT'S THERE WAS MONEY THERE, JUST WASN'T IN THE RIGHT PLACE, SO I MEAN THAT'S TAKEN CARE OF.

COMMISSIONER LEE - AND I'M GLAD YOU BROUGHT THAT UP, \$40,000?

HEATHER LEWIS - \$24,000, IT WAS \$24,000 WAS NEEDED AND THERE WAS ONLY \$20,000 IN THE LINE SO WE JUST NEEDED AN EXTRA \$4000 MOVED OVER.

COMMISSIONER LEE – OH, I THOUGHT IN THE CONTRACT IT SAID \$40,000 AND THEN THERE WAS \$20,000 IN THERE, STATE IS COMING IN WITH \$10,000 AND YOU WERE MOVING \$4,000, I'M REALLY CONFUSED.

HEATHER LEWIS - WELL THE STATE WILL GIVE US \$10,000 FOR EVERY NEW COALITION THAT STARTS FOR THE FIRST THREE YEARS. SO, THEY'RE GOING TO GIVE US \$10,000 PLUS I HAD THE FUNDING ALREADY IN MY BUDGET TO PAY FOR THIS COALITION SO REALLY, WE DON'T EVEN NECESSARILY NEED TO WORRY ABOUT THE 10,000 UNTIL THE DIVISION OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH GIVES IT TO US AND THEN WE COULD USE THAT NEXT YEAR IN THE BUDGET OR WHATEVER. WE HAVEN'T SEEN THAT YET FROM THEM THEY PROMISED US, BUT WE HAVEN'T BEEN GIVEN THOSE FUNDS YET.

COMMISSIONER LEE – OKAY. SO, THE NUMBER IS \$24,000.

HEATHER LEWIS – YES.

COMMISSIONER LEE - 40 I WAS TRYING TO GET TO THE 40.

HEATHER LEWIS – YEAH, NO, IT'S JUST \$24

COMMISSIONER LEE – I HAD 20 AND 10 AND 4 AND I WAS LIKE IT DOESN'T ADD UP

HEATHER LEWIS – IT DOESN'T ADD.

COMMISSIONER LEE - OK THAT WAS THE ONLY QUESTION I HAD.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – I HAVE A QUESTION ON THIS ONE. HOW DO WE THINK ABOUT YOU KNOW YOU MENTION THERE'S FUNDING FOR THIS, BUT ARE WE WILLING TO ENTER INTO THESE? I DON'T KNOW HOW WE BUDGET FOR THIS WHERE WE'RE SUPPORTING THE CITY OF PLEASANT GROVE. I'M NOT SURE EXACTLY HOW MANY CITIES GO TO THIS OR ENTER INTO A COMMUNITY CARE, HOW DO YOU KIND OF DEAL WITH PARITY BETWEEN THE CITIES ON THIS ISSUE?

HEATHER LEWIS - WELL THE CITIES ALL PROVIDE A MATCH AS WELL SO PART OF THE FUNDING THAT WE GET FROM THE DIVISION OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH IS TARGETED FOR CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE COUNTY FOR THESE COALITIONS. SO CURRENTLY WE HAVE 5 COMMUNITIES THAT CARE MODELED COALITIONS, THIS IS THE NEWEST ONE. SO, THE \$24,000 THAT THE COUNTY DOLLARS PROVIDE THEN THE CITY ALSO WILL BE MATCHING WITH ANOTHER \$10,000 TO PAY FOR THE POSITION AND PAY FOR WHATEVER ACTIVITIES, TRAINING, WHATEVER OTHER NEEDS ARE NECESSARY, BUT BASED ON EACH CITY, WE ENTER INTO THE SAME AGREEMENTS. I GIVE OUR PORTION IS ANYWHERE FROM \$16 TO \$20,000, THIS TIME \$24 BECAUSE THEY ARE BRAND NEW AND SO BUT EACH YEAR IT'S \$16 TO \$20,000 DEPENDING ON WHAT THE DIVISION BUDGET LOOKS LIKE FOR ME, AND THEN THE CITY PROVIDES A \$10,000 MATCH. THAT'S JUST HOW ALL OF THE CITIES WORK.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - THAT MEANS IT'S A PRETTY STANDARD DEAL.

HEATHER LEWIS – YES.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – IT'S KIND OF PENDING OFFER FOR ANY OF THEM WHO WANT TO ENTER INTO IT AND IF THEY DO ENTER INTO IT, IT'S GOING TO BE THE SAME DEAL FOR EACH CITY.

HEATHER LEWIS – YES.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – HEATHER, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG BUT IF MY RECOLLECTION SERVES ME RIGHT, WE REALLY INITIALLY WITH THESE TARGETED A LOT OF THESE CITIES THAT WERE HIGHER USE AREAS, RIGHT?

HEATHER LEWIS – ABSOLUTELY.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - SO WE'VE TRIED IDENTIFIED THROUGH DATA THAT CITIES IN THE COUNTY HAD THE HIGHEST SUBSTANCE ABUSE RATE AND TRIED TO PUSH TO GET THOSE CITIES ON BOARD AND NOW FORTUNATELY SEEING THE SUCCESS IN AREAS LIKE SPANISH FORK AND SALEM, A LOT OF THESE OTHER CITIES ARE WANTING TO COME ON BOARD AS A RESULT.

HEATHER LEWIS – THAT'S CORRECT.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - WOULD THAT BE ACCURATE?

HEATHER LEWIS – YES. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

COMMISSIONER IVIE - I DON'T SEE ANY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

HEATHER LEWIS - THANK YOU.

10. APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE SIGNING OF THE WRITTEN CERTIFICATE OF UTAH COUNTY RE: \$65,000,000 UTAH COUNTY, UTAH SUBORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2016

- Cherie Bunce, Legal Assistant

COMMISSIONER IVIE – OKAY, WE'LL GO AHEAD AND MOVE TO WORK SESSION AGENDA ITEM NUMBER TEN. THIS IS TO LOOK AT APPROVING AND AUTHORIZE THE SIGNING OF THE WRITTEN CERTIFICATE OF UTAH COUNTY RE: FOR \$65 MILLION ON THE BONDS. WE HAVE SOMEONE HERE? DAVE, ARE YOU?

DAVE SHAWCROFT, DEPUTY COUNTY ATTORNEY - I CAN ADDRESS THAT, YES. THIS DEALS WITH THE BUS RAPID TRANSIT BONDING THAT OCCURRED BACK IN 2016. THE PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THAT BONDING WE ARE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THIS CERTIFICATE TO CONFIRM THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT. PART OF THAT IS SO THAT ANY REMAINING FUNDS IN THE CONSTRUCTION FUND CAN BE TRANSFERRED TO THE BOND FUND. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THERE ARE NO REMAINING FUNDS, SO THIS WILL BE SOMEWHAT OF A HOLLOW CERTIFICATION, BUT STILL IS A CERTIFICATION REQUIRED TO BE MADE.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – OKAY.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - WE ARE RELYING ON THE CERTIFICATE OF UDOT WE'VE OBTAINED AND THERE IS A PUNCH LIST WHICH IS ATTACHED TO THAT CERTIFICATE INDICATING THOSE PUNCH LIST ITEMS THAT STILL REMAIN RELATED TO THE PROJECT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – SO, I JUST HAD A QUESTION BECAUSE IT LOOKS LIKE WE'RE SUPPOSED TO SIGN THIS AND I'M NOT AWARE OF, IT SEEMS LIKE THERE'S SOME REAL STUFF HERE YOU KNOW IF YOU LOOK AT ITEM NUMBER TWO, WE'VE BEEN INFORMED THAT THERE EXISTS A CLAIM BY CONTRACTOR AGAINST UTA AND THE PROJECT RELATING TO EXTENDED OVERHEAD COSTS.

