

**MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MOHAVE COUNTY, KINGMAN, ARIZONA
REGULAR MEETING – OCTOBER 07, 2024**

The Board of Supervisors of Mohave County met in Regular Session this 7th day of October 2024 at 9:30 A.M., at 700 W. Beale Street, Kingman, Arizona, in the BOS Auditorium. In attendance were: Travis Lingenfelter, Supervisor District 1; Buster D. Johnson, Supervisor District 3; Jean Bishop, Supervisor District 4; Ron Gould, Supervisor District 5; Ryan Esplin, Chief Civil Deputy Attorney; Sam Elters, County Manager; and Laura Skubal, Clerk of the Board.

The following Mohave County Elected Officials, Department Heads and staff addressed specific items as noted: Melissa Palmer, Public Health Director; Scott Holtry, Development Services Director; and Luke Mournian, Chief Financial Officer.

9:00 A.M. EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR DISCUSSION AND CONSULTATION WITH LEGAL COUNSEL IN ACCORDANCE WITH A.R.S. 38-431.03 (A) (3) & (4) & (9) TO DISCUSS ITEMS NOTICED ON THE AGENDA WITH AN ASTERISK.

9:30 A.M. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER WITH INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

Chairman Bishop called the meeting to order. The invocation was given by Pastor Toni Henry, and the pledge of allegiance was led by Chairman Bishop.

Chairman Bishop stated Madam Clerk can you advise whether or not Supervisor Angius will be with us this morning?

Clerk of the Board, Laura Skubal stated she is not on the line.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD:

ITEM 1: Discussion of pending or contemplated litigation claims and demands: Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to call for an Executive Session to be held October 21, 2024, at 9:00 A.M. for discussion and consultation with legal counsel in accordance with A.R.S. 38-431.03 (A) (3) (4) & (9) to discuss items noticed on the agenda with an asterisk. Motion carried 4-0 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Chairman Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated discussion of pending or contemplated litigation claims and demands, Attorney Esplin?

Ryan Esplin, Chief Civil Deputy Attorney, stated good morning, I have nothing to report, thank you.

ITEM 2: Committee and/or Legislative Reports:

Chairman Bishop stated okay, committee and or legislative reports. I'll begin by stating that I did travel to Phoenix this past week for the County Supervisors Association meetings. Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I believe we have a water report. I have nothing additional to report. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated okay Supervisor Gould?

Supervisor Gould stated nothing today, Madam Chairman.

Chairman Bishop stated and supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated nothing, Madam Chair.

ITEM 3: Lobbyist report from HighGround, Inc:

Chairman Bishop stated okay, we'll go on now to the lobbyist report from high ground.

Nick Ponder, Senior Vice President for Governmental Affairs, HighGround, Inc., stated Madam Chair, Supervisors, thanks again for the opportunity. I wanted to update you the last time we spoke, I mentioned that there may be an opportunity that the Governor's Office would be seeking out discussions about regulating other basins in the state. There are several communities throughout the state who are desperate for some groundwater protections, and seeing that the nothing passed in the legislative session and that things had sort of hit a lull, I think, DWR was getting to the point where they felt like they had to take some type of action and have conversation that led to last week, there being a hearing for DWR in the Wilcox basin in Southeast Arizona. And that meeting lasted about two and a half hours. DWR gave a very thorough but dry presentation on the groundwater challenges being faced down there, and then laid out the two options that they had an INA or an AMA, and really led the viewers to believe that the only option was an AMA based on the land subsidence in the basin. I say all this to inform you that obviously Gail Griffin was in attendance at that meeting. It is her district, but also an issue that you know, she's slowed down any progress from our perspective on a solution to Mohave County. She did speak. The first thing that she said was that we already have all the tools that we need that resulted in a vocal dissent from the audience. And so, I would expect that the next step for DWR, it would be a formal hearing. Now the one last week was informal. You may recall that when we did the INA process in 2021 there was a September informal hearing that led to a November formal hearing that led to a December decision to create the INA. So, I would anticipate that we would likely lead into a formal hearing for the Wilcox basin as early as maybe next month, they have to allow 30 days for the notice and then a decision sometime thereafter. It could be that the hearing is later than that. We don't know for sure, but all this to say there will be, I imagine, some conversations that go on about the legislation that that failed to pass last year, and if there's

an opportunity, I do know that Senator Kerr in particular, as well as representative Dunn have indicated a desire to potentially resolve some of these items in the lame duck after the election in November. If that's going to happen, then meetings need to start happening in earnest, and so I will keep the county apprised of those conversations as they happen. With that, I'm happy to take any questions.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, anyone have any questions?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Lingenfelter go ahead.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Mr. Ponder, with regarding the Wilcox basin. I know that, I think it was in 2022 and the legislature expanded Water Infrastructure Finance Authority. They also mandated that the Arizona Department of Water Resources would do a supply and demand report for every single one of the groundwater basins within the state of Arizona every five years. And in order to do that, they're coming out with, I think around 6, 7, 8, new supply and demand reports every year. Last year, I think they came out with 7, 6 or 7 in December of 23 one of those was the Wilcox basin. Which has been identified as the worst, or I, should I say the most unhealthy basin in the state. Do you remember what the annual groundwater deficit was in the Wilcox basin?

Mr. Ponder stated yeah, Madam Chair, Supervisor Lingenfelter, the annual groundwater deficit in the Wilcox basin based on the supply demand study and Mr. Lingenfelter is correct. They were one of the first basins to be analyzed. And I believe there were 8 that were done last year. The annual groundwater deficit, to my recollection, was around 110,000-acre feet, which ended. The dairy down there uses about 108,000-acre feet per year. That's roughly the equivalent of the water usage of the city of Tucson.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated and not just the City of Tucson, but the city, the City of Tucson metropolitan area, which is about 1.1 million people. That's a lot of water.

