

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MINUTES WITH SUPPLEMENTAL TRANSCRIPT
(Where a supplemental transcript is available, it is printed in bold type)

OFFICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

Prescott, Arizona

May 16, 2005

The Board of Supervisors met in regular session on May 16, 2005, at 9:00 a.m., in Cottonwood, Arizona.

Present: Carol Springer, Chairman; Thomas Thurman, Vice Chairman; Chip Davis, Member; Bev Staddon, Clerk.

Also present: Jim Holst, County Administrator; Dave Hunt, Board Attorney, Assistant County Administrator (via video conferencing).

Clerk's note: A copy of these minutes with a supplemental transcript is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and is also available on the County website.

CONSENT AGENDA With the exception of items C8. and C11., all items were approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman. No comments from the public. See items C8. and C11. for detail.

C – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- C1. Approve minutes of meeting of May 2, 2005, and of special meetings of April 25-28, 2005.
- C2. Liquor license for which there are no protests, Series 10 Original Beer and Wine Store, Barefoot's Country Market & Deli, Rimrock area, Stacey Ann Barefoot.
- C3. Approve appointment of precinct committeeman as recommended by the Yavapai County Libertarian Party and also acknowledge removal of a precinct committeeman, all as evidenced in Board Memorandum No. 2005-7.
- C4. Consider approval of Change Order #1 with Straightline Builders, Inc., for the Verde Valley Senior Center project in the additive amount of \$53,101 to be paid by CDBG funds.
- C5. Approve appointment of precinct committeemen as recommended by the Yavapai County Democrat Party and also acknowledge removal of precinct committeemen, all as evidenced in Board Memorandum No. 2005-8.
- C6. Approve vouchers.

C – CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT

- ~~C7. Permission to make a replacement capital outlay of \$10,500 for a new copy machine for the Verde Valley office, to be paid from unused budgeted funds in the Equipment \$5,000+ account.~~
WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO MEETING

C – FLEET MANAGEMENT

- C8. Permission to apply for one undercover plate for a replacement vehicle. Fleet Management Director David Gartner participated in discussion of this item. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman.

Supervisor Davis asked Mr. Gartner how the Board could be assured that when a new plate is requested for an undercover vehicle another one would be removed. Mr. Gartner said this request was for a replacement vehicle and that the old plate would be destroyed. Supervisor Davis asked Mr. Gartner to provide the Board with more information in the future with regard to this type of request.

C – HUMAN RESOURCES

- C9. Consider reclassifying a Program Manager III position in the Community Health Services Department that is funded through the Health Fund at .5 with a budgeted salary of \$24,723 to a new Nurse Practitioner Supervisor position funded through the Health Fund at .35 with a budgeted salary of \$23,035 with remaining .65 of funding for the position to be paid through grants.

C – JUVENILE PROBATION

- C10. Consider approval of an intergovernmental agreement between Yavapai College and the Yavapai County Juvenile Court for the YouthStep 2005 summer program, in the amount of \$92,210 to be paid from State Treatment Account.

C – PUBLIC WORKS

- C11. Award or reject bids received for Prairie Lane Pavement Reconstruction and Widening in Yavapai County, Arizona, Project #2312882. Bids opened May 3, 2005, with bids received as follows: Asphalt Paving & Supply, Inc., \$265,370.60; J. Banicki Construction, \$262,866.60. Recommend awarding to J. Banicki Construction in the total amount of \$262,866.60. To be paid

from HURF, Construction in Progress. Public Works Director Richard Straub participated in discussion of this item. Approved by unanimous vote, upon a motion by Supervisor Thurman, seconded by Supervisor Davis.

Mr. Straub explained that this project was approved last year to be done in the current fiscal year budget. He said he believed that the reason the bid had come in higher than the anticipated cost of the project was related to higher asphalt prices and also higher prices on some other construction-related items. Supervisor Thurman asked if the project had already been started. Mr. Straub said it had not, and that the project would be paid for from the Construction in Progress account because the project itself had already been approved.