DAVE SHAWCROFT – CORRECT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - SO I AM NOT AWARE OF THAT, SO I DIDN'T REALLY WANT TO SIGN THAT UNTIL I UNDERSTOOD WHAT WAS HAPPENING.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - THOSE ARE IDENTIFIED IN THE CERTIFICATES ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT A TO THE DOCUMENT, WHICH IS A CERTIFICATE FROM UDOT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – YOU KNOW THE CERTIFICATE JUST SAYS THE SAME THING.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - CORRECT AND I DON'T HAVE A GOOD DETAIL.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – IT DOESN'T DESCRIBE WHAT IS ACTUALLY HAPPENING.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - THAT'S ALL THE DETAIL THAT I HAD. THAT I'M AWARE OF WE COULD REQUEST MORE DETAIL FROM UTA IF YOU WOULD LIKE.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - SO I'M JUST I GUESS I'M NOT ENTIRELY SURE HOW THIS AFFECTS US BUT IT SOUNDS LIKE SOMEONE IS RESERVING CLAIMS OR MAKING REFERENCE TO CLAIMS AND SO I WOULDN'T NORMALLY WANT TO ALLOW THAT TO HAPPEN UNLESS WE AGREED, AND WE ARE AWARE OF SUCH CLAIMS.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - YEAH THAT'S WHY THE CERTIFICATE MENTIONS THAT EXCEPTION SO THAT IT'S CLEAR THAT ANYONE WHO RELIES ON THE CERTIFICATE IS MADE AWARE OF THAT, BUT THAT THOSE CLAIMS EXIST AND HAVE BEEN DISCLOSED IN THE DOCUMENTS WE'RE SIGNING.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – OKAY, SO IT'S UNCLEAR WHETHER THIS AFFECTS, I STILL DON'T UNDERSTAND WHETHER THIS AFFECTS US OR NOT, BUT IF YOUR OPINION IS THAT IT COULD, THEN I WANT TO KNOW, I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE MORE DETAIL ON EXACTLY WHAT THE CLAIMS ARE.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - I CAN REQUEST THAT THE UTA PROVIDE US WITH THAT ADDITIONAL DETAIL.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - AND JUST SO IT SAYS WHEN IT SAYS CLAIMS AGAINST UCA AND OR THE PROJECT, SO DOES THAT, WOULD THAT EVER ATTACH ANY LIABILITY TO US AS A COUNTY?

DAVE SHAWCROFT - IT SHOULD NOT AND IF THERE WERE ANYTHING UTA WOULD HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO DEFEND AND INDEMNIFY US. MY RECOLLECTION THAT'S CONTAINED WITHIN THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT THAT WAS SIGNED WITH THE UTA, SO WE WOULD HAVE PROTECTION THERE.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – ALRIGHT, THEN MAYBE I'LL JUST HOLD THIS ONE AND WOULD LOVE TO GET SOME OF THAT MORE INFO. THANK YOU.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - IF THAT'S THE CASE THEN PERHAPS I'D SUGGEST THAT WE NOT PUT THAT ON THE NEXT WEEKS AGENDA UNTIL, I'LL PUT IT BACK ON ONCE WE GET THAT DETAIL FROM UTA.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – OKAY.

11. RECONSIDER POLICY PROHIBITING DDAPT FROM BILLING COMMERCIAL HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS

- Richard Nance, Department of Drug and Alcohol Prevention and Treatment Director

COMMISSIONER IVIE - SOUNDS GREAT. ALRIGHT, WE'LL GO AHEAD AND MOVE ON TO, I KEEP ON SAYING REGULAR AGENDA, WORK AGENDA ITEM NUMBER ELEVEN, WHICH IS TO RECONSIDER POLICY PROHIBITING DDAPT FROM BILLING COMMERCIAL HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS. RICHARD NANCE.

RICHARD NANCE, DIRECTOR DDAPT - RICHARD NANCE, DEPARTMENT OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL PREVENTION AND TREATMENT. THIS IS KIND OF REVISITING A DISCUSSION WE HAD AT THE LAST LOCAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING WHERE WE MADE THE REQUEST TO THE LOCAL AUTHORITY BOARD TO KIND OF DEPART FROM THE HISTORICAL POLICY, IT'S NOT A WRITTEN POLICY, IT'S JUST AN INFORMAL PHILOSOPHICAL POLICY THAT WE HAVE IN PLACE THAT WE DON'T COMPETE WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR FOR CLIENTS FOR DRUG AND ALCOHOL TREATMENT AND SO HISTORICALLY THE WAY WE'VE MADE THAT DETERMINATION WHETHER WE COMPETE OR NOT IS WHETHER WE TRY TO GET ON COMMERCIAL HEALTH INSURANCE PANELS AS A PROVIDER FOR PEOPLE WHO HAVE HEALTH INSURANCE THROUGH THEIR EMPLOYER, FOR INSTANCE AND SO MOST OF THOSE FOLKS GO TO PRIVATE PROVIDERS AND WE'VE BEEN THE SOCIAL SAFETY NET PROGRAM. ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT'S COME UP FOR US IS WITH MEDICAID EXPANSION NOW AND SOME REDUCTIONS IN STATE GENERAL FUND DOLLARS.

WHEN YOU LOOK AT OUR REVENUE BUDGET FOR 2020, WE HAVE A GAP THERE THAT WE NEED TO TRY TO BACKFILL RATHER THAN DIP INTO RESERVES, WE WANT TO LOOK AT OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCES OF REVENUE TO DO THAT. WHEN WE HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR MEDICAID UNDER THE EXPANSION UP TO 138% OF POVERTY, THOSE FOLKS ARE ALSO ON AN ACCOUNTABLE CARE ORGANIZATION PLAN. SO YOU'VE APPROVED ALL THE

CONTRACTS FOR THOSE AND THERE FOUR OF THOSE. SO, THEY'RE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH HEALTH PLANS, SELECT HEALTH, STEWARD AND MOLINA. AND ALL FOUR, I'M NOT SURE ABOUT STEWARD, BUT AT LEAST THE OTHER THREE HAVE ACCOUNTABLE CARE EXCUSE ME AFFORDABLE CARE ACT HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGE PLANS THAT THEY OFFER. WHEN WE HAVE SOMEONE WHO WE START ON MEDICAID AT ELIGIBILITY LEVEL OF 138% OF POVERTY, ONE OF OUR FIRST TREATMENT PLAN GOALS FOR THEM IS TO GET THEM A JOB. SO TYPICALLY, WITHIN TWO OR THREE MONTHS AFTER THEY ARE TO BEGIN TREATMENT WITH US, WE COULD GET THEM EMPLOYED AND THEY NO LONGER ELIGIBLE FOR MEDICAID EVEN AT 138% OF POVERTY. SO, AT THAT TIME WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO GET THEM ENROLLED ON EXCHANGE PLANS BECAUSE THEY ARE OFFERED ON A SLIDING FEE SCALE, SO THEY ARE SUBSIDIZED. SO, FOR SOMEONE WHO MIGHT APPLY FOR A SILVER PLAN, DEPENDING ON THEIR INCOME AND FAMILY SIZE, IT MIGHT COST THEM NO MORE THAN ABOUT \$20 A MONTH TO GET ON ONE OF THE EXCHANGE HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS. SO, WHAT WE ASKED IN AT THE LAST AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING WAS WHETHER OR NOT WE COULD SIGN ON TO BECOME PANEL PROVIDERS FOR THE EXCHANGE PLANS. AND COMMISSIONER AINGE SAID WHY DON'T YOU TRY TO BILL A FEW OF THEM FIRST AND SEE WHAT YOUR EXPERIENCE IS. SO, THERE WERE TWO ATTACHMENTS TO THIS AGENDA ITEM, ONE WAS A SPREADSHEET THAT HAS SOME INFORMATION ABOUT EXCHANGE PLANS ON IT, AND THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF THE INFORMATION RELATED TO WHAT COMMISSIONER AINGE ASKED WAS IN OUT OF THE LAST FIVE COLUMNS THE 1ST THREE AND THEY ALL SAY, "OUT OF NETWORK, OUT OF NETWORK BENEFITS NOT COVERED", SO WE DIDN'T BILL ANY OF THESE BECAUSE BASED ON WHAT WE LEARNED DOING OUR RESEARCH WE WOULDN'T HAVE GOTTEN PAID ANYTHING ANYWAY.

