

MINUTES OF HOUSTON COUNTY COMMISSION
JUNE 13, 2005

PRESENT: Chairman Mark S. Culver, Commissioner Curtis Harvey, Commissioner Bobby R. Snellgrove, Commissioner Frances M. Cook, Commissioner Phillip L. Forrester, Gary Sherrer, Attorney, Mark Pool, Engineer, and Roy J. Roberts, Administrator.

ABSENT: None.

Chairman Mark Culver called the 10:00 A.M. meeting to order. Rev. Tom Skeen, former Pastor, Rocky Creek United Methodist Church, Ashford, gave the invocation. Commissioner Bobby Snellgrove led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Harvey made a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting. Commissioner Cook seconded; and the motion carried unanimously.

Announcements.

Chairman Culver stated he did not have any. Commissioner Cook recognized Don Clements, City Commissioner, and stated he had been a longtime friend of her family.

ITEM #1. Recognition of Houston County Queens – Mrs. Sue Hicks.

Chairman Culver asked Mrs. Sue Hicks of the Altrusa Club to come forward along with the Houston County Queens. Mrs. Hicks reported the Future Little Miss, Elena Illerson, is in Europe, and the Junior Miss and Teen Miss are both at Cheerleader camps in Florida. She introduced “Little Miss Houston County”, Taylor Skipper, and stated that she is the daughter of Billy and Tanya Skipper and the grandchild of Commissioner Don Clements. Mrs. Hicks introduced “Miss Houston County”, Lindsay Shirley, daughter of Andy and Cecelia Shirley. Mrs. Hicks stated that they are delighted to be a part of the Houston County family and appreciated everything the commission has done for them. Chairman Culver stated the commission appreciated both of the queens and are very happy the two of them are representing Houston County this year. He wished them the best of luck in the “Miss National Peanut” pageant. Ms. Shirley stated she and Taylor were very excited about representing Houston County and stated they look forward to meeting everyone and working on the upcoming events.

ITEM #2. Request from Taylor Industrial Development Board.

Chairman Culver reported the Taylor Industrial Development Board is making this request. He stated that Mayor Joel Napier of the Town of Taylor and Matt Parker of the Dothan Area Chamber of Commerce are present are requesting the county to assist the Taylor Industrial Development Board. Mr. Parker stated he

appreciated the opportunity to work on an economic development project that will stimulate a lot of activity for the Town of Taylor. He reported that they have been working for the last 8 months on this project in a tribute to the county's vision to reach out and support the rural entities and to offer assistance in any way it can to stimulate activity. He pointed out this project is a result of that effort that started about a year ago with the county. Mr. Parker reported the development will be approximately 36,000-40,000 square feet in size and it will provide service related activities as well as retail services in the Taylor community. He pointed out the 52 west corridor and the 84 west corridors are very strong to create some more opportunities. Mr. Parker stated through Mayor Napier's leadership and the formation of the industrial development board they are able to get everything together so that they can begin work on some economic development activities. He stated they felt this project would stimulate about \$360,000 in sales tax annually for the town and would be split between the county, the city and the state. Mr. Parker reported the Town of Taylor had been very aggressive with extending infrastructure as part of this development, and they were requesting assistance from the county to help with grading of the site through the industrial development board, who owns the property. Mr. Parker reported that the project would create about 80-124 jobs and that number would fluctuate depending on the final tenants that go into the development. He reported that Amendment 766 passed a year and a half ago and it has opened up opportunities for more commercial related business through powers of industrial development boards and government entities to help entice and stimulate more activity in the community. Mr. Parker reported Commissioner Clements is present and he has been very visionary in supporting and creating commercial development policies for some other activities that are being worked on. He stated he appreciated Commissioner Clements support. Chairman Culver stated this project was the vision of the Town of Taylor who wanted to be progressive and step out and do some things to enhance the economy in their community. He reported they created the industrial development board which benefits not only this project but will provide some future opportunities for them. Chairman Culver stated this request comes from the industrial development board and the property is owned by the industrial development board and the commission is within its legal ramifications both from an economic development law and the passage of Amendment 766. Chairman Culver stated they appreciated the Town of Taylor and other towns in the county who are moving forward to try to enhance the growth within Houston County. Commissioner Snellgrove asked about the exact location? Mr. Parker stated it was on Highway #52 east of Brannon Stand.

