MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY QUORUM COURT

Monday, October 5, 2015 5:30 p.m. Washington County Quorum Court Room



- 527.1 The Washington County Quorum Court met for a special meeting on Monday, October 5, 2015. The meeting was called to order by County Judge Marilyn Edwards who stated the purpose of this meeting was to continue working on matters pertaining to the 2016 budget process.
- 527.2 S. Lloyd led the Quorum Court in a prayer and in the Pledge of Allegiance.
- 527.3 <u>MEMBERS PRESENT:</u> Daniel Balls, Harvey Bowman, Rick Cochran, Robert Dennis, Lisa Ecke, Ann Harbison, Sharon Lloyd, Tom Lundstrum, Eva Madison, Sue Madison, Joel Maxwell, Gary McHenry, Joe Patterson, Butch Pond, and Bill Ussery.
- 527.4 <u>OTHERS PRESENT:</u> County Judge Marilyn Edwards, County Chief of Staff George Butler, County Comptroller Cheryl Bolinger; Interested Citizens; and Members of the Press.
- Judge Edwards stated that she has been requested to remind everyone to please turn on their microphones when speaking and likewise turn them off when they are not.
- 527.6 <u>ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA:</u> Judge Edwards asked if there were any additions or deletions to the agenda.
- 527.7 R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. B. Pond seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
- 527.8 S. Madison asked when the tabled budget controls from last week would be discussed; to which Executive Assistant Karen Beeks replied that this would be on the October 8 Special Quorum Court meeting agenda.
- A. Harbison stated that before they get started reviewing the scheduled budgets tonight, she would like the Quorum Court to consider spending one night to determine a policy for all vehicles for all departments. A couple of hours were spent the other night discussing this that really resulted in no decision. She believes it would be more productive for the Court to take this matter up during one meeting to discuss policies and determining who drives and who does not drive a county vehicle.
- 527.10 A. Harbison made a motion that a Quorum Court meeting be scheduled for the purpose of determining a vehicle policy for all departments.

- L. Ecke asked whether this would actually need to be addressed by the Personnel Committee; to which Judge Edwards responded she can add this as an item on a full Quorum Court meeting agenda.
- E. Madison stated that the Public Works Committee started on this last year when she was Chair of that committee; however, she was not reappointed to that committee and was unable to continue with the work they were attempting to do to address the concerns that JP Harbison raises. Trying to do this in the midst of the budget process will not work because one of the departments with a significant number of vehicles is on the agenda tonight and it is too late in the process to try to do this piece meal. This good discussion needs to happen with the Public Works Committee.
- 528.3 County Attorney Steve Zega noted that there was not anything to discuss yet as A. Harbison's motion had not received a second.
- 528.4 A. Harbison's motion died for lack of a second.
- REVIEW BUDGET REQUESTS FOR CAPITAL AND PERSONNEL AND/OR CHANGES FOR 2016: Glenda Audrain, Director of the Washington County Library system, addressed the Quorum Court stating the only capital request she is making for 2016 is \$27,250 for new proprietary library software server that runs the automated system allowing all of the libraries to check in and out their books, place holds, run overdue notices, etc. She noted that this actually came up last year, but they were too far into the budget process for her to put it in, so they are already a year behind. She stated in the justifications in her budget last year, she indicated that they would be needing to purchase this software this year. G. Audrain reported that the County Library Board has approved this budget request for 2016.
- A. Harbison pointed out that the library budgets that have a board that oversees it; they have their own money and their own millage.
- 528.7 A. Harbison made a motion to approve the County Library budget requests as presented. B. Pond seconded.
- S. Madison stated that she knows there is a County Library Board, but she has always felt strongly that elected officials need to decide how money is spent because they represent the public in that regard and their Board is not elected as far as she is aware; to which Glenda Audrain responded that the members of the County Library Board are selected elected by the mayors of the cities.

- S. Madison asked what the County Library's millage must be spent for; to which S. Zega responded the library's dedicated millage is much like the Road Department's dedicated millage as it has to be spent on items specific to the library and the administration of the library system. He stated that they may employ library directors, administrators or librarians; buy books, periodicals, engage in subscriptions; pay for infrastructure directly related to the library cost, to include the purchase of real, personal and intangible property. He stated that this particular request of G. Audrain would probably fall within the personal and infrastructure capital. He further stated that they are welcome as a Quorum Court to infuse General Fund monies into the library, but just like the Road Department's dedicated millage, the door does not swing the other way and Library Fund monies cannot be transferred into the General Fund.
- G. Audrain stated that the County Library actually pays the County to be 529.2 their fiscal agent with that money too. The largest portion of their budget is distributed out to the member libraries based on a funding formula that the Library Board agonized over to make the distribution somewhat fair to all. Most of their member libraries are smaller and then they have Springdale, so if they do it strictly per capita, Springdale would get all the money and if they do it evenly, then it is not fair to Springdale. She stated that she basically has to figure out where the revenues are and how much she can give the libraries and still have enough to employ the people in her office and at the Greenland and Winslow branches as she directly supervises them, as well as all supplies, library cards, bar codes, operating equipment, etc. G. Audrain stated they do have two vehicles that are not taken home and used strictly for library purposes; one by the courier who makes the rounds between the libraries every weekday and the other by the children's librarian who travels to the various libraries in the county and provides programming. She stated that she prepares that budget for the Board and then she prepares the budget for the County such as the overdrive or e-books that they provide, and then she balances with a carryover that is adequate enough to carry them through the first five months of the next year. She explained that they receive some state-aid at the end of the first quarter, but they do not receive the property tax until May which is only for the banks and lenders; then in October, they get their second infusion of property taxes. She stated this year state-aid to public libraries was cut on the last day of the Legislative Session.
- 529.3 S. Madison asked whether there were other services the County provides to the County Library that they do not pay for such as IT, building, janitorial services; to which G. Audrain responded she pays a percentage cost for all of those things.

