

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

August 21, 2006

The Board of Supervisors met in regular session on August 21, 2006, at 9:00 a.m., in Cottonwood, Arizona.  
Present: Thomas Thurman, Chairman; Chip Davis, Vice Chairman; Carol Springer, Member; Bev Staddon, Clerk.  
Also present: Jim Holst, County Administrator; Dave Hunt, Board Attorney/Assistant County Administrator.

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 Springer, 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 August 7, 2006, and of special meetings of July 19, July 25, July 31 and August 8, 2006.
- C2. Liquor licenses for which there are no protests: (a) Series 7 Person Transfer, Beaver Creek Golf Club/Ranch House Restaurant, Lake Montezuma area, Peter J. Hill; (b) Series 13 Domestic Farm Winery License, Alcantara Vineyards & Winery, Cottonwood area, Barbara Predmore.
- C3. Pursuant to A.R.S. §11-644, authorize reissuance of voided check in the amount of \$108.15 to Pinon Estates, Inc. for overpayment of taxes of parcel 202-09-045.
- C4. Co-sponsor Verde River Day annual event to be held on September 30, 2006.
- C5. Appoint Raymond Arnold to the Local Work Force Investment Board (LWIB) Executive and General Committees as a private sector representative, to replace Howard Haines, with term to expire September 2009; and appoint John McDonough to the LWIB Executive and General Committees as a private sector representative, to replace Kristin Jansky, with term to expire February 2009. Clerk's note: Following the meeting, the Clerk was made aware that the agenda item submitted for the appointment of John McDonough was incorrect and that the intent of the LWIB was to request appointment of Mr. McDonough only to the LWIB General Committee. Removal of Mr. McDonough from the LWIB Executive Committee is expected to be on the agenda for the September 5, 2006, Board of Supervisors meeting.
- C6. Appoint William Velez to the LWIB Youth Council as a juvenile corrections representative, with term to expire August 2010.
- C7. Consider approval of Resolution No. 1621, Reaffirming the County's Program for Regional Road Construction and Reconstruction Using Funds Allocated for Regional Road Purposes, Authorizing Use of Allocated Revenues for Certain Other Road-Related Projects and Deleting Provisions Requiring a Unanimous Vote of the Board of Supervisors for Approvals of Actions Related to the Regional Road Program.
- C8. Intergovernmental agreement with the City of Cottonwood for the Cottonwood Area Transit System (CATS) in the amount of \$62,450 to be paid from the Regional Road Fund.
- C9. Approve vouchers.

C – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- C10. Zoning map change from R1L-70 to R1L-35, Cathedral Rock, LLC, 408-30-017C, Village of Oak Creek area, Gail Herrick applicant/agent for Cathedral Rock, LLC, #H6089. Consideration of a Zoning Map Change for a five acre parcel from R1L-70 (Residential; Single Family Limited; 70,000 sq. ft. minimum) zoning district to R1L-35 (Residential; Single Family Limited; 35,000 sq. ft. minimum) zoning district. Located across from the Verde Valley School in the Village of Oak Creek. S35 T17N R05E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the zoning map change with the following stipulations: 1). Property, if developed, must be in accordance with the Letter of Intent dated May 30, 2006 and the site plan stamped received May 30, 2006 and property will be developed in accordance to all fire district, county, state and federal regulations; 2). An engineered drainage report must be submitted and approved by the Flood Control Unit prior to application for any building permits; 3). Access road to four of the five parcels will be designed to County standards; 4). A demolition permit must be issued and demolition of existing structure must be completed within six months of Zoning Map Change approval; 5). The survey recording the lot splits must indicate a 1 foot non-vehicular access easement along the western boundary to prevent development of social trails unto the forest service property; 6). Applicant will pave the portion of Verde Valley School Road to County standards from the end of the paved portion to the proposed driveway to parcel 5.

C – FACILITIES

- C11. Award bid for replacement of a 70-ton chiller unit for facility located at 255 E. Gurley Street, Prescott, to sole bidder Brooks

Mechanical in the amount of \$69,857.12 to be paid from Construction in Progress.

C – FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT The Board of Supervisors resolved into the Board of Directors of the Yavapai County Flood Control District and following consideration of the item listed below reconvened as the Board of Supervisors. Reference: Flood Control District minutes.

- C12. Request for approval and signature on Community Rating System (CRS) Re-certification Form AW-214 for year 2006 credit for the unincorporated areas of Yavapai County.

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

### YAVAPAI COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

#### Minutes of Meeting

August 21, 2006

The Board of Supervisors resolved into the Board of Directors of the Yavapai County Flood Control District.

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

Upon a motion by Director Davis, seconded by Director Springer, the Board voted unanimously to approve the following item:

Request for approval and signature on Community Rating System (CRS) Re-certification Form AW-214 for year 2006 credit for the unincorporated areas of Yavapai County.

### C – JUVENILE PROBATION

- C13. Accept grant from the State of Arizona in the amount of \$500 for funding assistance to send detention personnel to the Representing America's Youth Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, October 15-18, 2006, presented by the National Partnership for Juvenile Services, no County match required.
- C14. Accept grant from the Arizona Supreme Court Administrative Office of the Courts in the amount of \$38,448 for funding of the Juvenile Drug Court Program. No County match required.

### C – MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

- C15. Permission to donate three laptop computers slated for auction to the Jerome Library.

### C – PUBLIC FIDUCIARY

- C16. Permission for Public Fiduciary Shari Tomlinson to attend the National Guardianship Conference in Newport Beach, California, October 7-10, 2006, at a cost of \$1,134 to be paid from Travels and Meetings account.

