**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MINUTES**
**GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

Date: September 21, 2010

**MICHAEL A. PASTOR**
Chairman

**TOMMIE C. MARTIN**
Vice-Chairman

**SHIRLEY L. DAWSON**
Member

**JOHN F. NELSON**
Clerk of the Board

By: Marilyn Brewer
Deputy Clerk

Gila County Courthouse
Globe, Arizona

---

PRESENT: Michael A. Pastor, Chairman; Tommie C. Martin, Vice-Chairman (via ITV conference); Shirley L. Dawson, Supervisor (via phone conference); Don McDaniel, Jr., County Manager; John Nelson, Deputy County Manager; Marian Sheppard, Chief Deputy Clerk; and Bryan Chambers, Chief Deputy County Attorney.

**Item 1 – Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance – Invocation**

The Gila County Board of Supervisors met in a regular session at 10:00 a.m. this date in the Board of Supervisors hearing room. Jacque Griffin led the Pledge of Allegiance and Reverend Kelly Woolridge of the Payson First Assembly of God Church delivered the invocation.

**Item 2 - PRESENTATIONS:**

**2A. Gila County Attorney Daisy Flores will present Globe Police Department Officer Danny Rice with the Officer of the Quarter Award.**

Daisy Flores, County Attorney, presented Globe Police Department Officer Danny Rice with the Officer of the Quarter award and gave a brief summary of his background and the reasons he was nominated for the award. Officer Rice thanked the Board for the award and gave a few brief comments. On behalf of the Board, Chairman Pastor thanked Officer Rice for his dedicated service to the community.

**2B. Presentation of the Globe Boys & Girls Club's update on its 2010 Summer Program, with consideration to adopt Proclamation No. 10-08 to proclaim Friday, September 24, 2010, as Boys & Girls Clubs Day for Kids in Globe.**

Russ Fetterman, Globe Boys & Girls Club President, provided an update on the Boys & Girls Club (BGC) Summer Program in which 11 staff members supervised 80 children (the average daily attendance). The Summer Program was provided at a cost of $25/week and ran from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. It included 2 snacks and lunch along with 2 field trips. He stated that a new tracking program has been implemented for scanning membership cards for those children entering and exiting the program for security purposes and to track daily attendance. Currently there are 270 children registered in the database in Globe and there are 127 children registered in the after-school program. A Bylas unit was recently added so the entire BGC program is now serving over 1,000 children from the San Carlos and Globe-Miami areas. He stated that the BGC has a "National Day for Kids" Program, which has been ongoing for the past several years. It was held last year at the casino in conjunction with the San Carlos BGC with approximately 800 children in attendance. This year it will be held at the club in Globe on Friday, September 24, 2010, from 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. with food and booths by different sponsors and everyone can view the programs available for the children. Mr. Fetterman invited everyone to attend and requested adoption of the Proclamation. Each Board member thanked the many volunteers that made this BGC a reality. Supervisor Dawson made the motion to adopt Proclamation No. 10-08 proclaiming Friday, September 24, 2010, as Boys and Girls Clubs Day for Kids in Globe. She then amended her motion to state "for kids in Globe-Miami of Southern Gila County." The motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Martin and unanimously approved.

**Item 3 – PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**3A. Public Hearing - Information/Discussion/Action to consider granting the transfer of a non-exclusive 15-year water franchise license from Bonita Creek Land and Homeowner's Association to William Glaunsinger d/b/a Bonita Creek Property and Preservation Association.**

Marian Sheppard, Chief Deputy Clerk, stated that on July 27, 2010, the Board accepted an application from William Glaunsinger for the transfer of a water utility franchise license from Bonita Creek Land and Homeowner's Association (BCLHA) to Bonita Creek Property and Preservation Association (BCPPA). This began the process of an internal review. Ms. Sheppard reviewed the application on behalf of the Board and included in the process was an internal review conducted by Bryan Chambers, Chief Deputy County Attorney, and Steve Sanders, Public Works Division Deputy Director, for the Engineering Department. Ms. Sheppard stated that if this license is granted, it would be for a period of 15 years. She advised that part of the internal process was to post a public hearing notice in the official newspaper of the County, which was done for a period of 3 weeks in the Arizona Silver Belt newspaper, and the notice was also posted for 3 weeks in the Payson Roundup newspaper. Ms. Sheppard stated that after she received the application, she also received paperwork from

a group of Bonita Creek residents who are opposed to this transfer and all of the information has been provided for both the Board's and the public's review. Present in Globe and Payson were individuals wishing to speak both in favor and against this transfer. Ms. Sheppard advised that Mr. Glaunsinger also submitted additional paperwork after the application submission and it has also been included for the Board's review.

Ms. Sheppard advised that on September 15, 2010, she received an email from Mr. Glaunsinger stating that he had resigned as President of the BCLHA. She also received a call from Ms. Lita Washburn, who will be speaking about the application today from Payson instead of Mr. Glaunsinger.

Ms. Sheppard stated that, in summary, from the paperwork she has reviewed, those opposed to this transfer believe that the transfer was not legal according to the constitution and bylaws of the BCLHA.

Ms. Sheppard stated that she asked Mr. Glaunsinger to provide her with proof that the name had been changed legally. She requested that Mr. Glaunsinger provide a copy of the minutes reflecting that the BCLHA Board of Directors (BOD) had approved the name change and also a copy of the meeting minutes showing that the minutes for the name change were also officially approved by the BOD. Mr. Glaunsinger submitted to Ms. Sheppard the August 5, 2004, minutes of the BCLHA. An excerpt (in italics) of the August 5, 2004, meeting minutes, which pertain to the vote on the name change is as follows: *"After some discussion, Bill* (Bill Glaunsinger) *motioned that the name be changed to Bonita Creek Property and Preservation Association. Linda* (Linda Soto) *was concerned that this name change would be difficult to do legally. Bill* (Bill Glaunsinger) *said he would check into the legal requirements before making this official. Dave* (Dave Kelley) *seconded the motion and it was carried by a 4-0 vote. Note: Bill* (Bill Glaunsinger) *found that the paperwork for the Arizona Corporation Commission and the IRS was straightforward, so we can proceed with the name change."*

Ms. Sheppard stated that Mr. Glaunsinger also provided her with the minutes of the September 4, 2004, meeting. An excerpt (in italics) from those minutes is as follows: *"Minutes of the June 13, 2004 and August 5, 2004 BOD meetings were approved."*