- S. Zega stated that G. Audrain's budget always was basically self-sustaining when he was on the Quorum Court, but that may have changed in the four years that he has been gone; to which G. Audrain added that she has never asked for anything and does not intend to.
- S. Zega added that the County Library sits on the County's South Campus and her capital expenditures, like her vehicles, are all Washington County property, so she does get support from the county-at-large to do her job and pays a percentage of her total budgets.
- T. Lundstrum pointed out for the benefit of new members on the Quorum Court that G. Audrain is not asking for anything from the General Fund and the money is already in the County Library budget to do this.
- G. Audrain stated even with the cut in State aid, with the revenues they will be able to give the member libraries a 3% increase this year over what they gave last year.
- 530.5 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to approve the County Library budget as presented.
- 530.6 VOTING FOR: R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, D. Balls, and H. Bowman. The motion passed unanimously. The budget request was approved as presented.
- 530.7 Washington County Assessor Russell Hill presented his 2016 personnel request to the Quorum Court. He is requesting two additional Deputy Assessors at their entry level that handle personal property and adding ten hours to a current position of GIS Tech Research Analyst. He reported that beginning in January 2016, with the cooperation of the State Revenue Office and County Collector, they will be opening an additional Assessor's Office located in the Fayetteville Revenue Office on Razorback Road. He stated this will be very similar to what they have in Springdale with three Assessor's stations and two Collectors and will alleviate a lot of the traffic that comes to the Courthouse, though they will maintain that office with two people to handle walk-in traffic. Mr. Hill stated that they will be renting this space from them at \$1 a year and will have this set up to service taxpayers. This addition should also give some relief to the Springdale Revenue Office. For the first year, he explained they will need one additional Deputy Assessor to help man the new office and will also transfer current two employees from the Courthouse to the new location.

- R. Hill stated that a second Deputy Assessor is needed to manage growth of personal and business property records. He pointed out in 2010, they had 89,569 personal property records on file managed by 9 deputies; in 2014, they had 99,033 personal property records with 11 deputies; and as they approach the end of 2015, they will eclipse 100,000 records. He would like to have a total of 12 deputies due to population growth. He pointed out that they are in these records multiple times whenever someone buys or sells a vehicle and estimate 3-5 times per record. Each deputy can manage 8,000 to 10,000 records a year.
- R. Hill stated with the opening of the new office, the first year they will need a little bit of extra help manning the Courthouse Office full time. He noted he has a Deputy Assessor who will be retiring in 2017 and when that happens, this new hire would absorb that position. He explained that they will not be closing the Assessor's Office at the Courthouse because they still have people who visit the Courthouse office for real estate property and they will continue to handle personal property as well. He stated that these 2-3 deputies will handle their on-line business and phone calls out of the Courthouse, as well as walk-ins.
- 531.3 R. Dennis made a motion to approve the County Assessor's budget request as presented. G. McHenry seconded.
- In response to a question from A. Harbison about where this money will be coming from, R. Hill stated that they are looking at a total \$111,000 increase in their budget. As the Assessor is a commissioned office, the County will be responsible for approximately \$10,000.
- A. Harbison asked R. Hill if he drives a County vehicle to and from work; to which he responded that he does and his department has a total of six county vehicles; four of these vehicles are driven to and from work by salaried employees.
- E. Madison stated that it is hard to consider this request by the Assessor without having the context of his entire budget because it appears that he tried to off-set some of the additional expenses for these positions by cutting other areas of his budget and the increase overall is fairly modest. She pointed out that the Assessor's Office is the department that serves the entire county population, and as the County grows this office needs to grow in line with that, and this new location will make the process more efficient and accessible to citizens.

- R. Hill stated with respect to the GIS Tech Research Analyst, this position is currently part-time at 30 hours a week, but in order to attract the talent needed they need to make it a full-time position. He reduced his part-time budget by \$17,000 to help offset this cost.
- Judge Edwards reiterated that the court is only addressing capital and additional employees and they are not approving the total budgets.
- With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to approve the County Assessor's budget request as presented.
- 532.4 VOTING FOR: R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, D. Balls, and H. Bowman. The motion passed unanimously. The budget request was approved as presented.
- John Adams, IT Director, addressed the Quorum Court stating that one of 532.5 the things with computer technology in the County is that they are an infrastructure connecting the communication systems for all county offices and it is critical that they keep these systems up, managed, and backed up, some by law and regulation. He stated that in the last couple of years they have gone above and beyond with a very good and aggressive programmer and were able to create a program for the Coroner's Office that would have cost them \$1 million out on the market with all of the customizations needed by Coroner Roger Morris. Prior to this, the files were being stored in trunks of cars and in file boxes. They have also created an Environmental Affairs Program that allows them to efficiently keep up with numerous violations and enforcement. They have enhanced the Road Department program that they purchased, adding a road concern application saving the Road Department a huge amount of time in identifying and addressing road problems.
- J. Adams reported that the programmer that he refers to resigned his position with the County a month ago because he was overworked. By having good quality programmers that they take care of would continue to save the county money. He noted that today the County went live with the Circuit Clerk's Contexte case management system program that has been mandated by the State. It did not cut over 100% and there were a lot of bugs, but the IT Office had trained employees on staff that could address them without additional cost. He noted over the last two years his staff, with the training that the County has provided for them, has insured that they all have security plus certification which means they have been trained and recognized by an organization that they can predict or see certain

trends going on and how they can avoid them. He stated that he is asking for \$127,506 for the addition of two Programming and Systems Analyst positions which would allow them to support the requests from county offices for new programs and to provide back up for any absence.

- J. Adams stated that he is also requesting \$25,000 for a replacement vehicle that would allow them to support all sites in the County. He explained that they currently drive a 1996 Toyota with over 300,000 miles that has required nearly \$5,000 in repairs this year.
- J. Adams further noted that the additional positions, such as just discussed for the Assessor's Office, also affect the IT Office as they will require new equipment and service. He explained this year the number of help desk calls will exceed last year by 1,000 because the better technology that they are getting requires assistance by IT to learn the new operations and applications.
- J. Adams stated that he is requesting capital funding to replace fiber cables between north and south campuses and a backup devises for the wide area network which should handle five years of expected growth. He reiterated that IT supports the entire county and ensure not only that they have technology that works, but that they have backups. They would be purchasing off of the state contracts which allow for a small rebate at the end of the year that goes into the General Fund. He reported that State Auditors advised him that Washington County is number one in security mechanisms within the State of Arkansas.
- On behalf of the IT Office, County Planning Director Juliet Richey addressed the Quorum Court stating that a few years ago the County funded a program to be written for their office that greatly improved their efficiency. A lot of the success of that program relied on having a good IT Department to help with bridging communication with the program contractors. She stated as technology changes, they rely a lot on being able to integrate with other county departments' technology, most importantly the Assessor to retrieve property owner data and parcels information used to make maps and notifications. J. Richey stated that she believes it is critical to have good educated people in these IT positions as the Planning Department cannot work efficiently unless they have a good technology team behind them.
- R. Cochran asked about the new program she referred to, stating that her department achieved some savings over market price, and asked if she recalls what the maintenance fees were for those products; to which J. Richey responded \$10,000 to \$15,000.

