

SEPTEMBER 28, 2010

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, IN AND FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, MET IN SPECIAL SESSION ON THE ABOVE DATE AT 5:05 P.M. AT THE WASHINGTON COUNTY ANNEX, BOARD MEETING ROOM, 1331 SOUTH BOULEVARD, CHIPLEY, FLORIDA WITH COMMISSIONERS BROCK, PATE, HOWELL, HOLMAN AND STRICKLAND PRESENT. COUNTY MANAGER EMORY PITTS AND DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW WERE ALSO IN ATTENDANCE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER. COMMISSIONER HOWELL OFFERED PRAYER AND LED IN THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN CLARIFIED THE BOARD WAS HERE TO ACCEPT THE BUDGET FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR AND THEY WILL DISCUSS THE COUNTY MANAGER'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT. HE ADVISED AS FAR AS THE PUBLIC, ANYTHING ELSE THEY ARE HERE TO DISCUSS WILL HAVE TO BE DONE OCTOBER 23RD AT THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING. IF THEY HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR NEED TO TALK ABOUT SOMETHING PRIOR TO THE OCTOBER 23RD MEETING, THEY CAN GET WITH THE COUNTY MANAGER, MR. PITTS AND MR. PITTS CAN GET WITH HIM AND THEY WILL GO FROM THERE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN THEN HELD THE FINAL PUBLIC HEARING ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011. HE STATED THE PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING IS TO HOLD THE FINAL PUBLIC HEARING TO ADOPT THE MILLAGE RATE AND BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011. THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS ADVERTISED IN THE WASHINGTON COUNTY NEWS ON SEPTEMBER 25, 2010. THE PROPOSED BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011 TOTALS \$37,224,702. THE TENTATIVE BUDGET IS 12.542% GREATER THAN THE 2009-2010 BUDGET. THE PROPOSED MILLAGE RATE OF 8.9195 IS 1.89% LESS THAN THE ROLL BACK RATE OF 9.0913.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD WITH ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE TENTATIVE MILLAGE RATE OF 8.9195. NO ONE RESPONDED.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE ON THE BOARD WHO HAD ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE TENTATIVE MILLAGE RATE OF 8.9195.

COMMISSIONER BROCK, FOR INFORMATION, STATED THIS WAS THE SAME

MILLAGE THE BOARD ADOPTED LAST YEAR; THERE WAS NO INCREASE.

DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW ADVISED IT WAS NOT THE SAME MILLAGE RATE AS LAST YEAR; IT IS MORE THAN LAST YEAR'S MILLAGE RATE BUT LOWER THAN THE ROLL BACK OF 9.0913.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PATE AND CARRIED ON A ROLL CALL VOTE TO ADOPT THE RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TENTATIVE MILLAGE RATE OF 8.9195 AS THE MILLAGE RATE FOR FY 2010-2011.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD WITH ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011 TOTALLING \$37,224,702. THERE WAS NO RESPONSE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE ON THE BOARD WHO HAD ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011. THERE WAS NO RESPONSE.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HOWELL AND CARRIED ON A ROLL CALL VOTE TO ADOPT THE BUDGET RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TENTATIVE BUDGET TOTALLING \$37,224,702 AS THE FINAL BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN STATED THE TENTATIVE MSBU BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011 TOTALS \$697,780. HE ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD WITH ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE TENTATIVE MSBU BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011.

SAL ZURICA ADDRESSED THE BOARD STATING TWO MONTHS AGO A COMMITTEE SENT A LETTER TO THE BOARD AND ROGER HAGAN REQUESTING THE 5% INCREASE BE HELD BACK THIS YEAR BECAUSE OF THE ECONOMY AND HE GUESSED IT WAS IGNORED.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HE SEEN THE LETTER.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED IF THERE WAS ANY FURTHER COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD. THERE WAS NO RESPONSE.

KAREN SHOEN, SUNNY HILLS, ADDRESSED THE BOARD ON HER READING

IN THE NEWSPAPER THERE WAS A NEW BUILDING GOING UP FOR A COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT. SHE QUESTIONED WHO WAS PAYING FOR IT; WHICH BUDGET IS IT COMING FROM.

MR. PITTS INFORMED MS. SCHOEN THE GENERAL FUND BUDGET WAS PAYING FOR THE BUILDING. THE COMMISSIONERS APPROVED OF \$75,000 SEVERAL MONTHS AGO TO PUT THE BUILDING UP.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE ELSE IN THE AUDIENCE THAT WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON THE MSBU BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011. THERE WAS NO RESPONSE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE ON THE BOARD WHO WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT OR HAD ANY QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO THE TENTATIVE MSBU BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011. THERE WAS NO RESPONSE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PATE AND CARRIED ON A ROLL CALL VOTE TO ADOPT THE BUDGET RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TENTATIVE MSBU BUDGET TOTTALLING \$697,780 AS THE FINAL MSBU BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ANNOUNCED THE FINAL PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED BUDGET FOR FY 2010-2011 WAS NOW CONCLUDED.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ADDRESSED EACH OF THE BOARD MEMBERS HAD A COPY OF THE COUNTY MANGER'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT. HE SAID HE WOULD HEAR ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS THE BOARD MAY HAVE AT THIS TIME AS THEY HAVE HAD AMPLE TIME TO REVIEW THE COUNTY MANAGER'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED IF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY WAS SUPPOSE TO BE HERE. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HE DIDN'T KNOW; BUT, HE WAS GIVEN A COPY OF THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT AND WROTE HIS COMMENTS ON IT.

