

**MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
WASHINGTON COUNTY QUORUM COURT**

Thursday, April 21, 2016
6:00 p.m.
Washington County Quorum Court Room

REC'D BY L. WALKER
CLERK & FRIEDRICH
WASHINGTON CO. AR

2016 MAY 20 PM 4:07

FILED

- 95.1 The Washington County Quorum Court met in regular session on Thursday, April 21, 2016. The meeting was called to order by County Judge Marilyn Edwards.
- 95.2 S. Madison introduced Brianne Christiansen, Co-Minister for Youth and Young Adults at the First United Presbyterian Church, who led the Quorum Court in prayer. S. Madison the led them in the Pledge of Allegiance.
- 95.3 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** 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.
- 95.4 **MEMBER ABSENT:** Daniel Balls.
- 95.5 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Chief of Staff George Butler, County Attorney Steve Zega, County Comptroller Cheryl Bolinger; Interested Citizens; and Members of the Press.
- 95.6 **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA:** Judge Edwards asked if there were any additions or deletions to the agenda. She noted that "Other Business" had been erroneously omitted from the agendas mailed out last week but has been added tonight to the printed copies.
- 95.7 **A motion was made and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented with the inclusion of "Other Business". The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote. The agenda was adopted.**
- 95.8 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Judge Edwards asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the January 14, January 21, and February 18 Quorum Court meetings.
- 95.9 E. Madison stated that she had not had a chance to review the February 18 corrected minutes and was not prepared to vote on them.
- 95.10 **E. Madison made a motion to table approval of these minutes until the next regular meeting. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote.**

- 96.1 A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING BLAKE PENNINGTON TO SOLEMNIZE THE MARRIAGE OF BENJAMIN TYLER LYNCH AND RHONDA MARIE SALZMAN ON MAY 21, 2016, IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, ARKANBSAS: In the absence of D. Balls, E. Madison introduced **A Resolution Authorizing Blake Pennington To Solemnize The Marriage Of Benjamin Tyler Lynch And Rhonda Marie Salzman On May 21, 2016, In Washington County, Arkansas,** and County Attorney Steve Zega read the Resolution.
- 96.2 **E. Madison made a motion to adopt the Resolution. B. Pond seconded.**
- 96.3 CITIZEN COMMENT: Blake Pennington, Benjamin Lynch and Rhonda Salzman were recognized and given a round of applause and best wishes by the Court.
- 96.4 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the Resolution.**
- 96.5 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, and T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present. The resolution was adopted.**
- RESOLUTION NO. 2016-04, BOOK NO. 3, PAGE NO. 138**
- 96.6 TREASURER'S REPORT: County Treasurer Bobby Hill reported from the Treasurer's Financial Summary for March stating that this historically is not a great month for revenue collections. County General, Road and Jail all had expenditures over revenues, but their projections for the quarter is right on target with big tax settlements expected for April and May. He noted that they began March with a balance of \$31.5 million and ended March with a balance of \$24.0 million which is mostly due to paying out \$5.0 million in excess collector's commission that they do every year.
- 96.7 B. Hill reported that the County's 1% sales tax was down by 2% in March, the first decline since April of 2015, which he is not concerned about because they usually have one month like this every year. He stated that the ¼-cent jail sales tax was likewise down by \$14,000 from the same time last year, but they are still up by \$87,000 for the same period in 2015. He reported that the road ½-cent sales tax came in highest this month for the year at \$109,000. He reported that they ended the month better than they started in the Employee Insurance Fund at \$1.5 million.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 3

- 97.1 In response to a question from R. Cochran with regard to the Employee Insurance Fund, B. Hill stated that he believes they have a big claim coming in, but as of April 21 they have a balance of \$1,368,000 in the fund.
- 97.2 COMPTROLLER'S REPORT: In the absence of Comptroller Cheryl Bolinger, Assistant County Comptroller Ashley Farber reported that the ending balance for the Month of March was \$7,833,953 in General Fund Unappropriated Reserves, showing a difference of \$2,389 due to the ordinance passed last month for the Circuit III position. She also addressed the March 2016 Summary of Revenues and expenditures and the Summary Statement of Operations-Expenses by Fund and Department that shows encumbrances and percent used for each department.
- 97.3 A. Harbison addressed the General Fund Unappropriated Reserves for February 2016 and inquired about the transfer of \$268,356 from the Jail Reserves; to which A. Farber explained that a portion was the carryover, as well as the increase they gave for the two jail positions.
- 97.4 A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY JUDGE TO APPLY FOR A BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT ON BEHALF OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE: R. Cochran introduced **A Resolution Authorizing The County Judge To Apply For A Bureau Of Justice Assistance Grant On Behalf Of The Washington County Sheriff's Office**, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the resolution.
- 97.5 **R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the resolution. J. Maxwell seconded.**
- 97.6 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.
- 97.7 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the resolution.**
- 97.8 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, and T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present. The resolution was adopted.**

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-05, BOOK NO. 3, PAGE NO. 139

98.1 A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY JUDGE TO APPLY FOR A BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT: R. Cochran introduced **A Resolution Authorizing The County Judge To Apply For A Bureau Of Justice Assistance Grant**, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the resolution.

98.2 **R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the resolution. G. McHenry seconded.**

98.3 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.

98.4 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the resolution.**

98.5 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, and T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present. The resolution was adopted.**

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-06, BOOK NO. 3, PAGE NO. 140

98.6 A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR A BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT TO BE USED FOR BULLET PROOF VESTS: R. Cochran introduced **A Resolution Authorizing The Submittal Of An Application For A Bureau Of Justice Assistance Grant To Be Used For Bullet Proof Vests**, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the resolution.

98.7 **R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the resolution. J. Maxwell seconded.**

98.8 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.

98.9 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the resolution.**

98.10 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, and T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present. The resolution was adopted.**

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-07, BOOK NO. 3, PAGE NO. 141

- 99.1 AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$28,920 FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO THE SHERIFF-ENFORCEMENT AND SHERIFF-WORK RELEASE BUDGETS; APPROPRIATING THE AMOUNT OF \$13,475 FROM THE JAIL FUND TO THE JAIL BUDGET; RECOGNIZING REVENUES OF \$78,760 IN THE ANIMAL SHELTER GRANT FUND; AND APPROPRIATING THE AMOUNT OF \$84,743 FROM THE ANIMAL SHELTER GRANT FUND TO THE ANIMAL SHELTER GRANT BUDGET FOR 2016: B. Ussery introduced **An Ordinance Appropriating The Total Amount Of \$28,920 From The General Fund To The Sheriff-Enforcement And Sheriff-Work Release Budgets; Appropriating The Amount Of \$13,475 From The Jail Fund To The Jail Budget; Recognizing Revenues Of \$78,760 In The Animal Shelter Grant Fund; And Appropriating The Amount Of \$84,743 From The Animal Shelter Grant Fund To The Animal Shelter Grant Budget For 2016**, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the ordinance.
- 99.2 R. Cochran explained that this ordinance is a combination between Sheriff, Jail and Animal Shelter funds combined. On the surface, this might look like they are appropriating money, but actually in Articles 1 and 2, this is a reimbursement back from duties that the Sheriff's Department performed by contract for University of Arkansas athletic events and in Articles 3 and 4, these are monies moving out of a revenue line item for the donations to the Animal Shelter moving into their grant fund.
- 99.3 **R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the ordinance. R. Dennis seconded.**
- 99.4 E. Madison stated that she knows they accepted a check from the Animal League that they asked to be designated for capital purposes and questioned how they ensured that it went for capital purposes when it did not end up in the capital line item; to which Animal Shelter Director Angela Ledgerwood responded that this is included in this ordinance under the Building Materials and Supplies along with the money from the Lib Horn's estate.
- 99.5 E. Madison asked what the capital plans are for this money; to which A. Ledgerwood responded she has talked to Animal League Director Carmen Nelson about an awning project over their entire walkway and part of their kennel runs so the Work Release inmates can work outside walking dogs when it is raining lightly.
- 99.6 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.

100.1 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.**

100.2 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, and T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present. The ordinance was adopted.**

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-19, BOOK NO. 10, PAGE NO. 415

100.3 AN ORDINANCE SUSPENDING JESAP POLICIES FOR CERTAIN PERSONNEL POSITIONS; CHANGING THE TITLE OF A JUVENILE OFFICER POSITION TO A JUVENILE INTAKE DIVERSION OFFICER IN THE CIRCUIT COURT III BUDGET; CREATING AN ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL POSITION IN THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY'S BUDGET; AND APPROPRIATING THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$36,072 FROM THE GENERAL TO PERSONAL SERVICES LINE ITEMS IN THE CIRCUIT COURT III AND PROSECUTING ATTORNEY BUDGETS FOR 2016: B. Pond introduced **An Ordinance Suspending JESAP Policies For Certain Personnel Positions; Changing The Title Of A Juvenile Officer Position To A Juvenile Intake Diversion Officer In The Circuit Court III Budget; Creating An Additional Personnel Position In The Prosecuting Attorney's Budget; And Appropriating The Total Amount Of \$36,072 From The General To Personal Services Line Items In The Circuit Court III and Prosecuting Attorney Budgets For 2016,** and County Attorney Steve Zega read the ordinance.