- R. Cochran asked if on top of this savings, whether this program had saved in personnel costs if they had gone with another program that was not quite as interconnecting; to which J. Richey responded that it had probably saved approximately one-half a position so \$15,000 in salary cost, plus benefits.
- County Library Director Glenda Audrain also addressed the Quorum Court noting that J. Adams' team will be replacing their exchange server which is no longer supported by Microsoft. This will save them \$12,000 by not having to contract with another group. She noted she does nearly all IT work herself in-house except for the big things, but she has to have assistance to keep up with technology and believes they are very fortunate to be able to rely on J. Adams and his team.
- On behalf of the IT Office Jeane Mack, Director of the Juvenile Detention 534.3 Center, addressed the Quorum Court and stated not only does the IT Department take care of their computer system, but their most critical security system of cameras that monitor the residents as well as to protect her staff from liability. She stated that J. Adams and his team have been to the JDC this year in excess of 100 times. She further reported that the Governor has appointed a new Juvenile Reform Board and one of the big topics is the discussion of education and detention for juveniles which is a very critical area and will require a lot of new equipment. She noted that they are going to Chromebooks and J. Adams has helped them with this over the last few years as this has been a critical issue in Arkansas. She stated that she is working with the IT Department at Fayetteville Schools and they have devised a plan where they believe they can keep the kids at their normal schools if they are in JDC, using these Chromebooks and J. Adams has assisted them with that. She pointed out that in the past, the kids' school work did not count while they were in detention.
- J. Adams introduced his IT team who were in attendance and reported that two of them worked the entire previous weekend. He encouraged anyone to visit their office anytime to learn more about what the IT Department. He stated his goal for the County is to try to think of the future and what they need to make sure they plan for it accordingly so it is not one big expense like it was when they started five years ago.
- L. Ecke asked what grade level his two programmers would be coming in at; to which J. Adams responded they would be a Grade 25. L. Ecke commented that this seems a little high to her and J. Adams welcomed her to come by his office to discuss this. She asked J. Adams to prioritize his three requests and he responded that they did that last year and it did not work so well, reporting that they ended up spending the money that was cut from his budget last year because the items they were talking about not only

saved them money, but they replaced the FAX program and the voice over IP. He stated that it is very difficult for him to prioritize because these are things that come in from the elected officials in various departments. He stated he would rather wait until the end of the budget when the final decisions are being made and he will work with them if the money is not there.

- A. Harbison stated that J. Adams has indicated the amount of money that he has saved them for the Planning Board and asked if he could do the same for the other departments. He gave the example of the Coroner's Office that was looking at spending \$1 million for a program and was able to be done in-house with the cost to the County of one person's time for six months or approximately \$35,000 to \$40,000. J. Adams stated that if they went with the vendor for the program additions to the Road Department, it would have cost \$250 an hour and would only do at time and materials that will drive the cost up. The IT Department worked on and off for a couple of months to develop these programs.
- A. Harbison pointed out that they have cut the IT budget every year for the last five years.
- A. Harbison asked J. Adams what kind of backup devices were needed; to which he explained in the old days, backup used to be much like the old 8-track tapes, but now it is hard drives on disk which have to be moved off site. He stated if he was to move the backup off site to an internet connection, it would cost him approximately \$7,000 a month and this is only one-tenth of the data or the most critical at that moment. J. Adams stated that the new backup devices will be hard drives that they call a SAN (Storage Area Network) which has multiple hard drives so if one fails, another takes over and includes warranties for replacing drives. He explained this would allow having a backup at both the north and south campus.
- J. Adams also explained that the fiber cables are private, not the public fiber that they share with Cox. By having six strands instead of two; it increases the accessibility to increase the band width as needed. He stated once these cables are installed, the county will save approximately \$4,000 a month for internet, plus they gain the band width and will own it to be depreciated over 20 years.
- R. Cochran stated that the IT Department has taken the County a long way at a high cost, but they are now able to see some of the fruits of their investments. He knows that there are other departments that have not had to add personnel because of the IT Department even though they have not

been able to come forward to say so. He verified that they have UPS on the SAN backup devices. As far as the fiber installation, what is the repair process if it is disturbed; to which J. Adams responded that they have an insurance policy that will cover that as well as a service level agreement.

- R. Cochran asked about doing a redundant route with Cox; to which J. Adams stated that they could, but currently because of cost, he has not pursued that yet. He pointed out that their phone systems remain up if they were to lose service.
- R. Cochran pointed out that four years ago, J. Adams asked the Quorum Court for three additional staff members and over the last three years they have given him one.
- R. Cochran made a motion to approve the IT Department budget full request as presented. A. Harbison seconded.
- In response to a question from S. Madison, J. Adams stated that the IT Department has three county owned vehicles. Once on site, two of the pickups are used by his staff as pool vehicles to travel to various work sites or attend meetings and the other is used by only one person as it is a stick shift. He stated that one of these vehicles was donated by the DEM, 9-1-1 and this truck has about 250,000 miles. J. Adams stated that he drives a county owned GMC 4-wheel drive extended cab pickup home every day and he lives in Rogers for a 48 mile round trip and takes approximately one gallon of gas per trip.
- S. Madison asked what the logic was for him to be able to drive this vehicle home every day; to which he believes this is for a different conversation as when he was hired, a vehicle was part of his compensation package as noted by then Chief of Staff Dan Short. The other two vehicles go home with his employees who are on-call, one to Lincoln and one to Bella Vista and is also a part of this Database Administrator's compensation.
- In response to a question from E. Madison about whether the county attaches a \$1.50/day commuting rate to these vehicles, J. Adams reported that he pays \$780 per vehicle per year for the use of those vehicles. Regarding why he would need a county vehicle, he noted that that all of their vehicles are equipped with the needed tools and equipment so they can immediately respond to any emergency call.