COMMISSIONER PATE ASKED COMMISSIONER BROCK IF HE WANTED TO SEE THE NOTES HE WROTE ON HIS COPY OF THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE DIDN'T KNOW WHAT HE WROTE, WHAT HIS OPINION IS OF THIS CONTRACT AND THOUGHT THE ATTORNEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN HERE TO ADDRESS THE CONTRACT.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN TOLD COMMISSIONER BROCK EVIDENTLY HE DIDN'T

THINK IT WAS IMPORTANT ENOUGH OR IF THE ATTORNEY HAD ANY NEGATIVE INPUT ABOUT IT, HE WOULD HAVE NOTIFIED MR. PITTS OR ONE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS AND HE HAS NOT HEARD ANYTHING FROM HIM.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED WHO PREPARED THE CONTRACT. MR. PITTS STATED THAT HE AND HEATHER HAD PREPARED THE CONTRACT; IT WAS TAKEN FROM PETE'S CONTRACT. IT WAS BASICALLY THE SAME AS PETE'S PREVIOUS CONTRACT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK STATED FROM WHAT HE IS SEEING, IT IS A WHOLE LOT STIFFER CONTRACT THAN PETE'S. EMORY HAS AN AUTOMATIC RENEWAL IN THERE. MR. PITTS ADDRESSED IT BEING A TWO YEAR CONTRACT WITH AN EVALUATION AT THE END OF THAT TWO YEARS.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID SOMEBODY NEEDS TO CHECK ON THE STATUTE TO SEE WITH A NEW SETTING BOARD COMING IF THEY CAN CONTRACT FOR TWO YEARS. HE THINKS IT IS ONE YEAR.

DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW SAID THE CONTRACT AGREEMENT SAYS THIS AGREEMENT SHALL BE DEEMED AUTOMATICALLY RENEWED AT ITS EXPIRATION UNDER THE SAME TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUBJECT TO ANY INCREASES IN THE COUNTY MANAGER/BUILDING OFFICIAL'S COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS FOR AN ADDITIONAL ONE YEAR TERM.

MR. PITTS SAID WHEN YOU DIG INTO THE MEAT OF THE CONTRACT IT DOES SAY AN EVALUATION AT THE END OF TWO YEARS. MR. PITTS SAID HE IS NOT AWARE OF ANYTHING IN THE STATUTES THAT WOULD PREVENT THE BOARD FROM EMPLOYING SOMEONE FOR TWO YEARS.

COMMISSIONER BROCK, REPRESENTING THE COUNTY, THOUGHT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY SHOULD HAVE PREPARED THE CONTRACT; NOT THE EMPLOYEE HIRED FOR THE JOB. THAT IS HIS HONEST OPINION AND HE TOLD MR. PATE HE WAS ENTITLED TO HIS OPINION. THAT IS WHY THEY HAVE COUNTY ATTORNEYS.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED COMMISSIONER BROCK IF HE WAS ON THE COMMITTEE WHEN MR. PETE'S CONTRACT WAS DONE. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE HAD NEVER BEEN ON A COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED COMMISSIONER BROCK IF HAD ANYTHING TO DO

WITH MR. PETE'S CONTRACT. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID "NO;" HE DIDN'T HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH IT.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID ACCORDING TO THE MINUTES, COMMISSIONER BROCK DID; BROCK, MR. PETE AND JOHN HALL ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL MINUTES.

COMMISSIONER BROCK TOLD COMMISSIONER PATE TO SHOW HIM THOSE MINUTES; HE HAS NEVER HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH NO CONTRACT. THE ATTORNEY DRAWS UP THE CONTRACT AND THE BOARD ACCEPTS IT.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID THEY WERE NOT GOING TO ARGUE; HE HAD HEARD IT THURSDAY AND HE IS NOT GOING TO HEAR IT TODAY. THEY ARE GOING TO DISCUSS THIS CONTRACT IN A PROFESSIONAL MANNER; THEY ARE NOT GOING TO ARGUE.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE WAS NOT TALKING TO JOEL; HE WAS TALKING TO EMORY. HE REITERATED HE THOUGHT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN INVOLVED AND SHOULD HAVE DRAWED UP THE CONTRACT WITH THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THE ATTORNEY DID REVIEW THE CONTRACT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE DIDN'T KNOW THAT; HE WAS JUST TOLD THAT THE ATTORNEY DID REVIEW IT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK WENT BACK TO COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR QUALIFICATIONS UNDER THE ORDINANCE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ADOPTED FOR THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR ACCORDING TO THE STATUTES OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA. HE READ "THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR SHALL BE QUALIFIED BY ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXECUTIVE EXPERIENCE. THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR NEED NOT BE A RESIDENT OF THE COUNTY AT THE TIME OF HIS APPOINTMENT; BUT, DURING HIS TENURE IN OFFICE, THE ADMINISTRATOR SHALL RESIDE WITHIN THE COUNTY."

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED IF MR. PITTS HAD BEEN RESIDING IN WASHINGTON COUNTY. HE BELIEVES, IF THEY WILL CHECK, THEY WILL FIND OUT AS OF TODAY, MR. PITTS IS STILL LIVING IN BAY COUNTY. HE KNOWS MR. PITTS HAS RENTED A TRAILER OUT ON DELTONA; HE KNOWS PITTS VOTED, HE HAS GARBAGE BILLS. THERE IS A LOT HE KNOWS. ON THOSE

GROUNDS, HE IS GOING TO HAVE TO VOTE NO ON MR. PITTS' CONTRACT; LEGALLY HE IS IN VIOLATION OF THE LAW RIGHT NOW UNDER THE ORDINANCE THE BOARD HAS ADOPTED BY THE STATE OF FLORIDA.