100.4 **B. Pond made a motion to adopt the ordinance. R. Dennis seconded.**

100.5 S. Madison stated that she is still uneasy with the language of suspending JESAP policies and asked for an explanation of why and what they were suspending; to which B. Pond responded the policy is that if they are going to do something like this, that it needs to be brought before the Quorum Court and to their attention that they are creating a position because JESAP policy is not to create something like this outside the budget process.

100.6 S. Madison stated that she interprets B. Pond's explanation that it should have gone to JESAP but it did not; to which L. Ecke stated that her understanding from what Lindsy Huffaker, Human Resources Director, had advised them the last time this occurred was that suspending JESAP policy was necessary because the position was created mid-year and not at the beginning of the budget process. She stated if it had been at the

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 7

beginning of the budget process, they would not come to the full Quorum Court for any approval whatsoever, but since it is mid-year, they have to suspend the rules and come to the Quorum Court for approval for this position.

101.1 B. Pond added that this position did go through JESAP as well.

101.2 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.

101.3 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.**

101.4 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present. The ordinance was adopted.**

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-20, BOOK NO. 10, PAGE NO. 417

101.5 AN ORDINANCE ANTICIPATING AND APPROPRIATING REVENUE OF \$63,529 IN THE DRUG COURT GRANT FUND FOR 2016: R. Cochran introduced **An Ordinance Anticipating And Appropriating Revenue Of \$63,529 In The Drug Court Grant Fund For 2016**, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the ordinance.

101.6 **R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the ordinance. The motion was seconded.**

101.7 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.

101.8 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.**

101.9 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present. The ordinance was adopted.**

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-21, BOOK NO. 10, PAGE NO. 419

101.10 COUNTY JUDGE REPORT: Judge Edwards stated that a representative of the Washington Water Authority had planned to be present to give their

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 8

annual report at this meeting, but as they are working on a water project, they have rescheduled for the next regular meeting on May 19.

- 102.1 COMMITTEE REPORTS: E. Madison reported that the County Services Committee met on April 4 and heard a presentation from Elizabeth Bowen at the Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning Commission on the Commission's work on a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for all of Northwest Arkansas and that they expect county lands may be implicated at some point. She stated that they further heard a year in planning report from Juliet Richey from their Planning Department that continues to be busy; and a year-end report from John Adams with the Information Technology Department on the work that his department concluded for 2015.
- 102.2 E. Madison reported that the Committee discussed community sewer systems and Grant Administrator Renee Biby brought to them an ordinance reinstating some previous requirements that they had dropped because the State had them. However, the State thereafter dropped the requirements, so the County wants to put them back in and there are some folks present to discuss this later in the agenda.
- 102.3 E. Madison stated that B. Pond brought a resolution to the Committee supporting the Springdale City Council and naming part of the northern bypass after a deceased police officer that will be discussed later in the agenda as well.
- 102.4 E. Madison reported that the Committee also discussed some recent animal issues as well as County's Animal Concerns Advisory Board, and will continue these discussions in a future committee meeting.
- 102.5 H. Bowman reported that the Public Works Committee did not meet this month due to lack of an agenda.
- 102.6 B. Ussery reported that the Ordinance Review Committee met on April 18 and have completed their review of the first two chapters of the County's Code. They plan to present these at the next Quorum Court meeting, some of the changes they would like to recommend for the ordinance, such as changing the language of "smoking" to "tobacco use" which is more inclusive.
- 102.7 B. Pond reported that the Personnel Committee met on April 11 and heard a request from the Judge Stacey Zimmerman, Circuit Court, Division III, for a salary increase for a Juvenile Officer position; and Juvenile Court

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 9

Services Director Norma Frisbee addressed the committee stating that there is already someone in a Juvenile Officer position that has been doing case work, but is acquiring additional duties. This new position will be responsible for monitoring up to 10 ankle monitors, as well as keeping up with the equipment, website and software in order to track the youth. He noted that committee voted to pass this request onto the full Quorum Court with a do-pass recommendation. B. Pond reiterated that anytime these position requests come to the Committee, they have first gone through JESAP and been approved.

- 103.1 B. Pond reported that the Committee also heard a request from Prosecuting Attorney Matt Durrett for a new Assistant Case Coordinator position and this new position and job description was rated at a JESAP meeting. This is a supervisory position and will be responsible for keeping cases flowing in and out of the offices as there is currently too much work for two part-time people to handle, and the request was that one part-time position be changed to full time. The Committee also voted to pass this request to the full Quorum Court with a do-pass recommendation.
- 103.2 T. Lundstrum reported that the Jail/Law Enforcement/Courts Committee did not meet this month due to lack of an agenda.
- 103.3 AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY TO DO BUSINESS WITH ALLEN REED AND PAUL REED: A. Harbison introduced **An Ordinance Authorizing The County To Do Business With Allen Reed and Paul Reed**, and County Attorney Steve Zega read the ordinance that was tabled at the March regular meeting.
- 103.4 A. Harbison explained that this ordinance would allow the County to do business and buy dirt from the Reeds, but since Travis Reed is employed by the County, the approval of the Quorum Court is required in order to do this. She referred to a quote from the Architect Frank Lloyd Wright, "Follow the truth, not the facts", stating that this is very appropriate to this issue because the truth is that this is good dirt and the facts are that the geological survey states this is poor dirt, but there are pockets of good dirt.
- 103.5 **A. Harbison made a motion to adopt the ordinance. B. Pond seconded.**
- 103.6 S. Zega stated that this motion was out of order as it is not an appropriation ordinance and will require three readings.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 10

- 104.1 T. Lundstrum stated that he still has a problem with the County doing business with family members of Washington County employees. Even though he does not believe they are trying to do anything sneaky, the perception of those outside the Quorum Court may be different. He stated also that he would like to see some detailed numbers on the project as far as the cost of the road to the dirt pit which has to be sufficient to get their trucks in and out of the site or as far as the cost per load to haul the dirt including employee and equipment costs. He stated he could not support the ordinance at this time and would suggest that they table it one more time to get the figures together. He stated they tend to act like this is free because the County is doing it themselves, but it is costing taxpayer money to do it.
- 104.2 **T. Lundstrum made a motion to table the ordinance. E. Madison seconded.**
- 104.3 Judge Edwards pointed out that there were people from the Road Department present that are prepared to give a presentation and provide figures on this project.
- 104.4 **S. Madison called for a point of order regarding the motion to table.**
- 104.5 County Attorney Steve Zega stated that the motion to table takes precedence and is not subject to debate, so they need to vote on that motion before further discussion.
- 104.6 **Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to table the ordinance.**
- 104.7 **VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Patterson, H. Bowman, S. Lloyd, and T. Lundstrum. VOTING AGAINST: J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, B. Pond, B. Ussery, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, and A. Harbison. The motion to table the ordinance failed with six members voting for and eight members voting against the motion.**
- 104.8 **R. Cochran made a motion to allow the Road Department to speak to this issue at this time. T. Lundstrum seconded. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote.**
- 104.9 County Road Superintendent Charles Ward and Assistant Road Superintendent Brad Phillips addressed the Quorum Court stating that they wanted to be able to answer all questions with regard to this dirt pit for everyone concerned. An aerial map was shown off of Highway 71

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 11

South that set out where the proposed Winslow Dirt Pit would be located, as well as a map of the existing County-operated dirt pit locations and the State-Aid projects. The long distance was pointed out from the southern part of the County to any of the dirt pits, as well as the fact that the County receives no State aid for that area. By opening the Winslow Dirt Pit, it will save the County in mileage, wear and tear on trucks, oil changes, and should minimize accidents coming off of the Highway 16 pit as their exposure to heavy traffic roads would be minimized.