- E. Madison asked what happens when another employee is on call who does not have a vehicle; to which J. Adams stated that this has not happened but would be dealt with on an individual basis should a situation arise.
- E. Madison stated that she does not believe the IT Department has the justification for having three vehicles. If the current vehicle is high mileage and unusable then they should deal with only having department vehicles. The County is spending far too much money for people to daily place 48 personal round trip miles on a vehicle at taxpayers' expense. E. Madison added that there is also no business justification for the vehicles to be a part of the compensation package and is part of a package that the Quorum Court has not approved. Mr. Adams if very well paid but she cannot justify adding a vehicle on top of it.
- 537.3 E. Madison made a motion to amend this budget request removing the \$25,000 replacement vehicle request. L. Ecke seconded.
- R. Cochran noted at an earlier committee meeting in the year when they were at the Sheriff's Annex, Lindsi Huffaker commented that there were no vehicles provided by the county as part of compensation, and that the HR Department was unaware of Chief of Staff Dan Short advising J. Adams that a vehicle would be a part of his compensation package.
- 537.5 R. Cochran stated that he would accept E. Madison's motion as a friendly amendment to his motion.
- J. Maxwell stated that the Quorum Court appreciates the efficiency that J. Adams brings by automating the various county departments. He stated one thing he struggles with is when he does the math on the IT's Budget, they are about 1.7% of the General Fund budget requests, but the increase he is asking for is about 25% of the total \$2.3 million that is being requested. He stated that the Court's task is to weigh all of the good projects and ideas because they cannot fund them all to decide which they fund first and which they fund second, etc.
- In response to a question of how he was able to justify that large of a request, J. Adams stated many of the things that are put on his budget to purchase are items that they have to have as well as contracts, licenses, maintenance fees, etc. He stated that the capital expenditures that they are talking about tonight and how he came to those conclusions is that these are the needs that they have in the County. The County is continuing to grow and each and every one of them has the responsibility to

provide these services and in order for him to do that, he needs these people and these products.

- J. Maxwell pointed out that there are several county departments that also have very justifiable needs and unfortunately the revenues are already set; to which J. Adams responded that he disagrees with that because they have the millage which was reduced by another Quorum Court and this reduction is perhaps the percentage that they are missing in order to keep the revenues and reserves up.
- G. McHenry asked whether IT has looked into remote support, to which J. Adams responded that they do a lot of remote support and are able to address issues from home. The types of emergency calls that he receives are from the JDC when their security cameras go down, they have to go there and run wire and cabling, and often times when a machine dies, they cannot just remote in to fix it. He noted this year they responded to 150 emergency calls to the JDC where they had to respond; 25 of those were for remote support and the remaining required on-site work.
- 538.3 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to approve the IT budget request as presented less the \$25,000 request for a vehicle.
- 538.4 <u>VOTING FOR:</u> R. Cochran, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, G. McHenry, and D. Balls. <u>VOTING AGAINST:</u> R. Dennis, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, and H. Bowman. The motion failed with five members voting in favor and ten members voting against the motion.
- 538.5 S. Zega explained that someone who voted against the motion would have to call for that reconsideration.
- R. Dennis stated that he would call for reconsideration because what he was voting against was the \$25,000 for the vehicle. He stated the way they worded the motion and then did the friendly part, changed the original motion completely which was almost like an amendment that they did not get to vote on, so he was voting against removing the vehicle.
- S. Zega explained that the motion to reconsider has to be made at this meeting by somebody who voted against the motion and it can be seconded by anyone. Further, he stated that this has to pass by simple majority for them to vote again on R. Cochran's main motion.
- 538.8 R. Dennis made a motion to reconsider. A. Harbison seconded.

- Judge Edwards called for a vote on R. Dennis' motion to reconsider. 539.1
- VOTING FOR: R. Cochran, R. Dennis, A. Harbison, and B. Pond. 539.2 VOTING AGAINST: L. Ecke, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Ussery, D. Balls, and H. Bowman. The motion failed with four members voting in favor and eleven members voting against the motion.
- A short recess was taken at this time. 539.3
- Renee Oelschlaeger, Chair of the Washington County Election 539.4 Commission, addressed the Quorum Court introducing Commissioner Max Deitchler, Programmer Lynn Hodge, and Election Coordinator Jennifer Price who is the face of elections in this Courthouse. Commissioner Bill Ackerman was unable to attend tonight's meeting. R. Oelschlaeger first provided some information to the Quorum Court. She addressed the September 8, 2015, election in Favetteville and explained that their election staff started setting up for this election on Saturday, September 5, and worked September 6 and 7, and before the polls opened at 7:30 a.m. on Tuesday, September 8. They worked throughout the day until the polls closed at 7:30 p.m. after which the ballot boxes are returned to the Courthouse. They left the Courthouse around 9:30 p.m. after finishing counting ballots. She noted that the citizens and the candidates expect to have those election results so staff does not leave until all votes are counted. R. Oelschlaeger stated that the election staff is unique as they are not considered full-time employees and are not eligible for bonuses or raises; they use their own vehicles and often do not submit mileage reimbursement requests. As Mrs. Price presents the Election Commission's budget request, she urged the Court to be aware that their election staff is dedicated and motivated and their budget is usually quite frugal.
- Jennifer Price stated that with next year being a Presidential election year, 539.5 they are expecting voter turnout to be anywhere from 70% to 75%. She reported in 2004, Washington County had the largest election year they had ever seen with 88,000 registered voters with a 73% voter turnout. Currently in 2015, they have 117,000 registered voters and expect that this number will continue to increase well into 2016. She stated as the population increases and number of registered voters increase, their needs increase which is why she is requesting more voting equipment and personnel for the expected expenditures for the Presidential election year.
- J. Price reported in 2006, the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) gave the State 539.6 of Arkansas and most states money to buy voting equipment which was the

> last time they updated their equipment. She stated in 2006 with around 88,000 registered voters in Washington County, the money they received from the HAVA purchased 171 touch screens and 3 central counting machines used on election night. When the State of Arkansas and Secretary of State's Office looked at replacing voting equipment as Washington County's voting equipment is now well over 10 years old, they program their elections on Microsoft XP and you cannot buy XP computers anymore so the equipment they have cannot be updated and is breaking down on them. She stated that \$30 million was allocated for new voting equipment and then allocated to each county. The Secretary of State's Office used numbers from 2006, not the current numbers in Washington County. She noted while 41 counties lost registered voters, Washington County gained registered voters yet every county received the same amount of equipment they received back in 2006. J. Price stated that they have gone to the Secretary of State's Office, written letters to the Governor's Office, to local Representatives and Senators asking them to help them in asking the Secretary of State to rethink how they will allocate the funding, but so far that has not worked. She stated that she is now asking the County to help fund \$420,000 to purchase the appropriate amount of voting equipment needed to go forward.