MR. PITTS COMMENTED HE DID LIVE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND HAS BEEN LIVING IN WASHINGTON COUNTY FOR ABOUT THREE WEEKS NOW. HE GOES OUT OF TOWN ON THE WEEKENDS; HE GOES TO HIS HOME IN BAY COUNTY ON THE WEEKENDS. HE LEAVES WASHINGTON COUNTY ON FRIDAY EVENING AND COMES BACK ON SUNDAY AFTERNOON JUST LIKE ANYONE ELSE THAT WOULD GO OUT OF TOWN FOR THE WEEKEND AND GO SPEND A WEEKEND AT A RESORT, ETC. HE IS STILL IN CONTACT BY PHONE 24/7. HE REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER BROCK SAYING HE HAS PROOF HE (MR. PITTS) IS NOT A RESIDENT OF WASHINGTON COUNTY; HE WOULD LOVE TO SEE THAT PROOF BECAUSE HE HAS PROOF OTHERWISE. IT IS JUST LIKE SOME OF THE OTHER THINGS BEING TOLD THAT HE WAS FIRED FROM HIS LAST JOB; THAT IS A BALD FACED LIE. HE WORKED OUT A THIRTY DAY NOTICE AT HIS LAST JOB. ANYTHING THAT COULD BE SAID TO TEAR SOMEONE DOWN, JUST BECAUSE IT IS SAID IT IS NOT TRUE; IT DOESN'T MAKE IT TRUE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL POINTED OUT, EVEN IF MR. PITTS LIVED IN BAY COUNTY NOW, THE ORDINANCE SAYS DURING HIS TENURE HE SHALL RESIDE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY. HE COULD MOVE TO THE COUNTY TOMMORROW. IF THEY HIRED SOMEBODY FROM SOME OTHER COUNTY, THEY WOULD HAVE TO MOVE HERE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ADDRESSED SEVERAL ITEMS IN THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT:

1. ON PAGE 2 UNDER COMPENSATION, THE SALARY DISCUSSED OF \$85,000. HE AND MR. PITTS HAS HAD DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT AND MR. PITTS UNDERSTANDS HOW HE FEELS ABOUT IT. COMMISSIONER HOWELL ADDRESSED THE BOARD HAVING ASKED MANY OTHER EMPLOYEES TO DO MULTIPLE JOBS IN THE COUNTY AND NOT COMPENSATED THEM FOR IT. HE TRIED TO COMPENSATE ROGER HAGAN LAST YEAR WHEN HE TOOK ON THE MSBU COORDINATOR AND THE BOARD WOULDN'T ALLOW THAT TO HAPPEN. WHILE HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT MR. PITTS IS SAYING IT IS PROBABLY FAIR AND WARRANTED, HE JUST FEELS LIKE THIS POINT IN TIME WITH THE BUDGET SITUATION

THE WAY IT IS, ETC. THEY MAYBE OUGHT TO SETTLE ON A SALARY JUST FOR THE \$70,000 OR \$73,000.

2. HE IS OKAY WITH THE TWENTY FOUR MONTH PERIOD. HE THOUGHT THIS WOULD GIVE MR. PITTS A FREE REIGN FOR TWO YEARS; BUT, HE THINKS IT WILL TAKE THAT LONG TO CLEAN THINGS UP. THERE IS NOTHING THAT SAYS THE BOARD CAN'T TERMINATE MR. PITTS WITHIN THAT TWO YEARS; THIS JUST GIVES MR. PITTS AN IDEA SO HE WON'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT IT FOR A WHILE.

COMMISSIONER BROCK REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAYING THERE IS NOTHING IN THE CONTRACT THAT SAYS THE BOARD CAN'T TERMINATE MR. PITTS WITHIN THAT TWO YEARS AND ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYTHING IN THE CONTRACT IF THEY DO TERMINATE HIM PRIOR TO THE TWO YEARS, MR. PITTS WOULD AUTOMATICALLY FALL BACK TO THE BUILDING POSITION. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID IT DOES SAY THAT; BUT, HE WANTS TO ADDRESS THAT IN A MINUTE.

3. ON PAGE 4 OF THE CONTRACT, ITEM 2D, WHERE IT TALKS ABOUT THE FLORIDA RETIREMENT SYSTEM, SENIOR MANAGEMENT SERVICE PLAN, HE ASKED MR. PITTS IF THAT WAS HIS NORMAL CLASS NOW. MR. PITTS SAID "YES." COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THAT WAS SUFFICIENT.

4. ON PAGE 5 OF THE CONTRACT, WHERE IT TALKS ABOUT DISMISSAL WITHOUT CAUSE, THERE IS A SECTION UNDER ITEM 2 THAT TALKS ABOUT HAVING A SALARY LOWERED AND IT ALSO HAS A SECTION IN THE FRONT THAT SAYS THEY CAN'T LOWER MR. PITTS SALARY ANY LOWER THAN ANY OTHER PERSON IN THE COUNTY. HE DOESN'T THINK THIS REALLY APPLIES TO THAT AND HE DOESN'T FEEL LIKE THAT NEEDS TO BE IN THE CONTRACT.

MR. PITTS SAID IT MAY BE A DUPLICATION; IT SAYS THE SAME THING. IT JUST SAYS IN A GREATER PERCENTAGE THAN APPLICABLE ACROSS THE BOARD REDUCTIONS OF ALL COUNTY EMPLOYEES.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL REITERATED IT SAYS IN FRONT, THEY CAN'T DO THAT, ANYTHING MORE THAN THAT AND HERE IT SAYS THEY CAN DO AND THEY AREN'T GOING TO DO THAT BECAUSE IT SAYS THEY CAN'T IN FRONT.

DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW QUESTIONED IF COMMISSIONER HOWELL WAS

WANTING ITEM B2 ON PAGE FIVE TAKEN OUT OF THE CONTRACT. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THE FIRST PORTION WHERE IT TALKS ABOUT THE SALARY OR BENEFITS OF COUNTY MANAGER/BUILDING OFFICIAL IN A GREATER PERCENTAGE THAN APPLICABLE ACROSS THE BOARD REDUCTIONS AND IT SAYS IN ANOTHER PART THEY CAN'T DO THAT SO HE DOESN'T THINK IT APPLIES.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL AGREED HE DIDN'T THINK THE AGREEMENT IS NOT SOMETHING THE ATTORNEY OUGHT NOT TO SEE, ESPECIALLY AS THEY MOVE FORWARD WITH IT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE THOUGHT EACH BOARD SHOULD HAVE THE AUTHORITY AT REORGANIZATION IF THEY WANT TO ADVERTISE FOR A BUILDING INSPECTOR, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR OR WHATEVER THE ISSUE IS; THEY SHOULDN'T BE TIED DOWN THAT THEY CAN'T. WHAT THIS IS DOING, IS TYING THEM DOWN.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ADDRESSED THERE IS SOMETHING IN THE CONTRACT WHERE THE BOARD CAN DISMISS MR. PITTS; THEY CAN TERMINATE HIM.

COMMISSIONER BROCK AGREED; BUT WHEN THEY DO THAT, THERE IS AN ARTICLE IN THERE THAT SAYS HE GOES BACK TO THE OTHER POSITION.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HE WANTED TO ADDRESS THAT TOO. IF THEY DISMISS MR. PITTS WITH CAUSE, THEY AREN'T GOING TO PUT HIM IN ANOTHER POSITION; THEY AREN'T GOING TO PUT HIM BACK IN THE BUILDING OFFICIAL'S JOB IS HIS OPINION. IF THEY DISMISS HIM WITH CAUSE, THEN HE DOESN'T NEED TO BE WORKING FOR THE COUNTY.

5. ON PAGE 5, #3 WHERE IT TALKS ABOUT WHAT THE TERMS ARE FOR DISMISSAL UPON THE FILING BY THE APPROPRIATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIAL OF AN INDICTMENT, ETC; HE RE-WROTE SOME OF THAT AND SAID THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS MAY DISMISS THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR WITH CAUSE AND LISTED A FEW THINGS, ONE BEING UNBECOMING CONDUCT OF A COUNTY OFFICIAL. HE THOUGHT THIS WAS IN THE AGREEMENT BEFORE.

MR. PITTS SAID WHAT THEY HAD IN THE PREVIOUS AGREEMENT WAS VIOLATION OF ANY STATUTE RELATING TO THE CONDUCT OF AN EMPLOYEE.

6. ON PAGE 6, ITEM F ON DISMISSAL, WHERE IT STATES "IT IS RECOGNIZED BY COUNTY THAT THE COUNTY MANAGER/BUILDING OFFICIAL HAS

PERFORMED HIS ASSIGNED DUTIES EFFICIENTLY AND SATISFACTORILY AS BUILDING OFFICIAL SINCE HIS DATE OF HIRE, JULY 5, 2006, AND IF REMOVED FROM THE POSITION OF COUNTY MANAGER, WITH OR WITHOUT CAUSE, HE WILL BE PLACED BACK INTO THE POSITION OF COUNTY BUILDING OFFICIAL. HE WANTED TO TAKE "WITH" OUT AND IT READ IF REMOVED FROM THE POSITION OF COUNTY MANAGER WITHOUT CAUSE, HE WILL BE PLACED BACK INTO THE POSITION OF COUNTY BUILDING OFFICIAL AT HIS ORIGINAL SALARY WITH NOTIFICATION. IF THEY REMOVE ANYBODY WITH CAUSE, THEY DO NEED TO BE A COUNTY EMPLOYEE.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID IF THEY WERE GOING TO PUT THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT OFF, HE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A STRONG SUGGESTION THE BOARD GET A COPY OF PETER HERBERT'S CONTRACT AND READ IT; ALSO, GET A COPY OF THE MINUTES WHEN HERBERT'S CONTRACT WAS WRITTEN AND SEE WHO WROTE IT BECAUSE THE NAMES WERE RIGHT THERE IN THE MINUTES AND THERE WAS SOME CONTROVERSY THEN.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND DIDN'T HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN AGREED WITH COMMISSIONER HOWELL AS FAR AS THE SALARY AT THIS TIME DUE TO THE BUDGET; ALSO, THE COUPLE OF OTHER THINGS THAT NEED TO BE REWORDED OR CHANGED. HIS RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD WOULD BE TO ADOPT THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE CHANGES COMMISSIONER HOWELL STATED THAT THEY BE DONE.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND ASKED IF MR. PITTS WOULD TAKE THE CONTRACT FOR THE MONEY COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID.

MR. PITTS ASKED TO SPEAK TO THE MONEY ISSUE. HE ADDRESSED THIS BOARD HAS NOT PROMOTED ANYONE ELSE IN THIS COUNTY IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION WITHOUT AN INCREASE IN PAY. WHEN HE WAS PUT IN DIRECTOR'S POSITION ALONG WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF STAFF THAT WAS PUT INTO THAT POSITION, THERE WERE ADDITIONAL DUTIES AND THERE WAS NO ADDITIONAL PAY AND THEY ALL UNDERSTOOD THAT AT THAT TIME. HE BROUGHT THEIR ATTENTION TO THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF EMS WAS RECENTLY PROMOTED AND GIVEN A SIZABLE RAISE; HE HAS BEEN PROMOTED AGAIN TO DIRECTOR AND

