MINUTES OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL/REGULAR MEETING OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY QUORUM COURT

Thursday, January 15, 2015 6:00 p.m. Washington County Quorum Court Room

- 1.1 The Washington County Quorum Court met for an organizational/regular session on Thursday, January 15, 2015. The meeting was called to order by County Judge Marilyn Edwards.
- 1.2 Judge Edwards reported that she received a letter today from Justice of the Peace Jimmy Mardis resigning as JP for District 2. The Quorum Court will need to declare a vacancy at the regular meeting in February. She further welcomed the returning JPs as well as the five new members and stated that she looks forward to working with them.
- T. Lundstrum led the Quorum Court in a prayer and in the Pledge of 1.3 Allegiance.
- 1.4 MEMBERS PRESENT: Daniel Balls, Harvey Bowman, Rick Cochran, Robert Dennis, Lisa Ecke, John Firmin, Ann Harbison, Tom Lundstrum, Sue Madison, Joel Maxwell, Butch Pond, and Bill Ussery.
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Eva Madison and Joe Patterson. 1.5
- Judge Edwards reported that E. Madison and J. Patterson were out of town 1.6 on business.
- OTHERS PRESENT: County Judge Marilyn Edwards, County Attorney Steve 1.7 Zega, County Chief of Staff Dan Short, County Comptroller Cheryl Bolinger, Interested Citizens; and Members of the Press.
- 1.8 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA: Judge Edwards asked if there were any additions or deletions to the agenda.
- A motion was made and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented. 1.9 The motion passed unanimously by voice vote by those present. The agenda was adopted as presented.
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Judge Edwards asked for approval of the minutes 1.10 of the December 18 regular meeting of the Washington County Quorum Court.
- S. Madison stated that she could not vote on these minutes as she was not at 1.11 the December 18 meeting.

- 2.1 A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as distributed. The motion passed by a vote of 12 in favor and 1 abstaining by voice vote. The minutes were approved.
- A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ALFORD JOE MAIN TO SOLEMNIZE THE MARRIAGE OF SAMANTHA RENEE GOODING AND JAMES ZACHARY SMITH ON JANUARY 16, 2015, IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, ARKANSAS:

 R. Cochran introduced A Resolution Authorizing Alford Joe Main To Solemnize The Marriage Of Samantha Renee Gooding And James Zachary Smith On January 16, 2015, In Washington County, Arkansas, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the resolution.
- 2.3 R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the resolution. J. Firmin seconded.
- 2.4 <u>Citizen Comments:</u> There were no comments made.
- 2.5 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the resolution.
- 2.6 The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote. The resolution was adopted.
- 2.7 The couple who was present was congratulated.

RESOLUTION NO. 2015-01, BOOK NO. 3, PAGE NO. 94

- POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE QUORUM COURT, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT, GENERAL MEETING CONDUCT, AND MEETING PROCEDURES: County Attorney Steve Zega stated that the three broad areas that former County Attorney George Butler would touch on at the organizational meetings included the Freedom of Information Act, powers and duties of the Quorum Court, and solemnization of marriages. He referred to memorandums previously distributed regarding FOI and the marriage issue, stating that he would begin by touching on a summary of those items in the memo.
- Freedom of Information Act: County Attorney Steve Zega stated that the Freedom of Information Act "FOIA" covers two areas, the open records and open meetings with which government/elected officials have to concern themselves. The underlying principal is the same with both. The publics' business has to be conducted in public which means what they do and how they make their decisions and county policy. Discussion they have about county policy should be in a way that is accessible to the public, that they

> understand and have the ability to comment, criticize, question and clarity when necessary. He stated that sometimes open records and open meetings become a little muddled in terms of which is which, and if there is not a distinction, the idea is that if it is a question, generally speaking, about whether they should do something in public and whether they should disclose, then the answer is yes. He stated that there were exceptions and exclusions from the FOIA such as HIPPA protected information that was generated by government, things that are accepted from disclosure or immediate notice to the public such as open criminal investigations. He stated that in general when they do something that affects county business, they have to do it in public. He stated that the Arkansas Supreme Court has taken a very broad definition of what is "county business" as anything that touches on county policy, the performance of county officials or employees, what they ought to do or are thinking about doing about; for example, a certain county road or something that the County Judge has done in the County Court. S. Zega again reiterated if they have to think about whether it is county business or not, then it probably is.

- 3.1 County Attorney Steve Zega stated that he has never believed that JPs cannot communicate with each other in writing as long as it is not a back and forth type communication where they are responding to each other by instant messaging or Skype, etc. or e-mails that they are responding to instantly which becomes an electronic meeting that the public has not been notified of or is not aware of and the press does not have notice of. He stated that he does not believe that JPs cannot write each other letters as long as they are made available to the public, or that they cannot send each other e-mails as long as they are not beginning real time conversation, and as long as the email is made available to the public. He noted that he has asked and advised the JPs to do when they write to each other, that they make that writing available to the Quorum Court Coordinator and in general copy it to the press so that they know what is going on. He stated that he does advise against JPs talking to each other on the phone or in person about county business for the reason that they do not want to create the appearance that they are not doing business in public, so the FOIA puts constraints on JPs and Quorum Court members that maybe other lawmakers do not necessarily face, but it is incumbent upon them to make sure that they do the publics' business in public.
- 3.2 County Attorney Steve Zega stated that the natural question is what happens if they violate FOIA, and noted that there is a criminal penalty, Class C misdemeanor which is punishable by up to 30 days in jail and up to a \$500 fine. He thinks that the court's opinion on this is if the mental state that you have to have to violate FOIA is negligently, or you do not even have to intend

or mean to do it, and if you were negligent in violating the FOIA and found a prosecutor willing to prosecute then potentially they could face the above penalty. He stated that he is not meaning to intimidate JPs by that, but it is his job and incumbent upon him to explain the ramifications and possible sanctions for FOIA violation. He stated that the real "hammer" for violations of the FOIA is if there is an ordinance or resolution found to be passed by a Quorum Court in violation of FOI, then the court can void that policy. The Quorum Court does a lot of hard work and does not want to have to throw it away on something silly like that.