ONE OF THE CLINICAL PIECES THAT MAKES US IMPORTANT IS IF WE HAVE SOMEONE THAT WE STARTED IN TREATMENT AND THERE WITH US TWO OR THREE MONTHS AND THEN WE NEED TO TRY TO WHEN THEY BECOME NO LONGER ELIGIBLE FOR MEDICAID EXPANSION, WE PUT THEM ON AN EXCHANGE PLAN WE CAN'T PROVIDE TREATMENT SERVICES FOR THEM ANY LONGER AND WE HAVE TO TRANSFER THEM TO ANOTHER PROVIDER. SO THAT'S KIND OF DISRUPTIVE TO THE CONTINUITY OF THE CARE AND TYPICALLY WHEN YOU DO THAT KIND OF TRANSFER THE FOLLOW THROUGH IS AROUND 50%. SO, WE WOULD KIND OF LOSE THE INVESTMENT OF THE FIRST TWO OR THREE MONTHS OF TREATMENT WHERE SIX AND NINE MONTHS IS A TYPICAL EFFECTIVE LENGTH TO STAY IN TREATMENT. SO WHAT WE WANTED TO DO WAS TALK TO YOU ABOUT LETTING US AGAIN, SINCE WE ALREADY HAVE THESE CONTRACTS IN PLACE WITH THE FOUR ACO'S, WHERE THEY INCLUDED LANGUAGE FOR US TO BILL THEIR COMMERCIAL PLANS AND PROVIDED US RATES THAT ARE MORE ATTRACTIVE THAN THE MEDICAID RATES, WE'D LIKE TO BE ABLE TO JUST FOR THOSE, THROUGH THOSE FOUR ACO CONTRACTS, BE ABLE TO BILL COMMERCIAL INSURANCE FOR THOSE CLIENTS THAT WE ALREADY HAVE IN TREATMENT THAT HAVE BEEN ON MEDICAID. SO THAT'S THE REQUEST.

COMMISSIONER LEE - BUT WOULD THEY BE OUT OF NETWORK? WILL WE STILL HAVE THE SAME PROBLEM OR WHAT?

RICHARD NANCE – NO, THOSE FOUR WE’RE ALREADY IN THEIR NETWORK.

COMMISSIONER LEE – THOSE FOUR ARE IN THE NETWORK?

RICHARD NANCE – RIGHT. SO, ANY OF THE OTHERS WE WOULDN’T, WE WOULD TRY TO DIRECT CLIENTS TO CONTINUE WITH THEIR CURRENT ACO PLAN UNDER THEIR EXCHANGE PROGRAM. SO, IT’LL BE SOMETHING THAT OUR CASE MANAGER WOULD COORDINATE WITH THE ACO CARE MANAGERS TO DO THAT APPLICATION.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO WHERE WAS IT IN THE PAST, IF THIS ISN'T OR WASN'T A WRITTEN POLICY OR ANYTHING YOU KNOW NOT TO COMPETE WITH THE PUBLIC SECTOR, WHERE DO YOU SEE THAT COMPETITION IF YOU GO FORWARD WITH THIS, WHERE DOES THAT HAPPEN WHERE DO YOU SEE THAT THERE WOULD BE SOME POTENTIAL COMPETITION WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR?

RICHARD NANCE - WELL IT WOULD BE JUST AS IT ALWAYS HAS BEEN. SO, THIS POLICY WAS KIND OF PUT IN PLACE THIS IS MORE OF A PHILOSOPHY THAN A FORMAL POLICY ACTION.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – YEAH, I WOULD SAY PHILOSOPHY.

RICHARD NANCE – YEAH.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - IT'S KIND OF LIKE THE CONVENTION CENTER SHOULDN'T COMPETE YOU KNOW WITH BRIDAL PLACES FOR HOSTING WEDDINGS OR SOMETHING, RIGHT? IT'S NOT NECESSARILY A WRITTEN RULE, YOU COULD STILL DO IT THERE BUT WE'RE TRYING TO AVOID THE GOVERNMENT COMPETING WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

COMMISSIONER LEE - WHO SAID? I MEAN BECAUSE I KIND OF AGREE WITH THAT PHILOSOPHY, SO I’M JUST KIND OF WONDERING.

RICHARD NANCE – WELL, WE HAVE ALWAYS TOO.

COMMISSIONER LEE – AND YOU HAVE TOO. THAT’S WHY I’M WONDERING IF WE ARE BENDING OUT OF THAT.

RICHARD NANCE - THE ENTIRE LANDSCAPE HAS CHANGED SINCE ABOUT 2010, EVERYTHING IS REALLY DIFFERENT. I STARTED HERE IN 1998 AND THERE WAS NO AFFORDABLE CARE ACT, THERE WERE NO EXCHANGE PLANS, THERE WAS NO 138% OF POVERTY MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY, THERE WAS NO TAM (TARGETED ADULT MEDICAID).

COMMISSIONER IVIE - RICHARD LET ME ASK YOU WHY DON'T WE, I DON’T MEAN TO RUIN YOUR THOUGHT, BUT I THINK MAYBE THIS QUESTION MIGHT BRING SOME CLARITY TO IT. BECAUSE WE TALK A LOT ABOUT 138% OF POVERTY. WELL, THAT'S NICE, I HAVE NO IDEA, WHO IS THAT, RIGHT? I MEAN ARE WE TALKING ABOUT THE FULL TIME EMPLOYEE AT MCDONALD'S WHO HAS A HEALTH CARE PROGRAM BUT THEY WOULD FALL INTO THIS YOU KNOW

WORKING CLASS POOR TO WHERE THEY'RE JUST REALLY NOT GETTING THE MEDICAL CARE AND TREATMENT THAT THEY'RE NEEDING OUTSIDE OF A GOVERNMENT SAFETY NET EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE ON A PRIVATE INSURANCE PROGRAM THROUGH THEIR WORK? BECAUSE THEIR SALARY, I MEAN WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THIS THIS DEMOGRAPHIC, WHO ARE WE TALKING ABOUT? WHAT DO THESE OR WHAT DOES THIS DEMOGRAPHIC LOOK LIKE IN REAL WORLD TERMS? NOT NECESSARILY YOU KNOW PERCENTAGE FIGURE TERMS.

RICHARD NANCE - IF YOU WORK FULL TIME, 100, WELL FIRST OF ALL, 100% OF POVERTY IS \$14,290.00 A YEAR. IF YOU WORK FULL TIME AND YOU WORK 2000 HOURS A YEAR, THAT'S ABOUT SEVEN AND A HALF DOLLARS AN HOUR. THAT'S NOT VERY MUCH. IF YOU LOOK AT 138% OF POVERTY, I WISH I HAD PRINTED OFF THIS OTHER WORKSHEET THAT WE'RE WORKING ON NOW, WE'RE TRYING TO FIND OUT WHO IS AT THAT CUTOFF AND OF COURSE IT VARIES BASED ON FAMILY SIZE BUT YOU'RE STILL NOT EVEN TALKING \$10 - \$11 AN HOUR FOR AN HOURLY WAGE FOR SOMEONE WHO WORKS FULL TIME AS AN INDIVIDUAL. SO, IF YOU'RE MAKING \$15.00 AN HOUR AS A CONSTRUCTION WORKER AND YOU'VE GOT YOU KNOW A WIFE AND TWO KIDS AT HOME, YOU'RE GONNA FALL IN THAT LEVEL.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - YOU'RE GOING TO BE CLOSE TO THAT.

RICHARD NANCE – RIGHT. SO THAT'S ANOTHER THING THAT'S BEEN KIND OF DIFFICULT FOR US BECAUSE OUR SLIDING FEE SCALE HAS BEEN BASED AROUND 100% OF FEDERAL POVERTY GUIDELINES SO WE REALLY HAVEN'T LOOKED AT THAT GAP WHILE WE'VE HAD HISTORICALLY AND THIS IS SELF-REPORT AGAIN SO WE'RE NOT ENTIRELY COMFORTABLE THAT THIS IS 100% ACCURATE BUT ABOUT 93 TO 95% OF EVERYBODY THAT COMES TO US FOR TREATMENT COMES THROUGH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM OR THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM AND THEY ARE, WELL NOT THAT MANY ABOUT 70-80%, THE REST OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND JUSTICE COURTS, 95% OF EVERYBODY WE SEE IS AT OR BELOW 100% OF FEDERAL POVERTY WHEN THEY COME TO US TO START TREATMENT. THAT'S WHY GETTING THEM EMPLOYED IS SO IMPORTANT AND WE DO PRETTY GOOD JOB WITH THAT.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - YOU DO GOOD JOB AND THAT'S WHY I RAISED THAT QUESTION BECAUSE I'M TRYING TO, I UNDERSTAND, I MEAN I LIKE THE PHILOSOPHY THAT OUR STOP IS A SAFETY YOU KNOW SOCIAL SAFETY NET, RIGHT? BUT IT REALLY FEELS LIKE AS YOU MENTIONED MAYBE OVER THE COURSE OF THE LAST 10 YEARS WITH THE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE LAW BECAUSE OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE FACT OR MAYBE SEEING A SHIFT OF WHERE THAT SAFETY NET ACTUALLY FALLS.