Mr. Glaunsinger also provided Ms. Sheppard with the minutes of the September 3, 2005, annual meeting of the BCLHA in which item number 8 "New Business" states (in italics), *"Members voted to change the Association's name to Bonita Creek Property and Preservation Association."* The opposing property owners provided Ms. Sheppard with a letter Mr. Glaunsinger sent to the members of the BCLHA advising them of the September 3, 2005, BCLHA's annual meeting and the agenda for the annual meeting was a part of that

letter. Ms. Sheppard advised that under Item V –New Business of that combined letter and agenda, there is nothing mentioned on the agenda for the members to vote to change the BCLHA's name. (Item V-New Business states (in italics): *"a. Hiring Tree Pro to remove stacked, trimmed brush from Association members lots, b. Continuation of 431 road clearing effort, c. Maintenance and roof for entrance sign, and d. Recycling."*

Ms. Sheppard concluded by stating that these are her concerns on behalf of the Board of Supervisors and advised that she had also shared these concerns with Mr. Chambers. She asked Mr. Chambers whether he would like to make any additional comments. He stated, "I suppose as you go through the hearing there may be some need for comments or the Board may decide they need some legal advice going through the hearing, but Ms. Sheppard outlined the issues very well."

Chairman Pastor inquired whether the Board had any comments. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she had no comments at this time; however, she would like to listen to what the public has to say. Supervisor Dawson stated, "I'm not clear on whether the association is having problems within the association and something that the Board could not act upon in knowing whether the Bonita Creek Property and Preservation Association is, in fact, a legal entity or is it the Homeowner's Association?...Here we are being asked to take an action when it doesn't seem to be that it's clear legally who represents what is the true legal entity...I guess I would like legal counsel to tell us if he believes that Bonita Creek Property and Preservation Association is the legal entity to be asking for this transfer." Chairman Pastor inquired of Mr. Chambers if he wanted to answer that now or wait until after the public comments. Mr. Chambers stated, "It might make some sense to wait until after the public comments because those speaking will probably have a lot to say as to whether or not they believe that the entity that is requesting the transfer is in fact a legitimate entity."

Chairman Pastor opened the public hearing for public comment and called on Vickie Goulette, a resident of Payson, who spoke on behalf of a large group of concerned residents and property owners in the Bonita Creek area that are opposed to the name change. Ms. Goulette stated that she is a property owner and full-time resident in the community known as Bonita Creek. She stated, "I appreciate the Board taking the time to listen to the concerns of many of the property owners in our little community. In order to familiarize you with Bonita Creek, I want to take a few seconds to tell you about us. We are located approximately 18 miles northeast of Payson with the last 5 miles being dirt control road. We are 160 acres small. We are made up of four 40-acre subdivisions. Our area is classed as recreational property so of the 155 lots, only 54 have homes or cabins built on them and only 10 of those are lived in on a full-time basis and only 7 of those are on the water system. These 155 lots range in size from a quarter acre to 5 acres and are owned by 108 different

property owners. Many of these owners have not seen their property in over a decade and several live out of state. I tell you all of this so that when you look at the number of property owners who have signed the various petitions that have been provided to you or joined the association versus the actual number of property owners, you don't consider our numbers to be insignificant. We'd like you to understand that we rarely see the bulk of the property owners. Mr. Glaunsinger, the president of our volunteer home owner's association, who just resigned this past Saturday, filed this petition with you to have the County franchise license for our local water company transferred from the Bonita Creek Land and Homeowner's Association (BCLHA) to the Bonita Creek Property and Preservation Association (BCPPA). The BCLHA was formed in 1990 after the Dude fire destroyed our community, 60 homes and killed 6 firefighters. The individual who owned the water company at that time did not want to restore the water system after the fire, but the community members that were still there wanted water, so the individual agreed to sell the water company to the people if they formed a homeowners association. The reason for the formation and the sole purpose of the association was to run the water company; nothing more. As the years went by the BCLHA took on other tasks such as clearing hiking trails and working with the County to keep our roads graded and I don't have a problem with that. These are all good things. However, in 2004, Mr. Glaunsinger decided that he didn't like the stigma that the homeowners association had so he took it upon himself to come up with a new name. He spoke with 3 other members of the board, as Marian mentioned, at that time and they agreed to have him see what would be involved with changing the name. They didn't actually give him permission to change the name. The minutes of the board meeting of August 5, 2004, reflect this and further state that Mr. Glaunsinger would check into the legal requirements before making this official. An additional note was added that 'Bill found that the paperwork for the Arizona Corporation Commission and the IRS is straightforward, so we can proceed with the name change.' This should have never happened since the board does not have the authority to change the name according to the constitution and the bylaws of our association. In spite of that, when the invitation letter for the annual meeting in September 2004 was sent out, it stated that the board had voted to change the name and for everyone to make their checks payable to the BCPPA. The members of the BCLHA never even had a say in the matter let alone the opportunity to vote as our bylaws state they should. Mr. Glaunsinger has further stated to the Arizona Corporation Commission on his application with that organization that the members did vote. We have already provided you with a letter from one of the property owners, who is also an attorney, who stated that a vote was never taken. He also provided us with the copy of the agenda for the 2005 annual meeting that was personally handed to his wife by Mr. Glaunsinger's wife along with an invitation for them to join the association since they had just recently bought their property. There is no item on the agenda for voting on a name change. My husband, John Goulette, contacted Mr. Glaunsinger a few months ago in regards to looking at the corporate log book and was very upset to find

