

**DRAFT - Agenda**  
**Tuscola County Board of Commissioners**  
**Committee of the Whole**

**Wednesday, September 29, 2010 – After Board of Commissioners Meeting P.M.**  
**Almer Charter Township Hall (1310 Cameron Caro, Mi.)**

**Finance**

Committee Leaders-Commissioner Peterson and Bardwell

**Primary Finance Items**

1. **Review of Tuscola County Coastal Zone Needs Assessment (Copies distributed at Meeting)**
2. **2011 Budget Development – Tuesday, October 5, 2010 Meeting**
3. **County Jail Reimbursement Program Choice of Billing Method (See A)**

Secondary/On-Going Finance Items

1. Treasurer Bank Statement Reconciliation
2. Emergency Services
3. DELEG Energy Grant
4. Tire Collection Program
5. Three-Year Dog Licensing
6. Juror Card Program
7. Probate Court Budget Change Request
8. Allied Information Systems
9. Draft Policy Confidential Information on Copiers and Fax Machines
10. Jail Prisoner Overcrowding Alternatives
  - House Arrest Services Re-Contacted – Tether Program
  - Evaluation of Housing More Prisoners in Tuscola Jail

**Personnel**

Committee Leader-Commissioners Peterson and Roggenbuck

**Primary Personnel Items**

1. **Legal Information Regarding Telephone Meeting Attendance (See B)**

Secondary/On-Going Personnel Items

1. Circuit/Family Court Personnel Policies
2. MERS Bridged Benefits Valuation
3. Labor Negotiations

## **Building and Grounds**

Committee Leader-Commissioners Petzold and Kern

### **Primary Building and Grounds Items**

1. **Parking Lot Sealing and Repair**
2. **Airport Zoning Ordinance Update (See C)**
3. **Office Space Planning – Next Steps**

### **Secondary/On-Going Building and Grounds Items**

1. Vanderbilt Park
2. Parks and Recreation Commission Possible Re-Structuring

### **Correspondence/Other Business as Necessary**

1. Other County Resolutions
2. Opinion Regarding the ability to Conduct Meetings without all Members in Attendance

### **Public Comment Period**

### **Closed Session – If Necessary**

### **Other Business as Necessary**

#### **Notes:**

Except for the Statutory Finance Committee, committee meetings of the whole are advisory only. Any decision made at an advisory committee is only a recommendation and must be approved by a formal meeting of the Board of Commissioners.

If you need accommodations to attend this meeting please notify the Tuscola County Controller/Administrator's Office (989-672-3700) two days in advance of the meeting.

This is a draft agenda and subject to change. Items may be added the day of the meeting or covered under other business at the meeting.

### **Statutory Finance Committee**

1. Claims Review and Approval



**Mike Hoagland**

---

**From:** Leland Teschendorf [ltesch@tuscolacounty.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 3:04 PM  
**To:** MHoagland@TuscolaCounty.org  
**Subject:** RE: CJRP SPECIAL UPDATE, COUNTY ACTION NEEDED

Mike,

I have forwarded this to Lt. Turner for an estimate on which will be the better plan for our situation. It will take a few days for her to determine the one most beneficial.

Lee.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Mike Hoagland [mailto:MHoagland@TuscolaCounty.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 1:04 PM  
**To:** Glen Skrent; Lee Teschendorf  
**Cc:** Clayette Zechmeister (Clayette Zechmeister); Amanda Roggenbuck; 'Jerry Peterson'; tbardwell@hillsanddales.com; Tom Kern  
**Subject:** FW: CJRP SPECIAL UPDATE, COUNTY ACTION NEEDED  
**Importance:** High

Sheriff and Undersheriff

Apparently counties have to decide from optional criteria for CJRP billing. Please advise. A decision needs to be made before October 15, 2010. If you have any information for the Committee of the Whole meeting tomorrow night it would be helpful.

Thank you.

Mike h.

Michael R. Hoagland  
Tuscola County Controller/Administrator  
207 E. Grant St.  
Caro, MI 48723

(989) 672-3700 Phone  
(989) 672-4011 Fax  
mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org E-mail

---

**From:** Tom Hickson [mailto:hickson@micounties.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 11:41 AM

Subject: CJRP SPECIAL UPDATE, COUNTY ACTION NEEDED  
Importance: High

COUNTIES HAVE UNTIL OCTOBER 15TH TO DECIDE WHICH CJRP PROGRAM TO USE

As reported earlier by MAC, counties will have until October 15th to decide which criteria for billing the Department of Corrections under the County Jail Reimbursement Program (CJRP).