- C12. Award or reject bids received to Supply or Supply and Deliver Crack Fill Material in Yavapai County, Arizona, Contract #2513835. Bids opened May 3, 2005, with bids received from the following vendors: Crafcro, Inc.; Maxwell Products, Inc.; and P & T Products. Recommend awarding to all bidders at various unit prices. To be paid from HURF.
- C13. Award or reject bids received to Supply or Supply and Deliver Fill Material in Yavapai County, Arizona, Contract #2513836. Bids opened May 3, 2005, with bids received from the following vendors: Granite Mountain Design; Rinker Materials (Camp Verde and Prescott); Yavapai-Apache Sand & Rock. Recommend awarding to all bidders at various unit prices. To be paid from HURF.
- C14. Consider approval of Change Order #3 (Final) for Earth Tech, Inc., for the Mingus Avenue Extension Project, Cottonwood, Yavapai County, Arizona, Project #998144, in the decreased amount of \$2,219.78. Half-cent sales tax project.
- C15. Consider granting a public utility easement across County-owned property adjacent to the new Fain Road.

C – SHERIFF

- C16. Permission to submit application for the Criminal Justice Records Improvement Program grant funds in the amount of \$95,715. Grant requires a 25% local cash match (\$23,928.75) to be paid from Jail Enhancement Funds.
- C17. Consider approval to purchase two new personal computers for Wexford Medical Services in the amount of \$3,240 to be paid from Inmate Health Services Fund. WITHDRAWN AT MEETING

ACTION ITEMS

A – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- A1. Permission to begin the hiring process for four additional Building Safety personnel. Ken Spedding, Development Services Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman. No comments from the public.

Mr. Spedding said there had been discussion at an earlier study session regarding this request. He said the Board might want to make approval of this request contingent upon approval of expanding the urban overlay zones County-wide, which he noted was also on this day's agenda. He added that the purpose of this request was to begin recruiting for these positions, but that people would not actually be hired until July 1.

A – FLEET MANAGEMENT

- A2. Consider approval of 3rd Quarter Accidents & Incidents Report for 2004-2005. David Gartner, Fleet Management Director and Richard Straub, Public Works Director. Sheriff Steve Waugh participated in discussion of this item. Approved by unanimous vote, upon a motion by Supervisor Thurman, seconded by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.

Chairman Springer noted that one officer from the Sheriff's Office had been listed with four reportable incidents and another with five. She said she was always concerned about officers with multiple accidents and that it should be a red flag, and that if an officer was involved in that many accidents the Board should have a comprehensive look at the situation. Sheriff Waugh said that when an employee from his department is involved in an accident there is a review done and that disciplinary action may be involved. He said he was considering creating a review board specifically for vehicle accidents, and that historically he had taken people out of the field until they can learn to drive and that in some cases he had terminated employees because they never learned to drive. Chairman Springer asked who would sit on the review board. Sheriff Waugh said it would include management level personnel, such as a lieutenant, and also other staff and that the review board would look at the circumstances of an accident and the past record of the employee involved in the accident. Chairman Springer said the review board sounded like a good idea and she asked Sheriff Waugh if he would consider including on that board a representative of the public who is not affiliated with law enforcement. Sheriff Waugh said he would prefer not to do that, and that he would prefer instead to keep it in-house. He added that he was looking at setting up the review board after July 1. Supervisor Davis said he agreed with Chairman Springer and that he thought what the Board was

going to attempt with regard to vehicle management would help with regard to accidents because by putting the responsibility for vehicles with each department, the departments would take a harder look at accidents. Chairman Springer said she agreed, and that the issue was accountability.

A – PUBLIC WORKS

- A3. Consider approval of an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Prescott for the Side Road/State Route 89A Traffic Interchange, at a cost of \$1,500,000 to be paid from Regional Road Fund. Richard Straub, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Thurman, second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.

Mr. Straub said that this item had been under negotiation for quite some time, and that when this portion of S.R. 89 was designed there were no provisions for at-grade intersections. He told the Board that an agreement had been reached with the City of Prescott whereby the County would contribute \$1.5 million at such time as the city begins advertising for construction of the project and that this would have to happen within the next four years. Mr. Straub said that the County still owned right-of-way on Side Road for about 600 feet and that he anticipated the city would be asking the County for donation of that right-of-way prior to beginning construction. Supervisor Thurman said this area was being referred to as "Anthem North" and he asked whether developers associated with plans to build subdivisions in the area would also be asked to contribute to the cost of the interchange. Mr. Straub said the City of Prescott was planning on developer funding as part of the package and that he hoped the developers would be required to pay their fare share. Mr. Holst asked if it was possible that developers would pay back part or all of what the County contributes to the project. Mr. Straub said there was a good possibility of that happening. In response to a question from Supervisor Davis regarding the total cost of the project, Mr. Straub said that as it was originally designed, as a two-lane bridge, the interchange would cost about \$3.5 million. He said if it was determined that the bridge needed to be larger he did not know what the cost might be. Supervisor Davis asked what percentage of the area was City of Prescott and what percentage was County. Mr. Straub said the majority of the area was currently in the County and that he did not know what would happen with regard to annexations, but that it could be a combination of Chino Valley, Prescott Valley and Prescott. Supervisor Davis asked the value of the County's right-of-way on Side Road. Mr. Straub said it was worth about \$3,000 per acre. Supervisor Davis said it was probably worth about \$200,000 an acre now and he asked whether the value of the right-of-way could be applied to the \$1.5 million contribution. Mr. Straub said he did not think so, and that if the County donated the right-of-way to the city it would be eliminating liability for anything that might happen in the right-of-way.