RICHARD NANCE – EXACTLY. YEAH, IT'S NO LONGER IN THE FEDERAL SUBSTANCE PREVENTION TREATMENT BLOCK GRANT ALMOST 75% LIKE IT WAS TEN YEARS AGO IT'S NOW ABOUT 60% PLUS OR MINUS ON MEDICAID AND THEN FOR THOSE AGAIN ON THE 138% OF POVERTY PROGRAM THEY WILL FALL OFF THAT AT SOME POINT ONCE THEY'RE IN TREATMENT WITH US, WHEN WE GET THEM EMPLOYED.

AND THEN TO GO BACK AND ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, WHO WOULD WE NOT COMPETE FOR IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR? WE WOULDN'T COMPETE FOR INSTANCE FOR COUNTY EMPLOYEES WHO ARE ON SELECT HEALTH PLAN. WE WOULDN'T GO FOR BLUE CROSS OR AETNA COMMERCIAL INSURANCE CLIENTS. WE'RE JUST INTERESTED IN THOSE ONES THAT WE ALREADY HAVE CONTACT WITH THAT WE STARTED IN TREATMENT AND WHEN WE DO OUR BEST TO KIND OF PUSH THEM BACK INTO THE MAINSTREAM ECONOMY IN TERMS OF HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT AND OTHER COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT YOU KNOW COMMERCIAL HEALTH INSURANCE IS ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT WE HOPE THAT THEY WILL GET. YOU KNOW ONE OF THE SCENARIOS THAT WE'VE PUT TOGETHER TO EDUCATE LEGISLATORS IS WE HAVE A GUY WHO WAS A COMMERCIAL TRUCK DRIVER, AND BECAUSE OF THE DRUG PROBLEM LOSES THIS COMMERCIAL TRUCKING LICENSE. ONCE WE GET INTO TREATMENT BY THE TIME, WE GET HIM YOU KNOW HALFWAY THROUGH TREATMENT WE'RE ABLE TO GET HIS COMMERCIAL TRUCK DRIVERS' LICENSE BACK. SO, HE MIGHT BE ABLE TO GO TO WORK FOR A COMPANY LIKE CISCO, THEY PROBABLY HAVE A COMMERCIAL HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN FOR THEIR EMPLOYEES HOPEFULLY HE WOULD GET ON THAT PLAN. AND THEN AT THAT POINT WE WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO BILL FOR THAT INSURANCE BECAUSE HE'S NEARLY DONE WITH TREATMENT. WE WOULD PROBABLY TRY TO TRANSFER HIM TO ANOTHER PROVIDER AT THAT POINT.

COMMISSIONER LEE – OKAY, SO I GUESS THE CROSS BETWEEN WHEN THE TREATMENT OR WHEN WE WOULD BE BILLING FOR IT AND WHEN A PRIVATE COMPANY WOULD BE BILLING FOR IT, IS THERE A LACK OF SERVICE THAT'S GOING ON WHERE THE PRIVATE SECTOR IS NOT PICKING IT UP OR ELSE ARE THEY PICKING IT UP BUT THEY'RE DOING IT AT A HIGHER COST TO THE INDIVIDUAL? IS THAT WHAT IT IS?

RICHARD NANCE – YEAH.

COMMISSIONER LEE - AND SO WE CAN DO IT FOR LESS AND THAT'S WHERE IF GOVERNMENT IS INVOLVED YOU KNOW WE'RE DOING FOR LESS, THERE'S A LITTLE BIT THERE'S SOME SUBSIDY THAT'S GOING ON WITH THAT LESS THAN THE PRIVATE SECTOR. THAT'S WHY THE PRIVATE SECTOR USUALLY SQUAWKS AND SO THEY CAN'T COMPETE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT CAN ALWAYS DO IT FOR LESS.

RICHARD NANCE – RIGHT. WE ARE TAKING THE ONES THAT THEY REALLY DON'T WANT.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO THAT'S STILL IMPORTANT FOR ME TO KNOW. IS THAT IF WE HAVE A GAP IN THERE IN WHICH THE PRIVATE SECTOR IS NOT PICKING THEM UP AND THERE'S INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE FALLING OFF FROM THAT, BUT HOW DO WE KNOW THAT? I DON'T, HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT THAT'S THE CASE?

COMMISSIONER IVIE – THAT'S A GREAT QUESTION.

RICHARD NANCE - WE DON'T. WE DON'T IF THEY START WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR, WE NEVER SEE THEM UNLESS THEY RUN OUT OF INSURANCE COVERAGE OR MONEY AND THEN THEY WANT TO DUMP THEM ON US BECAUSE WE'RE SUBSIDIZED. IT WORKS THE OTHER WAY YOU KNOW FROM THE TOP DOWN BUT NOT REALLY FROM US FROM THE BOTTOM UP VERY OFTEN.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - AND THIS 138% IS A NEW NUMBER, RIGHT? SO WE DON'T KNOW HOW THE PRIVATE SECTOR IS EVEN GOING TO TREAT THIS DEMOGRAPHIC, IF THEY'LL TREAT THEM DIFFERENTLY AND NATURALLY DUMP MORE OF THEM TO US. WOULD WE ANTICIPATE SOME OF THAT OR NOT?

RICHARD NANCE - I DON'T REALLY THINK THE PROBLEMS THAT ARE GOING TO BE PRESENTED OR THE NEED FOR TREATMENT IS GOING TO BE VERY DIFFERENT AT ALL. WE'VE HAD SOME INTERESTING DISCUSSIONS FOR INSTANCE WITH LDS FAMILY SERVICES ABOUT PROVIDING TREATMENT FOR THEIR KIDS AND SOME OF THEIR ADULTS, THEY WANT TO SEND FOLKS OVER TO US FOR SCREENING AND IT'S LIKE GREAT WE'RE HAPPY TO DO THAT FOR YOU, AND YOU KNOW I'VE ASKED THIS IS WHAT OUR CLIENTELE LOOKS LIKE, IS THIS THE CLIENTELE YOU'RE SENDING US LOOK SUBSTANTIALLY DIFFERENT? AND THEY SAID NO, THEY ARE ALMOST EXACTLY THE SAME.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – RICHARD, ONE QUESTION I DID HAVE, WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT THE 138% OF POVERTY LEVEL BUT WE ARE ALSO TALKING ABOUT EXCHANGE PLANS AND BEING IN NETWORK WITH THOSE. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THERE ACTUALLY IS NO INCOME THRESHOLD RELATED TO THE EXCHANGE PLANS.

RICHARD NANCE - THERE'S NOT AN INCOME THRESHOLD BUT THERE IS A SUBSIDY BASED ON INCOME FOR THE EXCHANGE PLANS.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – EXACTLY, BUT IF SOMEONE MAKING \$150 GRAND GOES ON, THEY WOULD BUY THE EXACT SAME PLAN AS SOMEONE MAKING \$25 GRAND. THE DIFFERENCE IS THAT A FEDERAL SUBSIDY WOULD HELP THE PERSON WITH THE LOWER INCOME PAY FOR THAT PREMIUM.

RICHARD NANCE – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - BUT BOTH OF THOSE PEOPLE WOULD BE IN THE SAME NETWORK AND ONCE YOU'RE IN NETWORK WITH THAT PLAN, YOU COULD BE SEEING EITHER OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS.