that the log book contained both an agenda and minutes of the 2005 annual meeting reflecting the name change on the agenda and the vote taken by the membership. Note: We are talking one year after the name was changed by Mr. Glaunsinger. We have spoken to several members who were at that meeting in addition to the attorney who states very specifically that there was no vote. The other thing to note here that since we are dealing with issues from 6 years ago, all the pages in the log book had colored with age except for the 2 pages that contained the 2005 agenda and minutes. Those 2 pieces of paper were really white and really new looking. One other item to mention is that up until December 2009, all annual reports with the Arizona Corporation Commission as well as tax returns filed with the IRS have all been filed in the name of the BCLHA, not the BCPPA. The board discovered last year that it's not a straight forward process like Mr. Glaunsinger originally indicated and, in fact, has turned out to be both expensive and a real pain in the back side. So first and foremost, the board did not have the authority to change the name of our association. The bylaws of our association state 'All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order' and according to those rules, in order to amend, annul, repeal or rescind any part of the constitution, bylaws or rules of order, it requires a 2/3 vote of the membership. In addition it states, 'No motion is in order that conflicts with the laws of the nation, or state or with the assembly's constitution or bylaws, and if such a motion is adopted, even by a unanimous vote, it is null and void.' We believe that the action that Mr. Glaunsinger took was not within his authority to do and therefore is null and void. In the past few years the BCPPA has had anywhere from 18-35 members, but this year 80 memberships were paid for. A large, for us, group of property owners got together in the months prior to the annual election on September 4, 2010, to come up with enough candidates and votes to get control of the board in hopes of being able to get this entire situation taken care of in-house; however, the process was corrupted so badly by 2 members of the nominating committee, 1 of whom was the president's wife, that now we have to conduct an entirely new election. The BCPPA board currently only has one official member, whose term has not expired, so that's why he wasn't up (for re-election). The president and vice-president have resigned and the other positions who were voted on at the meeting are either being contested or the number of ballots cast don't even match the number of memberships that were paid for. The BCLHA, on the other hand, has been revived by our group of homeowners and we currently have 35 members representing 59 lots with an interim president, secretary and treasurer already in place and an organizational meeting scheduled for Oct 2nd to appoint our nominating committee and get going with the election for our official officers. One member of the BCLHA is a certified level 2 operator for both water treatment and distribution and, in fact, ran the water company for almost 14 years up to December 2009. We have everything we need in place to take care of what rightfully belongs to the BCLHA. In conclusion, this group of people who have banded together to file these oppositions with the Arizona Corporation Commission, you who have signed the petitions and showed up

here today, we can only hope and pray that you will look at all the facts and the information that we provided to you and then not reward the erroneous actions of an over-zealous president. We ask that you deny the application for transfer of the franchise license and allow the rightful owner, the Bonita Creek Land and Homeowner's Association, to keep, maintain and run the Bonita Water Company. Thank you very much."

Chairman Pastor requested a copy of Ms. Goulette's written statement for the minutes, which was provided. Chairman Pastor then called on Ron Allen, a resident of Scottsdale, who also wished to speak in opposition. Mr. Allen stated, "I own property in Bonita Creek, lot 40, Antelope Trail. I would ask the Board of Supervisors to deny the petition in hand. The community up there is in turmoil. The actions taken by the current board that is calling themselves the BCPPA and the Homeowner's Association I don't believe is proper. Initially when I was told in 2004 that they wanted to have a new name, it was to separate the issues from the water. We've got community issues about the roads, the trails, fire-wise district, things that are important to the community, but they kept getting confused with the water company. And then the money coming into an association like that tended to be mixed. You had association member dues buying parts and equipment and stuff for the water company and those people don't have any water on that side of the creek. So it's just a big mess. Personally I think it's important to be a part of a community when you own land. I've never been a member of the association until this year, but I have been a water company customer even though I don't have any building or any use for the water. The water meter has never turned over in numbers, but I have been paying the water bill for over 10 years and I think it's important to support that issue so that my property in the future will have water. The problem is it's become political and it's become political in the fact that the BCPPA doesn't want to let go of the power of controlling water for the community. I think the 2 should be separate. I think the home owners association legally owns the water company. They need to stay the legal owners of the water company and the BCPPA can form its own new association for other issues."

Chairman Pastor then called on Lita Washburn, a resident of Payson. Ms. Washburn stated the following: "I would just like to say that the original purpose of the association was much larger than just the water company. The whole area had been burned in the Dude fire and it needed to be rebuilt. The roads needed to be restructured and the infrastructure of the water system had been destroyed and so through the years we've added different things. We have fire prevention and we have a wonderful fire-wise grant for, I believe, the original amount was around $200,000 and then we just got an additional grant to clear the interior properties for $115,000. During this board of directors meeting in 2004, I wasn't present. My husband and I were members of the board at the time, but we were out of town. When we got back in town and found out what the action had been we were concerned because we thought

that it would be a very long and costly process. They did bring it up at the meeting - they announced at the 2004 annual meeting that they had decided to change the name to the Bonita Creek Property and Preservation (Association). They had said at that time that they were going to go out and Bill (Mr. Glaunsinger) had said that he was going to check into the cost of doing this because there were several of us that had a concern about what it would cost to change the name. Nobody at the annual meeting objected at that time to the name change. Then at the next annual meeting in 2005, I remember receiving the agenda. We received the agendas a month in advance and during that month's period there may be additional items that are added to the agenda because of the length of the period and he sends the document out to people and asks for their input. So this does change the agenda and it can also change the minutes. And I've implemented a policy that from now on the minutes and agendas when they are finalized will be signed by 2 people on the board so that we never have this problem again. And if you look back historically at other agendas you'll find that they may have changed after they've been sent out. At our last annual meeting, we had 2 new motions added to the agenda so this isn't an unusual thing to happen. And I feel that there was no malice in trying to change the name, he just thought that people, because there were a lot of things going on with homeowner's association at the time, he thought it would be friendlier and more people would want to join the association. There were several people that were treasurer and secretaries during this period of time and some of the names were changed. The actual forms that came for the water company were not changed. They had the Bonita Creek Land & Homeowner's Association name on them, but the accounts were all still the same no matter what name they had on them. The money followed whatever purpose it was. When I took over as treasurer in 2007, I tried and also Linda Kelly, that was the treasurer at the time, to get them to send the statements to the Bonita Creek Homeowner's Association and they kept going to her home. I went in at least 5 or 6 times, I wrote letters, I called them on the phone and she did the same thing and they never changed. I found in the records that she had written a letter to the bank in 2006 asking them to change the name to Bonita Creek Property and Preservation name and they didn't follow through with things and she can verify that if you need to. It has been a mess and we've spent $600 changing the name so far and we still have probably more monies that we are going to be putting out. The association normally only brings in about $2,600/year and we've had to spend another $1,100 approximately on liability insurance because of this issue. It just seems like a foolish waste of money. We're all trying to help better our community and make it a safer place to live. The water company has been run wonderfully through the years since they started in 1956. We knew the problem with the system. Everybody that has taken care of it has done a fine job. I don't see what the problem is here other than everybody is questioning everybody. We have officially 81 new members at this point in time, or maybe 82, and it's both for and against this factor of changing the name. It's kind of split down the middle. The whole voting process has been pretty much split

down the middle. I just think it's time for the community to heal. Let's get on with it. We're right in the middle of changing the name. Everything is done except transferring the assets and the franchise. I just feel that it needs to happen instead of paying more money out to change it all back again."

