

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

December 4, 2006

The Board of Supervisors met in regular session on December 4, 2006, in Prescott, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m.

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.

PRESENTATIONS

P – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- P1. Recognize the following Elected Officials and Department Directors for reaching a service milestone during calendar year 2006. Thomas Thurman, Chairman. Human Resources Director Julie Ayers participated by distributing service awards and certificates.

10 Years of Service

Chip Davis, Supervisor District 3
Robert Brutinel, Superior Court Presiding Judge
Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director
Howard Hinson, Jr., Superior Court Judge
Dave Hunt, Board Counsel
Ross Jacobs, Treasurer
Debi Schaefer, Court Administrator

15 Years of Service

John Kennedy, Mayer Justice of Peace

20 Years of Service

Ken Spedding, Development Svs. Dir.

25 Years of Service

Thomas Lindberg, Superior Court Judge

CONSENT AGENDA With the exception of item C12., all items were approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

C – ATTORNEY

- C1. Permission for Deputy County Attorney Bob Johnson to take a County vehicle out of state to Las Vegas, Nevada, December 3-7, 2006, in conjunction with attendance at the Government Civil Practice Seminar.

C – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- C2. Approve minutes of meeting of November 20, 2006.
- C3. Liquor licenses for which there are no protests: (a) Series 7 Person Location Transfer, The Art of Wine, Village of Oak Creek area, Laura Seemann Gisborne; (b) Series 12 Original Restaurant, Circle Bar Steak House, Bagdad area, Lisa Annette Murphy; (c) Series 10 Original Beer and Wine Store, Casey's Corner, Cornville area, Michael James Anderson.
- C4. Award or reject bid received for publication of advertising, legal notices, minutes, etc. Bid opened on November 21, 2006, with one bid received from Prescott Newspapers, Inc. (The Daily Courier). Recommend awarding to Prescott Newspapers, Inc. and approve bond in the amount of \$1,243.90.
- C5. Acknowledge receipt of official canvasses of elections held in the following special districts on November 7, 2006: Black Canyon City Water Improvement District; Groom Creek Fire District; Sedona Fire District; Williamson Valley Fire District.
- C6. Approve lease of County-owned property to Groom Creek Fire District.
- C7. Approve Park Management Agreement with Groom Creek Fire District.
- C8. Approval of new members to the General Local Workforce Investment Board Committee as recommended by the LWIB: Susan Howery, Yavapai College, to replace Paul Kessel, with term to expire November 2010; Isabel Rollins, NACOG, to replace Margaret Kenner, with term to expire December 2007. Also approve new members to the Youth Council: Don Yeager, Yavapai College, with term to expire November 2010; and Tanya Hiatt, NACOG, with term to expire November 2010.
- C9. Approve vouchers.

C – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- C10. Use permit to allow installation and operation of an electrical substation in an RCU-2A zoning district, 800-20-041Y, Wilhoit

area, Wilhoit Electrical Substation, Steve Deming agent for Arizona Public Service, #H6133. Consideration of a Use Permit to allow installation and operation of an electrical substation on approximately 1.5 acres of a 1,494.7 acre parcel of land leased from the Arizona State Land Department in a RCU-2A (Residential; Rural; 2-acre minimum) zoning district. Located approximately 1.3 miles West off of SR 89 on the Northwest intersection of Donegal Drive and Red Rock Road in the Community of Wilhoit. S31 T12.5N R03W G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the use permit, with the following Stipulations: 1). Use Permit shall be granted on a permanent basis consistent with the letter of intent dated July 19, 2006, and site plan dated August 21, 2006, and shall be in conformance with all applicable county, state, and federal codes and ordinances; 2). Certificate of Compliance shall be granted within one (1) year of the Board approval date; 3). Applicant shall comply with State Fire Marshal requirements.