RICHARD NANCE - WE COULD, BUT THAT'S NOT OUR INTENTION. WHAT WE WANT TO DO IS FOR THOSE THAT COME TO US ALREADY ON THAT ARE ELIGIBLE FOR MEDICAID AND ENROLLED IN MEDICAID WHEN THEY FALL OFF, WE JUST WANT TO BE ABLE TO CONTINUE THEIR CONTINUITY OF CARE WITH US UNTIL THEY'RE DONE WITH THEIR TREATMENT EPISODE AND THEN BILL THE EXCHANGE PLANS. AND THIS WILL HELP US WITH THAT \$3,000,000 BUDGET HOLE THAT WE'RE TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN BACKFILL.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - WELL I'M SUPPORTIVE OF THAT AND I DON'T REALLY VIEW THIS AS A CHANGING PHILOSOPHY AND QUITE FRANKLY I THINK THAT

WHEN WE DECIDE TO ENTER INTO AN ACTIVITY THAT ENGAGES WITH THE MARKETPLACE LIKE THE CONVENTION CENTER OR LIKE THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT IN TODAY'S HEALTH INSURANCE WORLD, IT'S A BIT OF A FICTION TO SAY THAT WE'RE NOT COMPETING. WE ALWAYS ARE. THERE MIGHT BE THINGS ON THE EDGES THAT WE CAN DECIDE WE DON'T WANT TO DO, THAT WE WANT TO LEAVE TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR, BUT THERE ALWAYS IS GOING TO BE SOME LEVEL OF COMPETITION AND I'M COMFORTABLE WITH THAT.

RICHARD NANCE – WELL, IF IT MAKES YOU ANY MORE COMFORTABLE, WE'RE NOT GOING TO GO OUT AND MARKET OUR SERVICES TO COMMERCIAL HEALTH INSURANCE OR EMPLOYERS OR ANYBODY ELSE THAT WE WOULD KIND OF TYPICALLY CONSIDER TO BE IN THE PRIVATE MARKETPLACE. THAT'S NOT WHAT WE DO.

COMMISSIONER LEE – WELL, I MEAN EITHER WAY I'D LIKE TO HAVE MORE CONVERSATION ON THIS WITH YOU.

RICHARD NANCE – OKAY. DO YOU WANT TO TALK OFFLINE OR WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO DO?

COMMISSIONER LEE - WELL I THINK THERE'S PROBABLY, I DON'T HAVE, I HAVEN'T FORMULATED ALL THE QUESTIONS FOR IT. YOU KNOW I HEAR KIND OF WHERE WE'RE GOING WITH IT, BUT I THINK MAYBE FOR ME MAYBE JUST A ONE ON ONE WOULD LOOK KIND OF WORK DOWN THROUGH A LITTLE BIT BETTER.

RICHARD NANCE – OKAY. YEAH, I'M HAPPY TO DO THAT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - EXCEPT FOR RICHARD, I THINK WE NEED TO HAVE AN ADMIN MEETING WITH THE THREE OF US AND YOU TO DISCUSS OTHER CHANGES.

RICHARD NANCE - I'D LIKE TO SIT DOWN WITH THE THREE OF YOU AND DISCUSS OTHER CHANGES AS WELL.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - SO LET'S TRY TO GET THAT ON THE CALENDAR AS SOON AS WE CAN.

RICHARD NANCE – OKAY. ANYTHING ELSE YOU'D LIKE TO ASK ABOUT THIS?

COMMISSIONER LEE – NO.

RICHARD NANCE - SO RIGHT NOW, ARE WE IN LIMBO OR ARE WE GOING TO MOVE AHEAD? SOUNDS LIKE COMMISSIONER LEE HAS SOME ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – RIGHT, CAN YOU MEET WITH COMMISSIONER LEE HOPEFULLY, DO YOU THINK YOU COULD GET TOGETHER BEFORE NEXT WEDNESDAY?

COMMISSIONER LEE – OH YEA, YEA.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – SO WE COULD MAYBE PUSH THIS TO WEDNESDAY? IF YOU TWO COULD COORDINATE CALENDARS.

RICHARD NANCE – AGAIN, THERE IS ANOTHER QUESTION. THIS IS A WORK SESSION ITEM. IT REALLY, IT'S NOT GOING TO RESULT IN THE CONTRACT, OR WE COULD CREATE A WRITTEN POLICY FOR THIS/

COMMISSIONER AINGE – YEAH, BUT YOU KNOW I WAS THINKING THE SAME THING, NATHAN. I'M NOT SURE THAT WE EVER VOTE ON THIS. THIS WAS JUST KIND OF DISCUSSION AND TO A CERTAIN EXTENT SOME OF THIS IS ALREADY TAKING PLACE.

COMMISSIONER LEE - IT'S INTERESTING ONE THAT WAY BECAUSE IT'S SO YEAH IT SAYS POLICY, BUT I MEAN I DON'T REALLY CONSIDER IT POLICY AND I GUESS IT'S MORE OF A PHILOSOPHY.

RICHARD NANCE – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - AND PHILOSOPHICALLY IF YOU'RE FALLING WITHIN THE SET PARAMETERS OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY NET FOR WHAT'S BEING DEFINED AS POOR, RIGHT? AND I THINK THAT WE'RE PROBABLY, FOR ME YOU'RE ON SAFE GROUND.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - I MEAN WE ALREADY APPROVED THE CONTRACTS WITH THE ACOS, RIGHT? THAT WAS THAT THOSE WERE THE OFFICIAL ACTIONS.

RICHARD NANCE - AND I'M ASKING YOU THIS BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO GET IN TROUBLE. ONLY ON PURPOSE DO I WANT TO GET IN TROUBLE. SO, I DON'T WANT TO INADVERTENTLY GET IN TROUBLE YOU KNOW BY PURSUING THIS WHEN THIS HAS BEEN SOMETHING THAT WE'VE ALL DISCUSSED A COUPLE OF TIMES AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE ALL AGREE THAT WHETHER WE PURSUE THIS PATH OR NOT. BUT AGAIN, WE'RE LOOKING AT FILLING A BUDGET DEFICIT AND THIS WILL HELP US DO THAT TO A CERTAIN EXTENT. I'LL FOLLOW UP WITH YOU.

COMMISSIONER LEE – BRIAN'S RIGHT THERE SO WE CAN SCHEDULE.

12. DISCUSS PROCESS FOR ADDING APPROVED POSITIONS TO THE STAFFING PLAN

- Merritt Fullmer, Human Resources Management

COMMISSIONER IVIE – OKAY, THANKS RICHARD. ALRIGHT NEXT UP WE'VE GOT OUR LAST AGENDA ITEM NUMBER TWELVE TO DISCUSS PROCESS FOR ADDING IMPROVED POSITIONS TO THE STAFFING PLAN. LOOKS LIKE WE GET RALF.

RALF BARNES, DIRECTOR HUMAN RESOURCES - GOOD AFTERNOON RALF BARNES, HUMAN RESOURCES. AS WE GET INTO THE 2020-YEAR BUDGET AND I

WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE ON THE SAME PAGE AS FAR AS THE PROCESS OF ADDING THESE APPROVED ROLES TO THE STAFFING PLAN, HOW WE WANT TO HANDLE THAT WITH THE AGENDA AND IF THERE'S ANYTHING THAT YOU DON'T HAVE THAT YOU DO NEED. OF COURSE, THIS STEMS FROM YOU KNOW VARIATION IN THE ESTIMATES GIVEN BY THE DEPARTMENT HEADS DURING THE BUDGET PROCESS AND THE ESTIMATE THAT HR HAS ALWAYS PROVIDED WITH THE AGENDA ITEMS. AS I DID LOOK INTO THAT MORE, I DID FIND IT AT A HIGH-LEVEL IT REALLY IS JUST A VARIATION IN TWO ESTIMATES ESSENTIALLY. YOU KNOW DEPARTMENT HEADS DURING THE PROCESS OF MAKING THE BUDGET OR TRYING TO COME UP WITH AN ESTIMATE OF WHAT THEY THINK IT'S GOING TO COST. AS WE ADD THE AGENDA ITEM, WE ARE YOU KNOW THE TIMING IS DIFFERENT AND WE'RE LOOKING AT ALL THE COSTS OF BENEFITS AT A MAXIMUM LEVEL BECAUSE WE WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE NEVER SHORT, WE NEVER WANT TO MAKE A DECISION ON HIRING SOMEONE YOU KNOW BASED UPON THE COST OF BENEFITS. AND SO, IT'S OFTEN TIME THERE'S YOU KNOW, IT'S NOT UNCOMMON THAT THERE'S AN EXCESS THERE IN THE COST OF THE BENEFITS. IN THE MOST RECENT EXAMPLE, YOU KNOW WAGES WERE OFF BY ABOUT \$1300 BUCKS, YOU KNOW BENEFITS WAS OFF BY ABOUT \$875. I DO UNDERSTAND YOU KNOW THE IMPORTANCE OF THESE BEING EXACT AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE. WE'RE TRYING TO STAY YOU KNOW WITHIN WHAT HAS ACTUALLY BEEN APPROVED. I GUESS AT THIS POINT I WOULD JUST LIKE TO ASK QUESTIONS OF THE COMMISSION OF WHAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE GOING FORWARD AND IF YOU SEE ANY ISSUES OR PROBLEMS THAT WEEK HELP SOLVE.