- 4.1 County Attorney Steve Zega introduced Brenda Blagg, a long-time journalist and someone he has a lot of respect, to address the Quorum Court further on the Freedom of Information Act.
- 4.2 Brenda Blagg stated that she has been covering this county government's news for the past 29 years through the transition from the very old kind of Quorum Court into the new one, stating that it is a different critter than it used to be. She stated that part of the transition was learning to live within FOIA. She noted that the 1967 version of this law was passed when she was in college and she remains a member of the FOI Coalition which is a statewide organization that does what they can to keep the law strong. She referred to an FOI booklet that was distributed noting that they are redone following every legislative session because they inevitably do something that affects the law, and this booklet should help the JPs find provisions in the law on their own. She stated that by going to the Arkansaspress.org, the FOI Act booklet can be downloaded onto their computers and search anytime they have a question. Ms. Blagg stated that there are a lot of court cases, Attorney General Opinions, as well as questions and answers in the booklet that will answer most questions the JPs will come across.
- 4.3 Ms. Blagg stated that her main purpose tonight is to encourage the JPs to remember what it was like not to be inside the government, but to be on the outside looking in. There are thousands of citizens on the outside that are interested in what they do in the Quorum Court and unless they are allowed to be a part of it, they do not know how to respond to them. She stated that their best defense for anything that they do is transparency and FOIA assures it and people like herself to make sure that they do not forget that. She further stated that everything in this law is written for the public in general and not for the press, as their rights are the same as her rights as a journalist. Ms. Blagg stated if County Attorney Zega was not available for some reason, the JPs as well as public citizens are welcome to contact her at home at (479) 443-5702, and although she is not an attorney, she can guide them through the FOI booklet and help to answer their questions about FOIA.

- In response to a question from S. Madison relating to letters or e-mails to each other who in the press they need to copy to, Ms. Blagg stated that the law puts a burden on the media in a sense that they need to actually request that they be notified. She stated in general a paper-like NWA Times should have a request on file that says they want to be notified of special or regular meetings and any good politician will make sure that anyone that actively covers the public body is getting the notices. She noted that in the case of this Quorum Court, the Quorum Court Coordinator in the County Judge's Office sends those notifications to anyone who has made such a request at anytime.
- Powers and Duties of the Quorum Court: County Attorney Steve Zega stated that the memo he provided to the Quorum Court lists statutory duties and much like the FOIA information provided, it is not nearly all inclusive. He noted that from A.C.A. § 14-14-802, is provided a broad thumbnail statutory grant of authority to the JPs within the context of Amendment 55, which reorganized county government in the late 1970's. He noted that the list shows what they are mandated to do: (1) the administration of justice through the several courts of record of the county; (2) law enforcement protection services and the custody of persons accused or convicted of crimes; (3) real and personal property tax administration, including assessments, collection, and custody of tax proceeds; (4) court and public records management, as provided by law, including registration, recording, and custody of public records; and (5) all other services prescribed by state law for performance by each of the elected county officers or departments of county government.
- 5.3 S. Zega noted that perhaps the most important of JPs duties is codified at A.C.A. §14-14-904(b), to levy taxes and making of appropriations, including (i) the Quorum Court at its regular meeting in November of each year shall levy the county taxes, municipal taxes, and school taxes for the current year, and (ii) before the end of each fiscal year, the Quorum Court shall make appropriations for the expenses of county government for the following year.
- 5.4 S. Zega stated noted that a list of services that the Quorum Court may provide if it so chooses as shown in A.C.A. §14-14-802 or discretionary functions that a county government acting through the Quorum Court may provide through ordinance for the establishment of any service or performance of any function not expressly prohibited by the Arkansas Constitution or by law. He stated that these legislative services and functions include, but are not limited to agricultural services, community and rural development services, community services, emergency services, human services, solid waste services, transportation services, and water, sewer and other utility services.

- 6.1 Meeting Procedure: County Attorney Steve Zega stated that the Quorum Court constituted itself many years ago as a body that follows "Robert's Rules Of Order" and addressed a summary handout that talks about motions and what has to be brought to the Chair's attention; what kinds of various motions it takes to pass, etc. He noted that Roberts Rules of Order are modified slightly by procedural guides from the Legislature, such as the difference between passing an appropriation ordinance which may be passed on the first reading and other types of ordinances that do not have emergency clauses that take three readings to pass. He pointed out that frequently the rules are suspended and ordinances are placed on second and third readings if they are not particularly controversial, read by title only, and then they proceed to vote on them the first night brought up. He pointed out that certain types of ordinances take a two-thirds vote or anything with an emergency clause to approve and can be passed later without the emergency clause by simple majority. He stated that in general, their business will be done by having at least 8 affirmative votes. If they do not have 8 votes in the affirmative, as a present vote or abstention procedurally count as a no vote. then the ordinance or resolution will not pass.
- County Attorney Steve Zega stated that generally speaking the way the Washington County Quorum Court does business, most ordinances and resolutions begin in committee. There are regular committee meetings and Judge Edwards will talk about the assignments she has made to those committees. He pointed out if a JP's committee to whom they brought an ordinance says they are not going to pass it onto the full Quorum Court with a do pass recommendation, that JP as a member has the right to bring it around the committee to the full Quorum Court to present it anyway. He noted that this is not seen very often because generally speaking they try to respect the committee process because that is where most of the heavy lifting is done. Mr. Zega noted that he does not make policy for the county, but will advise the county to try to stay out the unconstitutional and illegal ditches, and if the question is whether something is the right thing to do for the county, ultimately that belongs with the 15 elected members of this body.
- Solemnizing Marriages: County Attorney Steve Zega stated that one of the best things he found about being a JP is that he was able to marry people. He stated as per Attorney General Opinions, as an elected Justice of the Peace, they can marry anyone in Arkansas and if they have served two terms, can perform marriage ceremonies even after they are off the Court. He noted that they are not allowed to collect a fee, at least as long as they are on the Quorum Court. He further noted if invited to a paid dinner or reception, this is allowed and not considered a fee. In general, he said not to take any type of pecuniary award for marrying people while on the Court, but rather do it because it is fun and a great public service.