Mr. Ponder stated yeah Madam Chair, Supervisor Lingenfelter, that is correct. The City of Tucson does not serve only Tucson residents, they, their water department, in fact, has a much larger service area, so you're right. They do serve well in excess of their 650,000 residents or so.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yeah, all together about 1.1 million people. That's how much water that many people uses. And the sad part about that is, much like here and in many other rural basins, there really is no plan B, because there is no canal system for the cap, and there is no other, you know, water supply where they can round out their water portfolio. It's that groundwater basin that people are 100% dependent upon for their economic development, to maintain their property values all these things. And right now, there's no tool in statute besides an AMA, which is a one size fits all, and it pushes all your groundwater control down to Phoenix. So hopefully they'll get together and get around the table. So as these supply and demand reports come out, we're not all pushed and stuck in these AMA'S. Thank you.

Mr. Ponder stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Lingenfelter, that is correct. And then this, I just want to go back to some of the data in the Wilcox is some of the, some of the wells had, had dropped. Their water level had dropped more than 400 feet since the 1960s and as you know, many of the Kingman wells were drilled before the 1960s and so this is why it was so important that we did get the INA in 2021 obviously, the INA doesn't limit the volume of water that can be withdrawn from the basin, but it does stop the irrigators from growing. But the Wilcox story is a, you know, a warning label for other basins throughout the state, and so that's why we're hopeful to be able to not only get the protections for the Hualapai basin, but to find some sort of mechanism that is a deterrent for similar type behavior in the Sacramento and the detrital and other basins across the state.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Mr. Ponder, thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated okay anyone else?

ITEM 4: County Manager's Report:

Chairman Bishop stated okay, we'll now go on to the County Manager's Report.

Sam Elters, Mohave County Manager, stated good morning, Madam, Chair and board members. I would like to give you an update this morning. It's just a brief update on the progress related to the ARPA funded project, and just to refresh your memories, Mohave County received 41,213,672 of that. And as you recall, the intent or the restrictions, was that we program all of it by the end of this year, the current calendar year, 2024. So, to date, 40 plus million dollars of the 41 has been programmed, which is equate to 98% of the funds. And 25 million of the 40 million that is programmed, which equates to 60% has already been spent. I if what, what I wanted to do is take that and put it into a handful of different buckets of approved uses, just to let you know where we're at. So, on the screen, as you can see, I broke it down into six different categories for all the projects. So, we have two and a half million dollars that you as a board have program that would be categorized for public health, one in \$1.2 million for public safety, broadband and technology comes to about \$8.6 million, Community Services is a bit over two and a half million dollars. Drinking water supplies a significant investment of little over \$12 million and last but not least, the infrastructure, which consists of a number of things including power, sanitary sewer and roads, gets the largest chunk of just under \$13 million. All these projects, or all these funds of \$40 million that has been programmed consists of over 80 different projects, small and large and, and I'm really proud to tell you that all of them are being administered in house by our county staff, no outside consulting services or third party involvement. This has been truly in in a significant undertaking for the last two years, since we received the funds and the board started programming them. It's and we've done so as you recall, with some challenging staffing issues and shortages and such, but we've stayed the course and, and we made a commitment to you the board to carry those forward. And the commitment at heart was that we would program those funds as required by the end of the calendar year, and then it would be spent in its entirety, as programmed, by December of 2026. So, we are on a trajectory to achieve that and while it's been

challenging and to keep track of it, if you all recall, we have a dashboard that is linked to, to additional information and map related to each of those projects and provides a status update. And so while it's been quite challenging, it honestly has been rewarding as well to know that all the funds went to the intended cause, which was to mitigate the impact of the pandemic that we experienced like every other agency in the country. So, I will end with, as I said, 40 of the 41 has been programmed. We clearly are on a trajectory to program the rest of it. We are working with every district that still has funds to allocate and program. We will, we will, without a doubt, achieve the milestone of programming the funds by December in two months from now, and to incur those dollars in two years by December of 2026. So, if you have any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer it, but I really wanted to provide it as an update, since we are on the eve of the December 2024, timeline, and to tell you that we are, it's a lot of work. It's hard work. We're grateful to the board for choosing this path, and we're, we're delighted and happy with the progress so far.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, Mr. Elters, thank you very much for that report. It has been a challenge for all five of us, and I think that each supervisor did the best they could with the monies allotted to them for their particular districts. My only wish is that we had more so that we could do the things that will help our citizens go forward and get over any effects that COVID had on their on their life and their business. Thank you for that report. Any of the Supervisors have anything they would like to add? Being none.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Pursuant to ARS 38-431.01(H) a public body may make an open call to the public during a public meeting, subject to reasonable time, place and manner restrictions, to allow individuals to address the public body on any issue within the jurisdiction of the public body. At the conclusion of an open call to the public, individual members of the public body may respond to criticism made by those who have addressed the public body, may ask staff to review a matter or may ask that a matter be put on a future agenda. However, members of the public body shall not discuss or take legal action on matters raised during an open call to the public unless the matters are properly noticed for discussion and legal action.

Chairman Bishop stated we'll go on to the call of the public then and I'll be going alphabetically. Mr. Greg Befort will be first, followed by Debbie Cleveland. Give us your name and community you're from.

