

Minutes for June 5, 2006

Disclaimer: This is only a web copy of the Whitman County Commissioners' Monday Meeting Minutes. Official minutes may be obtained by contacting the Whitman County Commissioners office at (509)-397-6200.

065535 THE BOARD OF WHITMAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS met in their Chambers in the Whitman County Courthouse, Colfax, Washington for **June 5, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.** G.R. Finch, Chairman, Greg Partch and Les Wigen, Commissioners and Maribeth Becker, CMC, Clerk of the Board attended.

9:00 a.m. - Call to Order/Board Business/BOCC Workshop.

Present: Marklynn Markley (9:30 a.m.).

065536 1. Items discussed included a Planning Commission nomination, an update on I-747 challenge and a position vacancy in District Court. No action taken.

9:50 a.m. - Pledge of Allegiance.

Present: Mark Storey and Roger Marcus.

D065536A 2. Motion by Commissioner Wigen to approve the consent agenda. Motion **seconded** by Commissioner Partch and **carried**.

065537 3. Claims/Payroll warrants numbered **191030-191126** for **\$140,714.87** approved.

FUND	FUND NAME	AMOUNT
001	Current Expense	15,043.20
103	Countywide Planning	84.00
104	Developmental Services	400.96
110	County Roads	7,543.62
111	CETC Building	520.42
118	Inmate Welfare	388.66
123	Paths & Trails	21.01
127	Drug Enforcement-Quad City	283.10
129	House Bill 3900-CASA	63.18
135	Prosecutor's Stop Grant	10.30
300	Capital Projects CIP-300.010.005	9,744.70
400	Solid Waste	15,766.92
501	Equipment Rental & Revolving	21,864.72
513	Communications Revolving	703.81
660	Whitcom-General-660.911.000	62,935.24
660	Whitcom-Grant Funding-660.911.001	5,341.03

065538 4. May 30, 2006 minutes approved.

065539-06542 5. Personnel board orders approved.

10:05 a.m. - Thinh Nguyen.

065543 6. Mark Storey, in the absence of Tim Myers, explained a Washington State Department of Transportation local agency agreement for the Bill Chipman Palouse Trail (BCPT) trailhead improvement project and federal grant. The project involves construction of a paved and lighted parking area with vehicular access to Sunshine Road and pedestrian access to the trail.

Roger Marcus stated this is part of the overall Sunshine Road development area project that includes the Whitman County Public Works Department, Whitman County Parks Department and Washington State Department of Transportation. The Parks Department piece is to develop a trailhead area in the SE corner of Sunshine and the BCPT. Their intent is to develop a number of parking spaces, provide space for a future restroom and provide paved handicap access to the trail from Sunshine Road.

The engineer noted the Rural Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) recommended this \$76,000 project for federal enhancement dollars. The first phase of the project will fund the design work for construction in 2007 and provide lighting in the tunnel. This year the bridge and tunnel will be constructed.

Commissioner Partch **moved**, Commissioner Wigen **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to sign the local agency agreement as presented.

065544 7. Mark Storey explained a second local agency agreement for \$13,600 in federal non-matching enhancement dollars for the Palouse Scenic Byway. The project involves installing 5 gateway signs at entrances to the Palouse Scenic Byway, installing trailblazer signs on existing signs throughout the byway, installing local area information signs where appropriate, carrying out site assessments for visitor centers/restrooms in 7 communities and developing an interpretive plan for the Palouse Scenic Byway.

Roger Marcus added this builds on the Scenic Byway already in place.

Commissioner Wigen **moved**, Commissioner Partch **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to sign the Washington State Department of Transportation local agency agreement for the Scenic Byway.

065545 8. The Prosecutor forwarded the commissioners a copy of the letter he received from Attorney Brian McGinn regarding his review of the proposed zoning codes.

D065545A 9. Commissioners' pending list reviewed.

10:20 a.m. - Recess.

10:30 a.m. - State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Ordinance.

