

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL
Finance and Administrative Services Committee

January 16, 2007

Committee Chair Sam Crawford called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m. in the Council Chambers, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Washington.

Present:
L. Ward Nelson
Carl Weimer

Absent:
None

Also Present:
Barbara Brenner.
Dan McShane
Seth Fleetwood

COUNCIL "CONSENT AGENDA" ITEM

1. **REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #06-122 TO SOLE BIDDER, ZUMAR INDUSTRIES, INC., FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE ANNUAL SUPPLY OF TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNS, IN THE APPROXIMATE AMOUNT OF \$130,595.71 (PURCHASES ARE BASED ON NEED AND THE BID WAS BASED ON AVERAGE USAGE) (AB2007-034)**

Crawford moved to recommend approval to the full Council.

Motion carried unanimously.

2. **REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #06-130 TO LOW BIDDER, HARDWARE SALES, FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE ANNUAL SUPPLY OF ADS N-12 CULVERT, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$81,646.05 (AB2007-035)**

Weimer moved to recommend approval to the full Council.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. **REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF AN ANNUAL SUPPLY OF LIGNOSITE FOR DUST CONTROL ON COUNTY ROADS FROM SOLE SOURCE VENDOR, MEENDERINK, LLC, ON AN AS NEEDED BASIS, IN THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF \$70,000 (AB2007-036)**

Nelson moved to recommend approval to the full Council.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. **REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF AN ANNUAL SUPPLY (ON AN AS NEEDED BASIS) OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, UTILIZING WASHINGTON STATE CONTRACTS: ROAD STRIPING PAINT & BEADS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$400,000; HERBICIDES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$80,000; TIRES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$50,000; GUARDRAIL**

1 **& MATERIALS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$50,000; AND RUBBERIZED ASPHALT IN**
2 **THE AMOUNT OF \$40,000 (AB2007-037)**

3
4 ***Crawford moved*** to recommend approval to the full Council.

5
6 ***Motion carried unanimously.***

- 7
8 **5. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**
9 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND NORTHWEST REGIONAL**
10 **COUNCIL TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THE LONELINESS AND**
11 **ISOLATION PROGRAM PROVIDED THROUGH THE INTERFAITH COALITION,**
12 **IN THE AMOUNT OF \$20,000 (AB2007-038)**

13
14 Weimer stated this goes through the Northwest Regional Council to the Interfaith
15 Coalition. Each group is taking a small administrative hit to the contract amount. He asked
16 if there is a need to pay for both the agencies, or if they can contract directly.

17
18 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated it's fair to reimburse their expenses.

19
20 Nelson stated the contract is administered by the Northwest Regional Council. This
21 was originally a pilot study funded from a State grant that went away. The County funded it
22 last year. He asked if there has been any discussion about continuing the program. Make
23 sure the program is being effective. It is a lower-end project at the Northwest Regional
24 Council. Desler stated the Council discussed this in the budget process. Everyone wanted
25 more time to do an evaluation. The Executive recommended funding for one more year to
26 provide time for that evaluation.

27
28 Nelson stated it's not a bad idea to have the Senior Service Advisory Board. Then
29 the Northwest Regional Council will then purview this. It gives the County an opportunity to
30 examine the program, see if the program is effective, make a recommendation, and even
31 find a partnership with the State to again fund this item. It doesn't hurt to have this run
32 through the Northwest Regional Council because of the senior services and because the
33 Northwest Regional Council advocates on a regional basis.

34
35 Crawford stated he is opposed to this contract. The program is another area that the
36 County has not funded in the past, and it doesn't have ongoing resources to continue
37 funding items like this. However, since the Council passed the budget, it's appropriate to
38 vote for the contract in this form.

39
40 ***Crawford moved*** to recommend approval to the full Council.