Chairman Pastor called on Betty McRae, a resident of Payson. Ms. McRae stated, "We have owned our lots since at least 1972. We lost our first log home in the Dude fire. We had owned it 18 years at that point and had loved Bonita Creek. It's always been such a treasure and a beautiful place. There were not a lot of homes up there at that point and the ones that survived the fire were most fortunate. We waited because it was such a devastated area to drive through to get to the area. We did not rebuild until 2005, '06 and '07. It took us 2 years to get it done. Our home is now finished and completely protected by a water suppression system. I never again want to lose a home in Bonita Creek. We just joined the homeowner's association. I've been members of other homeowner's associations all over the country—Jackson Hole, La Jolla, Paradise Valley. They can be a very good institution, but they can also be very (inaudible). And it saddens me greatly to hear some details about people that just can't get along. I don't know whether it's the way the world is going these days, but I can't image that there's divisiveness over the name. How important is that? If this new name has gotten down the track this far, I see no reason for that to be finalized and let's move forward with dealing with the issues of protecting the area against future devastation from fire, dealing with the water issues. I'm well aware there are lots across the creek from us that do not supposedly legally have a right to water. That saddens me. That creek has never run dry. It's poured out of the side of the rim since no one knows when it started. It disappears underground. SRP (Salt River Project) put dye in the water to try and prove where it came out into their system and they were very unsuccessful. Maybe it goes through to China. Who knows? But that Bonita Creek needs to be preserved and protected and we need to protect each other. We are neighbors in one of the most beautiful places in the state of Arizona."

Chairman Pastor called on Robert Johnson, a resident of Bonita Creek. Mr. Johnson stated that he heard there was a petition circulating about this name change and inquired if that was correct. Chairman Pastor advised him that there was a petition. Mr. Johnson stated that he has been a property owner for about 11 years and has been a member of the association and he has never seen this petition and wondered why he was not contacted. Chairman Pastor advised Mr. Johnson that he believes the petition the Board received was a petition of those opposing the name change and transfer of assets. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she would see that Mr. Johnson had the opportunity to review the petition. Ms. Sheppard advised that the petition was an attachment to this agenda item and was available for review on the County's website.

Chairman Pastor called on Vickie Goulette again. Ms. Goulette stated, "I just want to say here, it's not just about the name change. It's about the water company and its goals and duties and responsibilities and they didn't have a right to change the name, but it's not just about the name change. I will agree with Ms. McRae it would be petty, but to do what they are trying to do in the manner that they have been doing it is wrong. That's why we are here and that's why we are opposed."

Chairman Pastor called on Doyle Warner, a resident of Bonita Creek. Mr. Warner stated, "I've owned property at Bonita Creek for just over 25 years. I went through the Dude fire. I assisted in rebuilding part of the infrastructure for the water company. I'm the current on-site representative and operator for the water company. It is in good standing with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. We've made several upgrades over the past year to get it to that point. My concern is not about a name. My concern is that the association in approximately 1990 purchased the water company along with all the assets and spent a lot of money putting it back together so that it could serve the community and I'm most concerned about protecting the quality of the water. I do feel that the water company should serve the entire community and in fact this franchise is for160 lots in all of the property in Bonita Creek. If we can ever work together and resolve this issue, if the people on the other side of the creek want water it behooves everybody to help that happen. They should pay for any infrastructure that has to be added and the water company could hook up to it. At that point in time, we would go from 44 customers to some larger and of course the more customers you have the better the revenue base and the better job we can do."

Chairman Pastor again called on Ron Allen, who stated, "I think Doyle (Warner) properly exposed what this is really all about. It's about one side of the creek having water and it's been there for 56 years and the other side of the creek not having water. The property owners over there don't and realistically that's what this whole issue has been about. Bill Glaunsinger and many of those people are on the dry side of the water. When they bought the land that they purchased they knew there was no water there. The parcels that they bought were much larger. You can't have a parcel less than an acre and it was cheaper. When I was looking up there to buy land, I drove the whole community. I made a choice to buy a piece that was with water at a higher price and that's really what this whole issue is about and I believe that if they want to have water, fine, let's talk about the issue instead of trying to control the water company through a fictitious made-up association and get it back to where it started, where it was the Bonita Creek Homeowner's Association and let the other stuff be separate."

Vickie Goulette stated, "When the people bought on the dry side they received and I can provide you with a copy of it, a 4-page HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development) report that says there is not enough water in the

creek to support a complete build-out. And they bought that property knowing full well that there was no water and in fact 2 of the people that we have here today live on the dry side. They've put in a water collection system. They collect water and what not. They've invested a lot of money. The attorney who wrote the letter that was provided to you also lives on the dry side and they have put in a rain collection system and invested over $10,000. If they want to try and tax the people on that side of the creek to try and put in water over there, there's going to be another war. We'll probably be seeing you again because the HUD report specifically says no and they bought the land full well knowing that it was no."

Doyle Warner requested to speak again adding the following: "There have been studies that show the creek flows approximately 1,000 acre feet per year. There is currently a line in the creek that has the capability of diverting around the community up to 200 acre feet a year. The water company currently uses about 4.5 acre feet a year to serve the whole community and if it built out completely you would have a maximum of 20 acre feet per year. I don't understand that there's not enough water to go around. I've never heard of such a selfish attitude and I think it's what's fundamentally wrong with our community."

Betty McRae added, "Having been a member of that community for perhaps the most years here...I am appalled that we would take the attitude there is not enough water. As I mentioned before that creek has always run. It has never come close to being a dry creek or being a low producing creek. When we first were there we used to pump directly out of the creek because there was no water company. There was no way to get water any other way. We'd put the pump in, pump water while we were there and pull the pump out when we left. I am glad that's not the case anymore because I know there are animals that use the water as well as people. I spent $32,000 on a fire suppression system. Does that mean that I should not want fire protection delivered to other people because I chose to spend money that way? I hope not. I would be the first one to say that fire protection belongs to everybody. The fact that I chose to invest beyond that and I'm now referring to people who collect rainwater, I think that's delightful that they do that. A lot of people do that just because they want to have the water from the rain versus from some other source. I don't think that we, as human beings, should take the position that we would deny water. The chances even of that whole community being totally built out is probably slim, but we just heard from Doyle (Warner) that there is adequate water and I firmly trust his judgment. He's doing an excellent job of running the water company and is very contentious and committed."