- 105.1 In response to a question from JP Dennis, Brad Phillips stated that they will be required to go through ADEQ to obtain permits for drainage, runoff, and sediment.
- 105.2 S. Lloyd asked if it was possible to figure an estimated cost benefit analysis on the total anticipated cost compared to the total benefits for the County; to which Brad Phillips stated that this information is included in the Quorum Court's packet on Page 46. It states that, "The cost savings for this comes in the form of significantly reduced wear and tear on equipment (including mileage and maintenance, including tires), fuel costs, and labor. With an average of five trucks a day running from Highway 16, it comes out to 375 miles round trip; three trips a day equal 1,125 miles a day. This type of mileage of vehicles results in a \$230 oil change/per truck every two weeks, and \$2,800 in tires/per truck approximately every month. In comparison, with one truck running from Winslow, twice the number of trips can be made (six trips), coming out to 14 miles round trip; with only 720 miles being put on the equipment. Additionally, the savings in labor for one employee verses three would also have to be factored in at their current rate of pay.
- 105.3 Judge Edwards reported that recently Lindsey pit increased their rate per load from \$3.50 to \$4.00.
- 105.4 B. Ussery commended the Road Superintendents for putting together this presentation which was very thorough and answered all of his questions. He stated that he has had a call from a resident in this area who just wants the roads fixed and urged the County to get this matter resolved. It was further pointed out that there is no other place to obtain red dirt in this area. He appreciates this information.
- 105.5 T. Lundstrum questioned what the road was costing; to which Brad Phillips stated that this was included in the packet on Page 43. The existing haul road cost approximately \$14,000.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 12

- 106.1 T. Lundstrum stated that what he is looking for when talking about a cost analysis, they would need to take the total cost to do it and add that to the price per load of dirt over some period of time. Further, he is not sure that this only red dirt in this part of the County and it belongs to the family of one of their supervisors which creates a perception.
- 106.2 Brad Phillips responded that the County would like to know if there is anyone in this area that has red dirt and is willing to sell it.
- 106.3 In further response to a question from T. Lundstrum, it was noted that the way this would be the same as with their Highway 16 dirt pit, the County would dig, load and haul the dirt. Les Rogers would charge around \$12 a load if they did this work rather than the County doing it.
- 106.4 Charles Ward stated that in the short run, it looks like this is costing them more, but if they can keep this pit open long enough to repair several roads in the area, the cost savings from hauling the red dirt a longer distance and exposing the trucks to more opportunities for accidents and broken windshields, etc. In a three year plan they will be saving money.
- 106.5 R. Cochran noted that the cost savings the report shows does not even mention fuel cost savings and questioned how many loads would they expect to run out of this pit through this summer; to which Charles Ward stated that they estimate 1,000 loads, and Brad Phillips added that this pit could last 10-15 years based on this usage as there is plenty of dirt there.
- 106.6 R. Cochran stated he believes this dirt pit would save the County plenty and he applauds their effort in finding this cost savings which is what they want every department to do in finding more effective and efficient ways to use the County's taxpayer money and he will support this.
- 106.7 S. Madison asked how long the owner of this pit was willing to let them dig in this pit and if they had a contract; to which Brad Phillis stated that the contract will run from year to year; however, there is not one yet at this time as they have been waiting to see if the Quorum Court was going to let them do business with the Reeds.
- 106.8 S. Madison pointed out therefore that they could be making a substantial investment and not know how long they could draw on that investment; and Brad Phillips noted that the Road Department, at the direction of himself and Mr. Ward, built the road to this pit unaware originally that they could not do business with the Reeds because they were family members of one of a county employee.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 13

- 107.1 S. Madison noted her concern over the way the County handled the issue on Smokey Bear, where there was a property owner who let dirt be used from his property and as a consequence the County built him a lake and ADEQ required work to be done on the levy around the lake. She inquired as to what kind of side benefits would accrue to the property owner by virtue of having this dirt pit there; to which Charles Ward pointed out in this scenario, the only thing they will have to do to remediate is to make sure the slope is there, and that there are not vertical drop-offs and this is figured in with the cost savings/trips.
- 107.2 Brad Phillips stated that the cost of \$14,000 includes everything they have done to date and have required them to do until they pulled off of the site.
- 107.3 Charles Ward further explained that what they intended to do is to open up 3-4 acres at a time and as they get done with that 3-4 acres, they would remediate as they go which is using a bulldozer and trimming the slope back so it is not a vertical slope, applying grass seed, and closing the area and then move onto the next section. The expense for this remediation has not been physically put in there because as they are digging, they can be remediating and the grass seed would be the biggest expense in the remediation.
- 107.4 S. Madison stated that this situation to her is much more egregious than the issue on Smokey Bear because there is close family involvement with the County. It does not pass her smell test, and she finds it hard to believe that it did not occur to the two Road Superintendents that they were working on the property of a family member of a county employee; to which Brad Phillips clarified that they knew this to be the case. What they did not realize was that they could not do it because of it being a family member without an ordinance.
- 107.5 Charles Ward added that as far as the issue with Smokey Bear, the resident gave the county the dirt and he ended up with a pond. The cost was not there for the dirt and the cost was not there to build a road to get the dirt out.
- 107.6 J. Maxwell asked if cost of future remediation would be any different than what they would anticipate with other red dirt pits they currently run and are currently assuming that cost in obtaining that red dirt; and Charles Ward was explained that the cost and remediation would be the same.
- 107.7 In response to J. Maxwell, Charles Ward further clarified that the County had a previous signed contract with this property owner as they believed they were in compliance.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 14

- 108.1 J. Maxwell echoed B. Ussery's statements regarding the thoroughness of this report and proactiveness in trying to answer as many questions ahead of time. In response to his question whether if approved, did they have a set minimum number of years that they would ask the Reeds to agree to so if the county invests upfront costs for the road, he would want them to amortized out over a long enough period of time that it makes financial sense; to Brad Phillips stated that they would like to go with five years and do not expect any resistance from the Reeds on this. In further explanation of his previous statement, Mr. Phillips stated the cost of \$12 per load would be for someone buying red dirt off of someone else with that individual doing the same thing the County is doing but he is selling it. He would be paying \$12 to loading his own trucks, and then the cost per load would be higher than that. The County currently loads its own trucks.
- 108.2 E. Madison asked what red dirt would cost per load delivered to the work site; to which Brad Phillips was explained it would depend on the distance they were hauling it, but just to buy the red dirt out of a red dirt pit, it would cost \$40-\$45 per load for them to take their trucks to a pit and have them load the dirt.
- 108.3 E. Madison inquired about the cost of having Les Rogers carry the red dirt from their pit to the south part of the County to cut out all of those costs to the county; to which Brad Phillips guessed this would run around \$110-\$120 a load. Charles Ward added that this would also depend on where they were getting the dirt as well.
- 108.4 E. Madison stated she appreciates the information provided, but the Road Department did not actually price it out to see what it would cost in the marketplace; to which Brad Phillips questioned why they would compare it to the marketplace when they would still be hauling their own dirt from another pit that they did compare for a cost savings.
- 108.5 E. Madison explained her logic that they do not know whether they save money until it is bid it out and get a price from a third party in that business; to which Charles Ward stated that they can definitely look into this.
- 108.6 E. Madison further asked how it is determined that there is enough dirt at this location for 1,000 loads per year for five years; to which Charles Ward and Brad Phillips explained that it is half a mountain side over 20 acres and the Reeds will let them go back as far as they want to with 1,000 loads coming off of approximately 1/2 acre.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 15

- 109.1 E. Madison inquired about testing for the depth of bedrock at this site and stated she was concerned about the information Arkansas Dem-Gazette Reporter Scarlet Sims learned from the USDA about the quality of this soil and asked what has been done in this regard; and Charles Ward explained that the Road Department actually had a geo-technician from Arcon take samples to test which was declared to be adequate to use for road fill.
- 109.2 E. Madison stated like T. Lundstrum, she is troubled by the closeness of the familial relationship as they are talking about the Bridge Supervisor's Dad and Brother and questioned the efforts made to find someone else with red dirt in this area of the County; to which Charles Ward explained that they are trying to be smart about it looking geographically so they do not have to travel on miles of dirt road which would affect residents with dust, etc., This particular situation just works coming onto a main State highway with relatively low traffic in the southern Winslow area.
- 109.3 Brad Phillips further reported that he and Charles Ward traveled to 10-12 farms in the area, knocked on doors, spoke to the people, and left their business cards. The people who said they would think about it did not show any interest by contacting them back.
- 109.4 In further response to E. Madison, Charles Ward stated that it was all physical contact and they did not follow up their visits with letters nor did they advertise in the newspaper. They physically went around and contacted people who generally had large portion of land that were geographically ideal for the trucks to not cause damage to their roads or other public roads.
- 109.5 E. Madison asked whether the \$14,000 road cost included equipment costs; and Charles Ward responded that this amount included equipment costs, fuel, man hour labor, gravel and road crossing installed. He will provide a breakdown of this information.
- 109.6 E. Madison inquired about the additional steps that needed to be taken with seeking permission from neighbors; to which Brad Phillips and Charles Ward responded that this was because they are moving a portion of the existing road that they started as it was determined by the Planning Board that the sight distance out of the original planned exit was not sufficient and by moving that road, they can allow for that sight distance. They currently have verbal permission from the neighbors, but nothing in writing at this time.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 16