Commissioner Cook stated Taylor was in her district and she commended Mayor Napier and the industrial development board for their work on this development. She also commended Chairman Culver because the commission gave him the job to go out and help the smaller communities to bring some economic growth to these smaller municipalities. Commissioner Cook made a motion to fund the Taylor Industrial Development Board \$85,000 for the industrial project. She stated she was making her motion as stated because it will not interfere with the

paving projects and other ongoing projects with the Road and Bridge Department. Commissioner Cook stated she felt this would be a way to help Taylor and not interfere with the projects the county has ongoing. Commissioner Snellgrove seconded the motion.

Mr. Larry Register stated that the energies put forth by the mayor and the industrial development board is well put. He reported that he did not know anything about this project until he read it in the paper. Mr. Register stated he had also put under contract an intended purchase of some 6 acres of land at a good price in Taylor. He stated that his intention is to build a shopping center, and he was here on concept defense. Mr. Register reported that if the county goes ahead with the project as designated and he is excluded, they would pay a big price in not being able to put forth their shopping center. He stated he felt being in Taylor, he should get equal treatment if the industrial development board goes forth with a project they would like the benefits of that also. He stated there are certain tax benefits under the industrial development board, and he felt they should be entitled to them. Mr. Register stated that he felt that sewer should be provided because his project is only a mile away, and if grading will be done for the facility, then they should get grading also. He stated there are serious public policy issues with this matter and he asked the commission to table this until it could be worked out. Mr. Register stated otherwise, they would just be meeting in court. He stated he wanted assurance in writing that he would get the same treatment for his shopping center. Chairman Culver stated the commission has an ongoing initiative to try to help towns in Houston County that cannot do it on their own. He reported this request is not from any developer; but from the Town of Taylor Industrial Development Board. The Chairman stated if the commission gets another request from the Town of Taylor Industrial Development Board concerning other projects, they would certainly entertain those at the proper time. Mr. Register stated that he would like for the commission to look at the situation before it goes through because he would have no assurance that his project would receive the same treatment.

Mayor Napier reported on Friday, he talked with Mr. Register about the sewer system and the other project he was concerned with, and the town will put in the sewer system on Highway #52. He stated the town wanted to treat everyone equally, and he believed the industrial development board would be willing to help Mr. Register in any way they can. Mayor Napier thanked the commission for all of their assistance.

Mr. Register stated he thought Taylor is a good community and is progressive and he certainly did not want to do anything to affect the town's progress. He reported he could not take the position that something will happen later on. He stated that he wanted to be on the same playing field, and assurance in writing that he would get the same benefits that Taylor does. Chairman Culver stated that Mr. Register would not get the same benefits that Taylor does because the commission cannot do work on private property. He reported this request is from

the Town of Taylor. Mr. Register stated if the commission would delay it he would meet with the Town of Taylor. He stated if this request passes, they would go to court and if not, then he would sit down and talk about it at a later meeting.

