

MONDAY, MAY 31, 2004

The Board of County Commissioners met in continued session at 8:00 o'clock A.M. Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Robinson were present.

COUNTY OFFICES CLOSED—MEMORIAL DAY

At 5:00 o'clock P.M., the Board continued the session until 8:00 o'clock A.M. on June 1, 2004.

The following are the claims for the month of May, 2004.

VENDOR NAME	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
A&A RESEARCH	QUESTIONNAIRE DEV/DATA AN	\$6,160.00
ABBOTT LABORATORIES, INC	3 QUICK HIV1 KITS	\$107.57
ABC COPIERS	COPIER MAINT	\$750.65
ABOUTMONTANA.NET INC	3 MONTHS INTERNET SERVICE	\$449.50
ACCURATE FIRE SYSTEMS LTD	3 F/E CYLINDER 6 YR INSPE	\$1,156.50
ACCUTRAN	REF RECON-WILEY	\$12.00
ADAPCO, INC.	ALTOID XR BRIQUETS/ALTOSI	\$16,330.77
ADULT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	MAR & APR MENTAL HEALTH V	\$2,400.00
ADVANCED RESTAURANT SUPPLY INC	CAMBRO TRAYS	\$242.20
AIR FLOW SYSTEMS INC	MOUNTING BANS - 14" FRT	\$63.12
ALBERTSONS	FOOD	\$120.21
ALL BRIGHT WINDOW CLEANING	WINDOW CLEANING	\$2,938.00
ALL CREATURES VETERINARY CLINIC	EXAM GLOVES	\$57.60
ALLEGIANCE BENEFIT PLAN MANAGEMENT	FLEX CHILD DEDUCTION	\$18,255.05
ALLIANCE TITLE	REF CK#49422	\$12.00
ALLISON, ROBERT B	DN REPRESENTATION/APR 04	\$1,332.05
ALPINE BUSINESS CENTER	AOA JUNE RENT/ALPINE AUCT	\$1,957.00
ALPINE LOCK & SAFE	EMERGENCY ROADSIDE	\$30.00
AMERICAN RED CROSS	8 EMPLOYEES TRAINED	\$420.00
AMERICAN WEST CHROME INC	REPAIR CYLINDER ASSEMBLY	\$270.00
ANDERS BUSINESS SOLUTIONS	MAINT AGRMT COPIER	\$395.29
ANDERSON, DAVE	REFUND/70 AMER JEEP	\$9.38
ANDERSON, SUSAN CECELIA	PLANTS/EXPO	\$284.64
ANFENSON, MOLLY	MONITOR 10 GAMES	\$400.00
ANIMAL CARE EQUIPMENT	CAT LITTER PANS	\$31.84
ANIMAL CLINIC	MILLER NEUTER	\$123.98
ANIMAS PUBLISHING INC.	02104225 DN-03-003C	\$215.63
ANSELL-AMERICAS	1 CASE CONDOMS	\$37.50
ANYTIME LOCK & SAFE	GATE KEYS/RINGS	\$80.15
APPLIED INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGIES	4160831 BEARING LOCKWASHE	\$1,801.30
APS HEALTHCARE	EAP SERVICES/MAY	\$1,026.00
ARCHITECTS DESIGN GROUP PC	NEW BLDG PROF SERVICES	\$102,858.84
ATKINSON, JIM	COOKIES FOR SHR MTG	\$425.72
AUSTIN FUNERAL HOME	SANCA, JOHN CHARLES VET BE	\$2,500.00
AVENTIS PASTEUR	TETANUS/DPTHERIS/TYPHIM/T	\$1,921.76
BAKER & TAYLOR ENTERTAINMENT	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$552.40
BAKER, SHEILA	TRAINING SEMINAR MISSOULA	\$35.00
BANK OF AMERICA MORTGAGE	REF RECON-LEE	\$12.00
BARNHART, LUCINDA	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$92.34
BARR LABORATORIES, INC	7041074 96 PLAN B	\$846.72
BARRYMAN, KEN	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$8.28
BARTLETT, BILLIE	PERDIEM/MLA CONF 4/24-27	\$259.65
BARTON, WENDY RD	PERDIEM/MT PUBLIC HEALTH	\$46.00
BEARGRASS CONSTRUCTION, LLC	REPLACE SHOP ROOF	\$11,950.00
BEASLEY, CHANTEL R	PERDIEM/GIS CONF	\$120.00
BEE BROADCASTING INC	HAZMAT ADS - KKMT	\$1,344.00
BELLMORE, LARRY D	CAB FARE/WASTE EXPO DALLA	\$531.22
BENJAMIN, BETH ANN	REIM NITROGEN, LIQUID	\$14.55
BENWARE, JENNIFER ANN	REIM/TRAINING BOZEMAN	\$34.00
BERTELSEN, SALLY KAY	TRIBAL HEALTH PROVIDER TR	\$431.38
BIG JOHNS	7585811 TRIMMER LINE & O	\$153.19
BIG SKY JOURNAL	1 YR SUBSCRIPTION	\$25.00
BIG SKY MONUMENTS	VETERANS MARKERS	\$560.00
BIGFORK SENIOR CITIZENS	SITE MANAGEMENT MAY 04	\$300.00
BIGFORK WATER/SEWER DISTRICT	WATER/SEWER SLITERS RESTR	\$35.12
BIRKY, DR. PERRY	MAYNARD	\$995.00
BOEHM, MARTY	35 HRS 5/9-15/04	\$3,625.25
BOLINDA PUBLISHING, INC	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$176.40
BOLSTERS TOWING INC	TOW VEHICLE FROM SHOP TO	\$465.00
BOLT, LEAH	PERDIEM/MT PUBLIC HEALTH	\$46.00
BOUNCEBACK INC	APRIL MAINT FEE	\$118.80
BOWEN, TAMMY RN	FILL IN NURSE	\$712.50
BRASS & BULLETS	CASES & BARRELS	\$2,559.71
BRESNAN COMMUNICATIONS LLC	ADULT JAIL CABLE TV/JUN	\$248.85
BROWDER, DOROTHY	ERDIEM/CORNER TRNG	\$30.00
BROWDER, JAMES	PERDIEM/CORONER TRNG	\$30.00
BRUNINGA, JOHN	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$79.56
BRYAN A STIRRAT & ASSOCIATES INC	PROF SERV PHASE 16B	\$35,317.95
BRYAN BLOCK SURVEYING	SURVEYING	\$161.00
BUECHLE, JAMES	20 MILES/MO BOARD MTG	\$7.50
BUENTEMEIER, RONALD H	CORBAN,ALBERT VET BENEFIT	\$250.00
BUFFALO HILL FUNERAL HOME	THORNTON,DELLIVAN VET BEN	\$2,050.00
BURTON, JAMES H.	SURVEYING	\$1,552.50
C SPECIALTIES, INC	CAT BOXES	\$218.50

CAMPBELL, RAEANN L	OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$863.57
CAN-AM SAR	BASIC MAN TRACKING COURSE	\$390.00
CARDINAL DISCOUNT SUPPLY INC	FILTER/JUV DET	\$626.98
CARDINAL HEALTH	GLOVES/ALCOHOL/CTNBLS/SYR	\$1,525.27
CARQUEST	440 BOAT KIT	\$29.41
CARQUEST	BELT	\$1,370.41
CARQUEST	COMMERCIAL BATTERY	\$227.21
CARQUEST	BELT	\$7.98
CARROLL, BONNIE	MILEAGE REIM	\$11.25
CARSON BROTHERS INC	REFRIGERANT,SERV & LABOR	\$293.16
CARTER, KARI	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$91.14
CBK SERVICES	STEWART,ARLENE	\$361.37
CBM FOOD SERVICE	MEALS APR 22-28	\$15,753.38
CDW GOVERNMENT INC	BAKCUPEXEC FOR JADE	\$488.99
CELLULAR ONE	CELL PHONE/JAY	\$314.23
CELLULAR ONE	04124EBYDZH PHONE CASE	\$24.99
CELLULAR ONE	CELL PHONE	\$847.35
CELLULAR ONE	PHONE/MEREDITH	\$124.98
CELLULAR ONE	LINCOLN CO 2/26-3/25/04	\$193.08
CELLULARONE	JAIL PHONES/MAY	\$787.80
CELLULARONE	BATTERIES/LEATHER CASE/CA	\$137.50
CENEX HARVEST STATES	VALVE	\$520.73
CENEX HARVEST STATES COOP	OIL CHANGE/COUNTY CAR	\$42.90
CENTRAL FIBER CORPORATION	880 TOPCOAT	\$13,159.02
CENTURYTEL	PHONE SERVICE	\$22,194.20
CHANNING BETE COMPANY INC	HRTSVR ED SUPPLIES	\$556.40
CHECKER AUTO	DEGREASER/PAINT/DIGITAL C	\$79.79
CHIEF SUPPLY CORPORATION	BATTERIES	\$381.87
CHILD SUPPORT DIVISION	NELSON, S P65428	\$338.22
CHILTON, JIM	CAB FARE/WASTE EXPO DALLA	\$214.50
CIAMBRA, PETER J	REFUND/60 HD MC	\$26.50
CIARDELLA, M.J.	MILEAGE MAR/APR	\$17.20
CITY OF WHITEFISH	REIM/ 3RD QTR WAGES	\$1,931.00
CITYSERVICEVALCON	FUEL FIRE TRKS/MILL FIRE	\$48,645.64
CLOUD, CLAY E	SUPPLIES/BOOK	\$61.97
COCA-COLA BOTTLING	POW ARC SHATTER/JAGGED IC	\$226.00
COCHRAN, MINDY	PERDIEM/GIS CONF	\$120.00
COLONIAL LIFE AND ACCIDENT INS CO	PREMIUM/AFTER TAX	\$147.00
COLUMBIA CONTAINERS	CONTAINER RENTAL/MAR-APRI	\$150.00
COLUMBIA FALLS AUTO CLINIC	REPLACE FUEL FILTER #391	\$58.00
COLUMBIA MORTUARY	HANSON,HELEN VET BENEFIT	\$750.00
COLUMBIA PAINT	REF CK#107940	\$2.00
COLUMBIA PAINT & COATINGS	WOODTECH SEM-SOL OIL STAI	\$312.28
COMERFORD, DAN	ADDT'L MILEAGE 1ST QTR 04	\$24.30
COMMERCIAL MACHINE SERVICES	STRAIGHTEN AUGER	\$174.65
COMMUNITY BUSINESS SERVICES	AD	\$209.50
COMSTOR	APRIL MICROFICHE	\$159.98
CONCEPTION TECHNOLOGIES	10 ASSURE HCG/URINE-25 TE	\$230.00
CONFEDERATED SALISH/KOOTENAI POLICE	REIM/3RD QTR WAGES	\$13,217.35
CONOCO CAR CARE CENTER	PARTS,SERVICE & LABOR 97	\$735.17
CONRAD MAIN STREET LLC	RENT/MAY 04	\$2,790.66
CORAY-LUDDEN, ME LEE	MILEAGE	\$37.50
CORPRON, SHANE	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$33.48
COSNER COMTECH INC	LICENSING FEE/FCC NOTICE	\$30.00
COSTCO WHOLESALE	SPORTS DRINKS/CHIPS	\$688.09
COUNTRYSIDE ANIMAL CLINIC	BLUNT NEUTER	\$150.00
COX, SAMUEL	UNIFORM ALLOWANCE MAY/DEC	\$450.00
CRESCENT ELECTRIC SUPPLY CO	120V GE, GRN FLASHLIGHT	\$67.23
CROWLEY, HAUGHEY, HANSON, TOOLE &	RESEARCH LABOR AGRMTS	\$4,949.00
CROWLEY, JASON	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$9.00
CROWLEY, KIM	MILEAGE/MT SHARED CATALOG	\$136.50
CROWN AWARDS	FREEFORM TBALL RIBONS, MI	\$292.49
CROWN ENTERPRISES INC	WATERPROOF MAP CASE	\$731.96
CULLIGAN WATER	SALT	\$1,068.04
CUMMINS NORTHWEST INC	SERVICE CALL/GENERATOR	\$423.00
CUSTODIAL WESTERN CASCADE SUPPLY	FLOCK LINED NITRILE	\$3,399.60
CUSTOM FENCE	REPAIR 5' CHAIN LINK FENC	\$265.80
D&D EXPRESS INC	GREIGHT ON FUEL TANK BRAC	\$19.00
DAILY INTERLAKE	PH: D&P PROP TAX INCENTIV	\$2,694.43
DALEN'S DIESEL SERVICES LLC	PARTS	\$2,892.89
DAVEY, AMANDA	SCOREKEEPING 13 GAMES	\$130.00
DAVIS PIPE & MACHINERY	3 HOSE A	\$157.00
DAY RIDER, MARTHA	27 HRS 4/16-28/04	\$1,062.00
DEES DRAPERY SHOP	MINI BLINDS	\$160.00
DEIST, DEBRA J	UNIFORM ALLOWNACE APR/DEC	\$318.75
DELL MARKETING LP	005898685 LAPTOP	\$15,067.18
DEMCO	DOUBLE VIDEO CASES & ROUN	\$254.84
DEPRATU FORD	LABOR/96 CROWN VIC CRANKS	\$18,765.54
DEPT OF ADMINISTRATION	SUMMITNET CHGS	\$110.00
DEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	RENEW WATER/WASTEWATER OP	\$30.00
DEPT OF JUSTICE	FINGERPRINTING	\$128.00
DEPT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY	CRANE HOISTING OPERATOR L	\$40.00
DEPT OF LIVESTOCK	7 RABIES TESTS	\$175.00
DEPT OF PUBLIC HEALTH & HUMAN SRVS	ACT#LS150005/APR 04	\$2,071.97
DEPT OF REVENUE	ADDT'L STATE INCOME TAX	\$21,893.00
DEPT OF REVENUE	STORAGE TANK FEES	\$108.00
DEPT OF REVENUE	ADDT'L ST INCOME TAX	\$20,291.00
DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION	LOCAL SHARE PROJECT COSTS	\$5,482.12

DICKMAN, DANIEL	MPHA BD MTG/HELENA	\$54.23
DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM, INC	INSTALL PHONE LINE/RELOCA	\$203.42
DIXON-SHANE LLC	5 ZITHROMAX	\$484.50
DOC'S ORIENTAL RUG CLEANING	CARPET CLEANING/APR	\$400.00
DOELY, WENDY	303 MILES OUTREACH	\$198.76
DOLPHIN CAPITAL CORP	SHARP COPIER & STAND JUN	\$73.98
DROWNE, TIMOTHY P	MILEAGE/APRIL	\$69.38
DRURY, NOEL MD	SMITH,VAUGHN 3/9-12/04	\$2,184.00
DTG MAPS	10 MAPS	\$169.50
DUNCAN, AVA	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$27.54
DUROS, LAURA LEE	CHILD SUPP/PARKER, BRAD	\$261.00
DUSING, PADY CNM	MAYNARD	\$140.00
DYON, MICHAEL R	MILEAGE/100 MILES TO GYMS	\$37.50
EAGLEDEER, SUNDOWN	PERDIEM/TRIBAL HEALTH TRN	\$151.26
EDUCATION & EMPLOYMENT LAW	RENEWAL	\$159.00
EISINGER MOTORS	900 ROD	\$1,135.96
ELECTION ADMINISTRATION REPORT	ELEC ADMIN REPORT	\$197.00
ELECTION SYSTEMS & SOFTWARE INC	440 BALLOT SLEEVES	\$2,508.00
ELLIOT, RANDI	36 MILES @ .375	\$13.50
ENERGY EQUIPMENT & SUPPLY INC	ELEMENTS/FRT	\$2,852.39
ENVIRO-TIRE INC	PICKUP 35 USED TIRES	\$355.00
EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY	EQUIVEST PREM/UNIT 729435	\$2,230.00
ERICKSON, CONNIE J	332 MILES @.375	\$124.50
EVERGREEN ANIMAL HOSPITAL	RAGOZINSKI NEUTER	\$10.00
EVERGREEN DISPOSAL INC	DISPOSAL SERVICE	\$1,037.93
EXPRESS SERVICES INC	PAPER ORDER WORKERS	\$123.30
FAERBER, MIES WILLIAM	LEGAL COUNSEL	\$1,056.44
FAGRE, CASEY	REIM DOUBLE PAYMENT	\$55.00
FALCON ASSOCIATES, INC	AD:ADMIN OFFICER	\$45.00
FAMILIAN NORTHWEST INC	SEWER PUMP LESS MOTOR	\$2,447.62
FASTENAL COMPANY	T-ROD B 7 3/8-16 X 6	\$1,964.13
FICKLER OIL COMPANY INC	INMATE TRANSPORT GAS	\$117.83
FIREFREEZE WORLDWIDE, INC	COLD FIRE/MILL FIRE 2/15-	\$5,003.00
FIRST AMERICAN EQUITY	REFUND	\$6.00
FIRST BANKCARD	GIS CONF/DENNY HOTEL	\$7,981.80
FIRST CITIZENS BANK, N.A.	REFUND	\$12.00
FIRST INTERSTATE BANK TRUSTEE	GRP LIFE DEDUCT/BEFORE TA	\$172,796.31
FISHER, CLYDE	30 MILES/MO BOARD MTG	\$11.25
FISHER, COURTNEY ELIZABETH	OFFICIATE 15 GAMES	\$210.00
FISHER, JED S	1/2 PERDIEM KALISPELL MOS	\$11.00
FISHER, RON	OVERHAUL KIT	\$64.99
FISHER, SUSIE	FISHER,JED CHLD SPPT DR02	\$863.08
FLANAGAN, MICHAEL	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$36.72
FLATHEAD ANIMAL CLINIC	SARGENT NEUTER	\$10.00
FLATHEAD CO DEPUTY SHERIFF ASSOC	UNION DUES-DEPUTY SHERIFF	\$410.00
FLATHEAD CO SEARCH & RESCUE	BLDG PMT	\$2,715.67
FLATHEAD CO SHERIFFS ASSN	UNION DUES	\$540.00
FLATHEAD COUNTY LIBRARY FOUNDATION	CORRECT DEP MT COMM FDN C	\$1,000.00
FLATHEAD CREDIT UNION	CREDIT UNION DEDUCTION	\$25,618.46
FLATHEAD ELECTRIC CO-OP	ELEC/RECS PRES	\$25,774.12
FLATHEAD FORCE	JUNK VEHICLE AD	\$110.00
FLATHEAD JANITORIAL & RUG SERVICE	CLEAN CARPET/COMMAND VAN	\$60.00
FLATHEAD PUBLISHING GROUP	TOBACCO AD	\$376.00
FLATHEAD VALLEY CHEMICAL DEP CLINIC	APRIL 04 SALARY	\$8,766.20
FLATHEAD VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SECRETARIES DAY WORKSHOP/	\$177.00
FLATHEAD VALLEY ORTHOPEDIC & SPORTS	PETTY - DR	\$274.00
FLATHEAD VALLEY UMPIRE'S ASSOC.	UMPIRE FEES/COREC BLAST O	\$1,740.00
FLEET INDUSTRIES	LIGHT BAR/FLANGE/AMBER	\$391.07
FOOD SERVICES OF AMERICA	FOOD	\$3,750.56
FORD CREDIT	PRINCIPLE:FORD ESCAPE	\$6,318.45
FORDEN, KATHRYN	OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$6.80
FRAME, KATHY M	PERDIEM/LIVESCAN CLASS IN	\$46.00
FRANK'S EXPRESS DRUG	RX MAR & APR 04	\$404.89
FREEBURY, ERNIE	PERDIEM/CORONER TRNG	\$30.00
GALE GROUP, THE	155896 LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$24.71
GALLES FILTER SERVICE, INC.	RUBBER ELBOW/T-BOLT CLAMP	\$25.20
GALLS INC	CLEAR HIGHLIGHTER REPLACE	\$3,107.77
GAZETTE, THE	DN-02-028A	\$265.65
GE CAPITAL	RICOH COPIER SYSTEM	\$565.60
GENES EQUIPMENT FINDER SERVICE	BLUNT FLARE BITS	\$5,580.00
GERHARD, HEATHER L	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$33.27
GERHARD, KEN	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$7.20
GLACIER BANK FSB	REF RECON-VANBELOIS	\$4,974.00
GLACIER REGIONAL PATHOLOGY LTD	MAYNARD	\$122.00
GLACIER WHOLESALERS INC	FOOD	\$754.80
GLAZIER, HOWARD	RECLAMATON OF HOWARD GLAZ	\$5,000.00
GLAZIER, TODD	LEGAL COUNSEL	\$532.00
GONZALES, PATRICIA	PARISH,BRUCE	\$161.52
GOODWIN, ANN W	PERDIEM/MLA CONF 4/24-27/	\$259.65
GREAT WEST DISTRIBUTING LLP	PAPER ORDER	\$8,076.56
GREATAMERICA LEASING	LIGHTING SYSTEM RETROFIT	\$1,098.94
GRIMM, BEVERLY E	TRAINING SEMINAR/MISSOULA	\$702.52
GRIZZLY GRAVEL	1688 TONS 3/4" CRUSH GRAV	\$12,660.00
GRIZZLY SECURITY ALARMS	ALARM MONITORING - OFFICE	\$225.00
GULLEDGE, TRACI	PACK OF LIES & QTR TOBACC	\$249.88
GUMDROP BOOKS	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$861.65
GUNDERSON CONSULTING	REVIEW STATE HAZMAT PLAN	\$625.00
GUTIERREZ-FALLA, EDUARDO	LEGAL COUNSEL	\$1,452.00
H&H BUSINESS SYSTEMS, INC	EXCESS COPIES	\$361.27