- A4. Consider approval of Change Order #6 (Final) with Vastco, Inc. on the Mingus Avenue Extension Project, Cottonwood, Yavapai County, Arizona, Project #998144, in the increased amount of \$36,400. Half-cent sales tax project. Richard Straub, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman. No comments from the public.

Mr. Straub said the bridge that the County had built over the Verde River was the longest bridge it had ever built in the County, and that when the first section of the bridge deck was paved the contractor noticed there was a considerable uplift in the rest of the bridge. He said that the contractor had said he did not want to be responsible for a big hump in the bridge, and that as a result the County had shut down the contractor in order to allow time for the consulting engineer to look at the situation. Mr. Straub said the project was shut down for a few weeks and that the contractor had filed a claim because of additional expenses incurred as a result of being shut down. He said he had been negotiating on this issue for several months and had eliminated about \$15,000 from the contractor's claim and that the consulting engineer had also given up about \$5,000 because of delays on his end. He said he believed what remained was a reasonable amount, adding that in the end the deck was smooth but that there was no way to know for sure at the time whether or not that would be the result. Supervisor Davis asked whose fault this was, saying it was his understanding that it was the consulting engineer who shut down the project and sent the contractor home. He said the project had been shut down for two weeks and that \$60,000 in additional costs had been incurred and that in the end there was no change at all in the actual work. Mr. Straub said Public Works had shut down the project, but that he did feel the engineer was delayed in looking at the situation. Supervisor Davis asked if it was common for something like this to happen. Mr. Straub said it was not, and that the problem in this case was the long span of the bridge. He added that it was the contractor who brought the situation to the County's attention. Supervisor Thurman asked if this project had come in under bid. Mr. Straub said he believed that with all of the changes that had been made the final cost was probably pretty close to the estimate, but that it was true that the bid on the project was much less than the engineer's estimate. Supervisor Thurman said he was also a little concerned about this request, and he asked whether it would be the engineer's fault if there was a bump in the bridge. Mr. Straub said yes, but

that if the project had continued without additional review and there was a problem it would have been a real catastrophe.

- A5. Consider approval of a right-of-way project on El Don Drive, Mayer area. Richard Straub, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Thurman, second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.

Mr. Straub said this request involved a situation where the County was maintaining a paved road for which it does not have right-of-way, and that one of the property owners along the road had come forward with an offer to donate right-of-way.

HEARINGS

H – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES Planning & Zoning Commission member Joan McClelland was present to represent the Commission.