Greg Befort stated Greg Befort for the record, from Yucca. I'm here on the anniversary of October 7th, the event where we were told that there was a surprise attack by Hamas on Israel, on Israel, that killed 1,139 people and injured 8,730 people. I produced a video shortly after that that you can find on desert sage podcast called quit, you know, stop cheering for democide, where I outlined how this conflict was nothing like you're being told. It's just like COVID 19, when I came up and told you you're being lied to, and over time, the truth has come out. There's no different than this thing here. I told you you're being lied to, and I said Israel was an apartheid state that they were had been supporting Hamas all along. This is from Israeli newspapers. Netanyahu has been supporting and then government has been supporting it for strategic and geopolitical purposes all along, and we again, we were told this was a surprise attack. I talked about my experience as an officer, where the federal government sent me another law enforcement trainers to a two-week school put on by Israelis Shin Bet and Mossad intelligence. I knew the event that they were describing this infiltration could not have happened the way that they described it. And I talked about that

in my video and what we have seen now over time is again, nothing but Israel being acting as a genocidal apartheid state, doing nothing but ethnically cleansing Palestinians from their home, from their homeland. That's what's occurring. Gaza, you can compare Gaza and Auschwitz. That's no different. Gaza is an open-air prison. Now the way they're being killed, it might be different. But ask yourselves, would the prisoners in Auschwitz, would they have had the right to rise up and kill their oppressors? How about the slaves? The black slaves? Would they have had the right to rise up and kill their oppressors, the people enslaving them? This conflict is nothing like you've been told. Israel knew, it's come out now. Israel knew a year in advance, a document called the Jericho wall, 40-page document called Jericho wall, where they knew a year in advance that this was going to occur, and they ignored it. They allowed it to occur to advance their geopolitical and strategic purposes. The people that were killed were also killed by friendly idea forces, that's been discovered now called the Hannibal directive. They want to make sure that nobody has escaped that prevents soldiers from being captured, and that's what happened. There were innocent civilians. Yes, Hamas committed an atrocious accident. I'm not condoning that, but the people at the top of that power pyramid do not care about how many Palestinians or Israeli Jews, or anybody else Christians who were also being killed there. They don't care how many of them are being killed. They do not care. They do not care. I'll be back.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you. Debbie Cleveland. If you're the next one up, please make your way to the front so that we can move this along a little quickly. Jennifer Esposito, you'll be next.

Debbie Cleveland stated hi, I'm Debbie Cleveland and I have been working the fairgrounds for a few years, and I thought I was on the agenda, but I'm not, so that's okay. I wanted to talk.

Chairman Bishop stated can we at least have the community you're, you're representing or live in, you gave us your name, not where you live.

Debbie Cleveland stated oh, I live in Kingman here. You want to know where? No, okay, there's a few things that I wanted to talk about, and I don't know if I'm really in the right place or not. Maybe I should take this to the other guy. But anyway, I wanted to talk about making sure that the books the fair books are get out before school lets out. This is imperative, and I'll tell you why. It's because when I get the books out before school lets out in the summertime, in April, that way the teachers have a chance to figure out what they want to do as a project. I don't know if any of you been to the fairgrounds to see the open exhibits. But I have a thing called the wall of beauty, and the reason I call it the wall of beauty, it's because all the children from ages one, first grade to about the third grade, create little artwork, little splashes of color that's kind of goofy, but they get tickets. Each kid gets a ticket. One ticket for a first grader. Can that first grader come into the fairgrounds? No, guess who they have to bring with them, mom and dad and grandma and grandpa. And that's money. That's money for the fairgrounds. And that's why it's an important thing that we get those books out early. Next, we need to cut that book order in half because they're just not getting out. The next thing I want to discuss is the volunteers. We had no volunteers. That's one of the reasons it was a pretty it was pretty low. The way that you keep volunteers is you make it have fun. All of my volunteers are retired. They've been doing their, their crocheting or their sewing or whatever

they're doing. That's what they've been doing for years. And so, they want to be involved, but they want to be involved and have fun. And how do you have fun? You feed the volunteers. So, what do I do? I turned around and I got the chef Qualls from the high school. He has a group of kids that he's in. He's a cook out there. He teaches them, and they come in and they did the cooking for the fair. My volunteers, 10 days is all I'm asking for. For money for 10 days, it's right around \$2,000 which isn't all that much money to feed my volunteers. What we do is we sit around the round table and we talk to each other. We create relationships, and everybody comes back again next year, and it works out really fun. We have fun time. We talk with each other, we eat. We have a little soda, little water, and everybody has a fun time socializing with the food. The kids show up. Chef Qualls brings in these kids, and they're dressed in their little white jackets and their little white hats, and they're all coming to attention. It's awesome to see how he has these children, these kids, high school kids, and they're ready to start their own businesses, in cooking, in restaurant business, really, okay, am I done?

Chairman Bishop stated you are done. Thank you.

Debbie Cleveland stated okay, \$2,000 that's all I want.

Chairman Bishop stated name and community you live in please.

Jennifer Esposito stated Jennifer Esposito 3211, East Snively Avenue, Kingman. First, I wanted to say that where to correct something or get some information, possibly at the last meeting, Supervisor Johnson said that there were two cases ongoing against the Golden Valley improvement district. So, I can only take from that that KP Ventures has filed an appeal to the Arizona Supreme Court. But I would like to point out for the record that that case is not against GVID, it is against the county procurement for failing to pay invoices that were due, and for screwing up their due process and for making them sign a contract where their due process appeal rights were not in alignment with state statute. After that happened, you guys had to go back and actually fix your procedures and policy manual for county procurement because you screwed them. You should have paid them, just like Mr. Deshazer. You should pay him too. I don't know if you people actually read the litigation. I'm looking forward to Mr. Esplin's response to my, my opening brief in the First Circuit Court regarding our constitutional right of initiative and referendum on the Golden Valley water rates. But moving on, I finally have my phone to where I can show you the picture, I wanted to show you last month. The pictures actually, so I'm going to put this up here, and then I'm going to read from this fine fellow. This is Supervisor Bishop's appointee to the planning and zoning board, Mr. Cullin Patillo, the guy whose Facebook profile has the anarchy sign on his forehead. Over the summer, he put up, he got let back into Facebook, and he put up some rather enlightening posts, you know. So, we talk a lot about decorum and the way that our board members behave, or the way that candidates behave on and off of professional stuff. Here's a lovely post where he attacked school board candidate Daniel Oli Keck, and here's one where he attacks Kelly Ward. I'd like to read that for you, just so that you know the kind of person that you have. Who is also representing Golden Valley and this area on the general plan. Mr. Cullin Patillo says on May 21 apparently, the chemtrail sprayers wanted to show solidarity with

chemtrail Kelly due to her recent indictments on multiple felonies in her attempt to become the official presidential cock sucker for president, or for Trump's second term in 2020, hashtag, Kelly Ward. The things that he said about Ms. Keck and myself, or, you know, in a similar vein, I don't have, I'm running out of time. I can't, but what I'm trying to say is I hope that whoever takes over Supervisor Bishop's seat find someone who's more mature and who handles themselves in a more professional manner, and I don't think he belongs on the General Plan Committee. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated Roy Hagemyer, followed by Scotty McClure.