H&H EXPRESS	FREIGHT	\$31.70
HAAG, ANDREW L	INMATE TRANSPORTS	\$26.00
HACK, RUTH E	APR VOL DRIVER MILEAGE	\$88.02
HALL, BRENDA	MILEAGE APR 04 81 MILES	\$30.38
HALL, TYLER & SMITH, STEPHANIE	REFUND/95 GMC YKN	\$65.00
HAMISEVICZ, MARY	FIRE SERV 1ST RESPONDER P	\$150.00
HAMMER & STEEL, INC	(2) 2 3/4" GUIDE GIBS	\$868.75
HAMMER, HEWITT & SANDLER, PLLC	ATTORNEY FEES/BLAKE VS FL	\$626.00
HARTSOCH, DOROTHY	SITE ATTENDANT/CRESTON	\$300.00
HARWOOD, ROLLIN F	REFUSE FEE REFUND #034436	\$65.00
HAWK, GARY	HAWK,WILLIAM SR VET BENEF	\$250.00
HEALTHCENTER NORTHWEST	BRUMITT/XRAY	\$271.00
HEBB, DAISY	IMS CONSULTING	\$2,480.00
HEDLEY, DAVID	REIM/GAS-MED 2	\$31.50
HEDSTROM, MARK	REFUND/83 FORD VAN	\$25.00
HEINO, BRIAN	PERDIEM/FTO SCHOOL	\$103.00
HELGESON, DELLA	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$12.15
HELMS, FAWN M	REFUND/94 BUIC CEN	\$10.00
HELMS, ROBERT	REIM/NASAR PAPER/INK/MISC	\$100.00
HENRY SCHEIN	REPLACEMENT BULB/GLOVES	\$119.05
HERRMANN EQUIPMENT, INC	BEARINGS/FRT	\$617.26
HIGH COUNTRY LINEN SUPPLY	CLEAN UNIFORMS/RUGS	\$1,782.36
HINCHEY, SEAN	DN REPRESENTATION/APR 04	\$126.00
HINES, THOMAS	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$4.86
HO PARTS PLUS	LENS/HAZMAT TRAILER	\$12.41
HOGAN, JEANNE	MILEAGE CF CLINIC	\$206.50
HOLBROOK, VICKI	PERDIEM/MT PUBLIC HEALTH	\$81.00
HOLMES, PAMELA	UNIFORM ALLOWANCE MAY/DEC	\$283.34
HOME DEPOT	8164569 BOLTS/BUNGEEES	\$48.64
HOOPERS NURSERY AND GREENHOUSES	HEDGES FOR RACE TRACK	\$540.00
HORIZON SERVICES INC	SENSOR/FRT	\$137.74
HOUSE OF CLEAN	CLEANING SUPPLIES	\$168.65
HOUSER, DR. VICTOR C.	KRAMER,D	\$320.00
HULLA, WES	PERDIEM/HOME GRANT WORKSH	\$185.38
HUNGRY HORSE NEWS	1 YR WEEKLY HH NEWS	\$30.80
HW WILSON COMPANY, THE	PLAY INDEX 1998-2002	\$225.75
IABTI	2004 RENEWAL DATE CHG/MAR	\$50.00
IKON OFFICE SOLUTIONS	IMAGERUNNER MAINT AGRMT M	\$156.59
INFORMATION SYSTEMS OF MONTANA	ETRUST ANTIVIRUS ANN MAIN	\$2,656.90
INGRAM LIBRARY SERVICES	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$6,008.42
INSTALLATION TECHNOLOGIES	INSTALLATION SUPPLIES	\$4,184.92
INSTY PRINTS	500 BUSINESS CARDS/B VIOL	\$1,980.45
INTAB INC	STICKERS/BALLOT BOXES	\$3,913.38
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OP ENGINEERS	UNION DUES	\$2,536.00
INTERSTATE ALARM INC	981298 MONITORING SERV 6/	\$90.00
JACKOLA ENGINEERING & ARCHIT	ARCH ENG - LUTHERAN CAMP	\$5,065.75
JACKSON MURDO ETAL	REFUND	\$13.00
JAMES, ANNE M	MLA CONF 4/24027/04	\$51.00
JANITORS WORLD	WHISK BROOMS	\$516.94
JESCO BOAT CENTER LLC	TIEDOWNS & GAS TANK VENT	\$47.28
JETTE APPRAISAL & CONSULTING, INC	APPRAISAL/HELENA FLATS BI	\$3,975.00
JIM DOWEN IMPORTS INC	TIGHTENED ALL BELTS	\$49.00
JJ KELLER & ASSOCIATES, INC	RENEWAL/OSHA REGULATIONS	\$275.50
JOBS AVAILABLE INC	AD:ADMIM OFFICER	\$119.60
JOHNSON & JOHNSON PED INSTITUTE,LLC	AMAZING TALENTS OF NEWBOR	\$62.50
JOHNSON, PAUL	33 MILES/MO BOARD MTG	\$12.38
JOHNSON, STEPHANIE	MILEAGE/CONF/MISSOULA	\$97.50
JONES, CHRIS	REFEREE 8 GAMES	\$160.00
JONES, LADD L	REFEREE 8 GAMES	\$160.00
JORDAHL & SLITER	CONSULT/PREPARE FORM 1023	\$1,265.00
JOURNEYWORKS PUBLISHING	SELF-HELP PUBLICATIONS	\$97.90
JTL GROUP INC	5 GALS TACK OIL	\$1,589.10
KALISPELL AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	FLYER FOR F&G SHOW	\$100.00
KALISPELL AUTO PARTS	RETAINER	\$4,540.50
KALISPELL CITY	FIRE LINE 4/1-30/04	\$582.17
KALISPELL CITY AMBULANCE SERVICE	MCBRIDE/AMB	\$468.65
KALISPELL COPY & BLUE INC	FLAGGING TAPE/CARDSTOCK P	\$27.10
KALISPELL COPY & BLUE INC	(4) 4 THICK LATHE	\$112.96
KALISPELL DIAGNOSTIC SVC, PC	HAZMAT PHYSICAL FOR TRAIN	\$173.00
KALISPELL FOOT & ANKLE CLINIC	WADE	\$53.96
KALISPELL POLICE DEPARTMENT	REIM/KPD CF DISPATCHER TR	\$1,500.00
KALISPELL REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER	PROVIDER CARDS	\$15,239.49
KALISPELL SENIOR CENTER	SITE MANAGEMENT MAY 04	\$500.00
KALISPELL STAMP & SEAL WORKS	STAMPS	\$29.65
KALVIG, JANICE	PERDIEM/MSC TRAINING CLAS	\$174.87
KAMAN INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGIES CORP	ROLLER BRG INSERT/FRT	\$3,374.81
KANALLY, JULIE	IMM TRAINING/HELENA	\$66.45
KAR PRODUCTS	FITTINGS/ADAPTOR/HOSE	\$1,898.63
KARI DODGE CHRYSLER PLYMOUTH HYUNDA	LINE/TUBE	\$20.51
KEEFE SUPPLY CO	INDIGENT KITS	\$210.00
KELLY'S HAULAWAY	HAULING	\$3,711.11
KENWORTH SALES MISSOULA	REGULATOR-WINDOW	\$89.46
KINNIBURGH, VIOLA	KINNIBURGH,THEODORE VET B	\$250.00
KMART 7030	FRAMES	\$222.53
KNUDSEN, JAKE & YARDE, TERESA	REFUND/89 DODG TK PK	\$111.50
KOIS BROTHERS EQUIPMENT CO	SEAL:CERAMIC SVC/IMPEIR	\$599.55
KOSITZKY, JO ANN	PERDIEM/MLA CONF 4/24-27	\$324.75
KRANTZ, ADELE	ANNUAL MOTOR VEHICLE "TAC	\$197.85

KUSTOM SIGNAL INC	20110 MIC & TRANSMITTER	\$181.00
LAISY, WAYNE	APR VOL DRIVER MILEAGE	\$76.14
LAKESIDE BAPTIST CHURCH	SITE MANAGEMENT MAY 04	\$300.00
LANKTREE GLASS	REPLACE WINDSHIELD	\$1,544.84
LASALLE AUTOMOTIVE	REPAIR STARTER/PARTS	\$185.95
LASALLE TOOL	PUNCH	\$5.20
LAWRENCE, PAULETTE	12.25 HRS 5/1-15/04	\$319.75
LAWSON PRODUCTS, INC.	DUCT TAPE/TY-RAP/ELEC TAP	\$9,691.83
LAWSON, RANDY	REFUND/01 HD MC	\$36.75
LC STAFFING SERVICE	LUCHT, PHYLLIS WE 4/25/04	\$4,004.15
LEE, ROBERT M	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$24.84
LELANDS'S HONDA-SUZUKI-BMW	HONDA EV3000 GENERATOR	\$1,899.95
LENTZ, KAREN	PERDIEM COPS CONF	\$298.35
LES GUGLER'S A-1 AUTO ENTERPRISES	L FENDER FLARE	\$45.00
LES SCHLEGEL ENTERPRISES INC	HAUL EXCAVATOR TO FIRE AN	\$2,229.24
LES SCHLEGEL ENTERPRISES, INC	WATER TRUCK/WATER DEMERSV	\$1,240.00
LES SCHWAB TIRE CENTER #904	ALIGNMENT/BRAKES SUBURBAN	\$1,335.83
LINATEK, INC	TARGET CURTAINS	\$731.93
LINCOLN CO COURTHOUSE	CARPENTER - RX	\$123.33
LINCOLN CO SHERIFF	REIM 3RD QTR WAGES	\$21,269.59
LINEBERRY, AMBER	MONITOR 4 GAMES	\$95.00
LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	PUBLICATION	\$384.50
LOREN'S AUTO REPAIR, INC	ALT PULLEY #1498	\$68.15
LUCY, DANIEL & MARY	REFUND/01 VOLK	\$25.00
LUND, JEANNINE M	PERDIEM/MT PUBLIC HEALTH	\$204.75
M&M COMMUNICATIONS INC	MIDLAND RADIO	\$2,420.00
MADDUX, DONNA	MACSS SPRING CONF	\$307.15
MAHUGH FIRE & SAFETY, LLC	CONTRACTED SERVICES/APR 0	\$2,000.00
MAILCODE	ES3 CONTRACTS 6/1/04-5/31	\$3,070.00
MANN, CASEY	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$11.88
MARBLE, ALAN FOREST	REIM/BOOK - ENDGAME:THE T	\$27.95
MARION AMBULANCE SERVICE	TRANSPORT TO WARM SPRINGS	\$1,420.75
MARQUARDT, WENDY	PERDIEM/GOV CONF ON AGING	\$76.98
MASTER'S TOUCH, THE LLC	3000 #10 ENV	\$1,481.76
MCDONALDS #3059	FOOD/MILL FIRE 2/15-16/04	\$180.00
MCELROY & WILKEN INC.	4.5 YARDS CONCRETE	\$679.00
MEADOW GOLD DAIRIES INC	DAIRY PRODUCTS	\$768.27
MEASURE & WILSON	REFUND	\$1.00
MEDICAL ARTS PHARMACY	EPINEPHRINE	\$18.60
MEDICAL ARTS PRESS	2 LOCKING WALL DESK/WRITE	\$253.20
MEYERS FAMILY TRUST	200347886/PROTEST	\$497.32
MICHAELS CONVENIENCE STORE	#856 WASH	\$231.11
MICHELS, KAREN	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$6.12
MICROFILM SERVICE OF MONTANA INC	TIFF CONVERSION/RERUNS/MS	\$1,127.79
MICROMEDIA	ML BI-WEEKLY MICROFICHE	\$11.56
MID AMERICAN RESEARCH CHEMICAL CORP	COOL WAVE METERED	\$102.68
MIDWEST CANCER SCREENING	PAP TESTS APR 04	\$1,520.78
MIKE'S OF COLUMBIA FALLS	DIESEL FUEL	\$12.07
MILD FENCE COMPANY	700 FEET 6' GREEN LINE OF	\$4,980.00
MILLER ELECTRIC LLC	POWER PROBLEM/FOREST ACRE	\$50.00
MISSION VALLEY SECURITY INC	TRIBAL-POLSON OFFICE ALAR	\$70.50
MISSOULA CO SHERIFF	JUVENILE BOARD	\$4,320.00
MIZEE, CAROL	MILEAGE/CFALLS BOARD MTG	\$26.02
MOBILFONE	PAGER SERVICE	\$26.18
MODERN MACHINERY CO	GASKET FOLD SECT/FRT	\$60.90
MONTANA ASSN-CLERKS OF DIST. COURT	MACDC DUES/ANNUAL	\$512.00
MONTANA BROKERS, INC.	OPINIO OF VALUE - 155 BRO	\$150.00
MONTANA CO ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION	SEMINAR JUL 7-9	\$990.00
MONTANA CORONERS ASSOCIATION	ADV CORNER TRNG	\$150.00
MONTANA DIGITAL LLC	ONLINE SERVICE/MAY	\$1,510.00
MONTANA ENVIRONMENTAL LAB LLC	WATER TESTING/CLIFORM MF	\$148.00
MONTANA LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY	SMITH/BASIC	\$600.00
MONTANA OE-CI TRUST FUND	CENTRAL PEN .10HR BEN-ROA	\$8,405.63
MONTANA OFFICE SYSTEMS INC	TONER	\$477.87
MONTANA ONE CALL CENTER	PAGER	\$362.85
MONTANA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ASSN	UNION DUES	\$524.50
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY	CO SHARE OF SALARY APRIL	\$4,985.72
MONTANA SUPREME COURT	DELL POWEREDGE 2600 SERVE	\$2,000.00
MONTANA TAX FOUNDATION, INC	1 YR SUBSCRIPTION	\$55.00
MONTGOMERY, RICHARD T	96 HRS APR 04	\$2,400.00
MOOG, SANDI	MISC CLASSES TAUGHT 4/22-	\$750.00
MOORE MEDICAL CORP	1251311 MEDICAL SUPPLIES	\$283.61
MORINE, DEBORAH	MILEAGE	\$6.75
MORRISON MAIERLE/CSSA	PROF ENGINEERING SERV/AUC	\$1,076.60
MSU CONFERENCE SERVICES	DICKMAN,DAN REG SUMMER IN	\$710.00
MUNSINGER, MARK	2 PUBLIC WATER INSPECTION	\$290.00
MURER, DIANNE M	100 MILES POLSON/BALLOT R	\$37.50
MYSIS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM	25% DWN MYSIS FIELD LICEN	\$9,797.50
NAME IT GOLF, INC	SUPPLIES/DISASTER PREP TA	\$44.95
NASCO MODESTO	1 OBESE CHOKER MANIKEN W/	\$443.74
NATIONAL CITY MTG	REFUND	\$26.00
NATIONWIDE TITLE	REFUND	\$12.00
NEC SOLUTIONS (AMERICA) INC	FINGERPRINT MACHINE MAINT	\$3,757.70
NEIL CONSULTANTS INC	ENGINEERING SERV/FARM TO	\$1,798.14
NELSON, PETER B DMD	C ARNOLD	\$51.00
NEWMAN TRAFFIC SIGNS	FLA040 BORDER BK/BLANK YL	\$911.00
NIELSEN, DELLA	NIELSEN,STANLEY VET BENEF	\$250.00
NITRO PROMOTIONS	MONSTER TRUCK SHOW	\$17,500.00

