RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS SKAGIT COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Monday, June 13, 1994

9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

Board of Health - Pat Pearce, Director.

- Public Hearing Revising Skagit County Code 12.16 to Include a New Section Allowing Recording of Demolition Waste Disposal Sites with the Skagit County Auditor.
- 2) Family Services Restructuring Network Steering Committee Update.

10:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Public Works Department - Rich Medved, Director

- 1) Submittal by Skagit River Flood Control Committee Representatives.
- Signature Resolution Establishing 1994 Skagit County Flood Control Grant Projects.
- 3) Discussion Bow Hill Road Project.
- Miscellaneous.

CONSENT AGENDA.

MISCELLANEOUS.

1:30 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Bid Opening - Senior Catered Meals.

2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Work Session - 6-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Executive Session - Personnel, Litigation and Land Acquisition.

The Skagit County Board of Commissioners met in regular session on Monday, June 13, 1994, with Commissioners Harvey Wolden, Robby Robinson and Robert Hart present.

BOARD OF HEALTH - Pat Pearce, Director.

 Public Hearing - Revising Skagit County Code 12.16 to Include a New Section Allowing Recording of Demolition Waste Disposal Sites with the Skagit County Auditor.

Chairman Wolden opened the Public Hearing. Ken Willis, Health Department Staff, briefly reviewed the purpose of this amendment to Skagit County Code 12.16. Mr. Willis advised that problems relative to instances where houses were burned down and the debris buried have the potential to cause groundwater contamination and/or environmental problems. This new section is proposed wherein a notice would be recorded with the Skagit County Auditor spelling out public health and environmental concerns and would provide a disincentive for this practice.

Jim Hinton, Gunderson Road, stated that this is another case of "big brother" trying to take care of the citizenry. Mr. Hinton expressed his concern that the word "demolition" is too vague for the concerns intended by this amendment. Mr. Hinton pointed out that commercial properties sold are required by financial institutions to certify that the subject properties are "hazardous" free, and urged the Board to consider a more clear definition of "demolition" in the amendment.

Mr. Willis clarified that inert waste includes concrete, asphalt and tile, and is clearly defined in the Code. Demolition waste has a specific definition as material from buildings including sheetrock, copper, metals, carpet material, vinyl flooring, etc. Hazardous waste is a completely different category of waste than solid waste, and is completely out of the control of the County Health Department.

Chairman Wolden queried Mr. Willis concerning the record required of Northwest Air Pollution in removing or continuing to burn demolished buildings. Mr. Willis indicated individuals are willing to pay the fines to Northwest Air Pollution rather than properly dispose of the waste. Mr. Willis further noted that in any kind of environmental audit, not all of the history of a given site is brought to bear. Mr. Willis indicated the necessity to create a paper trail and history.

Commissioner Hart indicated at some point regulations reach the point of overkill and expressed his concern that the County may be building a bureaucracy and not be able to provide adequate staff to impose such regulations. Mr. Willis concurred that there is not enough Staff time to enforce everything, but stated that with the Inman Landfill closure, further abuse will be forthcoming if some sort of regulations are not put in place. Mr. Willis stated that he does not feel this amendment is overregulating.

Commissioner Hart stated that, unfortunately, those people really trying to comply end up paying more and that those burying solid waste will continue to do so. Commissioner Hart queried Staff on the possibility of having Northwest Air increase their pertinent fines. Commissioner Wolden clarified that Northwest Air Pollution is the regulatory agency for burning, and indicated his feeling that individuals currently pay the low fines in order to alleviate the payment of proper disposal.

Chairman Wolden suggested that the Health Department may need to look at enforcing this type of resolution through Northwest Air Pollution by increasing their fine structure for such violations.

Mr. Willis stated that in his opinion Northwest Air Pollution's regulations alone are not taking care of all of the situations on solid waste demolition, and there is no other agency to fill in this loophole.

Jim Hinton stated that there are regulations through Northwest Air Pollution and ultimately the EPA to levy larger fines. Consequently, there is no need for the County to be involved.

Ken Johnson, Francis Road, Mount Vernon, expressed his concern for over-regulating and overkill. Mr. Johnson concurred that there is a need to be environmentally conscious, but to the lengths proposed in this amendment are ridiculous in taking that much time to record and track the insignificant amounts of solid waste involved. Mr. Johnson stated that the concerns of the Board are very valid, and indicated his feeling that this is an overkill regulation in the way it is written.