Under the budget bill for FY 2011, if counties do not submit this form by October 15th, they will not be reimbursed. It is unclear if a submission comes in at a later date, if counties can opt back in. The best option is for counties to submit a form to DOC by October 15th!!

The bill for the corrections budget (SB 1153) is currently on the Governor's desk and should be signed soon, however, time is very short and counties need to act quickly!

Attached to our update is a breakdown of the new three tiered program, and some differences between it and the old program. There are positives and negatives to both. Also attached is the county opt in form to select which program to subscribe to as well as a FAQ sheet on the history of the program from the Department of Corrections. Also, please note the e-mail from the CJRP coordinator Marilyn Peterson. MAC encourages you to work with your Judges, Sheriffs, Prosecutors and Jail Administrators to select the best program for your county. If you have any questions, please let us know!

Please make sure you get the form in by October 15, 2010!!

Sincerely,

Tom Hickson

1-800-258-1152

Hello, All,

This email is being sent to county sheriffs, CJRP coordinators, county clerks, and county board chairs for whom email addresses are available.

(Many thanks to the Michigan Association of Counties for assistance with email addresses for clerks and board chairs.) Please forward to anyone whom you think might be interested.

Senate Bill 1153, which would create the Fiscal Year 2010-11 budget act for the Department of Corrections, has been passed by both the Senate and the House, and is on its way to the Governor's desk. Section 414 of the act would provide for the county jail reimbursement program

(CJRP) for the coming fiscal year. New this year: counties are offered two different CJRP options - in essence two different CJRP programs - and each county must by October 15 choose which program it will participate in for the fiscal year. Under the terms of the bill, a county cannot be allowed to revise its decision after it is submitted.

One option reenacts the county jail reimbursement program as it was in FY 2008-09, while the other option reenacts the program as enacted in June 2010 for January through September 2010.

The attached letter explains the options in SB 1153 and includes a form to be returned to MDOC indicating your county's decision. Please note that the form is to be signed by the county clerk or his or her designee.

For your convenience, I've also attached a copy of the FY 2010 CJRP manual, which includes a list of "Group One" crimes and "nonperson"

Class F crimes (these distinctions are relevant to the FY 2010 program criteria and to the FY 2011 options).

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions. I can be reached

at 517-335-4371 or (preferred) [peterm1@michigan.gov](mailto:peterm1@michigan.gov).

Marilyn B. Peterson

Contracts and Grants Manager

Financial Services Section

Bureau of Fiscal Management

Michigan Department of Corrections

[peterm1@michigan.gov](mailto:peterm1@michigan.gov)

Phone: (517) 335-4371

# MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

*“Expecting Excellence Every Day”*

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** September 27, 2010

**TO:** County Clerks  
County Sheriffs  
County Boards of Commissioners  
County Jail Reimbursement Coordinators

**FROM:** Marilyn Peterson, Contracts and Grants Manager, Financial Services Section

**SUBJECT:** FY 2011 County Jail Reimbursement Program Options

Senate Bill 1153, which would create the Fiscal Year 2010-11 budget act for the Department of Corrections, has been passed by both the Senate and the House, and will soon be on its way to the Governor’s desk. Section 414 of the act would provide for the county jail reimbursement program (CJRP) for the coming fiscal year. New this year: counties are offered two different CJRP options – in essence two different CJRP programs – and each county must by October 15 choose which program it will participate in for the fiscal year. Under the terms of the bill, a county cannot be allowed to revise its decision after it is submitted. One option reenacts the county jail reimbursement program as it was in FY 2008-09, while the other option reenacts the program as enacted in June 2010 for January through September 2010.

Specifically, the options are as follows:

### **Option A (Analogous to FY 2008-09 Program)**

The standards outlined in subsections (2) and (3) of section 414 of 2008 PA 245 as outlined below:

(i) The county jail reimbursement program shall reimburse counties for housing and custody of convicted felons if the conviction was for a crime committed on or after January 1, 1999 and 1 of the following applies:

(A) The felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range upper limit is more than 18 months, the felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range lower limit is 12 months or less, the felon's prior record variable score is 35 or more points, and the felon's sentence is not for commission of a crime in crime class G or crime class H under chapter XVII of the code of criminal procedure, 1927 PA 175, MCL 777.1 to 777.69.

(B) The felon's minimum sentencing guidelines range minimum is more than 12 months under the sentencing guidelines described in sub-subparagraph (A).