- C11. Zoning map change from RCU-2A to M2, Yavapai Block Company, Inc., 105-07-009A, Prescott area, W. Alan Kenson agent for 89 Industrial Properties, LLC, #H6144. Consideration of a Zoning Map Change from RCU-2A (Residential; Rural; 2 acre minimum) zoning district to M2 (Industrial; Heavy) zoning district to allow for the relocation of their pre-cast batch plant and equipment storage on an approximately 3.5 acre site. Located approximately 7,500 ft. Northeast from the intersection of Hwy 89 and Hwy 69 and approximately 100 ft. West of Sundog Ranch Road in the Prescott area. S26 T14N R2W G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the zoning map change, with the following stipulations: 1). Property to be developed and business to be conducted in keeping with the site plan and letter of intent dated September 18, 2006 as submitted with the zoning map change application, and in accordance with all applicable codes, ordinances and regulations; 2). Waiver of setback requirements to allow for zero foot (0') setback on Front and Rear, and ten feet (10') setback on the side; 3). Building permits to be applied for within one year of Board of Supervisors approval or rezoning to be null and void.

C – PUBLIC WORKS

- C12. Consider accepting dedication of roadways in Rancho Santa Maria Unit 1 as shown in Book 24, Page 27 of Maps & Plats and Rancho Santa Maria Unit 2 as show in Book 40, Page 75 of Maps & Plats. Chino Valley area. Public Works Director Phil Bourdon participated in discussion of this item and after brief discussion the Board voted unanimously to approve the request. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.
- C13. Consider accepting a slope easement along a portion of the southwesterly right-of-way of Cornville Road for the construction and turn lane improvements and to facilitate slope maintenance.
- C14. Consider approval of ADOT Aeronautics grant E7F47 for the rehabilitation of Taxiway A at the Sedona Airport in the amount of \$30,264 to be paid from Outside Services, General Airport Account and reimbursed by ADOT Aeronautics.

C – RECORDER

- C15. Permission for Mitchalene McFarland to participate in the Home-Based Employee Program.

C – SHERIFF

- C16. Permission to continue to accept donations to fund the "Right by Kids" program and for Finance to establish a separate fund number for this program.
- C17. Consider approval of fee increase for dog licensing in the unincorporated areas of the County.
- C18. Permission for Sgt. Luis Huante to take a County vehicle out of state to Las Vegas, Nevada, December 10-13, 2006, in conjunction with attendance at the Discipline & Internal Investigations Workshop.

ACTION ITEMS

A – MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

- A1. Consider approval of the following technology projects: (1) Purchase of video equipment and software for home-based employees in the amount of \$12,036; and (2) award or reject bids received for electronic agenda program; bids opened November 14, 2006, with bids received from Destiny Software in the amount of \$22,350 and Novus Solutions in the amount of \$40,583.75; recommend awarding to Destiny Software in the amount of \$24,049 (includes tax). Stephen Welsh, MIS Director. Following brief questions from the Board, which Mr. Welsh answered, the Board voted unanimously to approve these projects as listed. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

A – PUBLIC WORKS

- A2. Consider approval of a right-of-way project on Davenport Lane, Black Canyon City area. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.
- A3. Consider approval of Change Order No. 1 to Authorization of Services No. 2616465 with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$20,000 to add Traffic Signal Warrant Studies to their Design Services on the Four-Lane Widening of Williamson Valley Road Project from Sidewinder Drive to Pioneer Parkway. Regional Road project. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Springer, second by Supervisor Davis.

No comments from the public.

HEARINGS

H – PUBLIC WORKS

- H1. Consider approval of a resolution to abandon a portion of Onyx Drive, Diamond Valley No. 3. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Resolution No. 1631 was approved by unanimous vote, upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

H – SHERIFF

- H2. Consider implementation of a \$5 fee for fingerprinting service. Held in abeyance on November 6, 2006. Sheriff Steve Waugh. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

H – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

- H3. Zoning map change (from RCU-2A to M1) or use permit to allow for cabinet making business, R.C. Woodworking, 306-40-124L, Paulden area, Suzanne B. and Juan Ramon Chacon, #H6141. Elise Link, Planning Manager. Consideration of a Zoning Map Change from RCU-2A (Residential; Rural; 2-acre minimum) zoning district to M1 (Industrial; General Limited) zoning district or a Use Permit to allow for a cabinet making business in a 40'x60' steel building on an approximately 2.33 acre site. Located approximately .5 miles East off of HWY 89 on El Rocko Lane in the Community of Paulden. S15 T17N R2W G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended denial of the zoning map change or use permit. The following persons spoke in favor of the application, generally stating that the Chacon's were very good people, ran a clean business and that the rezoning would not negatively affect the area: Thomas Adler, Marilyn Bielak, Charles Schoeppner, and Bruce Weatherford. The following individuals submitted public participation forms in favor of the application, but did not speak: Philip Phillips, Pattie Adler, R.G. Keen, Mike and Jackie Latessa, and Jesse Meloling. Karen Lacy and Jeanette Ford spoke in opposition to the application, generally citing concerns about allowing industrial activity in a residential area and about traffic impacts. Chairman Thurman moved to deny the application (to uphold the recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission). Supervisor Davis seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Ms. Link provided background information, including recommendations from Environmental Services, Building Safety, and the fire department for upgrades to the property should the application be approved. She said the property was considered to be within the area of municipal influence as defined in the County General Plan, and that the Town of Chino Valley's plan showed the area as medium density residential. Ms. Link said she had spoken to the Town of Chino Valley's planning director, who had indicated the town was looking at annexation of the area and that perhaps the best way to accommodate the Chacon's request was to do an area plan. She said the Commission had recommended denial of the application because they felt it was spot zoning, would not be of benefit to the surrounding area, and that they also took into consideration the increase in traffic. Ms. Link said that if the Board chose to approve the application she would have three conditions of approval. In response to questions from Chairman Thurman, Ms. Chacon said she and her husband had owned the property since May 2006 and that in addition to themselves and two brothers working in the shop they also had five other employees. She said that sawdust was not a problem because there was a dust collection system for their machines and other sawdust was bagged and picked up by people with horses and so on. She added that with regard to the road, her husband had already started doing some work on it that would benefit everyone in the area. Chairman Thurman said he would have a hard time over-ruling the Commission's recommendation unless there was new information. He said he might look at the application differently if it was just for a use permit and for a finite time, but that he believed approval of this application would set a precedent that could result in the neighborhood going commercial. Supervisor Davis said this matter was not about the character of the applicants, but instead about land use and that if the Board went into anyone's neighborhood and allowed permanent industrial zoning the Board would not be doing its job.

- H4. Use permit/General Plan Amendment, expansion of Gray Wolf Landfill, 800-01-014T Ptn, 403-05-001M, 001N, 001R, 001F, 001D, 001J and 001L, east of the Town of Dewey-Humboldt, Vince Murphy agent for Waste Management, #H6117 and #H6118. Elise Link, Planning Manager. Consideration of a Use Permit and Major General Plan Amendment to allow for the expansion of the Gray Wolf Landfill from a total of 160 acres (with 80 acres of development) to a total of 425 acres (with 285 acres of development) in a RCU-2A (Residential; Rural; 2-acre minimum) zoning district. Located on the South side of SR 169, approximately 2.8 miles West of the SR 169/I-17 intersection and approximately 8.7 miles East of the Dewey-Humboldt town limits. S8 & 17 T13N R3E G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the use permit/General Plan amendment, with the following stipulations: 1). Use permit approval contingent

upon land trade between Waste Management and the USFS. Use Permit H6117 to supersede existing landfill Use Permit H5681; 2). Applicant to adhere to all conditions of the 1991 use permit (except for: excluding stipulation # 3 that required a traffic analysis and amending # 4 to allow the landfill to be transferable and # 12 to refer to the most recent development plan dated October 26, 2006) with regards to operating the existing landfill site and as those 1991 conditions apply to the establishment/operation of the proposed landfill expansion; 3). Use permit to be transferable with the duration limited to and run concurrently with ADEQ Operations Permit and Closure Plan(s); 4). Landfill to be expanded and operated in accordance with Waste Management's Use Permit Application Updated October 26, 2006 and applicant's letter dated September 27, 2006 and in keeping with all applicable local, state and federal codes, ordinances and regulations; 5). Applicant to pick-up litter along SR 169, from I-17 to the Dewey Town limits, a minimum of approximately every 90 days. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.

