

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

September 19, 2005

The Board of Supervisors met in regular session on September 19, 2005, in Cottonwood, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m.

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

Also present: Jim Holst, County Administrator; Dave Hunt, Board Attorney.

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 Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Thurman, the Board voted unanimously to approve all items appearing on the Consent Agenda. No comments from the public.

C – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- C1. Minutes of meeting of September 6, 2005.
- C2. Liquor licenses for which there are no protests: (a) Series 10 Original Beer and Wine Store, Beaver Creek Gas Mart, Rimrock area, Douglas M. West; (b) Series 12 Original Restaurant, Verde Santa Fe Golf Course Grille, Cornville area, Thomas L. Bienek; (c) Series 10 Beer and Wine Store, The Country Corner, Wilhoit area, Cynthia Carey.
- C3. Ratify action taken by staff to eliminate the tax rate set for Big Park Domestic Wastewater Improvement District, as requested by the District.
- C4. Appoint Mike Flannery, Vice Mayor of Prescott Valley, to the Water Advisory Committee to replace Larry Tarkowski as the representative for the Town of Prescott Valley.
- C5. Appointment of precinct committeemen as recommended by the Yavapai County Republican Committee and as evidenced Board Memorandum No. 2005-15.
- C6. Appoint the following persons to the Local Workforce Investment Board Youth Council as recommended by the LWIB: Tammis Anderson, ESR Consulting, private sector member; Janai Reynolds, WIA Youth Participant, youth member; and Lonnie Densberger, Yavapai College, education member.
- C7. Resolution Amending Resolution No. 1551 Delegating Authority for Approval of Special Event Liquor Licenses, Wine Festival/Wine Fair Licenses, Temporary and Permanent Premises Extension of Patio Permits, Fireworks Permits and Parade Permits, and Establishing Administrative Procedures and Adding Administrative Procedures for Special Event Permits for Various Types of Races and Other Special Events. Resolution No. 1593.
- C8. Board of Supervisors meeting schedule for regular and special meetings in 2006.
- C9. Appoint the following persons to the Yavapai County Cooperative Extension Advisory Board: Dan Black, to replace Dr. Steven Dow, with term to expire May 15, 2006; Gary Mortimer, to replace Phil Knight, with term to expire May 15, 2006; Angela Teskey-Peterson, to replace Barbara Killian, with term to expire May 15, 2007; and reappoint Brenda Hauser, with term to expire May 15, 2007.
- C10. Approve vouchers.

C – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- C11. Zoning map change from RCU-2A to M1, Tiffany Construction, 405-23-006K, McGuireville area, Herb Tiffany agent for Phyllis and C.A. McDonald, #H5104. Consideration of a Zoning Map Change from RCU-2A (Residential, Rural, two-acre minimum parcel) to M1 (Industrial: General Limited) on approximately 3-acre portion of a 29 acre parcel. Located one mile north of the Cornville Road and I-17 interchange in the McGuireville area. S33 T15N R5E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the zoning map change with the following stipulations: 1). Future Development shall submit a detailed traffic analysis, which must be reviewed and approved by Public Works, and make any necessary improvements to mitigate their impact to the County's roadway system prior to any development; 2). The 3 acres portion of the property under lease by Tiffany Construction shall be surveyed and a legal description shall be provided to the County Development Services Department within 3 months of Board approval or the Zoning Map Change shall become null and void.

C – FINANCE

- C12. Appropriation transfers to cover departmental deficit balances for fiscal year 2004-2005.
- C13. Reissue a check in the amount of \$102.70 to SunWest Dermatology, in accordance with A.R.S. §11-644.