(ii) State reimbursement under this subdivision for prisoner housing and custody expenses per diverted offender shall be \$43.50 per diem for up to a 1-year total.

### **Option B (Analogous to Program for January - September 2010)**

The standards outlined and defined in subsections (2), (3), and (6) of section 301 of 2010 PA 89 as outlined below:

(i) The county jail reimbursement program shall reimburse counties for convicted felons in the custody of the sheriff if the conviction was for a crime committed on or after January 1, 1999 and 1 of the following applies:

(A) The felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range upper limit is more than 18 months, the felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range lower limit is 12 months or less, the felon's prior record variable score is 35 or more points, and the felon's sentence is not for commission of a crime in crime class G or crime class H or a nonperson crime

in crime class F under chapter XVII of the code of criminal procedure, 1927 PA 175, MCL 777.1 to 777.69.

(B) The felon's minimum sentencing guidelines range minimum is more than 12 months under the sentencing guidelines described in sub-subparagraph (A).

(C) The felon was sentenced to jail for a felony committed while he or she was on parole and under the jurisdiction of the parole board and for which the sentencing guidelines recommended range for the minimum sentence has an upper limit of more than 18 months.

(ii) State reimbursement under this subdivision shall be \$60.00 per diem per diverted offender for offenders with a presumptive prison guideline score, \$50.00 per diem per diverted offender for offenders with a straddle cell guideline for a group 1 crime, and \$35.00 per diem per diverted offender for offenders with a straddle cell guideline for a group 2 crime. Reimbursements shall be paid for sentences up to a 1-year total.

(iii) As used in this subdivision:

(A) "Group 1 crime" means a crime in 1 or more of the following offense categories: arson, assault, assaultive other, burglary, criminal sexual conduct, homicide or resulting in death, other sex offenses, robbery, and weapon possession as determined by the department of corrections based on specific crimes for which counties received reimbursement under the county jail reimbursement program in fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008, and listed in the county jail reimbursement program document titled "FY 2007 and FY 2008 Group One Crimes Reimbursed", dated March 31, 2009.

(B) "Group 2 crime" means a crime that is not a group 1 crime, including larceny, fraud, forgery, embezzlement, motor vehicle, malicious destruction of property, controlled substance offense, felony drunk driving, and other nonassaultive offenses.

(C) "In the custody of the sheriff" means that the convicted felon has been sentenced to the county jail and is either housed in the county jail or has been released from jail and is being monitored through the use of the sheriff's electronic monitoring system.

A form for selecting Option A or Option B follows; please send your completed and signed form to:

Ann Marie Brady  
Financial Services Section  
Michigan Department of Corrections  
Grandview Plaza Building  
206 E. Michigan Ave.  
P.O. Box 30003  
Lansing, MI 48909

Email: [bradyam@michigan.gov](mailto:bradyam@michigan.gov)

Remember, the selection commits the county to one option or the other for the entire fiscal year, and the form must be postmarked no later than October 15, 2010. A scanned and e-mailed signed copy is acceptable providing it sent no later than October 15, 2010.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions. I can be reached at 517-335-4371 or at [peterstonm1@michigan.gov](mailto:peterstonm1@michigan.gov) (e-mail is better).

c: Michigan Sheriffs' Association  
Michigan Association of Counties  
Barry Wickman, Bureau of Fiscal Management  
Lia Gulick, Financial Services Section  
Ann Marie Brady, Financial Services Section



**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**  
**Fiscal Year 2010-2011 County Jail Reimbursement Program Selection Form**  
(Pursuant to Section 414 of Enrolled Senate Bill 1153)

*This form must be completed and must be postmarked or emailed by October 15, 2010 in order for your county to be able to receive county jail reimbursement program reimbursements for services provided after October 15, 2010.*

1. Name of County: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Name and Signature of County Clerk or Designee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

3. County Jail Reimbursement Program Selection: select either Option A or Option B.  
Do NOT select both.

**Option A (as described below)**

The standards outlined in subsections (2) and (3) of section 414 of 2008 PA 245 as outlined below:

(i) The county jail reimbursement program shall reimburse counties for housing and custody of convicted felons if the conviction was for a crime committed on or after January 1, 1999 and 1 of the following applies:

(A) The felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range upper limit is more than 18 months, the felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range lower limit is 12 months or less, the felon's prior record variable score is 35 or more points, and the felon's sentence is not for commission of a crime in crime class G or crime class H under chapter XVII of the code of criminal procedure, 1927 PA 175, MCL 777.1 to 777.69.