- H1. Update, amendment and expansion of the Cornville Community Plan as a minor amendment to the Yavapai County General Plan, #H5052. Enalo Lockard, Assistant Development Services Director. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval with minor corrections of the Cornville Community Plan as a Minor Amendment to the Yavapai County General Plan. Cornville Community Plan chairman Judy Miller and Cornville Community Association chairman Dana King participated in discussion. Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Thurman, the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Mr. Lockard told the Board that the citizens of Cornville had been working on the plan for 27 months and that they had set out five areas to address: Community character, transportation, water resources, open space and recreation. He said the plan included no industrial uses and very little commercial use, and that the boundaries of the plan area had been expanded to include the Page Springs area and some state lands. Chairman Springer asked if the people in the expanded area had been included in surveys and the like. Mr. Lockard said yes, and that the committee had used the zip code for the entire area which included people in Page Springs. He added that the committee's efforts had been comprehensive. Ms. Miller told the Board that the committee had conducted a community survey that went to everyone in the Cornville zip code, and that the plan boundaries were far enough out to mesh with Big Park, the Red Rock-Dry Creek Community Plan area, and the city of Cottonwood. She said the committee had provided opportunities for public comment and that it had also placed the proposed plan on a website. Ms. Miller said the committee had obtained a grant from the Arizona Department of Commerce to assist with the cost of developing the plan, and that there were four reasons for having a plan. She said the first reason was that the plan would allow the citizens of Cornville to say what they wanted their community to look like, and that secondly it would be a guide for government with regard to the community. She said the third reason was that the plan would serve as a basis for discussions on issues of regional importance and that fourth, the plan would provide an agenda for community action, i.e., it was filled with ideas for the community association to follow up on. Ms. Miller said she recognized that implementing the plan would really depend upon the community's association with the County, and that she wanted to thank Planner Chris Bridges, Planning Manager Elise Link, Mr. Lockard, Development Services Director Ken Spedding, Assistant Public Works Director Phil Bourdon and Interim Water Advisory Committee Coordinator John Munderloh for their help. Supervisor Davis said the Board had seen different ways of doing community plans, and that the last community plan to be completed was the Dewey-Humboldt Community Plan, which he said had involved a consultant at a cost of about \$80,000 and that when the plan came to the County for approval there was an all-out brawl over it. He said he believed that the way the Cornville Community Plan was developed was the wave of the future because there were no expensive consultant fees involved but instead an investment from the County's planning staff. Supervisor Davis said the plan originated from people who live in Cornville and that while the community itself was very diverse, taking in newer subdivisions like Verde Santa Fe and also agricultural properties, everyone managed to end up on the same page. Ms. Miller agreed, saying the committee had kept its brawls in its committee meetings. Supervisor Davis said he hoped this kind of process could be accomplished in other communities throughout the County, adding that he was nominating the Cornville Community Plan process and committee for the Governor's Rural Development Award this year, and that he understood Development Services was also nominating it for a planning association award. Supervisor Davis presented a certificate to Ms. Miller from his office, and Ms. King presented one to Ms. Miller from the Cornville Community Association. Chairman Springer said she thought the first draft she had seen of this plan was an excellent document and that she especially appreciated the fact that the committee took the time to include so much information about the history of the area. She thanked the committee for its efforts.

- H2. Consideration of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to eliminate Section 470 C. and Section 510, and to modify Section 602 I., Definitions, and Section 602 I.G.3, Planning & Zoning Commission, #H5076. Enalo Lockard, Assistant Development Services Director. Consideration of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to eliminate Section 470 – Overlay Zones C. Rural/Urbanizing Overlay Zones and Section 510 – Commercial/Industrial/Multi-Family Buildings in Rural Overlay Zones and to modify Section 602 Parking and Off-Street Loading, I. Off-Street Parking Regulations, Definitions by deleting “Rural” and “Urbanized Zone” and Section 602 I. G. Parking Area Surfacing Improvements 3. Commercial Uses Thresholds for Improvements (including accompanying table) by eliminating all references to the “rural “ and “urban” or “urbanized” areas as part of the effort to uniformly apply the adopted Building Codes to all of the unincorporated areas of Yavapai County. Not all areas within the unincorporated areas of Yavapai County have Building Codes applied to all new construction, with the exception of those structures where specifically addressed by Section 510, and thus have designations of “Rural” where the noted codes are not enforced and “Urban” where they are enforced. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment to eliminate Section 470C. and Section 510, and to modify Section 602 I. Definitions and Section 602 I.G.3. Development Services Director Ken Spedding participated in discussion of this item. Upon a motion by Supervisor Thurman, seconded by Supervisor Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission. No comments from the public.