- H5. Zoning map change from RCU-2A to M1, Asphalt Paving & Supply, 103-05-0262H and 262N, Prescott Valley area, Chris Graff agent for Asphalt Paving & Supply, Inc., #H6145. Elise Link, Planning Manager. Consideration of a Zoning Map Change from RCU-2A (Residential; Rural; 2-acre minimum) zoning district to M1 (Industrial; General Limited) zoning district to allow for the construction of an approximately 10,200 sq. ft. metal building with a concrete foundation to be used as a testing/quality control lab and repair shop on an approximately 5.15 acre site. Located approximately 1,500 ft. South of Hwy 69 off Castle View Drive in the Prescott Valley area. S23 T14N R1W G&SRB&M. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the zoning map change, with the following stipulations: 1). Property to be developed and business to be conducted in keeping with the site plan dated August 14, 2006 and letter of intent dated September 18, 2006 as submitted with the zoning map change application, and in accordance with all applicable codes, ordinances and regulations; 2). Building permits to be applied for within one year of Board of Supervisors approval or rezoning to be null and void. Approved by unanimous vote. Motion by Supervisor Davis, second by Supervisor Springer. No comments from the public.
- H6. Zoning map change from R1L-175 to R1L-2A, 103-05-011A and 011, Lynx Mountain View Estates area near Prescott Valley, Doug Suits agent for Kevin Branch, owner, Planning & Zoning Commission applicant, #H6150. Elise Link, Planning Manager. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended denial of this application. This application was withdrawn by the applicant. Therefore, the Board took no action on it.

STUDY SESSIONS

S – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- S1. Presentation of information and discussion regarding community facilities districts. Grant Hamill, Stone & Youngberg, LLC and Keith Hoskins, Gust Rosenfeld. Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr participated in discussion of this item.

Mr. Hamill said that he and Mr. Hoskins were not present on this day to advocate the use of community facilities districts (CFDs), but to provide the Board with information about them. He said that CFDs have defined boundaries and a substantial amount of public infrastructure and that the higher the land value in the CFD the better. Mr. Hamill said that although the statute allowing cities and towns to establish CFDs had been in place since 1988 the use of CFDs did not really take off until into the 1990s. Mr. Hoskins explained that CFDs were now available to counties as the result of a law passed by the legislature in 2006, and that to establish a county CFD would require the signatures of 100% of the property owners. He said that CFDs could use more financing options than a county improvement district and that while there were negative aspects to a CFD those negative aspects were manageable as long as did not establish every CFD that might be requested. Mr. Hamill said the majority of jurisdictions using CFDs were communities experiencing rapid growth and that from a public agency perspective a CFD could facilitate construction of regional infrastructure including recreational and cultural amenities without the use of general tax dollars, and that it could also generate economic development and construction related jobs. He said that from a developer's perspective, a CFD could provide lower cost infrastructure financing, shorter equity commitment, and the ability to design a financing program that mirrors cash flow and helps reduce carrying costs during development. Mr. Hoskins said that while a CFD comprised of more than 600 acres could have its own local governing board, the Board of Supervisors might want to serve as the board of directors in order to retain control over the CFD, and that in terms of County staff operation of a CFD he would compare the work involved to that involved with operating a domestic water improvement district. He said that the developer has to front the money for the infrastructure, and that the CFD would do a bond issue at such time that there is sufficient secondary assessed value in the CFD to allow for it. He said it was also possible to require a developer to pay down a certain amount each year in order to keep a reasonable tax rate for the CFD. It was noted that in addition to a tax rate for bond debt service, a CFD could also levy a rate not to exceed 30 cents for maintenance and operation of the CFD. Mr. Hamill said that the bonds issued for CFDs are generally sold to sophisticated investors and that these types of bonds are highly regulated. Mr. Hoskins said the Board should think about whether it wants to allow CFDs, and that if it does it will need to consider what types of improvements it would be willing to allow. He said that control by the