GIVEN ANOTHER SIZABLE RAISE. OTHER MEMBERS OF THAT DEPARTMENT WHEN THEY WERE PROMOTED WERE GIVEN A RAISE. WHEN ANY POSITION IN THIS COUNTY WAS OPEN AND SOMEONE FROM INSIDE WAS PROMOTED, THEY TOO WOULD GET A RAISE. HE STATED HE FELT IT WAS QUITE UNFAIR TO EXPECT HIM TO TAKE ON THESE DUTIES AS WELL AS BE THE BUILDING OFFICIAL OF THIS COUNTY WITH NO INCREASE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED WHERE THE \$70,000 OF THE \$85,000 SALARY MR. PITTS IS ASKING FOR WAS COMING FROM. MR. PITTS SAID THE \$70,000 WAS BUDGETED OUT OF THE GENERAL FUND; THAT IS WHERE IT HAS BEEN BUDGETED FOR THE LAST TWO OR THREE YEARS IN THE GENERAL FUND OUT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET. THE \$15,000 WOULD BE TAKEN FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT TO SERVE AS THE BUILDING OFFICIAL. THE \$85,000 HAS ALREADY BEEN CALCULATED INTO THE BUDGET THE BOARD APPROVED TONIGHT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED WHO IS IN CHARGE OF CODE ENFORCEMENT. MR. PITTS ADVISED HE WAS.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED IF THE CODE ENFORCEMENT SALARY WAS \$30,000; THE BOARD PUT \$30,000 IN FOR CODE ENFORCEMENT.

MR. PITTS SAID THERE WAS \$30,000 BUDGETED FOR THAT WHICH WAS ORIGINALLY PUT IN THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT AND WAS REMOVED THIS YEAR BECAUSE OF THE MOVES THEY HAVE MADE BY PUTTING HIM INTO THE ADMIN BUDGET AND HIRING A PART TIME BUILDING INSPECTOR. THE \$30,000 WAS NOT NEEDED ANYMORE. ACTUALLY THERE WAS NO MONEY GOING INTO CODE ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE 2010-2011 BUDGET. THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT, BOTH HIMSELF AND THE PART TIME BUILDING INSPECTOR, DOES PLAN TO COVER THE CODE ENFORCEMENT.

MR. PITTS ADDRESSED IN THE EIGHT MONTHS HE HAS BEEN IN THE COUNTY MANAGER POSITION, HE HAS SAVED THE COUNTY OVER \$67,000 AND THAT IS RENEWABLE MONEY EACH YEAR; IT ROLLS OVER INTO SAVINGS EACH AND EVERY YEAR UNTIL INFLATION EATS IT AWAY.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN RECOMMENDED GIVING MR. PITTS THE \$85,000 SALARY AND THE REST OF THE ITEMS COMMISSIONER HOWELL STATED, CHANGE THEM.

DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW, FOR CLARIFICATION, SAID THERE WERE SOME ITEMS COMMISSIONER HOWELL DIDN'T SPECIFY SPECIFICALLY; THERE WAS ONE SECTION HE SAID HE HAD ADDED A FEW THINGS.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID THEY NEEDED A CORRECT CONTRACT WITH THE CHANGES; NE NOTICED THE COUNTY ATTORNEY, IF HE CAN READ IT RIGHT, MADE A NOTE ON THE REMOVAL OF POSITION OF COUNTY MANAGER WITH OR WITHOUT CAUSE.

DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW SAID SHE THOUGHT IT NEEDED TO BE GONE THROUGH, SAY THE SECTION, WHAT THE WORDING COMMISSIONER HOWELL WANTS IN IT AND WHAT THE BOARD APPROVES BECAUSE THEY COULD GO AWAY AND SOMEBODY COULD HAVE A MISUNDERSTANDING, INCLUDING HER.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID THE WORDING IN THE CONTRACT IS VERY CRITICAL AND HE WANTS THEIR ATTORNEY INVOLVED IN THIS. HE WANTS TO TALK TO THE COUNTY ATTORNEY.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID TO POSTPONE THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT UNTIL OCTOBER 7TH. HE AGREED THERE HAD BEEN A LOT OF CHANGES DONE HERE, SEVERAL THINGS TALKED ABOUT. THEY CAN GO THROUGH AND PULL OUT THE GOOD THINGS AND TALK ABOUT SALARY AGAIN AS IT MIGHT BE NEGOTIABLE.

MR. PATE REITERATED FOR THE BOARD TO BE SURE THEY GET A COPY OF THE MINUTES WHEN THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT PETE HAD WAS WRITTEN.

DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW SAID THAT WASN'T IMPORTANT REALLY; IN HER EYES IT WASN'T IMPORTANT AT ALL. COMMISSIONER HOWELL AGREED IT REALLY DOESN'T MATTER.

COMMISSIONER PATE REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER BROCK HAVING SAID HE DIDN'T WRITE PETE'S CONTRACT AND HE IS PICKING MR. PITT'S CONTRACT APART; WHAT IS GOOD FOR THE GOOSE IS GOOD FOR THE GANDER.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID AGAIN HE HADN'T WROTE NO CONTRACT; THE DIDN'T HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CONTRACT. THE ATTORNEY WRITES THE CONTRACT; HE DON'T WRITE NO CONTRACT.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID HE WOULD LET THE MINUTES SPEAK TO THAT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID THEY MIGHT HAVE APPROVED THE CONTRACT

THAT WAS WROTE JUST LIKE THEY ARE WANTING TO APPROVE THIS ONE; BUT, THE ATTORNEY WROTE THE LAST ONE AND THE EMPLOYEE IS WRITING THIS ONE.

