## OFFICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

Prescott, Arizona January 26, 2000

The Board of Supervisors met in special session on January 26, 2000.

Present: Chip Davis, Chairman; Gheral Brownlow, Vice Chairman; John Olsen, Member; Bev Staddon, Clerk.

Also present: Jim Holst, County Administrator; Dave Hunt, Board Attorney/Assistant County Administrator; Randy Schurr, Deputy County Attorney; Richard Straub, Public Works Director.

ITEM NO. 1. Board of Supervisors.

- 1. Discussion and possible action regarding changing "Part B" of the Regional Road Construction Program, County Road Improvement District Partnering Program, to eliminate contribution limit of \$100,000. Mr. Holst provided a brief explanation of the development of the Regional Road Construction Program, saying that the current limit on contributions to County road improvement districts is 15% of the total project cost or \$100,000, whichever is less. He recommended that the Board eliminate the \$100,000 limit, saying that it would not affect sales tax revenues in any way. Supervisor Olsen moved to eliminate the \$100,000 limit. Supervisor Brownlow seconded the motion. In response to a question from Chairman Davis, Mr. Schurr said the 15% limitation applies to each project, and that the Board has the discretion to advance funds or to contribute funds provided the funds are available. Chairman Davis called for the vote, which carried unanimously.
- 2. Consider approval of items appearing on the Consent Agenda. Item 1 was approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Brownlow, second by Supervisor Olsen. No comments from the public. See Consent Agenda for detail regarding Item 2.

ITEM NO. 2. Resolve into Board of Directors of Coyote Springs Road Improvement District II. Study session for discussion only regarding the proposed project to pave Coyote Springs Road. Reference: Special district minutes.

ITEM NO. 3. Resolve into Board of Supervisors. Consider making a reimbursable contribution of up to \$300,000 from half-cent sales tax revenues to Coyote Springs Road Improvement District II for engineering services and right-of-way acquisition. Requires unanimous vote of the Board. Mr. Holst said that there had been discussion regarding the Board making funds for this district available through the Regional Road Construction Program at this time through a reimbursable contribution in order to pay for engineering services and in order to pursue condemnation for right-of-way, if necessary. He said it was his understanding that if the road improvement district did not move forward then the costs would be charged to the district, but that if the district did move forward the Board could consider giving up to \$300,000 as a permanent contribution. He said it was his understanding that if the County proceeded with condemnation it would not tie up construction of the project. Mr. Schurr noted that the district does not have the necessary easements to move forward with the project, and that there had been some discussion among staff regarding the possibility of requesting easements with reversionary clauses that would allow for the easements to revert to the property owners if the project is not completed within two years. He said there were some people who might not want to give up right-of-way and that if it is necessary to pursue condemnation it would also be necessary to obtain appraisals and title reports and that it would be necessary to go to court in order to obtain a judgment and that this would have to be completed before the