COMMISSIONER LEE - I THINK ITS COMMUNICATION. I DID TALK WITH PATRICK AS WELL. YOU KNOW SPECIFICALLY GOING BACK TO THIS ONE ISSUE THAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT AND HE MENTIONED TO ME, HE SAYS, WELL WHEN HE WAS PUTTING HIS BUDGET TOGETHER, HE HAD TO ASK YOUR DEPARTMENT YOU KNOW FOR THE NUMBERS, HE DOESN'T JUST HAVE THE NUMBERS HIMSELF. AND SO, WHEN HE TURNS IN A BUDGET NUMBER, HE'S TURNING IT IN BASED OFF OF AN UNDERSTANDING THAT THE NUMBERS THAT HE GOT FROM YOUR DEPARTMENT ARE THE NUMBERS. AND SO THAT THROWS HIM A LITTLE SIDWAYS BECAUSE HE DOESN'T QUITE KNOW HOW TO HOW TO HANDLE THAT. BUT I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THEY DON'T NECESSARILY GET HIRED IN, YOU KIND OF DO IT ON A WORST-CASE SCENARIO OR NOT A WORST CASE, LET'S PUT IT AS A, YOU HAVE BUILT-IN BUFFERS IN THERE FOR SOME FLEXIBILITY. AND SO, THIS IS KIND OF A YEAR-END DISCUSSION MORE ON BUDGETING THAT IS ON NECESSARILY STAFFING PLANS AS THEY COME FORWARD YOU KNOW THROUGHOUT THE YEAR BECAUSE THAT SHOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN IN PLACE THROUGH THE BUDGETING PROCESS. BUT I THINK THAT JUST MAYBE ON A COMMUNICATION, BECAUSE I THINK HE WOULD HAVE PROBABLY PUT THE OTHER NUMBER IN IF HE WOULD HAVE KNOWN THE OTHER NUMBER IN HIS BUDGET AND I DON'T SEE IT AS BEING NECESSARILY A PROBLEM WITH THIS ONE POSITION BECAUSE BY TIME THAT EVEN HAPPENS ON A HIRE, YOU'RE GOING TO BE FOUR OR FIVE OR SIX PAY PERIODS DOWN THE ROAD.

RALF BARNES - THAT'S RIGHT. THAT'S EXACTLY RIGHT. AND WE ACTUALLY DID THE ESTIMATE ON I THINK THE 19TH OF LAST YEAR OF DECEMBER SO WE WERE ASSUMING THE WORST CASE WHEN I SAY WORST CASE, THE SOONEST

HIRE AS POSSIBLE, AND THEN WE ALSO OF COURSE ASSUME YOU KNOW FAMILY COVERAGE IN MEDICAL, WE ASSUME THAT THEY'RE GOING TO ENROLL IN THE FULL AMOUNT IN THE 401K, YOU KNOW WE MAKE THOSE ASSUMPTIONS BECAUSE AGAIN WE DON'T EVER WANT TO BE SHORT ON BENEFITS. AND THAT'S I THINK, THE SAFE WAY TO GO BECAUSE AGAIN WE NEVER WANT TO SAY OH, WE'RE NOT GOING TO HIRE YOU BECAUSE YOU NEED A FAMILY PLAN, WE DON'T HAVE THE MONEY FOR THAT. SO THAT'S REALLY, I THINK SUPER IMPORTANT. BUT AGAIN, I DON'T SEE THIS BEING AN ISSUE MUCH YOU KNOW GOING FORWARD. I THINK IT REALLY IS BECAUSE IT WAS THE FIRST ONE OF THE YEAR AND WE JUST HAD SOME VARIATIONS, AND YOU KNOW PATRICK DIDN'T MAKE A MISTAKE. I THINK OUR OFFICE DID WHAT WE NORMALLY DO, BUT I THINK BEING AWARE MORE OF WHAT HAS ACTUALLY BEEN APPROVED IN THE BUDGET AND MAKING SURE THAT WE'RE IN ALIGNMENT I THINK IS GOING TO BE A SOLUTION FOR THAT. BUT AGAIN, WITH THAT BEING SAID, WE'RE GOING TO GET INTO SEVERAL MORE OF THESE BECAUSE WE DO HAVE, I THINK YOU KNOW 15 OR 20 YOU KNOW JOBS THAT HAVE BEEN APPROVED THROUGH THE BUDGET PROCESS AND SO WE'LL SEE SOME MORE OF THESE. AND WE JUST AGAIN, I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE GIVING YOU WHAT YOU NEED TO MAKE YOUR DECISIONS SO IF THERE'S ANY QUESTIONS OR ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK YOU NEED PLEASE, LET ME KNOW.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - SO FROM MY PERSPECTIVE I'M GLAD, IS DANENE STILL IN THE ROOM?

DANENE JACKSON - I'M HERE.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - SO I WANT DANENE'S PERSPECTIVE ON THESE, YOU KNOW. THESE ARE ONE ITEM THAT I THINK IT'S ALWAYS VERY HELPFUL TO HAVE HER REVIEW, SO THAT WE REVIEW THE AGENDA BEFORE IT GOES ON TO CONFIRM THAT THERE'S BUDGET. I ALSO VIEW THIS AS, THIS IS KIND OF A WEIRD ONE RALF, BECAUSE HR IS OBVIOUSLY MY PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT, BUT I DO THESE MORE RELATED TO THE UNDERLYING DEPARTMENT. SO, YOU KNOW, IF I SEE A STAFFING PLAN AND IT RELATES TO THE RECORDERS' OFFICE, I'M GONNA BE TALKING TO JEFF ABOUT IT AND ABOUT HIS BUDGET MORE THAN IN TALKING TO YOU ABOUT IT. AND IF IT RELATES TO *IT*, THEN MY EXPECTATION IS THAT BILL'S HAVING THAT CONVERSATION, NOT ME, RIGHT? AND SO I THINK FOR ME STAFFING PLAN CHANGES HAVE THE BIGGEST BUDGETARY IMPACT OF ANYTHING WE VOTE ON AND SO I WOULD JUST WANT TO HAVE DANENE SIGN OFF AND IT'S ALSO IMPORTANT TO ME GIVEN THAT TIMING DISCUSSION WE JUST HAD, THAT WE ANALYZED IT IN THE RIGHT WAY. SO, GOING BACK TO A FAMILIAR EXAMPLE IF IT'S LATER IN THE YEAR AND WE'RE MAKING A HIRE OR SEVERAL HIRES AND THE BUDGETARY ANALYSIS IS SIMPLY THAT THERE'S ENOUGH IN THE BUDGET THEN, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT'S AN ADEQUATE ANALYSIS. I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE YEAH WELL THAT'S BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO BE ON PAYROLL FOR NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER, BUT NEXT YEAR THAT'S GOING TO INCREASE THE BUDGET BY X AMOUNT OF DOLLARS. I JUST PERSONALLY, THAT'S CERTAINLY HOW I'M GOING TO APPROACH IT WHEN THEIR STAFFING PLAN CHANGES WITH MY PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT. I DON'T KNOW HOW THE OTHER TWO FEEL ABOUT YOU KNOW MAKING SURE THAT DANENE REVIEWS THOSE FOR EVERY STAFFING PLAN CHANGE, BECAUSE WE CAN KIND OF HAVE AN OPEN DIALOGUE THERE.