C – PUBLIC WORKS

- C14. Accept fiscal year 2006 LTAF II grant funds in the amount of \$72,004.49 and enter into grant agreements with various public transportation providers who qualify for financial aid under the 2006 Local Transportation Assistance Funds (LTAF II) guidelines.
- C15. Intergovernmental agreement with the City of Cottonwood for the Cottonwood Area Transit System for transportation services for the period beginning October 1, 2005, and ending September 30, 2006, at a cost of \$48,725.01 to be paid from the General Fund (\$15,000) and from LTAF II Grant Funds (\$33,725.01).
- C16. Accept Special Warranty Deed recorded by First American Title in Book 4274, Page 324, for a portion of Circle Drive, Oak Creek Vista Acres, Page Springs area.
- C17. Release funds being held in retention under the financial assurances for Talking Rock Ranch Phase Two – A. Roads are classified as private and will not receive maintenance from the County.
- C18. Release funds being held in retention under the financial assurances for Talking Rock Ranch Phase Two – B. Roads are classified as private and will not receive maintenance from the County.
- C19. Release funds being held in retention under the financial assurances for Talking Rock Ranch Phase Two – C. Roads are classified as private and will not receive maintenance from the County.
- C20. Release funds being held in retention under the financial assurances for Talking Rock Ranch Phase Twenty-Seven. Roads are classified as private and will not receive maintenance from the County.
- C21. Release funds being held in retention under the financial assurances for Amante at Verde Santa Fe. Roads are classified as private and will not receive maintenance from the County.
- C22. Change Order #1 (Final) with Asphalt Paving & Supply, Inc., for Big Chino Road Reconstruction Project in Yavapai County, AZ, Project #2212305, in the decreased amount of \$67,802.50. HURF.
- C23. Extensions for completion of services for the following Authorizations of Services: Project Engineering Consultants, for Black Canyon City Drainage Improvement, AOS #2515189, extend to December 31, 2005; and Arcadis G&M, Inc., Road 5 South to S.R. 89A – Enhanced Project Assessment – AOS #2415185, extend to October 1, 2006. No funds required.
- C24. Bid received from sole bidder CBJ Asphalt & Concrete Contractors, LLC, for Annual Contract for Crack Sealing in Yavapai County, AZ, Contract #2513849. Bid opened September 6, 2005. Recommend awarding to sole bidder at unit price bid. To be paid from HURF.
- C25. ADOT Aeronautics grant E6F04 for design of security perimeter fencing at the Bagdad Airport. FAA portion is \$19,912; ADOT match is \$524; County match is \$524 to be paid from budgeted funds, Outside Services, General Airport Account.

C – SHERIFF

- C26. Take one County vehicle out of state in conjunction with Detention Services training for two employees in Las Vegas, Nevada, October 23-26, 2005.
- C27. Take one County vehicle out of state for two Detention Services employees' meeting with Las Vegas Metro Police Department, September 20-23, 2005.
- C28. Take two County vehicles out of state in conjunction with employees' attendance at Arizona Homicide Investigators Association Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, September 25-29, 2005.
- C29. Intergovernmental agreement with the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe for Law Enforcement Services.

ACTION

A – ASSESSOR

- A1. Proposed settlement of tax court case, Arizona Department of Revenue vs. Nextel West Corporation, case numbers TX2003-0001, TX2003-000678 and TX2004-000999. Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman. No comments from the public.

Mr. Schurr explained that this lawsuit involved 13 counties for tax years 2002, 2003, and 2004, and that the settlement would result in a refund from Yavapai County of approximately \$830 for all years and all jurisdictions. Supervisor Davis asked Mr. Schurr if he had reviewed the case and whether he believed the settlement was fair. Mr. Schurr said it was his recommendation that the Board approve the settlement.

A – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- A2. Proposal to lease County property at Fair Street, Prescott, to the Prescott Antique Auto Club, Inc. Dave Hunt, Board Attorney. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman. No comments from the public.

Mr. Hunt said it had been proposed that the County lease a portion of its property adjacent to the parking area at the Fair Street building to the Prescott Antique Auto Club. He noted that this type of lease was authorized by statute and that it would be a below market lease. He told the Board it would be necessary to publish notice of the proposed lease for four weeks and that the lease term would be for approximately 15

years. Mr. Hunt noted that the County would reserve the right to have the property available for overflow parking, and he added that currently the property being proposed for lease is in the name of the Yavapai County Flood Control District and that at the next Board meeting he would request that the Flood Control District quit claim the property to the County. He said that the only action being proposed on this day was approval to publish the notice of proposed lease. Supervisor Davis asked if the property was in the flood plain. Mr. Hunt said it was and that there were some flood-related issues that would have to be dealt with but that the authority with jurisdiction was the City of Prescott. Supervisor Davis asked if the County would own the buildings at the end of the lease term. Mr. Hunt said no, that the proposed building was a modular that could be taken away at the end of the lease. Supervisor Davis asked whether it was true that the County generally took ownership of buildings on land it leases. Mr. Hunt said that was generally true. Supervisor Davis asked if the lease agreement could be amended so that the County would receive ownership of the building. Chairman Springer said she believed the proposed building was a Quonset hut type of building and that after 15 to 25 years of use it probably would not be worth much.