- 7.1 T. Lundstrum stated that he is both a JP and an Ordained Minister and has never married anyone as a Justice of the Peace, noting when he signs the Marriage Certificate, he signs as a Minister with the book and page on the Marriage License. He further has never charged to perform a marriage ceremony, but does say that they can give a contribution to the church that he pastors, which he will take and give to the church. He stated he believes he can do this without any question, but he does not want any false accusations made because he is not marrying them as a JP.
- 7.2 County Attorney Steve Zega addressed T, Lundstrum stating that he did not believe this would raise any issue with the scenario he described.
- 7.3 L. Ecke asked if it was permissible for money to be given to a favorite charity in her name; to which County Attorney Steve Zega responded that would be allowed as long as she is not taking money herself as she is not to be personally compensated for performing a marriage.
- 7.4 S. Madison asked how their seating at the meetings was determined; to which Judge Edwards responded that the JPs are seated alphabetically by her.
- 7.5 S. Madison further asked if there was statutory authority for this; to which County Attorney Steve Zega stated in general the presiding officer can arrange the room. She asked Mr. Zega to check to see if there was statutory authority for that and if not, whether that would fall to one of the prerogatives of the court. S. Madison noted that she does not have any problem with the way that it is being done, but wants to know procedurally because there are certain legislative functions that belong to the legislative body.
- 7.6 REVIEW OF QUORUM COURT COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS FOR 2015/2016, AND SCHEDULING OF MEETING DATES/TIMES: Judge Edwards referred to a document distributed that set forth the Quorum Court Committee assignments that she had made for the 2015-16 term. The assignments were as follows: County Services D. Balls, R. Dennis, J. Firmin, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, and JP District #2; Public Works H. Bowman, R. Cochran, A. Harbison, T. Lundstrum, J. Maxwell, J. Patterson, and B. Pond; Personnel D. Balls, H. Bowman, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, J. Patterson, B. Pond, and B. Ussery; Jail/Law Enforcement/Courts J. Firmin, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, J. Patterson, and JP District #2; and, Finance and Budget R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, J. Firmin, A. Harbison, B. Pond, and B. Ussery.
- 7.7 Judge Edwards referred to the Committee descriptions and responsibilities that were also distributed as were proposed dates/times for the initial

meetings. She noted after the committees meet and elect their chair, they can change the future date if they wish to, but they needed a date set up so they can follow procedure to be able to get the committees started.

- 8.1 A motion was made and seconded to confirm the first committee meeting dates as set. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote. The first meeting dates were confirmed.
- 8.2 <u>SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE TO SERVE ON THE ARKANSAS ASSOCIATION OF QUORUM COURTS FOR THE 2015/2015 TERM:</u> Judge Edwards stated that the Quorum Court needs to select a JP to serve as its representative to the Arkansas Association of Quorum Courts for this new term and asked for any nominations.
- 8.3 H. Bowman nominated JP S. Madison to serve as the Quorum Court's representative.
- 8.4 S. Madison declined the nomination.
- 8.5 R. Cochran stated that E. Madison has served Washington County well in this capacity for the last two years and questioned whether she might be willing to continue such. He asked S. Madison if she thought E. Madison would be willing to do this; to which S. Madison stated that she was not comfortable answering for E. Madison.
- 8.6 Judge Edwards suggested that since E. Madison was not in attendance at that meeting, that they table this matter until their regular February meeting.
- 8.7 R. Cochran made a motion that they postpone assignment of the representative to serve on the Arkansas Association of Quorum Courts until their next regular Quorum Court meeting. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote. The matter was tabled.
- H. Bowman stated that they are aware that the State Legislature has given Judge Edwards the authority to limit the size of committees. He referred to County Attorney Steve Zega's previous statement that most of the "heavy lifting" of their business is done in committees and he has given this a lot of thought believing that every one of them has a responsibility to make a contribution to managing the finances of the county and if they are not on the Finance/Budget Committee they can make comments, but cannot vote and he believes there is great deal of difference between the two. He noted by the time they get to the final approval of the committee reports, it basically

comes down to a "rubber stamp" type of situation. H. Bowman stated that he wanted to appeal to Judge Edwards to reverse her position regarding limiting the number of people on the Finance/Budget Committee to seven and allow all 15 members to serve on this committee because it is incumbent on every one of them to make their opinions known and their votes cast.

- 9.1 Judge Edwards addressed H. Bowman, stating that she appreciates his comments, but will be leaving the number to serve on the Finance/Budget Committee at seven.
- 9.2 S. Madison stated that she has done a little research on this issue herself and in casual conversation with a lawyer friend in Little Rock, noting that the Act that the Legislature passed giving the County Judge the authority to determine membership of a Committee of the Whole was in fact after Washington County had already passed an ordinance establishing their Finance Committee as a Committee of the Whole. In looking at a recent ballot issue, a court opinion said that the Legislature is presumed to be acting prospectively unless they specifically say they are acting retroactively. She stated that it seems that this court has determined to apply this new statute retroactively.
- 9.3 County Attorney Steve Zega responded to S. Madison stating that two points about this is that he does not believe that this the statute applies retroactively in their case because this is a new court with new committee members. Secondly, whether the ordinance passed by the County Quorum Court in organizing a Committee of the Whole is displaced by a state statute and in his opinion in this case it is because the language in the statute is, "A regular or special committee of a Quorum Court shall not consist of more than a quorum of the whole body without consent of the County Judge." He stated that is in the present by any language or rule of statutory construction and he believes that it applies to this court for those two reasons.
- 9.4 S. Madison asked if the committees that were established by that ordinance did not continue unless the ordinance is changed and the assumption would be that they have continued because they have not taken any new action. She stated that she does not understand the logic that says that the Finance and Budget Committee does not continue as it was constituted under the ordinance.
- 9.5 County Attorney Steve Zega responded to S. Madison stating that he would agree with that in terms of the means of the committees and their assigned duties, but State law in his opinion displaces or trumps that ordinance.