Mr. Sherrer asked Commissioner Cook to amend her motion to state based on the information provided to the Houston County Commission, the Commission hereby finds that the request from the Town of Taylor Industrial Development Board has for its objective the promotion of public health, safety, prosperity and the general welfare of the County and the Town of Taylor, Alabama, provides public benefit and serves a public purpose, will advance the development, advertisement and promotion of resources of the county and promote the location of agriculture and industry in the county and thereby the creation of jobs and prosperity for the citizens of Houston County, Alabama. By doing so, "This commission will make a finding of a public purpose for the purpose of development, advertising the resources of the county and for the purposes of locating and promoting agricultural, industrial, manufacturing plants, factories, and other industries in the county." He reported if the commission makes that finding, it advances the development of the resources of Houston County. Commissioner Cook amended her motion to state as follows: I make a motion that based on the information provided to the Houston County Commission, the Commission hereby finds that the request from the Town of Taylor Industrial Development Board has for its objective the promotion of public health, safety, prosperity and the general welfare of the county and the Town of Taylor, Alabama provides public benefit and serves a public purpose, will advance the development, advertisement and promotion of the resources of the county and promote the location of agriculture and industry in the county and thereby the creation of jobs and prosperity for the citizens of Houston County, Alabama and as a result I move that the Houston County Commission provide funds of \$85,000 to the Industrial Development Board of Taylor for the purposes stated herein and Commissioner Snellgrove seconded Commissioner Cook's motion as amended.

Mr. Register stated he was sure this was legal and the county has good legal advise, but for them to defend their investment they would be in court. He stated that it was a moral question whether they are to be taxed for the benefit of the development. Chairman Culver stated he understood, and that Mr. Register had to do what he had to do. He asked Mr. Register to understand the commission was not dealing with a developer; they were dealing with a request from the Town of Taylor as they have dealt with projects from Dothan, Ashford, Columbia, and all over the county. He pointed out the commission has a policy that deals with how the county works with the towns. Chairman Culver stated that he and Mr. Register did discuss establishing some type criteria and he thought that is something that needs to be looked into. Mr. Register stated that it was fine with him if the Mayor of Taylor will say that conditional must get equal treatment. He reported it will have the assurance that the sewer will be brought to his

development and the assurance from the county based on a request that they will have some dirt moved around and they will get the tax exempt status. Mr. Parker stated he was out of town last week and did not get a chance to meet with Mr. Register when he met with Mayor Napier and he would like to sit down and talk with Mr. Register about his project and see what else they can do to support it within the legal means and powers they have.

Mr. Jerry Dillard, resident of Taylor, stated that he felt instead of industrial development they needed some sewer lines by their homes. He asked who was the property bought from and what curtails how much they paid for it and the cost of the project? Chairman Culver stated that he thought the mayor would be happy to provide Mr. Dillard with that information. Mr. Dillard asked the chairman to ask the mayor to come up front and tell everyone? Chairman Culver stated that was a question for the Town of Taylor and not the commission. He stated Mr. Dillard needed to ask the Town of Taylor at their meeting. Mr. Dillard stated South Park Avenue needs resurfacing. Mr. Dillard stated he thought the commission should consider the questions he asked before voting. He suggested this issue be tabled until another meeting. Chairman Culver stated there was a motion on the floor as amended by the attorney, and he called for the question. The motion carried unanimously. Chairman Culver asked Mr. Parker, Mayor Napier, and Mr. Register to get together as soon as possible. Mr. Register asked if the motion was passed to proceed or to proceed after the discussion. Chairman Culver stated the request was for the county to provide in-kind service and grade the site. He reported as Commissioner Cook stated there was some concern about the county getting its other work done and the motion was to provide \$85,000 funding to the Industrial Development Board the Town of Taylor.

ITEM #2. Request to adopt Resolution changing make-up of E-911 Advisory Board.

Chairman Culver stated the changes are on the page that says Amendment Enhanced 911 Agreement. Commissioner Snellgrove stated the only changes to be made are in addition to the old agreement as follows: "the local ambulance companies shall have one representative on said committee and when there is more than one company they will rotate every 12 months." "The chairman of the committee will be elected annually from the members of the committee." Commissioner Snellgrove made a motion to grant the request to adopt the Resolution changing the make-up of the E-911 Advisory Board as presented. Commissioner Cook seconded; and the motion carried unanimously. (Please see in Resolution Book)

ITEM #4. Request from In-Home Service for an additional person – Mary Lou Strickland.