LINDA OBERSON, ORANGE HILL, WASHINGTON COUNTY, 2401 GILBERTS MILL ROAD, ADDRESSED THE BOARD QUESTIONING WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF HAVING A MEETING AT 9:00 A.M. WHEN THE WORKING PEOPLE CAN'T COME. THEY WANT IT AT 5:00 P.M.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN STATED THEY WEREN'T GOING TO DISCUSS THAT TODAY. MS. OBERSON SAID THEY ALREADY DID. SHE JUST BROUGHT IT UP.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN REFERRED TO HIM HAVING SAID IT BEFORE THE MEETING BEGAN TODAY THEY WERE NOT GOING TO DISCUSS ANYTHING EXCEPT THESE TWO ITEMS

MS. OBERSON SAID HE HAD BROUGHT IT UP THOUGH IS THE REASON SHE IS DISCUSSING IT. CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID THEY WOULD TALK ABOUT IT AT THE NEXT BOARD MEETING OCTOBER 23RD AT 9:00. THE MEETING ON OCTOBER 7TH IS FOR THE JOINT MEETING OF THE BOARD AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW SAID THAT IS WHEN COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID TO BRING THE COUNTY MANAGER'S CONTRACT BACK UP TOO.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ASKED COULD THEY HOLD THE MEETING ON THE COUNTY MANAGER'S CONTRACT ABOUT 11:00 A.M. ON OCTOBER 7TH.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID HE DIDN'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH DOING IT THEN.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THEY NEEDED TO TALK ABOUT A SPECIAL MEETING FOR THE SIDE TRACK AGREEMENT; THE POSSIBLE LOAN FOR THE RAILSPUR.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID IN OTHER WORDS AFTER THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD GETS TOGETHER AT 9:00 A.M. ON OCTOBER 7TH, AFTER THAT MEETING COMMISSIONER HOWELL WANTS A BOARD MEETING TO FINALIZE THE COUNTY MANAGER'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT AND TALK ABOUT THE RAILSPUR.

THE BOARD'S CONSENSUS WAS AFTER THE 9:00 JOINT MEETING WAS CONCLUDED, TAKE A FIFTEEN MINUTE RECESS AND RECONVENE INTO A REGULAR BOARD MEETING TO FINALIZE THE COUNTY MANAGER'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT AND DISCUSS THE POSSIBLE LOAN FOR THE RAILSPUR.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN TOLD MS. OBERSON WHEN THE NEW BOARD TAKES OVER, THEY CAN SET THEIR OWN TIMES THEY WANT TO HAVE THEIR MEETINGS; BUT, UNTIL SUCH TIME, THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER WILL BE AT 9:00 A.M.; THE OCTOBER 7TH MEETING PERTAINING TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD WILL BE AT 9:00 A.M. AND ONCE THAT MEETING IS OVER, THERE WILL BE A FIFTEEN MINUTE BREAK AND THIS BOARD HERE WILL COME BACK IN SESSION TO TALK ABOUT THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE COUNTY MANAGER AND THEY WILL ALSO TALK ABOUT THE RAILSPUR AT THE INDUSTRIAL PARK NORTH OF CHIPLEY. ANY CHANGES IN THE BOARD MEETINGS, CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED MS. OBERSON TO COME BACK NOVEMBER 18TH, ADDRESS THE BOARD AND ASK THEM TO CHANGE THE BOARD MEETING TIMES AND IT WILL BE UP TO THEM.

NAN THOMPSON ASKED IF THERE WAS GOING TO BE ANY ADVERTISEMENT ON THE BOARD MEETING AFTER THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID IT WOULD HAVE TO BE. MS. THOMPSON SAID THEY WOULDN'T HAVE TIME.

MR. PITTS SAID IT HAD ALREADY BEEN ADVERTISED AS A JOINT BOARD MEETING AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND UPDATED THE BOARD ON PETE HAVING BEEN ASKED BEFORE HE LEFT TO WRITE A LETTER TO CSX ON THE RAILROAD TRACKS IN CARYVILLE AND HE DOESN'T KNOW IF IT GOT DONE OR NOT. THE RIGHTS CREEK ROAD TRACKS ARE REAL BAD AND IN NEED OF MAINTENANCE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN TOLD COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND TO GET WITH MR. PITTS AND GET A LETTER WROTE TO CSX.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL REFERRED TO THE BOARD HAVING TALKED PREVIOUSLY ABOUT THE LIABILITY INSURANCE AND THEM PAYING SOMEBODY \$14,000. THE BOARD IS HEARING THEY ARE NOT GETTING ANYTHING FOR THAT \$14,000 AND THEY DON'T HAVE TO HAVE A REGISTERED AGENT FOR THE LIABILITY INSURANCE. HE ASKED THE BOARD'S PLEASURE ON THIS. ARE THEY PAYING \$14,000 FOR A SERVICE OR ARE THEY PAYING \$14,000 FOR NOTHING. HE ADDRESSED THAT BEING HIS CONCERN AND HE WAS TOLD THE DEADLINE WAS

OCTOBER 1ST TO RENEW THE LIABILITY INSURANCE; IF THE BOARD WANTS TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT, THEY NEED TO MAKE A DECISION TODAY TO DO THAT.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SAID IT SEEMS LIKE THE COUNTY IS DOING THE WORK.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THAT WAS HIS THINKING; IF WE ARE DOING IT, THEN WHY PAY CLARK SOMETHING FOR THAT. IT IS A SIZEABLE CHUNK OF MONEY; IF THEY ARE DOING SOMETHING FOR US, LETS SIT DOWN AND TALK WITH THEM AND SEE WHAT THEY ARE DOING FOR US.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN STATED THEY HEARD THAT AT THEIR LAST MEETING.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL FELT THAT FIGURE COULD BE REDUCED SIGNIFICANTLY OR DONE AWAY WITH ALTOGETHER.

COMMISSIONER PATE QUESTIONED IF THIS INSURANCE THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT IS FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES TRUST, THE COUNTY'S INSURANCE COMPANY. HE ASKED WHY IS CLARK GETTING ANY KIND OF CUT OUT OF IT.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HE THOUGHT MS. FINCH HAD TOLD THEM THAT THE OTHER DAY; CLARK INSURANCE SERVICES IS THE AGENT OF RECORD. WE ARE TOLD WE DON'T EVEN NEED AN AGENT OF RECORD. THE BOARD IS GIVING CLARK INSURANCE SERVICES \$14,000 FOR NO REASON.