- 110.1 E. Madison pointed out that sometimes people can be put on the spot when someone knocks at their door to ask for such permission and believes that a letter received in the mail with time to respond is a better way to go; to which Brad Phillips pointed out that these neighbors were contacted by phone, but this is all preliminary as they have been in a holding pattern waiting to see if they will be able to do business there. It would be a waste of everyone's time to try to do some of these things before the Quorum Court approves this ordinance.
- 110.2 E. Madison asked if the Planning Board has given their full recommendation; to which Juliet Richey responded they did not. Charles Ward added that their biggest issue is knowing whether they can do business with Paul Reed and if not, then what they have done up till now has been in vain.
- 110.3 S. Lloyd verified with Charles Ward that a contract with the Reeds would specify how long the County can haul dirt from this site and that the section that they would be working in is approximately 15-20 acres. Also Charles Ward verified that there will be a mandatory sediment pond required by ADEQ to catch the sediment, but the County would not be remediating in any way to make a pond. It was further reiterated that the cost per load from this dirt pit would be \$3.50 per load.
- 110.4 A. Harbison stated she sees this as a win-win situation for the county as they get dirt cheap to repair several miles of roads in this portion of the County. She reported that she has driven a school bus on Bunyard Road and knows the condition of this road which needs reconditioning very badly. The Road Department does their best to keep roads in this area graded and with gravel, but they need to be built up because the population is starting to increase in this area since they have water out there. She reported paying \$110 a load for some red dirt from Les Rogers which did not include the distance haul. She stated that she looks at things realistically and she has confidence that the Road Department can build good roads with this material and it is a win-win situation for her constituents as well. A. Harbison pointed out if the Quorum Court does not approve doing business with this dirt pit, they might have to transfer the \$1.2 million back from reserves into the Road Fund in order to get these roads repaired.
- 110.5 R. Dennis stated that he came into this meeting perfectly balanced on this issue and though he reads the book that says to avoid the appearance of all evil, he sees absolutely no evil here. Northwest Arkansas is small and there are a lot of people that are akin and can work together. He further

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 17

made several calculations that showed extreme savings in every area, commending both the Road Superintendents and the Reeds for their efforts. He noted that he called around and got good references and he also received some calls on some good references. He also gave his personal testimony on Bridge Supervisor Travis Reed noting that everyone was working on the Stonewall Bridge construction and Travis Reed was running the show. He realizes that the appearance of this may not look right, but he will support this dirt pit based on the County Attorney saying it is legal, the money savings, and the convenience of the dirt pit.

- 111.1 R. Cochran noted that this is a huge savings and he will continue to support the dirt pit. He inquired whether they should include in their ordinance that they secure a 5-year period and that the Reeds delineate the area that the County would be able to mine; to which County Attorney Zega responded that he actually thought about that but his hesitation in doing that is that essentially the Quorum Court's role is to determine whether or not they do business with the Reeds, with the other side being equal contracting parties. He is not sure whether they can force a five year contract on them.
- 111.2 R. Cochran suggested that when the Road Department negotiates a new contract, that they try to get a five year term and have the Reeds delineate the area that they will be able to mine so they know they will have an adequate supply for 5,000 loads and that they contract rate set and locked in at \$3.50 per load for five years.
- 111.3 **B. Pond made a motion to suspend the rules and place the ordinance on second reading by title only. R. Cochran seconded.**
- 111.4 **Judge Edwards called for a roll call vote on the motion to suspend the rules.**
- 111.5 **VOTING FOR: J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, B. Pond, B. Ussery, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, and S. Lloyd. VOTING AGAINST: E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Patterson, H. Bowman, and T. Lundstrum. The motion failed with nine members voting in favor and five members voting against the motion. The motion to suspend the rules and place the ordinance on second reading by title only failed.**
- 111.6 County Attorney stated that the ordinance would now need to proceed to the next Quorum Court meeting for second reading.
- 111.7 **A short recess was taken at this time.**

- 112.1 **AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE AMENDING WASHINGTON COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 2.7 IN REGARD TO DANGEROUS, POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS, AND HAZARDOUS ANIMALS:** E. Madison introduced **An Emergency Ordinance Amending Washington County Code Chapter 2.7 In Regard To Dangerous, Potentially Dangerous, And Hazardous Animals.**
- 112.2 **E. Madison made a motion to read the ordinance by title only. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote.**
- 112.3 County Attorney Steve Zega read **An Emergency Ordinance Amending Washington County Code Chapter 2.7 In Regard To Dangerous, Potentially Dangerous, And Hazardous Animals** by title only.
- 112.4 E. Madison explained that S. Madison, B. Ussery and she wanted to bring this ordinance back because there were some people absent from the last meeting and additionally, some were unfamiliar with the ordinance, especially the "Hazardous Animal" addition at the last meeting and she was concerned that the newness of some of it may have resulted in people's reluctance to vote on it.
- 112.5 E. Madison stated that she was curious about making a motion to sever the original ordinance and then address the Hazardous Animals ordinance separately because she believes that there is a difference in opinion over those.
- 112.6 County Attorney Steve Zega responded to E. Madison questioning whether she was asking if she can strip out the parts of the ordinance that deal with the "Hazardous Animal" definitions and essentially take it back to the original ordinance.
- 112.7 E. Madison explained she is worried that they may have lost some votes because of that addition and while she appreciates B. Ussery's work on that for which she joined, she felt they should give members the chance to vote on the two ordinances separately. She stated she thought it was a motion to sever or to split an issue.
- 112.8 S. Zega stated that it seems to him what they have before them would need to be amended to do that. He explained with a motion to sever, you have two distinct issues on the floor and the last time it was done, A. Harbison had moved for two things and E. Madison moved to split them into two distinct issues, which was clearly proper. However, what is

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 19

before them now is published as #18.1 and they do not have an alternative in front of the Court and while they could make a main motion first and then move to split that motion, but he is not sure how the mechanics of that would work. He stated in order to do what he thinks she is asking, he believes she would need to do a straight amendment and strike out all portions referring to "Hazardous Animals."

- 113.1 **E. Madison made a motion to adopt the ordinance with the amendments to remove the "Hazardous Animal" provisions, and the emergency clause.**
- 113.2 S. Zega responded to E. Madison's motion stating that they cannot vote to pass the ordinance yet because it has not been read three times, so they would need to amend it and then pass it, especially as they are striking the emergency clause. Further, he stated that it will take him some time to go through the ordinance and strike all references to "Hazardous Animals".
- 113.3 **E. Madison withdrew her motion.**
- 113.4 **E. Madison made a motion to amend the ordinance by removing "Hazardous Animals" and the emergency clause. S. Madison seconded.**
- 113.5 A. Harbison stated since they had two issues with the emergency clause and the "Hazardous Animal" clauses, they need to be voted on separately; to which E. Madison responded that would be a motion to sever; to which S. Zega responded stating that these issues can be voted on separately or together.
- 113.6 **A. Harbison made a motion to sever this motion to vote on these two items separately. The motion died for lack of a second.**
- 113.7 L. Ecke asked if they are talking about just removing the wording and definition of "Hazardous Animals" or the entire amendment presented by B. Ussery; to which it was explained they are talking about the entire amendment.
- 113.8 In response to a question from Judge Edwards whether he was okay with this; B. Ussery stated that he is confused as to why they would want to do this because the whole purpose of the work he did on the ordinance was so they could have balance. He stated that the way it was initially, according to the meetings they held, they would be tying the officer's hand who was responding to a call and he would have no choice but to either

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 20

put the animal up give them nothing. He stated if they pull this "Hazardous Animals" language out of the ordinance, part of it passes and part of it does not, they will be right back where they were and he certainly cannot support that.