### C – PUBLIC WORKS

- C17. Consider approving a right-of-way project on Stevenson Drive, Rimrock area.
- C18. Consider accepting petition to establish various roads in Highland Pines, Hootenanny Holler, Deer Trail Acres and the Seligman area as County highways and set hearing for September 5, 2006, at 10:00 a.m.
- C19. Consider accepting petition to establish a road in the Lake Montezuma area as a County highway and set hearing for September 18, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. (Clerk's note: The agenda listed September 19 as the hearing date. This was a typographical error.)
- C20. Accept application from Cathedral Vista Water Company for the renewal of an existing water franchise and set hearing for September 18, 2006, at 10:00 a.m.
- C21. Award or reject bids received for Contract to Supply and/or Supply and Deliver 1" to 4" Diameter Rock Material, 4" to 8" Diameter Rock Material, and 8" to 12" Diameter Rock Material in Yavapai County, AZ, Contract No. 2616533. Bids opened August 8, 2006, with bids received from the following vendors: ACT Contracting, LLC; Rink Materials (Camp Verde and Prescott). Recommend awarding to all bidders at various unit prices. To be paid from HURF, Road Material.
- C22. Consider approval of Authorization of Services No. 2616538 with Engineering and Testing Consultants, Inc. for geotechnical engineering services for Cornville Road and Two Segments of Beaver Creek Road in Yavapai County, AZ, Project #2616238, in an amount not to exceed \$6,800. To be paid from Regional Roads, Cornville Road and Beaver Creek Road.
- C23. Consider approval of Change Order #1 (Final) with Fann contracting, Inc. for Iron Springs Road Asphalt Rubber Friction Course Project in Yavapai County, AZ, Project #2112125 in the decreased amount of \$67,806.03. Regional Road project, Iron Springs Road.

- C24. Consider a contribution of \$10,000 to the City of Prescott to assist in the funding of a Household Hazardous Waste Day, to be paid from Contingency.
- C25. Consider approval of ADOT Aeronautics grant #7S02 to design Taxiway "A" rehabilitation at the Sedona Airport. Reimbursable grant amount is \$80,000 with \$8,000 match to be paid by Sedona Airport Administration. To be paid from Outside Services, General Airport account.
- C26. Consider approval of FAA grant 3-04-0033-16 for the rehabilitation of Taxiway "A" at the Sedona Airport. FAA grant amount is \$1,150,000; ADOT match is \$30,263; and Sedona Airport Administration match is \$30,263 for total funding of \$1,210,526. To be paid from Outside Services, General Airport account.
- C27. Consider approval of Authorization of Services #2616537 with Z&H Engineering, Inc. for the design and bidding services for Taxiway "A" rehabilitation at the Sedona Airport in an amount not to exceed \$79,060, to be funded from ADOT Aeronautics Division grant and grant match from Sedona Airport Administration. Outside Services, General Airport Account.

#### C – SHERIFF

- C28. Permission for five members of the SWAT team to take a County vehicle out of state to attend the National Tactical Officers Association conference in Los Angeles, California, September 9-16, 2006.

#### C – SUPERIOR COURT

- C29. Request for approval of \$370,150 Fill the Gap grant application to the Arizona Supreme Court to continue efforts to improve criminal case processing.

#### ACTION ITEMS

#### A – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- A1. Set primary and secondary property tax rates for 2006 for the following jurisdictions: Yavapai County, Fire District Contribution, Yavapai County Free Library District, Yavapai County Flood Control District, Fire Districts, Sanitary Districts, Ash Fork Street Lighting Improvement District, Seligman Street Lighting Improvement District, and Yarnell Street Lighting Improvement District, High Valley Ranch Domestic Wastewater Improvement District, and Ponderosa Park Domestic Water Improvement District; and convey tax rates for all jurisdictions to the County Treasurer. Jim Holst, County Administrator. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public. Resolution No. 1623.
- A2. Discussion and possible action regarding PL 106-393 Program, including establishing the percentage of 2006-2007 Forest Fee receipts to be reserved for Forest Projects and designating a schedule for application, review and award of 2006-2007 Forest Projects funds. Dave Hunt, Board Attorney/Assistant County Administrator. Upon a motion by Supervisor Springer, seconded by Supervisor Davis, the Board voted unanimously to set the percentage of 2006-2007 Forest Fee receipts to be reserved for Forest Projects at 20%. No comments from the public.

During very brief discussion of this item, Supervisor Springer noted that the Board funds a portion of the Sheriff's operation out of this money and that she would like to see the Board take 20% of the receipts and use more of that money for County projects.

#### A – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- A3. Authorization to enter into a contract with BAE Company in the amount of \$4,500 for the abatement of violations at 2648 S. Karlson Drive in Cornville, 407-07-338. To be paid from Outside Services account. Ken Spedding, Development Services Director. Land Use Unit Manager Steven Mauk participated in discussion of this item. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

Mr. Spedding said that staff had exhausted all administrative remedies with regard to this property. He said he had learned this morning that it might not be necessary to enter into a contract for abatement of the violations because the owner of the property had moved back into the state and was apparently in the process of selling the property. He said it might be possible for staff to work with the new owner regarding clean-up of the property. Mr. Mauk said staff would still like to request approval of this item in the event it was not possible to work things out. In response to a question from Supervisor Springer, Mr. Mauk said staff would ask that \$4,500 be held in escrow in the event the property is not cleaned up within 30 days. He said this approach had been used in the past on other properties in violation.

#### A – PUBLIC WORKS

- A4. Consider approval of Change Order No. 1 to Authorization of Services No. 238896 with Lima & Associates, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$49,200 for the Verde Valley Multimodal Transportation Study. To be paid from Regional Road Fund. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

- A5. Permission to enter into a purchase agreement with Martin Galvez Ramos and Micaela Molina Castro for acquisition of right-of-way from parcel 405-33-435 needed for the Jacks Canyon Road improvement project, in an amount not to exceed \$7,600 and authorize the Public Works Director to sign all necessary documents. Regional Road project. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.
- A6. Award or reject bid received for the purchase and delivery of one 12-Ton Vibratory Padfoot Soil Compactor, Contract #2616033. Bid opened August 8, 2006, with sole bid received from Empire Machinery in the amount of \$165,193.11. Recommend awarding to Empire Machinery in the amount of \$165,193.11 to be paid from HURF, New Equipment \$5,000+. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Chairman Thurman, second by Supervisor Davis. No comments from the public.
- A7. Award or reject bids received for Seligman Airport Rubberized Chip Seal and Slurry Seal in Yavapai County, AZ, Project #2614896. Bids opened August 8, 2006, with bids received from International Surfacing Systems, Inc., in the amount of \$215,312.49 and from Cactus Asphalt in the amount of \$229,154.71. Recommend awarding to low bidder International Surfacing Systems, Inc., in the amount of \$215,312.49 to be paid from ADOT Aeronautics grant in the amount of \$213,038 plus County match of \$10,652. Outside Services, General Services Airport. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

## HEARINGS

H – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES Planning & Zoning Commission member Curtis Lindner was present to represent the Commission. Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr participated via video conferencing from Prescott.