- A3. Canvass the results of the September 13, 2005, election in Montezuma Rimrock Fire District for adoption of the 2003 International Fire Code. Bev Staddon, Clerk of the Board. Approved by unanimous vote after Ms. Staddon announced that of the 121 votes cast, 109 had voted "yes" and 12 had voted "no." Motion by Supervisor Thurman, second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.

A – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- A4. Accept Award of Contract #G035-05-03, in the amount of \$10,000, Arizona Department of Commerce, Growing Smarter Planning Grant Program. Enalo Lockard, Assistant Development Services Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman. No comment from the public.
- A5. Zoning violation abatement, 405-23-012C, Bice Road in the Rimrock area, at a cost of \$24,999 or less to be paid from budgeted funds, Outside Services. Ken Spedding, Development Services Director. Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr participated in discussion. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Thurman. No comments from the public.

Mr. Spedding said this would be an expensive clean-up but that the owner was willing to give permission for someone to enter the property in order to clean it up. Supervisor Davis asked if it would be possible to introduce legislation to guarantee payment to the County in cases like this one. Chairman Springer said that was pretty much taken care of with the lien. Mr. Spedding said that staff was looking into the possibility of obtaining a deed of trust in abatement cases and that there were some people who were willing to execute such a deed if it meant the County would clean up their property. Supervisor Davis said he did not like the idea of government taking over private property. Chairman Springer said that whether it was a lien or a deed of trust it would still come in sequential order in terms of recovery. Mr. Schurr said Chairman Springer was correct and that the tax lien would still be the first lien. He added that the County might have to pay the taxes on a property in order to ensure that it would not be lost to a tax sale.

A – HUMAN RESOURCES

- A6. Appoint John Rasmussen to the position of Water Advisory Committee Coordinator, to be effective October 17, 2005, at an annualized salary of \$65,000. Julie Ayers, Human Resources Director. Mr. Rasmussen was present and was introduced to the Board. Approved by unanimous vote, upon a motion by Supervisor Thurman, seconded by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.

A – LIBRARY DISTRICT (The Board of Supervisors resolved into the Board of Directors of the Yavapai County Free Library District and after considering this item reconvened as the Board of Supervisors.) Reference: Library District minutes.

- A7. Purchase an existing building located on the corner of Cordes Lakes Road and Quail Run Drive to house the Cordes Lakes Library. To be paid from Building/Land/Rental account.

HEARINGS

H – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- H1. Final site plan, Cottonwood Pines Timeshare Resort, 407-37-936B, Cornville area, Woodhaven Resort Management, Inc./Leonard Wayne agent for Ron Gerasimos/Clark-Wayland, Inc., #H5133. Enalo Lockard, Assistant Development Services Director. Consideration of a Final Site Plan for a timeshare resort consisting of 48 two-story units in the Planned Area Development known as Verde Santa Fe on a 3.4-acre parcel. Located near the Southeast corner of Verde Santa Fe Parkway and Cornville Road in the Cornville area. S6 T15N R4E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the final Site Plan, HA# H5133, with the following stipulations: 1). Final Site Plan to be in conformance with the Letter of Intent dated 6/24/05 and the Final Site Plan dated August 3, 2005 consisting of five (5)