COMMISSIONER LEE - I HEAR WHAT YOU'RE SAYING ON THERE. THERE'S A CONCERN THAT I HAVE AND THAT IS, THAT IF A *HR* IS PUTTING IT ON THE AGENDA AND THAT'S HOW IT HAPPENS, THEN THE DEPARTMENT IS OUT OF THAT LOOP UNLESS AND I THINK BY OUR POLICIES ANYWAY IT SHOULD GO THROUGH A REVIEW ANYWAY FOR BUDGETARY MATTERS THROUGH DANENE AND SO IF IT DOES GO THROUGH DANENE, AND SHE SAYS THERE'S NOT ENOUGH BUDGET, YOU DON'T HAVE THAT BUDGET IN THERE, THEN THAT NUMBER WOULD COME BACK TO THAT BUDGETED NUMBER. THEN THEN THE DEPARTMENT HEAD WOULD THEN BE BACK IN THE LOOP BEING THAT THAT WAS THE NUMBER THAT WAS SUBMITTED IN THE BUDGET. SO, I AGREE THAT IT DOES NEED TO GO THROUGH AT LEAST THAT IF *HR* IS GOING TO BE PUTTING IT ON OUR AGENDA, THEN SOMEBODY, THE DEPARTMENT HEAD OR DANENE AND PROBABLY DANENE IN THIS CASE SAYS HERE'S THE BUDGET THAT'S HAS BEEN ALLOCATED FOR THAT POSITION AND THAT WAY IT CROSSES AND COMES TOGETHER INSTEAD IT HAS THAT SEPARATION THAT WE HAVE RECENTLY SEEN.

RALF BARNES - NO I THINK THAT MAKES SENSE AND I THINK THAT SHE SHOULD ALWAYS LOOK AT THESE AND MAKE SURE THAT THAT IS IN PLACE AND I THINK THAT'S HAPPENED NORMALLY.

COMMISSIONER LEE - NORMALLY THAT'S THE WAY IT'S BEEN DONE BUT THERE HAS BEEN TIMES WHEN SHE HASN'T SEEN IT.

DANENE JACKSON – I THINK IT MAY BE CONFUSING BECAUSE SOMETIMES WHEN THE AGENDA REQUEST IS CREATED THE BUDGET REVIEW IS NOT MARKED AS YES, IT'S MARKED AS NOT APPLICABLE. SO, I THINK THAT PROBABLY WOULD HELP. THE OTHER THING THAT I KIND OF HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT, I FEEL LIKE WE HAVE A FEW DIFFERENT TYPES OF STAFFING PLAN REQUESTS. WE HAVE THE ITEMS THAT THE COMMISSION'S SORT OF ALREADY REVIEWED AND GAVE APPROVAL TO FOR SPECIFIC INCLUSION IN THE BUDGET, AND THERE MIGHT BE THINGS THAT NOW COME UP AFTER WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE BUDGET PROCESS. AND I MIGHT SUGGEST THAT IT'S THAT TYPE OF POSITION THAT WE TALK ABOUT IT FIRST, IN A WORK SESSION TYPE MEETING, BEFORE IT'S EVEN ON THE AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER LEE - YOU'RE SAYING ONE THAT'S NOT EVEN BUDGETED? ARE YOU SAYING THAT OR?

DANENE JACKSON – YEAH, RIGHT. WHEN IT'S A TOTALLY, IT'S A NEW REQUEST THAT THERE WAS NEVER A STAFFING PLAN CHANGE, IT WAS NEVER DISCUSSED AS PART OF THE 2020 BUDGET PROCESS.

COMMISSIONER LEE - AND THAT WOULD BE GOOD BECAUSE THEN WE COULD SEE YOUR ANALYSIS ON WORKLOAD YOU KNOW IF IT'S A WORKLOAD CASE WHERE WE'RE YOU KNOW DOING 2 INSTEAD OF 1, BECAUSE OF WORKLOAD SCENARIOS AND SO FORTH, I THINK THAT WOULD BE GREAT FOR THIS THIS TYPE OF A FORUM.

RALF BARNES - I DO THINK THAT - OH SORRY, TANNER, GO AHEAD.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - WELL I LIKE THAT THOUGHT TOO DANENE AND I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND EXACTLY WHAT YOU MEAN. I MEAN I THINK I KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN BUT THAT'S ONE OF THE CHALLENGES BECAUSE SOMETIMES WE JUST ANSWER THE QUESTION IS THERE BUDGET FUNDS AND SO I'M NOT SURE WE I GUESS WE KIND OF HAVE TO GO BACK THROUGH THE WAY ITEMS ARE REQUESTED IN THE 2020 BUDGET PROCESS TO MAKE THIS DETERMINATION THAT YOU'RE SAYING OF WHETHER THEY WERE PART OF IT OR WHETHER THEY'RE NOT OR IS THERE IS THERE ANOTHER WAY THAT WE TRACK THAT?

DANENE JACKSON - SO I THINK HR HAS INFORMATION ON WHICH POSITIONS WERE APPROVED DURING THE BUDGET OR AT LEAST THE FUNDING THAT WAS, SO I MEAN I THINK IT'D BE PRETTY CLEAR TO THEM WHETHER IT WAS ALREADY DISCUSSED AS PART OF A VETTING PROCESS I WOULD SAY OR IF IT'S A TOTALLY NEW POSITION, I GUESS. THAT'S JUST A QUESTION FOR THE COMMISSION. DO YOU WANT ALL NEW STAFFING PLAN CHANGE REQUEST FORMS THAT JUST SHOW UP ON THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH ME MAKING BUDGETARY COMMENTS IF APPROPRIATE OR IF IT'S SOMETHING THAT'S NEVER GONE THROUGH A VETTING PROCESS, DO YOU WANT THAT TO BE ON THE WORK SESSION FIRST? AM I UNDERSTANDING THE QUESTION CORRECTLY? COMMISSIONER AINGE - I LIKE IT GOING ON WORK SESSIONS IF IT HASN'T BEFORE BUT I I'M ALSO THINKING DANENE THAT THERE'S A FEW CATEGORIES, RIGHT? THERE'S ONE THAT WAS APPROVED BUT THE TOTAL AMOUNT HAS JUST CHANGED,

DANENE JACKSON - RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – RIGHT? IN WHICH CASE I GET RALF’S POINT, I MEAN WE APPROVED AT A DIFFERENT POINT IN TIME WHATEVER IT'S \$2000 MORE NOW AT THIS POINT, RIGHT? AND THEN THE QUESTION THERE IS SOMEHOW WE GOTTA COME UP WITH THE FUNDS AND MAYBE THAT DEPARTMENT CAN JUST TRANSFER FUNDS OR TAKE IT FROM ANOTHER POSITION OR WE GOTTA DEAL WITH THAT IF THAT UNDERLYING POSITION MAY HAVE ALREADY BEEN SPECIFICALLY APPROVED.

DANENE JACKSON – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - THEN THERE'S THE ONES THAT HAVE ALL THE FUNDING, WERE SPECIFICALLY APPROVED, AND THEY'RE IN IT. FOR ME, I'M NOT GOING TO HAVE MUCH OF A CONVERSATION, THAT I'M JUST FULLY SUPPORTIVE ON PUTTING THAT ON CONSENT AND SIGNING IT.

DANENE JACKSON – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - SO AND THEN THE THIRD LIKE YOU'RE SAYING IS SOMETHING TOTALLY NEW THAT ALSO DOESN'T HAVE FUNDING OR THEY MAY HAVE EXTRA WAGES FUNDING IN THEIR DEPARTMENT FOR SOME REASON, BUT THE POSITION HAS NEVER BEEN DESCRIBED. PERSONALLY, I WOULD BE FINE I WOULD BE SUPPORTIVE OF THAT ON THE WORK SESSION.