- 114.1 In response to B. Ussery's comments, E. Madison stated her concern was that they lost some votes and it failed the last time because of the addition of the "Hazardous Animals" and she is trying to give people the opportunity to split the issues and is not trying to rule it out, but do it in phases and get something passed rather than nothing.
- 114.2 J. Maxwell stated that he thought what A. Harbison suggested a while ago is identical to what he thought he heard E. Madison suggest initially and that was to sever them, make them two separate issues, and approach them on two different votes so if the majority of them are in favor of part of it, but not all of it, it would not kill it all.
- 114.3 S. Zega responded to J. Maxwell stating that he is accurate in his perception, but until the ordinance in front of them was presented as #18.1. As it is drafted and presents problems for him in going through and crossing out just the "Hazardous Animals" and then later going back and essentially amending it at the same point. He further explained that his suggestion was that E. Madison states all of her amendments at once for that reason and then they could have a motion to sever which was A. Harbison's motion. He stated that it is not that they cannot eventually do exactly what she suggested; it was that they need to get the whole thing on the floor and then start splitting it.
- 114.4 B. Pond stated that because of the input received and discussion they have had on this issue, he was prepared to vote for this ordinance in its present form the way it appears as #18.1. He stated that he would like to have J. Maxwell's amendment in there as well, but he was going to settle for this. However, he will not support the motion to sever or the ordinance if they start amending and splitting it.
- 114.5 S. Madison stated if E. Madison's motion succeeds and they are back at the original ordinance and it passes, was there anything to keep them from also passing tonight the additions by B. Ussery; to which County Attorney Zega responded that he understands E. Madison's motion to be to strike the "Hazardous Animal" language so there is nothing preventing them from doing that, but then the question would be why strike the language worked on and added by B. Ussery and then add it right back.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 21

- 115.1 S. Madison stated that while she loved B. Ussery's amendment to the ordinance, she had a hard time voting for it last meeting because she felt it had been sprung on some of them and had not been vetted as thoroughly as the rest of the ordinance and felt it would jeopardize the entire ordinance and this seems to be what happened. She stated if they pass the original ordinance at this meeting to satisfy JP Pond, she would like for them to have the chance to pass B. Ussery's amendment tonight as well which she believes County Attorney Zega has said they might be able to do.
- 115.2 S. Zega responded to S. Madison's statements, that any ordinance is essentially amendable at the will of the Court at any point in time, but he just does not know why they would at the same meeting pass it as law and then amend what they passed as law.
- 115.3 S. Madison stated her reason is that they do not know what the votes will be until they vote and sometimes they do not decide until right before they vote and she would like for something to pass.
- 115.4 B. Ussery stated the reason he did what he did was because that was what he could support and he could not support the ordinance in its original form. Further, he believes part of the reason it failed at their last meeting was because people did not have time to study it and they have had plenty of time now. He stated that these amendments were made not on a whim or something that they could either take or not take, because he is very adamant that without his changes, he will not support the ordinance.
- 115.5 R. Cochran echoed B. Ussery's statements that they received the changes in the ordinance late in the game and he did not support it because of that. However, he has now reviewed it and is in full support of #18.1, primarily because it is enforceable and as it originally stood, it was not enforceable by their law enforcement. He will support #18.1 in its full form tonight, but nothing less.
- 115.6 H. Bowman stated that he has read the ordinance and all the proposed changes; has read other county and state's ordinances; and has had numerous vigorous conversations with people who love animals and support animal protection. However, he has not had one single discussion about this situation where people did not acknowledge the fact that pet owners have an obligation to not allow their pets to present a threatening situation and currently, he does not believe this ordinance covers that. He referred to Union County's ordinance on this issue which is far less

detailed, there is less legalese involved, and it addresses exactly what they are talking about here. He stated it gives law enforcement an opportunity to take matters into their hands when an animal is determined to be a vicious or threatening animal. He pointed out that people using public right-of-ways have a right not to be threatened. He addressed an interesting email from one of his constituents about the rights of individuals to have pets and he made some good points; however, he omitted the fact that the public all has a right to be up and down that road without being threatened or challenged. He stated that it is time for them to take action on this issue and while he believes they can do without the emergency clause, he would like to see them move forward with the rest of the ordinance.

- 116.1 **E. Madison withdrew her motion to amend the ordinance by removing “Hazardous Animals” and the emergency clause. S. Madison withdrew her second.**
- 116.2 **E. Madison made a motion to adopt the ordinance (#18.1) in its original form. The motion was seconded.**
- 116.3 J. Maxwell stated every constituent who called him and who he is supposed to represent had the same concern which was with the “hazardous” part wherein if their dog was not chained or fenced up, it would pertain to them in some form or fashion; and if interpreted just right, would be considered a possibility of approaching and impeding a cyclist. He stated the way this ordinance is written in its current form, a pet owner without a fence will not be allowed to tie their dog up and further, will be required to pay for the chipping of their dog, for building a fence, etc. It looked to him as with their perceptions as well, that instead of managing by exception, they are managing a whole lot of dogs, with 45-50 that are causing them problems in the County. He noted while this is no small number of dogs, compared to the number of dogs they have in the County, it is a very small fraction; and if you are the person that, that one dog or 50 of those dogs individually come after, it is a very important and serious issue that needs to be addressed.
- 116.4 J. Maxwell stated that the “hazardous” part of this ordinance does two things. It puts people who intentionally live in the county and do not live under a leash law and want their animals to roam free will not be able to do that to some degree; it are those animals that are not a threat to someone and do not have malicious intent are the ones he is speaking to, Secondly, he stated rather than managing by exception, they are managing all of this and his concern is that the majority of the calls to the

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 23

Sheriff's Department are for animal control. If they do this, they have given him a whole new job with a whole lot of man hours that to manage this number of phone calls and documentations to make for animals that are not showing vicious behavior, not threatening and not menacing, but just happens to run along the side of the road and someone feels like might leap into their path and feels threatened, they are using a really wide spread ordinance to opening this up broad spread instead of just really addressing the animals that are truly a threat to walkers, joggers, bikers, etc.

- 117.1 J. Maxwell stated he feels they could handle this in a much more concise way and really get to the heart of the problem without giving the Sheriff's Department a voluminous amount of calls, effort and man hours to be spent on that, nor will they be punishing community county residents who live in the county for a reason and do not have a vicious dog, but who just have a dog that is being a dog. Therefore, he stated as the ordinance #18.1 now stands, he will be voting against it for those reasons.
- 117.2 A. Harbison stated she is not satisfied with the ordinance in its present form because it does not protect livestock. She reported two calls just this week regarding calves, small cows and heifers being killed by packs of dogs. She concurs with H. Bowman that all people should be responsible for their animals and if they cause damage, then they need to pay for those damages, whether it is a biker attacked or livestock killed. She reported speaking extensively with Shelter Director Angela Ledgerwood and Animal Control Officer Lori Hodges about this and it comes down to sufficient evidence to prosecute. This ordinance is just a piece of paper and if the Sheriff does not write tickets, it does not mean anything, so it comes down to what the Sheriff's Department is willing to do. She questioned what type of evidence with inexpensive modern technology they can use to protect their farmers and small livestock owners from packs of dogs. She is aware of the State law that allows those people to shoot these animals but often people will be not be out there to witness the attack or will be present without a gun. She further wants an exemption for farm dogs from the confinement because county roads run between their houses and their pastures and those dogs protect their owners and livestock as work animals. A. Harbison stated she wants to come back with some amendments to this ordinance for something that would make it work as they are focusing on hikers and bikers and there are other issues that it needs to be included. She stated she is unsure whether she will vote on this ordinance at this time or not because she does not see anything in this ordinance different than what they already have because the Sheriff's Department currently has the ability to write

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 24

tickets and pick up dogs that have attacked people. She noted another situation of people out in the county who hoard dogs creating problems.

- 118.1 R. Cochran addressed page 73 under (a) under "Potentially dangerous animal", noting that it uses the word "human" and in the section above under Hazardous animal . . . , the word "person" is used instead. He questioned whether the word "human" would be better read as "person".
- 118.2 County Attorney Steve Zega responded to R. Cochran, and concurs that the language should be consistent throughout the ordinance. He further addressed something R. Cochran had brought to his attention at their last meeting which should have resulted in them removing the "vending machine" language; however, it still appears in Sec. 2.7-22(b) of the ordinance.
- 118.3 **R. Cochran made a motion to amend the ordinance, changing the word "human" in various sections on Page 73 to the word "person" and remove "vending machine" language from the last sentence of subparagraph (b).**
- 118.4 **E. Madison agreed to accept R. Cochran's motion as a friendly amendment, suggesting that all language following "inanimate object" in the last sentence of subparagraph (b) be removed from the ordinance.**
- 118.5 **B. Ussery made a motion to amend the ordinance striking subparagraph (b)(1) on Page 78 that refers to requiring an animal owner to acquire liability insurance.**
- 118.6 **E. Madison agreed to accept B. Ussery's motion as a friendly amendment.**
- 118.7 B. Ussery reported from all research he has done on this issue, he does not believe it is at all practical, in more ways than one. He further referred to Page 73 under potentially dangerous animal . . . (a), noting it refers to "...inflicts bites on a human or a domestic animal..." which would cover A. Harbison's concern that the ordinance did not cover or protect livestock. With respect to the comments made regarding overloading the Sheriff's Department, he noted that the Sheriff's Department was involved in drafting this ordinance as well as conducting additional training on their part to make sure they knew what to do. With respect to being able to identify the offending dog, he stated that many of the bikers wear cameras now that record everything.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 25