pages; 2). The use shall be in conformance with all applicable County, State and Federal regulations; 3). Screening per section 567 shall be required from the residential parcels along the Eastern property line. Applicant to work with the neighbors to come up with a mutually agreed upon decision regarding the type of screening along the eastern boundary of the parcel for review and approval by staff prior building permits; 4). Final Subdivision Plat to be applied for within two (2) years of Board of Supervisors approval or Final Site Plan to become null and void. Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr participated in discussion and Planning & Zoning Commission member Curt Garner was present to represent the Commission. Attorney Bill Ring and Todd Herrick, both representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the application. Barbara Litrell and Charles Bismack spoke in opposition to the application. Thomas E. Freuler and Cathy Gerlach submitted public participation forms in opposition to the application but did not speak. 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 located the subject property on the south side of Cornville Road, at the north end of the golf course. He noted that the project was originally approved as a PAD in 1987 and that it was amended in 1995. He told the Board that the applicant was proposing the development of a three-acre site with 48 two-story timeshares with lockouts, which he said would allow for 96 guests to be on the property at one time. Mr. Lockard said there was some concern expressed at the Commission meeting regarding access and that staff had asked Public Works to look at it again. He said Public Works had determined that from a design standpoint there was no need for additional improvements. He noted that the subject property was designated C1 and that this zoning designation allows for timeshares, hotels and motels. Mr. Lockard said that a petition containing the signatures of 248 people in opposition to the application had been submitted, as well as additional letters, emails and petitions in opposition, but that this application was not a request for a zoning map change and that the requirement that approval of the application by the Board be unanimous if 20% or more opposition was registered did not apply in this case. Supervisor Thurman asked if the applicant could have timeshares on the property as a matter of right. Mr. Lockard said the applicant had to come back to show how everything would fit on the property. Supervisor Davis asked what the role of the Board was with regard to final site plans. Mr. Lockard said the Board had to determine if the plan met the intent of the original approval. Supervisor Davis said the Board had a letter from the applicant's attorney saying this was an administrative proposal and that the Board should just shut up and rubber stamp it. Mr. Schurr said that the Zoning Ordinance required that the final site plan meet the same standards as the preliminary subdivision plan and that if it met all subdivision requirements the Board would have to approve it. Supervisor Davis asked if that meant that if someone came in and proposed putting 5,000 timeshares on a three-acre site the Board would have to approve it. Mr. Schurr said any proposal would have to meet setback requirements as well as other requirements. Supervisor Davis asked if someone could build 100-square-foot timeshares and the Board would have no say in the matter. Mr. Schurr said he did not think that was the case and that there was a minimum amount of square footage required for a timeshare. Supervisor Thurman said he thought the minimum was 600 square feet. He said that when someone obtains approval for a PAD and the Board gives approval for a portion of the PAD to be zoned a certain way it seemed they would have the right administratively to do whatever they want with it. Mr. Schurr said that if the subject project was just zoned C1 the applicant could pull permits but that it was part of a PAD and for that reason the applicant had to provide a final site plan. Supervisor Davis said it was his understanding that a PAD was proposed and if a piece was left blank the Board would have to look at it again. Mr. Schurr said it was the subdivision review process that was involved. Supervisor Davis asked if it was true that the only issue the Board could discuss was access. Mr. Schurr said access could be discussed, as well as water and wastewater issues, and interior road issues. Supervisor Thurman asked whether there were guidelines to follow. Mr. Schurr said everything was laid out in the Subdivision Regulations. Supervisor Thurman said it was his understanding that if the applicant stayed within the guidelines the Board would have to approve the application or risk a lawsuit. Mr. Schurr said that was correct. Supervisor Davis asked whether the Board should ever approve a PAD unless uses for all of the property involved were mapped out. Mr. Schurr said he would recommend that if the Board approves a PAD it at least have a preliminary site plan available and make approval of the PAD contingent upon meeting that plan. Mr. Lockard said the original PAD was approved in 1987 and amended in 1995 to allow for a golf course. He said the final site plan showed the golf course and pro shop but that the subject of this day's discussion was just outside that piece of the property. Chairman Springer asked if the sales office was really an ongoing commercial business to rent the timeshares that would be there forever. Mr. Lockard said that was his understanding. Chairman Springer said she assumed the lockout would allow a second bedroom and bath to be rented out, and that there was a counter area that could be available for cooking. She said she wondered how a second cooking area would fall within the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Lockard said the plans showed one kitchen with two bedrooms and that the lockout would not have a kitchen and that the plans complied with the Ordinance. Chairman Springer said the lockout did have a counter and sink and that it would be possible to use a microwave. Mr. Lockard said that was true. Ms. Litrell said she was