Supervisor Dawson stated, "Again, I'm back to the beginning question. We aren't here to decide whether the Homeowner's Association exists or doesn't or the Preservation Association. The purpose of the hearing was to consider granting a transfer of the franchise for the water company and we don't even

know whether there is legally a Preservation Association or legally a Homeowner's Association. Those are the things that the homeowners of that area have to work out themselves--transferring a water franchise from any entity to another one. Tommie always has a thing about war over whiskey and water. I don't want to get into that war and I hope these people who live in this beautiful area can work it out rather than coming to the Board to work it out. Certainly I appreciate your owner's comments on the amount of water there, but I also know that on your deed when you buy that you're told there's not going to be water available to you on the other side of the creek. There's some legal standing there. I don't see where the Board has anything to take action on. Thank you and I would like to hear what the County Attorney says."

Bryan Chambers, Chief Deputy County Attorney, stated, "At this point, I think what I would recommend is, and I'll say it's at the Board's pleasure, that the Board may wish to go into executive session to get legal advice. That is something that is on the bottom of every agenda so it is properly noticed that Board may go into an executive session for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from the Board's attorney on any matter listed on the agenda. I know the Board also likes to use that sparingly because it is disruptive. We have to figure out how to get all the phone calls together and that type of thing, but in this particular situation where there certainly is a divided community and there are potential legal consequences regardless of which way the Board chooses to vote today, it makes sense to get any legal advice in executive session. Then again that is the Board's decision." Chairman Pastor entertained a motion to go into executive session. Supervisor Dawson stated, "My feeling is that the Board should not take action on this at this time. The Homeowner's Association and/or the Preservation Group need to work out their own problems. We are forever fighting for the rights of individuals and for government not to step in and muddy the waters. For crying out loud, why would we decide that we have better knowledge then these homeowners do and they should work it out? They can re-file and bring it back if they want to form their water group or however they want to do this, but I don't see that we need to take action on this. I'm not sure we need to have legal advice." Vice-Chairman Martin stated, "I agree. I think it needs to go back to these folks and let them decide what they want and come to us then if that takes an action and we take an action at the time when they have had more time to deliberate amongst themselves. I'm not sure that we need an executive session at this stage of the game. I think the community needs to work it out amongst themselves and then come back to us. I would rather table it. I would rather not take an action one way or the other at this stage of the game." Chairman Pastor closed the public hearing and entertained a motion. Upon motion by Vice-Chairman Martin, seconded by Supervisor Dawson, the Board unanimously tabled this item until such time as the (Bonita Creek) community members come back to the Board to discuss this issue again. Chairman Pastor stated that he hoped the groups can get together and maybe come to some kind of consensus and work the problem out.

**3B. Public Hearing - Information/Discussion/Action to adopt Resolution No. 10-09-01 approving Planning and Zoning Department Case #LURPP 2010 Amendment, which complies with the requirements of the 2010 State of Arizona SH/HB 1398 as it relates to Federal and State management of land and resources.**

Bob Gould, Community Development Division Director, stated that a committee of the Planning & Zoning (P & Z) Commission has been working on the Land Use Resource Policy Plan (LURPP) for about a year or so. He stated, "The document provided to the Board today includes some additional changes made to it and are being recommended by the P & Z Commission. The changes were not substantive, but were simply to clean up some of the repetitive language and to eliminate one sentence out of Policy 13 that belonged in the Grazing Policy instead of under 'Recreation.' Other than those changes, it remains basically the same document that is easier to read with the redundancies removed." He stated that the P & Z Chairman Don Ascoli and Member Jay Spehar spearheaded this effort to get the document completed. It is simply a tool to help the County in working with federal land management agencies and how they make decisions and in trying to communicate with them. Mr. Gould stated that an extensive public participation process was gone through and even though there was not a lot of public participation, a lot of work and time was put into it. He then called on Mr. Spehar. Mr. Spehar stated that the P & Z committee did an extensive public outreach campaign. Without meaning to be disagreeable with Mr. Gould, he thought it was very successful because 7 public hearings were held and no negative comments were given. He stated, "I think that's a testament to the work that this committee and the full P & Z Commission did in terms of getting everybody's point of view brought into this document. He also stated that Supervisor Martin provided some good constructive criticism that was utilized and those changes were included in the final document. He concluded by stating, "I believe it's ready for your consideration and I certainly hope for your approval. It was a great exercise to get this done for Gila County." Don Ascoli stated, "The committee did go through a very extensive process. Some constructive comments were made so that it is just a better document to go out and represent Gila County, its wishes and its goals. I would encourage all the supervisors to support this document." Supervisor Dawson thanked the committee for its diligent work and for the public hearings. She requested that at the conclusion of the LURPP process, assuming that the Board adopts it, that the P & Z Commission set the date for its annual review and make certain that the Gila County Cattle Grower's Association receives notice when that meeting will be held and they certainly are welcome in the years to come to make any kind of comment, suggestions or input to the committee. She stated that the committee has stated clearly how the U.S. Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture will cooperate with Gila County and when the time comes for the County to work with them, this document will be very helpful. She stated, "Again I just want to say thank you for going beyond your role as

Commission members and being dedicated in bringing this forward." Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she recognizes and appreciates all of the hard work that this committee put in this and thanked them. She also appreciates the changes that were made as it makes the document more of a policy position and less of a political position and makes it less offensive in the way the County presents the information. On any future documents of this type, however, Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she would like the Board to have a little more input prior to it being released to the public, but she appreciates the changes that were made. Chairman Pastor thanked the committee for its work and he also appreciated members going to Tonto Basin for a community meeting and presenting the LURPP there and he knows those folks were appreciative as well. Chairman Pastor opened the public hearing and called for public comments. Jesse Bryant, representing KQSS Radio, stated, "I'm curious as to the language. I'm familiar with the bill SB1398. Does the LURPP exclusively use 'coordination' language or is the terminology 'cooperation' included also?" Mr. Gould stated that the "coordination" language is the priority, but where "coordination" is not available, it is specified in the document that "cooperative" efforts, "collaboration" and things like that are acceptable as well. Mr. Bryant was advised that the document is available to the public on the Gila County website. Chairman Pastor closed the public hearing and entertained a motion. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Vice-Chairman Martin, the Board unanimously adopted Resolution No. 10-09-01 approving Planning and Zoning Department Case #LURPP 2010 Amendment, which complies with the requirements of the 2010 State of Arizona SH/HB 1398 as it relates to Federal and State management of land and resources. **(A copy of the Resolution is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' Office.)**