- H1. Zoning Ordinance Amendment to add subsection "C" Minor Land Division under Section 546 Land Division with eight sub-categories relating to applicability, purpose, requirements, fee, action by the Department, method to record a land division and how to report or remove access/zoning deficiencies; Planning & Zoning Commission, #H6058. Consideration of an amendment to the Yavapai County Zoning Ordinance to add the review of Minor Land Divisions (those creating five or fewer parcels not constituting a subdivision) as allowed for in Arizona Revised Statute. This amendment will add subsection "C" MINOR LAND DIVISION under SECTION 546 LAND DIVISION with 8 sub categories relating to applicability, purpose, requirements, fee, action by the Department, method to record a land division and how to report or remove access/zoning deficiencies. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment to add subsection "C" MINOR LAND DIVISION under SECTION 546 LAND DIVISION. Enalo Lockard, Assistant Development Services Director. The planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of this application. Development Services Director Ken Spedding and Land Use Unit Manager Steven Mauk participated in discussion. Ivo Buddek and Michael Kerr, both private sector surveyors, also participated in discussion of this item, generally expressing concerns about language related to certification by surveyors of traversability of access to lot splits, the fact that review would be limited to lot splits of 10 acres or less, and the listing of deficiencies on deeds as opposed to a document that a buyer could see prior to purchase. Supervisor Davis moved to hold this item in abeyance until the October 2, 2006, Board meeting. Chairman Thurman seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Lockard introduced this item by saying it was the second or third attempt to enact a minor land division ordinance for the County. He said staff had put together a proposed ordinance based on state statute that would fit with the County's existing Zoning Ordinance and that the draft ordinance had been sent out to various entities, including homeowner associations, real estate companies and so on. Mr. Lockard said the Planning & Zoning Commission had held three hearings on the proposed ordinance. He noted that in the Board's back-up materials were copies of minor land division ordinances enacted by other counties. There was brief discussion regarding concerns expressed at prior Commission hearings regarding access for lot splits being traversable by two-wheel-drive vehicles. Mr. Lockard said that staff had tried to stay with state statute as much as possible in drafting the ordinance. Chairman Thurman called for comments from the public, at which point a very lengthy discussion ensued between the Board, staff, and Mr. Buddek and Mr. Kerr regarding several aspects of the proposed ordinance but focusing primarily on the issue of traversability and the appropriateness of asking surveyors to certify traversability for lot splits for which roads had not yet been built. Supervisor Springer said that in the old days there were many lot splits that showed a road going over a cliff or up a grade so steep that a road could never be built on it. She said the intent of the legislature with regard to traversability was just that a road could be built. She suggested changing the language in the proposed ordinance to "has physical access" or "can provide physical access." She said the language related to traversability was in statute and that the Board could not change it but that it could add to it or further it to help provide clarification, but that it could not change it. Mr. Lockard noted that the ordinance did not limit evidence of traversability to certification by a surveyor but also provided an option for other evidence of traversability. He said the County was not requiring surveyors to certify anything. Chairman Thurman said his problem was that there was no access until a road is built and that until the split is done there is no road and no one could really say whether access would be

traversable by a two-wheel-drive vehicle. Supervisor Springer reiterated that since the language regarding traversability was directly from state statute the Board could not change it, but that it could add a statement regarding under what conditions physical access could be built that would be traversable by a two-wheel-drive vehicle. Supervisor Davis said that failure to comply with any of the terms of the ordinance would not stop a lot split from taking place. He suggested not providing a building permit or certificate of occupancy until the stipulations of the ordinance are met. Supervisor Springer said the issue was really the liability imposed by the statute on surveyors. Chairman Thurman said that title companies were telling him they would not close on lot splits anymore because it was too confusing. He said his concern was whether the Board would be creating liability for the County by approving the ordinance. He said he was opposed to people circumventing the subdivision rules, but that in the Prescott Active Management Area there were people who would love to do subdivisions but could not because of the water issue and the only way they could develop their land was through lot splits. Chairman Thurman said there were other parts of the proposed ordinance that he also had problems with, such as the definition of legal access. In response to a question from Mr. Buddek, Supervisor Springer said the ordinance provided for review of lot splits of 10 acres or less because that was state law. She asked what other type of evidence would be acceptable to the County other than a surveyor's certification of traversability. Supervisor Davis asked about having the land owner or his legal representative certify the access issue, saying that would be more constant than a surveyor. Mr. Spedding said that surveyors already draw a 25-foot ingress/egress easement across the property when a lot is split. He said that if surveyors are already doing that he would think they would have made some reasonable effort to determine whether or not that easement is traversable. He said he did not see the problem with a surveyor stating whether or not the property could be traversed because it was the surveyor who was drawing the easement. Supervisor Davis said he thought the land owner should be responsible and that it was up to the land owner to build a road that would be traversable. Chairman Thurman said he thought the ordinance needed to say what was acceptable. Mr. Spedding said the issue was about disclosure, and that if someone gave the County a statement saying that access was not traversable because the road was not built then that would be a statement. Mr. Lockard added that when a person pulls a building permit he must indicate whether there is legal access to the parcel. Mr. Spedding reiterated that the issue was disclosure, and that the County could not deny anything. Chairman Thurman said it was scary that a person could not get a building permit until a road was built. Mr. Mauk said that building permits are withheld only for lack of legal access. Mr. Spedding added that four or five other counties have the same type of ordinance. Mr. Lockard noted that the draft ordinance had been sent to 19 title companies for review and that he had not received a response from any of them. There was some discussion about title companies and the deletion of certain aspects of legal descriptions, during which Mr. Buddek said that surveyors have problems with title companies changing legal descriptions and that surveyors do not do title research on legal access to properties. Supervisor Springer said that in this case the legal access would be granted within the split. She said she just wanted to be sure that each parcel that is recorded is recorded together with the legal access for the parcel. Mr. Mauk said that if someone presents a permit application to the department and says "this is what I am going to do" then a permit will be issued, and that if something happens later it is between the property owner and the buyer. He said staff was just looking for some disclosure to the potential buyer, and that the ordinance did not suggest anywhere that physical access be provided prior to the sale or that a building permit would not be issued due to lack of physical access. He said there was nothing in the ordinance that said access must be maintained. He said that if a person was splitting up 10 acres of property the statement could be that there is no physical access to the property. Chairman Thurman said he just wanted to be sure that if there were problems it would go back on the land owner and not on the County. He said he also had problems with language about emergency vehicle access. Supervisor Springer said that pretty much everything in the proposed ordinance was in state statute and that the only reason to enact the ordinance was for the County to be able to take a look at lot split proposals and make a determination about whether or not they might constitute an illegal subdivision. She said that everything else was an issue between the buyer and seller, and that she did not know why everyone was having such heartburn over something that was already state law. Supervisor Davis commented that it was because the Board was trying to do something about lot splits. Supervisor Springer said she agreed, and that by being able to look at lot split proposals up front the County might be able to do get people to do a better job of planning where they will put roads when they split property. Chairman Thurman said there were some people in the County who had 17,000 acres and were talking about doing lot splits. He asked what the ordinance would mean for the department in terms of workload. Mr. Spedding said he would rely on what was given to him and that with the ordinance, if someone was trying to circumvent state law with regard to subdivisions, they might think twice. Mr. Mauk added that he was not very concerned about being able to keep up with the workload. Supervisor Davis said that 90% of the County's growth was occurring through lot splits, and that the people who purchase those splits eventually end up in his office or in Supervisor Springer's office or in Chairman Thurman's office