41
42 ***Motion carried unanimously.***

- 43
44 **6. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**
45 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND NORSTAN**
46 **COMMUNICATIONS, INC. D/B/A BLACK BOX NETWORK SERVICES TO**
47 **PURCHASE AND INSTALL AN UPGRADE TO THE CURRENT PABX SYSTEM**
48 **SOFTWARE, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$54,856.54 (AB2007-039)**

49
50 ***Nelson moved*** to recommend approval to the full Council.

51
52 ***Motion carried unanimously.***

- 1 7. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A
2 CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND NORSTAN
3 COMMUNICATIONS, INC. D/B/A BLACK BOX NETWORK SERVICES FOR THE
4 PURCHASE OF ERICSSON ONE BOX/MX-ONE MESSAGING EQUIPMENT,
5 INSTALLATION AND IMPLEMENTATION TO UPGRADE THE CURRENT VOICE
6 MAIL SYSTEM, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$54,991.83 (AB2007-040)
7

8 *Crawford moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.
9

10 *Motion carried unanimously.*
11

- 12 8. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO AN
13 AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND PUGET SOUND ENERGY,
14 INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF 100% GREEN ENERGY FOR COUNTY
15 OPERATIONS AT \$0.01/KWH USED (APPROXIMATELY \$61,842) (AB2007-
16 041)
17

18 *Weimer moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.
19

20 Nelson asked if the County is buying green energy.
21

22 Weimer stated there is an increase in the cost per kilowatt to purchase green energy.
23

24 Nelson stated the County is subsidizing green energy. That needs to be stated in the
25 documents.
26

27 Weimer stated the Council discussed that government must lead these efforts some
28 times to get better types of energy going.
29

30 Crawford stated he is opposed because hydroelectric energy isn't included. This is
31 paying a private sector company to try and build a wind farm in Eastern Washington. They
32 can't get enough private folks to subscribe to this, so they are going after government and
33 big industry. There are better ways to generate power at less cost. This is not one of them.
34

35 *Motion failed 1-2 with Weimer in favor.*
36

- 37 9. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A
38 CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND HOAGLAND'S PHARMACY TO
39 PROVIDE PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICES FOR THE WHATCOM COUNTY JAIL
40 AND WORK CENTER, IN THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF \$198,778 (AB2007-
41 042)
42

43 *Nelson moved* to recommend approval to the full Council. Nelson asked if an
44 equivalent generic prescription would be substituted when available.
45

46 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated he would find out that process.
47

48 *Motion carried unanimously.*
49

- 50 10. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A
51 CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND DR. STUART ANDREWS TO
52 PROVIDE PHYSICIAN SERVICES FOR THE WHATCOM COUNTY JAIL AND

1 **WORK CENTER, IN THE MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT OF \$46,000 (AB2007-**
2 **043)**

3
4 *Nelson moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.

5
6 *Motion carried unanimously.*

- 7
8 **11. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**
9 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND DR. RICH ULLSMITH, DDS, TO**
10 **PROVIDE DENTAL SERVICES FOR THE WHATCOM COUNTY JAIL AND WORK**
11 **CENTER, IN THE MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT OF \$25,000 (AB2007-044)**

12
13 *Weimer moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.

14
15 *Motion carried unanimously.*

- 16
17 **12. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**
18 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND WHATCOM COUNSELING AND**
19 **PSYCHIATRIC CLINIC TO PROVIDE PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES FOR THE**
20 **WHATCOM COUNTY JAIL AND WORK CENTER, IN THE MAXIMUM ANNUAL**
21 **AMOUNT OF \$34,320 (AB2007-045)**

22
23 *Crawford moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.

24
25 Nelson asked if this is for county designated mental health professional (CDMHP)
26 counselors only or psychiatrists. The hourly rate for the service has increased.

27
28 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated he doesn't have that information. The
29 County has had difficulty trying to obtain psychiatric services for the jail.