Chairman Culver reported this was discussed on Thursday. He reported Mrs. Mary Lou Strickland runs the in-Home Service and they do a tremendous job for the home bound in helping to deliver groceries, medication, and most anything else they might need. He stated there is an ongoing issue with the Senior Aides Program because they are supposed to rotate every three years as to where they can work. The Chairman stated a problem has developed in a couple of areas because they cannot get senior aides. He reported she is requesting a part-time person to help with the deliveries or if they cannot find senior aides the other option would be to discontinue service to those people who really need the services. The Chairman stated he had been out and ridden with Mrs. Strickland and seen some of the needs that are out there, and he encouraged the other commissioners to do that some time. He pointed out there is already one part time position and the request is that the commission fund a second part-time position in a likeness to the first one. Commissioner Cook made a motion to approve the request from In-Home Service to fund an additional person through the proper budget amendment. Commissioner Harvey seconded the motion. Commissioner Snellgrove asked Mr. Roberts for the cost? Mr. Roberts stated the annual cost is approximately \$7,300 with \$6,100 in salary and \$1,200 in taxes and benefits. He reported the balance of the year would be around one fourth of that amount. The chairman called for the question and the motion carried unanimously. (Please see attached budget amendment in Minute Book)

ITEM #5. Request from Farm Center – approve budget amendment for the purchase of lawn equipment.

Chairman Culver stated Mr. Seago has moved some funds around and the request will not involve any new money. Commissioner Snellgrove made a motion to approve the request from the Farm Center to approve a budget amendment for the purchase of lawn equipment. Commissioner Forrester seconded; and the motion carried unanimously. (Please see attached budget amendment in Minute Book)

ITEM #6. Request from Revenue Commissioner – approve list of Errors, Insolvents, Litigations and Supplements, and Escape Reports.

Chairman Culver reported this is done annually in order to clean up some of the property lists. Commissioner Cook made a motion to approve the request from the Revenue Commissioner to approve the list of Errors, Insolvents, Litigations and Supplements and Escape Reports. Commissioner Harvey seconded; and the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #7. Request to approve policy statement for daily meal allowance for Houston County employees who attend the police academy.

Chairman Culver reported the discussion on Thursday was that when someone is sent out of town for three or four days, they bring back receipts and refunded

based on those receipts. Chairman Culver asked the sheriff how long the police academy was? The sheriff reported it was 12 weeks. Chairman Culver reported that creates a burden trying to keep up with the receipts for that length of time. He stated the request is to approve \$25.00 per day per diem for meals. Commissioner Snellgrove made a motion to grant the request to approve the policy statement for \$25.00 per day per diem for meals for Houston County employees who attend the police academy. Commissioner Harvey seconded; and the motion carried unanimously. (Please see attached in Minute Book)

ITEM #8. Request to award bid for video teleconferencing equipment.

Chairman Culver reported they have been trying to get this equipment in the jail since it opened. He reported Sean Curtis, Nancy Bristow, Leslie Ashworth, Roy Roberts, and the Sheriff have done a lot of work on this. Commissioner Snellgrove asked Mr. Curtis if the video will be in the existing jail and the monitor will be in the courthouse? Mr. Curtis reported there would be 2 monitors and one media cart that will roll around to the different courtrooms. Commissioner Snellgrove made a motion to award the bid for the video teleconferencing equipment to the low bidder meeting specs, InLine (Montgomery), in the amount of \$15,004.00. Commissioner Cook seconded the motion. Chairman Culver reported this system is designed to add monitors if there is a problem with not having enough. The chairman stated they had contacted Bay County about their video monitoring equipment and he thanked them for all their help. Chairman Culver called for the question; and the motion carried unanimously. (Please see attached Bid Summary Sheet in Minute Book)

ITEM #9. Request to award bid for food service at the jail.