wanting to know when their roads will be paved. He said it was pretty hard to look at management when the Board can only manage the 10% that come in through the subdivision process. Supervisor Davis said the Board had always rewarded people for doing things the wrong way. There was discussion regarding any deficiencies being listed in the deed, during which Supervisor Springer said that was also statutory language but that perhaps there could be another document listing deficiencies that could be recorded so that the deficiencies would show up in escrow.

- H2. Zoning map change from R1L-70 to R1L-35, Primrose Peaks Estates, 405-23-180, Rimrock area, Larry Cepek applicant/agent for Rimrock Properties, LLC, #H6090. Consideration of a zoning map change for a 46.72 acre parcel in the Rimrock area, from R1L-70 (Residential; Single Family; 70,000 sq. ft. minimum) zoning district to R1L-35 (Residential; Single Family Limited; 35,000 sq. ft. minimum) zoning district. Located North of Beaver Creek Road and West of Rimrock Airport. S34 T15N R05E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended denial of the zoning map change. Enalo Lockard, Assistant Development Services Director. The application has been withdrawn by the applicant and the Board will take no action with regard to this item.
- H3. Final site plan/use permit, for a winery complex that includes a tasting room, restaurants, casitas and a bed and breakfast, and a use permit for temporary use of the existing Farm House as a tasting room, Alcantara Vineyards & Winery, 407-21-006Q, Cottonwood/Camp Verde area, Robert and Barbara Predmore, #H6091. Consideration of a Final Site Plan/Use Permit for a twelve acre portion of a 69.96 acre parcel in a PAD (Planned Area Development) zoning district for a winery complex that includes a tasting room, restaurants, casitas and a B & B and a Use Permit for temporary use of the existing Farm House as a tasting room. Located off of S.R. 260 and Thousand Trails Road between Cottonwood and Camp Verde S20 T15N R04E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Final Site Plan/Use Permit with the following Stipulations: 1). Property must be developed in accordance with the Letter of Intent dated May 30, 2006 and the May 2006 Site Plan; 2). Applicant will schedule a preliminary code review meeting for the permanent facilities prior to applying for any building permits and an engineered drainage and site development plan must be submitted with the preliminary code review application; 3). That the Use Permit for the wine tasting event facility be granted for a period of three years and be non-transferable and that the Use Permit become void upon operation of the permanent facility indicated in the Site Plan and that events will conclude by 10:00 pm; 4). That a building permit for the farmhouse be applied for and as-built construction plans be submitted and approved by Building Safety prior to commencement of any public activities; 5). That a Certificate of Compliance be issued within six months of approval of the Use Permit; 6). Building permits for the permanent buildings must be applied for within two years of Final Site Plan approval; 7). Property will be developed in accordance to all county, state and federal regulations; 8). Screening to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to issuance of the Certificate of Compliance and will be required along the portion of the property that borders the developed residential area. Enalo Lockard, Assistant Development Services Director. Applicant's agent Tom Eade participated in discussion, speaking in support of the application. Adjacent property owner Nancy Futral spoke against the use permit portion of the application only, citing concerns about commercial uses in a residential area, lighting and noise. Supervisor Davis moved to approve the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission, except for stipulation #3 and to change that stipulation to grant the use permit for a period of one year with administrative renewal for up to two more years provided there are no violations. Supervisor Springer seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Lockard explained that the applicant was requesting the use permit in order to use an existing farmhouse as a wine tasting facility, and that one neighbor who was approximately 900 feet away had spoken in opposition. He said that the applicant was planning to make improvements to the road to the property subject to a use permit with the Forest Service. Mr. Eade provided graphics of the conceptual site plan, saying that more than 10 acres of vineyards had been planted and that the plan was to commercialize 12 acres for the winery, a bed and breakfast facility, and some shops. He said that because of the amount of time it would take to move forward with all of that the applicant wanted to have a use permit to go ahead with wine tasting at the farmhouse and also to have some special events, such as weddings. Ms. Predmore added that in the original letter of intent the use of the farmhouse had not been addressed, and that the reason for the use permit was to try to create some capital. Following Ms. Futral's comments, Chairman Thurman asked how enforcement of the use permit would be handled. Mr. Lockard said it would be taken care of through the Development Services office. He said that the lighting would have to conform to the County's lighting ordinance, and that the use permit was for a three-year period and would become void upon completion of the permanent commercial facilities. He said that events would have to be finished by 10:00 p.m. There was brief discussion regarding the applicant's plans to mitigate dust, during which Ms. Predmore said that prior to opening anything she would make sure that something to reduce dust was on the road all the way from Thousand Trails. She added that during construction she had been watering the road to keep the dust down. Supervisor Davis said he had some concerns in 2002 when this application first came to the Board, but that there was no opposition to it at that time. He said was concerned about the condition of the road after Thousand Trails and about the fact that any improvements would require Forest