30
31 *Motion carried unanimously.*

- 32
33 **13. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO AN**
34 **INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND THE CITY OF**
35 **EVERSON TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY/COUNTY JAIL INVESTMENT PROGRAM**
36 **(AB2007-046)**

37
38 *Nelson moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.

39
40 *Motion carried unanimously.*

- 41
42 **14. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO AN**
43 **INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND THE CITY OF**
44 **BELLINGHAM TO OPERATE THE LAKEWAY YARD WASTE COLLECTION**
45 **FACILITY (AB2007-047)**

46
47 *Crawford moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.

48
49 Weimer stated there was concern that the government was subsidizing this when
50 private companies were trying to get into the business. In addition, there were few users in
51 Bellingham. He asked if this issue has come up again.

1 Brenner stated the Solid Waste Advisory Committee hasn't discussed it at the
2 meeting she's been to.

3
4 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated this comes with a recommendation of
5 the Solid Waste Executive Committee.

6
7 Bruce Roll, Public Works Department, stated that costs were escalating, as were
8 expectations that the County would defray those costs. The Solid Waste Executive
9 Committee met, and it decided to not increase that budget. Therefore, the City added a
10 user fee. The Executive Committee agreed to subsidize 50 percent of the cost up to
11 \$120,000. Since that time, the program has been successful and continues to grow. At
12 some point, there will be some equilibrium with the curbside private services. There is a
13 demand for the material and demand for the site. Now, it's bringing in \$60,000 or \$70,000
14 per year. The budget was brought to the Advisory Committee, but the committee doesn't
15 go through each line item. They talk about the programs. There was clear support for the
16 program. For the last two years, the County's contribution hasn't escalated. The escalation
17 in their costs has been taken care of through the user fee. That's a good thing.

18
19 Brenner stated any topic the Solid Waste Executive Committee discusses should be
20 forwarded to the Advisory Committee. Roll stated they can do that. The Executive
21 Committee has met once per year for the past few years.

22
23 Brenner asked if issues go to the Advisory Committee or the Executive Committee
24 first. Roll stated it depends on the nature of the issue. They have to look at the interlocal
25 agreement that everyone has agreed to. The Advisory Committee has always presented
26 ideas to the Executive Committee.

27
28 Weimer asked about stormwater runoff from the Lakeway facility. Roll stated that
29 was almost two years ago. They've done a lot of work, including a whole stormwater
30 treatment system. He hasn't gotten reports since then about tracking the material.

31
32 ***Motion carried unanimously.***

- 33
34 **15. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT**
35 **AMENDMENT #8 BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND WASHINGTON STATE**
36 **UNIVERSITY TO CONTINUE THE SHARING OF COSTS FOR FACULTY**
37 **POSITIONS IN THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION THROUGH DECEMBER 31,**
38 **2007, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$79,610, FOR A TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT OF**
39 **\$597,947.90 (AB2007-048)**

40
41 ***Nelson moved*** to recommend approval to the full Council.

42
43 ***Motion carried unanimously.***

- 44
45 **16. REQUEST RATIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT EXTENDING THE**
46 **2004-2006 IBU/MMP COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT THROUGH**
47 **DECEMBER 31, 2007 (AB2007-049)**

48
49 ***Crawford moved*** to recommend approval to the full Council.

50
51 ***Motion carried unanimously.***

1 **17. REQUEST RATIFICATION OF THE 2008-2010 IBU/MMP COLLECTIVE**
2 **BARGAINING AGREEMENT (AB2007-050)**

3
4 *Nelson moved* to recommend approval to the full Council.
5

6 Crawford stated the County staff expressed appreciation to the bargaining unit for a
7 successful, pleasing negotiation.
8