district could approve a resolution of intention to order improvements. He said that if the County wanted to consider making a contribution to the district outside of any bond issue to pay for condemnation costs, the district could move forward with the resolution of intention but the County's contribution would not be reimbursable. There was brief discussion regarding the engineering work being provided to the district by Sunrise Engineering, during which Sunrise representative Tom Liuzzo said that there were approximately 40 easements currently in place but that they were checkerboarded and that there were probably around 60 properties for which right-of-way was still needed. Coyote Springs residents Bob Launders and Fay Lawrence participated in discussion, with Mr. Launders saying he believed there were around 80 property owners along the road. Ms. Lawrence said there were 17 property owners who had not signed over easements and that the Coyote Springs Road Association would be holding a meeting on February 4 to try to get more easements. Supervisor Brownlow referred to the 15% match, asking how much money was available for this project. He also noted that as a result of the publicity regarding the Coyote Springs project another group was also interested in forming a road improvement district and receiving funding from the County. Supervisor Brownlow asked if the portion of state land involved in the project, which he said would probably be taken up with turn lanes on Highway 89A would be eligible for funding with impact fee revenues. Mr. Schurr said he believed it would be eligible. Supervisor Olsen moved to authorize a reimbursable contribution to Coyote Springs Road Improvement District II of an amount not to exceed \$300,000. Supervisor Brownlow seconded the motion. Chairman Davis said he was not sure that he was comfortable with it. He said it was known that there were many people who had not signed over easements, and that if the County was going to consider deviating from its road standard, then the people in Coyote Springs needed to help. Mr. Launders said that he and others would have to go back and tell people that the easements they had already signed over were meaningless because they did not provide for the necessary width. Chairman Davis said his concern was that the percentage of property owners who had signed petitions to establish the district was very low, and he asked if the number of people supporting the district would now drop because of the change in the width of the easements. Mr. Launders said he thought what would kill the project would be the cost. Supervisor Olsen said he believed that if people thought they would get their road paved they would sign on. Mr. Schurr noted that only the property owners on the west side of the road would need to give up additional easements. Mr. Holst said he believed that if the project moved forward, the Board would need to make a commitment to donate the \$300,000. He noted that Coyote Springs Road would become a public road, saying that the Board would not allow the road to be built to an unsafe standard if it was to be accepted by the County. He said that if the \$300,000 was approved for part of the construction it would help to offset those concerns. There was additional discussion regarding easements and potential costs, during which Mr. Schurr said it would be wise to meet with the road association once the 30% engineering plans are complete. He said at that point, if it appeared questionable whether the district could move forward, then questionnaires could be mailed to property owners to see how many people would be willing to support moving forward. He said that if the project died, the district could levy a tax to pay for the cost of engineering. Mr. Liuzzo pointed out that although additional right-ofway would need to be obtained along the west side of the road, the district also did not have all of the necessary right-of-way on the east side of the road. Mr. Straub said that in some drainage areas the County might also need to ask for a 20-foot easement in order to be able to clean drainage structures. Chairman Davis told those present that he believed they needed to move the 51% of property owners who had signed petitions to establish the district to 60% or 65% in order to make it work. He said the Board wanted to help, but if it was going to stick its neck out then the people in Coyote Springs needed to make him feel very comfortable that they are behind the Board in this effort. Coyote Springs resident Art Gustafson asked what would happen to people who cannot afford to pay the assessment. Mr. Schurr said the district would be assessed a tax levy to help pay off the debt and that the delinquent properties would go up for sale. Coyote Springs resident Olive Smith asked how much interest the bonds would carry for people who do not pay the entire amount up front. Mr. Schurr said the bonds would be municipal type bonds, but that the interest rate would depend on the market. Chairman Davis called for the vote, which carried unanimously.

ITEM NO. 4. Resolve into the Board of Directors of the Yavapai County Jail District. Discussion and possible action regarding architectural services for jail expansion. Reference: Special district minutes.

ITEM NO. 5. County Administrator Jim Holst.

1. Discussion regarding Yavapai County Facilities Plan. Mr. Holst provided a brief update regarding County facilities, focusing on the need for more space at the Gurley Street building for the Public Defender's

Office and the possibility that Medical Assistance, which is currently housed at Gurley Street, could be moved to a different location. He said that a building on White Spar Road might be available for Medical Assistance. Special Projects Coordinator Angelo Manera said he had not spoken to the owner of the building regarding some improvements that would need to be made pending the outcome of the meeting on this day. Supervisor Olsen said it seemed to him that if there was a building that could provide space for the Medical Assistance Department for the next few years then the Board should move in that direction. Supervisor Brownlow said he agreed. Mr. Holst briefly provided some information regarding the Fair Street site, saying that with the race track leaving it would be possible to build a second building on the site to house Planning & Building, Flood Control and Environmental Services, and to consider selling the Marina Street annex.