NORCO	69945 8 PAIR SHOOTING GLA	\$1,991.31
NORMONT EQUIPMENT CO	CLASS II SOLID LIME REFL	\$2,403.78
NORTH VALLEY SENIOR CENTER	EXERCISE CLASS/APR	\$655.00
NORTHERN ENERGY INC	PROPANE	\$162.71
NORTHERN FIRE & COMMUNICATION	ANNUAL INSPECTION FOR DET	\$1,196.00
NORTHSHORE ANIMAL CLINIC	NEGIN SPAY	\$30.00
NORTHSTAR PRINTING INC	525 INSTRUCTIONS	\$535.00
NORTHWEST BUSINESS EQUIPMENT	SERVICE AGRMT	\$2,754.44
NORTHWEST MACHINERY INC	SEALS/ORING/BACKUP/FRT	\$172.50
NORTHWEST MONTANA HUMAN RESOURCES	HOMEMAKER/RESPITE/ESCORT	\$4,293.29
NORTHWEST PARTS & RIGGING CO INC	HOSES/BOLTS	\$358.08
NORTHWEST PIPE FITTINGS INC	FITTINGS	\$247.64
NORTHWEST PORTABLES LLC	CHEMICAL TOILET RENTAL	\$390.00
NORTHWEST TRUCK REPAIR INC	SLACK ADJUSTERS	\$1,722.85
NORTHWESTERN ENERGY	FAIRGOUNDS	\$5,242.33
NORWOOD, CAROL	MILEAGE MAIL/PAYROLL	\$33.75
NUPAC	12 YDS CONCRETE/WARTNOW B	\$477.50
NUTTING, ELLEN	MILEAGE 1ST QTR 04	\$36.45
NW SURGICAL ASSOCIATES PC	MCMURRY	\$1,826.00
OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH & WELLNESS SRVS	EMP SCREENING/BORGEN, BRO	\$1,380.00
OFFICE SOLUTIONS AND SERVICES	OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$7,553.94
OFFICEMAX	4995J057 4 LEGAL FILE CA	\$905.08
OFFICEMAX CREDIT PLAN	LABELS & BOOK COPY HOLDER	\$1,149.26
OKAMOTO, KAREN	GOVT AUDIT ACCT FIN REPOR	\$277.30
OLD CARS PRICE GUIDE	1 YR SUBSCRIPTION	\$19.98
OLD CREAMERY MALL	TRIBAL-RONAN OFFICE UTILI	\$255.00
OLD DOMINION BRUSH	CONV POLY WAFER BROOMS/MO	\$3,449.50
OLSON, FLORENCE	SITE ATTENDANT/LAKESIDE	\$575.00
OLYMPIAN HIAWATHA LLC	R1073	\$2,555.91
OMNIGRAPHICS INC	FLCO2 LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$226.30
ONE HOUR FAST PHOTO LAB & PORTRAITS	DEVELOPING/PROCESSING	\$7.80
ORTLEY, DAVID M	SPRING COURT SCHOOL PERDI	\$310.35
OZZIES DRAIN OIL	10 BARRELS	\$150.00
PACIFIC CLUTCH & BRAKE	CORE CHG	\$150.00
PACIFIC STEEL & RECYCLING	PLATE	\$581.80
PAGE NORTHWEST	PAGER	\$653.09
PAGE, KRIS	SHAVINGS & DELIVERY	\$1,700.00
PALCHAK, DR ANDREW E	ICC PHYSICAL	\$65.00
PALICZ, FRANK	MILEAGE FOR 1ST QTR 04	\$12.15
PAPER CHASE	COPY POLICY MANUAL	\$105.05
PAPILLON, ALFRED	MILEAGE/SOMERS FIRE SERV	\$15.00
PARADIGM MANAGEMENT PC	MANAGEMENT 10% APRIL	\$66,917.02
PARISH, BRUCE L	ADV PERDIEM/FBI COLLEGE	\$54.00
PARSONS TRACTOR & IMPLEMENTS CO	AIR FILTER	\$32.84
PASKELL, HANSEN	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$23.76
PASSWATER, TONYA MARIE	REIM/SCHOOLING	\$1,480.70
PATEFIELD, ELIZABETH A	PERDIEM/GIS CONF	\$472.88
PATHOLOGY ASSOCIATES MEDICAL LABS	MISC TESTS APR 04	\$668.88
PAULSON, JOAN	PERDIEM/PROMOTING FIRST R	\$169.40
PAVLIK ELECTRIC CO INC	LABOR/BACK-UP CONTROL POW	\$385.00
PEEWEE'S PORTA-POTTIES	SERVICE ON PORTAPOTTIES/M	\$190.00
PENCO POWER PRODUCTS	FILTER FOR WALKER	\$195.92
PETERSEN INDUSTRIES INC	PINS	\$315.04
PETKUS, JAMES R	REFUND/64 VOLK MIC VAN	\$7.00
PETTY CASH - LIBRARY	MATERIALS/BOOK TRUCKERS S	\$37.09
PETTY CASH - RSVP	PETTY CASH	\$46.87
PETTY CASH - SHERIFF	MAPS/SNYDER	\$18.00
PETTYJOHN'S THE WATER STORE INC	WATER	\$116.00
PFIZER PHARMACEUTICALS	300 DEPOPROVERA	\$5,200.86
PHOTO VIDEO PLUS	PROCESSING	\$246.25
PIERSON TRUCK PARTS	FUEL VALVES	\$660.48
PINNACLE INVESTIGATION CORP	BACKGROUND CKS/MCDONALD &	\$60.00
PIONEER RESEARCH CORPORATION	116981 CLEANER	\$172.05
PITNEY BOWES RESERVE ACCOUNT	POSTAGE METER RENTAL	\$25,341.74
PLAINSMEN PRINTING & SUPPLY	11 TRACT BOOK BINDERS	\$1,234.00
PNC BANK	REFUND	\$6.00
PORTLAND OBSERVER NEWSPAPER	DN-04-007C	\$450.00
POTTHOFF, RONALD B DDS, PC	SHANE/DDS	\$576.00
PRIDMORE, RICHARD	PRIDMORE,GEORGE VET BENEF	\$250.00
PRINTLINK	FREIGHT/DIR DEP NOTICE FO	\$25.28
PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS SYSTEMS INC	512MB PC-133 DIMM - NATE	\$412.00
PROPERTIES NORTHWEST REAL ESTATE	APPRAISAL:HOMESTEAD HOUSE	\$150.00
PRORIDER INC	BIKE & JUMP HELMETS	\$346.40
PRUNTY, DAVID ROBERT	FUEL/CAB WASTE EXPO DALLA	\$419.68
PURDY, ERIKA S.	COX,VICTOR SAM CHLD SPPT	\$137.50
QUICK TICK INTERNATIONAL	FAIR TICKETS	\$864.60
QUILL CORPORATION	967987 POSTAGE METER LAB	\$291.37
QUINLAN PUBLISHING CO INC	1 YR SUBSCRIPTION/ZONING	\$127.00
QWEST	WEST GLACIER 911/MAY	\$271.63
RANCH & HOME SUPPLY, INC	PROPANE W/EXCHANGE TANK	\$1,541.07
RANGER STORAGE	APRIL RENT	\$58.00
RDO EQUIPMENT CO	SPRING/FRT	\$174.31
REA, ROBERT DENNIS	PERDIEM/GIS CONF	\$120.00
REBUCK, LAURELLA	REIM/PLAYING CARDS	\$40.47
RED EAGLE AVIATION, INC	TROP FOR RADIO	\$628.00
RED LION COLONIAL INN	L BOLT/3 NIGHTS SPRING CO	\$638.79
REFERENCE SERVICE PRESS	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$45.00
REGENT BOOK COMPANY, INC	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$12.27
REGIONAL TRUSTEE SERVICE	REF RECON-BORCHERS	\$6.00

REID, LORRAINE	ON-LINE EXCEL COURSE	\$59.00
REYNOLDS, THOMAS	PERDIEM/GIS CONF	\$120.00
RHODES, SCOTT	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$50.40
RHODES, STELLA A	201.6 MILES @.375	\$75.60
RHOMAR INDUSTRIES, INC.	RHOMA-SOL/FRT	\$139.50
RIEBES MACHINE WORKS INC	MACHINE 4 BOLTS, 8" 5/8 A	\$505.50
RIMROCK STAGES INC	SHIPPING RABIES TEST	\$70.05
RINGQUIST SIGNS	GARAGE SALE BANNER	\$217.83
RITCHIE RILEY SHOOK TIRE CO	REPAIR/BOOT	\$2,629.00
ROBERTS, MARLA K	TRAINING SEMINAR MISSOULA	\$270.30
ROCKY MOUNTAIN IMAGES INC	250 POLY DRAW BAGS	\$1,284.29
ROCKY MOUNTAIN OUTFITTER	SWAT CLOTHING	\$766.93
ROCKY MOUNTAIN TRUCK CENTER	2 2004 CANCADE STIFF POLE	\$65,400.00
ROLL, ARLEN	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$12.77
RONS ALIGNMENT INC	ALIGNMENT	\$99.90
ROOT, NANETTE M	IMM TRAINING/HELENA	\$66.45
ROSAUERS	PAPER TOWELS	\$332.90
ROSCOE STEEL & CULVERT	BANDS 48"X12" 16 GA STD	\$161.28
ROWELL, NANCY	13 HRS 5/18-19/04	\$725.00
RUSSELL, JOSEPH W	REIM/FOOD BD OF HEALTH RE	\$105.96
SAFEGUARD BUSINESS SYSTEMS	P8X1VW CHECKS KALISPELL	\$73.70
SAFEGUARD BUSINESS SYSTEMS	896399 CIVIL RECEIPT SLIP	\$324.00
SALVATION ARMY	REFUND/91 CHEV VAN	\$201.00
SAM'S CAMERAS & ELECTRONICS	FILM,CAMERAS,ENLARGEMENT	\$43.84
SAND, LANETTE	PERDIEM/GIS CONF	\$120.00
SANDERS, RAY	14 MILES/MO BOARD MTG	\$5.25
SAUTER, SARAH	REFEREE 8 GAMES	\$95.00
SCARFF AUTO CENTER INC	04 GMC	\$49,609.35
SCHAEFFER, CHARLES	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$47.52
SHELLINGER CONSTRUCTION CO, INC	REFUND/98 CAT SM	\$289,583.78
SCHLEGEL & SONS CONTRACTOR INC	HAUL D8N 4 CORNERS/OLD ST	\$337.25
SCHLEPP, LISA	REIM/FOOD/ALL STAFF MTG B	\$20.32
SCHMITT, JACK	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$21.33
SCHOOL DISTRICT #6	RENT MAY 04	\$25.00
SCHULZ, KATIE F	DFS TRAINING/HELENA	\$205.08
SCHUMACHER, RANDY	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$20.88
SCHWARZ ARCHITECTURE & ENGINEERING	ENGINEERING SERV/RIVER RO	\$344.14
SCS PRODUCTIONS, LLC	DOWN PMT FREESTYLE SHOW/S	\$7,000.00
SELBYS	2RLS PAPER	\$417.89
SERVICEMASTER OF FLATHEAD COUNTY	JANITORIAL SERVICES	\$157.00
SESOCK, KEN	REIM/132 MILES	\$49.50
SEWARD, JANE J.	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$19.44
SHARE CORP	SAFETY SOLVENT/FRT	\$1,690.95
SHERWOOD, ELIZABETH	REIM/BASIC MEDICAL CODING	\$242.98
SHOPKO	TRUMPET HIGHBALL/TRUMPET	\$37.54
SIENKNECHT, CAROL	554.6 MILES @ .375	\$207.98
SITTE, KLAUS ATTORNEY AT LAW	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$24.95
SIX ROBBLEES' INC	4 WHEELS/FRT	\$813.96
SLITERS ACE	FLASHING/DEPTH GUAGE/FLAT	\$59.21
SMITH, RYAN	1ST QTR MILEAGE	\$12.60
SNAPPY SPORT SENTER	4 CS SOFTBALL	\$144.00
SNYDER, MARLENE	CONSULTING SERV 4/1-6/30/	\$6,000.00
SNYDER, THOMAS E	PERDIEM/LYNNWOOD WA TRNG	\$162.43
SPECIALTY STORE SERVICES	SINGLE VIDEO & SINGLE CD	\$247.69
SPECIALTY TECHNICAL PUBLISHERS	RENEWAL/FED TOXICS PROG C	\$310.00
SPECTRA ASSOCIATES, INC.	MYLAR PAGE REINFORCEMENTS	\$20.50
SPENCER, HANNA	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$19.17
SPIKE NASHBAR	VOLLEYBALL SCRUNCHES, TUB	\$174.40
SPOKANE HOUSE OF HOSE	50' 11/2S TITE X 15MFIPT-	\$201.89
ST MARIE GRAPHICS	PIN STRIPING	\$22.25
STACK, JAMES B & LISA A	200328944/PROTEST	\$531.04
STANDARD BATTERIES OF SPOKANE INC	BATTERY DISPOSAL	\$525.00
STANFORD POLICE & EMERGENCY SUPPLY	COLLAR BRASS	\$179.88
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	36898 PAPER,STAPLES	\$325.55
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	CORDLESS MOUSE	\$39.98
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	STICKY NOTES/SPINDLE/STAP	\$80.82
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	43908 WALLET CALCULATORS	\$24.35
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	MARKERS/POST CARDS/STAPLE	\$75.96
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	43908 WALLET CALCULATORS	\$44.91
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	27606 INK	\$122.24
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	38284 BINDERS/INSERTS:CAS	\$698.46
STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	37122 OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$140.08
STATE BAR OF MONTANA	ACVERTISING, MT LAWYER	\$48.00
STATE REPORTER PUBLISHING CO	#50 REPORTS VOL 318	\$57.26
STENBERG, CHRIS	03/CO FIRE SERV	\$20.00
STEWART, ARLENE	MILEAGE REIM APR 04	\$252.88
STOCK BUILDING SUPPLY	WOOD FOR RANGE	\$105.31
STOCKDALE, RICHARD	REIM UNIFORM PANTS	\$350.25
STOICK DRUG	1 BP KIT/1 THIGH BP	\$30,024.90
STOUT, BONITA L	REIM/JUICE IMM CLINIC	\$172.16
STRINGER, LLOYD T	ST VS CESNIK	\$64.01
STUFFT, DAVID FRANKLIN	LEGAL COUNSEL	\$240.00
SUPER WASH	BUS WASHES	\$182.50
SUPER 1 FOODS	SWEET & SOUR	\$242.79
SUPER 8 MOTEL OF KALISPELL	FOLIO 111814 S. MOOG	\$47.09
SURE-WAY SYSTEMS OF MONTANA INC	HAZARDOUS WASTE REMVL	\$168.96
SWAIM, JOHN R & LINDA J	REFUND/92 CHEVY AST VN	\$40.50
SWISS CHALET EXCAVATING	SNOW PLOW CORAM SITE 1/1-	\$5,600.00

SYKES PHARMACY	RX APRIL 04	\$94.00
SYSCO FOOD SERVICES OF MONTANA INC	FOOD	\$5,033.90
T-BEND CONSTRUCTION INC.	ASPHALT	\$26,215.00
TEAMSTERS UNION LOCAL #2	UNION DUES-AOA DRIVERS	\$154.00
TEAMSTERS UNION LOCAL #2	UNION DUES-R&B	\$788.00
TERRY HODGES CONSTRUCTION	TEST BARN & RACE STALLS	\$4,045.00
THIELMAN, DEANNA	POSTAGE	\$4.30
THOMAS, DEAN & HOSKINS INC	LIVESTOCK PAVILLION SERV	\$19,450.00
THOMAS, RONALD	SITE ATTENDANT/BIGFORK	\$1,925.00
THOMPSON, BOB	MILEAGE 1ST QTR 04	\$12.15
THOMPSON, LINDA	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$4.32
THOMSON WEST	1000476095 LIBRARY MATERI	\$95.00
THREE RIVERS BANK	OFFICEMAX/DESK FOR SNYDER	\$6,455.90
TIRE-RAMA WEST	TIRES	\$8,927.98
TOAVS, DENNIS	UNIFORM ALLOWANCE MAY-DEC	\$433.33
TOMARK SPORTS	DELUXE GROUND ANCHOR/HOME	\$83.06
TOP COPY PRINTING INC	PRINTING DMV POSTCARDS	\$51.90
TORQUE-A-MATIC	REBUILD TRANSMISSION	\$8,208.00
TOTAL ACCESS GROUP INC	CONDOMS	\$165.00
TOTAL SCREEN DESIGN	TSHIRTS/BLAST OFF COREC	\$514.80
TRAVELERS PROPERTY CASUALTY	PREMIUM/AUTO/HOUSE	\$5,133.84
TRIPLE W EQUIPMENT INC	TECH MANUALS/FRT	\$1,792.45
TRIPPETS PRINTING	STAMP MONICA	\$2,496.30
UMATILLA COUNTY SHERIFFS DEPT	DN-03-14A	\$28.00
UMENSO INTERNATIONAL LLP	NIBRS SYSTEM/TRAVEL, LODGI	\$7,901.93
UNISOURCE WORLDWIDE, INC	PAPER	\$1,138.71
UNISYS CORPORATION	HARDWARE MAINT	\$712.26
UNITED TOOL RENTAL INC	DIAMOND CORE DRILL BIT	\$96.00
UNITED WAY OF FLATHEAD COUNTY	VOL EVENT	\$593.07
US DEPT OF EDUCATION	MCCOMB/STUDENT LOAN	\$186.20
US DEPT OF JUSTICE #246	REF #CV0380GF	\$1.00
USF REDDAWAY	FREIGHT	\$270.51
VALIC	VALIC DEDUCTON	\$7,577.00
VALLEY GLASS INC	FINANCE DOOR GLASS	\$28.00
VALLEY WELDERS & INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY	OXYGEN	\$24.10
VAN SWEDEN, ROBERT P	VOL DRIVER MILES/APR 04	\$29.16
VAN WICKLIN, CHLOE	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$9.36
VANAKEN, LYNETTE DION	REIM/4000 WRIST BANDS/GET	\$87.38
VERIZON WIRELESS	MAY 04	\$1,207.15
VEYNA, AMANDA	48 HRS 4/18-5/1/04	\$960.00
VIELLEUX, LARRY JOE	SITE RENT/ESSEX	\$210.00
VIKING OFFICE PRODUCTS	WIRE ROLL/STEP STOOL BLAC	\$265.20
VISTA LINDA INC	63 LUNCHES/BT TABLETOP EX	\$441.00
VOSS, DOROTHY JANE	VOSS, GLENN VET BENEFIT	\$250.00
WALSTENS GARAGE DOORS INC	COMM DOORS/LABOR REMOVE &	\$5,199.00
WARDEN PAPER	PAPER	\$654.25
WASHINGTON BELT & DRIVE SYSTEMS	SPEC 26 24"X39'8" HI-SPEE	\$3,125.52
WEATHERELL, CHERYL	88 CHEV TRUCK/WINTER TIRE	\$40.74
WEST GROUP PAYMENT CENTER	SUBSCRIPTION	\$175.65
WEST, TERRY	REF DEED	\$6.00
WESTCOAST OUTLAW HOTEL	ST VS CESNIK	\$58.85
WESTERN ACE HOME CENTER	ROOFING NAIL	\$41.83
WESTERN BUILDING CENTER	TREATED LUMBER/TEST BARN/	\$3,190.20
WESTERN BUILDING CENTER	NVSR/HEATER	\$25.89
WESTERN BUILDING CENTER	DRILL BITS & SCREWS/RACE	\$94.64
WESTERN ELECTRONICS	PARTS/UNIT 7-1526 MOBILE	\$4,390.00
WESTERN NEWS	1 YR SUBSCRIPTION/KALISPE	\$47.00
WESTERN POWER & EQUIPMENT	FILTER GAUGE/FRT	\$29.21
WESTERN STAR TRUCKS	TANDEM DUMP TRUCK	\$139,250.00
WESTERN STATES EQUIPMENT COMPANY	TRANS FILTERS/SEAL O RING	\$6,709.48
WESTERN STATES HOSTAGE NEGOTIATORS	FREEBURY/HOSTAGE ASSOCIAT	\$50.00
WESTERN STATES INSURANCE	INS 6/8/04-6/8/05	\$3,229.00
WESTWOOD, BRENDA JOANNE	MILEAGE/OUTREACH	\$52.51
WHEATLAND FIRE EQUIPMENT COMPANY	USAR TECHNICAL RESCUE GLO	\$327.69
WHEELER, CAROL	WHEELER, GERALD VET BENEFIT	\$250.00
WHITE, JODY BETH	IMM TRAINING HELENA	\$66.45
WHITE, MANDY	OFFICIATE 12 GAMES	\$150.00
WHITEFISH AUTO PARTS INC	2 QTS HD 30	\$3,208.43
WHITEFISH CREDIT UNION	CREDIT UNION DEDUCTION	\$24,707.36
WHITEFISH GOLDEN AGERS	SITE MANAGEMENT MAY 04	\$671.00
WHITEFISH WESTERN BUILDING CENTER	BRACKETS/SHELF	\$451.20
WILDER, DR WALLACE S	2 HRS APR 04	\$100.00
WILLSON, LINDA	APRIL MILEAGE	\$63.00
WILSON, ELAINE A	FIRE SERV 1ST RESPONDR TE	\$100.00
WILSON'S GUN SHOP, INC	LITHIUM BATTERIES	\$37.65
WINGATE INN	2 NIGHTS/T GULLEDGE 4/28&	\$117.70
WINGERT, PETE	PRECURSOR MEETING/BILLING	\$46.00
WINTERNALS SOFTWARE LP	SERVER SOFTWARE SUPPORT	\$226.20
WISHERS AUTO RECYCLING	TOW 04 CAVALIER TO SHOP	\$105.00
WITHEY, BEVERLY J	CRICK, EARL VET BENEFIT	\$250.00
WOLL, PETE	28 MILES/MO BOARD MTG	\$10.50
WOODY'S COUNTRY STORE	USAR TRAINING/CRESTON FIR	\$140.56
WORKPLACE INC	PAPER ORDER WORKER	\$59.35
WORLD BOOK INC	LIBRARY MATERIALS	\$773.00
WRIGHT IMPRESSIONS PRINTING	BUSINESS CARDS	\$136.00
WW GRAINGER INC	800 810578930 12 VDC UTIL	\$63.30
XEROX CORPORATION	XEROX MACHINE/MAY	\$72.59
XEROX CORPORATION	2 DRY INK TONER CARTRIDGE	\$334.00

