

OFFICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

Prescott, Arizona

December 17, 2001

The Board of Supervisors met in regular session on December 17, 2001.

Present: Gheral Brownlow, Chairman; Lorna Street, Vice Chairman; Chip Davis, Member; Bev Staddon, Clerk.

Also present: Jim Holst, County Administrator; Dave Hunt, Board Attorney/Assistant County Administrator; Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr.

ITEM NO. 1. Board of Supervisors.

1. Resolve into the Yavapai County Board of Equalization and consider Notice of Claim for correction to the tax roll for a refund for Bashas', Inc. for tax years 1998, 1999 and 2000, for personal property numbers 13-1003096-01-3, 13-8401193-01-4, 13-8701339-01-3, and 13-9250558-01-2. Reference: Board of Equalization minutes.
2. Resolve into Board of Supervisors. Consider approval of items appearing on the Consent Agenda for Board of Supervisors and on the Consent Agenda for Special Districts. Unless otherwise noted, all items were approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Street, Second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public. See Consent Agenda for details.

ITEM NO. 2. Public Works Director Richard Straub.

1. Consider accepting the roads in Mira Monte Vistas Subdivision as fully-maintained County roads. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Street, second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.
2. Consider approval of an amount not to exceed \$101,436 for right-of-entry and down payment to the Arizona State Land Department for right-of-way needed for the New Fain Road, Prescott Valley area. Half-cent sales tax project. Mr. Straub said he had been informed by the state that this was the final price for the land, which he said was comprised of 50 acres. Upon a motion by Supervisor Street, seconded by Supervisor Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve this request. No comments from the public.
3. Consider adoption of the revised Yavapai County Disaster Plan and Guides, and approval of Letter of Promulgation. Emergency Services Director Nick Angiolillo participated in discussion. Chairman Brownlow said he had read most of the plan and wanted to commend Mr. Angiolillo for a job well done. Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Street, and with no comments from the public, the Board voted unanimously to approve the plan and the Letter of Promulgation.
4. Consider approval of Authorization of Services No. 018880 with Earth Tech, Inc., in the amount of \$21,662 for Design Services on Mingus Avenue Extension Project for Traffic Signal and Turn Lane Revisions at the State Route 89A Intersection. Half-cent sales tax project. Approved by unanimous vote after Mr. Straub pointed out that the City of Cottonwood had agreed to pay half the cost. Motion by Supervisor Street, second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.
5. Consider approval of a resolution to take by eminent domain land needed for the Hillcrest-Butterfield Extension. Half-cent sales tax project. Mr. Straub said that while preparing revisions on the project due to some changes requested by the Arizona State Land Department, his department had found that by purchasing another 5,000 square feet of right-of-way grades on the road could be lowered from 18% to 12%. Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Street, the Board voted unanimously to approve Resolution No. 1318.
6. Discussion and possible action regarding sidewalks policy. Mr. Straub told the Board that he was bringing this policy forward as a result of a number of requests pending for County participation in sidewalks. Mr. Schurr provided the Board members with a copy of the City of Prescott's sidewalk ordinance, saying that he did not believe the Board necessarily had to adopt a policy on this day.

He explained that the City of Prescott's ordinance required property owners adjacent to sidewalks to maintain them in good order. In response to a question from Supervisor Davis, Mr. Schurr said the County could require property owners to be responsible for sidewalks. He said that the County designed public roadways for vehicular traffic, and that if it was going to design sidewalks for public use it would need to ensure that the sidewalks are kept in reasonable condition. He added that the County had received claims from people falling on the sidewalks at the Courthouse Plaza, but that it rarely if ever received a complaint from someone falling while walking alongside a road. Supervisor Street said it was one thing to help someone make improvements, but she asked what would happen if someone did not want to give up right-of-way for a sidewalk. Mr. Schurr said there was also a question about what constitutes a sidewalk. He said a sidewalk was an area on the side of a vehicular right-of-way for people to walk on. He said the area did not have to be improved to any particular standard, and that the County could say the sidewalk had to be inside the public right-of-way. Mr. Schurr said if the area fell outside of the right-of-way it would not be a sidewalk, but instead would be a trail. Supervisor Davis said he believed that a sidewalk should minimize the potential for accidents. Mr. Schurr said there were rules for pedestrians and bicyclists, but that County roads were designed for vehicular traffic. Supervisor Davis said he would like to see the Board move forward with this issue. He said that if the Board was going to approve high-density development then it needed to be responsible for providing safe pedestrian access. He said that in this particular situation, a school district was willing to pay for the project and to accept responsibility. He said this was an opportunity for the Board to help create safe neighborhoods. He asked if it would be possible to specify in the policy that sidewalks or pathways must be adjacent to County roads. Mr. Schurr reiterated that if it was outside of the right-of-way it was a trail and not a sidewalk. Supervisor Street said that school districts obtain adjacent ways funds as the result of the school board imposing a property tax on all property owners in the district. She said there were two school districts in her district that were willing to look at imposing an adjacent ways tax in order to figure out how to get kids to school. Supervisor Davis said he believed the issue of adjacent ways funds was a school board issue. Mr. Schurr said the policy item had been placed on the agenda because staff was not receiving clear direction regarding the issue. Chairman Brownlow said the Board needed to be careful because if there was going to be a policy every neighborhood was going to want sidewalks. Supervisor Davis said he believed that was a good thing because it could result in safer neighborhoods. Supervisor Street said she did not think it was the County's job to maintain or insure sidewalks. Mr. Schurr said it was really a question of whether the County could do it. Chairman Brownlow asked Mr. Schurr if he was suggesting using paragraph "A" from the City of Prescott's ordinance as the County's policy. Mr. Schurr said he was, and that it could be expanded upon. He added that the Board might want to consider enacting an ordinance instead of just a policy. Supervisor Davis moved to hold this item in abeyance and to direct staff to continue working on a policy to address the Board's concerns. He said he would also like staff to look into what other counties are doing with regard to sidewalks. Mr. Schurr said that counties typically do not maintain sidewalks. Supervisor Davis added that the Board would be moving forward with the intergovernmental agreement with the Sedona-Oak Creek School District. Supervisor Street seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote. No comments from the public.