- 119.1 B. Ussery stated that this ordinance was drafted so as to protect county residents and give the Sheriff's Department as much latitude as they can when responding to a call, they can deem an animal "hazardous" so they would not have to haul the animal off or euthanize it. However, he explained if they remove the "hazardous animal" portion of the ordinance, then the Sheriff's Department has no choice and their hands would be tied.
- 119.2 J. Maxwell addressed subparagraph (a) under "Hazardous animal . . ." on Page 73 of the ordinance that defines this as "An animal, regardless of breed, that, when unprovoked: chases or approaches a person without menacing or without an apparent attitude of attack . . ." stating to him it seems that if animals, just being animals, approach without menacing or without an apparent attitude of attack, the outcome is that this owner would have to pay for microchipping, and make a decision to either lock that animal up or build a fence as he cannot tie it up; or the next time the Sheriff's Department received a call on the animal, it would move up the ladder to a "potentially dangerous animal". He stated that his concern with this is that they are actually broadening the net to the point where any animal, being an animal, which applies to a lot of them, this is starting the process of incurring costs to the dog owner when the dog has done nothing threatening and putting the dog in the process of easily being labeled "Potentially Dangerous Animal" when it actually had not been dangerous.
- 119.3 H. Bowman stated that he is sympathetic with A. Harbison and J. Maxwell's comments about farm animals where there are such issues that are very difficult to deal with and at this point, he does not have a solution. He explained that there could be a Doberman, a Pit Bull, and a Collie that all have quite different temperaments, but are considered farm animals and when/if they present menacing behavior, it would be hard to differentiate whether it was menacing or just friendly behavior. He stated it seems to him that they have a bigger problem than trying to differentiate between these farm animals in that situation; because when they have cyclists being attacked and legs being ripped apart, they need to do something. He understands the comments made and issues presented, and questioned how they can separate the two kinds of animals being encountered as above noting that he has yet heard a solution proposed.
- 119.4 A. Harbison reported from talking with their Animal Control Officer, Lori Hodges, she stated the policies and rules of the Sheriff's Department are if something is chasing a bike, they go out and give a warning and if it repeats this chasing behavior and they receive a second call, then they

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 26

receive a ticket. She stated that a "vicious animal" in the county needs to be immediately picked up and the owner should be issued an immediate ticket; however, these are policies and rules within the Sheriff's Department that the Quorum Court has no control over. She concurred with H. Bowman that she has not heard of one nor does she have the solution for this problem and she does not believe this ordinance is going to solve anything and reiterated what they currently have on the books is about as good as they can do which is to pick up and quarantine vicious animals and if necessary, euthanize.

- 120.1 B. Pond concurs that it has been touched on many times and made very clear that this ordinance is neither a fix-all nor cure-all, but it does assist Sheriff's Deputies in doing their job and maybe doing their job a little better. He noted he is a farmer and has liability insurance and if any of his several animals gets off of his farm and does damage to another, he is covered by that insurance. He does not think that the ordinance necessarily helps farmers and about the only thing that takes care of farms and farm animals are the farmers. He stated this ordinance has been looked at, discussed, re-discussed and according to the Sheriff's Department, they have made some improvements to what they already had, so he suggested that they just need to vote.
- 120.2 L. Ecke stated if this ordinance passes, it gives the perception that you have to put up a fence if you live in the county and own an animal. She has received several calls questioning why they should have to put up a fence in their yards when they have never had one and their dog stays within their property.
- 120.3 J. Maxwell responded to L. Ecke stating that the paragraph states, "A hazardous animal shall be, from and after their declaration as such by a law enforcement officer, restricted to its owner's property. The owner will be responsible for determining how to restrict the animal, so long as the restriction is humane and provides for adequate exercise and protection from the elements of the animal. The hazardous animal must not be tied or tethered to an inanimate object such as a tree, post, mailbox or vending machine." He stated they are restricted logically to take an animal that is not vicious and their only choice would be to build a fence if you do not have one already which would be the only way to contain the animal without tying it to an inanimate object
- 120.4 L. Ecke suggested they look for a way to strike the language that gives the perception that you have to build a fence if you are an animal owner out in the County.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 27

- 121.1 Angela Ledgerwood, Director of the Animal Shelter, addressed the Quorum Court stating that trolley systems are available that are not a fence nor tethering a dog to an inanimate object; rather, the dog can run the distance of the trolley allowing the dog to not get off of its property, but still have adequate room to move. She stated she is unsure of the cost of these trolley systems, but does not believe they are very expensive and certainly would not cost as much as a fence.
- 121.2 L. Ecke stated that the trolley systems would require installation of poles if trees were not available to attach to and this is still imposing a cost on county citizens when the majorities have good pets, but yet because of the perception, they are being penalized. She stated before they vote on this, they need to make this language definite and clear that all animals in the county have to be restrained.
- 121.3 B. Ussery stated this language was put in the ordinance in an attempt to protect cyclists riding by properties where the people who do not control their pets that run out into the street, knocking the bikes over and injuring riders on a regular basis. Further, they are trying to figure out a way to protect the farmers so when someone calls in a complaint, the Sheriff's Department does not automatically have to declare the animal to be vicious. He noted the Sheriff reports 80% of the time when they investigate these complaints, the issue goes away and this would deal only with those who have dogs are truly out of control and a problem. B. Ussery stated that there are many people who will not be affected by this if their dogs are under control and this is a way to educate many rural residents who are the exception. He related his own experience as a runner, stating there are many dogs that will run right to the edge of their property and then stop, he will cross over to the other side of the street, and there is no problem. He stated their intent is not to try to tell everyone what to do, but rather educate people on what the rules and expectations are because they need a way to protect the increasing number of people that are going to the country. He stated if there is a better wording or a way to do that, he is more than open to that.
- 121.4 G. McHenry stated his concern with the new "Hazardous Animal" definition goes to what J. Maxwell mentioned in that it almost feels like they are penalizing a dog for being a dog. He noted even with the example B. Ussery gave, if he is running on public property and the dog comes to the edge of its property, he could feel "reasonable fear or apprehension" and at that point in time, it could be declared that dog is causing a hazard. However, this is something that the Sheriff's Department is going to have to determine and in all likelihood, they would not declare that dog

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 28

hazardous, but the potential is there. He noted a couple of things he would like to see happen, that on Page 73 under "Hazardous Animal", subparagraph (a) be stricken because he believes that raises the bar for what it takes to be a hazardous dog. Further, under the "Potentially Dangerous Animal" section, in subparagraph (a), they allow for it to inflict a bite on a human which he is not comfortable with and would like to see any dog that inflicts a bite on a human to be immediately regarded as a dangerous dog as opposed to a potentially dangerous dog. G. McHenry stated he does not think any of them know enough about what potentially could happen out there to give this issue perfect law at this point in time, but at the same time if they pass something, they have the opportunity to go back and amend it as needed based on reports from the Sheriff's Department.

- 122.1 R. Cochran addressed the language in subparagraph (a) under the "Hazardous Animal" section on page 73 noting this is the language that several people have a problem with and asked Detention Major Randall Denzer of the Sheriff's Office whether in practical application since their ordinance will be complaint driven and a decision would need to be made after speaking to the complainant and observing the animal, how will they establish and resolve that a dog is super friendly or could be menacing to the individual. He stated that this is the crux of the problem with the hazardous animal and knowing how the Sheriff's Department can deal with it is going to help them decide whether this language is appropriate.
- 122.2 Major Denzer responded to R. Cochran stating that this will be a tough decision after taking statements from both sides, observing how the animal is acting, and review any evidence if such exists.
- 122.3 R. Cochran stated therefore, if the deputy responding to the call deems that the dog could reasonably have manifested those fears upon that person, then the case would be turned over to the County Prosecutor. On the other hand, if the complaint was made against a small yappy dog, the deputy would deem that it was unlikely from observing the dog's behavior and any other evidence that it was hard to believe there were fears manifested from the dog's demeanor and it would go no further.
- 122.4 In response to R. Cochran's question that given what they currently have and what is being proposed, did the Sheriff's Department have a preference; were they better off with this new version or to just stay with what they have; to which Major Denzer stated that is a difficult decision and one that Sheriff Helder needs to answer.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 29