9 *Motion carried unanimously.*
10

11 **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

12
13
14 **1. ORDINANCE AMENDING WHATCOM COUNTY CODE 3.08, PURCHASING**
15 **SYSTEM (AB2006-467)**
16

17 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated the proposed changes begin on Council
18 packet page 13. The administration would like to discuss current policies, timeframes,
19 contracting adjustments, and costs for administrative changes. One change is to conform
20 to guidelines in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Also, the Public Works Department
21 is moving toward project budgeting, which gives them more time for a single contract,
22 which is normally for a year. Once the Council approves the project budget, the Executive
23 would have the authority to execute the contracts. The contracts could begin two to five
24 weeks earlier. Contractors will be less inclined to request change orders to cover escalating
25 costs. They will have more effective use of staff time. The contractors will appreciate
26 having their contract begin earlier. The administration can return the bid bond to the
27 bidders sooner.
28

29 Joe Rutan, Public Works Department, stated this process will be applied to capital
30 improvement projects that span multiple years. The intention is to make an entire project
31 more transparent. Contingency amounts are now built into individual projects, not the
32 annual program.
33

34 Crawford stated the proposed changes don't say that this is for capital works
35 projects. Rutan stated they can amend the language to reflect their intention.
36

37 Brad Bennett, Administrative Services Department, stated the language proposed in
38 section 3.08.090(N) says that the Executive may award the contract unless it exceeds the
39 project budget, without going back to the Council for approval of the bid and contract.
40

41 Crawford asked if the term "project budget" in section 3.08.090(N) says that it's only
42 for projects, and not for regular budgeted items. Bennett stated that's correct. The County
43 Charter provides for a project budget. That means the appropriation is not based on the
44 year. It's based on the project's duration. It's only for capital improvement projects.
45

46 Crawford suggested language for 3.08.090(N), "...larger amounts require Council
47 approval. ~~Unless a project budget has been approved by Council for which a contract was~~
48 ~~enacted, in which case~~ In the case of capital improvement projects, the contract
49 amendment may be approved by the County Executive." Bennett stated he can suggest
50 alternate language.
51

52 Brenner stated the language should be specific to the Public Works Department.
53 Desler stated there are project budgets used in the Facilities Division.

1
2 Desler stated that currently, the Executive brings contracts before the Council if they
3 are over \$15,000 for professional services and over \$35,000 for purchase of equipment and
4 tools. The administration wants the Council to consider raising those amounts, which
5 haven't been adjusted in many years. This is not to avoid scrutiny, but to make sure they
6 are effectively administering the contracts and getting them out the door, without bringing a
7 lot of material before the Council all the time. Now is the time to talk about adjusting the
8 upper limits.

9
10 Crawford stated it's a reasonable request.

11
12 Nelson stated the Council Charter has limitations on what amounts can and can't be
13 approved by the Executive. Bennett stated the Code specifies the Executive's ability to
14 contract. The Charter identifies capital projects budgeting.

15
16 Crawford asked if this needs to be approved today. Desler stated they will make
17 language changes based on the committee's comments. (*Inaudible.*) There are other
18 County code changes related to other purchases of services and materials, which affects all
19 County contracts.

20
21 Brenner stated she has a problem with changing things for all contracts. When the
22 Council approves the budget, it approves a concept. If something changes in the concept
23 that the Council doesn't like, this is the Council's opportunity to deny something. If they
24 are talking about already-approved Public Works projects, she doesn't have a problem. It's
25 the County's staff doing those projects. When they are doing work with outside contractors,
26 she's not comfortable changing the process. Desler stated he understands the concerns.
27 There are existing limits now. (*Inaudible.*) The proposal now is to just raise the existing
28 limits.

29
30 Nelson stated that if the County doesn't have enough income to meet a contract, the
31 Council may reduce appropriations. He asked if the Council wouldn't be able to do that if
32 the administration makes those decisions. Bennett stated the adjustments to the budget
33 are only at the result of the Executive's request. There is specific language in the code that
34 places a burden on the departments to make a report or not spend money when revenues
35 are less than estimated.