(B) The felon's minimum sentencing guidelines range minimum is more than 12 months under the sentencing guidelines described in sub-subparagraph (A).

(ii) State reimbursement under this subdivision for prisoner housing and custody expenses per diverted offender shall be \$43.50 per diem for up to a 1-year total.

**Option B (as described below)**

The standards outlined and defined in subsections (2), (3), and (6) of section 301 of 2010 PA 89 as outlined below:

(i) The county jail reimbursement program shall reimburse counties for convicted felons in the custody of the sheriff if the conviction was for a crime committed on or after January 1, 1999 and 1 of the following applies:

(A) The felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range upper limit is more than 18 months, the felon's sentencing guidelines recommended range lower limit is 12 months or less, the felon's prior record variable score is 35 or more points, and the felon's sentence is not for commission of a crime in crime class G or crime class H or a nonperson crime in crime class F under chapter XVII of the code of criminal procedure, 1927 PA 175, MCL 777.1 to 777.69.

(B) The felon's minimum sentencing guidelines range minimum is more than 12 months under the sentencing guidelines described in sub-subparagraph (A).

(C) The felon was sentenced to jail for a felony committed while he or she was on parole and under the jurisdiction of the parole board and for which the sentencing guidelines recommended range for the minimum sentence has an upper limit of more than 18 months.

(ii) State reimbursement under this subdivision shall be \$60.00 per diem per diverted offender for offenders with a presumptive prison guideline score, \$50.00 per diem per diverted offender for offenders with a straddle cell guideline for a group 1 crime, and \$35.00 per diem per diverted offender for offenders with a straddle cell guideline for a group 2 crime. Reimbursements shall be paid for sentences up to a 1-year total.

(iii) As used in this subdivision:

(A) "Group 1 crime" means a crime in 1 or more of the following offense categories: arson, assault, assaultive other, burglary, criminal sexual conduct, homicide or resulting in death, other sex offenses, robbery, and weapon possession as determined by the department of corrections based on specific crimes for which counties received reimbursement under the county jail reimbursement program in fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008, and listed in the county jail reimbursement program document titled "FY 2007 and FY 2008 Group One Crimes Reimbursed", dated March 31, 2009.

(B) "Group 2 crime" means a crime that is not a group 1 crime, including larceny, fraud, forgery, embezzlement, motor vehicle, malicious destruction of property, controlled substance offense, felony drunk driving, and other nonassaultive offenses.

(C) "In the custody of the sheriff" means that the convicted felon has been sentenced to the county jail and is either housed in the county jail or has been released from jail and is being monitored through the use of the sheriff's electronic monitoring system.

Return this form no later than October 15, 2010:

Mail a signed original to:

Ann Marie Brady  
Financial Services Section  
Michigan Department of Corrections  
Grandview Plaza Building  
206 E. Michigan Ave.  
P.O. Box 30003  
Lansing, MI 48909

or e-mail a signed and scanned form to Ann Marie Brady at:  
[bradyam@michigan.gov](mailto:bradyam@michigan.gov)

**Mike Hoagland**

---

**From:** Patrick Kaltenbach [PatKal@BKF-LAW.COM]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 3:49 PM  
**To:** mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org  
**Subject:** Electronic Meeting Participation

**Attachments:** SKMBT\_42110092815100.pdf



SKMBT\_421100928  
15100.pdf (94 K...

Hello Mike,

Please find attached a memorandum which discusses our findings that holding an open meeting via electronic communications does not violate the OMA.

You have also inquired as to whether there may be a maximum number of members of a public body which can attend remotely without violating quorum requirements. We have not found any authority which would indicate that electronic participation would be problematic in this regard. Attached are two Michigan statutes, which are not directly applicable in this situation, but which make clear that in the context of corporations and nonprofit entities, electronic participation in a meeting is the same for legal purposes as actual presence. Therefore the advisable thing to do would be to set forth in the body's bylaws exactly what extent of electronic meeting participation is allowed, if at all.

If you need any help amending any Bylaws' language, let us know.