- 123.1 Judge Edwards stated that T. Lundstrum spoke to Sheriff Helder about this very thing and recognized him to respond to R. Cochran's question.
- 123.2 T. Lundstrum stated that he had a long conversation with Sheriff Helder about this recently and what he appreciates about the ordinance is having an ordinance where they can actually either cite somebody for an actual dangerous dog where somebody has been bitten. He stated that the new version is complaint driven and he does not like the idea of one of their Sheriff deputies having to even look into a situation where a dog just runs out to the edge of the property and scares a biker, but is not menacing or threatening because there is more important work for deputies to be doing. However, Sheriff Helder did appreciate the parts of this ordinance that gives them the authority to take a dog into custody, confine or euthanize a dog if necessary.
- 123.3 B. Ussery responded to T. Lundstrum's report from Sheriff Helder, stating where the Sheriff said there would be education for the 9-1-1 operators so they are trained to ask the right questions and weed out most of the calls that were not worthy of investigation. Sheriff Helder explained when these calls come into 9-1-1, it would only take about 30 seconds to identify which required immediate attention by a deputy to the location; and further have the freedom to put such calls on hold to address more important calls. With regard to the statements made earlier about the dog that runs just to the property line but stops, this provision does not even apply to them, but when they run out into the street onto the public right-of-way, this would take effect. B. Ussery stated that this is aimed at educating people, and by doing this they are actually trying to manage by exception and have the Sheriff's Department go after the problem areas and everyone else can continue to do what they do.
- 123.4 A. Harbison stated when she thinks of a "Hazardous Dog", she does not think of a "vicious" dog, but rather she thinks of a friendly dog who likes to chase cars and bikes, runs in front of a biker causing them to wreck which seems to be more prevalent than anything else that happens. She reiterated that the owner should be responsible for the accident that their dog caused, including medical expenses, and damage done to bikes, but does not believe they have the language in the new ordinance to do that. She believes that the language in the new ordinance potentially would identify such a dog as a vicious or potentially vicious dog and that this ordinance needs more work.
- 123.5 Judge Edwards noted that according to Robert's Rules, each person should only be recognized twice to speak to an issue.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 30

- 124.1 E. Madison stated that it does not do them a lot of good to require that the owner should be responsible for their dog knocking someone off their bike, hurting them and causing them to be off work for a year. She explained that they are already responsible under tort law, but that is assuming the person has the assets to pay for that. She noted that a constituent had an accident that was caused by a dog, was out of work for a lengthy period of time, had to undergo surgery, and has actually been too afraid to go out and ride again. She concurs with A. Harbison that under the law, the owner should be responsible for the actions of their dog, but their goal is prevention.
- 124.2 E. Madison further stated that they talk a lot about what county employees want and they put Major Denzer on the spot earlier, but this new ordinance does have the support of the Sheriff's Department. She recalled when Enforcement Captain Dallas McClelland talked to them about the difference between the current and new ordinances; the new ordinance gives county citizens due process that they currently do not have. She explained now if a dog is declared vicious by the Sheriff's Department, that is it; and the new ordinance actually provides a means for appeal to the County Judge and then to the Circuit Court which is meaningful and an important change. She further stated the folks at the Animal Shelter see this new ordinance as a welcome change and they seem to be losing sight of the fact that the people who deal with these issues on a day-to-day basis like these changes. She stated that the Sheriff's Department does not want to have 100% discretion and actually like the confinement that this creates. She stated that they do still have discretion and we appreciate that our Sheriff's Department exercises good discretion.
- 124.3 E. Madison stated she concurs that the "Hazardous Animal" subsection (a) is broad, but as pointed out by B. Ussery, it requires the animal to be off the owner's property and requires "to place a person in reasonable fear or apprehension or physical injury". She pointed out that "reasonable" would be determined by our law enforcement and judiciary branches who will know what is reasonable as well and we need to trust and give them credit for such. With respect to G. McHenry's comment regarding allowing a potentially dangerous animal to inflict bites on a human, the goal there was that even a nip is considered being bitten and she does not believe such a case should be classified as a dangerous animal. When advancing to the serious bites, they are then talking about a puncture wound of more than a superficial nature. She stated that they are not giving a free bite, because it is a free very superficial bite that should not be categorized in the dangerous category.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 31

- 125.1 E. Madison stated that she welcomes changes to this ordinance to amend and make it better and she knows there are still some concerns, but they have been studying this for a really long time, interested citizens have been attending meetings, and she does not believe anyone has really proposed much in the way of changes. She urged those who did not like it to make an amendment at this meeting and fix it and if there is no solution coming forward, suggested that they just vote and get it over with.
- 125.2 J. Maxwell stated that his concern over the "reasonable fear" is that will require one of their law enforcement officers to go out and even if someone is unreasonable, it will take, man hours and effort to do that. He concurs with T. Lundstrum that the Sheriff's Department is very much in favor of them having some "teeth" into this, so when they do encounter a dangerous or potentially dangerous animal that has shown negative intent or action, they then have the tools to enforce something and have a really good guideline to follow. He believes that a part of this does a fantastic job of that and he is 100% for it, but his concern is for the dogs that have not done anything but be a dog. He pointed out someone can call repeatedly claiming to have had a reasonable fear of a dog, and it would take the Sheriff's Department traveling to that location to overrule them every time and it will take a judicial proceeding which is a lot of time, money and effort that could be better spent on other things.
- 125.3 J. Maxwell noted that their ultimate goal with this is to prevent any dog from becoming a dangerous or potentially dangerous animal and there is only one way to even attempt doing that, to make consequences for the dog owner who possesses a dangerous animal who repeatedly causes problems egregious enough that he polices himself because there is no way for any of them to police all dogs and their owners in the county. He stated the only way to make this ordinance effective at preventing is to put the onus on the owners so if they have a vicious dog and are faced with stiff penalties, he believes those people will start to police themselves because they do not want that liability or to lose their dogs.
- 125.4 J. Maxwell stated he knows what their intent is with this ordinance and he knows that they have the intention of training folks and giving the Sheriff's Department a lot of discretion, but whatever they pass will be the law and whatever they intend will not necessarily be considered because once the ordinance is adopted, the intent does not matter anymore, but what is written in the law. He stated if they struck subsection (a) then a dog actually has to do something wrong before they spend the time, punish the owner, and do something to the dog; but under (a), the dog just has to be

a dog and they will spend the time, money and effort. He urged them to be careful to make sure what they intend to do and what they actually do line up.

- 126.1 **G. McHenry made a friendly amendment to strike subparagraph (a) under "Hazardous Animal".**
- 126.2 E. Madison asked B. Ussery to give his opinion on this amendment as he was the author of that portion and a co-sponsor of the ordinance.
- 126.3 B. Ussery stated that they need to move forward with this ordinance and if that is what it takes, he would agree with the motion. He further stated he believes that subparagraph (b) under this section covers it well enough.
- 126.4 **E. Madison accepted G. McHenry's friendly amendment.**
- 126.5 County Attorney Steve Zega reviewed what they would be voting on; striking section (a) under Hazardous Animal; and other than scrivener's errors previously discussed; changing the word "human" in various sections on Page 73 to the word "person"; and removing "vending machine" language from the last sentence of subparagraph (b), with the Emergency Clause.
- 126.6 R. Cochran noted that the ordinance refers to "public grounds" and questioned whether it would cover a dog that came onto his private property; to which Attorney S. Zega responded that it would not.
- 126.7 **S. Lloyd made a motion to strike Section (b)(1) on page 78 that required the animal owner to acquire liability insurance. L. Ecke seconded.**
- 126.8 S. Madison reported she had a tenant who had a pit bull and she required that they have insurance which they acquired through State Farm Insurance which she verified.
- 126.9 S. Lloyd responded to S. Madison that once a dog is labeled "dangerous", they cannot acquire liability insurance.
- 126.10 E. Madison stated that she wants everyone to be aware that they are making it so there will be very little difference between "Potentially Dangerous" and "Dangerous" and are basically just lumping them all into one category.

- 127.1 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to strike Section (b)(1) on page 78.**
- 127.2 **VOTING FOR: J. Maxwell, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, and S. Lloyd. VOTING AGAINST: E. Madison, S. Madison, G. McHenry, R. Cochran, and R. Dennis. ABSTENTIONS: J. Patterson and T. Lundstrum. **The motion failed with seven members voting in favor, five members voting against, and two abstentions.****
- 127.3 **Citizen Comments: Paxton Roberts, resident of Fayetteville and Executive Director of the Bicycle Coalition of the Ozarks, addressed the Quorum Court stating that three months has now passed after Richard Holt's unfortunate accident. It is the season with a lot of people out using the roads. He stated that he hears reference to "a dog just being a dog", but stated he feels he has the right to be safe traveling down a public roadway and so when a dog runs out in front of him on his bike, it is hazardous and dangerous to him and this is not just being a dog. Mr. Paxton related that he grew up in the country and understands that people do not want to lock up their dogs, but they are just asking for dog owners to keep them under control so they do not present a hazard when they are off their private property. He stated if they keep their dogs on private property, however they do so, then the danger and hazard is prevented which is what this ordinance does.**
- 127.4 **Mr. Paxton stated that he was at the meeting a month ago when Sheriff Helder voiced his support for this ordinance and he was present when the ordinance was revised, so the discussion about what is going on is frustrating to him at this point because it has been three months and this ordinance has been out there for a whole month. He stated that last month the Quorum Court was presented a petition with 109 signatures against this ordinance; he reported that Change.org has 260 signatures supporting the ordinance as written and 235 of those are in Washington County with people outside the County signing the petition on line because they cared about this issue.**
- 127.5 **Mr. Paxton addressed some key points discussed such as "off public property", stating that they are not talking about on; "reasonable fear or apprehension of physical injury", stating that if a dog runs out, he has a reasonable fear that he will be wrecked and people's lives have been altered permanently with pins in their necks, broken bones, and some will never ride a bike anymore because dog runs out. He stated they need to keep in mind that it could be his daughter riding her bike; and pretty soon**

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 34

there will be shared use paved trails going through the country with bikes, kids, walkers and runners who will all face these problems. He noted that the consequence if a dog is deemed "hazardous" is just being restricted to their property and if a dog never leaves its property, there is never an issue. He urged the Quorum Court to either amend this or keep the protection in this ordinance for people using the road as vulnerable road users.