YATCHAK, JANET A	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$39.60
YELLOWSTONE CO YOUTH SERVICES	SERV PROVIDED 5 DAYS	\$975.00
ZEE MEDICAL SERVICE	MEDICAL SUPPLIES	\$162.28
ZEP MANUFACTURING COMPANY	ZEP 45	\$272.12
ZERR, DON	1ST QTR 04 MILEAGE	\$37.08
ZIEGLER BUILDING CENTER	2X4'S PVC PIPE & PLYWOOD	\$1,843.51
ZOLL MEDICAL CORPORATION	1 TRAINER/ZOLL AED PLUS &	\$1,972.34
ZZZZZVALCON DISTRIBUTING LTD INC	1 BBL 1300 SUP 15W40/1 BB	\$2,089.49
1ST AVENUE CAMERA	4 CASES DIGITAL CAMERAS	\$96.00
TOTAL VENDOR ACTIVITY FOR THE MONTH		\$1,966,363.72

-----END OF REPORT-----

Minutes for the month of May, 2004, approved this 1st day of June, 2004

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Howard W. Gipe, Chairman

Paula Robinson, Clerk and Recorder

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 2004

The Board of County Commissioners met in continued session at 8:00 o'clock A.M. Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Robinson were present.

MONTHLY MEETING W/DONNA MADDUX, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS:

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, Superintendent of Schools Donna Maddux, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

General discussion was held relative to preparation for election.

MONTHLY MEETING W/NORM CALVERT, COMPUTER SERVICES

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:15 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, Computer Services Director Norm Calvert, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

General discussion was held relative to installation of sheriff's reporting software; continuation of conversion to JADE.

CONSIDERATION OF LAKESHORE PERMIT: FOLEY

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, Planner Tim Beck and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Beck reviewed Lake and Lakeshore Construction Permit filed by Bill Foley on Whitefish Lake to add two dock sections measuring 80 inches by 10 feet each. Move an existing canopy to cover two jet-ski ports and add one buoy. Dock will be relocated to a different site on the property. Staff recommends approval. General discussion was held.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve Lakeshore Permit #WLP-04-15 with 25 conditions and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Gipe and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

CONSIDERATION OF LAKESHORE PERMIT: CHICKERING

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe Commissioner Hall, Planner Tim Beck and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Beck reviewed Lake and Lakeshore Construction Permit filed by Nick Chickering on Whitefish Lake to install a new U-shaped EZ-Dock and a shore station with a canopy. Dock will measure 60 feet in length with a 19 ½ foot breakwater wing. Staff recommends approval. General discussion was held.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve Lakeshore Permit #WLP-04-16 with 17 conditions and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Gipe and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

CONSIDERATION OF LAKESHORE PERMIT: CREECH

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe Commissioner Hall, Planner Tim Beck and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Beck reviewed Lake and Lakeshore Construction Permit filed by Randy Creech on Whitefish Lake to amend existing dock to create an F-shaped dock measuring 59 feet in length with two breakwater wings measuring 29 feet each. Install a 25-foot trampoline and a buoy. Staff recommends approval. General discussion was held.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve Lakeshore Permit #WLP-04-17 with 31 conditions and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Gipe and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

CONSIDERATION OF LAKESHORE PERMIT: EVE

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe Commissioner Hall, Planner Tim Beck, Bruce Boody, Sarah Woodruff, Jim Stack, Chairman of Whitefish Lakeshore Protection Committee and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Beck reviewed Lake and Lakeshore Construction Permit/Minor Variance filed by Joseph Eve on Whitefish Lake to Remodel & expand existing dwelling unit in Lakeshore Protection Zone. When complete, 389 sq. ft. of dwelling unit, 375 sq. ft. of attached deck, & 46.5 sq. ft. of wooden steps will be located within the Lakeshore Protection Zone. Install set of dry stone steps & walkway that will extend from house to shoreline. Install an F-shaped EZ-Dock system. Remove existing shore station & install boat rail system. Installation of boat rail system will also included placement of fill to create new shoreline grade for system to sit on. Install native trees & vegetation across disturbed areas within Lakeshore Protection Zone. Replace existing waterline. Staff recommends approval. General discussion was held.

Stone Steps/Walkay: The total of all constructed areas within the lake and Lakeshore Protection Zone shall not exceed eight (8) square feet per each lineal foot of shoreline. The subject property has exceeded its maximum allowable impervious surface area of 800 square feet.

Boat Rail System/Fill: The proposal does not comply with the following construction standards:

- Policy criteria for Issuance of a Permit. All Lakeshore Construction Permits shall be evaluated against the policy criteria for issuance of a permit. A permit shall only be issued when it is found that the proposed action will not, during either its construction or its utilization; Alter the characteristics of the shoreline.
- Fill projects for the purpose of expanding existing land areas shall not be permitted.
- The volume of fill shall not exceed one (1) cubic yard per eight (8) lineal foot of lake frontage.
- The rails of the rail launching system shall not exceed four (4) inches in height and the rail system shall lie on and follow the grade of the existing lakebed and lakeshore.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve Lakeshore Permit #WLP-04-02 as written with denial of Stone Steps/Walkway and Boat Rail System/Fill conditions and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Gipe and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

CONSIDERATION OF LAKESHORE PERMIT: FISH, WILDLIFE, & PARKS

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe Commissioner Hall, Planner Tim Beck and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Beck reviewed Lake and Lakeshore Construction Permit/Minor Variance filed by Terry Campbell, Montana, Fish, Wildlife, and Parks on Whitefish Lake to remove gravel piled up at the end of the boat ramp caused by boat power loading. Extend boat ramp 28 feet into the lake with concrete planks to allow for improved low water launch conditions. Install 12-inch rock protection (rip-rap) along edges of ramp. Staff recommends approval. General discussion was held.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve Lakeshore Permit #WLV-04-03 with 21 conditions and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Watne, Gipe and Hall. Motion carried unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF LAKESHORE PERMIT: SCOGGINS

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe Commissioner Hall, Planner Tim Beck and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Beck reviewed Lake and Lakeshore Construction Permit/Minor Variance filed by Kirk Scoggins on Whitefish Lake to resurface decking of existing, nonconforming dock with either wood or a new material such as Trex. Install one shore station to accommodate two personal watercraft. Complete routine maintenance on existing, nonconforming boathouse. Clean up debris in Lakeshore Protection Zone; debris will be hauled out by barge or removed through land access. Replace a lost, grandfathered mooring buoy. Staff recommends approval. General discussion was held.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve Lakeshore Permit #WLP-04-04 as written with 13 conditions including DENIAL of Boathouse rail and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Gipe and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

CONSIDERATION OF LAKESHORE PERMIT: DUNCAN

Present at the June 1, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe Commissioner Hall, Planner Tim Beck and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Beck reviewed Lake and Lakeshore Construction Permit filed by Brad Duncan to install a Sunstream boat lift with a 30-foot canopy in the middle boat slip of existing dock. Two existing personal watercraft stations will be removed from the slip. Staff recommends approval. General discussion was held.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve Lakeshore Permit #WLP04-09 with 11 conditions and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Gipe and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

MONTHLY MEETING w/RAEANN CAMPBELL, HUMAN RESOURCES

Present at the June 1, 2004 10:00 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, Human Resource Director Raeann Campbell, Deputy County Attorney Jonathan Smith, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

General discussion was held relative to change in FMLA calculation and accident reports

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to grant 12 weeks FMLA for this fiscal year and adopt rolling year calculation when employee begins taking FMLA leave. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Hall and Gipe. Motion carried by quorum.

COS REVIEW: PERO

Present at the June 1, 2004 10:15 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, and Planning and Zoning Director Forrest Sanderson, Dawn Marquardt of Marquardt & Marquardt Surveying, Rob Pero, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Sanderson reviewed the Immediate Family Transfer request by Bernice Pero which divides property giving one parcel to daughter. Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve The Immediate Family Transfer request. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye -** Hall and Gipe. Motion carried by quorum.

DOCUMENT FOR SIGNATURE: UNION CONTRACT/SHERIFF'S DEPUTIES

Present at the June 1, 2004 10:15 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall. and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve the documents for signature for the Union Contract for Sheriff' Deputies. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Hall and Gipe. Motion carried by quorum.

CONSIDERATION OF MILL LEVY: PORT AUTHORITY

Present at the June 1, 2004 10:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, Elizabeth Harris, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to authorize funding for Port Authority as approved with Resolution 1389. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Hall and Gipe. Motion carried by quorum.

DOCUMENT FOR SIGNATURE: QUIT CLAIM DEED/TRANSFER PORTION DENVER ST. & COLORADO AVE. TO CITY OF WHITEFISH

Present at the June 01, 2004 10:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve the Quitclaim Deed transferring a portion of Denver St. & Colorado Ave to City of Whitefish and authorize Chairman to sign. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Hall and Gipe. Motion carried by quorum.

CONSIDERATION OF PRINTING BIDS: WEED/PARKS/MAINTENANCE DEPT.

Present at the June 01, 2004 10:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve the bid submitted on behalf of Weed, Parks & Maintenance by Wright Impressions for Department for 5000 Weed Control Practices Brochures in the amount of \$366.08. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Gipe and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

11:00 A.M. Chairman Gipe and Commissioner Hall attended FBIA Annual Luncheon at Westcoast Center Hotel
1:30 P.M. 911 meeting at the Justice Center

At 5:00 o'clock P.M., the Board continued the session until 8:00 o'clock A.M. on June 2, 2004.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 2004

The Board of County Commissioners met in continued session at 8:00 o'clock A.M. Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Robinson were present.

CONSIDERATION OF HR TRANSMITTAL FORM: LEADWORKER/COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND CONSIDERATION OF POSITION OPENING: OFFICE ASSISTANT/TREASURER'S OFFICE

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, County Treasurer Patty Arnold, Sassi Forden, Human Resources Director Raeann Campbell, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Sassi presented a request from the County Attorney's office for designation of Leadworker and increasing the pay step for said Leadworker.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve the step increase and designation of Leadworker for County Attorney's office. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

Patty Arnold presented memo announcing the retirement of Geri Zanon and wishes to promote Sue Wagner to her position and hire new office assistant.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve request as stated. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

Discussion was held regarding Patty Arnold's upcoming retirement.

AUTHORIZATION TO PUBLISH CALL FOR BIDS: PATROL CARS/SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to authorize the publication of the Call for Bids and authorize the Chairman to sign. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Gipe. Motion carried by quorum.

DOCUMENT FOR SIGNATURE: DPHHS CONTRACT #04-07-3-01-005-0

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve document for signature and authorize Chairman to sign. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

DOCUMENT FOR SIGNATURE: DPHHS CONTRACT #04-07-5-21-001-0

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve document for signature and authorize Chairman to sign. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

DOCUMENT FOR SIGNATURE: DPHHS CONTRACT #04-07-4-11-044-0

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve document for signature and authorize Chairman to sign. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

DOCUMENT FOR SIGNATURE: FARMER'S MARKET CONTRACT/AOA

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Watne presented document for signature which allows Agency on Aging to give vouchers to senior citizens to aid in purchases from the Farmer's Market.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve document for signature and authorize Chairman to sign. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

FINAL PLAT: FISCHER ESTATES, AMENDED PLAT OF LOT 2

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:30 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, Planner Johna Morrison, Bernie Olsen, Sandra Carpenter, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Morrison reviewed the application submitted by Willow Glen Farm with technical assistance by Brien Surveying for final plat approval of the Amended Plat of Lot 2, Fischer Estates, a two lot minor subdivision at the intersection of Angel Point Road and Conrad Point Road in Lakeside. The subject property is 27.6 acres in size and is located in SAG-10, Conrad Point Zoning District. Preliminary Plat approval was waived on January 22, 2004, subject to seven conditions. Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to adopt Staff Report #FWP-04-19 as Findings of Fact. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye**-Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve the final plat for Amended Plat of Lot 2, Fischer Estates. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

PRELIMINARY PLAT: HANGING ROCK HARBOR NO. 1

Present at the June 2, 2004 9:45 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Morrison reviewed the application submitted by Tim Connor and Sands Surveying for preliminary plat approval of Hanging Rock Harbor #1 Subdivision, a minor cluster subdivision that will create three residential lots. The subdivision is proposed on 20.001 acres and will be served by individual water and sewage systems. The property is located on Hanging Rock Drive in the Sportsman Bridge area of Bigfork. General discussion was held. Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to adopt Staff Report #FSR-04-17 as Findings of Fact. Commissioner Watne **seconded** the motion. **Aye**- Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

Commissioner Watne made a **motion** to approve the preliminary plat of Hanging Rock Harbor #1 Subdivision with 8 conditions. Commissioner Hall **seconded** the motion. **Aye**- Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

PUBLIC HEARING: RSID #138

Present at the June 2, 2004 10:00 A.M. duly advertised public hearing were Commissioners Watne and Hall, Sandra Carpenter, Kathleen Nangle, Walter Kuhn, Ken Larson, Kevin Malloy, Brian Carper, Holly Hand, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Commissioner Watne PT opened the public hearing to anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposed RSID.

Walter Kuhn speaking in favor wishing to upgrade water delivery and paving the road, they have overwhelming support for the RSID and hoping to get Commissioner approval.

No one rising to speak, Commissioner Watne PT asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the proposed RSID.

No one rising to speak, Commissioner Watne PT closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to adopt Resolution No. 1710A, creating the Rural Special Improvement District. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye** – Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

CERTIFICATE AS TO RESOLUTION AND ADOPTING VOTE

I, the undersigned, being the duly qualified and acting recording officer of Flathead County, Montana (the "County"), hereby certify that the attached resolution is a true copy of Resolution No. 1710A, entitled: "RESOLUTION RELATING TO RURAL SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 138; CREATING THE DISTRICT FOR THE PURPOSE OF UNDERTAKING CERTAIN LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS AND FINANCING THE COSTS THEREOF AND INCIDENTAL THERETO THROUGH THE ISSUANCE OF RURAL SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BONDS SECURED BY THE COUNTY'S RURAL SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT REVOLVING FUND AND ESTABLISHING COMPLIANCE WITH REIMBURSEMENT BOND REGULATIONS UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE" (the "Resolution"), on file in the original records of the County in my legal custody; that the Resolution was duly adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of the County at a meeting on June 2, 2004, and that the meeting was duly held by the Board of County Commissioners and was attended throughout by a quorum, pursuant to call and notice of such meeting given as required by law; and that the Resolution has not as of the date hereof been amended or repealed.

I further certify that, upon vote being taken on the Resolution at said meeting, the following Commissioners voted in favor thereof: Commissioner Gary Hall and Commissioner Watne; voted against the same: no one; abstained from voting thereon: no one; or were absent: Chairman Gipe.

WITNESS my hand officially this 2nd day of June, 2004.

Paula Robinson
Clerk & Recorder
Flathead County, Montana

By /s/ Monica R. Eisenzimer
Deputy

RESOLUTION NO. 1710A

RESOLUTION RELATING TO RURAL SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 138; CREATING THE DISTRICT FOR THE PURPOSE OF UNDERTAKING CERTAIN LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS AND FINANCING THE COSTS THEREOF AND INCIDENTAL THERETO THROUGH THE ISSUANCE OF RURAL SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BONDS SECURED BY THE COUNTY'S RURAL SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT REVOLVING FUND AND ESTABLISHING COMPLIANCE WITH REIMBURSEMENT BOND REGULATIONS UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Flathead County, Montana (the "County"), as follows:

Section 1. Passage of Resolution of Intention. This Board, on April 28, 2004, adopted Resolution No. 1710 (the "Resolution of Intention"), pursuant to which this Board declared its intention to create a rural special improvement district, designated as Rural Special Improvement District No. 138 of the County, under Montana Code Annotated, Title 7, Chapter 12, Part 21, as amended, for the purpose of financing costs of certain local improvements described generally therein (the "Improvements") and paying costs incidental thereto, including costs associated with the sale and the security of rural special improvement district bonds drawn on the District (the "Bonds"), the creation and administration of the District and the funding of a deposit to the County's Rural Special Improvement District Revolving Fund (the "Revolving Fund").

Section 2. Notice and Public Hearing. Notice of passage of the Resolution of Intention was duly published, posted and mailed in all respects in accordance with law, and on June 2, 2004, this Board conducted a public hearing on the creation or extension of the District and the making of the Improvements. The meeting of this Board at which this resolution was adopted is the first regular meeting of the Board following the expiration of the period ended 30 days after the first date of publication of the notice of passage of the Resolution of Intention (the "Protest Period").

Section 3. Protests. Within the Protest Period, 0 protests were filed with the County Clerk and not withdrawn by the owners of property in the District subject to assessment for 0% of the total costs of the Improvements.