Mr. Lockard said that the intent with this amendment was to allow the Development Services Department to enforce the Building Codes on a County-wide basis. He said that in conjunction with this there would be another item coming forward to the Board to change some of the permit requirements, and that he believed that item would be on the Board’s July 5 agenda. Chairman Springer asked what the reaction to this proposal was from developers or people in the construction trade. Mr. Lockard said that some were in favor of it and others were against it, but that the Contractors’ Association supported it. He noted that the number of permits and inspections required would also be reduced. Mr. Lockard said that if the amendment was approved it would go into effect on July 1. Supervisor Davis said he understood that this would clean up the Ordinance but that it would not actually make the Building Codes apply County-wide. Mr. Spedding said that approval of the amendment would eliminate any reference to “rural” or “urban” from the Zoning Ordinance and that it would, in effect, apply the Building Codes on a County-wide basis. Supervisor Thurman said he thought Mr. Spedding needed more time to get things rolling with new staff. Mr. Spedding said there would be no problem. Supervisor Davis asked if this would also expand the impact fee area. Mr. Spedding said it would not, and that the Board would need to discuss that issue with Public Works. He said he was aware that Public Works was planning to bring something to the Board. There was brief discussion about impact fees and what might be involved in expanding them County-wide, during which there appeared to be general agreement that revisiting the impact fee issue needed to be done as soon as possible. Supervisor Thurman said it would be important to give plenty of notice to people that impact fees might be applied County-wide because contractors often bid out homes several months in advance. Mr. Spedding said he believed the process related to the impact fee would take some time and that it would not be ready to coincide with the July 1 implementation of the Building Codes on a County-wide basis. After the vote was taken, Mr. Spedding said this issue had been a long time coming and that the County would now be able to apply for a rating at the national level that would be similar to the community ratings for flood issues.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS: ACTION ITEMS RELATED TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

E – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- E1. Convene in executive session pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(1), to discuss the possible appointment of Phil Bourdon as Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Thurman, second by Supervisor Davis.

EA – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- EA1. Consider appointing Phil Bourdon as Public Works Director, to be effective July 30, 2005. Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Thurman, the Board voted unanimously to appoint Mr. Bourdon as Public Works Director effective July 30, 2005, with a 10% increase from his current salary. Mr. Bourdon thanked the Board for the appointment, saying he would not let the Board down. Mr. Hunt requested that Mr. Bourdon provide a written confirmation of his acceptance of the appointment. There were no comments from the public.

STUDY SESSIONS

S – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- S1. Discussion and possible action regarding proposed 2005-2006 fiscal year budget. The following elected officials and department heads or department representatives participated in discussion: Julie Ayers, Human Resources Director (via video conferencing); Steve Waugh, Sheriff; Ken Spedding, Development Services Director; Enalo Lockard, Assistant

Development Services Director; David Gartner, Fleet Management Director; and Stephen Welsh, MIS Director (via video conference).

Mr. Holst said that at its last budget session the Board had looked at a number of program changes that involved primarily new positions or reclassifications of existing positions and that it had held consideration of other non-personnel items over to this day's meeting. He noted that \$1.4 million for new vehicles had been moved from the Fleet Management budget to Contingency pending the Board's decision about vehicle policy. Mr. Holst some new information had also been received, most particularly information related to the increase in the Arizona State Retirement System contribution. He told the Board that the County Supervisors Association had notified him that before adjourning its session the legislature had passed a bill allowing ASRS to make annual adjustments in the contribution rate. He said that because of this change the ASRS contribution would be 1.65% on both the employer and employee sides for the next fiscal year and that it would 1.2% in the following fiscal year. He said that reducing the percentage from 2.5% to 1.65% on the employer side for 2005-2006 had freed up about \$700,000. Mr. Holst said he had also increased the General Fund revenues by a little more than \$200,000 based on anticipated additional revenues from Development Services. He added that because of the changes in the ASRS contribution for this year, the Board could consider a 4.15% range adjustment for employees instead of a 5% range adjustment. Supervisor Davis said it would still come out with the same intent of giving employees a 2.5% increase plus covering the increase in the ASRS contribution. Chairman Springer asked about copiers and how things were coming with looking into whether it would be possible to get better pricing on them. Mr. Holst said that most of the copiers were on state contract and that Finance Director Mike Danowski was looking at the possibility of trying to standardize them. He noted that two requests for copiers had been withdrawn. The Board began reviewing the non-personnel program change requests from the departments, in each case reaching general agreement about whether to approve the request, deny the request, or hold the request for additional information from MIS regarding technology-related requests or for information from Finance regarding copiers. Beginning with the Adult Probation Department, the Board generally agreed to approve 12 laptops for field supervision positions, but to not include a new PowerPoint projector because of the likelihood that a used one would be available. Requests from the County Attorney for vertical filing cabinets and a fax machine and telephone were included but a request for 14 desktop computers, four black and white laser printers, two color laser printers, a flat screen television monitor and software, and investigations interview room equipment were held. A request from the Clerk of Superior Court for five credit card machines and transaction fees were held pending work that Mr. Danowski is doing on this issue, but requests for rolling shelves for the Prescott file room, 12 OnBase Named Licenses, a fax machine for the Early Disposition Court/Grand Jury/Appeals Processing clerks, and annual maintenance and support on the OSAM system were all approved. A request from Development Services for a new vehicle for the director was put on hold, as was a request for a scanner/printer. There was discussion regarding a program change request for \$130,000 for the Verde Valley Regional Plan. Mr. Lockard said that the various cities and towns in the Verde Valley would be contributing about \$30,000 toward the cost of the project and that the amount was approximately \$1 per head based on population in each jurisdiction. Chairman Springer said she thought that, at least collectively, the jurisdictions would put in as much as the County. She said she understood this was an unusual situation and that it was above and beyond the normal planning process, but that she did not know why the jurisdictions would not contribute an equitable share. Supervisor Davis said the original proposal was to do an equal share based on population, and that he thought it was Chairman Springer who had suggested that the County carry the lion's share of the project provided there was some buy-in from the other entities. Mr. Spedding said that the cities and towns had their own plans and that this was for a regional plan. He said he had hoped that by obtaining any kind of contribution from the other entities they would buy into the plan and use the plan. He said that the plan would actually affect mostly the unincorporated areas of the Verde Valley. Chairman Springer asked who initiated the idea, saying she thought it came from the community but that it sounded now like it was the County's idea. Mr. Lockard said it had been an ongoing issue for a number of years with requests from different areas of the community. He said the majority of the land involved in the plan was under County jurisdiction. Mr. Spedding said the cost of the project was about \$160,000 with the County's share being \$130,000 and that he would be looking at grant opportunities to help offset the County's share. Chairman Springer said the Board could not take the possibility of a grant into consideration on this day. She said she would support the request if it was contingent upon each of the incorporated areas paying \$1 per person toward the project. Supervisor Davis said any grant funds that might be received should be put into the General Fund Contingency account. There appeared to be general agreement that the \$130,000 for the project would be included in the budget. It was noted that a request from Elections for 100 Touchscreen DREs, software and equipment at a cost of \$476,050 would be reimbursed from the state and that it would be included in the budget. Discussion turned to requests from the Sheriff, with general agreement that