**3C. Public Hearing - Information/Discussion/Action to adopt Resolution No. 10-08-01 approving Planning and Zoning Department Case Z-10-01, in which Neal Nelson, Applicant for owner Milo LeBaron, is requesting a change in zoning from R1-D35 (Residence One with the Density of 35,000 sq. ft) to R1-D35 w/PAD (Residence One with the Density of 35,000 sq. ft with a Planned Area of Development) for Gila County Assessor's Tax Parcel 301-03-015A, Section 29, T12N, R8E located at 9597 W. Juniper in Strawberry, AZ.**

Mr. Gould stated that several months ago, Mr. LeBaron approached the County with the idea of dividing a 4.37 acre parcel in Strawberry into 5 separate lots. This is a lot that has 5 residential units on it today and is basically a family compound and the family wanted to get ownership of their home and the immediate land to it. The County couldn't provide them the opportunity to go through the land division process because they couldn't meet any of the standards that were established for R1-D35 property as they couldn't meet the area required for some places. One lot would have 2 housing units on it and 1 lot would be vacant. At the same time the neighbors raised a concern with the

rezoning in regard to increasing the density in the area. So the County compromised with both sides and came up with a proposal to rezone this to R1-D35, with a PAD (planned area development) extension. Through this extension, Mr. LeBaron can submit a subdivision plat and go through the small subdivision process, which will come back to the County in the future, but they'll be able to have variable lot sizes while at the same time maintaining the density that would ordinarily be built with that 4.37 acre parcel for D35 density. Mr. Gould felt it was a simple matter because they just want to divide it to create the separate ownerships there and requested that the Board consider it. Chairman Pastor opened the public hearing and called on Neal Nelson, brother-in-law of Milo LeBaron, and a resident of Mesa. Mr. Nelson stated that he is one of the homeowners of the subject property that has been in family ownership for 30 years. The homes were built by individuals with a great deal of care and effort and the intent is to develop a vehicle in which the decisions are made while there are still 5 brothers and sisters as the owners instead of the next generation consisting of over 150 people. He stated that the second reason is that when something like this belongs to everybody, it belongs to nobody. So they are trying to set up individual ownership so that there's responsibility so that his kids and grandkids can have another 30 years of enjoyment there. There's no intention of building anymore properties. Chairman Pastor closed the public hearing and entertained a motion. Upon motion by Vice-Chairman Martin, seconded by Supervisor Dawson, the Board unanimously adopted Resolution No. 10-08-01 approving Planning and Zoning Department Case Z-10-01, in which Neal Nelson, Applicant for owner Milo LeBaron, is requesting a change in zoning from R1-D35 (Residence One with the Density of 35,000 sq. ft) to R1-D35 w/PAD (Residence One with the Density of 35,000 sq. ft. with a Planned Area of Development) for Gila County Assessor's Tax Parcel 301-03-015A, Section 29, T12N, R8E located at 9597 W. Juniper in Strawberry, Arizona. **(A copy of the Resolution is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' Office.)**

**3D. Public Hearing - Information/Discussion/Action to adopt Resolution No. 10-08-02 for Planning and Zoning Department Case No. CUP-10-02, an application filed by Salado Properties for owner Jennifer King, which is a request for construction of a restaurant, Lake House Grill, to be located on Hwy 188 (across from the currently open Lake House Grill), Gila County Assessor's Tax Parcel 204-06-005E, Sec. 15, T3N, R13E. (The Board of Supervisors may consider adopting this Resolution with a stipulation that 8 conditions be included as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Department.)**

Mr. Gould stated that Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 10-02 was submitted for the purpose of allowing the owners to build a structure and house a restaurant within it. The present restaurant is located next to the country store on Highway 188 in Roosevelt and directly across the street an area has been graded where the owners intend to build the new restaurant. There is

significant separation between this restaurant and the Quail Run Subdivision and from the church that is located there. This has been noted because there were some comments mentioned that it was too close; however, the present restaurant is a lot closer. The owners want to build an 8,000-square-foot building and also have outdoor dining. Under the current zoning TR-TD, a person is allowed to have commercial space outright within there, but is limited to 2,500 square feet. The owner wants to go beyond that area and that is the reason he has applied for a CUP and so that the County can oversee the process and make sure it's going to be compatible to the area. Mr. Gould stated that he believes that the conditions that are implied on this will make it compatible. The owners requested permission to remain open until 2:00 a.m., which the County denied. With TR zoning, the restaurant will have to close at 11:00 p.m., which is the time the present restaurant has been closing. There is C3 zoning on the property frontage and then this lot is a 17-acre flag lot that provides access to it and then there's C3 zoning again between this property and where the Quail Run Subdivision is located. Approval of this CUP would in no way create any problems for people in the area. Mr. Gould requested that the Board consider approval of it through the Planning & Zoning Commission with the stipulation that the 8 conditions noted be met as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission as follows: 1) building permits shall be obtained; 2) sanitary facilities for the use shall be designed, constructed and approved by the Wastewater Department; 3) all parking must meet County standards and be accommodated on the site; 4) any applicable State and County Health Department regulations shall be complied, and all required permits must be obtained and remain valid so long as the use is in operation; 5) all outdoor lighting shall be appropriately shielded in accordance with County regulations; 6) a development must be submitted per the County Zoning Ordinance; 7) outside dining tables will be permitted and must be shown on the development plan; and 8) violations of any of the seven previous conditions shall be grounds for suspension or revocation of this Conditional Use Permit. Chairman Pastor questioned the lighting issue because the restaurant elevation is higher than the Quail Run Subdivision area. Mr. Gould replied that the lighting issue was addressed and the owner will be required to shield the lighting away from any potential neighboring areas. Chairman Pastor also inquired if a bar was going to be included in the restaurant. Mr. Gould replied that a bar was included. Supervisor Dawson stated that when they apply for a liquor license they will probably be requesting a 2:00 a.m. closing time again and the church nearby may have questions about that. Chairman Pastor stated that he believed the restaurant/bar would probably be 200-300 feet away from the church. Mr. Gould stated that it is estimated to be about 500 feet from the church. Mr. Gould also noted that the current access to the property is through the post office parking lot, but that will be changed. Chairman Pastor opened the public hearing and called for public comments; none were received. Chairman Pastor closed the public hearing and entertained a motion. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Vice-Chairman Martin, the Board unanimously adopted Resolution No. 10-08-02 for