Section 4. Creation of the District; Insufficiency of Protests. The District is hereby created on the terms and conditions set forth in, and otherwise in accordance with, the Resolution of Intention. The protests against the creation or extension of the District or the making of the Improvements filed during the Protest Period, if any, are hereby found to be insufficient. The findings and determinations made in the Resolution of Intention are hereby ratified and confirmed.

Section 5. Reimbursement Expenditures.

5.01. Regulations. The United States Department of Treasury has promulgated final regulations governing the use of proceeds of tax-exempt bonds, all or a portion of which are to be used to reimburse the County for project expenditures paid by the County prior to the date of issuance of such bonds. Those regulations (Treasury Regulations, Section 1.150-2) (the "Regulations") require that the County adopt a statement of official intent to reimburse an original expenditure not later than 60 days after payment of the original expenditure. The Regulations also generally require that the bonds be issued and the reimbursement allocation made from the proceeds of the bonds within 18 months (or three years, if the reimbursement bond issue qualifies for the "small issuer" exception from the arbitrage rebate requirement) after the later of (i) the date the expenditure is paid or (ii) the date the project is placed in service or abandoned, but (unless the issue qualifies for the "small issuer" exception from the arbitrage rebate requirement) in no event more than three years after the date the expenditure is paid. The Regulations generally permit reimbursement of capital expenditures and costs of issuance of the bonds.

5.02. Prior Expenditures. Other than (i) expenditures to be paid or reimbursed from sources other than the Bonds, (ii) expenditures permitted to be reimbursed under the transitional provision contained in Section 1.150-2(j)(2) of the Regulations, (iii) expenditures constituting preliminary expenditures within the meaning of Section 1.150-2(f)(2) of the Regulations, or (iv) expenditures in a "de minimus" amount (as defined in Section 1.150-2(f)(1) of the Regulations), no expenditures for the Improvements have been paid by the County before the date 60 days before the date of adoption of this resolution.

5.03. Declaration of Intent. The County reasonably expects to reimburse the expenditures made for costs of the Improvements out of the proceeds of Bonds in an estimated maximum aggregate principal amount of \$523,000 after the date of payment of all or a portion of the costs of the Improvements. All reimbursed expenditures shall be capital expenditures, a cost of issuance of the Bonds or other expenditures eligible for reimbursement under Section 1.150-2(d)(3) of the Regulations.

5.04. Budgetary Matters. As of the date hereof, there are no County funds reserved, allocated on a long-term basis or otherwise set aside (or reasonably expected to be reserved, allocated on a long-term basis or otherwise set aside) to provide permanent financing for the expenditures related to the Improvements, other than pursuant to the issuance of the Bonds. The statement of intent contained in this resolution, therefore, is

		Total	\$6,794.00	\$6,794.00

Explanation:

Prepared by: Gary L Como
 Approved by:
 Commissioners by
 Resolution

PRELIMINARY PLAT: LYNNEWOOD

Present at the June 2, 2004 10:15 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, Planning and Zoning Director Forrest Sanderson, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Sanderson reviewed the application submitted by Bill Reddig and Montana Mapping for preliminary plat approval of Lynnewood Subdivision, a minor subdivision that will create five residential lots. The subdivision is located west of Montana Highway 206, north of Badrock Drive. General discussion was held. Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to adopt variance allowing for road length longer than 1000 feet as Findings of Fact. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to adopt Staff Report #FSR-04-20 as Findings of Fact. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to approve the preliminary plat of Lynnewood Subdivision with 18 conditions. Commissioner Watne PT **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Watne and Hall. Motion carried by quorum.

MEETING W/FORREST SANDERSON & CHARLIE JOHNSON RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS & GRAVEL ROAD PAVING

Present at the June 2, 2004 10:30 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, Planning and Zoning Director Forrest Sanderson, Road Superintendent Charlie Johnson, Deputy County Attorney Jonathan Smith, Weed, Parks & Maintenance Superintendent Jed Fisher, Rick Breckenridge, Jerry Nix, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Forrest Sanderson – Since I found out about this yesterday at 6:15 when I came to work and have no idea what it’s about, I’ll let Charlie go.

Charlie Johnson – Well, Mr. Hall has me put together a meeting so that we could discuss where we’re at I guess and where we can go as far as getting some paving done with subdivisions.

Commissioner Hall – Did you get a report on the Planning Board Meeting? They met and discussed this issue. You presented a proposal.

Forrest Sanderson – That’s right, the Planning Board is supposed to meet tonight on road standards for subdivisions, as part of the growth policy workshops. Tonight they’re supposed to complete that portion of the evaluation and then kick it back for formal public hearing and recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner Hall – Are you attending that meeting tonight?

Forrest Sanderson – Yes, I will be here tonight at 6.

Commissioner Hall – I’ve asked this gentleman, if you don’t know him, Jerry Nix.

Jerry Nix – Before we get off the road issue Gary, I told you that I had this study that was compiled by Laramer County, Colorado and Fort Collins, Colorado. This is a whole compendium of information that they’ve done which parallels what you guys are all trying to do is to get reasonable impact fees and standards for the roadways and this actually shows what communities they examined before they came up with their policies and fees. I think it would be really timely for that. Paul was supposed to have given that to you and did never get to you. Mr. Nix presented Commissioners with the study.

Commissioner Hall – He says he did, I can’t find it

Jerry Nix - Well now you have it.

Commissioner Hall – Charlie, have you ever visited with him.

Charlie Johnson – Oh, I’m saying we have a time or two.

Commissioner Hall – Forrest, have you ever visited with him about this issue?

Forrest Sanderson – Not on roads.

Jerry Nix – This calls for all the impact fees, how they’re paid and how they construct their roads. What the standards are and how they came up with their standards by examining other communities and their study is in here for you. So it’s all timely and relevant stuff. It probably goes a little farther than Charlie’s proposal with 300 foot per subdivision but it’s something that we all need.

Commissioner Hall – Well, I’ve always wanted to, I just heard recently that Mr. Nix had this information and when I was at the Planning Board meeting the other night, I mean it was, you know there’s some very opposite potentially polarizing views from the Planning Board and on the Planning Board,

on both sides of this issue and I've requested and was excited to find out there is some information. I've always felt that there's other counties and communities that have done this similar thing; dealt with the same issues we're dealing with and growth and that there's some information out here that would help educate us on what they did, so we can learn from it because.

Charlie Johnson – Well, I think, you know I guess one of my questions is what other counties in Montana are doing this. I know Bozeman has impact fees, I know Jon has talked I think to some of the other people over there and I guess my question is: What can we do under the law?

Commissioner Hall – That seems to be the big question. That's one of the reasons I asked you Jon to come over and I know I didn't give you much prep on what we're talking about but.

Jonathan Smith - Bozeman and Gallatin Counties are both doing some impact fee things in their subdivisions; thus far the City of Bozeman has gone a lot farther than Gallatin County. The City of Bozeman has been sued on several occasions because their impact fees are substantially more than Gallatin County, so Gallatin County's gotten away pretty easily as far as litigation is concerned, what their impact is. What they did was hire a consultant, an outside, third party consultant who does this type of work to study impacts of subdivisions on roads. And they came up with a dollar amount per lot, per living unit or whatever. So they got this apparently costly and good study on the real impact a subdivision has on roads and with that they then inserted impact fees into their subdivision regulations and have been fairly successful in collecting them. The County Attorney told me partly because the city is trying to get so much more than they are that everybody looks at theirs and says well, this is pretty reasonable compared to what the city wants and they do have some factual backing for the amounts. It cost them \$35,000 or \$50,000 or something like that to have this consultant come in and do a study.

Jerry Nix – Is this public information? You think, probably.

Jonathan Smith - I would think.

Jerry Nix – And also the American Planning Network which is all the planners from the Western United States they're having their meeting in Missoula the 4th and 5th of August and a lot of this information that you're seeing here is basically everybody putting their heads together from similarly situated counties and cities to address some of our problems so their recreating the wheel. So, that data is real close and real handily available.

Commissioner Hall – Well, I think what we've discovered is that with the planning board certain members and I understand it and the survey development community those that represent the development community have some concerns and some issues, totally understandable but it's like do we sit around and wait you know forever to deal with this issue or do we try to come up with something that is acceptable and workable in this county. I don't think there's any question that with our road situation and the lack of adequate funding to catch up, I don't know what, or how many years behind we are but we're behind. Not that we want every new developer to cover the costs for what we're behind on but at least we need to start dealing with impacts on the roads in this county and how to help Flathead County deal with that extra burden on the roads. I'd like to see us get a copy of that report if we can and include it with some of the things that have been done in different states and different counties around the country. Are we getting too late for this planning board subdivision review process to get this implemented?

Forrest Sanderson – I would submit to you that if you want to pursue impact fees that you right now are going through the budgeting process and in the Commissioner's budget, you should set aside a block of money, you said \$50,000 Jon?

Jonathan Smith – That's \$35 – 50,000, it was fairly expensive.

Charlie Johnson – Actually, that's fairly cheap as far as I'm concerned.

Commissioner Hall – But, if the study's been done.

Forrest Sanderson – That study was done for Gallatin County, it's not for Flathead County. You'd have to do your own to comply.

Jonathan Smith – You'd have to do one yourself.

Commissioner Hall – I see, so it would apply to us.

Forrest Sanderson - It would give you the framework but you would still have to do the study but the way to properly go with out it would be to set aside the money under contracted services, put out a request for qualifications and then let it to bid to have somebody prepare the study for impact fee assignment, Flathead County, Montana. That's the proper way to go through it, to do it through the budgeting process. I don't know if Charlie did it in his budget or Jed, but we'd talked about a capital improvements plan we submitted a grant for that and I set aside \$5000 in my proposed budget to cover any cash and equities that we might have on capital improvements plan. It's the proper mechanism to make that happen, if Jed or Charlie were able to follow through.

Charlie Johnson – I'm not able to follow through, I mean just you know, given the guidelines the Commissioner's gave us to keep our budget under, just with my fuel I'm having a hard time you know, meeting that deal. So, I mean that's something we'll just have to address somewhere else down the line.

Commissioner Hall – But we do need to be talking about capital improvement plans, I appreciate you doing that.

Forrest Sanderson – That's one leg, I don't know if Sheriff Dupont or Jed with his three budgets was able to follow through on their pieces of puzzle but impact fees are something entirely different. A different body of law, it's going to take money to make it happen, you have to spend money to take a legitimate run at it, and otherwise you get beat up.

Commissioner Hall – I'm not opposed to getting beat up. I mean this is something we can not hide our heads in the sand.

Forrest Sanderson – Get beat up for it and lose, for not following the program specified in the law.

Charlie Johnson – There's a portion of the State law that says payment for extension of capital facilities, have you ever read that Jon?

Jonathan Smith - Where is it, what's the number on it?

Charlie Johnson – I kind of wanted to know what you thought about that. I guess the thing that concerns me about the planning board is everything that I got from the planning board in the couple meetings that I attended was it isn't going to happen. I have not seen or heard a counter proposal, I haven't even heard how they tend to help resolve this problem other than the fact is, well, the county gets gas tax, well the gas tax that we get and this

you know is and this exact figure is \$441,994.92 a year from the state for gas tax. Now, that doesn't really go very far, I mean the planning board has whipped out some numbers here on us that says \$8000 to pave 3000 feet and I'm assuming you know it's accurate because it was in the Interlake so it has to be accurate and you know using that figure it comes out to \$140,000 a mile to pave a road. Now, our reconstruction is running you somewhere in that neighborhood \$80-120,000, so maybe we're not that far off on that number.

Commissioner Hall – Is that before fuel prices went through the ceiling?

Charlie Johnson – You know and on a \$200,000 home, Flathead County gets \$64 you know for the Road Department for taxes and I guess what concerns me about the planning board's topic of discussion there all the time is well, let the gas tax pay for it, well obviously the gas tax isn't paying for it so we got to find some other source of revenue to solve this problem. I mean, we're just being swamped with calls.

Jonathan Smith – This is the statute we're referring to, it says the costs must reasonably reflect

Charlie Johnson – Right, that's kind of what I thought it was

Commissioner Hall – say that again, what you just said.

Forrest Sanderson - you have to have the study to establish the reasonable costs associated with a new lot

Jonathan Smith - The costs must reasonable reflect this impact fee, expected impacts directly attributable to a subdivision so this is what Gallatin County did, they hired a study done so that they can get a reasonable cost that's attributable to the subdivision.

Charlie Johnson – Well that's kind of what was my interpretation of it and I think we've been dancing around this issue of this study for the last

Commissioner Hall – Not only are we dancing around it, we've got some very strong opinionated people in this community and on the Planning Board that are against even looking at this. When I read that I thought, we need to be getting our heads out of the sand and at least dialoging about it. We've tried that, I sat here at the meeting and this fine gentleman in the back row there, he was there and it was good dialogue, at least we're talking about. To not discuss it and not talk about it is remiss on our part. We just can't continue on this way so.

Charlie Johnson – Well, I know I can't. We're just inundated with calls and I have no answers for people.

Commissioner Hall – I know, nor do I or Bob.

Charlie Johnson – Jonathan, can I ask you kind of a pointed question here, you probably can't determine it out of that. Okay, these subdivisions on say a paved road, this impact fee, the way I understand impact fees it's on a paved road and this question has come up quite often. Is that they pay this impact fee, can that money be used other places in the county. I'm saying yes it can if you go through all the legal procedures do we have to set up road districts in order to utilize that money or can you just take it and...

Jonathan Smith - I would think so, I think if you establish impact fees based upon a study that that would then just go into the Road Department's general fund used to maintain roads.

Forrest Sanderson – I would concur with that.

Jonathan Smith – I haven't looked at that issue but that's.

Commissioner Hall – I think what he's saying is currently, and maybe I misunderstood your question, but currently we do receive fees.

Charlie Johnson – No, I was talking about the money that would be raised on a paved road because there's been some question raised.

Forrest Sanderson – The money that would be raised on a paved road.

Jonathan Smith – I think the way they work is you get a general payment to the County road fund.

Commissioner Hall – So that's a general then, it can be used

Charlie Johnson – and that includes weeds, it includes parks, it includes sheriff and all down the line. I assuming when they do this study they talk you know all those departments, including library and fire services and that kind of stuff.

Jonathan Smith – it's really just capital facilities related to public health and safety including roads, sewer, water I don't know

Jed Fisher – There is a huge impact on weeds.

Commissioner Hall – so that answers your question about road districts?

Charlie Johnson – yeah, well kind of sort of, I didn't expect Jon to have an answer on it

Commissioner Hall – Because if you had road districts

Charlie Johnson – See, my concern would be that we should set up districts because you're going to take impact fees say from like Marion, if you don't and they're going to say, hey, why is my money being spent over here? And I think that probably districts would be a lot easier for the people to probably swallow.

Commissioner Hall – Did you hear that Jon?

Jonathan Smith – No

Commissioner Hall – Then you have to tell us what you were talking about.

Charlie Johnson - you know my personal opinion is to set up districts, you know if you were to go with an impact fee so that that money is collected in that district, it's spent in that district.

Jonathan Smith – yeah, we could create road districts.

Commissioner Hall – and you wouldn't necessarily have to go by fire districts, you could split the valley into four road districts.

Charlie Johnson – So what was you guys talking about?

Forrest Sanderson – We were talking about the departments that maybe could be funded through impact fees.

Commissioner Hall – well, it's obvious we want to do it legally and we want to do it properly and some may disagree with me on this but as a mayor when I discussed, a business would come to town and want to locate in the town of Columbia Falls, we'd sit down with them just as a leadership team and say this is what we'd like to see. We're not requiring it, this is what we'd like to see. They'd say, we'd love to love to do that, if that's what you want to see and we want to have the best property that we can have in the community and they're willing to work with you. I'm not saying that we have to; I just don't think it's going to be that hard of a pill to swallow for the developers that want to do a nice quality product.

Charlie Johnson – There are developers out there that won't do a subdivision without it. Spoklie's doing one out off of Kienas right now, back in there by Triplets. He's paving it. He's paving his own subdivision and he's going to pave down and tie into the portion of Kienas that's not paved. He says, his lots are selling before he can even get them done. I think that the responsible developers are starting to see that the return on their money is starting to pay off for them. If they put X amount of dollars into paving and they're getting more back than what they're putting in. But at the same time we got to get on top of this because I don't see where gas tax, like the planning board says that you get gas tax. Well, \$441,000 isn't going very far. I mean it's getting our 3 miles of paving a year and we're going to have to figure out some other way to do this and I'm really disappointed the planning board hasn't come back with any proposal. Everything that I've put into the planning board has been, nope, nope, nope. I mean I haven't heard anything back.

Commissioner Hall – Well, I sat here at that Planning Board meeting that whole night and listened to one person continually harangue the rest of the board concerning this issue saying it's impossible, we're not going to do it, you can't do it legally, there's no way you can possibly do this and every time someone would come up and say well, we need to study it, we need to figure out if there is a way that we can help Charlie and this one individual would say, no there's no way you can do that, there's no way we're going to ever charge impact fees in this valley. So, knowing that at least we're talking some more about it.

Charlie Johnson – Well, my concern is that if we don't do something now, everybody's complaining about the 300 feet that I'm talking about, well you know we've had this 50 foot in there for ever since I've been here but I never could reach the trip mechanism for it. If we would've started out at 50' and gradually backed our self into this, it might not be so painful. If we put this off for another year or two, when you take this leap off the cliff, it's going to be pretty dramatic. I mean, because this is out of control.

Commissioner Hall – Well, I also talked that night and suggested there's got to be a formula that can work for us. It's going to be unique to other counties in different areas but there has to be a formula that can work. The 300 per, I'm just speaking hypothetically, you recommend 300 per lot, well that's fine on a 10 lot subdivision, you have a trip mechanism if it's 20 homes on a subdivision it's down to 200, if it's 30 or more homes it's down to 100, I mean you know there's got to be a formula that we could come up with that would be and plus we need to change, Forrest we discussed this and you're going to have to help me interpret, but that this trip mechanism where if you access that subdivision out another way to reduce the traffic flow on the main entrance to the subdivision then that releases you from that requirement.

Forrest Sanderson - That is true, the way the regulations are written, until you hit the 200 vehicle trips per day trigger, you don't have to do any paving offsite. The way to deal with that is to eliminate the vehicle trip triggers and say this is the standard period.

Charlie Johnson – well, yeah and for nine years I've questioned this 250 trip deal in hopes that it would disappear and we would get at least the 50' of paving. That's always been kind of a hurdle that I've never been able to get over and that's what I'm saying, if we would have started off at the 50' of paving in the beginning, and slowly backed into this, but right now we're getting absolutely nothing because what happens to me is with this 250 trip and it happened to me up on Von Der Heide, oh well, they're going go out through Hoffman Draw, well, I never could reach that, it's an unattainable goal. You get down into Lower Valley where you got Farm Road and Manning, hey there's four exits there, I've got to get 2000 cars before I get 1 ounce of 50' of paving. I mean it's an unattainable goal.

Commissioner Hall – Ok, so what can we do to fix

Charlie Johnson – we need money for an impact fee study.

Forrest Sanderson – yes, we need money for an impact fee study

Commissioner Hall – ok, we've already established that and what about changing that particular language.