- 10.1 S. Madison stated that she would get a copy of the Supreme Court case she is referring to for County Attorney Zega to review.
- 10.2 H. Bowman asked for Judge Edwards to share her rationale of selecting only seven people to serve on the Finance and Budget Committee instead of having all fifteen JPs serve on this committee.
- Judge Edwards responded to H. Bowman stating that she feels that there was an awful lot of time taken and a lot of expenditures with the Quorum Court going \$95,000 over their budget this last year with all the meetings they had and she feels like seven members can make these decisions. She further pointed out even though they are not all voting, every JP can attend the Finance and Budget meetings and make comments so that they are aware of what is going on when the issues come before the full Quorum Court.
- 10.4 H. Bowman stated that he does not believe there is a question that they do not all know what is going on, but those committees do pass on issues that are rubber stamped, and not being able to vote in that process makes a great deal of difference. By the time the Quorum Court meets to approve those, a lot of the details have fallen to the wayside.
- 10.5 Judge Edwards stated that she understands where H. Bowman is coming from.
- H. Bowman stated that his JP compensation last year was about \$10,000 and with 15 JPs on this court would total \$150,000 paid out. He noted with all the intellect and experience that they bring to the table, the total cost of \$150,000 brings a great deal of value to Washington County. He noted that they had a very difficult budget situation this past year because of all the finance pressure, which created the most time consumed in that process and he thinks to eliminate the contributions as per our agreement in this process is really less than favorable to the county.
- 10.7 R. Cochran stated that there have been several times when he attended meetings, but was not sitting on the committee and brought up an idea that was pertinent to the subject at hand and while he could not make the motion to amend, it was done by one of the committee members. Therefore, he stated that even though they are not voting members of the committee, their involvement is still very important and can have a positive impact.
- T. Lundstrum stated that discussing this topic tonight is basically a mute point because what is it is, but he does believe what the State Legislature did was a violation of the doctrine of separation of powers and at every level of

government that he is aware of, the legislative body makes their own decisions regarding committees. He stated that this has been a long time part of their government process nationwide and suggested the thing to do was to go to Little Rock and try to get this changed back the way it should be.

- 11.1 S. Madison stated that their desire to save \$95,000 is being negated by the statement that they are all able to attend the committee meetings anyway and give input, even though to a muted degree. She stated that they are not going to save any money if they all still go to Finance Committee meetings, but this just means that some of them will have less influence and less of an ability to work through the problems of this county's budget. She thinks that the hard work done last year had a very good result for the county and there was significant savings which she believes is important that they all continue to strive for. She stated that she attended many of those meetings and believes it was important for the Finance Committee to have everybody there and she appreciated their hard work, but believes that this is a setback for the county.
- 11.2 <u>COUNTY JUDGE'S REPORT</u>: Judge Edwards referred to the memorandum distributed from her reporting on property disposed of during 2014 that was no longer of value to the County that she is required to make the court aware of.
- 11.3 A motion was made by Sue Madison and seconded to accept this report.

 The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote.
- Judge Edwards announced that Chief of Staff Dan Short would be giving report from the Road Department.
- Dan Short addressed the Quorum Court introducing himself as the Chief of Staff for Judge Edwards wherein he assists her in administration and management of 15 departments. He noted that typically Shawn Shrum, Assistant Road Superintendent, would present this information; however, Mr. Shrum was out of town this evening.
- Mr. Short reported for 2014, the Washington County Road Department rechipped and sealed approximately 60 miles of road, noting that reseal on chip and seal roads is done about every seven years, so they typically try to complete 50-60 miles every year. He reported that they turned 4.5 miles of gravel road into a hard surface of some kind with 2.7 miles chip and seal and 1.8 miles asphalt. Additionally, they overlaid about 2.9 miles of asphalt. Mr. Short reported that the next major event for the Road Department in 2014 was beginning to replace the Stonewall Bridge over the Muddy Fork of the Illinois River.

- Mr. Short reported that current new construction is CR1090 and CR199 near Round Mountain, preparing those road beds for chip and seal during this year. He stated that they are also working on Wolf Track Road southwest of Summers preparing that road bed for chip and seal this year. He noted that they are working on Smokey Bear off of Black Oak Road, widening that area due to a request from citizens living in that area who felt like it was necessary for the buses that travel this road to pick up school children, noting that there are two different schools that serve that road. He noted that this road was narrow in some spots and they are in the process of widening that road which will be a better gravel road.
- Mr. Short reported that they have closed two bridges in Washington County this week; namely they closed Orr Bridge west of Highway 265 on 1/12 and on 1/13, and the Woolsey Bridge adjacent to Highway 71 south of West Fork. He explained the reason for both bridge closings was a safety factor. He noted that they inspected both structures last year and Judge Edwards made the decision that they could no longer let the public drive over those bridges. He stated that they will be starting the eastside end walls and wing walls on Stonewall Bridge as soon as weather permits and currently have the head wall and wing wall on the other side and two piers in the middle finished.
- 12.3 S. Madison asked what changes have been made at the Road Department in response to the allegations of inappropriate construction and gave the example of how they bend rebar and are they using epoxy to firmly establish rebar in already poured concrete. She referred to the article Mr. Holtmeyer wrote in the newspaper about the county roads left her with quite a few questions as to the Road Department's construction on bridges and left her less than assured that they are following proper procedures.
- Mr. Short addressed S. Madison stating that he is a little hesitant to respond specifically in a situation where a lawsuit has been brought. He stated that they strive every day to improve their methods and if methods are identified that they are lacking in, they will take every step they can to improve.
- 12.5 S. Madison stated that it concerns her considering they just had two bridges closed because of safety and the conclusion she jumps to is whether they have been following proper maintenance guidelines. She stated if they are not following plans given by that the engineers, who they pay for the plans, are they following plans for proper maintenance.
- 12.6 Mr. Short responded that S. Madison is assuming that the Road Department did not follow plans that the engineers laid out and he cannot say that this is a true statement.