Present: Denis Tracy and Thinkh Nguyen.

065546 Prosecutor Tracy said after passage of the revisions to Whitman County Code Chapter 9.04, a number of typographical errors have been discovered that deserve correcting. Commissioner Partch also had some suggestions, but the Prosecutor preferred not making those changes at this time. He preferred to limit today's action to just the typographical errors. The errors involve numbering and the word "not" inadvertently omitted from Section 9.04.085(a). State law prohibits intermediate appeals. The county cannot authorize them when the state prohibits them. The ordinance was originally drafted with the word "not" included, but it was accidentally dropped during the revision process. Without this word, subsection "b" does not make sense.

065547 Commissioner Wigen **moved**, Commissioner Partch **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to accept the Prosecutor's recommended typographical error corrections as presented.

RESOLUTION NO. 065547

BEFORE THE BOARD OF WHITMAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

WHEREAS the Board of County Commissioners for Whitman County, Washington, recently amended Chapter 9.04 of the County Code, regarding the State Environmental Policy Act; and,

WHEREAS in the course of that process a few typographical errors were made; and,

WHEREAS the Board recognizes such to be merely scribes' errors and wishes to correct them; and,

WHEREAS the Board recognizes these scribes' errors consist of numerical omissions from various section titles, and the omission of the word "not" in 9.04.080 (A).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners that the scribes' errors referenced above, and specifically noted on the attached copy of County Code Chapter 9.04, shall be made and effective immediately.

Dated this 5th day of June 2006 and effective immediately.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

G.R. Finch, Chairman

Greg Partch, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Maribeth Becker, CMC
Clerk of the Board

Les Wigen, Commissioner

**Title 9
ENVIRONMENT***

**Chapter 9.04
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT**

**Chapter:
9.04 State Environmental Policy Act**

Sections:

- 9.04.010 State act adopted by reference.
- 9.04.020 SEPA guidelines adopted by reference.
- 9.04.030 Definitions.
- 9.04.040 Time limits applicable to the SEPA process.
- 9.04.060 Use of exemptions.
- 9.04.070 Lead agency determination and responsibilities.
- 9.04.080 Environmental checklist.
- 9.04.090 Preparation of EIS.
- 9.04.100 Additional elements to be covered in an EIS.
- 9.04.110 Designation of official to perform consulted agency responsibilities for the county.
- 9.04.120 Designation and duties of responsible official.
- 9.04.130 Public access to documents.
- 9.04.140 Fees.

9.04.010 State act adopted by reference: The county adopts by reference the policies of the State Environmental Policy Act as expressed in RCW 43.21C.010 and 43.21C.020. (Ord. 31939 §1, 1978)

9.04.020 SEPA guidelines adopted by reference: The county adopts by reference the following sections or subsections of Chapter 197-11 of the Washington Administrative Code, the "SEPA Guidelines" adopted by the state of Washington, council on Environmental Policy, and amended by the Department of Ecology: WAC 197-11-010 Through WAC 197-11-955, and as hereafter amended. (Ord. 31939 §2, 1978)

9.04.030 Definitions: In addition to those definitions contained within WAC 197-11-040, the following terms shall have the following meanings, unless the context indicates otherwise:

- A. "CEP" or "the Council on Environmental Policy", when used regarding action to be taken subsequent to midnight, June 30, 1976, means the Washington State Department of Ecology. This meaning also applies to all such references in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) sections or subsections incorporated into this chapter by reference.
- B. "County" means Whitman County, Washington.
- C. "Department" means any division, subdivision or organizational unit of the county established by ordinance, rule, or order.
- D. "SEPA Guidelines" means WAC Chapter 197-11 adopted by the Council on Environmental Policy and amended by the Department of Ecology. (Ord. 31939, §3, 1978)

9.04.040 Time limits applicable to the SEPA process: The following time limits, expressed in calendar days, shall apply to the processing of all private projects and to those governmental proposals submitted to the county by other agencies:

