

TASK	RELATIONSHIP
PRES	Speak for Yourself
Ask Questions	Listen Actively
Summarize	Gatekeeping
Polling	Compliment & Agree
80/20 Principle	Humor
Build Consensus	Process Check



What are we asking for?
 Why is it important?
 Is it realistic?

**APRIL 15th, 2009 MINUTES
 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS – MANAGEMENT TEAM
 WORK/STUDY SESSION
 8:30 AM**

Attending: Commissioners, Charlotte Garrido, Steve Bauer, Josh Brown, Nancy Buonanno Grennan, Co. Administrator; Steve Boyer, Sheriff; Shawn Gabriel, Director Administrative Services; Greg Sandstrom, Coroner; Denis Bonneville, Undersheiff; Bud Harris, Director Information Services; Bert Furuta, Director Personnel; Chip Faver, Parks & Recreation; Frank Maiocco, Superior Court; Randy Casteel, Director Public Works; Fernando Connil, Personnel; Michelle Davis, Sheriff’s Office; Dave White, Sheriff’s Office; Dave Peterson, Clerk; Barbara Stephenson, Treasurer; Jim Avery, Assessor; Jacquelyn Aufderheide, Civil Division; Tina Holguin, Community Development; Lisa Fryer, Administrative Services; Stephanie Pinard, Administrative Services; Scott Diener, Community Development; Deanna Erstad, Commissioners Office; Pat Campbell, Dean Beoning, Public Works Solid Waste Division; Teresa Osinski, Home Builders, Steve Gardner, Kitsap Sun; Brynn Grimley, Kitsap Sun; Chris Dunagan

Anticipated Time

- 1. APPROVAL OF 04/08/09 WORK STUDY MINUTES 8:30 – 8:35**

Minutes were approved as submitted

- 2. BUDGET UPDATE (SHAWN GABRIEL) 8:35 – 9:45**

Shawn gave update on first quarter budget update. He passed out general information showing:

- 1st quarter revenues vs. expenditures
- End of year projected budget shortfalls
- Retail sales tax revenue
- Overtime and extra help
- REET revenue

A more specific chart shows the budget reduction scenarios for each department. Since each department chose how they would reduce, the group reviewed them individually.

- 1st quarter budgeted vs. actuals

The first quarter shortfall is \$519,637 and the projected end of year shortfall is \$3,051,575.

- Questioned how departments are looking for rest of the year – i.e seasonal, training etc. Working with all departments to use staff rather than extra help when possible.
- Salary & Benefit Reduction Coverage - Risk Mgmt rate reductions; information services – computer replacement, deferment for Exchange e-mail replacement,
- Decision Points: Closure of Admin Building, Acceptance of 4% vs 6% as submitted, MOU for full medical.
- Question on One time money, Defer of UGA Silverdale Study - need further discussion.
- Scenario Reduction Summary Table – went through by each department – salaries & benefits – supplies and services
- Making employees .9 vs .8
- For overtime and extra help the Jail and Juvenile is tracking above what was budgeted. Discussion last fall about opening the extra pod of the jail - state is guaranteeing additional 20 beds but not enough for opening the additional pod. Opening the pod would require 7-8 additional people.
- Sheriff said even though there are no guarantees on grants, he feels very confident that they will come through. If for some reason they don't, further reductions will be made at that time.
- Parks and Recreation - deduct meters installation – Charlotte is suggesting this be included in stimulus request as energy efficiency changes.
- Jacquelyn talked about the various departments who have stepped forward to agree to pay for civil services based on their use last year. Need for service contracts between Civil and other departments to provide services.
- Barbara Stephenson noted that the Treasurer's office has met their reduction of \$56,111. She and Budget will update the summary.
- Steve talked about closing the North district court. He does not agree that should be done. We have made the commitment to the city of Poulsbo and he feels it is a critical service to not make people drive down to Port Orchard. Silverdale was closed to allow keeping Poulsbo open. He wants the Commissioners to take a good look at this scenario and work to keep the Poulsbo Court open.

It was agreed that we move forward implementing the one day closure of Administration Building effective May 8, 2009. There are issues that need to be addressed, i.e. how citizens can drop off paperwork for offices in the building and use of conference rooms and the chambers.

3. **SITE SPECIFICS (SCOTT DIENER)**
Executive Summary and Handouts ([pdf](#))

9:45 – 10:30

Scott briefly talked about pushing the RWIP meeting back a couple of weeks from the scheduled May 13th meeting. He would like to meet with each Commissioner prior to get specifics on what they are trying to achieve.