Chairman Culver reported this is a decrease over the previous price. Commissioner Snellgrove asked if the decrease was due to volume? He asked if there were more inmates at the jail than we have had in the past? The sheriff stated there are more people than there have been in the past. The sheriff stated the city is probably at their maximum and it includes the city. Chairman Culver reported the county feeds the city inmates and those in the community corrections program. Commissioner Harvey made a motion to award the bid for food service at the jail to ABL Management, the low bidder meeting specs, in the amount of \$.795 per meal. Commissioner Snellgrove seconded; and the motion carried unanimously. (Please see Bid Summary Sheet in Minute Book)

ITEM #10. Request to award bid for inmate telephone service.

Mr. Roberts reported when this was put out for bid the county contracted with Praeses Corporation, and there were a large number of people who provide this service. He pointed out in the bid specs, the evaluation and selection criteria was that 40% of the rates and commission would be used as part of the evaluation, 35% would be based on technology, equipment and services. He

stated with a high rate they do not keep the phones working and you are not getting the income. Mr. Roberts reported service was a strong consideration in the bid specs. He stated 25% of the criteria was based on industry experience, pending lawsuits, financial information, years in the industry, etc. Mr. Roberts reported after having twice chosen the highest rate only to receive delayed payments and poor service, and some difference in the method of calculating the rate the desire was to obtain some expertise in trying to develop bid specs that would allow for proper service and timely payments. He stated one of the requirements was that the companies that chose to bid on the project would coordinate all of their questions and requests for any clarifications through Praeses. Mr. Roberts reported one of the stipulations in the specs was that during the solicitation and evaluation process, all questions would go to Praeses and inappropriate contacts with the county or anyone else would be grounds for suspension and/or exclusion of the proposal. He pointed out there were a number of quite detailed requirements that each company had to provide. Mr. Roberts reported when the original process was evaluated only one company out of six that submitted proposals according to Praeses met the specifications and were in compliance with their request. He stated based on that information the county had requested the bid be awarded to the only bidder meeting specs with a request for us because there were two different proposals to allow us to negotiate between the two different proposals that would be for the best interest of the county. Mr. Roberts reported there have been some evaluations of some items that did not meet specs, and he is concerned there may have been more than one that met specs. He stated there are also other extenuating circumstances such as the inappropriate contacts. Mr. Roberts reported the county has received numerous calls from one company that made proposals that violated the specs. He stated there are other things that were done that failed to be in compliance with the request for bids, and he felt he needed to confer with the county attorney. Mr. Roberts reported this needed to be tabled until the next meeting or all bids needed to be rejected and rebid. He stated that was not his original request for approval but at this point there are enough questions about the process that he was not comfortable with proceeding. Chairman Culver stated he did not think the commission should go ahead and make the determination to rebid it because they may can award these bids. He stated if Mr. Roberts needed to meet with the attorney, then the commission should table it for two weeks. Commissioner Snellgrove made a motion to table this request for two weeks. Commissioner Forrester seconded the motion. One of the vendors stated he had some proposals he would like for the commission to look over. Chairman Culver stated since a motion to table this item is on the floor, he asked him if he could come back on June 23rd when it is brought up again? The gentleman stated yes. The chairman called for the question and the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #11. Request to award bid for auctioneer for sale of surplus property for Sheriff's Department.