- A. Categorical exemptions. Identification of categorically exempt actions shall occur within seven days of submission of an adequate application.
- B. Threshold determinations.
 - 1. Threshold determinations which can be made based upon review of the environmental checklist submitted by applicant should be completed within fifteen days of submission of an adequate application and the completed checklist.
 - 2. Threshold determinations requiring further information from the applicant or consultations with other agencies with jurisdiction should be completed within fifteen days of receiving the requested information from the applicant or the consulted agency. Requests by the county for such further information should be made within fifteen days of the submission of an adequate application and completed checklist. When a request for further information is submitted to a consulted agency, the county shall wait a maximum of thirty days for the consulted agency to respond.
 - 3. Threshold determinations which require that further studies, including field investigations, be initiated by the county, should be completed within thirty days of the submission of an adequate application and the completed checklist.
 - 4. Threshold determinations on actions where the applicant recommends in writing that an EIS be prepared because of the significant impact asserted and described in the application shall be completed within fifteen days of submission of an adequate application and the completed checklist.

5. The time limits set forth in this subsection shall not apply to withdrawals of affirmative and negative threshold determinations.
6. When a threshold determination is expected to require more than fifteen days to complete and a private applicant requests notification of the date when a threshold determination will be made, the lead agency shall transmit to the private applicant a written statement as to the expected date of decision. (Ord. 31939 §4, 1978)

9.04.060 Use of exemptions:

- A. The applicability of the exemptions shall be determined by each department within the county which received an application for a license, or in the case of governmental proposals, by that department initiating the proposal. A determination by any such department that a proposal is exempt shall be final and not subject to administrative review.
- B. If a proposal includes a series of exempt actions which are physically or functionally related to each other, some of which are exempt and some which are not, the proposal is not exempt.
- C. If the proposal includes a series of exempt actions which are physically or functionally related to each other, but which together may have significant environmental impact, the proposal is not exempt.
- D. If it is determined that a proposal is exempt, none of the procedural requirements of these guidelines apply to the proposal. No environmental checklist shall be required for an exempt proposal.
- E. A department which is determining whether or not a proposal is exempt shall ascertain the total scope of the proposal and the governmental licenses required. If a proposal includes a series of actions physically or functionally related to each other, some of which are exempt and some of which are not, the proposal is not exempt. For any such proposal, the lead agency shall be determined, even if the license application which triggers the department's consideration is otherwise exempt. If the lead agency is the county, then the responsible official shall be designated.
- F. If a proposal includes both exempt and nonexempt actions, exempt actions may be authorized with respect to the proposal prior to compliance with the procedural requirements of these guidelines subject to the following limitations:
 1. No major action (nonexempt action) shall be authorized;
 2. No action shall be authorized which will irrevocably commit the county to approve or authorize a major action,
 3. A department may withhold approval of an exempt action which would lead to modification of the physical environment when such modifications would serve no purpose of later approval of a major action is not secured: and

4. A department may withhold approval of exempt actions which would lead to substantial financial expenditures by a private applicant which would serve no purpose if later approval of a major action is not secured. (Ord. 31939, §6, 1978)