representing more than 300 homeowners who were opposed to the subject property being used for timeshares and that the opposition was based on traffic and safety issues. She said the applicant had sent a letter to a select number of homeowners and represented that this was a done deal and the best alternative for a residential community. Ms. Litrell said people were not opposed to timeshares but that they had concerns about traffic and safety and density. She said she believed the project would create hazardous situations that had not been considered and that emergency personnel had not been asked to look at certain things. She said the sales office was not mentioned in the staff report and that people assumed it was not included in the application. Ms. Litrell said the opposition was based on significant traffic hazards because there was just one driveway for three different parts of the subdivision. She said it appeared that a traffic analysis was done in 1987 but that many things had changed since that time, and she talked about the number of accidents on Cornville Road and about how much traffic that road receives. Ms. Litrell expressed concern about the sales office and also about fire hazards, and said people were told that approval of the application would require a unanimous vote of the Board. She said the best thing would be less density, better access and no sales office and that she did not believe there had been an adequate traffic analysis provided for this project. Ms. Litrell asked that the Board not approve the application until all traffic and safety issues could be resolved. Mr. Bismack said his concern was safety related to access to the area and that he would suggest moving the entrance to the timeshares and golf course 100 feet to 150 feet farther south and make a separate entrance. Mr. Ring said he and his clients had listened very carefully to the questions the Board had asked. He said the letter he had sent to the Board about ten days ago did not say there was nothing the Board could do about the application. He said the application was not for a rezoning or a conditional use permit, but that it was just a site plan approval and that it should be in accordance with the PAD approved for Verde Santa Fe. Mr. Ring said a timeshare was a permitted use on the property, and that the Board was not prohibited from asking questions but that there did need to be some discussion about what questions could be asked and that those questions included things like setbacks, design, traffic and so forth. He said the Board had an analysis of the application that stated the applicant had met all of the specifications, and that both staff and the Commission had recommended approval of the application. Mr. Ring provided exhibits of the architect's rendering of the project, saying there would be 48 timeshare units that would have the potential for lockouts to create 96 units, but that the timeshares would be sold as single or double units. He said his client estimated that on any given day there would be only 60 occupants on the property. Mr. Ring described the design of the timeshares as a "Santa Fe" type design, saying it would fit in with the prevalent design in the area. He said that Ms. Litrell's assertion that a sales office had not been shown in the plan was not correct because the plan was presented as timeshares with sales, that timeshares were a commercial use and that any commercial use has a sales component associated with it. Chairman Springer said that the term "sales office" implied that at some point it would go away, and that in this case it really would not go away because it would be a leasing or management office. She said she believed the applicant should clearly state that fact. Mr. Ring said his clients had given him the authority to say that once the units are sold out on-site sales would be discontinued. Supervisor Davis said they would never sell out because they would go back on the market and that the sales component would never go away. Mr. Ring said the access easement was for the clubhouse, golf course and whatever use would go on his client's property, and that all three would have access off of Verde Santa Fe Parkway. He said there was a provision in the master plan that prohibited access to Cornville Road except for certain areas, and that the access easement that was portrayed as being 30 feet wide was actually 32 feet wide. Mr. Ring said that last week he had provided staff with a trip generation analysis developed by Shephard-Wesnitzer for his client's property in which the engineer had gone back and looked at the original traffic impact analysis that was approved in 1995. He said that of the total 2,125 trips per day generated from all three uses, it was estimated that his client's property would generate only 375 trips, or 15% of the total trips per day. Supervisor Davis said that without knowing the types of businesses involved it would be impossible to know how many trips would be generated. Mr. Ring said the 1995 traffic study assumed 30,000 square feet of commercial activities on his client's property, including office space and a 2,700-square-foot restaurant and that the estimate of 2,125 trips per day was based on that assumption. He reiterated that this was not a zoning case and that although the neighborhood was concerned about land use this was not a land use case. He said the fire department had looked at the plan and that the timeshare units would be sprinklered. Mr. Ring said the plan met zoning requirements, PAD requirements and the comprehensive plan. Supervisor Davis asked how many parking spaces would be provided for the timeshares. Mr. Lockard said the plan included 109 parking spaces. Supervisor Davis asked whether the County would normally require a secondary access. Mr. Lockard said a secondary access would not normally be required for a project this small and that it was also a commercial venue, not a residential venue. Supervisor Davis asked if the Cornville Community Plan identified the subject property as commercial. Mr. Lockard said he believed that community plan identified Verde Santa Fe as a PAD. Supervisor Davis asked if there was any discussion about adjacent property and intended uses