County was important with this type of district, and that the Board would have to be concerned about the possibility of a default. Chairman Thurman asked if a developer could sue to force the County to do a CFD. Mr. Hoskins said no. Chairman Thurman asked if developers utilizing a CFD would be required to pay wages in compliance with the Davis Bacon Act. Mr. Schurr said no, not for the initial improvements. Following additional questions from Chairman Thurman and Supervisor Springer, Mr. Hamill said that a CFD reimburses a developer for a portion of the infrastructure but that the developer must also contribute to the cost of the infrastructure. He said the Board should delay the sale of bonds until there is enough assessed value in the CFD to pay the debt service through a property tax levy, and that it was possible to keep the developer on the hook for any shortfall for a certain period of time. Supervisor Davis asked if it would be possible for the board of directors of a CFD to set housing prices within the district. Mr. Hoskins it might be possible to do some things through a development agreement, but that he was not sure setting housing prices would be possible. Mr. Schurr said Maricopa County's policy was that it would not establish CFDs. Supervisor Springer asked Development Services Director Ken Spedding, who was in the audience, to look into CFDs and to come back to the Board within 60 days with information. She said she believed there were many benefits to doing CFDs and that the more tools the Board could provide to encourage regulated development the better the County would be.

S – PUBLIC WORKS

S2. Review and discussion of the Roadway Development Fee Program. Phil Bourdon, Public Works Director. Development Services Director Ken Spedding participated in discussion of this item.

Mr. Bourdon noted that this was an update from a similar study session a few months ago and that as a result of that first study session more information was included about right-of-way preservation and that the various types of projects had been better defined. He told the Board that he and Mr. Spedding had reviewed projected building permits and that the 20-year estimate for permits had been revised downward from about 46,000 to around 38,000 and that reducing the projected number of permits resulted in the 50% level of impact fee going up from the approximately \$3,400 that had been discussed in the first study session to a fee of \$4,108. There was brief discussion regarding whether it would be possible to include an automatic escalator for the fee, during which Mr. Hunt said he was not comfortable with that idea based on the language in the statutes. Supervisor Davis said the Board could just review the impact every year. He said that if someone was purchasing a home he did not think it was fair they should have to pay an impact fee based on a 20-year project cost and that it would be better to establish a number that is appropriate for today and then annually review the fee. There was brief discussion about starting with a fee lower than \$4,108 and about the length of time it takes to increase the fee, which Mr. Bourdon estimated at about seven months. Supervisor Springer said she did not think that a fee of \$4,100 was unreasonable to start with and that this would provide for new permits to pay 50% of the impact of development. She noted that Pinal County had just approved an impact fee of more than \$7,000 and added that Yavapai County was experiencing growth problems similar to that in Pinal County. Mr. Bourdon said he believed that Pinal County had also included some things in its fee such as maintenance of vehicles. Mr. Hunt said he did not think it was typical for entities to raise fees on an annual basis and that instead they set them for a specific period of time. He suggested the Board consider setting a fee for a five-year period with the understanding that it would be reviewed annually to see how the program is working. Supervisor Springer said that transportation issues had reached a critical point throughout the entire state and that how to raise new revenues for roads would be a primary issue in the legislature. She said the Board was probably going to have to go to the public and ask them to pay for new roads, and that she did not think it was out of line to ask new people who are coming to Arizona to pay their fair share of the cost. She said she thought that everyone was going to have to pay more and that certainly new construction should pay its fair share. Chairman Thurman said that much of the new growth was occurring within cities and towns. He said he did not really like the idea of a \$4,100 impact fee but that he also thought the cost of building roads would increase faster than that for residential construction. He said he would like to see a fee somewhere between the \$4,108 and \$3,400. Discussion turned to whether the impact fee should apply to commercial development. Mr. Bourdon said there had been about 40 new commercial building permits in the County each year for about the last six years. He said that municipalities in the County that have impact fees for roads are Chino Valley, Prescott, Prescott Valley, and Sedona and that only Chino Valley and Sedona charged the impact fee to both commercial and residential development. He said that Pinal County was considering having a single fee for both residential and commercial and that Mohave and Yuma Counties were also looking at fees. Supervisor Davis asked whether it would be possible for cities and towns to adopt a similar fee that could be used to provide connectivity with County road projects. He said he wanted to be sure that whatever fee the County ultimately adopted was backed up with solid research and statistics and that he would be willing to look at something with no more than a five-year window.