- 13.1 S. Madison asked why she had to file an FOIA request to get the name of the engineer that did the plans for Harvey Dowell Bridge; to which Mr. Short responded that it was not necessary for her to file an FOI and if she had called him, he would have given her that information.
- 13.2 S. Madison responded to Mr. Short stating that she had asked both Secretary Karen Beeks and County Attorney George Butler and both ho were not sure, after which Assistant Road Superintendent Shawn Shrum was called. He would not give her that information unless she came to the Road Department, which she was unable to do that day.
- 13.3 Mr. Short apologized stating that if she had called him, he would have been able to give her that information as he sees no reason for not providing that information.
- S. Madison stated that she does not see any reason for her to have to jump from one elected official to another just to get a simple question answered that Mr. Shrum knew the answer; to which Mr. Short. She added that it was a little uncomfortable to have to file an FOI request with her own County.
- 13.5 S. Madison stated that she would like to know what happened to the extra yards of concrete that they are missing as Mr. Holtmeyer's newspaper article did not cover that. She noted that apparently 130 yards of concrete were poured for a 60 yard job, so 70 yards of concrete went somewhere or they paid for concrete that they did not get.
- 13.6 Mr. Short responded to S. Madison stating that he doubts that this happened.
- 13.7 S. Madison asked if these allegations were being investigated and coming up with answers as to whether they were accurate or not; to which Mr. Short responded that they are looking into all allegations.
- S. Madison asked when the Quorum Court would have the answers because the lawsuit is about whistle blower and freedom of speech; to which Mr. Short responded he thinks they will be able to be more forthcoming about the information once the lawsuit is complete as he hesitates to talk too much about what has been charged against the County.
- S. Madison stated that to her they are talking about spending public tax dollars and perhaps public safety; to which Mr. Short responded that he has the utmost faith in the construction of the Harvey Dowell Bridge and the Stonewall Bridge that they are currently working on, and would have no compunction in letting his family drive over the Harvey Dowell Bridge.

- 14.1 S. Madison stated that Mr. Ball, the State Inspector that she talked to, advised her that they do their ratings based on the engineering plans and assume that they are built as the plans show.
- 14.2 Judge Edwards requested that County Attorney Steve Zega speak to this matter.
- 14.3 County Attorney Steve Zega stated that Mr. Short's point about the fact that this is in litigation and S. Madison's point that they are talking about public dollars are both well taken. He stated that the issue is how much they talk about issues that are in litigation. As the County Attorney he would not be doing his job for the County and this body that appropriates money for the County if he did not say that it is never wise to start talking about matters that are directly under litigation while that litigation is going on for a variety of reasons that he would be happy to articulate in greater depth now or at a later time. However, he stated the point that they are talking about substantial amounts of public money is true, this lawsuit that is filed seeks substantial amounts of public money as well which is all more reason to be careful and safeguard what they say about things that are under litigation, including the specific plans for that bridge and whether or not any deviation was taken from them at any point in time. He stated that these are important matters that should be discussed in public; however, at some point in time they need to realize that the county is being sued as a derivative of those questions right now.
- J. Firmin questioned whether bikes could still be ridden over the Woolsey Bridge; to which Mr. Short responded that the Woolsey Bridge is totally blocked with mounds of dirt on both ends of the bridge as well as guardrails up on the parts that stand going up to the bridge.
- J. Firmin suggested that they put that information in the newspaper as there are a lot of people who ride bikes out there and it would require that they then go all the way back around.
- 14.6 Mr. Short added that this may not be able to keep people from doing that, but they also have sufficient signage out there stating that this road/bridge is closed.
- 14.7 Judge Edwards added that they have taken many steps for safety and if something were to happen and someone got hurt, the county would not be liable.

- 15.1 Mr. Short stated that they realize this is an inconvenience for many people who use those bridges and hopefully they will be able to start bringing the bridges down and replace them in the near future.
- T. Lundstrum asked if there was any current information on where the State is with the Woolsey Bridge project; to which Mr. Short responded that they did not at this point and they have discussed taking a delegation of concerned citizens down to the State Highway Department in the near future to talk about the speed with which they may help the county get started on that project.
- T. Lundstrum stated for the benefit of those new members on the Court, the State is working on some design issues on that bridge that was constructed in 1925. He further noted that both bridges they are talking about are nearly 100 years old.
- Judge Edwards stated that they closed one bridge and then closed the other after the State did inspections, during which they check several bridges, and made the county aware of some of the major problems with these two bridges which made her very uncomfortable. She stated that closing these two bridges was not something she wanted to do, but believed it was necessary to protect the public. She reported that she along with Mr. Short and a representative from the Road Department went to Brentwood to speak to the citizens and let them know in the community what they were doing and they were most appreciative of this as they were aware that someone would eventually get hurt. She pointed out that sometimes drastic steps cause drastic things to start to happen and she is hopeful that they will soon be able to move forward on this soon.
- Mr. Short stated that the Judge's administration currently covers the supervision of 202 county employees working in about 15 different departments who all have different missions and going in different directions. There is a lot going on every day. He stated if anyone on the Quorum Court has trouble getting anything from those departments that they can contact him directly and he will see that they get the information that they are looking for. He noted that he is in his office at the Courthouse part of the week and the remaining time he spends at the Road Department and he can always be reached by phone regardless of where he is.
- 15.6 B. Pond stated that the Harvey Dowell Bridge is in his District and he is proud of that bridge that they have been waiting on for a long time. He is not hesitant to drive across the bridge and sees no reason that any 80,000 pound gross weight vehicle could not cross it. He appreciates the job that the Road

> Department does and if they used a little extra concrete in those thin walls of the bridge that does not bother him at all.

- AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY JUDGE TO ENTER A
 CONTRACT FOR SERVICES WITH THE ASSOCIATION OF ARKANSAS
 COUNTIES: B. Pond introduced An Ordinance Authorizing The County
 Judge To Enter A Contract For Services With The Association Of
 Arkansas Counties, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the ordinance
 that is on first reading.
- 16.2 B. Pond explained that they must authorize participation in this Association and need this contract for risk management.
- 16.3 B. Pond made a motion to suspend the rules and place the ordinance on second reading by title only. R. Cochran seconded. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote.
- 16.4 County Attorney Steve Zega read An Ordinance Authorizing The County Judge To Enter A Contract For Services With The Association Of Arkansas Countles by title only.
- 16.5 B. Pond made a motion to suspend the rules and place the ordinance on third and final reading by title only. R. Cochran seconded. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote.
- 16.6 County Attorney Steve Zega read An Ordinance Authorizing The County Judge To Enter A Contract For Services With The Association Of Arkansas Counties by title only.
- 16.7 B. Pond made a motion to adopt the ordinance. A. Harbison seconded.
- 16.8 S. Madison stated that she looked up A.C.A. §14-20-107 and it says that it should be equal to one percent of the revenue received from the County Aid Fund and questioned if that is where this money comes from and how much money was in the County Aid Fund from last year.
- 16.9 County Attorney Steve Zega responded that he did not know this information.
- 16.10 County Comptroller Cheryl Bolinger stated that she did not have that amount at this time; to which S. Madison responded that the statute says that the amount they pay shall be equal to 1% of the revenue received by the County from the County Aid Fund and asked who did the math on that. Ms. Bolinger responded that she would get that information for S. Madison.