requests for a walk-in freezer, dry storage container, refrigerated storage container and three laptops with docking stations for vehicles would be included for the Criminal Investigations Bureau and that phase two of a communications upgrade for the Support Services Bureau would also be included. Sheriff Waugh said he wanted to hold off on a request for 12 self-contained breathing apparatus equipment for Detention Services (Jail District). Sheriff Waugh told the Board that he needed to do a vehicle study for his department and that he would like the Board to give him an opportunity to evaluate the entire fleet, look at take-home vehicle issues and come back to the Board with a policy. He said it would take some time to do the study and develop a policy and that he would like to hold off until September. He said that, historically, when a Deputy is put into service the vehicle is included. Sheriff Waugh said there were many things that needed to be looked at, including the fact that being able to take a vehicle home was something of a benefit. He said that in talking about line item proposals for maintenance of and damage to vehicles he needed to work very closely with Mr. Gartner. He said he was familiar with a system where everything is charged to the department and that he was now familiar with the County's system and that he thought the best thing would probably be a combination of both types of systems. Chairman Springer said that, with all due respect, the Sheriff's Office was not the only County department that had vehicles and that it was up to the Board to determine policy regarding vehicles. She said the Sheriff's request that the Board postpone a decision so that he could work out a policy was not what the Board was talking about and that it was talking about the Board setting a policy. Chairman Springer said she agreed that there were details that would need to be worked out but that she was not willing to put the issue off until September and that vehicle costs should be included in each department's budget. She said she agreed that more work would need to be done with some of the other issues regarding take-home vehicles and that she believed Sheriff Waugh knew the Board had some issues with regard to the "one man one vehicle" concept. Chairman Springer said that with regard to utilization of vehicles, Mr. Holst and Mr. Gartner were working on that issue and that the Board wanted to make some decisions on how vehicles would be managed and that it did not want to wait until September. Sheriff Waugh said he thought it was important to look at the reason for take-home vehicles for Deputies and that there were as many organizations that were moving toward that concept as there were moving away from it. He said if the County moved toward a situation where it would not have take-home vehicles he believed there would be a significant impact on response time. Chairman Springer said that as the Sheriff looked at this being an aspect of response time, she would like him to look at the people in his department who have take-home vehicles who are not subject to on-call duties. She said another issue was that people who had take home-home vehicles were considered to be on the clock when they get into the vehicle as opposed to when they arrive at work. She said if there was 30 to 40 minutes of commute time to and from their workstation they were getting paid twice and that not only is the actual workday reduced but that there were overtime issues that were considerable. Chairman Springer said there was a question as to whether it was really appropriate to use taxpayer money to pay people to get themselves to and from work regardless of where they work. She asked if the Deputies were actually on call if they were subject to call and if they were whether they were being paid for being on call. She said she agreed that there were some complex issues but that what the Board was talking about now was assigning the actual costs of vehicles to each department's budget. Sheriff Waugh said he realized there were many things that needed to be taken into consideration and that he hoped that as Board members and as members of the community the Board would recognize that he had expertise in his area just as each Board member had expertise in his or her own area. He said he entered his position as Sheriff in a cooperative spirit and that he hoped it would continue. Chairman Springer said that accountability had been missing and that she did not think that over time the Board had been aware of the cumulative effect of vehicles. She said her own personal view was that it was not a good idea to provide take-home vehicles for County employees at taxpayer expense. Discussion turned to non-personnel program change requests from Facilities, with general agreement that vehicles would be included along with a gas powered pole tree pruner, 32-foot extension ladder, a ladder climber's safety system and interior ladder, while requests for a five-drawer flat steel cabinet and a compactor were out. A request for a color laser printer was put on hold for MIS review. There was general agreement that requests from Fleet Management for a motor pool module, auto detailing trailer, key duplicating machine, Voyager EFI Software, and one desktop computer would be approved, along with one mobile automotive diagnostics computer, while a request for six shop computers would be handled by providing used computers through MIS. Human Resources requests for a service award program and Yavapai College Command Spanish Training Program were approved, while it was agreed that MIS could provide two used computers instead of the two new computers being requested by the department. There was general agreement that a request from Juvenile Probation for a laser printer for the detention control room, a high lumen project and three cameras for detention cells would be included in the budget. MIS requests for the Integration Project, Wireless Pilot Project, personal computers to laptop computers, laptop computers to personal computers and electronic imaging would be included but that a request for Polycom VSX 3000 video for the courts would be on hold. A request from the Public

