

BENTON-FRANKLIN BEHAVIORAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes | July 11, 2024

Call to Order: 2:01 PM

Introduction of Members: All voting and non-voting members introduced themselves.

Voting Members: Erin Petty (virtual), Sindi Saunders, Kevin Crowley, Chad Michael, BJ Olson, John Roach, Jason Bliss, Jim Raymond, Becky Grohs

Non-voting Members: Michele Gerber, Kyle Sullivan, Matt Rasmussen (virtual), Ryan Washburn (virtual), Carla Prock

Acting Clerk: Amanda Pearson

Opening remarks from BJ Olson; the work that they are doing has the potential to help the next generation. Thanked the people in the room.

Modified the Agenda: Discussion items will be: a presentation and discussion with Benton County Construction Manager, Riley Ollero, Bouten Architect, Jill Kurtz, and Bouten Project Manager, Brandon Potts; two resolutions, one regarding shared responsibility of stewardship of the Columbia Valley Center for Recovery and another enhancing communication and transparency; discussion around County contributions for betterments; discussion around sobering center.

MOTION: Jim Raymond moved to approve the modification. Jason Bliss seconded. Upon vote, motion carried.

Approval of Minutes from June 13, 2024: The committee members all reviewed the June 13, 2024, committee meeting minutes. Jason Bliss moved to approve the minutes as presented. Chad Michael seconded. The minutes were approved.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Discussion Items:

1. **Bouten Presentation: Betterments for the Recovery Center** – Riley Ollero, Jill Kurtz, Brandon Potts
 - a. M. Rasmusen introduced the speakers, Riley (Benton County), Jill (Bouten), and Brandon (Bouten), to speak about betterments and potential funding for the Recovery Center construction. Wanted to discuss these things and give a better understanding. To share a schematic update and review on target. What those additional dollars could do. Provided a memo with a list of betterments. The current budget allows for four of the betterments, but additional funding is needed to gain additional betterments.
 - b. The current renovation scope includes 40,000 square feet, but the building is 190,000 square feet. Additional funding would allow Bouten to upgrade a greater portion of the existing building to ensure can be improved in a much larger way. Code requirements for entire building (190,000

sq. ft.) are included in these upgrades just to be able to work on the 40,000 sq. ft. footprint. Having the ability to paint the exterior building one color would be great as well, instead of part of the building remaining the original pink color.

- c. The second item is related to building courtyards to allow for outdoor healing areas. Current budget has two very basic courtyards. Additional funding would allow for improvements to those courtyards and add two more courtyards (1 total for each program area, which is ideal).
- d. The third item on the betterments list was related to therapeutic environmental enhancements including built-in natural elements (wood, natural design features). The conversation focused on having funds to enhance the environment and rooms and add interesting architecture and interior design.
- e. Item number four is related to the secure drop off area. Current budget allows for a simple secure drop-off area. Additional funding would allow Bouten to enclose this drop-off area, which would help with privacy, safety, security and environmental concerns.
 - i. **Comment:** J. Raymond – The secure drop-off area needs to be enclosed.
 - ii. **Question:** J. Bliss – Thinking of utilizing the old ambulance drop-off?
 1. **Bouten** – East side of the main entrance is where it is anticipated to be. Unable to utilize the existing space of where the old ambulance drop-off is. Validation process analyzed multiple different options, most cost effective to put the program at the South portion of the building (newer portion, less upgrades to spend funds on).
 2. **Question:** J. Raymond – Who decided that?
 - a. **R. Ollero** – The executive team
 - b. **M. Rasmussen** – Validation report was based on economics and feasibility. Started with everything in the existing ER area as that would have been most desirable. But financially it did not pencil out to do it that way.
- f. Also mentioned on the list was the potential to change the current plan to provide double beds to allow for single beds in at least part of the facility, if not all.
 - i. **Question:** M. Gerber – Asked clarifying question related to the occupancy of each actual bed.
 1. **Bouten** – Clarified single and double occupancy rooms, not bed type.
- g. Item six is related to emergency power. Budget doesn't include emergency power services for some of the essential services like heating and cooling.
 - i. **Question:** J. Raymond - Asked about codes; wouldn't require generator backup power?
 1. **C. Michael** - Clarified that it would depend on the building.
 - ii. **Question:** J. Bliss - Asked about the building already having generators.
 1. **Bouten** – Shared that there would potentially be an opportunity to get them operational again.
- h. Lastly were the miscellaneous enhancements. However, presented on what they thought to be the most critical of them all.
- i. **Question:** C. Michael – Asked about the commercial kitchen; Not discussed because of the cost?
 - i. **Bouten** – This would fall under item seven and is something they are evaluating on with Benton County.
 - ii. **Question:** J. Raymond - Asked about how much the commercial kitchen would cost.
 1. **Bouten** – Anywhere around two to three million dollars (\$3.9 – hopefully that is a high estimate).
 2. **Question:** J. Roach - Asked about the timing to lock in the scope of the project related to decision dates and funding.
 - a. **Bouten** – Clarified that items can be added anytime within the process up until the building is turned over and is occupied, cost will just fluctuate. If