- 17.1 Judge Edwards asked that Ms. Bolinger get with County Treasurer Bobby Hill and look this up and provide it to S. Madison.
- 17.2 S. Madison asked how much money they were talking about paying to the Association of Counties and it was noted that on the Affidavit to County Account it shows 2015 Membership in the Association of Arkansas Counties at \$5,933.00.
- 17.3 S. Madison asked if in return for this \$6,000, basically all they get is the ability to buy insurance and stated that she has seen the Association of Counties Legislative Packet which is a huge packet of bills for which they hardly ever talk to anyone about. She stated she does not believe the AAC does much legislative work for the counties noting the entire time she spent down there, she only had input from the Association of Counties on maybe two bills and one was the bill that allowed JPs who had served two terms continue to perform marriages which was not even organized properly and required rewriting a shell bill to get it in on time.
- Judge Edwards stated that she could not say what all goes on in the AAC, but she does know that this is an important function. She noted that they provide insurance for many of the counties, but Washington County is self-insured and has their own health insurance, so they do not use it. She further verified that the County's Risk Management does come through AAC.
- S. Madison asked for an explanation of what risk management insures; to which County Attorney Steve Zega responded that risk management does, amongst other things, pay the attorneys that defend the County in multiple 1983 lawsuits from the jail; are currently working on the lawsuit referred to earlier tonight with outside counsel; and they also handle claims on anything related to the 1983 actions, including the 1983 42 United States Code and the 1983 alleged civil rights violations by the County. He stated if they were to lose in court and be assessed a judgment, that is where the claim would be paid from.
- 17.6 S. Madison asked if the risk management insurance is included in the \$6,000 they pay them or is this paid extra; to which S. Zega responded he does not know the answer to that question, but he knows that is a service that the AAC pays for them and is beyond the \$6,000 claim; to which Comptroller Cheryl Bolinger agreed.
- 17.7 S. Madison stated what happens if they pass this and it is not 1% of whatever the County Aid Fund is; to which Judge Edwards responded she did not know but this was always the way they turn this in.

- 18.1 County Attorney Steve Zega responded that his suspicion is that if they were not a contributing member of the AAC whether that would put their risk management funds at risk. He stated in other words if belonging to the AAC through this particular program is condition precedent to belonging to the risk management pool, it is important enough in his mind to recommend that they certainly need to do it.
- 18.2 S. Madison reiterated her question that if they pass this ordinance and it turns out that \$5,933 is not 1% of the money from the County Aid Fund, do they have to amend it; to which County Attorney Steve Zega responded that it depends whether she is talking about over billing or under billing. He stated that the AAC prepared the Affidavit to County Account that they are referring to, so he is:assuming that this is their bill and he would assume that they have already looked at their County Aid Fund.
- 18.3 S. Madison continues asking what happens if this ordinance is inconsistent with the statute; to which County Attorney Steve Zega responded that it depends on what the inconsistency is. He stated if it is simply an accounting error and the county overpaid them, then they would certainly ask for a refund and if they underpaid them, he is sure that they will come back with a bill in hand.
- J. Maxwell stated that it might be help to resolve this if they had some clarification as to what that \$5,933 actually gets the county; to which A. Harbison responded stating that there are several things that they get from AAC, but not much legislation because they are one of the larger counties in the State as they represent the majority of the counties. She stated that there is a list of things that the AAC provides and they always have the discussion that we would like AAC to do more for the county than they really do, but what they do provide the county cannot go without. She noted that the risk management has helped them settle a couple issues with the jail and since she has been on the court, AAC has received compensation from that in a larger amount than what they paid in.
- 18.5 B. Pond noted that this seems to be complicated, but there is no question that Washington County has many employees, buildings and other facilities, with many miles of road and the bridges that they cannot go without this liability insurance.
- 18.6 <u>Citizen Comments:</u> There were no citizen comments made.
- 18.7 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.

19.1 VOTING FOR: D. Balls, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, J. Firmin, A. Harbison, T. Lundstrum, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, B. Pond, and B. Ussery. The motion passed unanimously by those present. The ordinance was adopted.

ORDINANCE NO. 2015-01, BOOK NO. 9, PAGE NO. 534

- A RESOLUTION DISCOURAGING THE USE OF SMART PHONES, IPHONES, OR SIMILAR PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS DEVICES DURING MEETINGS OF THE QUORUM COURT OR ANY COMMITTEE THEREOF: B. Ussery introduced A Resolution Discouraging The Use Of Smart Phones, IPhones, Or Similar Personal Communications Devices During Meetings Of The Quorum Court Or Any Committee Thereof, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the resolution. The resolution has been drafted by County Attorney Steve Zega.
- 19.3 B. Ussery made a motion to adopt the ordinance. B. Pond seconded.
- 19.4 T. Lundstrum stated that he was deeply offended by the editorial that appeared in the Springdale News that said several JPs were clearly sending text messages to each other as the panel discussed public matters. He stated he has been on this court for 8 years and he has never sent a text to another Quorum Court member, nobody has ever sent him a text during a meeting, and he is unaware of that ever happening. He stated he is assuming that B. Ussery was given this information and if so, he believes that he should name the JPs who are being accused of doing this so they can face the accuser and he believes that proof should be submitted that it happened. He stated the very idea that elected officials would carry on secret conversations through electronic messaging is offensive to the idea of conducting the public's business transparently. T. Lundstrum stated that this court is made up of honorable people and this editorial makes them look far less than honorable. He noted the statement made in the article, "We applaud Ussery and Edwards for trying to clamp down on this disrespectful practice." He stated that he does not believe that this has ever happened and is not a practice of this court. He stated that he was at the meeting the night the lady in the audience came up and spoke about this matter and when she found out what was actually going on, she seemed very well satisfied with the explanations.
- T. Lundstrum stated that he and his wife are over 75 years old and pointed out if he were to have a family emergency during a meeting, he would want to know that immediately and it is no less disruptive of a meeting for his phone to vibrate and him take a quick look at it than it is for a Deputy Sheriff to have