- J. Price stated that the Election Commission set up vote centers this year which worked for the School Election and the September City of Fayetteville election. She stated what they saw from vote centers is with very little advertising on their part, 21% of the voters who cast their ballots on the September 8 election actually cast ballots at polling places other than their normal polling place. She stated that Central United Methodist and Trinity Methodist saw almost 50% of the ballots cast at their polling places were from voters outside that polling place. She noted that this worked well for voters who had address changes, especially college students. At Presbyterian, they heard from mothers who dropped children off at school that morning how convenient it was that they could just go in and cast their ballots. J. Price stated that is the future they see for elections in Washington County and they hope to offer vote centers across the County so that on Election Day, voters can cast their votes at the most convenient
- S. Madison asked for a comparison of the cost of paper ballots and counting machines with the touch screen voting machines; to which J. Price explained that the current touch screen voting equipment uses rolls of paper that cost \$18 a roll and changing the paper on the current machines is one of the most difficult jobs the poll workers have and they will never start out with a partial roll. She stated that the new voting equipment ballots cost 9-cents per ballot and they only use what votes they cast. She

locations and times for those voters.

stated when they look at voting equipment they look to go away from paper ballots that cost about 35-cents apiece, but they will maintain one central count machine because they will still have paper ballots for early voting and absentees. J. Price stated the new voting equipment for the central count is about \$115,000 and then spend the rest of their money on touch screens. The Secretary of State's Office is allocating close to \$1.5 million just for Washington County, but this does not match the growth that they have had which is why they are looking at the additional express votes (touch She stated to replace the three central count screens) machines. machines they have would be over \$300,000 and would count faster, but they want to just purchase one of those machines and then invest the rest of the money in the express votes touch screens that they would see on Election Day. All the old equipment that they currently have will no longer be usable and will be traded in. J. Price stated that they want to have enough express votes that they can move forward with vote centers on Election Day, but in order to do that they would need about 324 of the Additionally, the vote centers would have a express vote machines. limited number of paper ballots. J. Price noted the September 8th Election was the first election where they kept telling the voting population that it would be touch screen only and out of the 10,400 votes cast, they only had 32 paper ballots cast by voters who just did not want to vote on the touch screen.

- In response to a question from A. Harbison, J. Price explained that the \$333,346 is what it will cost to run the Election Commission for 2016 and the \$420,000 is the additional cost for the voting equipment for them to be efficient with elections going forward and this has to be in the small equipment line. However, she does not want it to be lost that she still needs the operating funds to go forward with the 2016 Presidential Election.
- A. Harbison stated that this is a lot of money, but something that they have to do to be very efficient with every vote counted and this serves every citizen in the county.
- A. Harbison made a motion to approve the budget of the Election Commission as presented. R. Cochran seconded.
- E. Madison asked about voting early on paper ballots in the Clerk's Office; to which J. Price explained that they know there will be a certain percentage of the voting population who will not want to deal with the touch screen. The County Clerk's Office is set up to handle all of the precincts and she believes it is prudent on their part to provide paper ballots during early voting in the County Clerk's Office only because she has the mechanism to keep them safe and in order. However, when they look at vote centers at

the polling places for a countywide election with 151 precincts, there is no way for them to keep 151 ballots sorted and know how many out of a particular precinct would show up. She stated moving forward their goal is to continue to keep paper ballots at the County Clerk's Office and only have a limited amount of paper ballots at the polls on Election Day, but for all practical purposes there will be touch screens only at the polls.

- E. Madison stated that she thinks there will continue to be mistrust of the electronic voting machines that there could be some kind of reprogramming and she questioned how this new equipment will address that and what Quorum Court members say to assure people that there is not a possibility of the election being rigged or invalidating their votes somehow.
- J. Price replied that nothing they do in regards to programming is ever connected to the internet and there is no way for an outside entity to actually hack the system. On the old system if they ever had to do a hand recount, it would be on the paper rolls whereby with the new system, the new ballots on the central count machine can actually run through those machines; in essence they are still voting on a paper ballot because their votes will show up on a piece of paper just like it appears on the touch screen. If they had to, then they could all be run through the central count and be counted that way. Finally, J. Price stated that they do what is called "logic in accuracy" where they do testing of the equipment before every election to make sure everything counts correctly.
- E. Madison stated that with 2016 being a Presidential election year, she 542.3 does not see that they have much choice but to fund the request, but questioned whether some of this money comes back to the County; to which J. Price responded that if they take out the \$420,000 for the voting equipment, the budget that they are asking for without that would be \$657,000 and they would get back from the State of Arkansas and cities almost \$333,000 which actually puts their budget at about \$323,000 and the \$42,853 is her actual increase from 2014 if you count the reimbursements. She further stated that the majority of this is for personnel because they are required by law before the Primary Election on March 1 to train every poll worker that works and they will go through that training in January. She stated when they receive their new voting equipment, they will have to retrain their poll workers on the new equipment and procedures so she has added money for training. J. Price further noted every year before the major elections, they offer touch screen training because the equipment they currently have are not easy to use and their poll workers want to be confident and comfortable on Election Day, so they come back for training whenever it is offered. She noted with the new voting equipment, they will

simply plug it in, flip a switch, and push a button. Going forward they do not anticipate equipment training will be necessary.

- E. Madison stated that supporting this is the right thing to do to give the citizens faith in the process and show the technological advances by connecting the people to the elected officials through their votes.
- J. Maxwell stated that J. Price has been very helpful through her context and sharing her vision. He stated that it sounds like the State to the tune of about \$1.5 million is helping with these new machines and asked whether the cities, fire departments and school boards participate in helping to purchase the machines as well; to which J. Price responded that they will not help to purchase the machines because they will be county property; however, whenever they have an election, they pay for their part of the election costs. She noted that they have been able to keep election costs low for cities and fire departments and this is partially because they have an in-house programmer. She reported that Benton County spent \$120,000 on programming alone before they had an in-house programmer.
- J. Maxwell stated it looks like the County and State pay for the voting machines and then he assumes that everyone pays equally for the cost of the elections and this might be a way to recoup some of this cost. One another thing he understands that the County currently has 171 touch screens and this proposal will take them to 324; however, J. Price mentioned if she needed to, she could phase in 27 additional machines each year at the cost of \$140,000. He suggested that they do a 3-year phase-in of touch screen voting machines to go from 171 to 198 touch screens for 2016 and do the same for two additional years. He stated this would help them cover those costs and not have to absorb all of it in one year.
- J. Maxwell made a motion to amend the Election Commission's budget to a lesser amount of \$140,000 to purchase new voting equipment. S. Madison seconded.
- J. Price responded to J. Maxwell that this would certainly be an option for the Quorum Court to take but they would not be able to move forward with vote centers with the smaller number of touch screen machines allocated to them because 2016 will be the biggest election year that they have seen which is the year that they would want to have the vote centers. J. Price explained that they can do vote centers a couple of ways; they can allocate certain polling places as vote centers and every other polling place would be open, but the problem with that is voter confusion as to where the vote centers are located. She stated that they look at vote centers as needing