Service approval and no one knew what kind of stipulations the Forest Service might require. He said that on May 25, 2006, Ms. Predmore had indicated to Ms. Futral in a letter that the use permit was for wine tasting only and that now she was asking to have events as well. Ms. Predmore said her letter of intent had listed both wine tasting and events. Supervisor Davis said Ms. Futral's concern was the commercial use and that once it occurred it would never change. He said that was not true and that once the use permit had run its course the property would revert to residential uses. He said he was concerned about the special events because he would not want to have to sit on his porch and listen to disruptive noises. Supervisor Davis asked Mr. Lindner if the Commission had discussed potential improvements to State Route 260 as a result of this land use. Mr. Lindner said he did not recall any discussions about the highway, but that perhaps it should have. He said there was quite a bit of discussion about the original use permit but that the applicant had demonstrated a need because of economics to make changes in the use permit. He said the Commission had tried to arrive at some kind of compromise. Mr. Lockard said the applicant had stipulated to having the access road improved to fire code standards, adding that there were already right and left turn lanes off State Route 260 onto Thousand Trails. In response to a question from Supervisor Davis, Mr. Lockard said the applicant might have to rent port-a-johns for large events. In response to a question from Supervisor Davis, Mr. Lindner said the Commission had discussed the size of events and that the applicant had indicated she would probably retire the use permit sooner than the three-year period. Mr. Eade said that events would be limited to approximately 100 people, adding that a total of approximately 120 people were expected to visit the property during the period from Wednesday through Sunday and that the applicant was looking to host small events and not conventions. Supervisor Davis said if he were a citizen looking at this application he would wonder why the Board of Supervisors would approve a commercial operation down a 30-foot Forest Service dirt easement. He said he thought the County might be at risk if the Board approved the application. Supervisor Davis told Ms. Predmore he understood her need to generate some income but that he would prefer to see the use permit for the wine tasting room only because it would be possible to maintain sound levels, and that he would rather not see special events on the property. He said he would also like to see a commitment regarding the use of the entire property. Ms. Predmore said she had a statement from the Forest Service with regard to the road and that she had also annexed into the fire district. She said she was trying not to sell out, but that she did have some of the property listed for sale. Ms. Predmore said she was doing as much as she could, that she had bent over backwards to try to make the venture successful and that she had bent over backwards to be a good neighbor. She said the Board was treating her like some big developer, and she asked if the Board wanted her to sell out. Ms. Predmore said that in order for her to continue developing the property she needed to make some money, that her property was a working farm and that the events she was requesting would be only on the weekends. She told the Board she thought that her venture was a great thing for Yavapai County but that the Board was making it impossible for her. Supervisor Davis said the biggest concern seemed to be the noise and that if that issue, or the number of events, could be addressed then things would be okay. Supervisor Springer said the County typically asks for comments from people within 300 feet of a project because they would be most affected. She said that in this case the closest neighbor was 900 feet away and that it seemed to her that the Board was looking at setting a different standard. Supervisor Davis said he believed the 900-foot distance was from rooftop to rooftop, and not from the property line. He asked where in the County the Board would approve a commercial venture at the end of a dirt road, saying that it would not and that impacts would have to be minimized. Supervisor Springer said there were very successful commercial uses along Oak Creek in the Sedona area and that she could not see a problem with allowing this part of the Verde River to develop in the manner that Ms. Predmore was proposing. She said Ms. Predmore's project looked like a very good project. Supervisor Davis asked Ms. Futral if she could see a compromise. Ms. Futral said the overall plan that Ms. Predmore had presented was for a specific commercial area and a specific agricultural area and that the problem she had was the commercial use in the residential area. Supervisor Davis noted that the use permit was for a three-year period and asked Ms. Futral what conditions she would need to keep disruptions to her property to a minimum. Ms. Futral said she would accept one event per month on a weekend with 75 people or less and no lights at night, with the event to be over with by 10:00 p.m. Supervisor Springer asked Ms. Futral if she thought it would be better to have a home on every two acres next to her or whether it would be better to have Ms. Predmore's project there. She said that if Ms. Predmore sold out that was what could happen, and that this was why the Board tried to work with people who are developing projects. Supervisor Springer said that one event per month would not provide an income for Ms. Predmore and she said that if Ms. Futral was going to make a suggestion it should be realistic. She said she appreciated Supervisor Davis asking for Ms. Futral's input, but that it should be reasonable. Ms. Futral said the issue of residential homes was not before the Board on this day and that the only problem she had was the commercial use in the residential area. She said she could not see sitting out on her property and listening to whatever was coming at her on a regular basis from Friday night through Sunday. Supervisor Springer said she thought the Commission had come up with

some very reasonable requirements. Ms. Futral said she would ask for the use permit to be limited to one and one-half years and for events to be every other weekend. Ms. Predmore said she really hoped the special events would be as successful as Ms. Futral feared. She said she had always tried to go beyond what the County was asking for, but that she did not like the idea of having special events only every other weekend. There was brief discussion as to the length of time for the use permit, during which Ms. Predmore said she thought she could get the permanent commercial portion of the project up and running within less than three years, but that permitting was going to take some time.