- 128.1 Terri Davis, resident of Wedington Woods county, addressed the Quorum Court stating one of the reasons she moved out to the county was to breathe non-city air and they have packs of dogs roaming in that subdivision. She reported having neighbors whose dogs run out into the roads and bite people who are walking and she personally has only been bitten by the small dogs. While she understands that people want to be in the country so their dogs can roam and "be a dog", but she is speaking of bad, irresponsible dog owners. She stated that responsible dog owners take care of their dogs and do not let them run out into the road to be hit by a car or bite someone. She further reported having neighbors who have fenced in back yards, but still let their dogs roam.
- 128.2 Barry Vassar, resident of Washington County, addressed the Quorum Court stating he believes this whole thing could have been shortened had it not been deemed an emergency ordinance and as a regular ordinance, there would have been three readings which would have allowed plenty of input and made it easier to make a decision. He suggested in the future, that they not use the emergency clause just to get it through. He stated there is definition in the ordinance that really is not declared questioning what happens to the person who provokes a dog on the outside, stating that it appears the dog will not get in trouble for it and the person will walk away which is teaching that habit to his dog who will continue the behavior. He stated that there is a lot of burden on restraining a dog, but a dog is a dog and puppies or young dogs will knock children over attempting to play and questioned whether they would deem that dog dangerous. Mr. Vassar stated that rules are fine, but they are tightening things up with this ordinance and while he agrees that something needs to be done about dangerous dogs and that everyone should be safe in a public area as should dogs, he sees this ordinance as a lot of ordinance at one time and does not believe that they should pass this with the idea that they can just come back and amend it in the future. He suggested that they slowly address changes to this ordinance, a piece at a time, instead of all at one time.

- 129.1 Bart Petrie, resident in the Winslow area, addressed the Quorum Court stating that they have three dogs; one is a Great Pyrenees used as a livestock guard dog and the only one that chases bicycles. He stated he has tried and is still working on finding a solution to stop this behavior, but the reason that he chases them is that they kick, holler, swat at him and then sprayed with something, and now sees the cyclists as a threat now to the livestock because they hurt him. He concurred with the previous speaker who stated that there is a responsibility of the cyclists also, noting that a person can walk by and his dog does not bother them. He stated while he does not believe his dog would bite anyone, he is worried that one of these days he will run out causing a cyclist to wreck and he does not want that to happen. He urged the cyclists to take responsibility and behave themselves as well as the dogs and dog owners.
- 129.2 Angela Ledgerwood, Director of the Animal Shelter, addressed the Quorum Court stating that animals are what she lives for, and with all due respect to everybody, her first point is that dogs can be dogs, but they can still behave and stay on their own property. Further, she stated that dogs are not going to be punished as long as they remain on their property and behave themselves, and they are free to defend that property. She stated that it is her responsibility to keep her pets on her property and they cannot lose sight of this because a dog on the public roadways present problems, whether they be friendly or unfriendly.
- 129.3 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the ordinance as previously outlined.**
- 129.4 **VOTING FOR:** E. Madison, S. Madison, J. Maxwell, G. McHenry, J. Patterson, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Dennis, and L. Ecke. **VOTING AGAINST:** R. Cochran, A. Harbison, and S. Lloyd. **ABSTENTION:** T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed with ten members voting in favor, three members voting against, and one abstention. The ordinance was adopted.**

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-22, BOOK NO. 10, PAGE NO. 420

- 129.5 **J. Maxwell and J. Patterson left the meeting**
- 129.6 **AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE RATIFYING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT GRANTED BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD:** B. Pond 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 April 7, 2016, for Habberton Wedding Chapel. This ordinance contains an emergency clause making it effective immediately upon passage.

- 130.1 B. Pond explained that the development in this ordinance is a fairly low impact and not densely populated. The Planning Board and Goshen Fire Department have both approved the Habberton Wedding Chapel as they have met all requirements. He reported that there have been no complaints from any of the closest neighbors who had previously protested other wedding chapel owners.
- 130.2 **B. Ussery made a motion to adopt the ordinance. The motion was seconded.**
- 130.3 In response to a question from R. Dennis, B. Pond stated that the only opposition to this CUP was from other wedding chapel owners, but he is unaware of any of their neighbors complaining.
- 130.4 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.
- 130.5 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.**
- 130.6 VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, G. McHenry, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum. **The motion passed unanimously by those present with three members absent. The ordinance was adopted.**
- ORDINANCE NO. 2016-23, BOOK NO. 10, PAGE NO. 432**
- 130.7 A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE SPRINGDALE CITY COUNCIL IN THEIR REQUEST TO NAME THE SPRINGDALE NORTHERN BYPASS (U.S. HIGHWAY 412) THE JOHN TILLMAN HUSSEY MEMORIAL HIGHWAY: B. Pond introduced and read **A Resolution Supporting The Springdale City Council In Their Request To Name The Springdale Northern Bypass (U.S. Highway 412) The John Tillman Hussey Memorial Highway.**
- 130.8 B. Pond stated he cannot begin to explain how much he appreciates the Springdale City Council efforts to have this done.
- 130.9 **B. Pond made a motion to adopt the resolution. A. Harbison seconded the motion.**

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Washington County Quorum Court
April 21, 2016
Page 37

- 131.1 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.
- 131.2 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the resolution.**
- 131.3 **VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, G. McHenry, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T. Lundstrum. The motion passed unanimously by those present with three members absent. The resolution was adopted.**
- RESOLUTION NO. 2016-08, BOOK NO. 3, PAGE NO. 142**
- 131.4 **AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE CONCERNING COMMUNITY SEWER SYSTEMS, WASHINGTON COUNTY CODE 11-99.1: R. Cochran introduced **An Emergency Ordinance Concerning Community Sewer Systems, Washington County Code 11-99.1.****
- 131.5 **R. Cochran moved that due to the length of this ordinance, that the rules be suspended to be read by title only. B. Pond seconded. The motion passed unanimously by those present by voice vote.**
- 131.6 County Attorney Steve Zega read **An Emergency Ordinance Concerning Community Sewer Systems, Washington County Code 11-99.1** by title only.
- 131.7 R. Cochran explained that Washington County had removed their ordinances pertaining to community sewer systems and relied on the State ordinances; however, the State ordinances were dropped recently and the County is now re-establishing them.
- 131.8 **R. Cochran made a motion to adopt the ordinance. B. Pond seconded.**
- 131.9 The Quorum Court thanked Renee Biby, Grant Administrator, for her work on this and bringing it to the Court's attention.
- 131.10 Citizen Comments: There were no citizen comments made.
- 131.11 **With no further discussion, Judge Edwards called for a vote on the motion to adopt the ordinance.**
- 131.12 **VOTING FOR: E. Madison, S. Madison, G. McHenry, B. Pond, B. Ussery, H. Bowman, R. Cochran, R. Dennis, L. Ecke, A. Harbison, S. Lloyd, T.**

Lundstrum. The motion passed unanimously by those present with three members absent. The ordinance was adopted.

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-24, BOOK NO. 10, PAGE NO. 438

- 132.1 OTHER BUSINESS: There was no other business to discuss.
- 132.2 CITIZEN COMMENTS: David Ruff, employee of the Washington County Road Department, addressed the Quorum Court stating that he is disappointed that the Reed Dirt Pit ordinance did not pass. This is in his District in southern Washington County and this dirt is needed to fix the roads in that area. He stated he has been building roads for 48 years and he cannot put rocks on top of rocks as it causes friction and then washboard for which he receives numerous complaints about. He stated if he had dirt that this rock could adhere to, he could fix the 50 miles of roads that he maintains himself.
- 132.3 Bart Petrie, resident of southern Washington County, addressed the Quorum Court stating that it feels to him like the naysayers have more of a personal grudge against Paul or Travis Reed, owners of the dirt pit, more than anything else, and does not consider this to be a judicial decision on the part of the Court. He stated that the math proves that this would be a cost savings to the County which is a cost savings to him, reporting the roads in the southern part of the County are horrible as they need dirt in order for the gravel to stay in place.
- 132.4 ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Carly Sandidge
Quorum Court Coordinator/Reporter