when the clubhouse was approved in 2004. Mr. Lockard said no, that there had been discussion only about parking. Supervisor Davis asked if anyone had looked at stacking of traffic on Verde Santa Fe Parkway. Mr. Lockard said staff had received a response from Public Works that it was okay. Supervisor Davis asked if the applicant's wastewater and water systems would tie into existing systems. Mr. Lockard said they would. Supervisor Davis asked if this project would have access to the amenities of the homeowners' association or whether the applicant would pay into the homeowners' association. Mr. Herrick said the applicant was paying a pro rata share on the road but would not have the use of the clubhouse. He said that with regard to sales and marketing issues, the room that activity would occur out of would be in one of the buildings and that once the project was sold out the marketing program on-site would be shut down. He said there would continue to be a check-in office and property manager. Supervisor Davis asked whether the Shephard-Wesnitzer study had forecast a traffic signal at the intersection of Verde Santa Fe Parkway and Cornville Road. Mr. Ring said he would have to look at the 1995 traffic impact analysis. He said that he, personally, could see that there would need to be a signal at that intersection at some point but that he had not meant to mislead anyone by saying there would be a signal at that location. Supervisor Thurman asked how the applicant would deal with the issue of safety in the parking lots. Mr. Herrick said that speed bumps and stop signs could be used and that people using the timeshares would only be allowed to park in the parking lots designated for that purpose. In response to a question from Supervisor Thurman, Mr. Herrick said there would be pre-sales, and that the infrastructure and amenities would go in first. Mr. Ring referred to page 25 of the 1995 traffic impact analysis saying it referred to long-range needs in the event that Verde Santa Fe was built out, and that it estimated 55,600 trips per day on Cornville Road. Supervisor Davis asked if the applicant had considered building single-story units to be more in keeping with existing structures in Verde Santa Fe. Mr. Davis said the two-story units were within the height limits and that even though the applicant could have used three stories on some units he chose not to do that. Supervisor Davis said many of the concerns had to do with the units being two stories and that he just wondered if the applicant had considered just building single-story units. Mr. Ring said there was not much interest in doing that and that he believed his client was in line with structures that already existed in the area. Supervisor Thurman said he wanted to thank Mr. Garner for being present on this day and he asked him to come forward and give his comments. Mr. Garner said the Commission had struggled with safety issues and viewshed issues. He said he believed that the completion of Verde Santa Fe north of Cornville Road would do more to deteriorate the existing views than the subject project would. Mr. Garner said that with regard to the 1995 traffic impact analysis he did not think that Shephard-Wesnitzer envisioned Beaverhead Flat Road being such a heavily used road. He said he did think there could be a tight entry on the 32-foot access, and that stacking could be an issue but that it would be more of an issue on Cornville Road. Mr. Garner said he thought there were some hydrologic issues, and that he also thought everyone was aware that at some point there would need to be a traffic signal at Verde Santa Fe Parkway and Cornville Road. Supervisor Thurman noted that Mr. Garner had voted yes on this application but had made a point of saying that the applicant would be subject to all County, state and federal regulations. Supervisor Davis said he hoped the residents of Verde Santa Fe understood the process. He said the entire Verde Santa Fe project approved in 1995 probably would not be approved in 2005. He said that Board tried not to write a blank check on PAD but that this situation was a good example of that having happened. He said that none of the current Board members was on the Board in 1995 and so had inherited this situation. Supervisor Davis said that what the Board had on this day was an approved use of the property and the proposal the applicant had brought forward appeared to meet all of the criteria set out by the County. He said that when someone plays by the rules it is very difficult to say no. In making the motion to approve the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission, Supervisor Davis said he was doing so reluctantly, and that as much as he personally did not like timeshares it was an approved use for this particular piece of property.

STUDY SESSIONS

S – ADMINISTRATOR

- S1. County Administrator's Report. Jim Holst, County Administrator. Management Analyst Allison Dixon participated in discussion.

Mr. Holst provided the Board with a brief update on current events, noting that the books for the 2004-2005 fiscal year had been closed and that the County was in good shape coming into the current fiscal year. He noted that sales tax revenues were up. Mr. Holst also briefly updated the Board on capital improvements, saying that information regarding financing had been compiled by Grant Hamill with Stone & Youngberg and that a request for qualifications for architectural services had also been drafted. He noted that the Board may want to look at justice of the peace precinct boundaries soon as any changes to those boundaries would need to be approved by December 1, 2005.