Forrest Sanderson - we will clear the planning board with some recommendation as to subdivision road construction standards. That proposal will leave the Planning Board. At that point in time, the Board of County Commissioners will have to bite the bullet as is your elected responsibility and impose whatever standards you believe you can defend. You can't just look at it – it's not just roads, it's all of the other capital facilities, hence the study. If you really want to look at this, you need to take a holistic approach again and deal with it responsibly, not piecemeal.

Charlie Johnson – and I agree with that. I mean we got other issues that are going to be as critical as the road situation in this county if we don't deal with them.

Commissioner Hall – Jerry, you've been sitting back and I know you've educated yourself on this, do you have any comment?

Jerry Nix - well, as a real estate developer, I've kind of worked throughout the western United States and our projects were in multiple counties, multiple cities, and they all had impact fees to some degree or another. Roughly the impact fees would be somewhere between \$5000 & \$8000 per unit and that's a drop in the bucket in regards to our housing prices here. I think that the one area that you have problems with is affordable housing. Everybody says that it drives up the overall housing and that makes it less affordable for the locals so you have to counter by creating an affordable housing program that helps out that element because it does drive up the general cost of housing. But if you take a look at most of the growth that is occurring, the growth is occurring people from Spokane, Seattle, Portland, LA out of the area and their housing prices that they're used to seeing is off the charts as opposed to what it is here in the Valley. So if you have an extra \$5000-8000 cost, they're not even going to wince at that type of fee. Once the developers get passed the initial adversity of paying for the impact fee and they realize that its simply a cost that's going to be passed along to the end purchaser, they actually find that they make more money because they usually take a cost plus type of approach and if they're investing \$100,000 and making 20%, they make \$20,000 you put in an extra impact fees, they're actually making that same 20% on the impact fees and they'd

make more money in the end anyway. I concur with what Charlie is seeing that most developers that put that extra money into a subdivision and have all the infrastructure in place over the long haul and their roads that lead to their subdivisions have improved as well, that there's a lot less problems for the community and for the residents and the long term.

Charlie Johnson - I think what we need to clarify is the difference between affordable housing and subsidized housing. Because I think those two issues get confused all the time.

Jerry Nix - and those are debated. I mean and that's something you'll have to wrestle with as you come to your study but in most communities that's what I have seen. I don't think that the actual impact fees are not used. I think they're used extensively and with good results. It's just that they also have an inherent problem of how to deal with the affordability issue and that's just something you'll have to figure out.

Charlie Johnson - what you said you know about the developer making money on this is exactly what Spoklie told me. He says, "I can stick my money in the bank and get 3.2% on it or I can pave the road in my subdivisions and get 7 or 8% out of it. You know just in return on the lots that I'm selling." This is something that the developers are going to have to decide amongst themselves how they want to make their money, but at the same time, the developers need to look at this and say hey, sooner or later we're going to end up in this situation, somehow, some way because the public outcry I think is going to get.

Commissioner Hall – Oh, it's not friendly at all and it's becoming actually abusive.

Jerry Nix – Well, and the commercial usually has a far different formula for development and a classic example that you're going to be facing is the mall. Where the mall is going to have to have infrastructure improvement on Reserve, Whitefish Stage, Rose Crossing and Highway 93, as well as internally and the huge amount of traffic that it will draw is going to demand the infrastructure to get there and there's going to have to be some commercial formula that also works so that when those come to the community whether they're independents or a mall and a conglomeration, if they have a formula that works for you in order to pay for all of the impacts that those types of developments bring.

Commissioner Hall - Well and you sit here from this side of the desk and you see and I know I can't control what goes on in the city but having nothing in place, we've missed a window of opportunity with all the development there at the Home Depot site and across the highway to get help with any improvements we wanted to do on Reserve and it ends up back in our lap and MDOT we're not addressing it. I feel like our heads have been in the sand and we've let a few dictate some of our future so I don't know. I don't have the answers but I'm glad we're talking about it.

Charlie Johnson - okay, question now, let's get down to separating the wheat from the shaft here. How are we going to fund this study? IF this is the direction we're going to go.

Commissioner Hall – Well, I don't think we need to discuss it at this meeting. We will discuss it amongst ourselves.

Commissioner Watne – We're just going to have to look for funds.

Commissioner Hall - I think the capital improvement program that we've been discussing that we can not another thing that we should have had in place years ago and we need to perhaps send another letter out to the department heads to consider, I don't want to discuss it right now.

MEETING W/DAN MCGOWEN/DES RE: GRANTS

Present at the June 2, 2004 11:00 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, OES Director Alan Marble, Kelly McHenry, Tina Frownfeller, Gary Mahugh, Scott Gunderson, Martha Smith, Dan McGowen, Deputy County Attorney Jonathan Smith, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Dan McGowen,- Let me just introduce myself, I'm Dan McGowen, I'm the Administrator for Montana Disaster and Emergency Services and also the Chair of the Homeland Security Task Force appointed by the Governor and I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to come and talk to you. I wanted to talk to you today about the grants and about the processes and some of those kinds of things. We had a meeting in March with the grant folks, with Alan, Kelly and Gary and Lynne and they had some questions on the grants and so forth and there in representation as well as the commissioners and because the Commissioners are the actual jurisdictional authority and the County is for the grants. All the grants are run through the local Emergency planning committees. They're the advisory for the grants and the tribal emergency response commissions the same on the reservations. And they do sign the applications however the jurisdictional authority is in this case the county so that's why I wanted to come and talk to you about all the grants and there's some things in all the paperwork that we were given in March and have done a lot of research on those things and just wanted to set the field of play square so that all of the issues were on the table. I have discovered some inequities there, some disconnects and so forth and so I wanted you to be aware of those. What I'd like to do though first is to give you an understanding of what the grants mean as far as Homeland Security and the whole process. The grants come from Department of Homeland Security or Office of Domestic Preparedness. You've probably heard the term ODP before and the State of Montana as all the States are are the State Administrative Agency for those federal grants in Montana for the First Responders and that's why the LEPC is a key player because that's the first response community on the Local Emergency Planning Committee. And all of those grants are run through us because that's where the focus is is for to build the infrastructure for first response and those kinds of things to be better prepared for Homeland Security issues. The State is the State Administrative Agency or the grantee for those grants from ODP. Meaning that any money that comes to the local jurisdictions or anything is done as a subgrantee. We have the responsibility to administer those grants to make sure that everything's being done according to the way the comptroller requires and all of those kinds of issues as well as not only at our level but at the county level as well. Because if there's ever an audit or anything, I mean we have to ensure that the processes are followed. We have to ensure that the grant requirements, the eligibility, that the money spent correctly, all those kinds of things. So with that said, what happens in the process is that ODP awards the money or an amount of money to the State of Montana okay and they tell the State of Montana you have so much money to use for this '03 or '04 expenditure year whichever it is and within a certain number of days, you need to submit to us your Initial Strategic Implementation Plan on how Montana sees best through the response communities and so forth; what they're going to do with that money. One requirement in that particular grant is that 80% of the funds need to be directed to local jurisdictions. Now, in the State ISIP (Initial Strategic Implementation Plan) that's where the definition is done is how is the money that has been sent to the State of Montana, how is it going to be, it's been set out, it's been obligated, there's a liability there for the State of Montana to disburse that money. How does Montana intend to allocate that money? Well, there's several choices, it could be done competitively, all of the money could go to one or five jurisdictions because it says 80% of the money must go to local jurisdictions. It doesn't mean all the jurisdictions in the State, it can go to 1 or to 5 or there could be an allocation basis done. The third is the option that Montana decided to choose through the Homeland Security task Force and their advice so that all of the jurisdictions in Montana including the counties and the tribes had a fair shot at using the money to bolster the infrastructure for their first responders and the eligible things that were for planning, for training, for exercising, for equipment purchases under those grants. So, once that ISIP is approved, in the process then, what the State does as the Administrative Agency and we have certain authorities granted to us by ODP we also have authorities under the State of Montana because we're a grant Administering Agency that we have to abide by and we even have the authority to make some of the federal processes and requirements a little more stringent according to what the State sees under the strategic plan for homeland security which is a three year plan. So, with that process then what the state does is turns around and it issues the application packages to the sub

grantees. The subgrantee is just like somebody going to a foundation to get a grant. The granting foundation says ok, here's the parameters of what you need to do in order to get those grants. And Bob, because you're closest, I just brought a copy of the packet that went out to all the counties and all tribal emergency response commissions with all the guidelines and all the rules and everything that's stated in there of what you need to do to successfully apply for this grant and that process. And the key word there is apply for the grant. You need to remember that because the money for local jurisdictional use can not be used at all until the application is in, the application's been processed, if there's equipment purchases being done that ODP approves that equipment and then once that's completed, that process then what we do is send the county or the jurisdiction of the tribe an award letter saying that everything has been approved, it's okay, go ahead and start making arrangements and then when all the invoices and everything come through the financial draw-down is a whole other situation because there's only, it's not like a typical grant where you as commissioners sign for a \$100,000 grant, and in three weeks you say, hey what happened to our grant? Where's the money? Well, we can't just send the money to the county because the federal requirements under the O&D circulars and financial requirements say that the money once it's been drawn down has to be spent within 3 days. So it becomes a reimbursable grant is what that means. It means that if you go out and purchase it and we can work the invoices right which happened with the fisher equipment situation, we pay the vendor directly so we met that federal requirement as a state administrative agency that we're required to meet. In other cases the county has spent the money, once that's been done we get the invoices, show it's been paid and we disburse the money back to the county. That's because of that financial requirement so that's another key important thing to understand in this whole thing. With that said, there are some situations with the grants that I want to go over with you and explain to you and show you where some of the disconnects are that we're seeing as a state administrative agency. Hopefully we can work through those things. And because you need to understand as well that there are certain rules of engagement to comply with the grant, when you apply just like with a foundation. The foundation says here's the rules, and like we publish the rules here those are the rules we have to go by. Because we're guarded by the federal guidelines as well and that makes a big difference in how you work with a grant. We look at it as a teamwork approach because we're working with the counties to try and do the best we can in the State of Montana to get the money disbursed for the intended purpose.

The first situation that I'll bring up involves the community emergency response team grant and this is a grant that was a FEMA grant okay, so this was like '02 money. This is not the '03 Homeland Security money. Some of the grants when they started back in 1999 to give you a little bit of history were DOJ (Department of Justice) Grants and then as they transgressed up through and '03 is when Office of Domestic Preparedness came on the scene. This particular SERC Grant however was a federal emergency management agency grant. And we sent out application packets and everything for all the counties to apply for their monies and the county in fact, Flathead County was awarded \$16,195 and of that \$2500 was allocated for a volunteer registration tracking system, then there was another available total that left \$7500 for program development and \$6195 for costs associated with SERC Training. To actually do a SERC training and we've had several successful SERC Trainings across the State and the State citizens corps council is the one that coordinates this effort and they did I think it was 6 or 7 pilots in varying population areas just to see how best is this going to work. How to pull it all together. There as a little bit of a snafu with the \$2500 on the database which I corrected once I found out what that snafu was because it was a miscommunication and I gladly, that was one that under the grant guidelines said that they couldn't pay back to the county and I said, "No, it will be paid back to the county because there was a disconnect there in the communication process." But we were given a sheet at the March meeting which was the budget worksheet, budget narrative for the project and basically the intended purpose was to say, "well, look at the budget worksheet and just tell us yes or no." Well, it's not as simple as yes or no, it's not as black and white as that, I had the staff go back and which we had to do by requirement to go back to the FEMA guidelines of what's eligible and what's not eligible and say that "is this eligible" or "is this not eligible according to the grant requirements?" And what we came up with after they did a thorough review and went through this about two or three different times, is that in the letter back to the County to explain on March 31, along with the specifics of it again, that on the program administration side, it was \$5800 that needed to be spent and that it was over on the SERC team training by about \$5700 according to the budget worksheet telling which was eligible and which was not. So we sent that back, haven't heard nothing in the interim except for just here a little while ago on another memo saying that the executive committee and I'm assuming it's the LAPC executive committee that's the only thing I can think of, said they were going to return the grant. I hate to see that happen to Flathead County and you as the jurisdictional authority are really the ones that have the authority to say who's going to return the grant or not. There's \$16000 there to develop SERC and they did a great job I've got to commend the DES people because there's a whole lot of donated stuff that this county put together to make the SERC program happen.

Alan Marble – That budget that you're looking at was put together by the LAPC and it was yes or no do we want to participate based on several issues and one of them was the administrative part, we did not want to start a program where we paid people up front, i.e. volunteers to start the program and then all of a sudden there's no more funding and now they're doing it for free. It didn't make any sense, our need was on the equipment side so all the organizations could get together and it could be an ongoing program. It's in our best interest not to participate in that \$16000 and just get the equipment on our own and anticipate where we can without having all those strings. Is that the consensus of the meeting? In other words the \$16000 would create us more problems than it actually would help, now the \$7000 side would be okay if we could spend that part on the equipment and then let go of the administrative part.

Dan McGowen - And see, that's part of the grant application stuff as far as there was money for program administration, program development, and then money for SERC Training. And so, understand that the LAPC is the monies that come down aren't granted to the LAPC, it's granted to the jurisdiction, that's why I say jurisdictional authority because the commissioners are actually, the county is the jurisdictional authority, the commissioners sign off as that authority so it would be up to the LAPC to make a recommendation as an advisory to the commissioners that if you want to return the grant money then that's your choice, I hate to see that happen so I wanted to explain that to you because that was one of the things.

The '03 grant, there's a couple of things with the '03 now it's switched office, it's the Office of Domestic Preparedness, there's a couple of things with the '03 grant. First of all for you to understand there was a huge timing initiative here because we had all of the DOJ grants, then we had the '03 and ODP was the first time they'd ever done this. Okay, so there were some rules of engagement set up which again now in '04 are different because they've changed those a little bit. We had some exercise things going on with all the counties, we had terrorism annexes that the counties were developing and that they were doing some planning things. There was threat vulnerability risk and needs scap analysis assessments that were required. ODP required the counties to do and the tribal emergency response commissions to do. With all of those things coming down, in talks with the counties, when the '03 grant came out, the counties requested as a whole as a majority of them to say, "Please don't dump the '03 grants on us until we get done with '02". Because they were just finishing off the '02 grants plus the other thing that was critical is all of the threat risk vulnerability and needs assessment, this is what the counties actually need was the basis for spending '03 money for equipment. Because that told you what kind of equipment was the best thing to buy and those needs analysis and so forth weren't going to be done until I think it was September. I think it was August, September or October time frame so , we sent the packets out and once all that threats assessment and that in November got completed, we put the packets out on the grants. That's just a key for you to understand that timing and that process. And so with those assessments then the application that came in indicated from Flathead County that there had been money spent prior to the grant award. Which in '03 there was two parts to a grant, there was part 1 and there was part 2. In part 1, it was allowable to use some money for wages because we wanted all the counties to be able to get their programs started going, if you needed to hire somebody to do planning and any of those kinds of things. ODP agreed to that. Equipment purchases however is a different story that had to follow, that was not an exception to the rule. That had to go through the application process and those kinds of things and there's been some things go back and forth about equipment not being approved and those kinds of things. Part of that reason is because the equipment could not be purchased until the State awarded the county the letter and that meant the application had to come in, that ODP had to approve the equipment, then we sent the county the award letter as far as shares, it's okay to spend the money on that equipment, it is approved. I think what some of the disconnect was is that as far as the grant administration in looking at the equipment, the county was looking at the standardized equipment list. The standardized equipment list is a federal list of equipment okay. That is not the ODP

approved equipment list. There was one piece of equipment, Alan I can't remember what the name of it was. A piece of x-ray equipment or something.

Alan – It's digital cameras

Dan McGowen – And it was for the OD stuff if I remember. There was some OD equipment too, x-ray technician stuff which is a whole different level of technical training that is EOD required but, it's not ODP, it's not the OPS (several people speaking, inaudible words). There was an inference that there was some equipment purchased and I just wanted to be square with you about the

Alan – that was some of the digital cameras, that was the thing.

Dan, okay because they came back to say that it was on the SEL, well even though its on the Standardized Equipment List, that doesn't mean that it's on the ODP Approved list.

Kelly – Right, I used the ODP Approved list to reference.

Dan – See, it's not on the ODP Approved list. That's the issue see.

Alan – If it gets denied to us it's neither here nor there.

Dan – Well, we want to work with you is what we want to do.

Alan – The problem is, is on the state trailer that you provided that equipment, you got video equipment.

Dan – We'll talk about that's a whole different issue, we'll talk about that one in a second. So at any rate, there's that little bit of a disconnect. And I think where some of that comes from okay, and Kelly this is nothing against anybody, okay but with the rules of engagement with grant administration, it's important to work with the granting agency as a team to make sure that we can work through all this and make it all happen and in some cases, what I'm seeing is that there's been an initiative to go into the grant, look at the grant and say yeah, it's approved so we're going to go ahead and purchase it without coming to the State Administrative Agency and that's just an example of the State Administrative, the Standardized Equipment list because even at the meeting in Polson, we had asked the team to not go to the liaison to do the business, they needed to come to the State Administrative Agency and the very next week they had gone back to our liaison with ODP. That liaison was at that meeting in Polson and she was very uncomfortable with even answering that because she knew what the agreement was. So there was a little bit of a disconnect there because we as a State Administrative Agency that is our liaison to ODP and we need to work with the counties to get everything copasetic so that then we can go to the liaison if we need to to take care of any issues.

Kelly – before you go on, I'd like to answer to that because I was the one that made the call.

Alan – Let me speak up, that is ie in the paperwork a federal help line, not a liaison. In your total documentation for the program, Bob has it in his hands and we're quite familiar with that. It is not enough to administer and put it out like several of the other states with dollars; they've adopted the federal and said here's your rules. The point I'm trying to make is that information wasn't there and that's why that federal help line.

Dan – Which information? Because Fran is not the federal help line. The 1-800 line says to call the State Administrative Agency, Fran Sentagotta is our liason.

Alan Marble – Well, you dial the federal help line, and it goes to agent 8, and they connect you.

Dan McGowen – well, they connected you with Fran and should have connected you back to the state because that's what they do.

Alan Marble – so, and the interpretation that on some of the federal stuff, needs to come from the federal and I personally don't have a problem with that because these are complex that are open to interpretation and all the states are doing it different ways. The federal guidelines haven't changed between the states, but just so you know that's the federal help line, that's why it's there.

Dan McGowen – Oh, I know why it's there.

Alan Marble – Okay then, I don't want you to chastise somebody that's been working on this stuff, and the fact we're using the federal help line to get a clarification on a federal.