9.04.070 Lead agency determination and responsibilities:

Replaced by 19.06.050

- A. Any department within the county receiving or initiating a proposal, any portion which involves a major action, shall determine the lead agency for that proposal pursuant to WAC 197-11-050. This determination shall be made for each proposal involving a major action unless the lead agency has been previously determined, or the department is aware that another department or agency is in the process of determining the lead agency.
- B. In those instances in which the county is the lead agency, the responsible official of the county shall supervise compliance with the threshold determination, and if an EIS is necessary shall supervise the preparation of the draft and final EIS.
- C. In those instances in which the county is not the lead agency, all departments of the county, subject to the limitations of the WAC, shall utilize and consider as appropriate either the declaration of nonsignificance or the final EIS of the lead agency in conjunction with the decisions of the county on the proposal. In such instances, no county department shall prepare or require preparation of a declaration of nonsignificance or EIS in addition to that prepared by the lead agency.
- D. In the event that the county or any department thereof receives a lead agency determination made by another agency which does not appear to be in accord with WAC 197-11-050, it may object thereto. Any such objection must be made and resolved within fifteen days of receipt of the determination, or the county must petition the Washington State Department of Ecology for a lead agency determination within the fifteen day time period. Any such petition on behalf of the county shall be initiated by the department of public works.
- E. Departments of the county are authorized to make agreements as to lead agency status; provided, that any such agreement involving assumption of lead agency status by the county will first be approved by the responsible official for the county and that any department which will incur responsibilities as a result of any such agreement will approve the agreement.
- F. Any department making a lead agency determination for a private project shall require sufficient information from the applicant to ascertain which other agencies have jurisdiction over the proposal. (Ord. 31939 §7, 1978)

9.04.080 Environmental Checklist:

- A. Except as provided in 197-11-305, a completed environmental checklist, or a copy thereof, substantially in the form provided in WAC 197-11-960, shall be filed at the same time as an application for a permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use not specifically exempted herein. This checklist shall be the basis for a determination by the county as to lead agency status and, if the county is determined to be the lead agency, then for the threshold determination.
- B. For all proposals for which the county is the lead agency, the responsible official of the county shall make the threshold determination pursuant to the criteria and procedures of WAC 197-11-300 through 197- 11-390.

9.04.085 Appeal:

- A. Appeal of the intermediate steps under SEPA (e.g., lead agency determination, scoping, draft EIS adequacy) shall not be allowed.
- B. Appeals of SEPA procedures shall be limited to review of a final threshold determination (DS, DNS or mitigated DNS) or final EIS.
- C. Only one administrative appeal of a threshold determination or of the adequacy of an EIS is allowed; successive administrative appeals are not allowed.
- D. An open record appeal shall be allowed to the Board of County Commissioners of any decision by the responsible official or county agency or board conditioning or denying a proposal under authority of SEPA, only if the responsible official's or county agency or board's decision on the underlying governmental action is a ministerial permit decision that does not require a public hearing, and only if that permit decision is appealable to the Board of County Commissioners and the SEPA appeal is consolidated with an appeal of the permit decision, and only if the SEPA determination has not already gone through one administrative appeal.
- E. Except as provided in subsections (F) of this section, any allowed appeals of procedural and substantive determinations under SEPA shall be consolidated with a hearing on, or appeal of, the underlying governmental action in a single open record hearing before the county official or body designated to hear and decide the underlying governmental action or appeal thereof. The hearing or appeal shall be one at which the county official or body will render a decision on the proposed action. For example, an appeal of the adequacy of an EIS must be consolidated with a hearing on a conditional use permit. If the County's procedures do not provide for a hearing on or appeal of the underlying governmental action, the County shall not hold a SEPA administrative appeal, except as allowed in subsection (F) of this section.

- F. The following appeals of SEPA procedural or substantive determinations shall not be consolidated with a hearing on or appeal of the underlying action.
1. An appeal of determination of significance (DS).
 2. An appeal of a procedural determination made by the County when it is the project proponent or is funding a project and chooses to conduct its review under SEPA, including any appeals of its procedural determinations, prior to submitting an application for a project permit. Subsequent appeals of substantive determinations by an agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project shall be allowed under the SEPA appeal procedures of the agency with jurisdiction.
 3. An appeal of a procedural determination made by the County on a nonproject action.
- G. In order to appeal a SEPA determination, an appellant must act promptly. Any administrative appeal of threshold determinations shall be filed with the responsible official who issued the EPA determination within fourteen days after the final determination has been made by the responsible official. At the time of filing an appeal, the appellant must pay any fees due for a SEPA appeal in accordance with County Code 9.04.140.
- H. Procedural determinations made by the responsible official shall be entitled to substantial weight in any appeal proceeding.
- I. For any appeal under this section, the County shall provide for the preparation of a record for use in any subsequent appeal proceedings, which record shall consist of, at a minimum, the following:
1. Findings and conclusions.
 2. Testimony under oath, taped or electronically recorded or written transcript.
 3. Any additional written record.