- Steve said what we do on this topic will make a great impact on the county in the future.
- Charlotte agreed that eventually meeting with stakeholders and public is necessary but need to regroup and take a good look at prior to that. First sitting down and getting a basic sense of what we are trying to do here, where do we want to go from here, who parties are and how we can hear from all of them. A lot of interested groups want to be able to address the Board with their ideas and thoughts.
- Josh suggested getting information in newspaper asking for groups who want time to address their issues.
- Steve asked that they could get information soon so they would have time to read and understand.
- Charlotte gave some history of series of programs countywide to find out what people think definition of “rural” is done in 1999. Shelley will put together the history on this and get to Commissioners. What is public policy for the entire county? Look at what the county is going to look like 20 years from now and the impact of this.
- Josh said that our community advisory groups need to be invited.

Scott gave presentation and asked for policy direction regarding 2009 Site Specific Comprehensive Plan amendments. He gave brief history and said there are 16 applicants in que right now.

Points:

- Context of decision in 2006 by board. So many issues dealing with at that time.
- (tape at 10:35)
- Policy recommendation makes sense-there needs to be designation for rural commercial or rural industrial. Use table will identify uses that are acceptable from date of adoption forward.
- Missing some basic information - need to understand what is rural, what is regional.
- Current circumstances there needs to be more balance of job opportunities vs. where people live and provide more jobs closer to where they live.
- Removing Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD) restriction would give more flexibility so more sensible businesses don’t have to go through the LAMIRD process. We need to look at support systems or infrastructure required for various businesses and what public cost would be.
- Staff would like to move forward with doing away with policy RL-8.
- Need to look at what businesses have moved out to the rural parts of the county and what appropriate uses are in rural areas.

Scott discussed Transfer of Development Rights (TDR’s).

- Would like board to considering approval of a two year window allowing applicant to get TDR certification within 2 years...as a condition of approval. Steve asked does this process grant use but that they can’t do anything with it until they come in with the certificate?
- Josh suggested and asked that instead of forcing someone to go out and buy development rights from someone in some part of the county, could we give him the same flexibility if they invested in some type of pool to go to urban resource or infrastructure-not impact fee but a fee in lieu of TDR program?
- This would give developer more flexibility to be creative and still work for the public good.

- **Transfer of development rights & improving them in the future - would like to look at adding this to the workload element for next year.**

Board asked Scott to schedule further discussion and thanked him for his presentation and all the work he has done.

FIVE MINUTE BREAK

4. SOLID WASTE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (DEAN BOENING) 10:35– 11:20 **Executive Summary and Handouts ([pdf](#))**

Pat gave briefing on background and what we need to do in the future. Dean went over specifics asking board for approval of preliminary draft goals, objectives and strategies and to approve the release of the Draft to the Department of Ecology and KRCC partners for review and comment.

- **Josh – heard that people in rural areas would be willing to pay more as long as it was within reason to have convenience of curb side recycling. Also in terms some of policy goals on construction standards, have we had different stakeholder groups involved and on policy goals that effect cities (referencing building code) are we asking things that are reasonable. Is everyone comfortable with what we are putting that out there?**
- **Charlotte asked in terms of policy objectives and development of public/private relationships - how are those going to be managed and maintained? Dean said they haven't thought that far ahead yet.**
- **Steve said these are important topics that need to be discussed. He feels the document is a little overreaching. He asked does the county have ability to tell cities what to do? Pat said that cities have agreed to but these are recommendation and we have no real control whether they do or not. Steve said he think it needs to go the city councils so it's just not our plan. His bigger concern is that he sees this document as setting policy for construction and that is overreaching. The plan needs to be confined to what the title is.**
- **DOE has given directives for counties as goals. We are saying “should” not “must”. These are recommended strategies.**
- **Need significant discussion with folks. Charlotte agrees that these are sustainability issues.**
- **Need to be moving in this direction and recognizing those who do support the five key initiatives of the State's Beyond Waste Plan.**
- **Steve is concerned that some of the policy objectives don't fit in the scope of a Waste Management Plan and we need to schedule some time for further discussion.**
- **Charlotte stated that wastefulness is part of our culture and the problem with mandating or stating so directly is more restrictive than a waste management document needs to be.**
- **Making curbside more widely available is one of priorities. Dean said that we are looking at rates to determine the true cost of customers bringing garbage to site -what we are paying for the actual cost vs what we charge.**
- **Nancy said she thinks it makes sense to back up, take a look at what's required, what we have currently and why are you asking for this. She suggested that we use part of the May 13th meeting to further discuss this issue.**

The Board thanked them for their work.

5. BOARD DISCUSSIONS

11:20 – 12:00

Jacquelyn, Shawn and Mark talked about the concern of departments being charged additional premiums as a result of Risk Management coming up with money to cover the shortfall in the Prosecutor's Civil Division. The money will come basically out of reserves that are kept at approximately a 70-75% confidence level. One thing effecting reserves is the move to ½ million deductible several years ago. It was recommended we don't do the additional 65,000 rate cut proposed earlier for Risk Management and fund the Prosecutors office only.

Reductions in Prosecutor's office was discussed.

Steve thanked Nancy in the huge role she has played in working on this budget.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05.

At 12:06 pm the Board recessed into a 5 minute executive session with legal council regarding existing litigation.

ADJOURN