Roy Hagemyer stated good morning Supervisors, Pastor Roy Hagemyer from currently beautiful Mohave Valley. Earlier this year, AEPCO and MEC teamed up trying to rezone a parcel of land in Fort Mohave to build two peaker plants on 19 acres, but due to public outcry, many meetings and lots of protests, the location was abandoned, or so we believe. They then, in April, attempted another one. They're starting to rezone on a large parcel of 80 acres in Mohave Valley, near homes, very near my home, and now they're adding an additional 193 and a half acres to build, who knows what, 40 peaker plants in addition to proposed battery storage. And we know how safe lithium batteries are these days, burning up all over America. And my question is, where's the county in all of this? Well, I can tell you where one of them is, the prior Chairman of this board of the Mohave County Supervisors is all in with AEPCO and MEC. In my opinion, we have a big problem with our prior Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, Hildy Angius. To date, AEPCO'S rezone application vote at the BOS has been moved three times, and it would appear all three times it was done illegally, ignoring the Board's own rules. According to the board's rules, it says the Chairman may continue or withdraw any item with consensus of the membership without a vote. Well, in checking on this, the pass but postponement this last one, the Chair conferred with one other Supervisor. The other three had no conversation, and that is a violation of the board's rules. In contacting one Supervisor, it was I was told that it was a violation of the Open Meeting Law, while the Open Meeting Law says, according to ARS 38 - 431 the means of gathering in person or through technological devices, a quorum of members, and that would be three of a public body which would discuss, propose or take legal action, calling one other Supervisor on the phone to get consensus is not a violation of the Open Meeting Law. The board's rules were broken to help AEPCO and MEC get this rezone in Mohave Valley to become obvious to me that AEPCO and MEC are being given special treatment by the prior Board of Supervisors. we are in contact with the Attorney General's office to get legal enforcement a few more points, peaker plants are highly polluters, according to the Government Accountability Report of May of 2024, sound levels far exceed AEPCO statements. Scare tactics are being used by MEC that hospitals will be without power. Well, according to OSHA, that is illegal. They have to have backup power. According to ARS 11- 251, it states in item 52 that the County Board of Supervisors make and enforce ordinances are more restrictive than state requirements to reduce or encourage the reduction of carbon monoxide and ozone levels. Water is a huge issue here. We are deeply concerned that they will suck our aquifer dry, and those of us that have wells in the general area will be without water. This plan is dangerous and irresponsible, and I ask you to vote no.

Chairman Bishop stated Scotty McClure.

Scotty McClure stated Scotty from Bullhead. Pastor Roy, I'll see you Saturday. We're going for pizza. Um, Pastor Roy, I turned that letter into Ryan Esplin's office trying to get it to the grand jury, and I haven't heard a damn thing about it, so whatever I tried. That came from the Arizona Republic open records request. That letter that we're talking about wasn't me. Wasn't anybody else who was there. A place down there in Phoenix, they asked for it, and I got it and that's when Hildy made that sorry excuse, when she commented about it, when I commented about it. Ron, would you please pull number 58 you yakked about this free trade zone before, this has got to stop. Who's next? A dog pound. Oh, we already did that one. It's just getting silly. You got enough crap on here today. And I hate doing this to Hildy, because she's not here face to face, but what she did to Valerie and Judge Williams here last time, when she held that thing there and Buster and Jean went against three, was what three to two, Ron and Travis stuck up for Valerie, Ron's secretary and my campaign manager. So, Hildy used this as a political event to get back at me, because I've called her a few names her and Jeanne Kentch and the rest of the clowns in Bullhead like the Mayor, Ron, Pamela Smith and Robert Deweerd and, oh, whatever. Should use this as a political game. Now what I'm asking you three, she's not here. I'm asking Buster, I know you're mad at Sam there and the finance department and stuff, and you've got 28 years in, you should be mad at somebody by then. But I'm asking and Jean, I know you don't like Ron, whatever. I'm assuming things here. I'm asking one of you two to please bring this back and put it on the agenda. It may be too late, because she's lawyered up with Phoenix lawyers. I don't know, even if you bring it back and try to settle with her, just like Chuck, he's on 87 today. He did not ask for any money. He asked for conditions, and you guys shot him down. So now he's hired Scottsdale lawyers, and I just talked to him Saturday. It's not secondhand information. Oh, before I only got 20 seconds, I got my tax bill. Remember five years ago when you charged me 10 cents? Well, this time you charged me eight cents. I paid seven cents this morning. I'm going to pay the other penny. Yeah, look at this thing here. The fire department gets 50% you guys want to get a penny.

Chairman Bishop stated Phillip Robinson, you're up next, followed by Kris Rodarte.