to walk in there and tell him that he has a call coming in. If he were to receive a call that he had to answer he would go back to the break room to do so, so as not to disrupt a meeting. He stated that he appreciates the opportunity to make his point publically on television because many people who read this kind of editorial assume that because it is in the newspaper, automatically believe it. He reiterated that the accused should have the right to face the accuser. He stated that he appreciates the fact that this is a resolution discouraging them from doing it because unless somebody passes an ordinance or some kind of law prohibiting him from doing it, he personally plans to have his cell phone at meetings.

- 20.1 Robert Dennis stated that there is a sign on the door coming into the Quorum Court Room stating not to use phones and it is common courtesy to set phones on mute and not use them. He noted when they start talking about dates of meetings; he needs to look on his phone's calendar for conflicts in his schedule, not for texting or calling someone. While he understands the purpose of this resolution and FOIA, in this day in age his phone is his daytimer.
- J. Firmin stated that he concurs with T. Lundstrum on this matter and was also disappointed with the editorial. He stated he is confident that they all observe FOIA. He stated if someone observes them texting from one person to the other, they have a responsibility to tell someone. He believes that they should respect each other and does not believe that this resolution is a good way to start the year and he will not support it.
- 20.3 R. Cochran concurred with J. Firmin that this is not a good way to start their year and believes that T. Lundstrum made good points that the accusations of impropriety towards this court are not well received. He stated it is not that he does not support the ideal of openness in government and believes that they practice it already, so will not support this resolution.
- 20.4 H. Bowman stated that he has been on this court two years and has never one time seen anybody be disrespectful with talking or texting on the telephones during meetings. He has seen there be some kind of issue where someone had to get up and leave the courtroom to handle an issue on the phone and he has seen some respond to texts. He pointed out that most of them on this court have a business or personal interest that requires them to receive important texts from time to time. He believes that this is completely out of order and he will not support it.
- 20.5 T. Lundstrum stated that the only person he has actually witnessed texting a Quorum Court member in this court, because he sat next to her, is Secretary

Karen Beeks texting former JP Candy Clark, Chairman of the Finance Committee, telling her to turn her mic on or giving her some detail that she knew Ms. Clark was not aware of regarding finance or helpful issues and had nothing to do with FOI. He relterated that if this were actually happening on this court he agrees with the article, but does not agree with making these types of accusations without any truth that it took place.

- 21.1 B. Ussery stated that he apologizes if he offended anybody, but he saw several people at the meeting last December texting and believes that it was very disrespectful in the manner in which is was being done and several people in the audience noticed that. He believes when people in the audience notice it to the point that they have to get up and say something, that is when something has to be done. He stated that this resolution does not in anyway say that they should not use these devices and that they are not an important part of what they do. He explained that the purpose of this ordinance is that they have a responsibility to be paying attention to what is going on at this table and not worrying about talking to someone else at the same time. He stated that there is no need to name names because those who did it know who they are. B. Ussery stated that they are not preventing using calendars or that they cannot have these devices, but they need to respect the Judge and people in the audience and focus on their responsibility here instead of other things that do not concern this court. He stated that the texting got out-of-hand at the meeting last December and that is what precipitated this resolution. He believes that sometimes they need to be reminded that there are some things that are inappropriate.
- A. Harbison stated that she is sorry that some people are offended by this resolution, but does not believe that they need to be texting during Quorum Court meetings which both she and B. Ussery have observed. She stated that they just want JPs to be more professional and the incident referred to appeared to be out-of-control. She stated that she is glad that B. Ussery brought this resolution to the table whether it passes or not because it says that they are professionals there to do the duty of the county's people and that they need to pay attention to that, and if they have personal business to take care of, that they leave the room to take care of it.
- S. Madison stated that most of them have other lives other than being a JP because this is a part-time job after all and she is a landlord with over 30 tenants relying on her to provide them with shelter. She stated that the new world of young people text and she receives texts all the time related to her rental properties and can be discrete and brief in doing so. She pointed out that there are people on this court who work for national and international firms that are in multiple time zones that have obligations besides those they

have at these meetings and they all feel very deeply about the trust that the public has given them to do their jobs and they do them to the very best of their ability and follow the letter of the law. She noted that she has her laptop with her that has instant messaging on it and she just downloaded the FOIA booklet so she can search it and they cannot take such electronics from them and let them do their jobs. She stated that she is not convinced that a useful purpose was served in bringing this resolution because may have cast doubt on this court. S. Madison stated that she will not support this resolution and does not intend to follow it if it passes.

- H. Bowman stated that they have talked about calendars on their phones and emails received and believes that they need to be careful about the assumptions that they make from what they see because not everything is what it appears to be and referred to the old saying of what you get when you break the word "assume" down you get a good explanation of what happens when you make the wrong assumption.
- T. Lundstrum stated that he is not offended by B. Ussery, but rather is offended by this editorial, which says that several JPs were clearly sending text messages to each other. He pointed out during Finance and Budget meetings he would have his phone on calculator trying to figure up numbers they were dealing with in that conversation, so he agrees that it could look like he was texting. He stated that the public needs to remember that there are more functions in their phones than just texting and calling and the night of the meeting in December, the lady that called this to their attention was well satisfied that night with the explanation that she heard from them. He further noted that E. Madison who has another firm in California, which is 2-3 hours earlier than they are, and was receiving text messages that night from somebody in her firm that she replied to, but it does not mean that she did not hear what was going on in the meeting.
- 22.3 <u>Citizen Comments:</u> Lorraine O'Neal, resident of 3001 West Wedington Drive in Fayetteville, addressed the Quorum Court stating that she understands the offense that some of them took from this editorial as she too can see both sides of the issue. She stated that she has been employed by someone who would insist that phones be turned off and put in their locker because none of them are so important that someone cannot wait. When they are here, she believes that their focus should be on the business at hand and everything else will just have to wait.
- 22.4 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the resolution.