CLAIMS AGAINST YAVAPAI COUNTY

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
General Fund	1,987,330.91	Jail District	555,290.46
Verde Valley Sr Center	59,864.00	Adult Center – Ctwd	68,914.00
WMD Planner	1,024.37	HS 2003 Supplem.	499.50
Improvement of Ed	870.34	Reading Special. H&S	1,180.46
Adult Prob Fees – 40	548.28	Dewey Humboldt Agree	6,966.74
Public Health Reserve	5,952.44	Environmental Health	11,438.27
Susan Komen Breast H.	113.22	Medical Reserve Corps	836.79
Resep Radiation Exp.	512.63	Comm. Health Center	24,328.54
AMPPHI	1,240.60	Family Planning	4,173.17
MCH Programs	1,259.66	Breast Feed. Couns.	2,482.36
Health Promotion	3,681.38	Cost Allocation	1,358.12
Nutrition	438.24	TB Control	93.37
WIC Program	14,491.10	Title X Family Plann.	1,739.76
Jail Enhancement	1,561.16	Juvenile Delinq. Reduct	16,280.66
Juvenile IPS	18,093.14	Family Counseling	950.00
Juvenile Food Prog	1,559.77	Probation Serv	4,383.91
Adult IPS	34,049.19	Adult Probation Fees	12,827.19
Prob Enhance	45,166.73	Recorder's Surcharge	15,467.18
Indigent Def/Dg	4,098.38	Crim Just/Atty	4,632.30
Bad Check Prog	2,538.04	CDBG Grant	9,141.50
Juv Prob Svs	1,985.88	Commodity Fd	1,329.59
Sexual Trans Disease	35.00	Hi Risk Chld HI	9,111.71
Clerk's Storage	1,347.22	HIV Counsel & Test	1,466.63
Atty Anti-Racket	38,008.26	PANT	9,779.09
Law Library	2,613.24	CASA	3,813.60
Case Processing	5,792.70	Prim. Care – V.V.	3,384.17
Victim Witness Prog	10,861.71	Council Court	778.75
Enhance Drug Court	4,178.48	Inmate Health Services	216.11
Drug Enforce. Fund	1,503.19	Probate Fund	1,104.74
Primary Care Services	12,236.22	PC Fees VV	570.47
Local ADR	239.72	Victims Rights Impl	3,993.53
JAIBG Juv Acct P-II	1,782.83	Yavapai Indian Agree	1,520.07
DUI Abatement 2005	239.08	Dietetic Intern	622.04
Immuniz Service	3,184.69	Personal Care Svs	3,984.56
Idea-Preschool	1,418.94	Subs Abuse/DARE	335.04
Chem Abuse	446.68	Family Drug Court	1,468.79
Juv Det/PACE	6,003.71	Collab. Comp Rev Gr	9,111.04
Special Program	20,862.21	Sm Schools Ecia	611.29
Sm Schools Beha	23,990.72	Fill the Gap – Courts	12,578.21
Set aside Fill the Gap	1,295.56	Hurf Road Funds	434,270.68
Assessor Surcharge	9,361.11	Assessor App Dev	10,810.91
Health Fund	70,229.39	Jail Commissary	6,099.63
Landfill Administ.	53,330.36	Judge Pro Tem Div B	10,810.91
Tire Recycle	14,902.08	Safe School Pro	8,927.10
Adhs-Svs Coord	781.83	Local Incentive Awards	765.05
Fill the Gap – Attorney	5,040.64	Family Law Commiss.	8,233.63
Comm Punish Pro	4,553.19	Juven. Detent Ed Pro	1,489.78
Regnl Road Project	38,762.93	Library Auto Consor	651.82
Health Start	2,315.01	Victim Comp. ACJC	2,150.63
Victim Comp. VOCA	3,022.52	DUI Comm Gov Office	600.00
Interstate Compact Prog	2,021.07	Ryan White II	4,861.28
Prepared. Bioterror	12,026.19	State Grant in Aid	595.83
Primary Care Fees	29,163.58	Perinatal Block	2,558.19
Well Woman Health	5,923.09	Tobacco Educ	11,170.46
School Reso. – Mayer	964.93	Direct Treatment Fund	7,911.81

Mental HealthRWJF	3,244.63	Mental Health Part.	3,244.56
Field Trainer	2,430.80	Attendant Care	23,013.61
Childrens Justice	1,791.29	Child Sup & Vis	914.84
Domestic Relations Ed	599.23	Self Service	885.01
VOCA	9,690.95	JTSF Treatment	23,294.20
Diversion Conseq.	748.66	Capital Projects	19,035.15
Jail Construction	18,111.83	ALTCS	1,998,683.28
Help Debt Svs Loans	191,015.63		

In addition, payroll was issued on September 16 for the pay period ending September 10; warrant numbers 2455679 through 2456022, in the amount of \$299,772.26. Jury certificates issued during this time; 6872461 through 6872619. Warrants issued for September 19 Board day, 4249854 through 4250231; 4250232 through 4250649.

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

ATTEST:

_____ Clerk _____ Chairman