Phillip Robinson stated morning y'all. Phillip Robinson, for once, I'm not going to be up here complaining. Well, it is a complaint, but we need to do something out in Golden Valley, and it's called protection. I'd love for you guys to get a hold of the sheriff. You could hire two deputies just to write tickets. They are running stop lights or stop signs. They are speeding drastically. I'm doing deliveries for El Cafe for Ron and or John and Francine. I get stopped or passed from people speeding on Chino. I'm driving 35 they're zooming by me. You could get two officers out there for 10-hour days, seven days a week. Well not seven days a week, four days. Put them on four days. Give them three days to get away from Golden Valley. You know, it'd be easy. He could make money. He could profit just off the Golden Valley. It's, it's getting insane out there. Chino is a death row now. They are running stop signs, speeding head-on's, T-bones. You go down every stop sign in Golden Valley has a cross. It's a death zone. We got to stop this. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated Kris Rodarte followed by Armin Stange.

Kris Rodarte stated Kris Rodarte, Mohave County taxpayer. Today we are living in an alternate universe. So, I will spare you the misery of my rhetoric in exchange for the eloquence of someone instrumental in our founding, see if you recognize him or see yourselves in any of these prophetic passages, when tyranny becomes law, rebellion becomes duty. The issue today is the same as it has been throughout all history, whether man shall be allowed to govern himself or be ruled by a small elite. When the people are afraid of the government, that's tyranny. But when the government is afraid of the people, that's liberty. I think myself that we have more machinery of government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industrious government big enough to supply everything you need, is big enough to take everything you have. The course of history shows that, as a government grows, liberty decreases. The two enemies of the people are criminals and government. So, let us tie the second down with the chains of the constitution so the second will not become the legalized version of the first. There is no justification for taking away individuals freedom in the guise of public safety, a true patriot will defend his country from its government when, once a republic is corrupted, there is no possibility of remedying any of the growing evils, but by removing the corruption and restoring its lost principles, every other correction is either useless or a new evil. When you abandon freedom to achieve security, you lose both you deserve neither. The defeat of the American Revolution will occur when government falls into the hands of lending institutions and moneyed incorporations. Evil triumphs when good men do nothing. A private central bank issuing the public currency is a greater menace to the liberties of the people than a standing army. We must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. See ARPA, democracy is 51% of the people taking away the rights of the other 49. The government you elect is the government you deserve. These wise words spoken by Thomas Jefferson are as relevant and significant today as they were nearly 250 years ago, heed these warnings. We are about to lose our country, and we are teetering on the brink of nuclear war. Have a nice day.

Chairman Bishop stated Armin Stange.

Armin Stange stated Armin Stange, from Fort Mohave, aka the German. I have nice things here. This is from our road, the school bus speeding down the road, dust cloud behind them. Since the road department fix Dunlap, we have more and more traffic going up and down the road. It's ridiculous. We have semis going up and down road, five o'clock in the morning. Why? And look at this. This is outrageous. The road department needs to do something with Cavalry road. Otherwise, I have to go to OSHA and complain about dust, and that's a health issue. So, that's just some of it, and then I have here an email from a code enforcement officer. Very interesting. He inspected a property, told the property owner all what is needed is view obstructing fence and nicer neighbors totally unacceptable. I think you need to look for a new job or completely retire. We all know who we're talking about. He's out on leave right now. And then the third thing is the Messner property, the Roseberry property, the Avelar property, they're all dragging more and more crap and again, and they all just got abated. What's going on here? There's something seriously wrong with the system. We don't go after people for just fun. We want the neighborhood clean, and since

we're at that point, I would like to ask the County Manager and County Attorney for meeting in our neighborhood in district five, and I really would appreciate it if we get that set up, and it's not only me who wants to meet, it's my neighbors as well. We have a few neighbors what are really annoyed with all the stuff. What is going on.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you. At this time, I'll ask the fellow board members, if anyone would like to respond to criticism, ask for things to be reviewed or put on a future agenda. Seeing none. We'll go on to proclamations. First proclamation will be declaring the month of October 2024 is Domestic Violence Awareness Month in Mohave County. Our next proclamation is available to be read. It's declaring the month of October 2024 as cybersecurity month in Mohave County.

PROCLAMATION

Approve a proclamation declaring the month of October 2024,
as "Domestic Violence Awareness Month" in Mohave County.

Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Johnson and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Approve a proclamation declaring the month of October 2024,
as "Cybersecurity Month" in Mohave County.

Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Johnson and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSENT AGENDA

The following items listed under CONSENT AGENDA will be considered as a group and acted upon by one motion with no separate discussion of said items unless a Board Member so requests. In that event, the item will be removed from the CONSENT AGENDA for separate discussion and action.

Chairman Bishop stated we'll now begin the consent agenda. Any of the board members that would like an item removed, please indicate. Starting with Supervisor Johnson.

Supervisor Johnson stated nothing, Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you Madam Chairman. Number 18 and number 58.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Lingenfelter.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated item number 28 please.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Gould and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes, to approve the Consent Agenda Items 5 through 76 minus items 18, 28, and 58 as follows.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSENT AGENDA (Items 5-76)

5. Approval of a Special Event Liquor License for Jennings Burdick, The London Bridge Days Music Festival, 699 London Bridge Road, Lake Havasu City, Arizona: Event date: October 18-19, 2024.
6. Approve the issuance of a Notice of Assessment in the amount of \$7,812.40 against Parcel No.: 324-04-474A on behalf of the Mohave County Development Services for remediation of an unsafe structure; authorize the chairman to sign the attached Abatement Assessment; and approve the recording of a lien against the property if the assessment is not paid in full within thirty (30) days of issue. – Development Services
7. Approve the issuance of a Notice of Assessment in the amount of \$6,129.08 against Parcel No: 324-19-689 on behalf of the Mohave County Development Services for remediation of an unsafe structure; authorize the chairman to sign the attached Abatement Assessment; and approve the recording of a lien against the property if the assessment is not paid in full within thirty (30) days of issue. – Development Services
8. Approve the issuance of a Notice of Assessment in the amount of \$15,411.35 against Parcel No.: 331-34-126 – 2566 E Calle Parral, Kingman, Arizona 86409 SUNWARD HO! RANCHES RESUB OF TURQUESA LOT 126 on behalf of the Mohave County Development Services for remediation of household trash/debris; authorize the chairman to sign the attached Abatement Assessment; and approve the recording of a lien against the property if the assessment is not paid in full within thirty days of issue. – Development Services
9. Authorize staff to pursue Cooperating Agency status with the BLM for projects requiring the NEPA process in the Arizona Strip District Office, with the Director of Development Services as the Primary Representative, and the Planning and Zoning Manager as the Backup Representative. – Development Services
10. Set a public hearing for November 18, 2024, to adjust the gate rates charged at Cerbat Landfill in accordance with section C-2.8.2 of the current Operations Extension Agreement and at