Supervisor Springer said that most cities and towns that have impact fees do not charge the fee to commercial development because they want to encourage economic development, but that she was not sure the rest of the taxpayers need to subsidize that activity. She said she would recommend that commercial development also pay the impact fee. Mr. Bourdon noted that the current ordinance does not include a provision for commercial development, and that he would need to look at how that might be included. Supervisor Davis asked if including commercial development would be like double taxation because individuals would be paying the impact fee and then their jobsites would be hit with it as well. Mr. Bourdon said that commercial development pays sales tax and that developers of commercial properties are often required to contribute to roadway improvements such as turn lanes and the like. He said that during development of the original impact fee in 1997 the Board had discussed the issue of whether to charge commercial development and the feeling was that those properties were already contributing to roadway development. Supervisor Springer said she thought the Board was at a crossroads with regard to transportation, and that if it did not take steps to acquire rights-of-way soon it would be too late to do it. She said she believed the Board should start with a reasonable fee in order to do the necessary studies and acquire rights-of-way as soon as possible, and that if the Board delayed much longer many of the roads that would be needed would never be built because of the cost.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

E – BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

E1. Convene in executive session pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (A)(4) for legal advice, discussion and consultation regarding Verde Valley Senior Center Bond Claims and Yavapai County Fair Association Lease. Upon a motion by Supervisor Davis, seconded by Supervisor Springer, the Board voted unanimously to convene in executive session.

E – JAIL DISTRICT The Board of Supervisors resolved into the Board of Directors of the Yavapai County Jail District and upon completion of the executive session reconvened as the Board of Supervisors.

E2. Convene in executive session pursuant to A.R.S. 2138-431.03(A)(7) for discussion and consultation with designated representatives of the Jail District to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding possible lease of space in Jail District facilities. Reference: Jail District minutes.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

YAVAPAI COUNTY JAIL DISTRICT

Minutes of Meeting

December 4, 2006

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

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

Also present: Steve Waugh, Sheriff; Jim Holst, County Administrator.

Upon a motion by Director Davis, seconded by Director Springer, the Board voted unanimously to convene in executive session pursuant to A.R.S. 2138-431.03(A)(7) for discussion and consultation with designated representatives of the Jail District to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding possible lease of space in Jail District facilities.

-

CLAIMS AGAINST YAVAPAI COUNTY

-

<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>ACCOUNT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
General Fund	2,574,328.09	Forest Projects	402.11
Jail District	404,847.62	WMD Planner	2,864.34
HS 2004	97,805.23	Az Esa Prof Dev Prog.	1,475.22
Improve of Education	842.99	Enhance Ed thru Tech	2,594.33
Math & Science Ptnr	692.43	Adult Prob Fees over 40	1,350.07
Dewey Humboldt Agree	6,118.89	Forensic Interview Child	17,000.00
Cops Meth 2006	3,455.11	Sexuality Education	1,889.48
Public Health Reserve	13,815.49	Environmental Health	15,561.59
Susan Komen Breast H	659.42	Resep Radiation Exp.	336.65