7. Discussion and possible action regarding participation in the Central Yavapai Association of Governments (CYAG). Mr. Straub told the Board that for the last 17 or 18 years, central Yavapai County had had a transportation planning organization that had worked very well to distribute about \$700,000 per year in federal transportation funds. He said the area was now moving toward a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), and that CYAG had been set up as an interim organization. Mr. Straub said there were differing opinions about what CYAG should do, and that he felt the Board needed to approve the County having representatives to CYAG and also approve the County continuing to provide staff support for the organization. He said there was an intergovernmental agreement that had been signed by Prescott, Prescott Valley and Chino Valley, but that it had not been signed by the County, the Yavapai Prescott Tribe, or ADOT. Supervisor Davis said he had heard that Chino Valley was having second thoughts about CYAG. Mr. Straub said he had heard that Chino Valley was concerned that it might not be aware of all the facts. He said he was concerned that with the new organization funding would only go to the designated MPO area, which he said would be different from the planning area. He said he had heard that some entities were concerned about that. Chairman Brownlow asked if anyone had actually seen anything indicating that. Transportation Planning Engineer Mike Willett said ADOT had confirmed

it. Mr. Straub said he was concerned about the funding because the County had rural areas outside the MPO for which it would want funding. Prescott Valley Public Works Director Larry Tarkowski said the group had received mixed signals from ADOT about the planning boundaries, and that the most recent discussion regarding the issue had been about the boundaries not being too large. He said that the transition from the Central Yavapai Transportation Planning Organization (CYTPO) to CYAG would take some time. Mr. Tarkowski told the board that when Flagstaff was declared an MPO it had taken that area nearly two years to get everything in place, and that during that time funding was in limbo. He said that CYAG was trying to ensure that the tri-city area would be ready to make funding decisions once the MPO declaration was granted. He encouraged the Board to designate a representative to CYAG as well as appropriate technical staff so that CYAG could continue working out the details regarding the impending MPO. Mr. Schurr said it was his understanding that the intergovernmental agreement was not just for the MPO but that it also anticipated that CYAG would be involved in other planning functions. Mr. Tarkowski acknowledged that there had been discussions to that effect. Mr. Schurr said he had just wanted to clarify that issue. He told the Board that no one knew what the boundaries of the MPO would be. He said he had no objection to the County continuing to provide representation with regard to transportation planning activities but that there was not enough information to enter into an agreement with CYAG at this time. Mr. Hunt referred to the City of Prescott's amendment to the agreement requiring a majority vote of the entities, saying it seemed to him that approvals would require the vote of five of the six entities contemplated to be part of CYAG, or a supermajority. Mr. Tarkowski said that Prescott had asked for a simple majority, that Prescott Valley wanted a supermajority, and that he believed Chino Valley wanted to require a unanimous vote. Mr. Hunt asked if it was true that under the current agreement five of the six entities could approve a different planning direction than what the sixth entity wanted. Mr. Tarkowski said it was true. Supervisor Street said that through CYTPO, the entities had just worked together. She said that until an MPO was declared, there really was no reason for an intergovernmental agreement. She said the MPO was being forced on the area because of population, but that as far as she was concerned once the MPO was established it would be just another partnership for the County to work with, and that it should deal only with transportation issues. Mr. Holst said he believed what had brought the Board to this point was that the staffs of the various entities had met and thought there was the basis for an agreement, but that other issues had been raised later. He said he believed that staff needed to sit down and see if it could determine where each of the governing bodies was coming from. He told the Board that it was not a minor thing to start an organization that was based on voting and majorities instead of on consensus, saying that all of the decisions made by CYTPO had been reached by consensus. Chairman Brownlow introduced Prescott Valley Council Member Mike Flannery, who he said was the chairman of CYAG. Chairman Brownlow said he had concerns about the majority vote provision in the agreement and about the section of the agreement that provided for removal of a jurisdiction for disagreeing with the CYAG budget. He said that until the state was ready to answer some questions, he was not ready to sign the agreement and that he believed everyone involved should be very careful. He asked if the Board could approve continuing participation in the CYAG meetings. Supervisor Street agreed with Chairman Brownlow, saying the Board should not sign the intergovernmental agreement but should continue to participate in meetings and that perhaps eventually a new IGA could be developed. Mr. Straub told the Board that his department was serving as the staff to CYAG and that this involved a small cost of about \$400 to \$500. He asked if the Board had any problem with continuing in that role. Supervisor Street asked if the other jurisdictions were participating equally. Mr. Straub said they were not, and that the County had agreed to take on that role in the interim before the MPO is established. Supervisor Davis said he did not see why people felt this was a complicated issue. He said that CYTPO had been in effect for many years and had provided transportation planning. He said that when the MPO was declared, its purpose would be to do transportation planning. Mr. Straub said that was correct, and that the MPO would only pay for transportation. Supervisor Davis said if CYTPO was already in place providing transportation planning, he did not see where there was a problem. Mr. Holst said the problem was that CYTPO had been disbanded. Supervisor Davis said that with regard to the staffing issue, it was agreed that the County would provide staffing for the transportation planning organizations in both the Verde Valley and Prescott areas. He said that if CYTPO was disbanded, then the staff support agreement was gone as well. He said he did not understand why CYTPO was disbanded. Chairman Brownlow said that the MPO was mandated to hire staff. Supervisor Davis and Supervisor Street said there was no MPO at this point. Supervisor Davis said he believed this issue was premature, pointing out that the

intergovernmental agreements signed by Prescott, Prescott Valley and Chino Valley did not match. He asked how many MPOs there were in the state. Mr. Straub responded that Flagstaff, Yuma, Tucson and Phoenix were MPO. He said that he had looked at what happened when Flagstaff and Yuma became MPOs and had found that there was no county relationship in those areas and that becoming an MPO had been difficult. He said that in Yavapai County's case there was nothing broken because the County had brought everyone together to work on transportation planning. He said he believed the problem in this case was that some entities wanted to expand the responsibilities beyond transportation planning. Supervisor Davis said he could see that, and that problems did arise from land use planning not being coordinated with transportation planning. Chairman Brownlow said he was hearing that the Board was okay with having the County participate in CYAG and obtain more facts, and that continuing staff support was also appropriate. Supervisor Street said she had no problem with it, but that she wanted to make clear that participation did not necessarily mean the Board would be willing to sign an intergovernmental agreement.

8. Consider approval of items appearing on the Consent Agenda for Public Works. All items on the Consent Agenda for Public Works were approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Street. No comments from the public.

CONSENT AGENDA FOR PUBLIC WORKS: All items were approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Street. No comments from the public.

