



FROM: Planning Staff, Jason Boal
TO: Board of County Commissioners
RE: Planning Department Update
DATE: March 17, 2014
MEETING: March 20, 2014

Building:

- Department Update

Training:

- Floodplain- ASFPM, Seattle. June 1-6, 2014
 - I have received at least \$1569.56 in scholarship funds

Long-range Projects:

- Strong Towns-Economic Development Opportunity
- Staff Discussion



Teton County Planning
150 Courthouse Drive, Room 107
Driggs, Idaho 83422
Phone: 208.354.2593
Fax: 208.354.8778

FROM: Planning Administrator, Jason Boal
TO: Board of County Commissioners
RE: Building Department
DATE: March 19, 2014

It is that time of year where we start to see building permits, inquires and inspections increase. Attached is the summary of permits we received application for over the first two weeks of March.

I do have concerns with the requests of time being place on our Building Official for the LEC. The building is near its' contractual finish line, yet there are numerous changes and requests that are being made. Up to this point the Building Official has been the one reporting and requesting these changes. I would like the Building Official taken out of the equation for minor departmental changes. The departments that desire the changes should be better versed in why the changes need to be made and other options available. Tom has worked tirelessly through the process to ensure the building was construct as originally scoped, that it met health, safety, and welfare criteria, and was done in a timely manner. There are still a few things in the original contract that Tom should oversee, but there needs to be a transition to each department being responsible for their personal changes as opposed to Tom.



Permit Report

3/1/2014 - 3/19/2014

Permit #	Permit Number	Permit Date	Permit Type	Owner Name	Work Type	Use Type	Job Description	Total Valuation	Total Fees
	1293 2014-RW002	3/17/2014	Access Permit	CUTTHROAT RANCH LLC	New	Single Family Dwelling		0	
									0

Group Total: 1

Group: Residential

1295 PENDING		3/19/2014	Residential	SMITH, STEVEN RICHARD	New	Single Family Dwelling	SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING W/ ATTACHED GARAGE	217,200	
1294 PENDING		3/19/2014	Residential	HOFFMAN, TIMOTHY	New	Single Family Dwelling	SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING W/ ATTACHED GARAGE	92,100	
1291 14-0310-005		3/10/2014	Residential	LONG, LUDWIG M	New	Garage	BARN / GARAGE	81,548	\$595.30
1290 14-0310-004		3/10/2014	Residential	LONG, LUDWIG M	New	Single Family Dwelling	NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE W/ ATTACHED GARAGE	547,964	\$6,306.10
									\$6,901.40

Group Total: 4

Group: Shed/Pole Barn

1292	14-0313-006	3/13/2014	Shed/Pole Barn	ETHINGTON, REG PAUL	New	Shed - Equipment	BARN FOR HAY & BOAT STORAGE	28,980	\$211.55
1289	14-0306-003	3/6/2014	Shed/Pole Barn	NATIONAL OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP	Addition	Shed	POLE BARN ADDITION	13,248	\$150.00
								42,228	\$361.55
								Group Total: 2	
								981,040	\$7,262.95

3/19/2014

Total Records: 7



Teton County Planning
150 Courthouse Drive, Room 107
Driggs, Idaho 83422
Phone: 208.354.2593
Fax: 208.354.8778

FROM: Planning Administrator, Jason Boal
TO: Board of County Commissioners
RE: Neighborhood First opportunity
DATE: March 19, 2014

Teton Valley (Driggs, Tetonia, Victor and Teton County) have a unique opportunity to work with the Sonoran Institute and Strong Towns in the valley to aid in developing a "program" to identify small, incremental economic development and land use improvements in the valley.

This project was originally intended to "develop a "project list" of 8 (or so) projects that can be completed in a year for under \$25,000 that would have a high (and quick) return on investment for economic development in the valley." After an initial meeting in January, the scope changed a little to not only include training on how to identify projects that will aid in economic development, but also to "engage the public so that there is a process in place to identify and complete high-impact projects."

