PUBLIC MEETING
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 2014 – 1:30 P.M.
ROOM B14 – ADMIN BUILDING
MINUTES

If anyone attending the Public Meetings needs special assistance, please provide advance notice by calling 258-4877. Missoula County will provide auxiliary aids and services.

1. CALL TO ORDER
Commissioners Present: Commissioner (Chair) Jean Curtiss, Commissioner Bill Carey, Commissioner Michele Landquist

Staff Present: Deputy County Attorney, James McCubbin, CAPS, Hilary Schoendorf, Public Works Director, Greg Robertson, Chief Financial Officer, Andrew Czorny

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS
Missoula Aging Services is always looking for volunteers to deliver meals on wheels. There are some programs that they have that they can pay a stipend for volunteers that are over 55. Call Missoula Aging Services.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

5. ROUTINE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS
Current Claims List ($3,340,679.25)

Executive Session
Commissioner Carey made motion that the Board of County Commissioners approve the Current Claims List in the amount of $3,340,679.25. Commissioner Landquist second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

6. HEARING
JTL Rezone Request
Hilary Schoendorf gave staff report. Staff has recommended approval.

Chair Curtiss: At our Planning Board Meeting Monday we came up with some potential language changes in the covenants, James has proposed that and we’ll put that forward now.

James McCubbin: I have copies of the proposed changes to the covenants if anyone in the audience wants to see what we’re talking about. Basically I’m proposing adding a new Article 5 to the covenants proposed by the applicant that would set out the procedure for how these covenants could potentially be amended in the future. Which is a matter of law, you can’t really have covenants that are just set that can never be amended. I’ve seen them in the past where it doesn’t address the amendment and basically what we do is, we tell people, and the county has done this as well, that if all the parties to the covenants agree to an amendment, then they can be amended basically just as a plan matter of law. So that’s essentially what my proposed amendment language says.

Proposed Article 5 Amendment: these protective covenants, conditions and restrictions may be amended upon mutual agreement in writing by the property owner and Missoula County to the Missoula County Board of County Commissioners. Amendment may also be made by mutual agreement of the property owner and the Missoula County Board of Adjustment, as provided in Article 3. Amendments may be made to the text of and or exhibits to this document. In considering a proposal for amendment, the county shall take into consideration regulatory standards in place at the time of the proposal. I also note that that reference to the Board of Adjustment is the language that Hilary was mentioning earlier about motorized access. As drafted by JTL, that motorized access would be for mining purposes, would be limited to a maximum of 5 years. That’s already in their proposed language. If the County Commissioners don’t want to delegate that particular ability to amend the covenants to the Board of Adjustment, in other words, if you want to hold onto all review of amendments for just the Board of Commissioners, we could remove the second sentence here and basically the first sentence/paragraph of article 3. Then, all amendments would have to go to the Commissioners. That’s a policy call that just sort of what you want to do, I do note that if and when there is a special exception for mining on this property in the future, it would pretty much be meaningless unless there was some kind of motorized access to develop for mining. So those two things would have to go hand in hand, which I think is what JTL had proposed. That the Board of Adjustment be allowed to amend the covenants to go with the special exception. But you could require a two-part process, if you wanted to.

I also in my email to Hilary and Ken Jenkins, I pointed out that in the second whereas paragraph of the covenants, there’s a reference to the City of Missoula that should read Missoula County and there are a couple typos.

Ken Jenkins, Montana Northwest Company representing JTL Knife River: I would like to start by thanking Hilary for her efforts to assist in getting this project in front of you today. I would also like to thank Elizabeth with Parks Department at the City; we did spend a good deal of time. Our purpose is to get back to the approval that was granted in 2005 but never came to be. Except for having to go through this whole process again, there is a bright side to that, in that I think we made significant improvements to the language in the easement and in the covenants, over what was approved in 2005. I appreciate Hilary and Elizabeth and everybody in local government that was involved in that and James for taking a look at the covenants and how that would work.
I would ask and hope that you agree with the staff recommendation that the proposed zoning is a much better fit for the property than the current residential zoning. It is all within the floodplain or for the most part, except for the railroad grade, it is in the floodplain. There’s been much discussion about the riparian resources that are on the property; clearly it is not suitable for the residential zoning that’s in place now. If you look at the review criteria for zoning property, if you look at what’s being proposed and how well that fits the growth plan. If we look at this zoning that's being proposed, based on its merits, I think the staff recommendation for approval makes all the sense in the world.