1. Consider approval of Extensions for Completion for Services to Various Authorizations of Services, for which no additional funds are required. Half-cent sales tax projects.
2. Consider approval of additional escrow fees in an amount not to exceed \$500 for the Heather Heights Project. Half-cent sales tax project.
3. Request for permission to dispose of six old storage trailers and old road culverts currently located at the Public Works facility in Camp Verde.
4. Award or reject bids received for the Cottonwood Street Canal Bridge, Yavapai County, Arizona, Project #209907. Bids opened December 4, 2001, with bids received as follows: SPE Systems, Inc., \$76,852; Vastco, Inc., \$79,700; Critco, Inc., \$79,965; JMS Excavating & Grading, \$84,256; J. Banicki Construction, \$87,175; and ACT Contracting, \$97,600. Recommend awarding to low bidder SPE Systems, Inc., in the amount of \$76,852.
5. Consider approval of Amendment No. 6 to ADOT Grant EN514 (Sedona Airport), to extend grant to June 30, 2002.
6. Consider approval of Amendment No. 1 to ADOT Grant E1119 (Sedona Airport), to extend grant to June 30, 2002.
7. Consider approval of Amendment No. 2 to ADOT Grant E0120 (Seligman Airport) to extend grant to June 30, 2002.
8. Request for permission to renew 10-year lease with the Arizona State Land Department for the Skull Valley transfer station in the amount of \$1,500 per year, subject to future increases. To be paid from Solid Waste/Skull Valley/Bldg.-Land Rental account.

ITEM NO. 3. Fleet Management Director Dave Burnside. Approve or reject bids for vehicle additions or replacements for the 2001-2002 fiscal year. Bids opened November 20, 2001. Mr. Burnside told the Board that the recommended bids were all under budget. He said that this year State Contracts had selected the Impala from an out-of-state dealership and that he would like to purchase five cars from State Contracts. He said that Lamb Chevrolet came in \$15 over the State Contracts amounts and that he would like to award them a bid as well. He told the Board that the rest of the recommendations were based on low bid. Chairman Brownlow asked whether it would be better for the County to award the bids to Lamb Chevrolet because at least the County would be able to keep the County half-cent sales tax and get a share of the state shared sales tax revenue. Mr. Burnside said he could crunch some numbers to see how that would work. In response to a comment from Chairman Brownlow, Mr. Schurr said other County taxes involved would be the Jail District sales tax and the Flood Control District. Mr. Hunt told the Board it might need to consider rejecting the bids presented on this day and going out to bid again. Mr. Schurr said that in the past the Board had not considered sales tax in the bid process. Supervisor Davis moved to hold this item in abeyance. Supervisor Street seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote. There were no comments from the public.

ITEM NO. 4. Development Services Director Ken Spedding and Senior Planner Elise Link. Planning and zoning. Permitting & Compliance Director for the Cottonwood Division, Enalo Lockard, participated in presentation and discussion. Planning & Zoning Commission member Helmut Woellmer was present to represent the Commission.

1. Consider approval of items appearing on the Consent Agenda for Planning & Zoning, for which there were no protests at the Planning & Zoning Commission hearing. Items 1. and 2. on the Consent Agenda were approved by unanimous vote, upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Street, and with no comments from the public. The Board took no action on Item 5. See Consent Agenda for detail regarding Items 3. and 4.
2. Consider approval of the Yavapai County General Plan Phase I Draft, Planning & Zoning Commission, #1017. Consideration of the Yavapai County General Plan Phase I Draft for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Yavapai County General Plan Phase I Draft with the understanding that the consultant may make minor revisions prior to the Board of Supervisors Meeting. Ms. Link introduced General Plan Consultant Dava Hoffman of Dava & Associates, saying that what the Board was considering on this day was the culmination of more than six months of meetings, outreach and educational programs. She said the intent of the Plan was compliance with the Growing Smarter Act, and that last month the Planning & Zoning Commission had given the Plan draft its unanimous approval. Ms. Link told the Board that next year the Board would still be able to make amendments and revisions to the Plan. Chairman Brownlow thanked Ms. Hoffman and the Development Services Department staff for a job well done. He called for comments from the public. Esther Talbert asked for clarification on land use goals, and whether the Plan's stated goals meant that lot splits in rural areas would have to be more than five acres and whether people would be able to vote on the Plan. Mr. Schurr said the Plan provided general objectives for the entire County and that it did not mean that the Board would automatically rezone property. Supervisor Davis said that citizen input indicated that people did not want to see the County chopped up, but that there were still private property rights that had to be considered. Phil Terbell said he thought the Plan was a great beginning, but that he was concerned about the regulatory direction it seemed to be taking and what the economic impact might be. He said he believed the County needed to provide user-friendly processes to both residential and commercial development, and that the County could not afford to be just environmentally sensitive. Ron Volkman said he was representing the Sedona-Verde Valley Association of Realtors and that he wanted to applaud the drafters of the Plan for being able to incorporate the public comments into a readable document. He asked if the Plan was being adopted as a working draft that would not be given to the Commission as a new document to be used in decision-making. Mr. Schurr said the Plan would replace the existing County plan except for the specific plans that were incorporated into it by reference. He said that the current County land use map and land use categories in the Ordinance would remain in effect. In response to comments from Mr. Volkman, Supervisor Davis said he believed one of the concerns was whether the Board could amend the Plan. He said the Board could do that. Mr. Schurr said that was true, and that the Board could do minor amendments to the Plan at any time. Mr. Volkman said he was concerned about what would happen to applicants after January 1<sup>st</sup> if someone wanted to challenge a proposed development and the specifics to be developed in Phase 2 were not in place. Mr. Schurr said it was his opinion that the elements of the Plan satisfied the requirements of Growing Smarter Plus. In response to a question from Mr. Volkman, Mr. Schurr said no one knew at this time what the time frame was for the development of Phase 2. Supervisor Street said she thought it was fair to say that Phase I was the compilation of public input and that it did not necessarily mean the County would reach all of the goals included in the Plan. She said that with regard to new subdivisions, the County still had all of its zoning and processes in place and that those would not change in January. Supervisor Davis moved to approve the General Plan Phase I Draft. Supervisor Street seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.
3. Use permit and Amendment to the Big Park Community Plan to allow the operation of a youth center with the Church of the Nazarene in an R1L-35 zoning district, 405-28-271A, Village of Oak Creek area, John Lupo, Boys & Girls Club of America agent for Village of Oak Creek Church of the Nazarene, #1045. Consideration of a Use Permit and an Amendment to the Big Park Community Plan to allow the operation of a youth center within the Church of the Nazarene in an R1L-35 [Residential; Single Family Limited; thirty-five thousand (35,000) square feet minimum lot size] Zoning District on approximately 2.04 acres. Located on the west side of Rojo Drive approximately two hundred eighteen (218) feet west from its