36
37 Nelson stated that when the courthouse was remodeled. The budget was exceeded
38 each year. He asked how this new change would affect a situation like that. He asked if
39 those amounts exceeding the budget would come back to the Council. Bennett stated the
40 courthouse remodel is an excellent example of how a project budget would work better. In
41 a project budget, they appropriate the money for the duration of the project. In the annual
42 calendar year budget process, the budget is done in July, so they are always estimating
43 where they are going to be at the end of the year. They have to estimate conservatively,
44 and end up appropriating more money through several annual projects than in one project
45 budget.

46
47 Desler stated this ordinance is not related to budgeting. It's related to the execution
48 of the contract.

49
50 Nelson stated it still has to do with Council approval of cost overruns.

51
52 Rutan stated that the staff will also bring forward specific activities to provide the
53 Council a quarterly report on the projects.

1
2 (Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side A.)
3

4 Rutan continued to state that the Council will be able to follow along more closely.
5

6 Brenner stated the system isn't broken. She's fine with how things operate now.
7 The Council should be left in the loop. Desler stated this ordinance change is to allow
8 Executive authority, once the Council approves the project budget appropriation. It's
9 something the Public Works Department is requesting to gain some efficiencies in timing. A
10 secondary issue is to talk in concept about other changes the administration may propose in
11 the future to contracting for general services.
12

13 Brenner stated she's concerned about a change to contracting for general services.
14 The Council approves budgetary items, through the budget, conceptually. When the item
15 actually comes forward in the form of a contract, it's not conceptual anymore. It's very
16 specific. There may be things the Council needs to know. She is not in favor of that
17 change. This is permanent. It's not personal about this Executive or administration. This
18 applies to the future. She is interested in looking at specific language, but this is starting to
19 sound like a first step.
20

21 Crawford stated the administration can develop alternative language for the evening
22 meeting.
23

24 **Nelson moved** to recommend approval to the full Council and requested the
25 administration to bring forward language addressing the concerns raised by the committee.
26 The administration has a lot of latitude in developing the budget and bringing forward
27 appropriations to the Council. The public wanted protection in the form of Council review.
28 They can talk about raising limits.
29

30 Desler suggested amend 3.08.100(B). "~~B. In furtherance of a project and pursuant~~
31 ~~to a project budget approved by council~~ The contracts for the design, construction, and
32 right-of-way acquisition for capital projects, which are within the appropriation approved by
33 the County Council in a project budget."
34

35 Crawford stated he is concerned about 3.08.090(N). It must be clarified that this is
36 for Public Works project budgets. Bennett stated he will work on it.
37

38 **Motion carried unanimously.**
39
40

41 **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION** 42

43 **1. DISCUSSION REGARDING POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED 2007** 44 **UNIFIED FEE SCHEDULE (AB2006-440)** 45

46 Brenner stated she is not comfortable approving the additional information provided,
47 which the Council just received.
48

49 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated have a discussion today and the next
50 Council meeting, then have a hearing the first meeting in February.
51

52 Dennis Rhodes, Planning and Development Services Department, stated they've
53 been making adjustments. The discussion is based on an audit they received. He

1 forwarded a memo to the administration dated January 10, 2007 regarding proposed
2 Planning and Development Services Department (PDS) amendments to the unified Fee
3 Schedule (*on file*). He read from the memo. The memo describes the conditions the
4 department proposes to the Unified Fee Schedule. The fees were evaluated to recover both
5 direct and indirect costs. They were to establish \$100 per hour for the staff's baseline fee,
6 up from \$80 per hour. He worked with division managers to determine the actual staff time
7 it takes to perform each function. They also looked at comparables with other jurisdictions'
8 fees, including Thurston County.
9

10 Based on the 2006 audit, they were meticulous about identifying fees that the
11 Unified Fee Schedule didn't specifically call out. They made sure the authority provided for
12 each fee is identified. The fee changes fell into six categories. He read the categories from
13 the memo.
14