That being said, the property is owned by JTL Knife River. We fully understand that can cause some anxiety, they are an extraction company. I would reiterate again, there are no immediate plans, no plans in the near future, and no foreseeable plans to mine this property. That being said, when the property that’s within their ownership is zoned as residential, which by the way prohibits mining, the land itself cannot be seen as an asset for the company to own; zoned as it current is. Under the current zoning, if and when they ever wanted to try to do mining down there, under the current zoning, they’re dead in the water. They’re not even allowed to pursue that. It’s difficult for that property to be an asset to the company as it is now zoned and that is one of the primary purposes of why we’re here today. If in the future they ever wanted to pursue mining, there is a lot of local government process that would still have to be gone through. They would need a floodplain permit, which we’ve already heard is highly unlikely. They would need zoning compliance; it’s a special exception to the zoning, which allows local government review again, if they ever chose to ask to mine down there. And not to mention the DEQ permits that would be necessary. So there is a lot of process, a lot of opportunity for comment relative to environmental concerns. I understand where those come from because of who owns the property but as part of this process, I don’t know that going into great detail to address those type of concerns, this to me, isn’t the appropriate time to do that. That would be down the road when they are in additional processes that would be necessary to ___ away all the mining, as a special exception.

The benefits to this Hilary pointed out there’s an important link that the company is willing to donate on the railroad trail system. It’s a sizable piece of property that they plan to donate, that is south of the river. That happens to be a lot of acres of cottonwoods and where the bird study was done south of the river. That would be donated to the City Parks Department to become part of the Tower Street Park.

I don’t have a whole to add to what's been said, the language that James proposed, I think I certainly agree with that. There needs to be provisions for 50 years down the road if local government is going to revisit this or if the company wants to do something down there. I think it’s appropriate that the riparian resource mapping be looked at again. That the use of the property be looked at again, it would have to be a special exception to allow that and I think it only makes sense that years and years down the road we allow whoever local government is at that time to take a fresh look at it. I’m in agreement with that language.

The last thing I would add is the covenants that we’ve been talking about, the donations of land that we’ve been talking about, the protections to the riparian zones that are in those covenants; those are protections that are not in place today. Those are protections because of who the owner is; to alleviate some of that anxiety of the what-if. I don't want us to make our decision today based on what-ifs that may or may not ever happen. Nobody has a crystal ball and can predict that but because of who the owner of the property is; these protections are being offered by the applicant. So I think that’s noteworthy that there would be protections on the property if this zoning is approved, that aren’t there today. I would certainly field any questions if there are any and thank you.
Chair Curtiss: I have a question that may be good to state on the record. As Hilary stated this river has moved 400 feet into this property over the last ten (10) years. It seem to me that the owner, in the language that’s proposed, it says the 500 foot buffer moves as the river moves. The owner is taking a risk if he doesn’t do anything for (10) years, there might not be any gravel that’s left that isn’t protected in that buffer zone, is that true?

Ken Jenkins: That is something that the owner is aware of and that certainly is a risk. The river seems to have a pattern and 400 feet in ten (10) years is a lot. But that’s not to say that an ice jam couldn’t push it clear over to 3rd street next year.