Planning and Zoning Department Case No. CUP-10-02, an application filed by Salado Properties for owner Jennifer King, which is a request for construction of a restaurant, Lake House Grill, to be located on Hwy 188 (across from the currently open Lake House Grill), Gila County Assessor's Tax Parcel 204-06-005E, Sec. 15, T3N, R13E with the stipulation that the 8 conditions (as noted above) be met as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission. **(A copy of the Resolution is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' Office.)**

**Item 4 - REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:**

**4A. Information/Discussion/Action to authorize the Gila County Rabies Control Department to submit a Grant Application in the amount of $9,940 to the Arizona Companion Animal Spay and Neuter Committee to provide low cost spay/neuter services to qualified individuals in Gila County.**

John Castaneda, Animal Regulation Enforcement Officer, stated that this grant application is for a low-cost spay and neuter program to be implemented at the animal shelter for a 50% off voucher program for qualified individuals. The $9,940 in funds will come from a State license plate program where a portion of funds from purchasing a spay and neuter license plate goes into a special fund and will not require any matching County funds. The County will pay half of the spay & neuter cost for the individual and if the Society, which was formerly known as the Gila Humane Society, will pick up the other half, it could be a no-cost spay and neuter for individuals. This program will be open to all Gila County residents including Payson and San Carlos, which do have spay and neuter programs. Mr. Castaneda estimates that approximately 140 animals will be spayed or neutered as a part of this program. Upon motion by Vice-Chairman Martin, seconded by Supervisor Dawson, the Board unanimously authorized the Gila County Rabies Control Department to submit a Grant Application in the amount of $9,940 to the Arizona Companion Animal Spay and Neuter Committee to provide low cost spay/neuter services to qualified individuals in Gila County.

**4B. Information/Discussion/Action to approve Professional Services Contract 1005.221/8-2011 between Gila County and Northstar Survey, Inc. (Surveyor) whereby the Surveyor will provide GPS surveying services for the Town of Star Valley G.P.S. project.**

Steve Stratton, Public Works Division Director, stated that this is actually an item for the Gila County Assessor's Office; however the Public Works Division, Engineering and Surveying Departments, work with the Assessor's Office on providing land parcel data maps. This contract will be for a surveying company to verify the section corners, quarter section corners, etc. so that the County can get appropriate drawings done and it will also help the Surveying

Department and a portion will include GPS surveying services for the Town of Star Valley GPS project. This will be paid for by the Assessor's surcharge funds that are collected by the Recorder's Office when someone records a document. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Vice-Chairman Martin, the Board unanimously approved Professional Services Contract No. 1005.221/8-2011 between Gila County and Northstar Survey, Inc. (Surveyor) whereby the Surveyor will provide GPS surveying services for the Town of Star Valley G.P.S. project.

**4C. Information/Discussion/Action to approve Professional Engineering Services Contract 6510.526.REC04/8-2010 between Gila County and C.L. Williams Consulting, Inc., whereby engineering services will be provided for the Pine Creek Canyon Road Project in the amount of $68,382.00 from September 21, 2010, to June 30, 2011.**

Mr. Stratton stated that this project goes back several years at which time the Board awarded a contract to C.L. Williams in 2004 to design a road compatible with County standards for the ADT (average daily traffic) count on the Pine Creek Canyon Road Project. That ADT road count, taken on April 26, 2010, was 733 cars per day. As the design of the road began, there were a lot of right-of-way issues as residents owned portions of the road. It's very difficult to design a road to a standard for that ADT count. The County did a change order in the amount of $18,000 to this previously to try and establish 8-10 property boundaries and that work was completed. As the County continued trying to meet the standards, it became more and more obvious that the current standard was not going to be met so the County has now reviewed the issues and is just going to try and improve the drainage and the right-ability of that road, which is approximately 1-3/4 miles long. There was approximately $64,672 remaining on the original contract with C.L. Williams & Associates, but because the scope of work has changed so much, the cost has slightly increased. An update will be provided to the Board. He requested that the Board approve this new contract. Chairman Pastor inquired whether the County went out for bids on the original project in 2003 in order for C.L. Williams & Associates to do the engineering work. Mr. Stratton replied that the project was not bid out; it was done under the old professional services agreement at the time. Chairman Pastor inquired if this needed to go out for bids this time. Mr. Stratton stated that he didn't believe this needed to go out for bids; however, the Agreement was reviewed by the County Attorney's Office and he deferred to Mr. Chambers. Mr. Chambers stated that because this is for engineering services and it is a professional services contract, there is no need to go out for bids. Mr. Stratton also added that since a substantial amount of the work has already been completed by Mr. Williams' firm, to back up and issue a call for bids would probably cost the County a significant more amount of money. Chairman Pastor stated that one of his concerns was putting too much work on Mr. Williams because he is dealing with a lot of large projects right now for the County. Chairman Pastor recommended that the

County also look at other engineering firms to help out if that was possible. Mr. Stratton replied that County has been reviewing that and is using Jacobs Engineering on the 512 Young Road project and he is also going to contact the Arizona Department of Transportation for a current list of their approved engineering firms since they have been prequalified. He was also going to discuss this issue with Mr. Chambers. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that since this project has been dragging on for so long, she wouldn't want to start over with another firm. Chairman Pastor clarified that he didn't wish to start over with a new firm; he was just concerned about the workload on Mr. Williams' company. Upon motion by Vice-Chairman Martin, seconded by Supervisor Dawson, the Board unanimously approved Professional Engineering Services Contract 6510.526.REC04/8-2010 between Gila County and C.L. Williams Consulting, Inc., whereby engineering services will be provided for the Pine Creek Canyon Road Project in the amount of $68,382.00 from September 21, 2010, to June 30, 2011.