asking about adding items with no change in the projected schedule, it depends on the item.

- i. Commercial Kitchen: 1-2 weeks from now, if you want it open at the same time as highlighted in scheduled completion date.
 - ii. Single vs. Double Occupancy rooms: few weeks to a month.
3. **Question:** J. Bliss - Asked if the scope included the old dining hall being converted into a mess hall?
- a. **Bouten** – Current plan is to not utilize the old dining hall/kitchen from the old hospital, due to it being further north of the space that is being renovated. A new warming kitchen and dining area will be in the Spaulding building (further south in the old hospital). Food would be brought to the 4 different RTFs.
4. **Question** (from the audience, with no objection from Committee): Related to retrofitting the old kitchen and the footprint of the building. Question was already answered.

J. Raymond stated that he would like to make a motion. B. Olson asked for him to wait until that comes up on the agenda. Discussion related to when it should be brought up.

- j. **Question** (from the audience, with no objection from Committee): Asked for clarification on single vs. double occupancy, is that bringing just one unit from double occupancy or is that for all four units?
 - i. **Bouten** – Two separate items on the betterment list.
- k. **Comment:** J. Raymond shared his thoughts on the price range related to the cost of the commercial kitchen; 10-12 million dollars with 12 million being the high-end estimate.
- l. **Comment:** J. Roach made comments about creating a goal of the timing to provide a complete list of betterments.
- m. **Question:** K. Sullivan – Asked M. Rasmussen about a bi-county meeting.
 - i. **M. Rasmussen** – Nothing scheduled but agrees that ultimately needs to happen dependent on what comes out of the meeting today.
 - ii. **Comment:** J. Roach – Prospect of that meeting to come together in the next two weeks is unlikely. Recommendations can still be given to each set of Commissioners without a bi-county meeting taking place. Should include what this committee believes should be prioritized off the betterment memo.
 - iii. **Comment:** J. Raymond – Meeting with Franklin County on Wednesday (workshop setting) and will bring it up.
- n. **Comment:** M. Rasmussen – Spoke about varying opinions on the betterments. Including the debate on rooms whether it should be single or double. At some point those decisions should be made. Does the committee want to say which betterments they believe are more important than the others? Or does everyone unanimously agree that it is all of them? A decision will need to be made on this.

2. **County Contributions for Betterments**

- a. **Comment:** J. Roach - Shared the first recommendation would be to allocate money. Then, the second would be to *maybe* form an ad-hoc subcommittee in the next week that would come together, and go to the Benton and Franklin County Commissioners to present next week.
- b. **Comment:** M. Rasmussen - Clarified that \$5.9 million of behavioral health sales tax (from Benton County) will be going to the base funding for the construction project, not the betterments list.
 - i. **Question:** C. Michael – Asked about Franklin County’s portion of funding baseline funding.