- 2. Discussion regarding the 2000-2001 budget process and numbers. Mr. Holst provided a brief overview of the current year budget and also provided information regarding his efforts towards putting together the 2000-2001 budget. He said that the implementation of the Yavapai County Jail District would result in a reduction in the General Fund because revenue to operate the jail would be available through the Jail District. He anticipated that the next year's budget would be approximately \$124,922,296, which he said was an approximately 4% increase over the current year, and that the County's primary property tax rate would drop from \$1.72 to \$1.62. There was brief discussion regarding salary-related issues, capital improvements and communication costs. Mr. Holst said that for the upcoming budget process he would like departments to be aware of the efforts that have been made to provide technology to help them do their jobs better. He said he believed the budget process would be very straightforward and that he did not expect much expansion in terms of personnel. He said he would like each Board member to let him know what specific issues they would like to have discussed during the budget process. Chairman Davis said some of his issues would include the employee classification system and acquiring more heavy equipment to allow the Public Works Department to do more in-house work. He said he would also like ten-year review information provided on each department, as was done last year, and that he would also like to have cost-of-living index information. Supervisor Brownlow said he would like to see some facts on what benefit there might be to having a grants writer and that he would also like to look at the idea of having a purchasing agent. There was brief discussion regarding a proposed initiative that would reduce the vehicle license tax to a flat fee and the impact that it could have on the County if it is on the ballot and passes. There was general agreement that the upcoming budget hearings should be spread out over a longer period of time but utilize half-day sessions. Supervisor Brownlow said he would like to see the Board make some decisions at the hearings so that department heads leave the hearing with some idea of what their budgets will look like.
- 3. Discussion on lot splits. Planning & Building Director Mike Rozycki participated in discussion. Mr. Hunt provided a brief update on the work of the Growing Smarter Commission, saying that one of the Commission's proposals was to require that a disclosure statement be filed when a lot split occurs and that another was to provide a separate set of standards for small subdivisions that would allow for administrative review instead of requiring approval through the Planning & Zoning Commission process. He said there was also a legislative proposal to reduce the number of allowed lot splits from five to three. Mr. Schurr pointed out that the state's counties are divided on their approach to this issue, saying he did not know how effective the County Supervisors Association would be with regard to it. Mr. Rozycki said he believed that if the Growing Smarter Commission did not come up with some good recommendations it would only add fuel to the Citizens Growth Initiative. Supervisor Olsen agreed, saying the Growing Smarter Commission needed to be encouraged to include recommendations that would encourage the public to go along with it. He said that disclosures need to follow the property, or they would be useless. He said he believed the County should determine its minimum requirements on lot splits and make sure that it is included in the legislation. Mr. Rozycki said he believed that the County first needs to support the recommendations of the Commission. There was brief discussion regarding the possibility of implementing a lot division ordinance such as that enacted in Coconino County. There was also brief discussion regarding the possibility of developing different standards for very small subdivisions, during which Mr. Rozycki indicated that if ADEQ review authority could be delegated to the County it would help make that idea work, but that he thought it would be better if the County could simply encourage subdivisions.
- 4. Schedule next study session. There was general agreement that the next study session would be on February 23, 2000, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

ITEM NO. 6. Public Works Director Richard Straub. Request to fund landscaping for the medians on Verde Valley School Road through VOCA, in the amount of \$15,000 with funds coming from deleted portion of road

contract for the Verde Valley School Road. Chairman Davis noted that the landscaping work was being done by volunteers, and following brief discussion regarding the best way to handle the funds, the Board voted unanimously to approve the request with the understanding that staff will work out the details regarding billing and the like. Motion by Chairman Davis, second by Supervisor Brownlow. No comments from the public.

CONSENT AGENDA FOR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS: Unless otherwise noted, approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Brownlow, seconded by Supervisor Olsen. No comments from the public.

- 1. Appoint Ash Fork Fire District Secretary/Treasurer Lewis Hume as Fire Chief to replace Carlos L. Luna, and appoint Ronald Muenks as Secretary/Treasurer to fill vacancy created by Mr. Hume's appointment to Fire Chief. A.R.S. §48-804(B).
- 2. Consider awarding construction contract for Cottonwood administrative building remodel to apparent low bidder, Shrader-Martinez, in the total amount of \$1,343,994 (includes base bid and alternates 1 and 2). Special Projects Coordinator Angelo Manera provided a brief explanation of the bids, saying that Shrader-Martinez had come in quite a bit lower than the next lowest bidder. Chairman Davis pointed out that this project had utilized a local architect and that the Board would be able to award the construction contract to a local contractor who would use local subcontractors. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Olsen, second by Supervisor Brownlow. No comments from the public.

ATTEST:		
	Chairman	Clork

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.