- H4. Consider adoption of revised Development Services fees. Ken Spedding, Development Services Director. Land Use Unit Manager Steven Mauk participated in discussion. Upon a motion by Supervisor Springer, seconded by Chairman Thurman, the Board voted unanimously to approve the increases as presented, with the exception of abandonment of plats, for which the current fee would not change, and to make the new fees effective November 1, 2006. There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Spedding explained the changes in the fees, saying that most of the jurisdictions that staff had spoken with were also considering fee increases. He said that care had been taken to try to have the fees cover the cost of services. Chairman Thurman asked if the fees were comparable with those charged by the City of Prescott and the Town of Prescott Valley. Mr. Spedding said they were. In response to a question from Chairman Thurman, Mr. Spedding said it was his goal to be able to operate the Development Services Department by covering the department's expenses. Chairman Thurman said the construction community needed to know the fee increases were coming. There was brief discussion regarding specific fees, with Supervisor Davis asking questions and Mr. Spedding and Mr. Mauk answering the questions.

-  
H – PUBLIC WORKS

- H5. Consider approval of a resolution establishing various roads in the Sycamore Farms and Rio Verde Acres areas as County highways. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Resolution No. 1622 was approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

E – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- E1. Convene in executive session pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(7) for discussion/consultation with designated representatives to consider position and instruct representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase or sale of real property located in the Prescott area and in the Cottonwood area. Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Springer, the Board voted unanimously to convene in executive session.

ACTION ITEMS (Continued)

The Board of Supervisors met with the Verde River Basin Partnership (VRBP) Structure Committee at the Verde Valley Senior Center, 322 South 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Cottonwood, Arizona, with regard to the following items:

- A8. Consideration and possible action on the financial structure of the VRBP, including fiduciary choice and legal framework. The following persons participated in discussion of this item: Doug Von Gausig, Mayor of Clarkdale and Chairman of the VRBP Structure Committee; Jack Herring, Prescott College; Jack Wilson, Citizens for Reasonable Growth; Greg Kornrumph, Salt River Project; Muriel Haverland, Citizens Water Advocacy Group; John Kaminski, Paulden Area Community Organization and Co-Chair of the VRBP Structure Committee; Steve Kling, Verde River Citizens Alliance; John Rasmussen, Yavapai County Water Advisory Committee Coordinator; Dan Campbell, The Nature Conservancy; Jane Moore, Town of Jerome Town Council; Dick Ellis, Keep Sedona Beautiful; Keran O'Brien, Northern Arizona University; Dorothy O'Brien, Big Park Regional Coordinating Council; Leslie Myers, Bureau of Reclamation; and Max Castillo, Arizona State Parks/Verde River Greenway. The Board took no action on this item.
- A9. Composition and qualifications for the Implementation Committee, including consideration and possible action on qualifications for membership on that committee or another committee serving substantially the same function in the VRBP.

Four proposals for possible structure of the VRBP and committees were presented. Mayor Von Gausig's proposal was for an Implementation Committee with membership comprised of Mr. Kornrumph; a representative of the Department of Water Resources; Mr. Campbell; one representative to represent the municipalities of Prescott, Prescott Valley and Chino Valley; one representative to represent the municipalities of the Verde Valley; Mr. Rasmussen to represent counties; a representative of the USGS; and possibly two additional, undesignated representatives. His proposal also called for the entire VRBP to be comprised of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), with a maximum of 12 members, the Implementation Committee and the Communications Committee. Mayor Von Gausig said there needed to be people on the



Implementation Committee that everyone could trust, and that he did not think the TAG should act autonomously. He added that smaller groups were more workable. Mr. Wilson said he did not think that 12 people on the TAG made sense. Mr. Kornrumpf said he thought 12 members was okay but that 19 members would be alright as well. He said he liked Mayor Von Gausig's proposal because it was simpler and that he had been concerned all along about the structure being too large. Ms. Haverland said she thought Mayor Von Gausig's proposal would work, and that the most important thing was to get the job done. She said as long as her organization still had input and could challenge if they felt things were not moving in the right direction, the proposal was workable. Mr. Kling said he had always felt that it should not be difficult to establish criteria for membership in the TAG, and that professional experience and background should be the key. He said he did not think that having 18 to 20 people on the TAG would be prohibitive and that it could be beneficial. Mayor Von Gausig said that one of the things the Implementation Committee should be doing is meeting with the TAG. Supervisor Springer said she appreciated the fact that Mayor Von Gausig was trying to simplify things, but that if the purpose of the Structure Committee was to come up with a committee that would be acceptable to everyone, her view was that the farther people strayed from a literal reading of Title II the more trouble they were asking for. She said she thought the proposal was good, but that she did not believe it conformed to Title II, and that she thought it was premature to talk about committees. Supervisor Springer said that the governing body of the VRBP should determine who is on the committees, and that if this group was talking about a structure for the TAG and allocating authority to it then it was taking authority away from the overall governing body. She said that the TAG should be an advisory committee to the governing body and that it should not operate independently. Supervisor Springer said she knew everyone was in a hurry but that she felt they needed to stick to the literal meaning of Title II. Mr. Kornrumpf said he thought it was important to look at the committees and subcommittees as working groups. He said there were many people who wanted to move this thing forward and who had come together to try to move things along. Mr. Kornrumpf said he thought what had been done already was great and that he appreciated Mayor Von Gausig's attempt to simplify things. He said he also believed the language in Title II was pretty generic. Mr. Rasmussen said part of the issue was getting buy-off from all the communities, and that it was important to recognize that groups like the Water Advisory Committee and its technical committee do not operate in a vacuum. He said he wondered if there was interest in having some kind of elected officials group to provide oversight. Mayor Von Gausig asked Mr. Rasmussen what the value of that would be to the VRBP. Mr. Rasmussen replied that he saw it as a way to get buy-off from the communities. Mr. Campbell said the "KISS" approach was good because it keeps the focus where it needs to be. He said keeping things simple and small was good, and that keeping the politics out of it was also good. Ms. Moore said the proposal seemed to satisfy the requirements of Title II and that it left politics out of it. Mr. Ellis said he agreed with a good part of the proposal, and that with regard to the number of people on the TAG he would like to suggest a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 20. He said that Title II was vague and that he thought a structure should be created and presented to Senator McCain to see if it would meet with his approval. Mr. O'Brien said the people best qualified to determine who should be on the TAG were the members of the TAG. He said the TAG was working in that it was best not to mess with it. Ms. O'Brien said the proposal seemed to be counter to the results of the survey of VRBP members, but that she did think there needed to be a simple structure. She said she wanted to remind everyone that whatever they came up with it would have to go back to the full membership in September. Mr. Rasmussen said it was not just the people who had signed the charter but also those for which the Partnership needed buy-in. Mr. Herring reviewed his proposal, which called for supporting membership comprised of individuals or organizations; a Partnership Advisory Committee (PAC) that would be the primary authority of the VRBP and would be comprised of elected officials from counties and municipalities, the Tribes, and representatives from state and federal agencies, Salt River Project, water companies, development interests, agricultural interest, environmental conservation groups and citizen water oversight groups; an Implementation Committee with the TAG and Communications Committee as its subcommittees; and other committees as deemed necessary by the Implementation Committee. Mr. Herring said his proposal would work, but that it would be much less efficient than what Mayor Von Gausig was suggesting. He said that the PAC was modeled after the San Pedro Partnership. He said that his proposal recognized the need to acknowledge political issues but that if the stakeholders would agree to a more efficient structure it would be a good thing, and added that he did not think everything needed to start over from scratch. Supervisor Springer presented her proposal, which provided for a voting membership of 34 to be comprised of counties, municipalities, state agencies, federal agencies, the Tribes, water providers and others. She said she had created a general membership, that she did not think it was much different from what Mr. Herring had proposed and that she also thought it was similar to what Mayor Von Gausig had proposed. Supervisor Springer said she had heard many times that people want to keep the politics out of the VRBP, but that it was not going to happen. She said that when one was talking about water, one was talking about politics and that everyone had an interest. She said it was a political process and that the real purpose was trying