to be all polling places and this is why it worked so well for the City of Fayetteville and the school election because they did not have to explain that out of the 17 polling places, 3 are vote centers and if they did not go to those then they would have to go to their normal polling place. She noted that they currently have 56 polling places and to designate any 2-3 of those as vote centers would lead to a lot of confusion for their voters. She stated that they also have to have voting machines for early voting as well, so they currently use 43 machines used for early voting and that does cut them short.

- R. Cochran stated that they got about ten years out of their current voting equipment and asked what the expected life was on the new equipment; to which J. Price responded that they will probably tell them that it is ten years; however, from what she has been told, the new equipment can be upgraded as technology advances while their current equipment cannot.
- Regarding the plans to purchase only one counting device, H. Bowman asked if they would not need a second counting device in case of a problem; to which J. Price explained the counting device only counts the paper ballots. Early and absentee votes would eventually be their biggest majority of paper ballots and those are counted before the polls are closed. If there were problems with the voting equipment, they should be able to get it fixed beforehand.
- H. Bowman recalled last year they allowed two weeks for early voting at the locations. He stated that he does not understand why they need to allow that much time and questioned whether it would reduce their cost to only have one week of early voting; to which J. Price responded stating that it would obviously reduce their cost by almost half, but voters are creatures of habit and in order for them to get consistency with early voting, maximize their early voting and relieve the polling places, they need to strive to get to 50% early voting and stick with the two weeks that they have consistently had. She noted that some of their polling places have 4,000 to 5,000 registered voters and if the majority of them cast ballots at that polling place on Election Day, it is very hard to manage and makes the lines long for voters.
- H. Bowman questioned if they spread out the early voting over two weeks, should that not reduce the number of voting machines they need to get everyone through; to which J. Price responded that currently on Election Day, there are between 60% to 70% paper ballots and about 30% to 40% touch screen. She stated in order to have vote centers moving forward, they need to make it be all touch screen on Election Day and the main reason that they have vote mostly paper ballots on Election Day is because

they do not have enough machines. She further noted with early voting for the General Election, the County pays half and the cities pick up the other half.

- L. Ecke asked whether any feedback had been received from the Secretary of State as to why they are not going to fund Washington County any more than what they have; to which J. Price responded they stated they would look into it, but she has heard nothing further to date. She noted they have chosen the vendor Election Services & Software (ES&S) which is their current vendor and part of the Request for Proposal that ES&S submitted to the Secretary of State's Office that was accepted included a spread sheet with the amount of equipment each county would be getting that was figured into a dollar amount and she believes the Secretary of State's Office is stuck with that amount and will not be willing to budge from that. J. Price noted that Benton and Sebastian Counties are in the same situation as well.
- L. Ecke commented that she is an early voter and she spreads the word about early voting whenever she can and everyone has responded that they did not know about early voting. She pointed out that they have only used the vote centers for the two local elections to-date and, therefore, should not have created creatures of habit in that regard. She supports J. Maxwell's amendment for cutting this budget because at this point she cannot justify spending that amount of money unless the County had it to give. She believes breaking it down to 2-3 payments to purchase the voting equipment is the best way for them to proceed. The voters have not had this equipment so they do not know what they are missing.
- A. Harbison stated that Mrs. Price knows better than anyone on this Quorum Court what she needs to run an election. With the large Presidential election in 2016, they need to get everyone out to vote and remind people to vote early. She stated when they cut corners on elections, they are cutting corners on democracy, pointing out that voters are less likely to stand in long lines to vote.
- J. Price clarified that for the small equipment line item, she is just asking for the \$420,000 because she still has \$5,000 in that line as well.
- J. Maxwell restated his amending motion clarifying that it is to reduce the amount of \$420,000 requested for voting equipment by \$280,000, and that it does not affect the Small Equipment Line Item amount of \$5,000. S. Madison, as second to the motion, agreed to this restatement.

- H. Bowman asked what will happen to the voting process with that reduction in funding; to which J. Price stated that they would still vote like they have in the past; however, they would still be required on Election Day to go to the normal assigned polling place for both the General and Primary elections. She stated with the addition of more touch screens, it will lessen the amount of paper ballots that they use on Election Day which means that they will get done much earlier on election night with the results going much quicker.
- E. Madison stated she is against the amendment as it is important to fund all of this at once and is not something that will be ongoing cost, but a one-time expense and she believes this is what reserves are for. She believes they are missing out by having them do this piece-meal over time where they are not able to implement the full advantages of the technology immediately. She concurred that people are not used to the voting centers yet, but the reaction she heard was so positive to them that pushing that off is not a good idea, but they need to go ahead and take advantage of this technology all at once.
- B. Ussery stated since the Secretary of State's Office is unwilling to discuss changing the formula as they are already purchasing these machines, would them only buying a portion of their allotment of machines affect that in any way; to which J. Price stated that it would not because they are allocating a little less than \$1.5 million to Washington County and in order for them to move forward with voting centers, they would need that additional equipment.
- B. Ussery pointed out that when they receive the new machines, there is a certain process they need to go through with training staff to implement the equipment and questioned whether by adding the equipment incrementally, the costs would be incurred each time instead of just once; to which J. Price stated that there would be repetition associated with receiving the equipment incrementally and they would have to redo things at each election cycle.
- In response to H. Bowman's question whether acquiring the election equipment incrementally could cause problems in the election/voting process, Election Commissioner Deitchler stated that with their goal of going to vote centers, in doing so they only want to get one piece of central counting voting equipment. He stated if they do this incrementally, they will still have probably half of the votes on paper ballots with only one central piece of equipment to count the ballots on election night, whereas now they have three with a lot of paper ballots to count if they do it incrementally for the Presidential election.