Public Comment

Jim Cusker: Longtime resident of upper Grass Valley, Hellgate Community. I just recently became aware of this request when I attended the Planning Board Meeting, July 1st. I had attended at that time for a look at an item that was later in the agenda; I didn’t realize it would be that much later because this particular topic occupied the better part of two (2) hours. As I listened to Hilary’s presentation that night and again this afternoon, I thought it was very complete. I thought things were laid out very well and I think that you did a very good job in pointing out the natural resources that are present on the property. These are as indicated renewable resources; there’s a riparian zone, there’s a cottonwood forest, there are all the birds that are associated with that, which have been documented very well by the Audubon Society. Certainly the zoning requested today would put that property more into compliance with the Wye-Mullan Plan. As I listen to the presentation then, I thought well this is a slam dunk until Mr. Jenkins gave his presentation. I congratulate him on being very forthright and honest in stating the causes or the reasons for JTL wanting to have this particular rezoning put in place. The thing that bothered me at the time was the fact that the present zoning, which really isn’t very appropriate, would prohibit gravel mining. The zoning as proposed would allow it to happen. If these renewable resources are that important then perhaps we should take a look at whether or not they could be best protected by rezoning or leaving things the way that it is. You bet assured this is most certainly true that in the event that down the line Knife River would like to apply for a mining permit on that property, if it were rezoned, that there would be plenty of opportunity for public hearings. That sends a shiver down my spine. Years and years ago I was in attendance at the public hearing that was held at the Hellgate Middle School when the original gravel pit off from Mullan Road permission to have that occur brought before the community. The gym was absolutely packed and person after person, neighbor after neighbor got up and said; we do not want a gravel mine here, for many reasons, one of the reasons being that; hey, that’s been wonderful farmland since 1870. Other reasons of course would include the noise and nuisance and all that sort of thing. I believe only one or two persons who were would of directly benefitted from the gravel mining being permitted spoke in favor of everyone else overwhelmingly negative. The person who chaired the hearing said; well my goodness, we certainly understand where you folks are coming from. Within two weeks the permit was issued. Hilary, if we could look at the Fish Wildlife & Parks slide you can see the mining operation, that’s the one where...

Hilary Schoendorf: This is actually owned by another mining company.

Jim Cusker: Yes, that’s Jenson but as you can see the renewal natural resources are absolutely gone and never can be replaced. The non-renewable resource is being extracted and extracted very, very rapidly, it can’t be replaced either. Immediately to the
East the open space belongs to a farmer who has been approached by the adjoining gravel company, they want to purchase his property, they've been after him for years to do that. He has declined and at present I'm sure you'll remember in the paper just recently that that track of land, approximately 70 acres, has been converted to a rapidly growing poplar farm. One that will not only take advantage of the wonderful soil that is present there, but it's also watered by the affluent from the sewage treatment plant, further purifying the water. The farmer has given a long term lease for that property and in fact, if we go directly to the south we'll be considering another 30 acres going through the same thing. Contrast that to the property immediately to the west, renewable resources are being used and will be reused and reused forever. It may be a long time before JTL decides to move into this area that's proposed for rezoning but when that time comes, if you vote for approval today, you will have removed one of the big protections of that area today. I want to take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate and give my thanks to the commission for the legacy that you people will be leaving Missoula County. You are known throughout the State as the commission that looks out for the preservation of open space, including Ag and forestry land. You passed an open space bond in 2006, since that time 30 projects have taken use of the money to protect 23,500 acres of open space land, forest land, Ag land, open space land, and over four (4) miles of trails; a wonderful legacy, thank you. Interestingly enough, just a few miles down the river in 2007 from the proposed site one of the very first projects to come before the city open space bond committee was a request to acquire 40 acres of land very similar to that being considered today. Again, with exactly the same type of highly renewable resources present there and that was done. Are there alternatives for the preservation of these resources, other than rezoning it today with the possibility that in a number of years it's going to be mined? Well of course there are. It may be unlikely, but Knife River owning this land and wanting to regain some of the money that they have put out for it, if they could no longer list it as an asset, they could say hey, we'll put this entirely an open space and there's still money left in that fund just looking for projects such as this to set aside. Now if JTL decides not to take that route, then I would highly urge the commission to leave the zoning just as it is today. Why? First of all it will exclude a gravel mine but more importantly another great thing that the commission has done and working on right now, is revising the subdivision review regulations, and it's coming right along. If that area with its one house per acre zoning right now was up for subdivision, by that time there will be some wonderful mitigation standards present in these regulations that will probably come out this fall, which will protect land like that. So if we are truly interested in preserving that land for the open space that it has and the renewable resources that are on it, I request that you say no to this proposal.