- 23.1 <u>VOTING FOR:</u> A. Harbison, B. Pond, and B. Ussery. <u>VOTING AGAINST:</u> D. Balls, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, J. Firmin, T., Lundstrum, S. Madison, and J. Maxwell. The motion failed with three members voting in favor and nine members voting against the motion.
- 23.2 Judge Edwards stated that she appreciates the discussion and some points have been made. She noted that she does not even bring her phone into the Quorum Court Room because she knows it will ring and she will not be able to answer it. She thanked B. Ussery for the resolution, stating that it may make people more aware of what they are talking about.
- AN ORDINANCE CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION ON THE QUESTION OF THE LEVY OF THE ANNUAL DUES OF THE WEST FORK RURAL FIRE DEPARTMENT AND PRESCRIBING OTHER MATTERS PERTAINING THERETO: A. Harbison introduced An Ordinance Calling A Special Election On The Question Of The Levy Of The Annual Dues Of The West Fork Rural Fire Department And Prescribing Other Matters Pertaining Thereto.
- 23.4 County Attorney Steve Zega addressed this item explaining that in order to cemply with State statue, they will need to have the election within 60 days of it being read, and so it cannot be adopted until March. Therefore, they cannot move up the readings tonight for the election to take place when the West Fork Rural Fire Department wants it. He stated however, they can suspend the rules to read the ordinance by title only.
- 23.5 S. Madison made a motion to suspend the rules and read the ordinance by title only. J. Firmin seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote by those present.
- 23.6 County Attorney Steve Zega read An Ordinance Calling A Special Election On The Question Of The Levy Of The Annual Dues Of The West Fork Rural Fire Department And Prescribing Other Matters Pertaining Thereto, by title only.
- 23.7 A. Harbison explained that this is an ordinance for a special election to place the West Fork Rural Fire Department dues on the ballot and if approved, these dues will go on the residents' real estate tax bill.
- 23.8 Judge Edwards announced that this ordinance would be moved forward to their next meeting and will continue this for two more months and then that will get their dates correct so that the election can be held in June.

- 24.1 AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE RATIFYING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT GRANTED BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD: J. Firmin introduced An Emergency Ordinance Ratifying A Conditional Use Permit Granted By The Planning And Zoning Board, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the ordinance. The Planning Board granted a Conditional Use Permit on November 6 for Baldwin Cell Tower. This ordinance contains an emergency clause making it effective immediately upon passage.
- John Firmin stated that this was a cell tower that had been appealed; to which Planning Director Juliet Richey responded that the appeal has been withdrawn. The applicant for the tower and the appellant were able to work out an agreement that changed the style of the tower slightly to where it will now just be a flag pole type or monopole tower utilizing internal mount antennas instead of the antennas hanging externally. Ms. Richey referred to attachment #14.2 that goes through the conditions originally approved by the Planning Board and staff is recommending that all of those remain the same, plus the addition under #1 in General Conditions, "The style of tower should be a flag pole type tower (or monopole tower utilizing internal mount antennas".
- John Firmin stated that since it is an emergency ordinance that goes into effect immediately upon passage, he gets a little nervous about public perception that they are just pushing this through.
- Planning Director Juliet Richey responded stating that this is the way they always do CUPs and the appeal time period has run as they had 30 days from when the Planning Board approved it on November 6 and in that period there was only the one appeal. She further noted that they notified the neighbors of the pending appeal and then when it was cancelled, as well as letting them know that it would be on the agenda tonight.
- 24.5 J. Firmin made a motion to adopt the ordinance. B. Pond seconded.
- 24.6 R. Cochran asked how many residents were notified in this area; to which Juliet Richey responded that it was something like 35 residents. He asked if there was only the one person out of 35 that had a problem and that has been resolved; to which Ms. Richey responded that there were several that had questions or comments, but only one person appealed.
- 24.7 <u>Citizen Comments:</u> There were no citizen comments made.
- 24.8 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.

25.1 <u>VOTING FOR:</u> D. Balls, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, J. Firmin, A. Harbison, T. Lundstrum, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, B. Pond, and B. Ussery. The motion passed unanimously by those present. The ordinance was adopted.

ORDINANCE NO. 2015-02, BOOK NO. 9, PAGE NO. 535

- AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE RATIFYING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT GRANTED BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD: J. Firmin introduced An Emergency Ordinance Ratifying A Conditional Use Permit Granted By The Planning And Zoning Board, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the ordinance. The Planning Board granted a Conditional Use Permit on January 8 for Cooks' Rentals. This ordinance contains an emergency clause making it effective immediately upon passage.
- 25.3 J. Firmin made a motion to adopt the ordinance. A. Harbison seconded.
- 25.4 <u>Citizen Comments:</u> There were no citizen comments made.
- 25.5 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.
- 25.6 <u>VOTING FOR:</u> D. Balls, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, J. Firmin, A. Harbison, T. Lundstrum, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, B. Pond, and B. Ussery. The motion passed unanimously by those present. The ordinance was adopted.

ORDINANCE NO. 2015-03, BOOK NO. 9, PAGE NO. 539

- 25.7 OTHER BUSINESS: Executive Assistant Karen Beeks introduced Carly Sandidge, who is the new Quorum Court Coordinator having replaced Jessica Biondi, who is attending the University of Arkansas and working there. She stated that either of them can be e-mailed if there is anything that they can do to help any of the court members.
- 25.8 S. Madison asked if their technology is such that things on the website could be PDF's rather than scanned because it is hard to work with a scanned document; to which Judge Edwards advised that she would check into this.
- 25.9 <u>CITIZEN COMMENTS:</u> Dan Holtmeyer, Reporter with the NWA Newspapers, addressed the Quorum Court stating that he wanted to make it clear that the article on cellphone usage that T. Lundstrum was talking about was an editorial written by an editor, and not by him.

26.1 ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carly Sandidge Quorum Court Coordinator/Reporter