1. **M. Rasmussen** – Clarified the finances and mentioned that Benton County is not officially asking Franklin County to attribute any dollars. Any requests will have been from movement(s) from citizens of Franklin County. Further clarified that the \$5.9 million is incorporated (not earmarked), making up the \$23 million base cost.
- ii. **Question: J. Raymond** – Believes Franklin County has around \$8.9 million from the tax revenue. Asked why not use the funds now to do it right and, in the meantime, taxes will be still collected for further funding every quarter.
 1. **M. Rasmussen** – Clarified that Benton County has ongoing expenses and dollars are already designated for those and looking at adding the field response program, but there is possibly an opportunity to add dollars. Mentioned something to consider is to instead of focusing on dollar amounts related to betterments, they focus on approval of items listed in priority order. Benton County is around roughly \$11 million from the tax revenue, but the \$5.9 is included in that number.

MOTION: Jim Raymond moved to adopt the July 11th memo (Bouten) as is and there be a 50/50 split of *up to, not to exceed*, \$12 million, between Benton and Franklin Counties. Jason Bliss seconded.
Amended below

Motion Discussion:

- i. Clarification about the commercial kitchen – C. Prock
- ii. Consider amending the motion to add the kitchen and acknowledge the dollar amount that Benton County has contributed already to meet the base amount. – J. Roach
- iii. Leave the dollar amount in. Any notion of a 50/50 split needs to at least recognize that \$5.9 million has already been spent out of Benton County’s tax revenue fund. – J. Roach
- iv. Not necessary to add the dollar amount from Benton County, as it was originally decided that Benton County would be contributing those funds for the base funding and Benton County is comfortable with that – M. Rasmussen
- v. Would this create an all in or out scenario? Could we potentially prepare a plan B recommendation to the Commissioners? – B. Grohs

POSED AMENDMENT: John Roach amended that it is recommended to both sets of Commissioners to use tax-revenue dollars to add all the betterments listed on Bouten’s July 11th memo with the potential addition of the commercial kitchen, which is not currently listed. Unclear who seconded, Jim Raymond accepted as an amendment. Upon vote, amendment carried.

AMENDED MOTION: Motion to recommend to both sets of Commissioners to use tax-revenue dollars to add all the betterments listed on Bouten’s July 11th memo with the potential addition of the commercial kitchen, which is not currently listed, and there be a 50/50 split of *up to, not to exceed*, \$12 million, between Benton and Franklin Counties. A vote was called. Upon vote, motion carried.

Motion Discussion:

- i. Just for clarity, there will still be a sub-group created to prioritize betterments. – C. Michael
- c. **Comment: BJ Olson** – The next part of the discussion is to prioritize the betterments.
 - i. **Comment: J. Roach** – Just passed a recommendation to the Commissioners that they fund all the betterments listed. Ad hoc sub-committee is still needed to prioritize those. Prioritization should be biased towards program availability and capacity.

- ii. **Comment:** M. Rasmussen – Stated he thought it would be good to have a formal recommendation of the full list prioritized and important to have a discussion around it.
- iii. **Discussion:** J. Roach, BJ Olson – Composition of the group: representation from both Counties’ mental health representatives and current contractor, at least.

MOTION: John Roach moved to form an ad hoc committee made up of representatives of Benton and Franklin Counties, the current service provider - Comprehensive, the Coalition, the mental health and substance use sub-committees, to discuss, assess, and validate a prioritized list of the betterments to further inform the Commissioners as they discern what they want to do with the tax money. Becky Grohs seconded. **Amended below**

Motion Discussion:

- i. Would like to add that the contractor be part of that conversation. – B. Grohs
- ii. Add a person to get them together and would anybody like to volunteer. – BJ Olson

POSED AMENDMENT: BJ Olson amended to add Becky as the chair of the ad hoc committee. Jim Raymond seconded. Upon vote, amendment carried.

AMENDED MOTION: Motion to form an ad hoc committee, chaired by Becky Grohs, and made up of representatives of Benton and Franklin Counties, the current service provider – Comprehensive, the Coalition, the mental health and substance use sub-committees, the contractor – Bouten, to discuss, assess, and validate a prioritized list of the betterments to further inform the Commissioners as they discern what they want to do with the tax money. A vote was called. Upon vote, motion carried.