Ms. Rita Axtell: Gave the Commissioner a letter with her concerns. I do live in the area that is being rezoned, I moved there 7 ½ years ago. My issues are the same as the gentleman that just talked. I have no problem with gravel and so forth being mined, although when I moved there 7 ½ years ago it was very, very quiet. I since have had to retire from work due to health issues. In the morning and all day long, I hear the commercial backup and I do understand about OSHA of this urr noise. All of us that live off Mullan, we just want some peace and quiet. I enjoy so much the wildlife down there and the birds. Isn't this something we can preserve for the generations to come either by parks, walkways or whatever? I do live right in the middle of the flood zone and it doesn’t bother me at all. Yes I did get flooded but that's part of nature. I thank you for your time and for listening to me and I know that you will take the interest of everybody at heart before you vote.
Executive Session

Commissioner Carey: I'd like to ask Mr. Cusker a few questions. As always you've got some very precedence remarks and I appreciate that. I'm wrestling with this too, for me it's now clear cut; on the one hand we get easements for a trail to extend Milwaukee Trail, we get acreage for a park. We still have safe guards in place although it's a question of whether or not the Board of County Commissioners or the Board of Adjustments, or both of us whatever, are going to be able to take a look at any proposal to mine gravel. But what about those tradeoffs if we don't...we've got the opportunity for the trail easements, park land. Is that something we just say we can't do given the important nature of this particular piece of property or what?

Jim Cusker: Well most certainly the open space bond would allow for that entire piece to be placed in a conservation easement, with those things in place. As I mentioned before, this would allow Knife River to recover some of the money that they put into the purchase of that property. What that would do would be to absolutely seal for perpetuity. Those valuable resources and yet it's very troubling to me to think that, okay we make that tradeoff now; this is what we can get now and that the hearings will occur in 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, 30 years. We'll go against the gravel interest and reject might, well I don't think so, history hasn't told us that that's true. We've got to have gravel but it's just like building houses, there are places where you can dig it and there are places where you should leave the surface alone. This area that's being considered has a proven resource in gravel below the surface. It's there and it's convenient, very convenient, but there are other places within the county that have similar resources that do not have the extremely valuable natural resources.

Commissioner Carey: My preferred outcome would be some sort of purchase of the property. But, we need a willing seller for that and I haven't heard anything that indicates that they want to pursue that.

Jim Cusker: And I certainly understand that. One way to make it highly more profitable that they would consider selling would be to deny the rezoning. Because if you take away the ability to mine gravel they're gonna find some way to get the money then.

Chair Curtiss: I think part of our dilemma is that when someone asks for rezoning they have several criteria to meet, which are addressed in the packet that we've been given. Whether it confronts the objections of the comprehensive plan, it does. There are all these different criteria; I think there are six (6). Number 6 does say; does it consider expressed public opinion.

Commissioner Carey: I have a question or two for James. Do you know whether or not the recommendations from Elizabeth Erickson with the open space program, in her letter of May 22nd she asked for three (3) things that all basically...have they been addressed, her concerns?

James McCubbin: I think Hilary could probably answer that.

Hilary Schoendorf: Elizabeth is here today if you would prefer her to answer that.
Elizabeth Erickson with Parks Department: I want to reiterate a couple things that Hilary mentioned and then also Ken discussed that one aspect of this proposal the trail easement securing the Milwaukee Corridor for a public non-motorized trail is a very high importance to the City. It’s in a number of our land use plans as with some of the county land use plans. That is one of the pieces that is very valuable to the Parks Department and valuable to our plans and goals to have a trail through there. So that was one of the concerns that was in the agency comments and that would be addressed. I spent quite a bit of time working directly with Ken Jenkins to craft language in the easement that the Parks Department was comfortable with. It was reviewed by the City Attorney, it was reviewed by other staff within the Parks Department and it was reviewed by our GIS Specialist. And we feel comfortable that the trail itself would be protected, if and when the day arrived that a trail was actually constructed across this area. We feel comfortable that it would be compatible with whatever operations JTL moved forward with. More importantly, I have reviewed the proposal and having worked on these documents with Ken and having worked also on the warranty deed that would transfer the land south of the river to the City. Our department and I personally feel comfortable that there are sufficient mechanisms in place to protect the valuable riparian resources in this area. As Commissioner Curtiss mentioned those riparian buffer zones, they’re not static, they will move as the river channel moves. What that will do the area that’s viable for gravel mining down the road, I don’t know. But I do know that those would move with the river channel which adds an additional amount of buffer. My predecessor, Jackie Corday, spent quite a bit of time actually walking the site and measuring out the riparian vegetation to ensure that it would sufficiently protect those zones and I understand what Mr. Cusker is concerned with, as we all are. It’s of upmost importance to protect this amazing area, to protect these riparian resources. Knowing that JTL Knife River is a gravel mining company we have to be prepared for the possibility that down the road. I do also believe that there are other junctures along the way when there would be a review of the permit. As everybody has already discussed, there would be other times at which the specifics as to whether a mining is actually appropriate on this parcel would be addressed through a public process. Our department and myself, I feel comfortable that this would protect the resources in the area that need to be protected.