Mohave Valley Landfill in accordance with section C-2.7.2 of the current Operations Extension Agreement. – Development Services

11. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-203- The **ACCEPTANCE OF THE AS-BUILT IMPROVEMENT PLANS, AND APPROVAL OF A FINAL RELEASE OF ALL REMAINING ASSURANCES** for the completion of improvements, and the **ACCEPTANCE OF THE ROADS INTO THE COUNTY'S ROAD MAINTENANCE SYSTEM** for Valley View at Sunrise Hills, Tract 4201-C being a proposed subdivision located in a portion of Section 6, Township 18 North, Range 21 West, in the Fort Mohave vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. – Development Services
12. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-191 – A **PETITION OF EXCEPTION** for a waiver of the maximum length of a cul-de-sac for Scenic View Estates, Tract 3543, being a proposed subdivision of Assessor's Parcel No. 402-25-166, in the Scenic vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** – Development Services
13. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-192 – A **REZONE** of Assessor's Parcel No. 402-59-151 from an A-R (Agricultural Residential) zone to a R-1 (Single Family Residential) zone to bring the property into compliance in the Beaver Dam vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** - Development Services
14. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-193 – A **SPECIAL USE PERMIT** for Assessor's Parcel No. 226-41-010 to allow a temporary fire station in an R-O (Single Family Residential/Manufactured Homes Prohibited) zone in the Fort Mohave vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** – Development Services
15. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-194 – A **REZONE** for Assessor's Parcel No. 225-21-112 from an A-R/12A (Agricultural Residential/Twelve Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to an A-R/3A (Agricultural Residential/Three Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to allow for a minor land division in the Mohave Valley vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** – Development Services
16. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-195 – A **REZONE** for Assessor's Parcel No. 306-25-009D from an A-R/10A (Agricultural Residential/Ten Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to an A-R (Agricultural Residential) zone, to allow for a minor land division in the Golden Valley vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** – Development Services
17. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-196 – A **REZONE** for Assessor's Parcel Nos. 318-21-059 through -070; -098, and -099 from an R-E (Recreational Residential) zone to a C-RE (Commercial Recreation) zone to extend existing commercial recreation glamping facilities and amenities in the Meadview vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** – Development Services

19. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-198 – A **SPECIAL USE PERMIT** for Assessor’s Parcel No. 317-09-102C to allow two (2) digital billboards in a C-2H (Highway Commercial) zone in the Dolan Springs vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by 6-3 vote [Martin, Bradshaw, Hubbard])** -Development Services
20. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-199 – A **PRELIMINARY PLAT AND PETITIONS OF EXCEPTION** for Rose 66 Subdivision, Tract 3089, being a proposed subdivision of Assessor’s Parcel Nos. 310-21-087, in the Kingman vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** – Development Services
21. **Sitting as the Board of Directors for the Mohave County Flood Control District:** Approve the annual Flood Risk Management Plan (FRMP) review report as an update to the overall strategy of programs, projects, and measures that will reduce the adverse impact of flood related hazards on the community and increase the community resilience to future flooding events. The annual FRMP review report is required for Mohave County's CRS recertification, assuring that Mohave County will maintain our CRS Class 6 rating. The Class 6 rating provides a 20% discount on flood insurance premiums for qualifying County residents. – Development Services
22. **Sitting as the Board of Directors for the Mohave County Flood Control District:** Approve the annual Community Rating System recertification form CC-213, prepared by Mohave County Flood Control District staff, and authorize the Chairman to sign the form. The County is currently at a class 6 rating. This rating provides citizens of Mohave County who qualify a 20% discount on their flood insurance premiums. – Development Services
23. Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign the annual renewal of the Healthy People Healthy Communities Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for FY24 CTR055410 IGA Amendment No: 4 for Tobacco Cessation and Prevention, Health in Arizona Policy Initiative, Youth Mental Health First Aid Initiative, Suicide Mortality Review, and Child Fatality Review. Although included in the verbiage of the main contract, the Teen Pregnancy Prevention (Exhibit C, Items 3 & 5) program is not a program within Mohave County and no funding is provided for that program. Amended budget for fund 240-4-5128 attached to reflect an increase in funding for the Suicide Mortality Review program from \$25,000 to \$50,000. – Public Health
24. Approve and accept the donation of \$3,000 from Arizona Complete Health to the Mohave County Department of Public Health’s Behavioral Health Program budget for fund 224-4-5106, object code 39500 project #301 for revenue and object code 47940 project #301 for expenditures. – Public Health