These were the main points of our meeting in January:

1. Teton Valley places value and importance on small, neighborhood-scale projects as a means of economic development. Generally, these projects do not require a large investment in money or time. These types of projects include those spearheaded by government as well as those that are better initiated by a private entity such as a citizens' group or a non-profit.
2. While Teton Valley would like a list of small economic development projects, they are more interested in a way to engage the public so that there is a process in place to identify and complete high-impact projects. This process would ideally enable neighborhood groups to organize, mobilize and take action.
3. Important in the list of economic development projects is the cost-benefit (return on investment) analysis such as the examples provided by Strong Towns in the Brainerd Report.
4. The Sonoran Institute will develop a proposal to develop a process by which neighborhood groups (or other groups of citizens or government entities) can identify needed projects and find ways to take action on those projects to see them to completion. The proposal will include project-specific economic analysis from Strong Towns as the initial project list is completed.

The Sonoran Institute has come back with a Scope of Work (attached) that accomplishes the above mentioned goals and at a very reasonable price.

Driggs - \$500
Victor - \$500
County - \$500
Tetonia - \$100

I would like to use \$500 from the Special Planning Budget to participate in this project, as well as give the Board of County Commissioners the opportunity to support this project and work with the other communities in Teton Valley to find ways for economic development of the area.

More info- www.strongtowns.org.



Shaping the Future of the West

www.sonoraninstitute.org

Proposal to Work in Teton Valley

Background: Teton County community leaders have developed and adopted an Economic Development Plan for the Valley. The plan has already begun to be implemented and community members see the importance of actively pursuing economic development projects. The Sonoran Institute (SI) suggests, as part of that implementation, small, incremental economic development projects that do not require a large up-front investment and have high potential for success. Many small investments spread over many projects increases the resiliency of a local economy by not putting all of a community's proverbial eggs in one basket. These projects typically are low-investment, can be quickly accomplished, have a strong positive effect in their immediate surroundings, and they can be effective at involving a more diverse array of citizens in community betterment that promotes economic development. Teton County officials have expressed interest in creating a process to engage community members so that they can identify and advocate for these types of small projects to be completed in their own neighborhoods.

Proposal:

1. *Project (type) Analysis:* The purpose of this step is to give local leaders the tools needed to anticipate and define successful projects. Strong Towns (ST) visits Teton Valley and meets with small groups of community leaders, especially those that will be evaluating projects. Much of this visit will be walking in various neighborhoods around Teton Valley and in small group meetings. The ST representative will "train the trainer" and work with the community to determine which types of projects have high-impact potential. During this visit, an initial project list will be determined. The ST representative will work with the community to determine evaluation criteria for potential projects for standardized evaluation. ST will help develop a categorization system that could be used to determine potential positive impacts of projects. ST will work with community leaders to determine metrics that can be measured before and after projects so that over time, patterns may emerge that could indicate what will make a successful project.
 - a. Teton Valley Community Leaders' Obligation: Be available to meet with ST representative when he is in town. Glean knowledge, ask questions, provide feedback. Provide potential projects to be discussed as a team. Work with ST to develop evaluation criteria.
 - b. Deliverable: Visit by Strong Towns to Teton Valley to meet with leaders to discuss a framework for looking at projects and neighborhoods.

Summary of visit and bulleted list of cost-benefit criteria will be provided.
Analysis of first list of projects with help from Teton Valley leaders.

- c. Estimated Cost: \$3,500 ST time + travel; \$3,500 SI staff time and travel
 - d. Timing: Visit in April
2. *Public Engagement Process*: The purpose of this step is to develop a process that engages the community so that their concerns about the physical environment of their neighborhood are addressed thus improving the livability of Teton Valley. During and immediately after the initial visit, SI will develop a process by which projects can be identified. This process will include engaging community members and neighborhood groups, soliciting proposals, ranking proposals for selection, how to identify potential funding mechanisms, and implementation strategies. SI will work with ST directly during this phase to use their experience and lessons learned to develop the project selection and identification process. SI will provide between two to five options for different processes/methods to involve the public to develop project lists. To the best of its ability, SI will include Asset-Based Community Development strategies in their proposal, recognizing that true ABCD strategies might require formal training for community members. Teton Valley leaders will help chose the final process based on what they think will work best in Teton Valley.
- a. Teton Valley Community Leaders' Obligation: Provide feedback on different scenarios.
 - b. Deliverable: Actionable report that develops a process by which projects can be identified and initiated based on community engagement.
 - c. Estimated Cost: \$500 (contract for expert advice between SI and ST); \$5,300 SI staff time + travel
 - d. Timing: Preliminary options presented in April; final report (with project list) presented in May

Total Project Cost: \$8,800 (SI costs) + \$4,000 (ST costs) = \$12,800
Requested financial contribution from Teton County entities: \$1,750.