Commissioner Carey: Are the conditions in the covenants covered? That was your second request. You recommend the conditions be adopted as both conditions to the rezoning and this recorded covenants.

Elizabeth Erickson: I think the covenants addressed more of the buffer zone, I believe. I would have to review the covenants more specifically. I do know that the actual easement document itself, as well as those riparian buffer zones, in addition to the transfer of that land that’s south of the river that contains a lot of the very valuable riparian resource area. Those combined would do quite a bit to protect that riparian resource.

Chair Curtiss: Looking at attachment A, which we know will have a staff line that moves. If it’s moved could the property ever be mined? If it’s not in some kind protective zone and then you have to look at the map that includes the vegetation types also.

Hilary Schoendorf: The Board of Adjustment could modify those development zones at the time.
Chair Curtiss: True, if we leave the language that way.

Commissioner Landquist: I just want to thank everyone that worked on this from the Planning Board to Ken Jenkins, the owners and Parks folks and all the agencies that commented on it. There are some specific property rights here and I think that there are some definite givens that were getting out for protecting it for here and now. I think it gives the owners, JTL, what they need out of it for the time being. And I find more protection quite frankly having the zoning change so that not so many houses could be built in there with that many people in the flood plain, should they want to develop it as residential at some time in the future and knowing that the door is open, that they still have to go through a number of hoops to actually get a mining permit for this. This is not for them to get a mining permit; this is just a zoning change. I realize that the difficulties that people have had to wrestle with but I don’t think we really have sufficient findings of fact to deny it, should we want to go that way.

Chair Curtiss: I think one other thing that Bill alluded to is that the open space bond project was designed for voluntary, willing sellers. I guess you can always try to hold a hammer over someone’s head but it was not approved to be something that we try to force people to use. While it would be nice if they did that I think the donation of the cottonwood gallery on the south side of the river is really an important aspect of this project too.

Motion
Commissioner Landquist made motion that the Board of County Commissioners approve the request from CRR1 Residential to CA1 Open and Resource for JTL Groups property subject to the conditions based on the findings of fact contained in the staff report, public testimony and written comment. The subject property is legally described as the SE ¼ of the SE ¼ and that portion of Chicago Milwaukee Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad Companys right-of-way in the NE ¼ and SE ¼, also the portion of the NE ¼ and the SE ¼ South of the railroad right-of-way. All of S13, T13N, R20W PMM also NE ¼ NE ¼ less river in S24, T13N, R20W PMM Missoula County, Montana, Tract 1, Tract 2, COS 6384 containing 74 acres more or less. Including James’ amendment to the covenants, adding a new article 5 as stated previously in this meeting and correcting a couple typos. Commissioner Carey second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

7. PRELIMINARY BUDGET HEARINGS
   a. Seeley Lake Refuse District Budget & Annual Assessment

   Greg Robertson gave budget update. The purpose of the hearing today is to take public input on levying assessments for management of the Seeley Lake Refuse District. We are recommending no change to the assessment which is $150.00 per property within the district. It’s living within its means and we see no reason to adjust, revenues are keeping up with expenses.

   Public Comment
   None

   Greg Robertson: This is just for taking public testimony. There will be a Resolution presented to you next week for your consideration.
b. Missoula County FY2015 Preliminary Budget
Andrew Czorny gave budget update.

Public Comment
Sherry, Mountain Home Montana: I’m here today to recommend your funding of the Poor Fund and the Substance Abuse Prevention Fund as proposed in this budget. I can tell you from our experience with the CVO monies that we’ve really done a lot with the amount that you’re able to give us for our support of housing program. It really does go a long way to helping the valuable families that we do serve. We’re seeing an increasing number of families; this is as a result of our expansion of services with the supportive living apartments. We’re able to help more of these families who are in need. We still do operate with a waiting list; we have 14 on our waiting list right now. We want you to know how crucial this funding is to the support of housing work that we do. I also want to thank you for the substance abuse prevention funding that has been made available for our application. We hope to be able to use those monies for some community activities that will help the population that we serve, learn alternatives to substance abuse and help prevent some of the substance abuse issues that we’re seeing in our community.