25. Accept the FY 2024 Fourth Quarter in-kind donations totaling \$27,473.51 from the Senior Center Non-Profit Site Council organizations to support the Senior Nutrition Program. – Public Health
26. Approve the Arizona Health Zone Contract Amendment No. 5 RFGA2020-001-003 until September 30, 2025, and authorize the Chairman of the Board to sign the included contract amendment with no change in FY25 county budget. – Public Health
27. Approve the reappointment of the Mohave/La Paz Workforce Development Board members, Michael Kelly of Environmental Waste Solutions, Inc. (Waste Management & Remediation Services), to a four-year term with the WDB. – Community Services
29. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-206 approving contract #516-25 between the State of Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH) and Mohave County providing grant funds in the amount of \$222,081.00 for the period of twelve months (12) July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. Serving disabled, homeless, and disabled families of Mohave County. Fund #'s 87150827, \$176,202.00 for program and 87150828 \$45,879.00 for administration. Please see revised budgets for FY2025. – Community Services
30. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-207 approving contract #517-25 between the State of Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH) and Mohave County providing grant funds in the amount of \$150,202.00 for the period of twelve months (12) July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. Serving disabled, homeless, and disabled families of Mohave County. Fund #'s 87150887, \$111,876.00 for program and 87150888 \$38,326.00 for administration. Please see revised budgets for FY2025. – Community Services
31. Accept the resignations and replacement nominations of Mohave/La Paz Workforce Development Board (WDB) Members: Resignation of Craig Lefever (Title II Representative) and replacement nomination of Mitzi Esgro (Title II Representative). Upon approval, the replacement member will complete the term length of the resignation. – Community Services
32. Approve and sign Amendment No. Four (4) for Contract 20-P-04, Heavy Equipment, Parts, Accessories, Supplies, and Related Services with Empire Southwest, LLC, Tucson, Arizona (-01), and Crafcro, Inc., Chandler, Arizona (-04) extending the contracts for an additional one (1) year period through October 4, 2025, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same on behalf of the Public Works Department – Equipment Services and Roads Divisions. – Procurement
33. Approve and sign Amendment No. One (1) to Contracts 23-B-03, Chips Aggregate, with (-01) CS McCrossan, Inc., Tolleson, Arizona; (-02) Campbell Redi Mix, Lake Havasu City, Arizona; and (-03) S&S Concrete and Materials, LLC, Bullhead City, Arizona; renewing the Contracts through October 16, 2025, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same, on behalf of the Public Works – Roads and Engineering Divisions. Funding for these purchases will be

through Highway User Revenue Fund 205 budgeted funds for road maintenance. – Procurement

- 34.** Approve the continued utilization of BuyBoard Cooperative Contract # 729-24 with Southern Tire Mart, LLC, for the purchase of Tires, Tubes, Supplies and Equipment through February 28, 2027, should the lead agency exercise all available renewal options, on behalf of the Public Works Department – Fleet Division. Aggregate spend may exceed \$100,000 over the full term of the contract. All purchases will be made in accordance with adopted budgeted funds per fiscal year as applicable. – Procurement
- 35.** Approve utilization of Arizona State Cooperative Contract No. CTR067399, Statewide Furniture, Products, and Related Services, with Elontec, LLC., Phoenix, Arizona; and accept Quote No. 59953-7599 to purchase furnishings for the New Lake Havasu City Sheriff's Substation in the amount of \$133,683.31, sourced to the previously approved Sheriff's State Grant, on behalf of Public Works – Facilities Division and the Sheriff's Office. Approve continued use of the cooperative contract through August 31, 2027, should the state of Arizona exercise all available renewal options, and subject to approved budgeted project funding. - Procurement
- 36.** Approve and sign Amendment One to Contract No. 24-B-03, Cattle Guards, with Doherty Welding, LLC, Pilot Rock, Oregon, renewing the contract for the first additional one-year period through November 5, 2025, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same, on behalf of Public Works – Roads and Engineering Divisions. Funding for these purchases will be sourced to Highway User Revenue Fund 205. - Procurement
- 37.** Approve and sign Amendment No. Two (2) to Contract No. 23B02, Water Testing, with Aqua-Serv Engineers, Inc, Fontana, CA renewing the contract for an additional one-year period through October 2, 2025, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same, on behalf of Public Works – Facilities Division. Funding will be in accordance with the approved budgeted funds – Procurement
- 38.** Approve and sign Contract Amendment No. Four (4) to Contracts 20-B-16, Hot Mix & Cold Mix, with CS McCrossan, Inc., Tolleson, Arizona (-01), McCormick Construction, Inc., Bullhead City, Arizona (-02), and Campbell Redi Mix, Lake Havasu City, Arizona (-03), extending the Contracts for the final one (1) year period, through October 18, 2025, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same, on behalf of Public Works Dept. Roads Division. Funding for projects using these Contracts will be sourced to approved budgeted funds as applicable, on behalf of the Public Works Department – Roads Division. – Procurement
- 39.** Approve and sign Amendment No. Two (2) to Contract 24-P-03, Janitorial Services for County Facilities in Lake Havasu City, with Newby Services, LLC; dba Spruce Goose Janitorial of Lake Havasu City; renewing the contract through October 31, 2025, and removing a county

location lowering the monthly fee by \$334.79, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same, on behalf of Public Works – Procurement