There being no further public comment forthcoming, Commissioner Hart moved to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion, which unanimously carried.

Commissioner Hart indicated there needs to be some substantive reason to record this type of information rather than a discretionary call. Commissioner Robinson agreed, and noted the increase in population and different materials being utilized than in the past, and that individuals are not always responsible in disposing of certain materials. Commissioner Robinson further indicated the need to develop a cooperative effort between the Northwest Air Pollution Authority and the Health Department. Chairman Wolden agreed with the comments of Commissioners Hart and Robinson, and stated that there is a need to regulate due to the

fact that those not being responsible in their actions are causing problems for all. The Board stressed the need to do some refining and dressing up of the amendment as proposed, and directed Staff to come up with some threshold information. The Board further directed Staff to solicit information and input, and present the Board with a revised amendment.

2. Family Services Restructuring Network Steering Committee Update.

Pat Pearce, Health Department Director, briefly reviewed Legislation 2319 which has previously been discussed with the Board. Ms. Pearce advised that on May 31, 1994 a meeting called by the Family Policy Council (FPC) formed a steering committee for the purpose of reviewing the requirements of the new law and beginning the process of alerting local community groups to choose delegates to form a 23 member network. The network will determine the future of service delivery systems in Skagit County. Ms. Pearce is a member of this steering committee and noted the considerable concern in choosing people for the network who receive services. Various methods and ways of choosing these individuals were briefly discussed.

Commissioner Robinson queried Ms. Pearce on working with the Community Action Agency in finding these individuals. Ms. Pearce confirmed that this is a cooperative effort. Chairman Wolden indicated that the County is charged with filling the vacancies with individuals who may have no fiduciary interest in the subject area. Anybody that is involved in the social services cannot be involved. Chairman Wolden indicated that this is a tremendous project to select the citizens to participate on this Board.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Rich Medved, Director.

Submittal by Skagit River Flood Control Committee Representatives.

Dave Brookings, Public Works Department Staff, introduced Chuck Bennett who presented a letter to the Board regarding the Skagit River Feasibility Study. The contents of the letter were briefly discussed wherein the Flood Control Committee that has been working on the Skagit River Plan was shocked and surprised over the decision not to proceed with the Skagit River Feasibility Study. Commissioner Hart stated that the Board appreciated the letter and the committee's work, that there is great concern for flood control and the obvious need to find a way as quickly as possible to study the situation. Commissioner Hart further indicated that the committee's work is very valuable to the entire process. Chairman Wolden concurred with Commissioner Hart's comments.

2. Signature - Resolution Establishing 1994 Skagit County Flood Control Grant Projects.

Dave Brookings presented to the Board the 1994 Skagit County Flood Control Grant Projects recommendations in the total amount of \$200,000. Mr. Brookings advised the Board that 16 applications were received for a total of \$218,697.93 in grant requests. Mr. Brookings briefly reviewed each of the projects and the dollar amounts involved and the specifics of each project were reviewed and discussed with the Board.

Commissioner Hart asked Staff if some of the items not funded may be funded in the future. Mr. Brookings confirmed that this is in fact the case. Some funding may not be entirely used and the individual districts have been instructed to advise if they will have excess funds.

Commissioner Hart moved to approve the recommendations for the Skagit County Flood Control Grant Projects in the total fund amount of \$200,000. Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved. (Resolution #15386)

3. <u>Discussion - Bow Hill Project.</u>

Rich Medved, Public Works Department Director, advised the Board that this is a continuation of the discussion on the Bow Hill Road Project. Mr. Medved briefly reviewed the efforts taken to present alternatives to maintain the character of the area and improve the subject roadway. It was stated that the Board needs to pick one of the design standards presented and proceed.

Chairman Wolden asked Mr. Medved to clarify the various criteria for this project.

Doug Barnet, County Engineer, reviewed the options of a three foot shoulder versus a six foot shoulder, of not completing the project as proposed, and going ahead with improving the alignment of the roadway.

Mr. Barnet presented to the Board two exhibits for their review. The first was a comparison of a 28-foot and 34-foot roadway section. The second exhibit was a breakdown of advantages and disadvantages of 34 foot roadways and 28 foot roadways and a list of items unaffected by roadway width. Mr. Barnet reviewed the typical roadway section specifics.