Thanks,

Pat

C. Patrick Kaltenbach, Attorney  
Braun Kendrick Finkbeiner P.L.C.  
4301 Fashion Square Blvd.  
Saginaw, MI 48603  
Phone:(989) 498-2256 Ext. 512  
Fax:(989) 799-4666  
Mailto:patkal@bkf-law.com

**BRAUN KENDRICK FINKBEINER E-MAIL CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE**

The information contained in this message may be subject to the attorney-client privilege, constitute attorney work product, or be strictly confidential, and is intended only for the use of the addressee

listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

4301 Fashion Square Blvd.  
Saginaw, MI 48603  
Phone 989-498-2100  
Fax 989-799-4666

**BRAUN  
KENDRICK  
FINKBEINER P.L.C.**

## Memo

**To:** TUSCOLA COUNTY FILE  
**From:** CJJ  
**Date:** SEPTEMBER 22, 2010  
**Subject:** ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION IN A PUBLIC MEETING

---

### Issue

May a group whose meetings are subject to the requirements of the Open Meetings Act ("OMA") allow a member to participate in such a meeting via electronic means, such as teleconferencing, rather than being physically present?

### Brief Answer

Michigan law does not prohibit the practice of remote participation in an open public meeting, therefore the public body may freely choose whether to explicitly limit, prohibit, or allow involvement through such means.

### Analysis

In a 1995 Attorney General Opinion, Frank Kelley explained that participation by telephone or interactive television, rather than actual physical presence, by a member of a public body, does not violate the OMA. 1995 OAG No. 6835. In his opinion, Attorney General Kelley cited a Michigan Court of Appeals case from 1985 in which the Court held that holding hearings subject to the OMA via telephonic conference call does not violate the act. *Goode v Department of Social Services*, 143 Mich App 756 (1985).

Research reveals no other applicable legal requirement which would be offended by the remote participation of a county official in a public meeting. Therefore, where the group's bylaws do not prohibit electronic meeting participation, a member of the group is not barred from participating in an open meeting via electronic means.

**BUSINESS CORPORATION ACT (EXCERPT)**  
**Act 284 of 1972**

**450.1405 Participating in meeting of shareholders by conference telephone or remote communications.**

Sec. 405. (1) Unless otherwise restricted by the articles of incorporation or bylaws, a shareholder may participate in a meeting of shareholders by a conference telephone or by other means of remote communication through which all persons participating in the meeting may communicate with the other participants. All participants shall be advised of the means of remote communication and the names of the participants in the meeting shall be divulged to all participants.

(2) Participation in a meeting pursuant to this section constitutes presence in person at the meeting.

(3) Unless otherwise restricted by the articles of incorporation or bylaws, the board of directors may hold a meeting of shareholders conducted solely by means of remote communication.

(4) Subject to any guidelines and procedures adopted by the board of directors, shareholders and proxy holders not physically present at a meeting of shareholders may participate in the meeting by means of remote communication and are considered present in person and may vote at the meeting if all of the following are met:

(a) The corporation implements reasonable measures to verify that each person considered present and permitted to vote at the meeting by means of remote communication is a shareholder or proxy holder.

(b) The corporation implements reasonable measures to provide each shareholder and proxy holder a reasonable opportunity to participate in the meeting and to vote on matters submitted to the shareholders, including an opportunity to read or hear the proceedings of the meeting substantially concurrently with the proceedings.

(c) If any shareholder or proxy holder votes or takes other action at the meeting by means of remote communication, a record of the vote or other action is maintained by the corporation.

**History:** Add. 1978, Act 32, Imd. Eff. Feb. 24, 1978;—Am. 1989, Act 121, Eff. Oct. 1, 1989;—Am. 2001, Act 57, Imd. Eff. July 23, 2001.

**NONPROFIT CORPORATION ACT (EXCERPT)**  
**Act 162 of 1982**

**450.2405 Shareholder or member participation in meeting by conference telephone or other means of remote communication; conditions; participation as presence in person at meeting; participating and voting by remote communication.**

Sec. 405. (1) A corporation may provide in its articles of incorporation or in its bylaws for a shareholder's or member's participation in a meeting of shareholders or members by a conference telephone or other means of remote communication by which all persons participating in the meeting may hear each other if all participants are advised of the means of remote communication in use and the names of the participants in the meeting are divulged to all participants.

(2) Participation in a meeting pursuant to this section constitutes presence in person at the meeting.

(3) Unless otherwise restricted by any provisions of the articles of incorporation or bylaws, the board of directors may hold a meeting of shareholders or members conducted solely by means of remote communication.

(4) Subject to any guidelines and procedures adopted by the board of directors, shareholders or members not physically present at a meeting of shareholders or members may participate in the meeting by means of remote communication and are considered present in person and may vote at the meeting if all of the following are met:

(a) The corporation implements reasonable measures to verify that each person considered present and permitted to vote at the meeting by means of remote communication is a shareholder or member.