Comm. Health Center	18,083.25	AMPPHI	1,726.43
Family Planning	5,394.46	MCH Programs	10,260.75
Breast Feed. Couns.	4,427.30	Physical Activity	3,633.13
Cost Allocation	3,868.20	Nutrition	1,029.81
TB Control	941.51	WIC Program	17,601.09
Title X Family Plann.	2,528.53	Jail Enhancement	7,010.64
Juvenile Delinq. Reduct	13,341.94	Juvenile IPS	18,714.83
Family Counseling	1,592.00	Juvenile Food Prog	1,928.16
Community Advisory Bd	206.91	Probation Serv	4,177.14
Adult IPS	40,391.76	Adult Probation Fees	12,730.48
Prob Enhance	57,276.81	Recorder's Surcharge	6,377.28
Indigent Def/Dg	2,740.87	Misc Small Grants	692.98
Crim Just/Atty	5,682.62	Bad Check Prog	3,073.24
CDGB Grant	14,382.00	Juv Prob Svs	3,060.07
Commodity Food	500.98	Sexual Trans Disease	112.00
Hi Risk Chld HI	8,716.24	Clerk's Storage	1,476.05
HIV Counsel & Test	68.11	Atty Anti-Racket	14,818.86
PANT	6,077.41	Law Library	8,687.11
CASA	4,698.09	Case Processing	6,451.64
Prim. Care – V.V.	1,721.74	Victim Witness Prog	10,840.32
Conciliations Court	1,942.50	Enhance Drug Court	4,716.81
Inmate Health Svs	418.11	Drug Enforce. Fund	6,994.93
Probate Fund	1,468.48	Primary Care Services	16,095.96
PC Fees VV	382.28	Local ADR	125.00
FTG Indigent Defense	3,319.41	Victims Rights Impl	3,988.03
JAIBG Juv Acct Ph 8	35.56	Victims Rights Program	1,602.16
Yavapai Indian Agree	2,757.43	Dietetic Intern	307.68
Immuniz Service	2,433.07	Personal Care Svs	5,098.18
Idea-Preschool	1,337.91	Subs Abuse/DARE	330.67
Chem Abuse	248.03	Family Drug Court	1,044.58
Juv Det/PACE	4,246.92	Special Program	21,769.60
Sm Schools ECIA	302.33	Sm Schools BEHA	18,881.52
FTG Local Court	8,768.37	Hurf Road Funds	373,373.85
Assessor Surcharge	11,839.07	Health Fund	114,254.51
Jail Commissary	8,297.00	Judge Pro Tem Div B	11,134.10
Water Advisory Comm.	5,060.35	Tire Recycle	26,057.02
Safe School Pro	7,269.43	Service Coordinator	1,030.30
Local Incentive Awards	2,503.63	Fill the Gap – Attorney	10,118.71
Family Law Commiss.	9,152.55	Comm Punish Pro	4,463.61
Adult Drug Court	2,653.18	Juven. Detent Ed Pro	1,516.93
Regnl Road Project	26,290.43	Contributions SO	48.64
Library Auto Consor	148.51	Health Start	3,869.95
Victim Compens. ACJC	25,000.62	Victim Comp Restit.	575.00
Victim Comp Voca	7,787.37	Ryan White II	3,328.33
Prepared. Bioterror	31,645.03	PC Fees W. Yav.	54,252.51
Perinatal Block	2,542.79	Well Woman Health	7,516.51
Tobacco Educ	18,458.99	Victim Assist. ACJC	355.13
St Implement Grant	3,388.68	LSTA Potential	2,051.17
Tribe Donations	1,999.70	School Reso. – Mayer	2,312.56
St Grant in Aid	2,186.99	Drug Treat Ed	3,286.14
Mental HealthRWJF	299.69	Mental Health Part.	313.30
Field Trainer	2,036.12	Attendant Care	24,480.07
HIV WYGC	21.69	Childrens Justice	291.89
Child Sup & Vis	978.14	Juv Delq Case Proc.	1,083.90
Self Service	639.19	VOCA	8,340.02
JTSF Treatment	5,609.12	Diversion Conseq.	3,064.51
ALTCS	446,890.14		

In addition, payroll was issued on November 24 for the pay period ending November 18; warrant numbers 2466116 through 2466470, in the amount of \$297,044.77. Jury certificates issued during this time; 6880105 through 6880241. Warrants

issued for December 4 Board day, 4277268 through 4278431; 4278432 through 4278768.

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

ATTEST:

_____ Clerk _____ Chairman