Teton County Planning
150 Courthouse Drive, Room 107
Driggs, Idaho 83422
Phone: 208.354.2593
Fax: 208.354.8778

FROM: Planning Administrator, Jason Boal
TO: Board of County Commissioners
RE: Impact Fee Advisory Committee
DATE: March 17, 2014

Since our last meeting I have been combing through the Planning and Building Department's numbers to better understand where our work load is, and where it is going. I tried to identify some key indicators to show the need for additional staff.

The easiest way for me to relay this information is through charts and spreadsheets. Below is a list of each of the included documents and why they were included.

1. Department History- This provides a summary of the number of staff, as well as their positions since 2008. As you can see there has been a drastic cut from 8-9 people in 2008 to 3 people in 2014. (In 2008 Wendy's position, was actually 2 positions, in 2014 it is only one position, so it is not counted twice.)
2. Survey of Similar Planning Departments in the West (Spring 2013)- To help provide some perspective on what planning departments in other communities that are close to our size (population) look like I have provided this chart. This data was gathered as part of a survey for my thesis. It was administered to planners in the west.
3. Planning & Building Financial Indicators- Looking back to 2010 I was able to gather a lot of data that helps provide some valuable information about staff and the production levels. The last two columns project what 2014 would look like if we had an additional planner for a whole year versus if we had a contract planner for the whole year. For permits I utilized the three year average to determine the rate of change from 2013. The last part of the chart shows the value added to the County by new development (planning and building related). Here I just used 2013 numbers, which seems like a very conservative estimate. There are a few lines I would like to show you specifically:
 - a. Total Salary- The total salary for 2014 would be less than all previous years, even with hiring an additional staff member (keep in mind 2011 and 2012 were Comp. Plan years. This office would be completing the Impact Fee Study AND the Land Use Code update this year.)
 - b. Salary per Staff Hour- Adding additional staff would still put us below the previous year's hourly average.
 - c. Hourly return of revenue per salary- This shows how much return the county has for each dollar of salary that paid to staff. As you can see by adding an additional staff member we will still have a higher return than previous years.

I should note that the low numbers thus far in 2014 are not of concern. At the time of this report we have doubled the number of permits, impact fees and permits fees from 2013. The winter months tend to be a bit slower, but we start picking up in March and April. In fact we had

three single family home permits submitted just last week that are not included in these numbers.

4. Impact Fee Numbers Study- I included a quick brake down of our previous study and what an updated study MAY cost using those numbers. It is hard to get an estimate based on a previous contract. I also show the range of what Sand Point, Idaho's bids came in at. Also on this sheet the total cost to the county for adding an additional staff member.

I understand the Board has the desire to increase efficiency and service levels for the public, while at the same time being responsible with public funds. Finding this equilibrium can be difficult. Cutting too much can cause decreases in efficiency and service levels. Over staffing while increasing efficiency can create a perception that the County is being wasteful.

What I have provided here shows that by adding a staff member we will be both increasing service levels and being responsible with public funds. When I took this position Mr. Loosli was to work on the Land Use Code. Shortly after my arrival he ended his work with the County. The responsibility for the Land Use Code revisions then returned to this office, adding additional responsibility. I have also noted that the Impact Fee Ordinance desperately needs updating, the Flood Plain Ordinance needs revisions as well as numerous other tweaks that need to be made to the County Code outside of the Land Use Code (i.e. Yurts). In order to accomplish these tasks in addition to the day to day tasks of processing applications, working with the public to answer their questions, managing the department, reviewing building permits, and participating in outside meeting (Consortium, DCC, Recreation Study, etc.), I need an additional staff member. By adding an additional staff member this department will be able to continue to increase efficiency, accomplish studies/updates in house as opposed to continuously hiring expensive consultants, and be proactive rather than reactive to needs in the community.