intersection with Highway 179 in the Village of Oak Creek area. Located in SEC 24 TWN 16N R5E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Use Permit and Community Plan Amendment subject to the following stipulations: 1). Use Permit on a 5 year, non-transferable basis as per the letter of intent dated October 12, 2001; 2). Minor amendment to the Big Park Community portion of the General Plan to allow a Boys and Girls Club Facility on the subject parcel, which is designated for low-density single family residential; 3). Signage allowed on the subject parcel, including church and Boys and Girls Club uses to not exceed the standards set forth in Section 118 F.1.b for a single family residence; 4). Screening requirement in Section 108 B of the Ordinance for non-residential uses abutting residential zoning shall be waived; 5). Development of the property shall be in conformance with all other applicable standards and regulations in the Planning and Zoning Ordinance, unless waived by the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Link told the Board she believed the main reason for opposition to this application was a stipulation waiving the screening requirement. She said that the club had been at its current location for about a year without any problems related to screening, adding that the club was looking at relocating to a more permanent facility within the next three to five years. Supervisor Davis asked if it would be possible to delete the stipulation regarding screening and invoke the Screening Ordinance, saying he thought everyone would be happy if screening was required. Chairman Brownlow said there was no mention of what type of screening might be required or what it might cost. Mr. Schurr said he believed the Commission had felt that strict compliance with the Ordinance was not necessary in this case and that the applicant would voluntarily address the concerns of neighbors. Supervisor Davis said if the Board was going to address the screening issue it might also consider addressing the safety issue and make it cost-effective for the Boys & Girls Club. He said that fencing was needed in the play area, and asked if trees could be planted between the parking lot and the Heitmann property. Mr. Lupo, who said he was Director of Operations for the Boys & Girls Club, told the Board he would be more than willing to put up screening and plant trees between the parking lot and the Heitmann property and that a year in which to accomplish that would be sufficient. He said that the basketball court area was the only outside area used by the club, and that it did not use the area next to the Heitmann property. Hans Heitmann presented the Board with photographs of the subject property, saying he did not like fences but that he did not know what else could be done to keep the children confined. He said he believed that if the fencing or screening requirements were waived the County would be liable. In response to a question from Supervisor Davis, Mr. Heitmann said he would be happy with vegetative screening but that he was not willing to share in the cost of it. Area resident Richard Byrnes urged the Board to approve the application for the sake of the children in the area. Dorothy Hores, who said she was representing the Recreation Committee of the Big Park Regional Coordinating Council, said her organization was trying very hard to find facilities for children in the area, and that she hoped the Board would approve the application. Area resident Joan McClelland said she agreed with the comments of Mr. Byrnes and Ms. Hores, but that she did not understand why it was necessary to amend the Big Park Community Plan because that plan called for facilities for children. She asked the Board to approve the application. Mr. Woellmer said he was speaking on behalf of the three Commission members who voted against this application, saying their votes in opposition were not because they were opposed to the Boys & Girls Club but because they felt that neighbors have rights. He said that screening was very important and that he and the other two Commission members would have no objection to what the Board was proposing. He said that people in the area had indicated they would like to see this use reviewed in one year. Supervisor Davis moved to approve the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission with stipulation #1 to be changed to add "with staff review in one year" and stipulation #4 to read as follows: "Screening with vegetative screening every fifteen feet on center along the western property line and abutting the first 50 feet of Rojo Drive with fencing between the basketball court and the road to be installed within one year." In response to a question from Ms. McClelland about why the Big Park Community Plan had to be amended, Mr. Schurr said it was necessary because the community plan showed the area and subject property as residential. Supervisor Street seconded the motion. Mr. Woellmer said he believed the stipulation should refer to 15-gallon trees every ten feet. Supervisor Street said she believed stipulation #4 was fine as stated in Supervisor Davis' motion. Chairman Brownlow called for the vote, which carried unanimously.

4. Use permit to allow the continued operation of a childrens' daycare facility in an R1-18 zoning district, 406-07-013Q, Bridgeport area, Carol Scanlan and Cindy Wakefield, \$1046. Consideration of renewal of a Use Permit to allow the continued operation of a children's daycare facility in an R1-18 [Residential; Single Family, eighteen thousand (18,000) square feet minimum lot size] Zoning District on approximately

.29 acres. Located on the east side of Kelli Lane approximately two hundred (200) feet south from its intersection with S.R. 89A in the Bridgeport area. Located in SEC 01 TWN 15N R3E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Use Permit Renewal subject to the following stipulations: 1). Use Permit to be granted for a period of 5 years on a non-transferable basis in accordance with the letter of intent and a revised site plan for a maximum of 50 children; 2). Revised site plan to be submitted prior to BOS consideration and approval for parcels 406-07-013Q and 013S for traffic circulation and parking; 3). Drinking Water must meet ADEQ requirements prior to issuance of Certificate of Compliance; 4). Applicant shall obtain a Certificate of Compliance within 6 months of Board of Supervisors approval; 5). Signage shall conform to the requirements of Section 118 F.1.b. for schools; 6). Waiver of parking requirements. Applicant to provide 12 parking spaces on site and a drive through area capable of handling 3 vehicles; 7). Applicant to upgrade existing septic system to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Unit prior to issuance of C of C. Ms. Link told the Board that this daycare facility had been in operation for more than ten years and that the church located next door had provided a letter stating that the daycare operation had been a good neighbor. She told the Board that the revised site plan showed additional parking, and that the Environmental Services Department had stated that the existing septic system was adequate for the operation. Upon a motion by Chairman Brownlow, seconded by Supervisor Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission. There were no comments from the public.