Defender for a copier for the jail courtroom was held, a DVD duplicator was denied and it was agreed that a used computer from MIS could serve in place of a new computer for interns. A request from Records Management for a high volume shredder was included in the budget. The Board agreed to include in the budget requests from the Superior Court for an increased contribution to the Pro Tem A Division, increased contribution to the Family Law Division, replacement of a closed circuit television system and purchase of a carpet extractor/cleaner but to hold consideration of a copy machine. During discussion of requests from the Library District, there was general agreement to approve relocation of the Yavapai Library Network Equipment but to not approve a lease for a larger transit/sorting facility after Mr. Holst said he believed room could be made at Prosser Street to accommodate the District's needs. Requests from HURF Road for a hot asphalt patch truck and two 7-ton steel wheel vibratory rollers were approved but requests for a GPS system, a Dell Notebook and other technology requests were put on hold pending MIS review. Similarly, a request for a laptop in the Regional Roads budget was also put on hold. A request for \$90,000 for a backhoe for Solid Waste was cut to \$70,000 and included in the budget. There was brief discussion regarding the Jail District, during which Mr. Holst said that a 1.65% increase just for Detention Officers would equal \$115,000. He said if the District had the same amount of staff but 100 fewer inmates he questioned the need for overtime, pointing out that \$75,000 had been included in the District's budget for overtime. There was brief discussion regarding the revenue that would result from renting beds, during which Mr. Holst pointed out there was nothing included in the budget at this time to hire the Detention Officers that would be needed to open a pod in order to rent beds. Ms. Ayers noted that the District currently had only two Detention Officer vacancies.

S – ADMINISTRATOR

S2. County Administrator's Report. Jim Holst, County Administrator. Due to the lateness of the hour, the Board did not address this item.