**4D. Information/Discussion/Action to approve Order No. LL-10-04, an application submitted by Lisa Bramoff for a person to person transfer of a Series 6 bar license at the Strawberry Bear located in Strawberry, Arizona.**

Ms. Sheppard stated that this is an application for a Series 6 bar license. Once the County accepts an application, an internal review process is conducted by the Planning and Zoning Department as well as the Health Department and neither department had an issue with this application. Ms. Sheppard recommended the Board's approval to the Arizona State Department of Liquor Licenses and Control. Upon motion by Supervisor Dawson, seconded by Vice-Chairman Martin, the Board unanimously approved Order No. LL-10-04, an application submitted by Lisa Bramoff for a person to person transfer of a Series 6 bar license at the Strawberry Bear located in Strawberry, Arizona.

**Item 5 - CONSENT AGENDA ACTION ITEMS:**

**5A. Approval of an Intergovernmental Agreement (ADES Contract No. DE111006001) between the Arizona Department of Economic Security and Gila County Board of Supervisors in the amount of $2,632,208 (Adult - $642,076, Youth - $595,639, Dislocated Worker - $1,393,492) to provide Workforce Investment Act services to eligible Youth, Adults and Dislocated Workers in the Gila/Pinal Local Workforce Investment Area for the period April 1, 2010, through June 30, 2013.**

**5B. Approval of an Order to cancel elections and appoint governing board members to the fire districts, water districts, wastewater districts, sanitary districts, school districts and technological districts named in the Order.**

**5C. Approval of Amendment No. 2 for a price increase to Contract 120307-2-Pavement Marking between Gila County and Traffic Safety Inc. whereby the Contractor provides pavement marking on County roads.**

**5D. Approval of FY11DGVCC Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program Grant Adjustment Notice (Grant No. DC-10-036/Adjustment No. 1) advising of the renewal of a grant agreement between the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission and the Gila County Sheriff's Office in the amount of $344,288 for a total adjusted grant award amount of $688,576 and extending the grant agreement expiration date from June 30, 2010, to June 30, 2011. All funds will be utilized by the Gila County Drug, Gang and Violent Control Task Force.**

**5E. Approval of personnel reports/actions for the weeks of September 14, 2010, and September 21, 2010.**

**September 14, 2010**

Departures from County Service:

1. Tiffani Horton – Globe Regional Justice Court – Justice Court Clerk Associate – 08/27/10 - General Fund – DOH 03/22/10 – Failure to complete probationary period

Temporary Hires to County Service:

2. Richard Ruiz – Board of Supervisors – Temporary Laborer – 08/25/10 – Constituent Services II Fund
3. Manuel Rodriguez - Board of Supervisors – Temporary Laborer – 08/25/10 – Constituent Services II Fund
4. Billy Tarango - Board of Supervisors – Temporary Laborer – 08/25/10 – Constituent Services II Fund

Departmental Transfers:

5. Joel McDaniel – Public Works Consolidated Roads – From Road Maintenance Worker – To Road Maintenance/Equipment Operator – 08/02/10 – Public Works Fund

Request Permission to Post:

6. Administrative Services – Administrative Clerk – Vacated by Kimberly Rust

**SHERIFF'S PERSONNEL ACTION ITEMS**

Departures from County Service:

7. Christopher Bender - Sheriff's Office – Deputy Sheriff – 08/30/10 - General Fund – DOH 11/27/06 – Resigned

**September 21, 2010**

Departures from County Service:

1. Keith Van Zile – Probation – Deputy Probation Officer 2 – 08/27/10 – State Aid Enhancement Fund – DOH 08/30/99 – Resigned
2. Nicholas Campagna - Health and Community Services – Animal Control Worker – 09/03/10 – Rabies Control Fund - DOH 11/11/09 – Resigned

Hires to County Service:

3. Joshua Clark – County Attorney – Deputy Attorney Part Time – 09/20/10 - General Fund – Replacing Carolyn Borcherding

End Probationary Period:

4. Ernie Meeske – County Attorney – Chief Detective – 09/13/10 - General Fund
5. Carlos Mejia – County Attorney – Detective – 09/13/10 - General Fund

Position Review:

6. Kasey Jankowski - Health and Community Services – Community Health Assistant – 08/30/10 – 100% Health Start Fund
7. Kyle Mann – County Attorney – From Deputy Attorney – To Deputy Attorney Senior – 09/27/10 - General Fund

Request Permission to Post:

8. Health and Community Services – Community Health Assistant – Position vacated by Kasey Jankowski
9. Health and Community Services – Animal Control Worker – Position vacated by Nicholas Campagna
10. Globe Regional Justice Court – Justice Court Clerk Associate – Position vacated by Tiffany Horton

**SHERIFF'S PERSONNEL ACTION ITEMS**

Hires to County Service:

11. Rion Ramirez - Sheriff's Office - Detention Officer – 09/13/10 – General Fund

End Probationary Period:

12. Misty Allinson - Sheriff's Office – Sheriff Records Supervisor – 09/13/10 – General Fund
13. Matthew Hill – Sheriff's Office – Deputy Sheriff – 09/13/10 - General Fund

**5F. Approval of finance reports/demands/transfers for the weeks of September 14, 2010, and September 21, 2010. (separate handout)**

**September 14, 2010**

$682,180.59 was disbursed for County expenses by check numbers 230491 through 230674.

**September 21, 2010**

$2,288,048.93 was disbursed for County expenses by check numbers 230675 through 230885. **(An itemized list of disbursements is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' Office.)**

Upon motion by Vice-Chairman Martin, seconded by Supervisor Dawson, the Board unanimously approved Consent Agenda items 5A-5F.

**Item 6 - CALL TO THE PUBLIC: Call to the Public is held for public benefit to allow individuals to address issue(s) within the Board's**

**jurisdiction. Board members may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to Arizona Revised Statute §38-431.01(G), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to criticism, or scheduling the matter for further discussion and decision at a future date.**

There were no requests to speak from the public.

**Item 7 - At any time during this meeting pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02(K), members of the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrator may present a brief summary of current events. No action may be taken on issues presented.**

Each Board member presented information on current events. Don McDaniel, County Manager, had no comments.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Supervisors, Chairman Pastor adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m.

**APPROVED**:

_____

Michael A. Pastor, Chairman

**ATTEST**:

_____

Marian Sheppard, Chief Deputy Clerk