Teton County Department History

2008												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
P/A									Patrick			
Planner						Lori (Contract))						
Code Enforcment										Michelle		
Asst.						Sheila						
Building Official						Bruce						
Inspector						Tom						
Asst									Wendy			
Manager-GIS							Eric					
Tech							Spencer					
Total Staff	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	8	9	9	8	8
2009												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
P/A							Patrick					
Planner							Nickell					
Code Enforcment												Michelle
Asst.							Sheila		Wendy			
Building Official												
Inspector							Bruce					
Asst							Tom					
							Wendy					
Manager-GIS												Steve
Tech												
Total Staff	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	8

Teton County Department History

2010

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
P/A				Patrick					Angie			
Planner			Nickell							Curt		
Code Enforcement	Michelle											
Asst.						Wendy						
Building Official			Bruce								Tom	
Inspector				Tom								
Asst						Wendy						
Manager-GIS							Steve					
Tech				Susan								
Total Staff	8	7	7	7	7	5	6	5	5	5	5	5

2011

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
P/A												
Planner							Angie					
Code Enforcement							Curt					
Asst.							Wendy					
Building Official							Tom					
Inspector												
Asst							Wendy					
Manager-GIS		Steve								Rob		
Tech												
Total Staff	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5

Teton County Department History

2012

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
P/A							Angie					
Planner							Kurt					
Code Enforcement												
Asst.							Wendy					
Building Official							Tom					
Inspector												
Asst							Wendy					
Manager-GIS							Rob					
Tech										Paul		
Total Staff	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6

2013

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
P/A	Angie										Jason	
Planner	Curt			Stephen (Contract)								
Code Enforcement												
Asst.	Wendy											
Building Official	Tom											
Inspector												
Asst	Wendy											
Manager-GIS	Rob											
Tech												
Total Staff	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	3

Survey of Similar Planning Departments in the West (Spring 2013)

What state is your principal place of employment located?	What is your departments/organizations annual budget?	What is the size of your whole organization (including full time, part time or other types of staff)?	What is the size of your department/ planning organization?	Which departments or responsibilities?	What is the population of the community where your agency has responsibility?	What is the area (sq. miles) of the community where your agency has responsibility?	Attributes that are similar to Teton County
ID	\$250,001-\$500,000	41-75	4-6	Building, GIS, Code Enforcement	8000	450	4
ID	\$100,001-\$250,000	41-75	0-2	Building	12000	7639	4
OR	\$100,001-\$250,000	41-75	1-2	planning, permit administration, code enforcement, economic development	7700	2.5	3
WY	\$100,001-\$250,000	76+	1-2		8700	4154	3
ID	\$1,000,001-\$1,250,000	11-20	1-2	Parks, Economic Development	1137	2	2
ID	\$750,000-\$1,000,000	41-75	4-6	building code enforcement	3000	3.25	2
ID	\$750,000-\$1,000,000	76+	4-6	Planning, Building, Economic Devel	10000	7	2
ID	\$750,000-\$1,000,000	76+	10+	building, flood	12000		2
MT	\$100,001-\$250,000	76+	1-2	floodplain, addressing, special districts	7600	3594	2
WY	\$100,001-\$250,000	76+	3-4		12000	3,150	2
MT	Unsure	76+	1-2	Landscape Architects, Civil Engineers	2500		1
MT	\$100,001-\$250,000	11-20	3-4	building plumbing zoning annexation subdivisions floodplain	3500	15	1
SD	\$250,001-\$500,000	21-40	3-4	9-1-1 addressing, building, code enforcement, GIS, zoning administration, floodplain management, project administration	9000	50	1
UT	\$500,001-\$750,000	21-40	3-4	building and planning	8000	10	1
WA	Unsure	41-75	3-4	permitting, environmental health	3000	11.5	1
WA	\$250,001-\$500,000	21-40	1-2	Public Works	3000	2.2	1
WA	\$1,250,000 +	76+	4-6	code enforcement, building, administration	9451	7.62	1
WY	\$500,001-\$750,000	21-40	1-2	planning, zoning, parks and recreation	2000	-2 square miles	1
WY	\$250,001-\$500,000	41-75	4-6	Planning, Building & Code Enforcement	6000	5 sq. Miles	1
WA	\$250,001-\$500,000	76+	4-6		2100	246	0
WA	Unsure	21-40	3-4	Community Development	4200	don't know	0
WY	\$250,001-\$500,000	76+	3-4		15000	7,964	0