Chairman Culver reported that the Sheriff had asked the county to take bids and the results were in the packages. He reported the one highlighted is Ludlum Realty. Commissioner Snellgrove asked what kind of cost the second one on the list had? The chairman stated it was 3% commission plus 3% of gross sales. Chairman Culver asked Mr. Roberts if he or the sheriff analyzed these and one of them needed to come forward. Chairman Culver stated 3% commission would be 3% of the bid price. Mr. Roberts stated his interpretation would be their charge of 3% to us. He stated the county would have to pay them. He stated the 3% commission is not indicated as a buyer's premium the auctioneer's commission charged against the bid. Chairman Culver asked if the bids had been analyzed and if the sheriff felt Mr. Ludlum's was the bid for the county? Sheriff Glover stated he was following the advice from the information he had gotten from the accounting department. Commissioner Cook asked if she was the only one that was totally confused by all the numbers? She stated that she did not know what any of it meant? Chairman Culver stated if you do not deal with these all the time, then you would not know. Commissioner Harvey asked the difference between a buyer's premium and gross sales? Mr. Pool stated they were the same thing. Mr. Roberts reported a buyer's premium means any fees are paid by the buyer so that there is not a deduction off the bid. Mr. Bobby Lewis, auctioneer, stated the buyer's premium is paid by the purchaser of the item. He stated the gross sales could be either/or a buyer's premium or a seller's fee; it is up to the discretion there. He reported some other companies they have placed bids with refuse to accept buyer's premiums because of experiences they have had as far as reducing the value of items purchased. He stated they use buyer's premiums on real estate auctions and on estate auctions. Mr. Lewis reported the difference between a buyer's premium and a seller's fee is 10% of the buyer's premium would be charged to the purchaser of the equipment. He stated the seller's fee would be deducted from the value of the item sold. Mr. Lewis reported gross sales commission would be the same as a buyer's premium. He pointed out it is a seller's fee if it is not described as a seller's fee it is considered a buyer's premium. Chairman Culver stated the commission did not know what they were talking about and he asked who made the recommendation to go with Ludlum Realty? He asked if it was Mr. Roberts, Sheriff Glover, Mark Pool or who? Commissioner Snellgrove asked if it is customary for the seller to pay for the advertisement on the sales? Mr. Lewis stated generally there is a budgeted amount allowed in doing an auction. Chairman Culver asked for a motion to table this item and to ask Mr. Roberts to present the commission with a recommendation at the next meeting. Commissioner Harvey made a motion to table this item until the next meeting, and ask Mr. Roberts to present a recommendation. Commissioner Cook seconded; and the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #12. Request from Sheriff – take bids for the transportation of prisoners.

Commissioner Cook made a motion to approve the request from the Sheriff to take bids for the transportation of prisoners. Commissioner Snellgrove seconded; and the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #13. Request to approve budget amendment for Natural Resources EWP Grant.

Chairman Culver reported this is a soil conservation grant. Commissioner Cook made a motion to approve the request to approve the budget amendment for the Natural Resources EWP Grant. Commissioner Harvey seconded; and the motion carried unanimously. (Please see attached budget amendment in Minute Book)

ITEM #14. Request to send out proposals to auction or to sell large county dump trucks.

Ms. Nancy Bristow stated the commission was back to the same square as in Item #11, and she thought part of the problem arose when the information was sent out for the bids that they did not know they could do all the different percentages and ways of bidding. She stated she thought the commission needed to decide what is best for the county and send the specs stating so. Chairman Culver stated he had not seen that much confusion in the 18 years he has been on the commission and he asked what has changed? Ms. Bristow stated the county had gotten in the auction business. He stated auctions had been done before using GovDeals and the county had gotten high prices on the items. He pointed out he did not have anything against the local auctioneers. Ms. Bristow stated in the past, the norm has been that the county paid commission. Mr. Roberts stated that the competition is out there for auctioneers and they have come up with different ways than what the county has done in the past. He stated they have presented the different options. Commissioner Forrester stated if the county provides distinct specifications the auctioneers would have to stick to those specs, and he thought that was what was being asked of the commission. Mr. Harvey stated if gross sales and buyer's premium are the same thing then why can't the commission have one or the other? Mr. Pool reported the commission did not have this problem when the motorgraders were done because they did a guaranteed price. He stated he planned to do the same thing with the dump trucks. Mr. Pool stated the smaller trucks will be done differently. He stated if you just hire an auctioneer it is considered professional services. Mr. Pool stated the cheapest one is not necessarily the best, and that is what the county tried to do. The chairman stated he knew the county has been getting really good prices on what they have been selling and he did not want to mess it up. Mr. Pool stated they are not going to change anything from the last bid they did on the motorgraders. Commissioner Harvey made a motion to approve the request to send out proposals to auction or sell large county dump trucks. Commissioner Cook seconded the motion.