RALF BARNES – OKAY. YEAH, I THINK THAT MAKES SENSE. THE ONLY, I WAS JUST THINKING OF ANOTHER SCENARIO. WE DO HAVE A COUPLE OF CASES ON THE APPROVED FOR 2020 WHERE THE DEPARTMENT'S BEEN GIVING YOU LIKE A LUMP SUM FOR SEVERAL POSITIONS AND SO IT'S NOT NECESSARILY CLEAR ABOUT HOW MUCH MONEY IS ALLOCATED FOR EACH ROLE. SO, IN THOSE CASES, AND THERE'S ONLY A COUPLE OF THEM, BUT WE WOULD BE SUBMITTING WHAT WE THINK IS THE ESTIMATE, BUT IT MAY BE COMING OUT OF A TOTAL FOR THE BUDGET FOR THAT FOR THAT DEPARTMENT SO, JUST BE AWARE OF THAT. THOSE COULD I MEAN THOSE ARE GOING TO HAPPEN, BUT I AGREE THAT'S SOMETHING THAT HASN'T BEEN ALREADY VETTED IT SHOULD COME HERE FIRST. AND AGAIN, I'M NOT I THINK LIKE YOU I DON'T WANT TO EXTEND THE PROCESS TOO MUCH, BUT I ALSO THINK IT NEEDS TO BE VETTED. I DO HAVE A CONCERN ABOUT THE SPEED OF HIRE. THERE'S DEFINITELY A CORRELATION, I'VE SEEN THIS A LOT RECENTLY THAN THE COUNTY WITH THE ABILITY OF US TO MAKE IT HIRING DECISION AS FAST AS POSSIBLE TO GET THE HIGHEST QUALITY OF CANDIDATE, BUT I ALSO SUPPORT 100% JUST MAKING SURE WE HAVE THE FUNDING AVAILABLE. SO AS LONG AS WE CAN TRY TO KEEP THIS EFFICIENT AND GET THROUGH THESE PROCESSES AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE THAT'S IMPORTANT.

DANENE JACKSON - ALSO I SHOULD PROBABLY COMMENT THAT I REALLY FEEL LIKE I PROBABLY HAVE TO CHECK THE BUDGET 2 TIMES ONLY ONE OF WHICH THE COMMISSION WOULD BE AWARE THE FIRST TIME IS WHEN IT'S ON THE AGENDA BECAUSE THAT'S THE BEST GUESS OF WHERE THE EMPLOYEE WILL BE HIRED AT. THEORETICALLY THERE COULD BE AN EMPLOYEE WHO WAS A HIRE ABOVE WHAT THIS WAS AT WHICH WE TALKED ABOUT THEM THERE'D BE SOME TYPE OF PERSONNEL ACTION LIST THAT WOULD BE DONE OFFLINE THAT WOULDN'T BE PART OF THE MEETING.

RALF BARNES – CORRECT.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - AND THIS IS KIND OF GOES TO OUR PROCESS POINT EARLIER EVEN WITH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IS, RALF, TO YOUR SPEED OF HIRE POINT, I WOULD HOPE THAT DEPARTMENT HEADS, IF WE CAN GET THOSE ONES THAT ARE FUNDED ARE APPROVED JUST CLEARLY STATED THAT WAY IN THEIR AGENDA REQUEST, AND DANENE SIGNS OFF, THEN I THINK THOSE CAN JUST FLY RIGHT THROUGH, RIGHT? WE DON'T WANT TO CONFUSE, WE DON'T WANT TO BE DIFFICULT FOR THINGS IF THEY'VE ALREADY BEEN APPROVED, BUT WE DO WANT TO APPLY A HIGHER LEVEL OF SCRUTINY TO THE OTHER TYPES OF STAFFING CHANGES.

RALF BARNES – I THINK THAT MAKES SENSE. I REALIZED IN THE PAST IN 2019, IF IT WAS APPROVED IT DIDN'T ALWAYS GO ON THE AGENDA IF IT WASN'T AN ACTUAL INCREASE IN BUDGETING. I DO THINK IN THIS YEAR IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE HAVE COMPLETE TRANSPARENCY AND THAT THERE IS MULTIPLE EYES LOOKING AT THIS TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYTHING IS AS IT IS EXPECTED TO BE. SO THAT'S WHAT WE INTEND TO DO AND WELL THAT'S HOW WE'RE GOING TO GO FORWARD IN 2020.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SOUNDS GOOD.

RALF BARNES – ANY QUESTIONS?

COMMISSIONER LEE -NO, THANK YOU.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS

COMMISSIONER LEE - MOTION TO ADJOURN.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – WAIT, SORRY. NATHAN AND BILL, DO YOU GUYS, I THINK WE SHOULD MAKE THE MOTIONS RELATED TO

COMMISSIONER LEE – OH, RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER IVIE - GOOD CATCH, TANNER. SO, I’LL ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO MOVE THESE ITEMS FORWARD.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO LET'S SEE, WHICH NUMBER WAS THAT THAT WE WERE, 11?

DAVE SHAWCROFT - NUMBER 10.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - WELL SO I THINK IT'S ONLY, IT'S...

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO IS NUMBER 11 THEN, RICHARD IS THAT ONE THAT THAT WE'RE GOING TO TAKE TO A DIFFERENT FORUM? OR IS IT GOING TO GO ON THE AGENDA? WHAT'S THE, WE TAKE IT TO OUR AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING?

COMMISSIONER IVIE - I THINK THAT’S PROBABLY THE AUTHORITY BOARD.

COMMISSIONER AINGE – SO I JUST DON’T THINK THERE'S ANY ACTION ASSOCIATED WITH 11.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER LEE – RIGHT. THAT'S WHY WE TAKE IT TO THE AUTHORITY BOARD.

COMMISSIONER IVIE -THAT'S WHY WE TAKE IT TO THE AUTHORITY BOARD.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO FOR THIS REASON WE WOULD PROBABLY JUST...

RICHARD NANCE - ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I’M TRYING TO ASK, SORRY, ONE OF THE THINGS I’M GOING TO ASK THE DIVISION OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH IF WE CAN DO IS TO USE THIS MEETING FOR THESE KINDS OF QUESTIONS AS EQUIVALENT OF AN AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING. SO, I MEAN WE’LL STILL HAVE SEPARATE AUTHORITY BOARD MEETINGS BECAUSE WE

KIND OF HAVE TO BUY RULE, BUT SINCE WE DO SO MUCH OF OUR BUSINESS IN COUNTY COMMISSION MEETINGS FOR APPROVAL OF CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND THINGS LIKE THAT, THEY'VE ALLOWED US TO HAVE FEWER THAN FOUR YEAR BECAUSE WE HAVE THIS OTHER METHOD WHERE YOU AS A GROUP OF THE THREE COMMISSIONERS WHO ARE ALSO LOCAL AUTHORITY BOARD MAKE THOSE DECISIONS THERE.

DAVE SHAWCROFT - THIS CANNOT BE USED AS AN APPROVAL. THIS IS A WORK SESSION, AND NO APPROVALS CAN BE MADE IN THIS MEETING.

RICHARD NANCE – OKAY, THAT'S HELPFUL.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO THEN JUST FOR CLARIFICATION, SO WE WOULD BE INSTRUCTING KELLY NOT TO PUT THIS NUMBER 11 ON THE AGENDA, IS THAT CORRECT?

RICHARD NANCE – IT WOULD GO ON THE AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER LEE - SO BESIDES THAT, THEN THE MOTION WOULD BE TO PLACE ALL OF THE ITEMS ONE THROUGH TWELVE, EXCEPT FOR NUMBER TEN ON OUR NEXT COMMISSION MEETING.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – ELEVEN.

RICHARD NANCE – ELEVEN.

DANENE JACKSON – ELEVEN.

COMMISSIONER LEE - YEAH AND ELEVEN.

COMMISSIONER AINGE - SORRY BUT TWELVE ISN'T GOING ON.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – AND TWELVE.

COMMISSIONER LEE – AND TWELVE, THAT'S CORRECT, YEAH, OKAY, TEN, ELEVEN AND TWELVE.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – I HAVE A MOTION; DO I HAVE A SECOND?

COMMISSIONER AINGE – SECOND.

COMMISSIONER IVIE – PERFECT. I HAVE A MOTION AND A SECOND TO MOVE REGULAR OR WORK SESSION ITEMS NUMBERS ONE THROUGH NINE TO OUR NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED COMMISSION MEETING. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR PLEASE SAY AYE.

**AYE: ALL IN FAVOR
CARRY: 3/0**

COMMISSIONER IVIE – THAT WILL CARRY 3/0. OKAY, NOW WE’LL ENTERTAIN A MOTION.

COMMISSIONER LEE: MOTION TO ADJOURN

COMMISSIONER AINGE: SECOND

AYE: ALL IN FAVOR

PASSED: 3/0

MEETING ADJOURNED

In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify Kelly Adams at (801) 851-8111 at least three days prior to the meeting.

TANNER AINGE
Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Deputy Clerk/Auditor