Mr. Barnet clarified for the Board the definition of a "Clear Zone." This is the total roadside border area, starting at the edge of the traveled way (lane edge stripe) which is available for safe use by errant vehicles. This area may consist of a shoulder, a recoverable slope, a non-recoverable slope, and/or a clear run out area. The desired width of such Clear Zone Areas is dependent upon the traffic volumes, speeds, and the roadside geometry. Mr. Barnet further indicated that a Clear Zone needs to be devoid of obstacles. Commissioner Hart confirmed that a Clear Zone does not have to be a paved shoulder. It was also pointed out that utilities try to get as far to the outside of the right-of-way area as possible.

Mr. Barnet briefly reviewed the advantages of a 34-foot roadway which include that the road will be safer, there is more recoverability, more shoulder road for emergency purposes, adheres to the current road standard in city/county design guide, will be easier to maintain a functional shoulder, more non-motorized use, consistent with development standards, corresponds with goals and policies of transportation element of Growth Management Act, and is consistent with past planning documents. The only disadvantage is more impact on the front yards (+3 feet) of those living along Bow Hill Road. It was Mr. Barnet's opinion that this design option provides for a 20-year design life of the roadway.

Mr. Barnet then reviewed the advantages of a 28-foot roadway. These advantages include that the roadway would be less costly to build, there will possibly be less impact on the slough, and less impact on the front yards of homeowners along Bow Hill Road. Disadvantages include an increase in the legal liability due to the deviation from the County road standards, that substandard design may set a precedent for future improvements, and the three foot restricted use shoulder is not as safe for the non-motoring public. Disadvantages may include non-road related use of right-of-way inside the clear zone. Mr. Barnet advised that this design option does not provide a 20-year design life, and may require substantial redesign in the future.

Mr. Barnet advised that Engineering feels strongly that the 34 foot roadway is the best design for a wide

variety of reasons and is consistent with current existing design guides and standards. Mr. Barnet asked the Board for direction in this regard.

Mr. Barnet stated that the County has obtained more than half of the rights-of-way required, and is still working with people trying to address their particular issues with the roadway improvements as proposed.

Commissioner Hart asked Mr. Barnet if the shoulder of the road is required to be all gravel or all asphalt, or could it be 3 feet of gravel and 3 feet of asphalt. Mr. Barnet stated that Engineering recognizes that there is a changing nature of what we are using the roads for. Mr. Barnet confirmed that a shoulder combining 3 feet of asphalt and 3 feet of gravel is possible.

Mr. Medved emphasized that every option presented, or combination of options, improves the road situation for Bow Hill Road.

Keith Padgett, 1346 Bow Hill Road, commended Mr. Barnet on selling this project to the Board. Mr. Padgett pointed out that several issues have not been discussed, and that the Board has been presented with facts and figures that Mr. Padgett believes have not been true. Mr. Padgett stated that the road is deficient based on the current speed limit and that the road deficiency would be reduced if the speed limit is reduced. Mr. Padgett also pointed out that many of the existing clear zones need improved maintenance by the County road crews and at this time of year, the grass has grown quite tall, up to 2 and 3 feet, making it is impossible to see around many of the corners. Mr. Padgett stated that 3-foot or 6-foot shoulders are of little concern to the residents as they do not want the road improved at all, except for re-paving and regular maintenance. Mr. Padgett stated that the options listed are not viable. Mr. Padgett asked if the funding is still available under other types of construction, or is it only available for new construction. Mr. Padgett suggested that perhaps there are other ways to upgrade the road such as regrading or resurfacing that could be funded by the state-allocated funds. Mr. Padgett reiterated that most traffic on the road is local traffic and that local people should have more say into what the road means to them. Mr. Padgett briefly discussed the placement of the centerline, the issue of trees being removed and guardrails installed, headlights pointing at homes, and the realigned roadway being too close to homes along the road.

Brad Furlong, an attorney representing Janet and Jeff Poplasky, homeowners on Worline Road, stated that he is amazed that the County is considering going forward with this project. Mr. Furlong expressed his belief that the Board is being bluffed into a decision based on what the engineers have to say. Mr. Furlong further indicated that the numbers of vehicles projected for the Bow Hill Road seem to be in error and therefore create a false picture. Mr. Furlong stated that the Growth Management Act (GMA) process will have a drastic effect on the County, and there simply will not be the accelerated growth as in the past. The impact to the Poplasky's will put the roadway right-of-way against their back fence and backyard. Mr. Furlong stated that one of the major problems of this project is the assumption that the County owns the 60 foot right-of-way and that right-of-way goes from the center of the roadway out. Mr. Furlong pointed out that the right-of-way should be the same as established in 1877 and that the county will have a difficult time proving that the roadway owned now is in the same place as in 1877.