- R. Cochran stated that if they look at the \$420,000 investment in voting equipment over ten years that would be \$42,000 a year or just over \$3,000 a month. He stated that the Election Commission has not asked the County for voting equipment money in ten years and so he will support the full \$420,000.
- 547.2 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on J.

 Maxwell's motion to amend the budget to a lesser amount of \$140,000 for voting equipment.
- 547.3 <u>VOTING FOR:</u> L. Ecke, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, and J. Patterson. <u>VOTING AGAINST:</u> R. Cochran, R. Dennis, A. Harbison, E. Madison, B. Pond, B. Ussery, D. Balls, and H. Bowman. The motion failed with seven members voting for and eight members voting against the motion.
- 547.4 With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on A. Harbison's motion to approve the Election Commission's budget as presented.
- 547.5 VOTING FOR: R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, D. Balls, and H. Bowman. VOTING AGAINST: T. Lundstrum. The motion passed with fourteen members voting in favor and one member voting against the motion. The budget was approved as presented.
- Shawn Shrum, Assistant County Road Superintendent, addressed the Quorum Court stating that the Washington County Road Department is requesting a capital line item amount of \$50,000 for County matching funds that goes with their State aid money. He explained for each project the county does, they are required to pay 10% matching funds and without these funds being available, the county would not be able to participate in State aid jobs and could risk losing funds. He further stated that in personnel services, the Road Department is requesting to change two HEO-I positions to HEO-II positions and explained this will add more opportunity for advancement as they currently have a limited number of HEO-II positions available.
- S. Shrum further explained that Washington County receives a certain amount of State Aid funds a year with which they can do certain projects, noting this year they did overlay on a mile of CR11, around a mile of CR43, and approximately a mile of CR9. He stated if these matching funds are

not available, the County cannot use their State aid money and would lose it if it is not allocated or spent.

- S. Shrum stated that in the One-Half Cent Sales Tax Budget, he is requesting \$110,000 for a new brush hog; and \$270,000 for two new dump trucks. The County uses brush hogs year around and due to the nature of the work, they endure a lot of wear and tear. He stated that the County has four brush hog operators and currently have six brush hogs, two of which are spares each with over 8,500 hours use and are backup for when the newer tractors have mechanical issues. S. Shrum explained that due to the importance of keeping the county roads brush hogged, it is important that they keep reliable brush hogs. He reported in the past Washington County has tried to purchase a brush hog tractor at least every other year and the last one purchased was in 2012. He noted the condition of the two spares and abundance of rain this year has made it difficult to keep the roadsides maintained.
- E. Madison referred to the request to change HEO-I positions to HEO-II positions, stating that she knows the Road Department uses the HEO-I positions for a variety of functions and asked what the HEO-II positions would be dedicated for; to which S. Shrum responded that as discussed earlier this year, they want to give more opportunity to HEO-I employees which make up the majority of their employees and many of them could move up, but they only have a limited number of HEO-II positions. He stated that they currently have two HEO-I positions open and would like to change those to HEO-II positions to give the opportunity for advancement. He further explained that the difference between the two positions is in the pay and is based off of experience.
- E. Madison asked whether the upgrade comes with an increase in responsibility to which S. Shrum responded that an HEO-II should be able to operate a wider variety of equipment that they have learned to operate over their years of employment and the upgrade is a reward for that experience.
- E. Madison further asked whether there was a difference in the two job descriptions other than the compensation; to which S. Shrum responded the difference is in the experience.
- E. Madison stated she would think their pay bands that account for experience, but this sounds like they are giving someone a pay increase and therefore have to call the position something different because of the pay band issues. To her it sounds like a promotion and moving from an

HEO-I to an HEO-II should come with an increase of responsibility commensurate with the pay increase.

- S. Shrum stated one of the reasons they did this back before he was employed by the County was because people were maxing out at an HEO-I and were not able to get a raise, so they added this HEO-II position to allow them to move up based on their experience. He stated he is confused by E. Madison's questions because earlier this year he was told that they did not offer enough of these HEO-II positions and are now trying to do so.
- 549.2 E. Madison responded to S. Shrum stating the concern that came out during the course of the bridge investigation was that these coveted positions are currently in existence, but employees who wanted them had no means to apply for them. It was a mystery as to how they could be an HEO-II because there were employees who had been HEO-I for years and not given the opportunity for advancement while people were being hired outside the county directly into those HEO-II positions. She reiterated that she had it in her mind that there was a distinction between the positions other than purely compensation. She does not believe they should be creating positions just to give people more money and felt that this should be addressed through the JESAP Committee and with HR Director Lindsi Huffaker about whether the positions are properly banded or whether there needs to be a compensation change in the pay band. She stated that she cannot support creating positions that do not change job duties or increase responsibility.
- S. Shrum stated that he believes some of the reports on how people got these jobs were not correct from what she was told as well, adding that in a lot of ways, he does not believe that the bridge investigation was thorough or correct. He believes it is important to make these opportunities available.
- E. Madison responded that with all due respect she gave two weeks of her life up for this investigation and believes that it was very thorough and people were very candid with their concerns. She thinks the issue is that there needs to be an opportunity for advancement but it needs to actually be "advancement" and she does not think that this. If we are calling something an advanced position and it is in fact nothing more than a pay increase, then this is a compensation issue that needs to be addressed a different way. She would expect people who are promoted to have additional responsibilities and some type of supervisory responsibility.
- E. Madison addressed the request for machinery and equipment and S. Shrum verified that the \$110,000 is to purchase one brush hog and two dump trucks, and he would be trading in one of their backup spare brush

hogs and two of the oldest dump trucks as part of a package deal. He further explained that the County currently has six brush hogs, two for each side that they have operators for and two spares. The County currently has eight dump trucks that are hauling gravel all the time with specified drivers and they usually have an additional four that are filled up most of the time when they have drivers or are not broke down, as well as some that pull backhoes, trailers or other equipment for a total of approximately 20 dump trucks.