5. Use permit and Amendment to the Beaver Creek Community Plan to allow a retreat center and RV park in an RCU-2A zoning district, 405-23-016F, Rimrock area, Patricia Neitzel and Mary Jo Carey agents for Rainbow Acres, #1042. Consideration of a Use Permit and an Amendment to the Beaver Creek Community Plan to allow a retreat center and an RV park in an RCU-2A [Residential; Rural, two (2) acres minimum lot size] Zoning District on 28.23 acres. Located on the east side of Kimberly Way approximately two (2) miles northwest from its intersection with Cornville Road in the Rimrock area. Located in SEC 27 TWN 15N R5E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended denial of the Use Permit and Community Plan Amendment. Ms. Link told the Board that the subject parcel used to be a facility for disabled adults but that it had been closed down for about two years and the property owner was trying to sell the property. She said that following the Commission meeting the applicant had emailed staff and the Board indicating that there were differences between the staff report and the applicant's intent. Ms. Link said that the main access to the property was Kimberly Way, an unimproved road varying in width from 18 to 20 feet which crossed Beaver Creek and which could be reached off of Cornville Road. She said that the property could also be reached off of Bice Road, which was off of Interstate 17. Ms. Link said staff had received a phone call from the current owner of Rainbow Acres requesting that this application be referred back to the Planning & Zoning Commission. She said that although the Commission was advised that the number of RVs would be limited to 28, it felt the use was not consistent with the Beaver Creek Community Plan and that it also had concerns about the access. Ms. Carey asked the Board to defer its decision, saying that when she had begun the process there was a pre-planning meeting and she was told she had provided all the necessary information but that two weeks before the Commission she was informed by staff that she had not provided all of the necessary information. She told the Board that Bice Road would be the main road to the property, but that at the Commission meeting the discussion had never moved past the access issue. Ms. Carey said that when Beaver Creek floods, everyone who lives in the area of the subject property has to use Bice Road to get in and out. She said there were double-wide mobile homes in the area and a lot of people living there. She told the Board that the tunnel on Bice Road was a single-lane tunnel and 14 feet in height. Ms. Carey said she did not feel that the Commission had been open to her presentation and that she also was not aware that she could have provided a Power Point presentation. Chairman Brownlow said he had no objection to deferring a decision on this application. Supervisor Davis said he had heard different information, that he had received the emails and that staff appeared to have responded to Ms. Carey's allegations, but that there were differences. Ms. Carey said she had a different site plan now that marked the location of items that she had not been aware she was required to mark. In response to a question from Supervisor Davis, Ms. Carey said she was not asking for commercial zoning, but for a use permit. She added that there had been a community meeting to discuss her proposal. Mr. Schurr told the Board that the community plan designated the area as appropriate for PAD residential, and that there were concerns that Ms. Carey's proposal was not a residential use. Chairman Brownlow said he felt strongly that the application should go back to the Commission. Supervisor Street

said she would like for Ms. Carey to feel like she was at least treated fairly by the process. Chairman Brownlow moved to refer this item back to the Commission for consideration at its January 23, 2001, meeting. Supervisor Street seconded the motion, saying she would like staff to make sure that Ms. Carey feels she has been educated on the process and that she is able to present her entire program to the Commission. Chairman Brownlow called for the vote, which carried unanimously.

Consent agenda for planning and zoning items, for which there were no protests at the Planning & Zoning Commission hearing, and which provides for acknowledgement of deferred or withdrawn items which have been advertised for hearing on this date.

1. Final Site Plan for Golf Clubhouse Complex, 408-35-270A, 273A, 274A, 279A and 280A, Sedona area, Mike Withey agent for Sedona Development Partners, L.L.C., #1041. Consideration of a Final Site Plan for a Golf Clubhouse Complex located on portions of the following parcels: 405-35-270A, 405-35-273A, 405-35-274A, 405-35-279A and 405-35-280A and consisting of a thirty-four thousand six hundred fifty-eight (34,658) square foot clubhouse and twelve (12) casitas providing overnight accommodations for golf club members only. The clubhouse and casitas are located on the proposed Tract E consisting of a total of 6.40 acres. The complex is located in a Planned Area Development (PAD) Zoning District for the project known as Sedona at Seven Canyons consisting of a total of one hundred thirty-five (135) acres. Located at the end of Long Canyon Road approximately one and one-half (1-1/2) miles north of its intersection with Boynton Pass/Dry Creek Road in the Sedona area. Located in SEC 27 TWN 18N R5E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Final Site Plan subject to the following stipulations: 1). The development shall generally conform to the Letter of Intent dated October 23, 2001 and to the memorandum from the Greenbrier Southwest Corporation dated November 28, 2001 and to the Final Site Plan dated October 22, 2001 consisting of three (3) sheets; 2). Property shall be developed in accordance with all applicable County Ordinances, as well as any applicable State and Federal regulations; 3). The approval of the fire suppression system by the Sedona Fire District, in keeping with current fire codes, shall be obtained prior to the commencement of use; 4). The developer shall place signs around the perimeter of its development that designate the use of specific trailheads, as approved by the United States Forest Service, for accessing the Coconino National Forest; 5). Casitas for use by golf course members only.; 6). The Ordinance requirement that the paved area of the parking spaces must be 9'x 20' is waived. The paved area of the parking spaces may be 9' x 18' where the parking spaces are extended by an additional two (2) feet of adjoining non-paved surface.
2. Consideration of several amendments to a planned area development (PAD) known as Verde Santa Fe South, 407-09-105W, 105X, 141, 142A, 407-37-104, 105U, 105W, 105X, 105Z, 106A, 106C, 106D, 204A, 204E, and 205A through 353, northeast of the city of Cottonwood, Earl, Curley & Lagarde agent for Stardust Development, Inc., #1038. Consideration of several amendments to the Planned Area Development (PAD) known as Verde Santa Fe South to address signage, model homes and construction trailers as follows 1.) Comprehensive sign package addressing increased permanent signage and temporary signage for multiple homebuilders; 2.) Request for multiple model home sales complexes using a submitted typical layout for any unit within the overall project; 3.) Request for specific approval for the model home sales complex for Units 3 and 4; 4.) Request for approval of a typical construction trailer arrangement to be utilized by any unit developer; and 5.) Request to allow the current information center to be utilized by all homebuilders within the project. The project is located along the south side of Cornville Road east of its intersection with Highway 89A approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the City of Cottonwood. Located in SEC 6 TWN 15N R4E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the PAD Amendments subject to the following stipulations: 1). Development to conform to the submitted package with the cover letter of intent dated November 13, 2001 consisting of 5 parts including 14 full color 11 x 17 illustrations of the proposed signage & materials along with site plans for the model home location for Units 3 & 4 to be used as a typical for staff review of future applications, except where these stipulations vary, the stipulations shall govern; 2). All outdoor lighting shall comply with the current lighting ordinance in affect at time of building permit application with particular attention to down lighting signs rather than up lighting; 3). With the exception of security lighting outdoor lighting shall be extinguished at the close of business; 4). Permits be obtained and approved prior to installation of any construction offices/ trailers; 5). No banners and only one Flag (4'x 8') is permitted per sales office; 6). Staff administrative review of sales offices, temporary signage and construction trailers



every two years.