- d. **Comment:** M. Gerber – The Recovery Coalition is ready to pay for the indoor fitness area, and if something is needed in writing, they are ready.

3. **Resolution Presentation (2 separate Resolutions)** – BJ Olson

- a. (1) **Shared Responsibility and Stewardship of the Columbia Valley Center for Recovery**
 - i. Resolution was read aloud

MOTION: BJ Olson moved to approve the Resolution on Shared Responsibility and Stewardship of the Columbia Valley Center for Recovery. John Roach seconded. No discussion. Upon vote, motion carried.

- b. (2) **Enhancing Communication and Transparency**
 - i. Resolution was read aloud

MOTION: BJ Olson moved to approve the Resolution on Enhancing Communication and Transparency. Jason Bliss seconded. After discussion, upon vote, motion carried.

Motion Discussion:

- i. Number three in the Resolution (Scheduled updates to County Commissioners)
 1. Communication to Franklin County is not always occurring
 2. Believed that both sets of Commissioners have not been meeting regularly for updates
 3. Same information and updates should be shared and distributed with each Board
 4. BJ Olson shared his responsibility as chair to maintain that communication

- i. A presentation will be put together near the end of August that can be shared and presented to any entity on updates for the project.
 - ii. Idea to present the minutes to both Boards for their information.
- 5. Further discussion about how often the board should be updated and how to continue improving the level of communication, including utilizing the Communication sub-committee.
- 6. Comment was made regarding the Recovery Coalition and clarifying that on the BHAC, the Coalition is **not** a voting member.

4. **Sobering Center Update** – BJ Olson

- a. No contract for the sobering center as of yet.
- b. Mauricio (from audience) updated the committee on an upcoming meeting on July 29th, with the City of Pasco regarding codes.

MOTION: Jim Raymond moved to reaffirm the committee is in favor of a temporary Sobering Center at Our Lady of Lourdes for no more than a year. Becky Grohs seconded. After discussion (after Point of Order), upon vote, motion carried.

- POINT OF ORDER –

BJ Olson stated the committee can approve to extend the meeting an additional 10 minutes, if no objection. Being no objection, the discussion continued.

Motion Discussion:

- i. While in support of a sobering center, would like to revisit the contract with such a time gap from the last discussion with Lourdes. – B. Grohs
- ii. The substance of the motion is to reaffirm the committee's favor of the center, not specifically the details for now. – J. Roach
- iii. Not worth it, at this point in the timeline to establish that organization. – M. Gerber
- iv. Is there a discussion to be had on the dollars, whether it would be better to focus those funds on the temporary sobering center or to put it towards the betterments on the full facility. – K. Sullivan
- v. Since the initial vote in favor, with the increase in costs from Lourdes and timeline change, it would be appropriate to make a new motion to state the committee is still in favor of the temporary sobering center, if so. – BJ Olson
- vi. Conceptually yes, the sobering center is needed. But a more developed budget and better concrete plan for services delivered would help. – C. Michael
- vii. Provided clarity on Lourdes' request for funding; related to operational costs. – A member of the public

Public Comment:

- 1. **Member of the public** - Thanked the committee and shared that they were hopeful of the collaboration between both sides of the river.

Other Business:

MOTION: Jason Bliss moved that the committee make a formal recommendation that the Commissioners meet for a Bi-County meeting. Jim Raymond seconded. After discussion, upon vote, motion carried.

Motion Discussion:

- i. Will this come as a request? - B. Grohs asked if this comes as a request.

- ii. It was clarified that the members will inform the Commissioners.
1. **M. Rasmussen** – After reviewing the bylaws, new chair is appointed at the first meeting of each calendar year – vote will take place in January.
2. **BJ Olson** – Save the Date / Ribbon Cutting for Lourdes renaming: Thursday, **August 1st, 2024**
3. **M. Gerber** – Annual 5K Run for Recovery – **September 14th, 2024**

Adjourned: 3:50PM