to get everyone on the same page at the beginning. Supervisor Springer said that if people were talking about what the roles would be then they had gone beyond what they should be doing. She said the structure had to be something that the people who were not here on this day could accept or at least feel comfortable with. Mr. Kling said that in Mr. Herring's and Supervisor Springer's proposals there was reference to individuals being members of the VRBP and that he did not see that language anywhere in the law. He said that both proposals identified members who could not vote, and that he did not think it was desirable to have members who could not take an active role. Ms. Haverland said it appeared that what people would really be voting on was administrative issues. She said she did not see the power in the membership and who gets to vote and who does not, and that the most important thing was the science and representation from people who have to go back and do something. Ms. Haverland said her organization did not need to have a vote as long as she knew that whoever was doing the work was working in everyone's best interests. Mr. Ellis said that Supervisor Springer's proposal called for Yavapai County to have three votes, and that if this was going to be done on a population basis then Maricopa County should have 100 votes. Mr. Wilson said he agreed with Supervisor Springer's idea of looking at common ground. He said he had looked at Supervisor Springer's proposal last time as well and how to get to something that would be acceptable to him and to others. Mr. Wilson then presented his proposal for a Partnership Advisory Committee for which each member would have a vote and which would use the Upper San Pedro Partnership as a model for reaching decisions on a modified consensus basis. He reviewed what he called critical issues, i.e., that the Partnership should be science-based and not politically-based, and that one seat should equal one vote. Mayor Von Gausig said he believed those present on this day could decide as a group which of the two perspectives it wanted to adhere to. He asked how many people believed the group really needed to work on political sensitivities. Four hands were raised. He then asked how many people everyone could get along with just a simple structure. Many hands were raised. Ms. O'Brien said she would like to see Mr. Wilson's critical issues incorporated into Mayor Von Gausig's simpler plan. She said that the Communications Committee was doing nothing but housekeeping, and that the TAG was comprised of the scientists who would get the information and that from there it would go to the policy makers who make decisions. Ms. Haverland said she appreciated the participation by the Board of Supervisors and the fact that they had strong feelings about voting, but that aside from voting on things like vendors she could not understand what the Board thought it would be voting on since the VRBP was an advisory group. Supervisor Springer said the TAG would be deciding what kind of studies should be done, and that what the Title II legislation really meant to the entities was that the VRBP would be getting an allocation from Congress. She said it was elected officials who would ultimately be responsible to the taxpayers for the decisions. Mayor Von Gausig said he thought it was very important for all of the elected officials to know the truth. He said he did not even care to belong to the VRBP, but that he wanted smart people involved who could tell him about the water situation. He said he was present on this day because he wanted the data, and that he thought elected officials were interested in the VRBP because they need the data. Mayor Von Gausig said it was not a political decision but a scientific decision. Chairman Thurman said if there was going to be a membership that excluded some people then some government agencies could become very irate. He said he did not have a problem with keeping the TAG as small as possible and that as far as membership went he did not care if Yavapai County had one vote or three votes, but that everyone on the list needed to be involved. Ms. Myers said she thought there could be a larger body but also working groups and that the recommendations of the working groups could be brought to the larger body. Mr. Rasmussen asked if what he was hearing was agreement to get a larger group together to bless what was being proposed. He asked Supervisor Springer if she had any sense of what Prescott and Prescott Valley would agree to. Supervisor Springer said it might be easier to have a smaller working group but the problem then became who gets to select those groups. She suggested letting the larger group organize with the goal of choosing the working groups. She said that people were trying to make decisions about details and that was something that the larger group should be able to do. Supervisor Springer said she thought there was very little difference among the proposals with regard to who the Partnership members should be. Mayor Von Gausig said the Structure Committee was charged with the responsibility to come up with the structure for the VRBP and that it was not going to create a new membership. He said that in September new people could come in and sign the charter if they want to, but that the Structure Committee would present the outcome of its work. He said he did not see all of these questions going to the entire membership. Mr. Campbell said he thought things were getting somewhere in terms of process. He suggested putting the proposals side by side. Mr. Castillo said he was concerned about getting the scientific information, and that if the result of that information was that he had to close part of the Verde River so birds could nest then that was what he would do. He said there was much talk about all the cities and towns, but that the river did not get a voice. Chairman Thurman said that was why he wanted Mr. Castillo to have a seat at the table but that he did not have to be in a working group. Mr. Wilson said he thought some progress had been made, and he suggested a group of four to six people, including someone

representing the Board, to review the proposals and try to come up with something to put on the table at the meeting in September. Mayor Von Gausig asked if there should be another Structure Committee meeting in two weeks. Chairman Thurman said that if the TAG decided who should be on the TAG it would be lopsided, and that this decision was something the membership should be involved in.