3. Final Site Plan, 407-09-011H, Cottonwood area, Kenson Construction Co. agent for Robert Flynn, #1039. Consideration of a Final Site Plan in a M1-10 [Industrial; General Limited; ten (10) acre minimum lot size] Zoning District to allow the development of an industrial building for the business known as Flight Miniatures on a twenty (20) acre site. Located approximately thirteen hundred (1300) feet west of Hwy 260 and its intersection with the private road known as Coury Drive and just south of the southern most extension of the City Limits of Cottonwood. Located in SEC 31 TWN 15N R4E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Final Site Plan subject to the following stipulations: 1). The development shall be in general conformance with the Site Plan dated October 12, 2001/ stamped received October 23, 2001 and to the Letter of Intent dated October 19, 2001 except where these stipulations vary, the stipulations shall govern; 2). Right-of-way dedications/reservations (34 feet half width on property boundaries) and access improvement requirements shall be perfected before building permits are issued; 3). The Applicant shall provide thirty-six (36) parking spaces initially. The parking space design, pavement, delineation of parking spaces, handicapped access, signage and landscaping shall conform to the Yavapai County Planning and Zoning Ordinance. A reservation area for an additional twenty-one (21) parking spaces shall be maintained at the northwest end of the property to be fully improved at time of need or notice from the County when it is determined that parking needs have exceeded the improved spaces; 4). All outdoor lighting shall comply with the current lighting ordinance in effect at time of building permit application with particular note that parking lot lighting shall only be 18 feet in height with LPS lamps, contrary to the 30 feet shown on the site plan; 5). With the exception of security lighting, outdoor lighting shall be extinguished at the close of business; 6). The Applicant shall submit a signage package for Land Use Unit staff review. Until this signage plan is approved by staff building permits for signage shall not be issued; 7). The Applicant shall submit a drainage report that complies with the Yavapai County Drainage Criteria Manual. Until this report is approved by the Yavapai County Development Services Floodplain Unit, building permits shall not be issued; 8). The Applicant shall submit a fire suppression plan with building permit applications for the Verde Rural Fire Department to review. Building permits shall not be issued until this plan is approved by the Fire Department; 9). Wastewater disposal system needs to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Services Unit prior to building permit issuance. This item and Item 4., below, were taken together. Mr. Lockard told the Board that following the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on these items staff had received some conflicting information from ADOT. He said that staff had received a letter from ADOT indicating that it had no objection to either proposal, but that staff had since received phone calls and email from ADOT expressing concerns about the proposals because of the access management plan on Highway 260. Mr. Lockard said he had met with ADOT District Engineer Tom Foster and that Mr. Foster's concern was that the proposals might change the access point onto Highway 260. He said the real issue was that ADOT wanted to see that any road intersecting the access road was placed at least 1,000 feet back from the highway, which he said would put it 200 feet into the applicants' properties. Supervisor Davis asked why ADOT was interested in the interior design of access roads not located in the ADOT right-of-way. Mr. Lockard said ADOT's goal was to address all transportation issues related to access to Highway 260. Mr. Lockard said that Mr. Foster had told him he was willing to work with the property owners. He said the problem had arisen because originally ADOT had been working with a previous property owner, but that there was no state or County right-of-way involved in either proposal. Supervisor Davis said that the location of the intersection was what was important with regard to the access management plan. Supervisor Davis then moved to approve Item 3. and Item 4. (below) as recommended by the Planning & Zoning Commission, saying the County could let Mr. Foster know that interior issues could be dealt with later. Supervisor Street seconded the motion. Supervisor Davis said it was not appropriate for ADOT's comments to be submitted at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, and that the issue was the intersection onto the highway. Mr. Schurr said perhaps the applicants would be able to move things around in order to keep ADOT happy, but that the County should not hold the applicants hostage to ADOT's wishes. Chairman Brownlow called for the vote, which carried unanimously. There were no comments from the public.
4. Final Site Plan, 407-09-011Q, Cottonwood area, Kenson Construction Co. agent for Griffith Family Trust, #1040. Consideration of a Final Site Plan in a M1-10 [Industrial; General Limited; ten (10) acre minimum lot size] Zoning District to allow the development of an industrial building for the business known as Griffith Enterprises on a ten (10) acre site. Located approximately five hundred fifty (550) feet west of Hwy 260 and its intersection with the private road known as Coury Drive and just south of the southern most extension of the City Limits of Cottonwood. Located in SEC 31 TWN 15N R4E

G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Final Site Plan subject to the following stipulations: 1). The development shall be in general conformance with the Site Plan dated September 25, 2001/ stamped received October 23, 2001 and to the Letter of Intent dated October 23, 2001 except where these stipulations vary, the stipulations shall govern; 2). Right-of-way dedications/reservations (34 feet half width on the north and west property boundaries) and access improvement requirements shall be perfected before building permits are issued; 3). All outdoor lighting shall comply with the current lighting ordinance in effect at time of building permit application with particular note that parking lot lighting shall only be 18 feet in height with LPS lamps, contrary to the 30 feet shown on the site plan; 4). With the exception of security lighting, outdoor lighting shall be extinguished at the close of business; 5). The Applicant shall submit a signage package for Land Use Unit staff review. Until this signage plan is approved by staff building permits for signage shall not be issued; 6). The Applicant shall submit a drainage report that complies with the Yavapai County Drainage Criteria Manual. Until this report is approved by the Yavapai County Development Services Floodplain Unit, building permits shall not be issued; 7). The Applicant shall submit a fire suppression plan with building permit applications for the Verde Rural Fire Department to review. Building permits shall not be issued until this plan is approved by the Fire Department; 8). Wastewater disposal system needs to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Services Unit prior to building permit issuance; 9). All applicable Federal Aviation Administration guidelines to be adhered to for the development and operation of the heli-pad. This item was considered in conjunction with Item 3., above. Please see Item 3., above, for details.

5. Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Outdoor Lighting, Planning & Zoning Commission, #1004.

CONSENT AGENDA FOR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS: Unless otherwise noted, all items were approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Street, second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.