Kate Siegrist, Health Services: I’d like to echo the words that were just spoken in support of the Poor Fund. We have been able with the support of the county to leverage that money into sustainable foster child health program that has currently served over 240 foster children. Mountain Home Montana is a partner with us in that effort. This year in our application you might have noticed that 71% of the residents in 2013 in Mountain Home Montana had been in the foster care system as children. And 4 of the residents were currently foster children at the time that they were either pregnant or parenting at Mountain Home Montana, so we really appreciate our partnership with Mountain Home. But in addition to that, we’re working very closely with Child and Family Services as well as the foster care clinic at Providence Medical Center Grant Creek Practice to provide a really unique program in the state of Montana that’s getting attention at the State level. We’re hoping to be able to help other counties and prove their services to foster children by modeling our model here that really launched with poor fund support in 2012 and continues to thrive. So I want to thank you and I appreciate your interest in caring for these children.

Danette Rector, Director of Big Brothers and Big Sisters, Missoula: On behalf of the Board of Directors, the parents, the volunteers, the staff and especially all the little brothers and sisters, I want to thank you for investing in our program and for believing in the work that we do and how it is helping Missoula County children succeed and thrive in life. The funding that we have received through the substance abuse prevention levy has really made a difference to our program, it has allowed us to increase the number of matches and work with very high risk children in our community that are referred for services. These are children who are living in homes where they may have one or both parents that are incarcerated. We have children that are growing up in homes where they’re being raised by their great-grandparents because their parents are experiencing many stresses in life from jobs to income, to use of various drugs, so it’s very important that we put positive healthy adults into the lives of the children. In fiscal year 2014 we matched 242 children from Missoula and out of that number 21 of those matches were made and supported by funding through the SAPL Grant that we have been so appreciative of receiving for a number of years. Although we matched 242, we still started July 1 of this year with close to 60 boys and girls on our waiting list, of that number 58 of them are boys.
I always want to put a plug in for the fact that we need big brothers. Also, at least half of those boys have been waiting for at least 6 months or longer. So the good news is, with the funding that will come in for this fiscal year, we will be able to match, we know 21 of those boys with big brothers, thanks to the funding. And really that helps us then to use our other revenues and resources to match the other children that are on the list. I just want to again thank you for all you do, not only for the children and big brothers and big sisters but for all the children here in Missoula County, as well as their families. Again, they all say thank you very much.

**Peggy Seel:** I’m here for Steve Schmidt who had to leave. The forum just wanted me to thank you so much for not just funding the forum, but for the substance abuse mill levy. It funds many programs other than the forum and we all work together, and we can all help to reduce substance abuse problems we have in Missoula. The forum this year has taken off, that’s why nobody is here because they’re all doing forum work. All three (3) of them thank you very much and watch out for their work…coming up in September is a Prescription Drug Misuse Abuse Campaign that will target parents and just talking about the accidental misuse by kids because of the drugs being available in their own homes. I do have three (3) issues for you of the Best Beginnings Missoula Kids’ Book and this is the supplement to the one last year where Brandy gave you that it was for middle school and high school. This is for child care and elementary schools.

**Patty Murphy, Director of programs of the YWCA, Missoula:** I want to thank you for considering our two (2) CVO funding requests. One is for our Gateway assessment center/emergency housing, that’s actually the entryway for homeless individuals and families here in the community; we’re a base of the Salvation Army. We currently have seven (7) rooms and a local motel for homeless one and two parent families. We also give out one to three night emergency motel room vouchers. But our case manager works with each family with resources and referrals, just really working on trying to get the families housed. The other program is our YWCA Domestic Violence Shelter; we have a seven (7) bedroom shelter that is full on consistent bases, the funding will help support our case managers answering our 24 hours crisis line. We have walk-ins where we can meet one on one for crisis counseling, meeting the survivors of domestic and abusive violence for the women, children and men that we see here in the community.

**Executive Session**

Final Budget will be at the end of August after we get our numbers from the Department of Revenue.

8. **OTHER BUSINESS**

None

9. **RECESS**

Being no further business to come before the Board the Commissioners are in recess at 3:09.