(b) The corporation implements reasonable measures to provide each shareholder or member a reasonable opportunity to participate in the meeting and to vote on matters submitted to the shareholders or members, including an opportunity to read or hear the proceedings of the meeting substantially concurrently with the proceedings.

(c) If any shareholder or member votes or takes other action at the meeting by means of remote communication, a record of the vote or other action is maintained by the corporation.

(d) A shareholder or member may be present and vote at an adjourned meeting of the shareholders or members by a means of remote communication if he or she was permitted to be present and vote by that means of remote communication in the original meeting notice given under section 404.

**History:** 1982, Act 162, Eff. Jan. 1, 1983;—Am. 2008, Act 9, Imd. Eff. Feb. 29, 2008.

To: Tuscola County Board of Commissioners

From: Michael R. Hoagland, Controller/Administrator

Date: September 10, 2010

**RE: Airport Zoning Ordinance Update and Steps to Complete for Adoption**

### **Airport Zoning Ordinance Update**

Per the request of the Board of Commissioners Ione Vyse and I meet on Tuesday, September 7, 2010 to discuss the status of the Draft County Airport Zoning Ordinance. The objective established by the Board was to determine remaining issues that need to be decided and the remaining steps required to complete the adoption of the County Airport Zoning Ordinance. A summary of the meeting is as follows:

#### **Height when a Permit is Required in the 5 to 10 Mile Zone**

One of the remaining issues is to determine the height when a permit is required in the 5 to 10 mile zone around the airport. This zone is the one that is the farthest from the airport (**see attached map showing the three zones**). The attorney suggests a permit be required for structures above 200 feet. The Airport Committee suggests the height when a permit is required should be above 499 feet. Ione Vyse explained that the Airport Committee was of the opinion that the 499 feet requirement for a permit in this zone is sufficient to provide for public/aircraft safety and would be the most acceptable to land owners and wind power interests. The FAA only requires notification by the applicant of structures greater than 200 feet for mapping purposes and a variance for structures greater than 499 feet. The Committee was also of the opinion that at 200 feet an excessive number of unnecessary permits would be required adding time and cost to projects. **The Board of Commissioners needs to decide the height at which a permit will be required in the 5 to 10 mile zone.**

#### **Ordinance Administration**

The other unresolved issue is to determine how the ordinance will be administered. The ordinance is drafted giving local units of government the authority to administer the ordinance if they so choose. In situations when a local government chooses not to administer the ordinance it becomes the responsibility of the county. The outstanding issue for the Board of Commissioners is determining how the ordinance will be administered by the county in situations when a local unit of government has chosen not to do the administration. The Airport Committee has identified two alternatives methods of county administration: County Planning Commission or hire an individual. There was discussion regarding the problems with a group like the Planning Commission trying to administer an ordinance. If an individual is chosen it was felt that compensation should be provided from permit fees and paid when a permit is requested. **The Board of Commissioners needs to decide whether the County Planning Commission or an individual will administer the ordinance when administration is the county responsibility.**

### **Steps Required Adopting the Ordinance**

1. Make a decision regarding at what height a permit is required in the 5 to 10 mile zone and who will be appointed to administer the ordinance when the county is responsible for administration – **Potential date: September 28, 2010**
2. Authorize a public hearing to be held for review and consideration of ordinance adoption – **Potential date: September 28, 2010**
3. Make necessary changes to the draft ordinance after the above decisions are made – **Potential date: September 30, 2010**
4. Place a notice in the paper to conduct a public hearing – **Potential date: October 6, 2010**
5. Conduct the public hearing – **Potential date: October 12, 2010**
6. Consider ordinance adoption – **Potential date: October 12, 2010 or October 26, 2010**
7. Provide a written communication to all effected local governmental units asking if they are going to administer the ordinance or if the desire for the county to do the administration – **Potential date: October 14, 2010**
8. Assist (County Planning Commission) in the training of local zoning administrators to administer the Airport Zoning Ordinance for those local units of government who choose to administer the ordinance themselves – **Potential date: October 15, 2010**
9. In those situations when the county is responsible to administer the ordinance begin the process to appoint an individual to administer the ordinance if this method of administration is chosen by the county – **Potential date: October 15, 2010**
10. Hire the county airport ordinance administrator – **Potential date: November 9, 2010**
11. Determine Fees for Variance request, Board of Appeals compensation – **Potential date: November 9, 2010**
12. Request applicants to serve on the Airport Zoning Board of Appeals – **Potential date: November 9, 2010**
13. Appoint members to Airport Zoning Board of Appeals – **Potential date: December 13, 2010**