15 Brenner stated she is not comfortable comparing to Thurston County, which has a
16 reputation of being fairly extravagant. Don't make the department so much less dependent
17 upon the general fund that they are actually subsidizing other issues and tasks not
18 specifically attached to the permit. She asked if the fees are supposed to specifically cover
19 only the cost to process those permits. Rhodes stated the fees are based on actual staff
20 time required to accomplish these tasks. They compared to six different counties. He only
21 references Thurston County because they did a formal study. He did not attach Whatcom
22 County's fees to Thurston County's fees.
23

24 Brenner stated Whatcom County should really charge the actual cost of processing
25 the permits, and not anything else. She asked what percentage was based on Whatcom
26 County's numbers versus the comparables of other counties. Rhodes stated everything they
27 did is based on the time it takes Whatcom County staff to do work. They looked at other
28 counties to see how Whatcom County compares. The final decision is exclusively based on
29 the time it takes Whatcom County staff to do these things.
30

31 Crawford asked if Mr. Rhodes has reviewed Skeers vs. Bellingham. He asked if Mr.
32 Rhodes is comfortable that the proposal falls within legal guidelines. Rhodes stated he is
33 comfortable with the legality.
34

35 Crawford stated other counties don't have a comparable process for determining lot
36 of record in the subdivision fee. He asked what other counties are doing. Rhodes stated
37 that in his experience, lot of record is not performed by staff of other counties.
38

39 Bob Martin, Planning and Development Services Department, stated Whatcom
40 County is significantly more detailed in the lot of record review than is typical.
41

42 Crawford asked if it is being filtered to any degree, and if it is part of the subdivision
43 in other counties. Martin stated Whatcom County does more of that for either subdivision or
44 short plat than is typical. Many counties don't engage in that review.
45

46 Crawford stated the case can be made that the County can charge that fee because
47 Whatcom County has a higher standard. Also, an appeal to the Hearing Examiner should be
48 no cost. It is so often a disagreement over the code. There doesn't seem to be justification
49 for the increased cost. He doesn't deny that's the cost of the work for the staff. It's a
50 philosophical discussion. Rhodes stated he was asked to provide the administration and
51 Council information on the cost of doing certain things. He agrees that there are some
52 policy discussions. Staff will take whatever direction it's given. The staff has come up with

1 the baseline data, as requested. One suggestion was to tier the cost of appeals based on
2 the cost of the project. Staff is open to ideas.

3
4 Crawford stated he is interested in pursuing that idea.

5
6 Nelson stated a concern is the cost of the process and the amount of money the
7 public perceives it will get. He asked the increase in benefit received from the increase in
8 fee. Staff and the administration will have to make sure there is justification to the public
9 that they will get an increased benefit for the increased cost.

10
11 Crawford stated he agrees. People are willing to pay when they receive the service
12 and they know there is value to the service.

13
14 Rhodes stated the Planning Department is on the brink of making major changes to
15 the way it operates the permit center. They will see major improvements over the next six
16 months. He's working with the administration and the Planning Department staff on these
17 changes. He's talked to the Building Industry Association and Realtors about the planned
18 changes.

19
20 Desler stated the administration will submit the ordinance for the fee schedule. The
21 committee will discuss it again at it's next meeting. It would go to hearing at the first
22 meeting in February.

23
24 Nelson requested that the administration post the proposed fee changes at the
25 department and on the website.

26
27
28 **OTHER BUSINESS**

29
30 There was no other business.

31
32
33 **ADJOURN**

34
35 The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

36
37
38
39 Jill Nixon, Minutes Transcription

40
41
42 ATTEST
43 COUNTY COUNCIL
44 OF WHATCOM COUNTY
45 STATE OF WASHINGTON
46
47 Dana Brown-Davis, Council Clerk

42 WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL
43 WHATCOM COUNTY, WASHINGTON

44
45
46
47 Sam Crawford, Committee Chair