MR. PITTS SAID HE THOUGHT FACT HAS SAID THAT 75% OF THE COUNTIES DIDN'T HAVE AN AGENT OF RECORD. HEATHER REPLIED OVER HALF THE COUNTIES THAT FACT HAS DON'T HAVE AN AGENT OF RECORD FOR LIABILITY INSURANCE.

HEATHER REFERRED TO TRAVIS PITTS, WHEN HE ADDRESSED THE BOARD THE OTHER DAY, TOLD THEM THEY WERE REQUIRED TO HAVE AN AGENT OF RECORD. HE MAY BE RIGHT AS IT PERTAINS TO AN INSURANCE POLICY; BUT, FACT IS NOT AN INSURANCE POLICY. IT IS A RISK POOL; IT WAS DEVELOPED UNDER A TOTALLY SEPARATE STATUTE AND THEY DON'T HAVE TO ADHERE TO INSURANCE DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS. HOWEVER, THEY DO; MOST OF THEM.

HEATHER EXPLAINED WHEN SOMEONE HAS AN ACCIDENT IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND THEY CALL THIS OFFICE TO REPORT IT, THEY HAVE AN INCIDENT

FORM ON THEIR WEBSITE AND IT IS COMPLETED BY HR OR MR. PITT'S OFFICE, SHE SCANS IT AND SENDS IT DIRECTLY TO FACT. FACT ASSIGNS A LOCAL PERSON TO GO OUT TO THE ACCIDENT SCENE, AN ADJUSTOR, SO IT IS SOMEONE FROM THE PANHANDLE AREA WHO IS FAMILIAR WITH THE COUNTY ROADS, UNDERSTANDS THE WEATHER, DIRT ROADS, ETC. THEY ASSIGN SOMEONE THAT DOESN'T COST US ANY MORE MONEY. THE ONLY THING SHE HAS BEEN TOLD A LOCAL AGENT COULD DO FOR US, SUCH AS CLARK INSURANCE, IS TO HELP FACILITATE THAT; THEY COULD GO OUT AND TAKE PICTURES AS WELL. BUT, AGAIN FACT ALREADY DOES THIS AND DON'T CHARGE US ANYMORE FOR THAT.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ASKED WHO DOES THAT FOR FACT. HEATHER ADVISED BLISS MCKNIGHT IS THE CLAIMS COMPANY; WHEN SHE FILLS OUT THE CLAIM FORM, SHE EMAILS IT DIRECTLY TO BLISS MCKNIGHT. BLISS MCKNIGHT ASSIGNS A CLAIMS ADJUSTER; THEY HAVE SEVERAL THAT SHE WORKS DIRECTLY WITH. BLISS MCKNIGHT THEN ASSIGNS A LOCAL INVESTIGATOR OF SOME SORT TO GO TO THE SCENE AND GET IT CHECKED OUT. SHE REFERRED TO HAVING ONE THE OTHER DAY AND TODAY THE COUNTY ENGINEER WAS GOING TO LOOK AT THIS AREA BECAUSE IT IS A PROJECT HE JUST WORKED ON; SHE KNEW HE WAS FAMILIAR WITH IT SO SHE ASKED HIM TO GO LOOK AT THE AREA TO MAKE SURE NO ONE ELSE'S PROPERTY GETS HURT IN THIS AREA. SHE HAS SEARCHED HIGH AND LOW TO FIGURE OUT WHAT SHE IS MISSING, WHERE SHE IS MISSING AND SHE APOLOGIZES FOR THE DELAY IN GETTING THE BOARD THIS INFORMATION. SHE HAD NO IDEA THE COUNTY'S AGENT OF RECORD WAS GETTING 10% COMMISSION; SHE HAS NOT WORKED THE LIABILITY INSURANCE THAT CLOSELY UNTIL SHE HAD TO RECENTLY. THIS COMMISSION WOULD BE BETWEEN \$12,000 TO \$14,000.

HEATHER EXPLAINED THAT HER AND MR. PITTS HAD ASKED TRAVIS PITTS TO COME BY AND MEET WITH THEM AND THEY ASKED HIM WHAT THE COUNTY WAS GETTING FOR THAT MUCH MONEY. TRAVIS SAID ASSISTANCE WITH THE CLAIMS AND SHE HAS THE TRUST AGREEMENT FACT GIVES THE COUNTY THAT WILL TELL YOU THE THINGS THAT FACT ASKED THE BROKER TO HELP THEM WITH. THE BOARD HAS HER; THEY HAVE HAD EIGHT CLAIMS IN THIS FISCAL YEAR THUSFAR.

THE COUNTY HAS PAID OUT \$1246. YEAR BEFORE LAST, THE COUNTY HAD NINE CLAIMS AND THE PREVIOUS YEAR, THEY HAD EIGHT CLAIMS, THE YEAR BEFORE THAT THEY HAD NINE, THE YEAR BEFORE THAT THEY HAD THIRTEEN. SHE ADDRESSED THERE NOT BEING THAT MANY CLAIMS. SHE WAS TOLD BY FACT THE ONLY WAY TO DECREASE PREMIUMS WAS IS TO DECREASE COMMISSIONS TO THEIR AGENT OF RECORD OR UP THEIR DEDUCTIBLE. THE COUNTY'S DEDUCTIBLE RIGHT NOW IS \$1,000 PER INCIDENT WHICH HAS BEEN A FANTASTIC PAYOFF. IF THE BOARD WANTS TO THEY CAN UP THAT DEDUCTIBLE TO \$5,000; RIGHT NOW, A \$1,000 DEDUCTIBLE WORKS PRETTY GOOD.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HOWELL FOR DISCUSSION TO DO AWAY WITH THE AGENT OF RECORD FOR THE FACT LIABILITY INSURANCE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HE BELIEVES IN DOING BUSINESS LOCALLY IF THEY CAN WITH EVERYTHING THEY DO; BUT, IF THEY ARE NOT GETTING ANY SERVICE OUT OF THEM, THEY DON'T NEED TO CONTINUE TO PAY THEM.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAYS HE DOESN'T KNOW FOR SURE THEY ARE NOT GETTING ANYTHING OUT OF CLARK'S INSURANCE SERVICE AS THE AGENT OF RECORD.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HE DIDN'T EITHER; BUT, OCTOBER 1ST IS THE ABSOLUTE DEADLINE.