If an administrative appeal of determinations relating to SEPA is available under the procedures of this section, that procedure must be used before any person may seek judicial review of any SEPA issue that could have been reviewed under such procedures. (Ord. 31939 §8, 1978)

9.04.090 Preparation of EIS.

- A. The draft and final EIS shall be prepared either by the responsible official or his designee or by a private applicant or consultant retained by the private applicant. In the event the responsible official determines that the applicant will be required to prepare an EIS, the applicant shall be so notified immediately after completion of the threshold determination.
- B. In the event that an EIS is to be prepared by a private applicant or a consultant retained by the private applicant, the responsible official assure that the EIS is prepared in a responsible manner and with appropriate methodology. The

responsible official shall direct the areas of research and examination to be undertaken, as well as the organization of the resulting document.

- C. In the event that the responsible official or his designee is preparing an EIS, the responsible official may require a private applicant to provide data and information which is not in the possession of the county relevant to any or all areas to be covered by the EIS.
- D. No matter who participates in the preparation of an EIS, it must be approved by the responsible official prior to distribution.
- E. In all occasions of EIS preparation the applicant is encouraged to provide information to the responsible official (Ord. 31939 §9, 1978)

9.04.110 Designation of official to perform consulted agency responsibilities for the county:

- A. The department of public works shall be responsible for the preparation of the written comments for the county in response to a consultation request prior to a threshold determination, participation in pre-draft consultation, or reviewing of a draft EIS.
- B. The official designated in subsection A shall be responsible for compliance by the county with WAC 197-11-500 through 197-11-570 wherever the county is a consulted agency, and is authorized to develop operating procedures which will ensure that responses to consultation requests are prepared in a timely fashion and include data from all appropriate departments of the county. (Ord. 31939 §11, 1978)

9.04.120 Designation and duties of responsible official:

Replaced by 19.06.040

- A. For those proposals for which the county is the lead agency, the responsible official shall be the director of the department of public works—or his designee.
- B. Duties of the responsible official are as follows:
 - 1. The responsible official shall make the threshold determination, supervise preparation of any required EIS, and perform any other functions assigned to the lead agency or responsible official by those sections of the SEPA guidelines which were adopted by reference in Section 9.04.020, for all proposals for which the county is the lead agency.
 - 2. The responsible official may select an environmental checklist review team of at least three members selected for expertise in the fields of environmental science, soils, land use planning, public health and sanitation, public administration or any other areas of expertise deemed appropriate by the responsible official.

3. The review team shall study and report to the responsible official on those checklists referred for report to the review team by the responsible official. The review team may at the direction of the responsible official consult experts and witnesses from outside the review team.
4. On the day following an environmental checklist review the team shall submit to the responsible official a single written report for each checklist submitted to the review team by the responsible official. A majority report shall be submitted by the review team and shall contain comments on the adverse or lack of adverse environmental impact of the proposed action. (Ord. 31939 §12, 1978)

9.04.130 Public access to documents: All documents required by the SEPA Guidelines shall be retained by the county and made available in accordance with RCW 42.17.