Mr. Furlong further stated that this issue may end up in Superior Court, and that the County cannot walk in and take constituents' property simply for engineering expediency. Mr. Furlong urged the Board to look at the impacts to their constituents if this roadway improvement project proceeds.

Commissioner Hart asked Mr. Furlong when his clients purchased their property, and emphasized that the

pre-existing owner most likely knew of this road improvement project. Commissioner Hart indicated that Mr. Moon received a letter advising of the proposed road improvement schedule three years ago.

Several comments from the audience were made concerning the lack of communication by the County to the homeowners.

Don Shank, Rhododendron Cafe, 553 Chuckanut Drive, stated his concern that this road improvement project is like going for a Cadillac when only a wheelbarrow is required. Chuckanut Drive, which is a state highway and lacks shoulders of any kind, will have a "Cadillac" Bow Hill Road dumping on to it, and the two roadways are not compatible.

Paula Schefrancy, 2049 Prairie Road, stated that she feels paving and right of way requirements should be minimized to maintain the rural character of the communities involved, and that the people who live along the road should have input into the decisions made.

Bill Spyksma, Bow Hill Road, stated that the shoulders on the upper portion of this road have 3 foot gravel shoulders. Mr. Spyksma explained to the Board the difficulty he is having in selling his farm due to the uncertainty of the right-of-way and possible substandard setbacks.

Belinda Chambers, Bow resident, questioned whether there will be continued state funding to maintain the road or will the taxpayers of Skagit County have to pay for road maintenance. Ms. Chambers stated that number of estimated cars per day does not warrant the extensive road repairs or improvements proposed by the County, and urged the Board to retain the rural atmosphere of the area.

Chairman Wolden pointed out that there will be increased traffic as other areas pass to and from the Bow Hill area and that every road in Skagit County will see increased traffic over the next few years. Chairman Wolden stated that the Commissioners are charged with looking at the safety aspect of all rural roads.

Mr. Barnet briefly reviewed the process of road maintenance and improvements throughout the County.

Several of those present again pointed out the fact that the lack of maintenance along the road has caused many of the deficiencies.

Sylvia Padgett, Bow Hill Road resident, stated that the Commissioners should know exactly how the homeowners will be impacted by the improvements to the road, and that the Board must be responsible to the people who live on the road and pay taxes.

Keith Padgett, Bow Hill Road resident, stated that County Engineering is taking more heat that necessary concerning Bow Hill Road. Mr. Padgett applauded the efforts that are being made to make this road safer. Mr. Padgett expressed his dissatisfaction with the Commissioners, and stated he does not believe the Board has looked at this particular issue other than what the engineering department has presented to them. Mr. Padgett stated that looking at alternatives is much more difficult. Mr. Padgett stated his displeasure with Board not considering options reflective of the homeowners along Bow Hill Road.

On question from Mrs. Padgett, the Board indicated that they have visited and reviewed the subject road, but have not walked the road. Mrs. Padgettt indicated the need for the Engineering Department to expand on the disadvantages to the people on this road and respond to the needs of the homeowners.

Mr. Furlong suggested bringing in an independent consultant to look at what real growth will be. It was Mr. Furlong's opinion that there is bias and that it is time to take the Public Works Department off the hook and give the folks who live in the community some direction.

Commissioner Hart clarified that the remainder of Bow Hill Road has been improved. Commissioner Hart queried the citizens present on whether there are objections to having the road brought up to the standard of the rest of the road.

Mr. Padgett stated that the impact of the way the traffic moves in relationship to homes needs to be considered. Is the funding going to disappear if the County simply fixes the road in the current alignment?

Staff confirmed that the State money will disappear if not used for new construction.

Staff reiterated that County roads are in better shape that State roads. Chairman Wolden added that building a safe and up-to-date road with an engineered plan is advantageous rather than setting a precedent by allowing a substandard road which will mean a constant "catch-up" in the future.

In response to questions from the citizens in attendance, Commissioner Hart commented that communications concerning this matter were better than anticipated, and that letters were in fact sent out to those property owners affected by this roadway improvement. Chairman Wolden agreed that there had been adequate communication, but with any communication system there is always room for improvement.