CLAIMS AGAINST YAVAPAI COUNTY

ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT
General Fund	1,924,304.96	Jail District	523,472.15
District 1 Park Fund	940.53	District 2 Park Fund	507.61
District 3 Park Fund	2,617.88	WMD Planner	828.53
HS 2003 Supplement.	265,991.12	DOH HS Exercise	1,475.13
Improvement of Ed	650.00	Adult Prob Fees – 40	543.09
Electronic Doc. Image	410.40	Public Health Reserve	1,136.18
Environmental Health	10,510.92	Susan Komen Breast H.	737.85
Medical Reserve Corps	810.90	Resep Radiation Exp.	556.87
Comm. Health Center	29,082.46	AMPPHI	1,274.28
Family Planning	5,270.21	MCH Programs	1,907.29
Breast Feed. Couns.	1,097.26	Health Promotion	2,376.03
Cost Allocation	2,005.71	Nutrition	1,435.09
TB Control	425.00	WIC Program	16,634.61
Title X Family Plann.	1,940.67	Jail Enhancement	4,025.63
Juvenile Delinq. Reduct	12,992.21	Juvenile IPS	16,872.19
Juvenile Food Prog	6,006.51	Probation Serv	4,132.83
Adult IPS	33,249.83	Adult Probation Fees	13,445.09
Prob Enhance	41,047.36	Recorder's Surcharge	12,553.60
Indigent Def/Dg	4,271.29	Crim Just/Atty	3,435.35
Bad Check Prog	2,985.59	Juv Prob Svs	1,858.36
Commodity Fd	1,767.83	Hi Risk Chld HI	5,861.03
Clerk's Storage	1,788.62	HIV Counsel & Test	1,386.75
Atty Anti-Racket	5,539.60	PANT	7,840.91
Law Library	1,360.52	CASA	5,344.34
Case Processing	5,792.08	Prim. Care – V.V.	5,811.49
Victim Witness Prog	9,228.98	Court Enhancement	5,303.77
Council Court	3,251.09	Enhance Drug Court	4,233.13
Inmate Health Svs	4,687.21	Drug Enforce. Fund	3,778.19
Probate Fund	940.12	Primary Care Services	11,809.49
PC Fees VV	494.00	Local ADR	565.69
Victims Rights Impl	3,308.67	JAIBG Juv Acct P-II	1,681.09

DUI Abatement 2005	400.76	Dietetic Intern	586.88
Immuniz Service	2,963.52	Personal Care Svs	2,715.54
Idea-Preschool	1,481.69	Subs Abuse/DARE	512.02
Chem Abuse	850.52	Family Drug Court	1,193.70
Juv Det/PACE	3,580.08	Collab. Comp Rev Gr	9,272.95
Prevent Child Abuse	10,308.87	Special Program	26,948.56
Sm Schools Ecia	941.18	Sm Schools Beha	19,380.99
Fill the Gap – Courts	13,284.95	Hurf Road Funds	585,269.44
Assessor Surcharge	7,130.22	Assessor App Dev	9,463.03
Health Fund	60,852.81	Jail Commissary	7,256.44
Yav. Cemetery Assoc.	239.78	Landfill Administ.	20,959.92
Judge Pro Tem Div B	10,500.62	Tire Recycle	2,154.37
Safe School Pro	8,205.16	Adhs-Svs Coord	2,399.04
Local Incentive Awards	1,648.69	Fill the Gap – Attorney	4,759.43
Family Law Commiss.	7,343.47	Comm Punish Pro	7,205.45
Juven. Detent Ed Pro	3,414.25	Regnl Road Project	91,861.05
Library Auto Consor	1,485.94	Sterilization Services	300.00
Health Start	3,461.32	Interstate Compact Pro	2,321.70
Ryan White II	3,959.14	Prepared. Bioterror	13,086.92
St Grant in Aid	13,912.69	Primary Care Fees	31,115.49
Perinatal Block	2,975.18	Well Woman Health	3,202.09
Tobacco Educ	9,924.37	St Imple. Grant	132.80
School Reso. – Mayer	907.76	Az Region Support	89.30
Direct Treatment Fund	5,057.74	Mental HealthRWJF	3,855.61
Mental Health Part.	4,015.76	Field Trainer	2,293.16
Attendant Care	23,634.96	HIV/CT	28.51
Access & Visitation	740.25	Childrens Justice	336.29
Child Sup & Vis	889.14	Domestic Relations Ed	339.42
Self Service	193.33	VOCA	8,111.30
JTSF Treatment	6,010.71	Diversion Conseq.	1,075.25
Sedona Airport	1,337,797.49	ALTCS	1,766,793.87
Help Debt Svs Loans	380,493.76		

In addition, payroll was issued on May 13 for the pay period ending May 7; warrant numbers 2452557 through 2452893, in the amount of \$280,446.63. Jury certificates issued during this time; 6870309 through 6870655. Warrants issued for May 16 Board day, 4241749 through 4242122; 4242123 through 4242686.

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

ATTEST:

_____ Clerk _____ Chairman