Dan McGowen – and here's what the situation was as long as you're talking about it. This delves into another subject okay. Is it was a question about conference notes. Conference notes are what was faxed by Fran was there was conference notes that were asked for. Conference notes are the notes that are put together before they ever decide when they codify in the CFR the eligibility for grants. And Fran sent the conference notes and faxed them and everything and she said, "I feel really uncomfortable with it because we talked at the meeting about not coming directly to me," she was telling me this," and going through the State Administrative Agency". So I said, "Well, if that's happened, that's happened." I said, "If you sent out what was requested, that's what was requested". I said, "We'll have to work through the other problem because we are the State Administrative Agency and the State Administrative Agency is the conduit and if we can't do it, we go to the help line to find out what the answer is or we go to our liason with ODP." What happened then, after those conference notes were sent out, there was some things that came up that the State Administrative Agency was in violation of the Patriot Act in administering the grants. I know that subject came up when we came around for the Interoperable Northern Tier subject when Wayne and Skellman, Jack to get those signatures for that important project. The point being is that the Patriot Act and this has kind of keyed the ears of the US Attorney's office. They're very interested and wondering why the Patriot Act is being spouted as a violation of grant administration because the Patriot Act has nothing to do with grant administration. The Patriot Act is how they do intelligence gathering and so forth with terrorism events and wire-tapping and all those kinds of things. So, the US Attorney's office is really kind of interested in why that specific spin is coming out of the county.

Alan Marble – That's because that addresses the 80-20 pass through law.

Dan McGowen – no, that's the conference notes. The only thing in the Patriot Act is 10-14 because Martha has completely read through it and we've been in contact with the US Attorney's office. The conference notes that you received are the conference notes that address the 80% and everything and like I was trying to explain to you, those conference notes are what's used to develop the CFR for the grant and that's all they are is conference notes. It's like taking everything and putting it on the board and then they sit back and they say, "Okay, we're going to take this piece and this piece and this piece, that's what's going in the grant requirements.

Kelly - So you're talking about CFR 66 then?

Dan McGowen – I'm talking about the conference notes and what went into the grant. It has nothing to do with the Patriot Act and the Patriot Act has nothing to do with grant administration. My point is, the Patriot Act is being confused in with this situation and it need not be.

Alan Marble – what it comes down to is the 80-20 pass through and in the House Bill the laws are quite clear.

Dan McGowen- Well, the 80-20 pass through is to go with the jurisdictions....

Alan Marble – call it the rabbit came out the hat, I don't really care what you call it, it deals with the pass through laws, it was enacted by the house.

Dan McGowen - Those are the grant requirements that it's the 80-20 pass through and the US Attorney's office will differ with you that the Patriot Act has anything to do with grant administration. The Patriot Act has been the mother-head that we have been in other reps have said to me, "Well how come they're saying that we're in violation of the Patriot Act, the State is?" I said, "I don't know because it doesn't have anything to do with the Patriot Act and that's my point. The US Attorney's office is just keyed to it, so I don't know what to do with that, but the 80-20 pass through, they're right. 80% of the money is to go to local jurisdictions. 20% goes to the state and like I said before, that 80% could go to one county or it could get disseminated and allocated to all of them like we've done. We've chosen to do the allocation process because that's the fair way to do it. Regardless of the project, as long as the project money benefits a local jurisdiction, you're in the parameters of the grant, not that it gets separated out equally to all of them because in some of the grants, and that'll get into the Hazmat situation for the Hazmat team funding. Is that, some of the money in '03 part 1 and '03 part 2 was taken off the top and that was money that was used for that Hazmat initiative and that went to local jurisdictions so it met the requirements of the grant because it was used for local jurisdictional use and the thing to understand with the Hazmat team issue is that's a State Emergency Response Commission initiative that's been ten years in the making to try and develop some kind of a regional response for Hazmat teams. There's been several questions from the folks about how can you do this? Who has the authority? Who is the implementing authority and all those kinds of things? Well, the State Emergency Response Commission is the implementing authority because these trailers. It was just so happenstance and it worked out so slick that we could use ODP money to purchase trailers for the Regional Hazmat teams of which in the beginning it was suggested and Alan made a good suggestion that all of the equipment on those trailers be standardized because the State Hazmat plan that's under the authority of the SERC is set up so that there's 6 Hazmat teams across the State of which Flathead County can be one of those. There's an equipment trailer to use for Hazmat spills in the county. According to the State Hazmat plan though, one of the parameters for getting the trailer and being able to have it here in the county and access it is that if it's needed for a State Response that through our center and the plan and reimbursement through a fund that's been set up and everything, call upon the county and possibly two or three of the others to come to a location and respond to a spill. The beauty of it is that when they come and respond, because they all have the same equipment, all the responders know what's on the trailers. The other beauty of it, is something that was brought up at the Polson meeting which I don't understand yet, is that Flathead County wanted to purchase different equipment instead of the equipment that was on the trailer because they didn't want to duplicate. That's the intended purpose for all the equipment being the same so that when it comes outside the county that you're not left with the barn door open. That you still have your basic equipment that you need here in the county so it doesn't leave you unattended to a specific situation. So, and I don't know, they've go, in fact, Flathead's trailer is being prepared right now as we speak and we don't have the MOU back on the trailer for the State Emergency Commission for the use of the trailer.

Alan Marble – May I make a comment? First of all, you said Flathead County can become, we are one. I wanted to clarify the "can" first. We've gone back and forth. On the trailer, out of the 80-20, it came, everybody's good at saying off the top of, it came off the top of our 80% okay. And we understand that.

Dan McGowen – No, it came off before the 80-20 split was done.

Alan Marble – Well, I would like to see the documentation on that,. If that was true, then there would be no argument what so ever so if you can produce that or it didn't come out of the 80, we would be happy people.

Dan McGowen – Wait a minute.

Alan marble – No, I'm just talking a spreadsheet, but the Feds told us.

Dan McGowen – You're getting wrapped around the axle with the 80%. The money went to local jurisdictions so that's in the 80%.

Alan Marble – Yes, and further on in the rules it says that you have to have the MOU which is what you're after and we understand that, but if it came out of our 80%, redundant equipment which takes away from our ability to prepare in other areas, so which is okay. We've kind of bought into that concept and said we would do this, but the irony of it, the beauty's fine but the irony of it is you are asking us to sign an MOU that says that our trailer, paid for out of our 80% becomes the property of the State and can go elsewhere if we fail to perform or so forth and so on as in the agreement. So therefore it's truly not our equipment if it's looked at in the basis of it becoming your property if we fail to perform.

Dan McGowen – wait a minute, you're putting a whole different spin on it.

Alan Marble – wait a minute, what I'm saying is if it didn't come out of the 80% this whole things a whole moot point. If it came out of the 80% then we are not about to see equipment disappear out of our preparedness levels that is undefined and there's a bunch of stuff in that agreement that leaves open ended questions, it's not a good agreement to sign because.

Dan McGowen – All the other teams have signed it. The point is ...

Alan Marble – The other teams have signed it because they're cities and it hasn't gone before the jurisdiction. The difference is this went back to our LAPC, we're a little bit different than the other ones because you're dealing with cities individually. Here, we're dealing with a working LAPC that looks at that and they follow it.

Dan McGowen – you're suggesting that others are not working LAPC's and I don't appreciate that because we work with the LAPC's and if you followed us, here's the thing. And here's what you need to understand, regardless of what kind of spin you want to put on this thing. Is that the money that was used for the trailers came out of ODP money. It came out of the money that was meant for local jurisdictions. Now, like I said before, that's not to say it's Flathead's money, that it's Lewis & Clark's money, that it's Cascade's money, it's money that's set aside for local jurisdictions. That's where that money came from. It was through that plan the way that they set up to be able to say, "Okay, counties with hazmat teams, we're going to put a trailer in that county, this is how it's going to be equipped, if we call upon that trailer then you need to respond. That's one of the parts of the agreement of that whole plan. The other thing is that the response commission is the authority over that plan and that they're willing to put a trailer in that county as long as that county abides by the rules of the plan for engagement and there's also a reimbursement part in that plan.

Under the state Hazmat plan is where the authority comes for the trailer, it's just that we used ODP money, the local jurisdictions to be able to do an initiative to help local jurisdictions out. The State Hazmat plan is the one that puts all the guidelines and parameters on the use of the trailer. It's not the ODP money so you need not confuse those two issues and there's been some commingling of those two issues and we need to separate those because it's two separate things. The contract is out of the SERC, the SERC is the one that yes, they have the authority because it's been based on the State Hazmat plan. That is you're not keeping the trailer up right, if you don't respond like we request, if all those things don't happen, the SERC has the authority to say look, "we need that trailer back, we're going to give it to a local jurisdiction that wants to play by the rules of the game." That's basically what it is, it's local jurisdiction, it's not specific by name. It just happens that there's 6 local jurisdictions of which Flathead County is one of those, that have said "hey, these are good places to have Regional Response for Hazmat and it'd be great to do that so we've gone through the whole process to equip the trailers and all those kinds of things so that they SERC Initiative (State Emergency Response Commission Initiative) of the statewide response for Regional Hazmat teams can be realized. And it's a good thing for all of Montana.

Alan Marble – I'm starting to feel like a washing machine here Dan. First of all, there's a complete circuit, a simple budget. I'll just give you yes or no's. Has the state SERC adopted the Hazmat plan?

Dan McGowen – The Hazmat plan right now is going to the, there was a couple revisions suggested at the last meeting and yes, it's going to the SERC on the next meeting and then going to the Governor's office. The thing that we had to do was we needed to capitalize on the jurisdictional money for ODP while it was there to get the trailers ordered and get everything done because we knew that the final approval for the SERC was going to go through another committee meeting to get the plan finally approved and the final revision has been done now. It's gone out to all the SERC members and I'll be taking it up to the Governor's Office right after the next meeting.

Commissioner Hall – Are you optimistic that's going to be?

Dan McGowen – Yes Gary, it's come a long way. We've been ten years working on it and it's just gone through another revision.

Alan Marble – It's going to be an ongoing working document.

Dan McGowen – Well, it will but we're getting as close, here's what I don't want to do, I am not going to take a document to the Governor's Office and get the Governor to sign it and then all of a sudden there's some big snafus in it. So what I did at the last Emergency Response Commission meeting, they wanted me at that time to take it to the Governor's Office, and as a co-chair of that commission, I said, "no, I won't do it." There was some talk around the table from the first response community and those first responders and that caucus of people, which is a wide variety of different folks, together they said, "There are some disconnects here that aren't making sense." And I said, "Time out, go fix the disconnects and then I'll take it to the Governor's Office." They've repaired those disconnects and we've maybe been a little more proactive than we should because we got the agreements, we got the trailers, we got the equipment, but we had to capitalize on that ODP money while it was there, while we could so that in process, it all meshed together that we got the trailers, the agreement gets signed, and we're good to go in the state.

Alan Marble – Let me clarify one thing. You put in your thing, when you put in your document whatever you want to call it, to get the federal money from ODP, your document that goes in has to define the jurisdictions, is that not correct before you go any further? You have to determine who the jurisdictions are?

Dan McGowen – when we sent the ISIP in we said that the money can be allocated, and that was the fair way to do it in Montana. However, as the State Administrative Agency, like I said, we could've said, "No, we're just going to give all the money to one county."

Alan Marble – I'm not asking what you did. I'm asking what went on based on ODP and what it was the tribe you identified and the counties.

Dan McGowen – The tribe and the counties and ODP approves in the ISIP the expenditure of the funds.

Alan Marble - So that went in and you've now established your jurisdictions so it becomes moot for you to do it later because you can't because you've already established this.

Dan McGowen – you understand that in the ISIP's how they set it aside, then the jurisdictions.

Alan Marble – My problem with this particular issue is where the ODP money came from to pay for those trailers.

Dan McGowen – It came from out of the 80% money for local jurisdictions. It's a local jurisdiction initiative.

Alan Marble – Okay, the problem is with this community to turn around and say we're going to give \$250,000 to support the whole Hazmat team concept. In other words, there was no buy in on that equipment from the state; it came out of our 80%. There was no buy in from the jurisdictions of which we're going to go out and serve and have to pay our people because I'm sure that there's going to be a lot of expenses that we incur including maintenance of the trailer so forth and so on. But my point is, out of that 80%, we've spent that \$250,000 which came out of our preparedness fund and now we have grown and gone along with the system and said we will bite that bullet and do it. But the bullet we can't bite is that if we fail to perform in some of those things that you talk about which are not well defined yet, the end, in the memorandum it doesn't make reference to that Hazmat plan. The memorandum, the legal document.

Dan McGowen – Well, that's the SERC and the other thing for you to understand before you go any further.

Alan Marble – So if we fail to perform on these unknowns, that you now could come and take a trailer that we've paid for out of our preparedness money redundant or not and now give it to somebody else. So therefore, the 80% has not passed through.

Dan McGowen – Sure it has, it's gone to a local jurisdiction. We take money from local jurisdictions and move to local jurisdictions all the time. It's not spin, its local jurisdiction money.

Alan Marble – Now wait a minute, you have defined the jurisdiction. A jurisdiction is us.

Dan McGowen – and you can deobligate and obligate and reobligate money as long as it goes to a local jurisdiction and the thing about the Hazmat trailers is.

Alan Marble – No, because you distributed that money based on a population base which goes across the board.

Dan McGowen – No, some was allocated and the rest was done by population.

Alan Marble – Okay, but you can't arbitrarily go back.

Dan McGowen – well sure, if a county's not using some of the money or it needs to go, it can be reallocated.

Alan Marble – Not when you're talking a piece of equipment that comes in here.

Dan McGowen – yes you can because it's local jurisdictional money and the SERC. What you need to understand is the SERC has the authority.

Alan Marble – Well, I'd like to see a legal standing on that. The 80-20 rule's pretty clear.

Dan McGowen – I understand that, the money went to local jurisdictions and then it was separated out to all the jurisdictions what was left because that money for the trailers, local jurisdictional money went to the trailers, the rest of the money got separated out and I disagree with you that there's no buy in from the state because now at this point, out of the '04 money, the recommendation of the ISIP is out of the State's side of the money, in other words, the 20% the State gets to keep is going to go towards maintenance of equipment for those Hazmat trailers. So it's a whole process.

Alan Marble – We understand that the whole ODP '04 grant is to maintain and sustain what you came up with in '03. The point is, that was our money allocated on a population base that got taken for the trailer, is that wrong?

Dan McGowen – is that wrong? It was money that was local jurisdictional money that money was set aside it was 80% local. This is the problem, the problem is, and I'm going to be real point blank right here. With the standard equipment list, with some of the other issues and even some of the other stuff, you need to let the State Administrative Agency administer the grant and work with us as a team to effectively let the sub grantee utilize the money. I'm not going to argue anymore about it. The money in '03 that was local jurisdictional money, there was money that was taken for the Hazmat Initiative, for the response teams. Then the money was allocated out to local jurisdictions. And I'm going to say again, it keeps coming up and it keeps coming up, our money. It's **local jurisdictional money** and under that allocation process, that was what was decided for the rest of that money is we would allocate it instead of giving it to one county or five counties. That was the beauty of that whole thing was to be able to make something on the State Emergency Response Commission side become a reality and also use ODP money to do it because there would be no money otherwise for something that all the counties have been working on for ten years and the State had and the State Emergency Response Commission had been discussing to make it become a reality and it was eligible to do it. It's not like we went out and did it, we checked with ODP, we got ODP's grace and blessing on the whole thing and that's the bottom line. Whether you like it or not, I'm sorry but it was approved by ODP, it was an initiative that went by the whole task force and it was a win win situation. That gets into probably I guess I should say as long as Alan is on "our" money, we need to talk about the Northern Tier because they came last week.

Commissioner Hall – Let's stop right there. Jon, do you have any comment?

Jonathan Smith – No, I understand his distinction that the jurisdiction money wasn't all given out by population. Some of it was used first and the rest by population. Alan apparently doesn't agree with that.

Alan Marble – Well, we were told specifically by ODP that that came out of our 80%. You have told us it came out of our 80%. If we chose right now, if we chose not to be a regional team, would we receive that \$250,000?

Dan McGowen – for the trailer?

Alan Marble – No, would we receive that money back into our community?

Dan McGowen – You mean the money that went to the trailer, that's what you're saying right?

Alan Marble – If the money that was allocated to the trailer.

Dan McGowen – If you don't want to be a Regional Hazmat team, then we'll give that trailer to a county that wants to be a Regional Hazmat team.

Alan Marble – Will we get that \$250,000?

Dan McGowen – No, because that was local jurisdictional money that was taken off the top and that trailer went to 6 different jurisdictions.

Alan Marble – Can you supply that with a spreadsheet that shows it doesn't come out of our 80%?

Dan McGowen – See, you're mixing. You're saying our 80%.

Alan Marble – The Federal official point blank said, you aren't going to like this, but it came out of your 80%, and we know in the grant where you can do that but a follow up with that came out, you have to have a working MOU and the agreement of that jurisdiction, it's pretty clear. And we want to have that agreement, the only difference is we don't want to sign an agreement that doesn't have the definitions in there as to what performance and those kinds of things. We're a little bit different than the other 5 teams.

Dan McGowen – Then you need to work with us to do the MOU because that's what's out there now. That's been approved through legal and that's the MOU that the other teams have signed as well so that's what I'm saying. If we haven't heard that you have any problems with the MOU, if you do we need to sit down and we need to talk about it. The point being is that of all the local money, you understand how it was disseminated and 80% had to go to local jurisdictions and 80% did go to local jurisdictions. Part of it went for the Hazmat team to local jurisdiction; the rest got allocated out to all the other jurisdictions in the State of Montana. It's all local jurisdiction money and it was approved by ODP. It met the intent of the grant and the way that ODP has it set up.

Gary Mahugh – Dan, who is the ultimate owner of that trailer and that equipment?

Dan McGowen – Because of the way that it's set up for under the state Hazmat response plan that it's local money. That it comes into Flathead County so it's local money. I don't know the actual transfer title thing Gary, I can't answer that question.

Alan Marble – The laws are that it should transfer to the jurisdiction.

Dan McGowen – It's just that under the state Hazmat Response Plan is that's the parameters that guide that whole initiative and if something happens that, lets not pick on Flathead, let's pick one of the other counties. Let's say something happens that the county, they don't maintain the trailer, they don't respond when they're requested all those kinds of things and they're a signatory to the state Hazmat Plan, that State Hazmat plan has the

promigation authority to then take that trailer and say it'll go someplace else because that was the agreement with the plan. It could be done by MOU.

Alan Marble – Are you saying it's in the State Plan it's the trailer gets taken back? I don't remember.

Dan McGowen – No, to implement the State plan, that's where the MOU part comes in so that the State Plan can be implemented because if a local jurisdiction doesn't want to use the trailer and doesn't want to do it then the State Plan needs to put that asset in a place that will take care of it and do it. So that's why the MOU is important.

Commissioner Hall – So I have two comments. Apparently the MOU is, you have the option and ability from this point on to work on that MOU so it's satisfactory to both parties. Did I hear that?

Dan McGowen – I mean we have five jurisdictions now that have signed the MOU and if you have some things with the MOU I mean, I'm happy to sit down.

Commissioner Hall – Did I understand you to say that we're the only county, the others are municipalities?

Dan McGowen – yes, that's correct.

Commissioner Hall – So there is that option. The other question that begs to be asked is, is it the MOU the only thing that's hanging this thing up right at this moment? We've been told the Commissioners, as an elected body and I would go back to 10 minutes ago as the Governor's office. Elected officials don't like to have mud on their face because something wasn't done right but that said, if there's a possibility of working out that MOU then that seems like a very real option that needs to be done. The other thing is, if you don't think this has a future, then you better deny it now and step away from it.