CLAIMS AGAINST YAVAPAI COUNTY

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
General Fund	2,211,934.08	Jail District	606,736.10
Yavapai Co. Trails	4,458.33	Treas. Taxpayer Info	2,644.78
WMD Planner	2,806.88	Improve of Education	827.43
Enhance Ed thru Tech	2,624.45	Reading Special. H&S	1,484.35
IDEA Secure Care Gr	1,243.97	Math & Science Ptnr	13,279.38
Adult Prob Fees over 40	1,350.07	JCEF IPS Assistance	2,112.79
JCEF SAE Assistance	9,506.85	Dewey Humboldt Agree	7,200.72
Marijuana Eradication	948.62	Sexuality Education	1,589.98
Public Health Reserve	8,712.22	Environmental Health	15,048.81
Susan Komen Breast H	747.41	Medical Reserve Corps	252.18
Resep Radiation Exp.	325.58	Comm. Health Center	17,105.24
AMPPHI	661.71	Family Planning	3,705.50
MCH Programs	7,271.28	Breast Feed. Couns.	4,106.40
Physical Activity	2,946.07	Cost Allocation	503.28
Nutrition	503.28	TB Control	285.17
WIC Program	17,140.66	Title X Family Plann.	2,480.96
Jail Enhancement	1,585.30	Juvenile Delinq. Reduct	14,193.02
Juvenile IPS	22,156.04	Juvenile Food Prog	1,820.53
Probation Serv	6,389.82	Adult IPS	42,022.80
Adult Probation Fees	16,007.89	Prob Enhance	48,160.47
Recorder's Surcharge	125,342.54	Indigent Def/Dg	2,751.88
Misc Small Grants	328.08	Crim Just/Atty	5,521.13
Bad Check Prog	2,907.76	CDBG Grant	2,245.74
Juv Prob Svs	2,311.87	Commodity Fd	500.00
Sexual Trans Disease	7.85	Hi Risk Chld HI	6,499.76
Clerk's Storage	1,451.28	HIV Counsel & Test	67.02
Atty Anti-Racket	2,802.06	PANT	10,374.30
Law Library	144.00	CASA	8,189.18
Case Processing	6,521.96	Prim. Care – V.V.	6,098.49
Victim Witness Prog	9,052.50	Court Enhancement	54.18
Conciliations Court	2,213.75	Enhance Drug Court	3,723.84
Inmate Health Svs	163.50	Drug Enforce. Fund	3,491.92
Probate Fund	1,317.50	Primary Care Services	11,379.32
PC Fees VV	376.48	Local ADR	262.09
Victims Rights Impl	3,810.50	JAIBG Juv Acct P 8	2,000.42
Victims Rights Program	1,411.47	Yavapai Indian Agree	1,891.48
Dietetic Intern	296.80	Immuniz Service	3,341.96
Personal Care Svs	4,769.61	Idea-Preschool	1,319.08
Public Defender Train.	45.00	Subs Abuse/DARE	178.32
Chem Abuse	133.76	Family Drug Court	1,017.58
Juv Det/PACE	5,494.95	Collab. Comp Rev Gr	3,344.22
Special Program	19,106.73	Sm Schools BEHA	9,502.96
FTG Local Court	12,803.09	Hurf Road Funds	513,531.74
Assessor Surcharge	21,305.21	Health Fund	99,572.65
Jail Commissary	8,193.41	FEMA	23,633.63
Solid Waste	18,943.76	Judge Pro Tem Div B	11,285.70
Water Advisory Comm.	5,598.36	Tire Recycle	2,295.37
Safe School Pro	4,847.24	Service Coordinator	2,283.68
Local Incentive Awards	698.31	EII Consortium 03 NCLB	4,760.58
Fill the Gap – Attorney	6,567.32	Family Law Commiss.	8,899.06
Comm Punish Pro	7,299.23	Adult Drug Court	4,384.93

Juven. Detent Ed Pro	3,140.22	Regnl Road Project	145,509.40
Contributions SO	499.64	Library Auto Consor	7,554.65
Health Start	2,847.87	Victim Compens. ACJC	563.03
Victim Compens.VOCA	4,631.49	Interstate Compact Pro	3,372.53
Ryan White II	1,950.71	Prepared. Bioterror	17,909.93
PC Fees W. Yav.	42,022.92	Perinatal Block	2,511.67
Well Woman Health	5,276.31	Tobacco Educ	10,548.16
Victim Assist. ACJC	348.91	St Implement Grant	199.95
School Reso. – Mayer	975.30	Az Region. Support	10,304.81
Drug Treat Ed	18,654.13	Mental HealthRWJF	3,496.35
Mental Health Part.	3,496.37	Field Trainer	163.23
Attendant Care	22,656.53	HIV WYGC	12.03
Childrens Justice	2,406.88	Child Sup & Vis	961.56
Education & Mediation	655.22	Juv Delq Case Proc.	1,053.75
Self Service	837.53	VOCA	10,191.55
JTSF Treatment	6,042.97	Diversion Conseq.	1,466.26
ALTCS	1,836,058.36		

In addition, payroll was issued on August 18 for the pay period ending August 12; warrant numbers 2463666 through 2464025, in the amount of \$314,528.68. Jury certificates issued during this time; 6877620 through 6877959. Warrants issued for August 21 Board day, 4270236 through 4270667; 4270668 through 4271118.

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

ATTEST:

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