- E. Madison stated that she has a hard time approving additional items when we do not seem to know how many we have and asked how he came to the conclusion to ask the Quorum Court for two dump trucks when you do not seem to know when two you are talking about replacing; to which S. Shrum stated that does not believe see where that is relevant as they have the dump trucks with high mileage. If the money became available, he would probably choose two of the 2004 models with the highest mileage to replace.
- E. Madison asked what logic to determine to ask for two dump trucks if he does not know which two; to which S. Shrum replied that he would probably choose the two dump trucks with the highest mileage to replace, and will look those who have given them trouble and the maintenance reports to help determine which two he will trade-in and replace. He would not trade in a dump truck if they had just put a lot of money into its maintenance.
- Responding E. Madison's question as to where the information including in their agenda packet came from, S. Shrum stated that he included the information that reported that they purchased two dump trucks at the end of 2014, and prior to that had not purchased dump trucks since 2010. Some of their dump trucks are approaching 400,000 miles as they are used every day and the repair costs continue to rise as the mileage increases.
- E. Madison clarified her question that if she was coming to the Quorum Court with a budget request then she would know which dump truck was being replaced for a reason such as it is really old and its replacement cost is so many dollars; and S. Shrum stated that he would then have to ask for more dump trucks as they have several like that. He is just trying to do what he was asked by the Quorum Court to reduce its budget. He would love to ask for six dump trucks as that is what they need.
- E. Madison replied that she would not know if he would know what six dump trucks he would need replaced; to which S. Shrum stated that he was sure that he would know.

- R. Cochran asked what the expected hourly wage increase would be when someone goes from a HEO-I to a HEO-II position; to which S. Shrum responded he believes it is two grades and around \$15.00 an hour depending upon the person and years of service. S. Shrum further confirmed that he had a lot of people in the HEO-I category performing job requirements of HEO-II and basically is currently getting these employees at a lower pay scale.
- R. Cochran stated if the Road Department has eight HEO-II employees and several HEO-I employees with a lot of experience. They are underpaying these people which is not right, so they may need to make some additional changes in this regard.
- In response to B. Pond, S. Shrum stated that approximately 60 70 are HEO-l's and there are currently has 7 HEO-II employees. He further stated that the two dump trucks that he is asking to replace are tri-axle. Usually their tandem axle trucks pull backhoes as well as a couple MAC trucks that are tandem axle. He further verified that he did not replace any trucks last year.
- B. Pond stated that the Washington County is more than a legal line drawn on a map. Washington County is the people that live, work, pay taxes, retire, and die in the County. Those people are not just the heart of Washington County but they are the engine that drives the County. He wants the Road Department to be as efficient as they can be in maintaining the roads and bridges that are the arteries and veins that the heart uses. He stated if they start letting these roads and bridges fall apart, then their economy falls apart, and people who live in the City of Springdale rely on the economy of what goes on out in the County. He does not want to see them go backwards as far as road maintenance or by cutting the Road Department Budgets.
- L. Ecke stated that while the Quorum Court was on the recent county road trip, she asked S. Shrum what kind of capital he was looking at as far as equipment when they were at the gravel pit in Prairie Grove. He pointed out the dump trucks that they needed replaced rather than what they want which she supports.
- With regard to changing the HEO-I positions to HEO-II positions, L. Ecke asked if there is a certain skill set requirement that goes with the seniority and experience required to move up; to which S. Shrum responded he is not sure of the difference in the job descriptions, but time and experience is a factor and seniority is included with the job position process. There is a skill set defined in the descriptions, because at the Road Department they

have hired employees right out of high school with no experience as well as individuals with 30 years' experience. If there is not a HEO-II position available, they will hire in as an HEO-I and he feels like HEO-II is a goal for them to shoot for; however they only have seven HEO-II positions available and they are filled, so there is not that opportunity to move up. He further noted that the same situation exists with their mechanics as they have one master mechanic and the rest are senior mechanics, some of which should move up to a master mechanic but they do not have the positions. S. Shrum explained the reason he requested to change two HEO-I positions to HEO-II is because he had two available HEO-I positions that were not filled so he is asking that they be changed to HEO-II positions.

- L. Ecke stated that she concurs with E. Madison that this needs to go through personnel and the HR Department first to define these positions; to which S. Shrum responded that there are already job descriptions for both HEO-I and HEO-II positions that have been approved through JESAP.
- A. Harbison stated they need to approve the \$50,000 County matching funds. She pointed out the more efficient Heavy Equipment Operators become at running the equipment, the better job they do. Some of these employees have had no way to move up and are stuck and she can understand why they would leave to pursue a better job. She pointed out that during the recession of the past three years, Washington County had some of the highest employment in the County because these were steady jobs and now that construction jobs are coming back, these guys that are very well trained can walk out of the County and get twice as much money. There are also the guys who are getting a little older and like the steady income instead of the famine and feast situation that occurs in construction. A. Harbison noted that she will support the request to change HEO positions as well as the machinery and equipment requested.
- 552.3 S. Zega stated that he would suggest that they break these capital requests out because they come out of two different funds.
- A. Harbison made a motion to approve the Road Department's budget capital request for \$50,000 county matching for state aid projects. B. Pond seconded.
- With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to approve the Road Department's request for \$50,000 county matching for state aid projects as presented.
- 552.6 <u>VOTING FOR:</u> R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson,

- B. Pond, B. Ussery, D. Balls, and H. Bowman. The motion passed unanimously. The budget request for \$50,000 was approved as presented.
- S. Lloyd asked for an approximate dollar amount or range for the personal services before she can know how to vote on these HEO-II positions; to which S. Shrum responded that it will depend on who it is because a raise for someone who has been with the County for 20 years would be different from a raise for someone employed by the County for 5 years.
- 553.2 A. Harbison made a motion to approve the Road Department's request to change two HEO-I positions to HEO-II positions. R. Dennis seconded.
- E. Madison stated that she will vote against this request because it is too vague and does not seem to have involved any clear logical thinking.
- With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to approve the Road Department's request to change two HEO-I positions to two HEO-II positions as presented.
- 553.5 VOTING FOR: R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, G. McHenry, B. Pond, B. Ussery, and D. Balls. VOTING AGAINST: S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum, E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, J. Patterson, and H. Bowman. The motion passed with eight members voting in favor and seven members voting against the motion. The budget request was approved as presented.
- R. Cochran made a motion to approve the One-Half Cent Sales Tax Road Department's budget request for machinery and equipment as presented in the B. Pond seconded.
- With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to approve the One-Half Cent Sales Tax Road Department's budget request for machinery and equipment as presented.
- 553.8 VOTING FOR: R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, T. Lundstrum, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, D. Balls, and H. Bowman. VOTING AGAINST: S. Lloyd, E. Madison, and S. Madison. The motion passed with twelve members voting in favor and three members voting against the motion. The budget request for machinery and equipment was approved as presented.
- 553.9 CITIZENS COMMENTS: There were no citizen comments made.

554.1 <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>: The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carly Sandidge

Quorum Court Coordinator/Reporter