1. Requests from Board of Supervisors:

- a. Approve minutes of meeting of December 3, 2001.
- b. Consider approval of intergovernmental agreement with the Arizona Department of Revenue for data processing products and services related to the maintenance and production of property assessment and tax rolls for the 2002 tax year. Supervisor Street moved to approve this agreement, with payment to come from the Assessor's Storage and Retrieval Fund. Supervisor Davis seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.
- c. Consider approval of a resolution establishing policies for the creation of county improvement districts and other special taxing districts, and annexations thereto. Resolution No. 1317.
- d. Consider approval of funding agreement with Skull Valley Volunteer Fire Department in the amount of \$73,500 for Skull Valley Fire Equipment (CDBG).
- e. Approve request from the Town of Prescott Valley for permission to hold a mail ballot election on March 12, 2002, pursuant to A.R.S. §16-204, 16-225(C) and 16-409.
- f. Consider approval of request from the Yavapai Cemetery Association for County sponsorship of the Memorial Day Observance at Citizens Cemetery to be held on May 27, 2002.
- g. Approve appointment of the following precinct committeemen, as recommended by the Yavapai County Democrats: Joe Apolinar, Hillside Precinct; Norman Barnes, Cougar Precinct; Margaret Bethke, Chino Valley 2 Precinct; Julie Bradshaw, Perkinsville Precinct; Constance Burton, Agua Fria Precinct; Sue Campbell, Thumb Butte Precinct; Virginia Christensen, Quail Springs Precinct; Thalia Clinkscales, Big Chino Precinct; Joanne Doverspike, Mayer Precinct; Jo Ann Frost, Agua Fria Precinct; Dale Funk, Shadow Valley Precinct; Gloria Galion, Ponderosa Precinct; Maria Guth, Camp Wood Precinct; Victoria Harper, Cougar Precinct; Anne Morgan, Prescott South Precinct; Julia Frances Perkins, West Chino Precinct; Steve Pomeroy, Cherry Creek Precinct; Phyllis Roth, Deep Well Precinct; Henery Ulveling, Chino Valley 2 Precinct; Joan Schneider, Senator Precinct; Mary Rose Shelley-Webb, Mayer Precinct; Allan Whited, Cherry Creek Precinct; Charles Wilson, Castle Hot Springs; Verna Clifford, Superstition Precinct.. Also note resignations and removals of the following precinct committeemen: Jeri Culp, Hillside Precinct; Dorothy Evans, Quail Run Precinct; Verna Clifford, Prescott Valley 1 Precinct.

- h. Award contract for publication of newspaper advertising, legal notices, and minutes for 2002 to Prescott Newspapers, Inc. (The Daily Courier). Bids opened November 27, 2001, with Prescott Newspapers, Inc. being the sole bidder.
- i. Acknowledge receipt of canvass of Chino Valley Irrigation District election held on November 13, 2001.
- j. Consider approval of a funding agreement with the Town of Jerome in the amount of \$7,000 to hire a contractor to renovate an existing fire truck stall to create additional parking space for the police department in Jerome (CDBG).
- k. Consider approval of a funding agreement with the Yarnell Fire District in the amount of \$50,000 for procurement of a 2,200 gallon single axle water tanker truck (CDBG).
- l. Consider approval of a funding agreement with the Black Canyon City Fire District in the amount of \$30,000 for procurement of 11 to 14 new self-contained breathing apparatus (CDBG).
- m. Consider approval of agreement with DLR Group in an amount not to exceed \$23,000 for traffic impact study for the new Fair Street Administration Building, to be paid from Capital Improvements – Fair Street Building.
- n. Consider approval of CDGB agreements between the Department of Commerce and Yavapai County for the following projects: Ash Fork Fire District Fire Equipment, Black Canyon City Fire Department Equipment, Chino Valley Senior Center Computer Network, Jerome Park Improvements, Peeple's Valley Fire Vehicle, Skull Valley Fire Equipment, Verde Valley Senior Center Construction and Yarnell Fire Department Fire Department Water Tanker Truck.

2. Requests from Sheriff:

- a. Permission for Detention Sergeant Jason Miner to attend the American Correctional Association Winter Conference, San Antonio, Texas, January 11-16, 2002, at an approximate cost of \$1,900 to be paid from Jail Enhancement funds.
- b. Authorize the adoption of retiring K-0 "Rocco" to Daniel Raiss in the amount of \$1.

3. Request from Development Services for extinguishment of PAD zoning and reversion to underlying R1L-35 zoning district for parcels 106-10-016A and 106-10-015K, N, Q, S, U, V, W, X and Y.

4. Requests from Fleet Management:

- a. Set standard per gallon cost of \$0.10 over and above actual delivery cost to the County for fueling intergovernmental agreements with other governmental agencies. Supervisor Street noted that this had to do with an agreement with the Camp Verde Fire District, and that Sheriff Buck Buchanan had sent a memo expressing some concerns about it. Fleet Management Director Dave Burnside told the Board he was requesting that it set a standard for these types of agreements. He said the County currently had an agreement with the Camp Verde Marshal's office for five cents a gallon over and above cost and that he was currently working on the development of an agreement with the City of Prescott for ten cents over cost. Supervisor Street moved to approve the request. Supervisor Davis seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.
- b. Approve Accident/Incident Report for the first quarter of fiscal year 2001-2002. Supervisor Davis asked what happened to employees who are determined to be at fault in an accident. Fleet Management Director Dave Burnside said it was up to individual department heads and elected officials to determine how such employees should be dealt with. Supervisor Davis asked if it would be appropriate to establish a policy providing that any employee with a chargeable accident would not be eligible for the annual merit increase. Mr. Holst said he would talk with department heads about that idea, adding that some departments do have policies regarding this issue. Supervisor Davis said he would like to see something done, pointing out that an employee in one department had had multiple accidents and that many of the reasons given for accidents were simply stupid mistakes. Mr. Burnside said that accidents were costing the County on average about \$30,000 per quarter. He said that sometimes the accidents are not the fault of County employees, and that sometimes it is just difficult to assess the blame. Supervisor Street said she would be interested in knowing about patterns as opposed to just one-time-only accidents. Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Street, the Board voted

unanimously to approve the report.

- 5. Request from MIS for permission to dispose of three Bubble Jet printers for \$1 each to governmental entities, public improvement district, charitable, social or benevolent nonprofit organization in Yavapai County (one printer for each supervisorial district).
- 6. Request from Finance for approval of two cooperative purchasing agreements with the Western States Contracting Alliance (WSCA) allowing Yavapai County to purchase off of WSCA contracts awarded to Dell and IBM.
- 7. Request from Health Department for permission to submit Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grant proposal in the amount of \$300,000 to the U.S. Department of Justice.
- 8. Approve vouchers.