9.04.140 Fees: The following fees shall be required for actions by the county in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:

- A. All applicants and appellants shall be required to pay all fees in accordance with the fee schedule of the Public Works department in effect at the time of the filing of the application or appeal. The time periods provided by this chapter for making a threshold determination shall not begin to run until payment of the applicant's fee.
- B. Environmental Impact Statement.
 1. For all proposals requiring an EIS for which the county is the lead agency and for which the responsible official determines that the EIS shall be prepared by employees of the county, the county may charge and collect a reasonable fee from any applicant to cover costs incurred by the county in the participation of an EIS. If it is determined that an EIS is required, applicants shall be advised of projected costs of the statement prior to actual preparation and shall post bond or otherwise insure payment of such costs.
 2. The responsible official may determine that the county will contract directly with a consultant for preparation of environmental documents for activities initiated by such costs and expenses directly to the applicant. Such consultants shall be selected by mutual agreement of the county and the applicant after a call for proposals. Applicants may be required to post bond or otherwise insure payment of such costs.
 3. In the event that a proposal is modified so that an EIS is no longer required, the responsible official shall refund any costs collected under subdivisions 1 and 2 of this subsection where the costs were not actually incurred or the money spent by the County.

BOCC Minutes-06/05/06

C. Copies of documents. The county may charge any person for copies of any document prepared pursuant to the requirements of this chapter, and for mailing thereof, in a manner provided by RCW Chapter 42.17. (Ord. 31939 §14, 1978)

10:40 a.m. - Recess.

11:00 a.m. - Dane Dunford, Public Works Director.

Present: Mark Storey, Cindi Lepper and Thinkh Nguyen.

ACTION ITEMS

Engineering Division:

065548 1. Commissioner Partch **moved**, Commissioner Wigen **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to publish the notice of call for bids for crushing at Colfax Stockpile Site.

065549 2. Commissioner Wigen **moved**, Commissioner Partch **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to publish the notice of call for bids for crushing at Morasch Quarry.

Solid Waste Division:

065550 3. Ms. Lepper said a total of 34 tons of tires was collected at the recent Tire Amnesty event as compared to 25 tons in 2005 and 37 tons in 2004.

D065550A 4. To date, 30 individuals have pre-registered for the June 17th E-Waste collection event.

D065550B 5. The Director shared a certificate of appreciation to Cindi Lepper from the mayors of Pullman and Moscow for her involvement with Earth Day activities.

D065550C 6. The Director also shared a letter of appreciation addressed to Cindi Lepper for working with youth programs at the Whitman County Library promoting recycling and reuse.

Maintenance Division:

D065550D 7. Districts 2 and 3 are spot sealing and District 1 is doing asphalt work this week. It is the department's intent to put a seal coat on the Pullman-Albion Road, Whelan Road and east end of the Pullman-Airport Road next week, in advance of the regular July seal coating season and before the SR 270 project begins.

11:10 a.m. - Recess.

11:30 a.m. - Bob Reynolds, Parks/Facilities Management.

D065550E Mr. Reynolds consulted with G&M Construction, a roofing company the county has done business with over the past 10-15 years, on the jail roof. As a result, he recommended the jail roof be addressed within the next couple of years. Mr. Reynolds was instructed to add this project to 2007 CIP list. Commissioner Partch **moved**, Commissioner Wigen **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to approve the recommendation made by Mr. Reynolds for the jail roof.

11:20 a.m. - Recess.

1:00 p.m. - Trial Court Improvement Account.

Present: Doug Robinson.

065551 The Chairman reconvened the hearing for the proposed Trial Court Improvement Account and requested a report from Judge Robinson.

Judge Robinson said the purpose of this fund is to aid the counties in funding District and Superior Court improvements, i.e. staffing, programming, facilities or services. The courts would identify needs and present that information to the county commissioners with costs for consideration.

The courts recently received another distribution from the state. Although funds are not as extensive as originally anticipated, it will still be very beneficial and provide some funding to offset costs that the county would have otherwise incurred. Judge Robinson urged adoption of the resolution/ordinance.

No objections raised by those in attendance.

Chairman Finch adjourned the hearing.

Commissioner Partch **moved**, Commissioner Finch **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to approve the resolution/ordinance as presented.

ORDINANCE NO. 065551

AN ORDINANCE establishing a trial court improvement account for funding Superior and District Court staffing, programs, facilities, or services as appropriated by the Whitman County Board of Commissioners; and adding a new chapter to Whitman County Code, Title 2, Administration and Personnel, to be known as Chapter 2.06 and entitled "Trial Court Improvement Account".