Commissioner Snellgrove stated on the day of the administrative meeting, the commissioners get the requests from the department heads to either buy or sell the equipment. He stated they do not get the specs until after they vote to approve taking bids on the equipment. He asked to change the policy and ask the department heads to give the commissioners a copy of the specs on the admin day before they vote to take bids or sell the items. Commissioner Snellgrove stated he felt the commissioners would be familiar with the specs when they vote at the regular meeting. Commissioner Snellgrove stated they receive the specs sometime 3 or 4 weeks later due to it taking time for them to go out. The chairman stated he felt Mr. Roberts could use his judgment on those items. Chairman Culver stated for clarification, if it is a budgeted item, the commission does not vote to take bids but when the specs go out the commission can get a copy of them. Mr. Roberts stated anything that has to be approved by the commission as far as awarding bids should not be any problem. Mr. Roberts stated in all cases, they work with the department head to determine what they are trying to do. He reported the specs are pretty much put together by those people that deal with this. Chairman Culver stated that he thought it was an appropriate request but he would advise the commission to defer to the department heads for the specs. He pointed out it is not the job of the commission to get in the day to day operations of the county. Mr. Pool stated he did not have his specs ready in advance and sometimes he gets permission to send out for bids and it may be a couple of weeks before he actually gets them the way he wants them. Chairman Culver asked Mr. Pool to send them a copy when he gets his specs finalized? Mr. Pool reminded the commission they voted earlier in the year for department heads to sell on GovDeals at anytime. Chairman Culver called for the question and the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #15. Administrator's Report. There was none.

ITEM #16. Engineer's Report.

Mr. Pool stated the ACCA has formed a committee with the Association of County Engineers to form an emergency response team of men and equipment. He stated he had received a form to be completed and he asked for guidance from the commission. Chairman Culver reported there is a Mutual Aid Agreement that the counties operate under, and he felt the county's position should be if it can help others in time of need, then we should be doing that. Commissioner Snellgrove asked if this was statewide or would it be limited to districts? Mr. Pool stated it was statewide. Chairman Culver stated he thought it was between engineering departments and was above and beyond the mutual aid for fire and rescue and labor that is in the statewide Mutual Aid Agreement. He asked Mr. Pool to contact ACCA and see if there is a document they want each commission to approve.

Mr. Pool reported that he had received another letter from Frank Courson, State Department of Transportation, regarding turnouts. He stated he was asking

about this because they are having a preconstruction conference to bid asphalt and he needed to know what to tell them. Chairman Culver stated he thought he had discussed with Mr. Pool that he was going to ask whether the commission was going to adhere to the state's policy and he reported that was the commission's response. Mr. Pool reported he had a new letter that better described what commercial is and he intends to adopt the state policy that will allow the county to pave 10 feet from the edge of the pavement for commercial entrances. Chairman Culver asked Mr. Pool to get each commissioner a copy of the letter. He told Mr. Pool to go by the state policy until he hears different. Commissioner Snellgrove asked the deadline on the bids? Mr. Pool stated he did not know the date but the current bid runs out June 22nd.

Chairman Culver reported the crews are working on Highway #203. Mr. Justin Barfield reported the G treatment was being done on the Highway #231 end, and should be completed by June 14th. He stated they planned to start spot leveling around the middle of the week, and by the end of the week of June 20th, they hoped to have Highway #203 completed. Chairman Culver stated the commission appreciated the media outlets helping to notify the public. Mr. Barfield reported they will be paving Bazemore Mill Road the next couple of days depending on APAC's schedule. He also reported they are working in Ashford doing streets within the city limits.

ITEM #17. Adjourn.

Commissioner Harvey made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cook and carried unanimously.