HEATHER SAID SHE HAS SPOKEN WITH FACT AND ASKED IF OCTOBER 1ST WAS THE ABSOLUTE DEADLINE; FACT HAD TOLD HER THAT ORIGINALLY BUT THEY ARE GOING TO VERIFY THAT TO MAKE SURE. HE WAS GOING TO ACTUALLY GO INTO BLISS MCKNIGHT'S HOME OFFICE TODAY; BUT, SHE HASN'T HEARD BACK FROM HIM YET. ORIGINALLY SHE WAS TOLD THAT BECAUSE THAT IS THE COUNTY'S PLAN YEAR; OCTOBER 1ST THEY GET THEIR RENEWALS AND THE RENEWAL RATE THEY GET HAS THE COMMISSION AUTOMATICALLY FIGURED INTO IT.

HEATHER SAID THE BOARD MAY BE GETTING SOMETHING FROM CLARK INSURANCE SERVICE; BUT, THEY ARE NOT GETTING \$13,000 WORTH NOT WITH EIGHT CLAIMS A YEAR FOR THE PAST THREE YEARS.

MR. PITTS SAID EIGHT CLAIMS THAT TOTALLED \$1200; THE INSURANCE

COMPANY PAID NOTHING IN THE PAST THREE YEARS.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ASKED COULD THEY MODIFY THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR TO HAVE MR. PITTS AND HEATHER CHECK INTO IT AND DO WHATEVER THEY FEEL LIKE IS NECESSARY TO BE DONE. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE WANTED THEM TO BE SURE; HE DIDN'T WANT THEM GUESSING.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID WHAT COMMISSIONER HOWELL IS SAYING IF MR. PITTS AND MS. FINCH SAYS THE COUNTY DON'T NEED TO BE PAYING CLARKS INSURANCE SERVICE, THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO DO AWAY WITH IT. HE ASKED IF THAT IS WHAT THEY ARE SAYING. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID "YES."

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED WHY COULDN'T THEY BRING THIS BACK. COMMISSIONER PATE ADDRESSED THEY COULDN'T BRING IT BACK BECAUSE IT IS AN OCTOBER 1 DEADLINE.

THE MODIFIED MOTION CARRIED TO HAVE MR. PITTS AND HEATHER CHECK INTO THE NEED FOR AN AGENT OF RECORD FOR LIABILITY INSURANCE AND DO WHATEVER THEY FEEL LIKE IS NECESSARY.

COMMISSIONER BROCK, FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES, REPORTED ON BAY COUNTY HAVING FOUR AREAS OF EARLY VOTING AND THEY JUST ADDED ANOTHER ONE ON. HE HAS TALKED WITH MARK ANDERSON AND IT IS INCREASING THE VOTING PERCENTAGE BY PUTTING EARLY VOTING PRECINCTS IN THESE AREAS OF BAY COUNTY. HE THOUGHT THEY HAD IGNORED THIS, THE BOARD, CAROL; THEY NEED ONE IN THE CENTRAL PART OF THIS COUNTY BECAUSE PEOPLE SEEM TO FORGET IT IS SIXTY MILES ACROSS THIS COUNTY. MR. ANDERSON SAID IT COST BETWEEN \$8,000 AND \$9,000 TO DO AN EARLY VOTING PRECINCT. HE THOUGHT THEY NEEDED TO LOOK AT CENTRALIZING ONE SOMEWHERE DOWN TOWARDS VERNON; EITHER IN THE LIBRARY OR THE CITY HALL.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN STATED WHEN THE NEW BOARD COMES ON, THEY CAN LOOK AT THIS.

COMMISSIONER BROCK QUESTIONED IF THE OLD BOARD DIDN'T WANT TO LOOK AT IT. CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID HE DIDN'T.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE DOES AND ASKED COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND WHAT HE THOUGHT.

18-BCC
09-28-2010

BOOK 85 PAGE 453

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND ASKED IF MR. PITTS COULD GET UP WITH MS. GRIFFIN AND TALK WITH HER ON THE EARLY VOTING PRECINCT. HE SAID HE KNOWS THAT SHE RUNS THE SHOW DOWN THERE AND HE HATES TO TELL HER WHAT TO DO; BUT, HE THINKS IT WOULD BE GOOD TO HAVE SOMEWHERE DOWN THERE IN VERNON THEY COULD GO TO. HE IS PRETTY SURE, THEY COULD USE THE CITY HALL FOR THE EARLY VOTING.

COMMISSIONER PATE ASKED IF ANYBODY HAD TALKED TO CAROL ABOUT IT.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN REQUESTED MR. PITTS TALK WITH MS. GRIFFIN AND SEE WHAT HER COMMENTS ARE ON THE EARLY VOTING PRECINCTS AND LET THE BOARD KNOW AT THEIR OCTOBER 7TH MEETING.

COMMISSIONER BROCK OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIOENR HOWELL AND CARRIED TO ADJOURN.

ATTEST:

DEPUTY CLERK

CHAIRMAN