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE WHITMAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS THAT:

There is hereby added a new chapter to Whitman County Code Title 2, Chapter 2.06 to read as follows:

Chapter 2.06 - Trial Court Improvement Account

Sections:

- 2.060.010 Establishment
- 2.060.020 Deposits
- 2.060.030 Purpose
- 2.060.040 Interest
- 2.060.050 Effective Date

2.060.010 Establishment: Pursuant to Chapter 457 Washington Laws of 2005, there is hereby created in the county treasury a trial court improvement account.

2.060.020 Deposits: The County Treasurer shall make a quarterly deposit of funds to the trial court improvement account #143.030.000 in an amount equal to that received quarterly from the state for district court judge salaries.

2.060.030 Purpose: The purpose of the trial court improvement account shall be to fund improvements to Superior and District court staffing, programs, facilities, or services as appropriated from time to time by the Board of County Commissioners.

2.060.040 Interest: Interest earned on funds in the trial court improvement account shall accrue to the account.

2.060.050 Effective Date:

Effective this 5th day of June 2006.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF WHITMAN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

G.R. Finch, Chairman

Greg Partch, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Maribeth Becker, CMC
Clerk of the Board

Les Wigen, Commissioner

RESOLUTION NO. 065552

BEFORE THE BOARD OF WHITMAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners for Whitman County, State of Washington, met in regular session on Tuesday, May 30, 2006; and,

WHEREAS, Chapter 457 Washington Laws of 2005 requires the establishment of a Trial Court Improvement Account for funding Superior and District Court staffing, programs, facilities or services as appropriated by the County Board of Commissioners.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that a Trial Court Improvement Account Fund numbered 143.030.000 is created as follows:

- a. Pursuant to Chapter 457 Washington Laws of 2005, there is hereby created in the county treasury a trial court improvement account.
- b. The county treasurer shall make a quarterly deposit of funds to the trial court improvement account in an amount equal to that received quarterly from the state for district court judge salaries.
- c. The purpose of the trial court improvement account shall be to fund improvements to superior and district court staffing, programs, facilities, or services as appropriated from time to time by the Board of County Commissioners.
- d. Interest earned on funds in the trial court improvement account shall accrue to the account.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of June 2006.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF WHITMAN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

G.R. Finch, Chairman

Greg Partch, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Maribeth Becker, CMC
Clerk of the Board

Les Wigen, Commissioner

1:15 p.m. - Recess.

1:45 p.m. - Kelli Campbell and Sharron Cunningham.

Present: Gary and Valerie Hunt (2:15 p.m.).

D065552A 10. Commissioner Partch **moved**, Commissioner Finch **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to go into executive session with the above individuals until 3:00 p.m. for labor negotiation matters.

3:00 p.m. - Return to Open Session/Recess.

3:05 p.m. - Denis Tracy and Bob Lothspeich.

BOCC Minutes-06/05/06

Present: Kelli Campbell, Sharron Cunningham and Gary and Valerie Hunt.

D065552B 11. Commissioner Partch **moved**, Commissioner Wigen **seconded** the motion and it **carried** to go into executive session with the above individuals until 4:00 p.m. for labor negotiation/proposal matters.

4:00 p.m. - Adjournment.

D065552C Commissioner Partch **moved** to adjourn the **June 5, 2006** meeting. Motion **seconded** by Commissioner Wigen and **carried**. The Board will meet in regular session, in their Chambers', in the Whitman County Courthouse, Colfax, Washington, on **June 12, 2006**. The foregoing action made this **5th** day of **June 2006**.

ss/ Greg PARTCH, Commissioner

ss/ LES WIGEN, Commissioner

MARIBETH BECKER, CMC
Clerk of the Board

G.R. FINCH, CHAIRMAN
Board of County Commissioners