Planning & Building Financial Indicators

		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014	41%	2014	Full year with Planner	2014	Full year with Contract Planner
		Salary	Hours	Salary	Hours	Salary	Hours	Salary	Hours	Salary	Hours	Salary	Hours	Salary	Hours
Planning Admin															
	Planning	\$ 70,886.11	40	\$ 45,688.00	40	\$ 55,448.00	40	\$ 56,641.00	40	\$ 14,688.00	40	\$ 53,000.00	40	\$ 53,000.00	40
	Total	\$ 70,886.11	40	\$ 45,688.00	40	\$ 55,448.00	40	\$ 56,641.00	40	\$ 14,688.00	40	\$ 53,000.00	40	\$ 53,000.00	40
Land Use Ass't															
	Planning	\$ 16,215.61	20	\$ 16,442.41	20	\$ 16,755.24	20	\$ 17,555.17	20	\$ 14,817.00	20	\$ 19,786.00	20	\$ 19,786.00	20
	Total	\$ 16,215.61	20	\$ 16,442.41	20	\$ 16,755.24	20	\$ 17,555.17	20	\$ 14,817.00	20	\$ 19,786.00	20	\$ 19,786.00	20
Planner															
	Total	\$ 51,000.00	40	\$ 35,856.37	40	\$ 42,640.00	40	\$ 24,894.80	20	\$ -	0	\$ 40,955.20	40	\$ 40,955.20	40
Contract Planner consultant	Special Budget			\$ 2,030.00		\$ 807.00									
	Special Budget			\$ 45,000.00	Comp Plan	\$ 108,100.00	Comp. Plan			\$ 2,875.00					
Econ Dev. Con.						\$ 35,000.00		\$ 5,500.00							
	Total	\$ -	0	\$ 47,030.00	0	\$ 143,907.00	0	\$ 5,500.00	0	\$ 2,875.00	0	\$ -	0	\$ 52,000.00	20
Compliance Officer															
	Planning									\$ 2,931.26	4	\$ 4,217.00	4	\$ 4,217.00	4
	Total	\$ -	0	\$ -	0	\$ -	0	\$ -	0	\$ 2,931.26	4	\$ 4,217.00	4	\$ 4,217.00	4
Total Planning		\$ 138,101.72	100	\$ 145,016.78	100	\$ 258,750.24	100	\$ 104,590.97	80	\$ 35,311.26	64	\$ 117,958.20	104	\$ 129,003.00	84
Total Building		\$ 117,544.95	100	\$ 74,122.47	60	\$ 79,689.00	60	\$ 83,659.21	60	\$ 26,939.20	60	\$ 65,705.00	60	\$ 65,705.00	60
Total Salary		\$ 255,646.67	200	\$ 219,139.25	160	\$ 338,439.24	160	\$ 188,250.18	140	\$ 62,250.46	124	\$ 183,663.20	164	\$ 194,708.00	144
Permits															
	Planning	44		25	-43%	42	68%	40	-5%	10		46	15%	46	15%
	Building	80		50	-38%	63	26%	98	56%	22		127	30%	127	30%
	Total	124		75	-40%	105	40%	138	31%	32		173	26%	173	26%
Salary per permit															
	Planning	\$ 3,138.68		\$ 5,800.67	85%	\$ 6,160.72	6%	\$ 2,614.77	-58%	\$ 3,531.13		\$ 2,564.31	-2%	\$ 2,804.41	7%
	Building	\$ 1,469.31		\$ 1,482.45	1%	\$ 1,264.90	-15%	\$ 853.67	-33%	\$ 1,224.51		\$ 515.74	-40%	\$ 515.74	-40%
	Total	\$ 2,061.67		\$ 2,921.86	42%	\$ 3,223.23	10%	\$ 1,364.13	-58%	\$ 1,945.33		\$ 1,059.19	-22%	\$ 1,122.88	-18%
Permit Fees															
	Planning	\$ 21,957.50		\$ 9,602.40	-56%	\$ 20,358.60	112%	\$ 8,047.00	-60%	\$ 1,700.00		\$ 7,920.23	-2%	\$ 7,920.23	-2%
	Building	\$ 49,384.80		\$ 26,334.42	-47%	\$ 45,058.55	71%	\$ 73,356.26	63%	\$ 17,096.38		\$ 94,685.42	29%	\$ 94,685.42	29%
	Total	\$ 71,342.30		\$ 35,936.82	-50%	\$ 65,417.15	82%	\$ 81,403.26	24%	\$ 18,796.38		\$ 102,605.65	26%	\$ 102,605.65	26%
Salary \$ per Permit \$															
	Planning	\$ 6.29		\$ 15.10	140%	\$ 12.71	-16%	\$ 13.00	2%	\$ 20.77		\$ 14.89	15%	\$ 16.29	25%
	Building	\$ 2.38		\$ 2.81	18%	\$ 1.77	-37%	\$ 1.14	-36%	\$ 1.58		\$ 0.69	-39%	\$ 0.69	-39%
	Total	\$ 3.58		\$ 6.10	70%	\$ 5.17	-15%	\$ 2.31	-55%	\$ 3.31		\$ 1.79	-23%	\$ 1.90	-18%
Staff Hours per permit															
	Planning	118		208	76%	124	-40%	104	-16%	333		118	13%	95	-9%
	Building	65		62	-4%	50	-21%	32	-36%	142		24	-23%	24	-23%
	Total	84		111	72%	79	-61%	53	-52%	83		49	-7%	43	-18%
Salary per staff hour															
	Planning	\$ 26.56		\$ 27.89	5%	\$ 49.76	78%	\$ 25.14	-49%	\$ 25.88		\$ 21.81	-13%	\$ 29.53	17%
	Building	\$ 22.60		\$ 23.76	5%	\$ 25.54	8%	\$ 26.81	5%	\$ 21.06		\$ 21.06	-21%	\$ 21.06	-21%
	Total	\$ 24.58		\$ 26.34	7%	\$ 40.68	54%	\$ 25.86	-36%	\$ 23.55		\$ 21.54	-17%	\$ 26.00	1%
New Construction Value		\$ 80,285,343		\$ 24,959,227	-69%	\$ 32,748,173	31%	\$ 20,351,888	-38%	\$ 8,344,274.00	Using 2013 #'s	\$ 20,351,888	0%	\$ 20,351,888	0%
New Construction Value per Hour		\$ 7,719.74		\$ 2,999.91	-61%	\$ 3,936.08	31%	\$ 2,795.59	-29%	\$ 1,294.09		\$ 2,386.48	-15%	\$ 2,717.93	-3%
New Construction Revenue		\$ 187,387.30		\$ 82,054.82	-56%	\$ 140,392.15	71%	\$ 135,081.26	-4%	\$ 40,803.38	Using 2013 #'s	\$ 156,283.65	16%	\$ 156,283.65	16%
New Construction Revenue per hour		\$ 18.02		\$ 9.86	-45%	\$ 16.87	71%	\$ 18.56	10%	\$ 6.33		\$ 18.33	-1%	\$ 20.87	12%
Hourly return of revenue per salary \$		\$ 0.73		\$ 0.37	-49%	\$ 0.41	11%	\$ 0.72	73%	\$ 0.27		\$ 0.85	19%	\$ 0.80	12%