Mr. Furlong suggested that improvements should be made to come up to a particular standard rather than come up to the highest standards. Mr. Furlong expressed his belief that there will be difficulties in obtaining the required rights-of-way. Mr. Furlong urged the Board to accept the responsibility as leaders to somehow meld safety issues with the concerns of homeowners, and to look at creative alternatives that may save the County money.

Commissioner Hart stated that there is a legitimate reason to continue improvement of the road under the standards that exist, and frankly cannot see anything more than a 3 foot shoulder in this area.

Mr. Padgett indicated that the homeowners merely want the road repaired and resurfaced, and the other options are not palatable to the homeowners.

Mrs. Poplasky stated that the Board has the responsibility to the taxpayers to balance standards and determine if the standards are too high in this situation.

Gus Anderson, Bow Hill Road Resident, stated his concern about 3-foot shoulders as opposed to 6-foot shoulders. It was Mr. Anderson's opinion that if the road is going to be rebuilt, it would be silly to stay with 3-foot shoulders from a safety standpoint. Mr. Anderson stressed that if the County is going to build the road, build it right.

Mr. Furlong suggested that perhaps for \$150,000 the problems of the road could be solved without impacting the homeowners.

The Board confirmed with Staff that the other portions of the Bow Hill Road have 11 foot driving lanes.

Mr. Medved indicated that case-by-case mitigation will be the addressed.

Commissioner Hart indicated that a work session may possibly be scheduled to review the public hearing process to further consider the alterations to the road. Public Works Staff stated that they will advise those present of the possible work session as soon as it is scheduled.

4. Miscellaneous.

Commissioner Hart was absent for the Miscellaneous portion of the Pubic Works Agenda.

- A. A brief discussion ensued concerning a small portion of land along Chilberg Road and Staff advised that the determination of the land's ownership will be made by August 1.
- B. Staff presented a Supplement to a contract with Parametrix, Inc. for additional work required regarding the Inman Study and Remediation project. This supplement adds \$15,112.72 to the original contract, bringing the total contract amount to \$866,228.33. Commissioner Robinson moved to approve the Supplement as presented by Staff. Chairman Wolden seconded the motion, which was unanimously passed. (Contract #01344)

CONSENT AGENDA.

Commissioner Robinson moved to approve the Consent Agenda for June 13, 1994 as presented by Staff. Commissioner Wolden seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

* Commissioners' Office:

- 1. Record of the Proceedings from Monday, June 6, 1994.
- 2. Record of the Proceedings from Tuesday, June 7, 1994.
- 3. Record of the Proceedings from Wednesday, June 8, 1994.
- 4. Interlocal Cooperative Agreement among Anacortes School District, City of Anacortes and Skagit County for a child and family treatment program for an estimated cost of \$30,200 with the City paying \$6,500, Skagit County paying \$6,500 and the District \$13,000, for the period July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995. (Contract #02057)

* Public Works:

- 5. Resolution Designation of Solid Waste Facility: Sunland Compost Facility at Dai-Zen Poultry Farm. (Resolution #15387)
- Supplement to a 1976 Forest Development Road Cooperative Agreement with the U.S. Forest Service for centerline and edge striping of 22.5 miles of highways/roads as detailed in Schedule "A" thereto. (Contract #02058)

- 7. Resolution Awarding Bid for Franklin Road #8220 to Sligar Construction for the sum of \$63,468.08. (Resolution #15388)
- 8. Resolution Awarding Bid for Chilberg Road to Wedco Construction, Inc. for the sum of \$1,313,343.40. (Resolution #15389)
- 9. Change Order No. 1 to Contract with Coral Construction Co. for Farm-to-Market Road guardrail project increasing the contract amount by \$12,112.50 to a new total contract amount of \$225,445.63. (Contract #02023)
- Supplemental Agreement No. 1 to Consulting Services Agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. concerning the North Fork Bridge Seismic Analysis. The Supplemental Agreement provides for additional services, additional contract time to complete this request and increases the estimated total contract amount from \$49,907.75 to \$113,372.75. (Contract #01797)
- 11. Resolution Calling for Public Hearing Regarding the Six Year Road Program 1995-2000. (Resolution #15390)
- 12. Resolution to Establish a New Plat Road as a County Road (Okerlund Drive). (Resolution #15391)
- 13. Supplemental Agreement No. 2 to the Agreement with Perteet Engineering, Inc. for the Cook Road/Old 99 Signalization project extending the time of completion 123 days. (Contract #01740)