CONSENT AGENDA FOR DIRECTORS OF YAVAPAI COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL, FREE LIBRARY AND JAIL DISTRICTS, AND COUNTY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS: Reference: Special District minutes.

- 1. Resolve into the Boards of Directors of the Yavapai County Flood Control, Free Library and Jail Districts and other County improvement districts as follows, for the purpose of approving vouchers: Seligman Sanitary District; Bryce Canyon Drive Sewer Improvement District.
- 2. Resolve into the Board of Directors of the Yavapai County Flood Control District:
  - a. Approve minutes of meeting of December 3, 2001.
  - b. Request for amendment of intergovernmental agreement with the Town of Chino Valley for floodplain study and authorize Development Services Director to sign a letter of amendment.
  - c. Consider approval of a professional services contract with Dibble & Associates in the amount of \$67,620 for the first design phase for the UVX Road Drainage Improvements, to be paid from Outside Services – UVX Road.
- 3. Resolve into the Board of Directors of the Sun-Up Ranch Road Improvement District.
  - a. Approve minutes of meetings of October 16, 2000; July 2 and July 25, 2001.
  - b. Accept final engineering plans, specifications and cost estimate; approve Resolution No. 2001-1, the Resolution of Intention to make the proposed improvements in the District; and set hearing on protests for February 19, 2002, at 9:30 a.m.
- 4. Resolve into the Board of Directors of the Yavapai County Jail District:
  - a. Approve minutes of meeting of December 3, 2001.
  - b. Consider awarding bid for construction of Camp Verde Jail Expansion. Bids opened December 11, 2001. Recommend awarding of bid to Sletten Construction Company.

CLAIMS AGAINST YAVAPAI COUNTY

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
General Fund	1,469,458.24	Jail District	205,347.29
District 1 Park Fund	68.00	District 2 Park Fund	2,581.86
District 3 Park Fund	7.87	Family Planning	11,273.09
MCH Programs	2,556.48	Home Health Ser	13,849.78
Health Promotion	2,269.91	Nutrition	1,321.73
T.B. Control	300.08	WIC Program	11,601.90
Juvenile Delinq. Reduct	8,518.50	Juvenile IPS	15,656.16
Family Counseling	1,923.00	Juvenile Food Prog	1,278.04

Probation Serv	3,901.86	Adult IPS	26,932.76
Adult Probation Fees	17,794.34	Prob Enhance	31,065.63
Recorder's Surcharge	1,548.08	Indigent Def/Dg	1,163.57
Misc Small Grants	55.23	Crim Just/Atty	10,738.19
Bad Check Prog	3,033.08	Juv Prob Svs	6,619.95
Commodity Fd	342.77	Azeip Case Mgmt	2,687.00
Sexual Trans Disease	258.69	Hi Risk Chld HI	2,474.98
Clerk's Storage	428.79	WIC/TOB Intervention	1,276.31
HIV Counsel & Test	1,481.00	Atty Anti-Racket	6,286.22
PANT	4,097.64	CASA	4,506.23
Case Process	4,445.54	Azeip Coordinator	2,341.32
Vict Witns Prog	6,588.78	Court Enhancement	2,205.43
Council Court	2,520.84	Drug Enf Fndg	2,324.66
Primary Care Svs	11,419.33	Victims Rights Impl	3,624.97
JAIBG Juv Acct 3	3,264.93	Yav Indian Agreement	1,738.74
Hassayampa/LTC	930.25	Dietetic Intern	757.27
Immuniz Service	3,269.24	Personal Care Svs	804.88
Idea-Preschool	956.08	Subs Abuse/DARE	293.27
Chem Abuse	250.57	Family Drug Court	905.39
Juvenile Drug Court	3,382.19	Juv Det/PACE	3,379.10
Collaborative Comp	6,400.00	Prevent Child Abuse	1,270.66
Special Program	7,926.23	Sm Schools Ecia	698.99
Sm Schools Beha	21,955.89	Cops in School	3,957.11
Fill the Gap - Courts	10,145.94	Hurf Road Funds	389,732.55
Health Fund	80,363.69	Jail Commissary	3,673.81
Yav. Cemetery Assoc	35.03	Landfill Administ.	99,220.32
Water Advisory Comm	95,520.18	Clinical NICP	1,303.61
Tire Recycle	2,403.39	Safe School Pro	6,063.20
Adhs-Svs Coord	751.71	Local Incentive Awards	573.87
Fill the Gap - Attorney	2,080.58	Family Law Commiss.	3,700.68
Comm Punish Pro	4,526.37	Juv. Detent Ed Pro	637.81
Regnl Road Project	158,393.44	Health Start	4,278.08
Victim Compensa.	540.00	Interstate Compact Pro	2,258.31
Ryan White II	1,788.82	Primary Care Fees	405.50
Perinatal Block	2,303.38	Well Woman Health	1,397.04
Tobacco Educ	16,184.32	Hopwa Housing Op	140.44
Cops Fast	3,280.59	Ad Prob Education	380.23
Detention Education	95.08	School Res. Mayer	1,725.55
Direct Treat Ed Fund	7,870.87	Mental Health RWJF	359.45
Mental Health Partn.	359.51	Field Trainer	5,946.51
Comm. Access Pro	208.03	Attendant Care	20,205.70
HIV/CT	562.63	HIV Targeted	3,633.82
Child Justice	641.82	Child Sup & Vis	617.52
Domestic Relations	116.68	Self Service	1,250.68
VOCA	3,832.28	LTAF Vlt Local Trans	17,903.57
Yav. Drug Court	2,234.56	JTSF Treatment	4,657.10
Diversion Conseq.	717.22	Transferred Youth	1,502.47
Capital Projects	21,902.50	Jail Construction	13,911.68
Bagdad Airport	2,175.00	Sedona Airport	18,073.00
ALTCS	1,626,560.35		

In addition, payroll was issued on December 14 for the pay period ending December 8; warrant numbers 2413448 through 2413939, in the amount of \$374,410.27. Jury certificates were also issued, warrant numbers 6853306 through 6853434; 6853435 through 6853524. Warrants issued for December 17 Board day, 4161177 through 4161561; 4161562 through 4162031.

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

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_ Clerk \_\_\_\_\_ Chairman