Italics= estimated #'s Planning Building



WK: 208-354-2593 ext 202
CELL: 208-313-5106

Teton County Building Official
MEMO

150 Courthouse Drive
Driggs, ID 83422

March 19, 2014

TO: Board of County Commissioners
FROM: Tom Davis
SUBJECT: Law Enforcement Center Update

I have been informed by Ormond Builders that the tower will be shipped today and will arrive next week. White Cloud, the tower installation contractor, will begin installation immediately upon arrival of the tower. Clark Wireless, the antenna installation contractor, will install the antennas in early April. We have scheduled the Dispatch move for April 16th.

The following items are for your review and discussion at the March 20th meeting:

With the building near completion, the Sheriff has identified several areas of concern from both security and functional standpoints. I have requested pricing on these items but have not received an answer yet. It will be up to the Board's discretion to authorize funding not to exceed the estimated amounts.

- 1) Adding 4 LED light fixtures to the Conference Room. This is a functional improvement and was not part of the original trade contract. Estimated cost-\$4,000
- 2) Adding overhead door **stops** to the Holding Cell doors. Estimated cost-\$500

I have quotes on these 2 items:

- 1) Adding 3M Security Film to the glass on 7 doors and 2 windows. This is a security improvement that was not part of the original plans. Quoted at \$1,285
- 2) Removal of the opaque film on 5 windows between Driver's license and the public corridor. Quoted at \$250.