* Health:

- 14. Resolution Approving a Waiver Request by Curtis Wayne Conrad to Waive the Fee Required to Install an On-Site Sewage System. (Resolution #15392)
- 15. Grant Agreement from the State of Washington Health Care Authority to provide primary health care services from July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995, in the total grant award amount of \$38,268. (Contract #02052)

* District Court Probation:

16. Probation Services Agreement with the City of Burlington for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, with the City paying the County \$4,000 for such services. (Contract #02053)

* Parks & Recreation:

- 17. Resolution Establishing a Change Fund for the Clear Lake Park Swim Beach. (Resolution #15393)
- * County Clerk:

- 18. Appointment and Oath of Office of Rosemary Alar, Deputy Clerk.
- * Emergency Management:
 - Personal Services Agreement with James Hannawalt to act as lead instructor for one 8-hour Hazardous Materials Operations Level Class for the sum of \$160 effective June 7, 1994 through June 17, 1994. (Contract #02054)
- * Facilities:
 - 20. Contract with Earl Hansen Trucking Company, Asphalt Division, for miscellaneous accessibility projects at Howard Miller Steelhead Park for the total contract sum of \$34,894. (Contract #02055)
- * Human Services:
 - 21. Professional Services Contract with Sharon M. Robinson for performance reviews in program areas such as community mental health, substance abuse/chemical dependency and developmental disabilities at a rate of \$30 per hour for a maximum of 225 hours for the period July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995. (Contract #02056)
- * Assigned Counsel:
 - 22. Resolution Appointing Leticia Alvarez-Gubitosi to the position of Assigned Counsel effective July 5, 1994. (Resolution #15394)
- * Juvenile Probation:
 - 23. Cell Phone Purchase/Use Contracts for two cellular phones for the Juvenile Probation Department at the rate of \$7.95 per month until terminated. (Contract #02043)

MISCELLANEOUS.

- A. Mike Woodmansee, Budget/Finance Director, presented to the Board a Personal Services Agreement with Tom Carlson to analyze the State of Washington's tax database to determine incorrect codings. He will keep 25% of the revenue he finds for the County as a result of his audit efforts. Commissioner Robinson moved to approve the Personal Services Agreement as presented by Staff. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved. (Contract #02051)
- B. Mr. Woodmansee requested that the Board authorize Renee Guerriello to execute agreements on the Board's behalf with Western Washington University, Skagit Valley College and Pacific Lutheran University regarding the Best Self Program. The Agreements are set up to be signed by an employee representative and must be submitted monthly. Commissioner Robinson moved to allow Ms. Guerriello to sign the Agreements as discussed. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

C. Staff presented to the Board the paperwork necessary to complete the purchase of the new Public Works Building. The Board executed the necessary documents.

BID OPENING - SENIOR CATERED MEALS.

Commissioner Wolden waived the reading of the Notice of Call for Bids, as published in <u>The Skaqit Argus</u>. The following bids for Senior Catered Meals were received and opened:

See attachment.

ADJOURNMENT.

Commissioner Robinson motioned to adjourn the proceedings. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Harvey Wolden Chairman

Robby Robinson, Commissioner

Robert Hart, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Patti J. Owen, Clerk

Skagit County Board of Commissioners

Skagit Nutrition Program Catered Meal Bids

		<u>1994</u>		<u>1995</u>	
			No. 1	No. 2	No. 3
A.	Affiliated Health Services (for Burlington/Sedro Woolley)				
	Congregate	<u>2.95</u>	3.05	3.05	·
	Hot Home Delivered	<u>3.23</u>	3.23	3.23	
	Frozen	<u>2.21</u>	2.45		No Bid
В.	<u>Island Hospital</u> (for Anacortes only)				
	Congregate	<u>2.65</u>	2.85	2.85	
	Hot Home Delivered	<u>2.95</u>	3.10	3.10_	
	Frozen	<u>1.85</u>	1.90	,	<u>No Bid</u>
	Transportation	<u>7.50</u>			
C.	OtherAirline Catering				Frozen
	Congregate				
	Hot Home Delivered				1.61 Aluminum 1.72 Microwave
	Frozen				
	Transportation				7.50/day
D.	Other				
	Congregate				
	Hot Home Delivered				
	Frozen				
	Transportation			VUL D	79 PAGE 147