Alan Marble – we've already accepted the fact that we have to accept that in and use it, with the redundancy and so forth and so on and we bought into that. What we don't want to do is sign an unknown. If we can get more exact on that MOU, absolutely. I don't want to speak for the Hazmat team.

Commissioner Hall – That just makes common sense, that's what I've heard. I don't think we need to beat it to death, that's what I heard. That's an option and that's what we need to do next.

Gary Mahugh – That's the first time the option's been given though.

Commissioner Hall – It doesn't matter, it's given, let's move on from there.

Dan McGowen – The MOU was sent out to all jurisdictions. Here's the MOU, please take a look at it. When you sign the MOU we can get the trailer done. If because there's jurisdictional authority differences, and this is the first time that I've heard this issue, I'm not opposed to sitting down and taking a look at it because they're municipalities compared to a county. I don't have a problem with that at all.

Commissioner Hall – Alright, because I can see where there'd be an issue.

Dan McGowen – Okay, the next one is that we discussed in Polson is the EOD equipment. For you to understand what the issue is with that particular initiative, the situation with the EOD equipment has been a little bit interesting. What was brought up at the March meeting is that in order to get the money, they couldn't get the ODP dollars unless FBI certified. Let me explain to you the situation. Because we've done a lot of research, we've done a lot of connections and a lot of try and coordination to make this whole thing happen, just like we have in the other counties. The parameters are this, is that in order for you to become FBI certified through the Redstone and that's the only entity in the United States that certifies for EOD teams. Even EPA gets certified through Redstone because the FBI sets up through population and chooses where the placement of EOD teams are based on population and all other kinds of parameters. It is allowable under the ODP grant which Flathead wanted to become, you know get the equipment so forth and become certified, and what we did with the other counties is, we said, fine. There are certain equipment you need to have before you can even do any Redstone training. We don't have a problem with putting \$25,000 into equipment for Flathead County so you can go ahead and get your Redstone stuff and get it done, because in order for them to even do the Redstone they have to have the equipment. So it wasn't anything that you couldn't get the ODP dollars unless you got certified, we wanted to put the ODP dollars up so that you could get certified. The things that we've run into so far with that specific situation is that, in the application that was submitted to us, there was a bit of material misrepresentation because we sent a letter asking for applications and so forth to show that the applications had been sent in and Redstone had them so that we knew according to ODP that we could agree with ODP to say, yeah, everything's kosher, it's okay to, you know we can use the money for this, Flathead's right on top of the mark and they've got everything taken care of. What we found out was, in the application that there was several, the application has stated that Flathead County has applied for FBI hazardous device interagency team accreditation, has 4 Hazmat WMD bomb technicians that have applied for the FBI Hazardous device school and 1 Hazmat WMD Explosive specialist who's applied for FBI HDS Bomb Squad Commander school. The individual at FBI that handles all of this says that that is not correct. That there are no applications for those things and so that kind of turned a red light on to me and it bothered me because we were willing to put the money up to do this and then when we found out in checking further with the FBI and the Redstone folks is that even if the Flathead application was submitted that it would not be approved at this time because there are four steps that need to occur before any of that can be done and one of these that was to have been started some time ago was the needs assessment to be completed by the FBI and approved by Redstone, that's the very very first step before they'll accept any application. That needs assessment has not been done. The person that does that right now is on special assignment in Iraq for several months right now. But the assessment has not been done for Flathead County. The second is that once the assessment's approved, then the administrative representative and it needs to be Flathead County Sheriff's Office or local police department that's a deputized officer must attend the 3 day executive management course at Redstone and the next executive course is in October. After the executive management course, then they select the personnel to attend and they purchase the required equipment and insure that selected personnel have attended the Hazmat technician course, submit their applications to Redstone and then upon approval of the application they send the applicants to Redstone.

Commissioner Hall – okay, so you've covered two, we don't know about three and four because we haven't met two. You said you responded to this letter.

Alan Marble – yes, the process is correct, the officer that, or the FBI agent that need to do the study is in Iraq. Our sponsors are both the City police Chief, the County Sheriff, the one that's going to go to the Administrative part is Mike Meehan, the commander of our Armed Forces. The guy that was to do the needs assessment and he's doing the needs assessment based on we have individual from Ice and some of the other places that want on the team. So all the physicals are in place, all the applications are in place. Everything is on hold because he took a special assignment in Iraq...

Dan McGowen – but the applications haven't been submitted yet, like it said in the grant application that they've applied to.

Alan Marble – They have been submitted; actually they've been submitted twice. They're on hold.

Dan McGowen – Then the FBI doesn't know they have them?

Alan Marble – No, they're not in Redstone. The first applications were sent almost a year ago to Salt Lake and Redstone does know because I just got off the phone again with the Commander again.

Dan McGowen – With Dave?

Alan Marble – yes.

Dan McGowen – That's the person we've both been talking about? That's the same person because he's the one that said that they didn't have the applications.

Alan Marble – Right, and he said he has to get the guy in Iraq straight because the guy in Iraq was supposed to have done something he didn't before he went to Iraq. But that's neither here nor there. First off, you don't have to be an FBI certified team to get ODP money because that's already been distributed to teams.

Dan McGowen – No, I'm not saying that, you don't have to be FBI certified.

Alan Marble – We have chosen to do it because you have made that a standard and also the FBI wants to do it because of time and distance. So we're working with it and our equipment by the way is in place which I would really like before you leave to go down and look at it. So that your equipment that we applied for there is not our initial response equipment. We've had, there's been a bomb team here since 1947. The equipment's in place and what we've done is just ask for additional equipment because we're beefing that team up from 2 to 4 in coverage to save PD.

Dan McGowen – And see, that's where the snafu comes is that before we can release the ODP \$25,000 the applications and everything have to be into Redstone so that we know that process is going to be followed through, otherwise we're going to be answering to ODP when the comptroller comes through my door.

Alan Marble – The problem is, is ODP's already released the bomb related equipment to teams that aren't certified yet.

Dan McGowen – Well, I don't know where that's happened because in the State, all the applications have gone in and we only have...

Alan Marble – I'm not talking in the state, I'm talking in the country, as a matter of fact, Oklahoma City is not even an FBI team. There is other certification by the way, there's three certification agencies. The point is, we've taken the steps to do that, if you want to hold the funds until that happens, we don't care, just don't give them away because we're in the process.

Dan McGowen – well see, but here's the thing. We need to work closely with you in fact, maybe we should have a conference call with Dave okay because of the process so that you know, there's a sunset date to this money when it has to be expended and we're not going to turn it back to the Feds.

Alan Marble – He's due back in August, and nobody can do the assessment but the SBT whatever, a Senior Bomb Tech agent in Billings and I don't remember his name.

Dan McGowen – Then we need to have a 3-way call.

Alan Marble – He needs to finish his paper work before we can submit ours, that's all it amounts to.

Commissioner Hall – I think, so that issue I think you guys can work out.

Dan McGowen – Good, there's a success, alright. Now, we're just about done here. The other thing was I wanted you to understand about the consortiums with the '04 money. Is that we don't know for a fact, in fact it's not even in the President's '05 budget that any state except for some cities and ports and harbors are going to get any money in '05. In fact, Montana's not even going to count on any. In this strategic plan that was submitted and approved by ODP, before the '04 money came out, which was one of the parameters before all of the money could be awarded, in that plan was an initiative to use 30% of the funding off of the 80% and the 20% in local and state side for statewide regional priorities. And ODP guidelines require for that to happen that a consortium needs to be formed. It's not one that the State Administrative Agency can form. We can't even get into the formation of it. There were three consortiums that did form on their own initiative. One was for the Interoperable Communication project on the Northern Tier, the other one was, there was another one for Gallatin and one for the Big Sky area. There's a 5% contingency in that 30% for a local project that bolsters a statewide initiative. That's when they came to get the signatures.

Alan Marble- what we were sure is we didn't know what the 30% meant, he was saying 6 cents per capita and at 30% that's a difference of \$4800 versus \$400,000.

Dan McGowen – That's what I want to explain to you okay so that you're above board on it and you understand where it is because I don't want it to be a bone of contention. At any rate, that consortium with ODP, because it's money that's going to a local initiative, it just happens to have a statewide impact, and that Northern Tier backbone is a huge statewide impact with a lot of local ears, I think 11 counties and 5 tribes that were partnered in for that consortium. We as the SAA, the State Administrative Agency will be the ones to administer that consortium, should ODP approve that and we're sending in recommendations from the governor's office on that particular fund. With that consortium formed, what does that mean for '04 funding? What that means for '04 funding is that we were then able to do a win/win situation. We were able to allow the goal of the 30% in statewide strategic plan to be utilized for local jurisdiction. The second thing that was a win/win is that we were able to still allocate money to local jurisdictions, like we did in '03. When we allocate the money this time for '04, the only difference over '03 to the county will be a reduction of 6 cents per person, for Yellowstone County, it's about \$7200, for here I think it's about \$4800, something like that. So the main concern was that in '03 there'd been a whole host of initiatives started with local jurisdictions and my concern was that you know, in '04 we could've said and there was some pressure to go this way, and I had more heat than you want to know that we're just going to go competitive. Meaning there you go with the haves and the have nots, some counties are going to get it, some counties may not. It may only go to three counties; it may go to one whole project, who knows. I fought that because the counties have started something in '03 I wanted them to be able to continue in '04 with their plans knowing that in '05 we may not have any money. So, we did legally through the consortium aspect with the 30% and then said, "Look, because we're able to capture that local jurisdictional initiative that's a statewide type of a deal, let's just allocate the rest of the money to the local jurisdictions. So they can continue. So

that's why it's a win/win kind of a thing. That difference is that 6 cents per person or \$4500 whatever that mean for Flathead County. So virtually, in '04 you got just about the same amount of money you got in '03. So it's a good deal.

Alan Marble – Then we're not losing 30% off the top of the state and the..

Dan McGowen – Alan, the way

Alan marble – the State and the, take the 80/20 you taking 30% off the top of the big pot?

Dan McGowen – Take the pot and go 80% and 20%, take 30% of each one of those, that's about 6 million. So we're taking part well

Alan Marble – SO what happens that 6 million?

Dan McGowen – that's what the consortiums will share in and will competitively go for and that's what I have to go to the Governor's office for recommendation and then the money.

Alan Marble – How does that fit with 6 cents per capita though?

Dan McGowen – Well, because here's the thing. Let me draw you a picture and use my hands. You have a big pot of money; you do 80% from locals, 20% to the state. You take 30% of each one of those pots, that's 6 million dollars. That 6 million dollars, that's 30% okay that 6 million dollars will be competitively distributed to those consortiums. The money that's left over down here gets allocated to, of the 80% the money that's left over gets allocated to the counties and when we allocate that money in '04, the money that you'll receive will be 6 cents per person less, or \$42-4500 less than what you received in '03. So virtually you're going to get about the same amount of money in '04 as you did in '03.

Alan Marble – so we're seeing about 52% of the money is essentially what happens.

Dan McGowen – the key is is that, and I don't remember what your allocation was in '03 but you're getting virtually the same allocation in '04 to continue because I'll tell you what, I did not want to see the counties have to stop progress with what they started in '03.

Commissioner Hall – and the fact is you got consortiums put together again is the another.

Alan Marble – Well, the 6 cents was being misrepresented is it was only the cost of 6 cents per capita.

Dan McGowen – And you have to understand that those guys that came to get the signatures didn't have a clue about the financial, they didn't understand it, they tried like hell but they just didn't understand it.

Commissioner Hall – Well, they did a great job of confusing me and that doesn't take much.

Dan McGowen – So Gary, let me ask you this, are you unconfused now?

Commissioner Hall – Let's say this, I'm more educated than I was. It doesn't mean I'm less confused.

Tina Frownfeller – What does the ISIP stand for?

Dan McGowen – that's the Initial Strategic Implementation Plan, that's what we have to submit and the Fed's approve on before we can ever send out applications to you guys so you guys can send them in and then we can do an award letter so you can go spend your money. That's where we have to be really careful that money's not spent before the sub grantees, the counties, get their award letters because ODP looks at that and they go, "guess what, you're not giving them that money because they didn't get their award letter. It wasn't approved. They went out and spent it so I don't know where that situation is and how much it is, but we're certainly going to try and work with you because I don't want that to be a point of consternation.

To me it just doesn't make good business sense. We need to work together to make it happen and so. That's what I'm committed to do.

Commissioner Hall – Not when it's easily remedied.

Dan McGowen – So anyway, that ought to be enough. I just wanted you to understand, and I hope you understand. I feel bad for Bob because I've had my back to him. You'll find out in dealing with DES it may be different than in the past, I'm the kind of person that likes to put the issues on the table. I like to discuss the issues; I'm very open about them. I'm not afraid to discuss any issues and that's just the way I like to work things. When we went through all of the submissions and everything, and all of the questions that were being asked and the other things that we happening, there were some red lights that came on and I said, "Wait a minute, we need to put a stop to the freight train because it's going to get out of control here. We need to be able to work with these people, we need to be able to pull this together as a team to do it and because you are the jurisdictional authority, I wanted you to know about the issues that I was seeing and all the research that I spent doing, the staff spent doing about questions that Alan had raised and the team had raised about all those kinds of things and some of the things that we were seeing not only with the SERC grant, the '03 grant, and all those kinds of things because we want to be able to work through those things.

Commissioner Hall – I think it's important that we remember on the county level the, I don't know if I can choose a word that would describe the bureaucracy that we have to deal with on this level and understand that the State level is even more intense and somehow have a little bit of grace for that. And then you deal with the federals and that's inconceivable to me.

Alan Marble – You're doing a good job Dan for what you got to take over.

Dan McGowen- I'm trying, Martha's laughing.

Alan Marble – Dan inherited all of this and he's been doing an excellent job and I'm not saying that facetiously because you have Dan. The thing that we got to keep in mind.

Dan McGowen – I hope I understand your memo then that says "And the games begin" because you understand what I took over. There was a memo that came down that said, "and the games begin" and I said, "Let's not go there".

Alan Marble – But you've been correcting those issues or making every attempt to come close.

Dan McGowen – I want you to understand that I am an individual that's kind of pretty black and white. I'm a person of my word and I think you know that from the relocation project. Gary you obviously weren't here but I know Bob was and we went through a lot of renditions and a lot of gyrations on that. I guess the only thing I would say in closing is that number one, I appreciate your time and I thank you so much because I don't like these things to fester. Number two, we want to work together as a team with Flathead County to make these issues become a reality for the county and work through those things and number three, we do need to follow the rules of engagement with grant administration because I don't have any other choice folks and I would appreciate it, I think we have a collective understanding that we need to go through the State Administrative Agency when we're dealing with grant issues because we're the ones that are the ultimately responsible party on the line with ODP and the Comptroller and the ops gov and GAO and all those people and to help the counties keep their tail out of the ring. So, I know sometimes relationships it's a little bit tough and we're doing some things on our end there too.

Commissioner Hall – It's not a perfect world.

Dan McGowen – No, it's not and nobody said it was easy.

Alan Marble – One thing I'd like to say in closing, the frustrations of these people, that you lose on the county level and that is. Previous administration has been slow coming out with the rules and the rules seem to come up after you've already had a bunch of people meet to make a decision and then you go you can't do that. That doesn't flow well with credibility and we're beginning to see that stuff change.

Dan McGowen- I guess what I would appreciate is, I know you have a good team working on the grants but what I think we need to do is we need to have you be the point of contact because you are the grant manager and bring these issues forward because otherwise we get this triangulation thing going and we're either going to Gary, or to Kelly or to Alan. We just need to do one on one, if it's you and me that's fine but Sherry is our grant manager, Sherry Lanz and she's got a lot on her plate, she's juggling a lot.

Commissioner Hall – I'm about ready to put more on her plate because I'm going after Homeland Security money to fix the North Fork Road.

Dan McGowen – Are you really? How's that terrorist related?

Commissioner Hall – We have a border station up there that they're manning with over twenty some people and I have a road slump that I'm about ready to lose the road which cuts off total access to that border station. My county budget can not fix the road. I've already written the letter.

Dan McGowen – That's an issue too, we're working with the US Attorney's office on the cross border terrorism issues because it involves not only the port authorities, it involves all of that unprotected 600 and some miles or whatever plus the Canadian partner head so far so, let's have some conversations.

Commissioner Hall – I'll carbon copy you the letters and keep you apprised of what's going on. We're going to involve our congressional body too.

Dan McGowen – Absolutely because even if there's not ODP funds, we may be able to work it some other way. What I'm trying to do with the US Attorney's office is to pull together a larger group with Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia plus the partners on this side of the line to scope out the whole picture. Not just the interoperable part, not just across border terrorism, but to get our arms around the whole thing first and then start breaking it apart into logical pieces otherwise we're going to be spinning our wheels.

Commissioner Hall – We've got our work cut out for us. Thank you Dan.

MEETING W/CHARLIE JOHNSON & RAY HARBIN

Present at the June 2, 2004 11:00 A.M. Meeting were Commissioners Hall and Watne, Road Superintendent Charlie Johnson, Deputy County Attorney Jonathan Smith, Ray Harbin of Montana Department of Transportation, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Discussion was held relative to a request by Montana Department of Transportation to verify if Flathead County will maintain small strip of roadway in a section being constructed. Agreement was made to have Flathead County go through abandonment process for said roadway.

At 5:00 o'clock P.M., the Board continued the session until 8:00 o'clock A.M. on June 3, 2004.

+
THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 2004

The Board of County Commissioners met in continued session at 8:00 o'clock A.M. Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Robinson were present.

8:30 a.m. AOA TAB meeting at Lutheran Home Cottage

MEETING W/BOBBIE KELLY RE: RSVP CONTRACT

Present at the June 3, 2004 9:00 A.M. Meeting were Chairman Gipe, Commissioner Hall, Deputy County Attorney Jonathan Smith, Human Resources Director Raeann Campbell, Bobbie Kelly, and Clerk Eisenzimer.

Discussion was held relative to compensation; Chairman Gipe suggested \$30,000/year salary along with signing 1 year contract.

Commissioner Hall made a **motion** to offer hire Bobbie Kelly as RSVP Director and offer salary as suggested. Chairman Gipe **seconded** the motion. **Aye-** Hall and Gipe. Motion carried by quorum.

9:15 a.m. View roads w/Charlie Johnson (till noon)

10:00 a.m. Commissioner Hall attended MACo Conference Call

2:00 p.m. Commissioner Hall attended AOA Board meeting at Kalispell Senior Center

At 5:00 o'clock P.M., the Board continued the session until 8:00 o'clock A.M. on June 4, 2004.

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 2004

The Board of County Commissioners met in continued session at 8:00 o'clock A.M. Chairman Gipe, Commissioners Hall and Watne, and Clerk Robinson were present.

NO MEETINGS SCHEDULED

At 5:00 o'clock P.M., the Board continued the session until 8:00 o'clock A.M. on June 7, 2004.