40. **SITTING AS THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR MOHAVE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT:** Approve Change Order No. 2 to the “Grace Neal Channel – Phase 3 Improvement Plans” Project awarded to Wilson & Company, Inc.; utilizing Contract No. 21-PS-07-02, On-Call Professional Civil Engineering Services, authorizing channel realignment and an additional channel at an additional cost of \$45,379.50, for a revised total “not to exceed” project cost of \$210,726.50. The project will be funded utilizing the Mohave County Flood Control District budgeted funds. – Procurement
41. **SITTING AS THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE MOHAVE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT:** Approve and sign Contract 2025-019-CTR, Alert Flood Warning Systems Parts and Maintenance, with High Sierra Electronics, Inc., Grass Valley, California for the purchase and installation of replacement parts and equipment upon recommendation of the Procurement Director and based on the written determination made on September 19, 2024, in accordance with the Mohave County Procurement Code, Article III, Section 8, Competition Impracticable Procurement. The contract will commence upon award with an initial term of one-year with the option to renew for up to four (4) additional one-year periods. All purchases using this contract will be subject to adopted budgeted funds per fiscal year as applicable. – Procurement
42. Approve July 2024 Monthly Report for Procurement Activity between \$10,000 and \$100,000. – Procurement
43. Approve the multi-award and sign contracts 24-PS-21, Job Order Contract (JOC) Roof and Roofing Systems, Installation, Maintenance and Associated Parts; with Northern Arizona Roof Services, Flagstaff, Arizona (-01), and Progressive Roof, Phoenix, Arizona (-02), for an initial one-year term, commencing upon award, and the option to renew the contracts for up to four (4) additional one-year periods, on behalf of Public Works – Facilities Division. Projects will be awarded on an as needed basis, and all funding will be in accordance with adopted budgets per fiscal year. – Procurement
44. Approve and sign the revised quote from Sanity Solutions, Inc. (an authorized distributor of TD SYNEXX) for the purchase Dell PowerScale Storage in the amount of \$375,791.76 plus applicable taxes. The quote revision utilizes Omnia Cooperative Contract No. R200803, Cyber Security Solutions and Associated Products and Services, instead of the previously approved Omnia Cooperative Contract No. 01-170, Advanced Technology Solutions Aggregator. All terms and conditions of Contract R200803 will apply to the purchase, and there is no impact to price or schedule. Funding for the purchase is sourced to the previously approved District 3 ARPA allocation, with any excess costs being covered by the Information Technology budgeted funds. – Procurement

45. Approve the continued use, in accordance with the Mohave County Procurement Code, Article III, Section 8, Competition Impracticable, of Motorola's Managed GIS Services software on behalf of the Mohave County Sheriff's Office, at a cost of \$47,066.74 in FY25 and on an ongoing basis using approved budgeted funds each fiscal year, with total aggregate costs exceeding \$100,000.00. – Procurement
46. Approve and sign contract 2025-01 for Pre-Qualified Indigent Attorney for Indigent Dependency Case Services with Gutierrez Law PLC, with date of approval by the Board of Supervisors serving as the "Notice of Qualification" under Special Terms and Conditions, Section C. Contract Term, on page 12 of subject ongoing solicitation, on behalf of Mohave County Indigent Defense Services Department. – Procurement
47. **Sitting as the Board of Directors of the Mohave County Television Improvement District:** Approve and sign Amendment No. Two (2) to Contract No. 21-SS-45 Mohave County Television Improvement District Television Broadcast Services with WECOM LICENSECO LLC; Kingman, Arizona; accepting assignment of the contract to WECOM LLC (f/k/a WECOM Inc.), dba WECOM FIBER, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same. – Procurement
48. Approve Mohave County's warrant registers for August 2024 in the amount of \$10,266,813.45. – Finance
49. Approve and sign letters of engagement with CPA firm Walker & Armstrong LLP, on behalf of the Arizona Auditor General's Office to conduct Mohave County's required annual financial and compliance audits, Mohave County Housing Authority Report as required for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Real Estate Assessment Center, and the Mohave County Landfill Assurance Report for the year ended June 30, 2024. – Finance
50. **Sitting as the Board of Directors for the Lake Juniper County Improvement District:** Direct staff to obtain a formal proposal from Foothills Water and Sewer LLC. ("Foothills Water"), formerly Cerbat water company, in response to its interest in the transfer the assets of the Lake Juniper Water System to Foothills Water and return the item to a future meeting for consideration and vote as to whether to transfer the assets to Foothills Water. – Public Works
51. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-190 approving an intergovernmental agreement allowing the Kingman Unified School District to utilize the Mohave County Fairgrounds as an emergency shelter for Kingman Middle School students and personnel and authorize the Chairman of the Mohave County Board of Supervisors to sign said agreement. – Public Works
52. Acknowledge initiation of a new Franchise Agreement for a fiber optic cable system within the unincorporated areas of Mohave County, owned and operated by Wecom LLC, and direct Public Works to set a Public Hearing date and time at the Mohave County Public Works

Building located at 3715 Sunshine Drive, Kingman Arizona and give proper notice to the public of the hearing, and conduct the hearing. – Public Works

53. Acknowledge receipt of and refer to Public Works, a petition to the Mohave County Board of Supervisors requesting that (1) East Calle Lucero from North Avenida El Camino to North Avenida Sierra Madre, a distance of approximately 0.50 miles and (2) North Avenida Sierra Madre from East Calle Lucero to East Calle Nancy, a distance of approximately 1.25 miles, both roads located in the North Kingman area, be accepted into the Mohave County Road System for regular maintenance subject to meeting all applicable requirements and subsequent Board approval.- Public Works
54. Acknowledge receipt of and refer to Public Works, a petition to the Mohave County Board of Supervisors requesting that East Calle Nancy from North Avenida El Camino to North Avenida Sierra Madre, located in the North Kingman area, a distance of approximately 0.50 miles, be accepted into the Mohave County Road System for regular maintenance subject to meeting all applicable requirements and subsequent Board approval. – Public Works
55. Approve and authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign BOS Resolution No. 2024-185 authorizing, in accordance with the County adopted Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and Arizona Revised Statutes, the installation of NO PARKING signs between Hualapai Mountain Road, Mile 10.25 and Mile 11.37 for flip down, temporary operations in adverse weather and related emergencies, and ONE WAY and DO NOT ENTER signs at Pine Basin Loop in the Hualapai Mountain Park area in accordance to the August 29, 2024, Traffic Study performed and the engineer’s recommendation. – Public Works
56. **Sitting as the Board of Directors for the Golden Valley Improvement District No. 1:** Approve the adoption of District Resolution No. 2024-02 and accept the owner’s request for adjacent property addition to the Golden Valley Improvement District No. 1 as permitted by A.R.S. § 48-906I for the property legally described as: Lot 8 and Lot 9, Block K, Golden Sage Ranchos Unit 61, according to the plat thereof, as recorded March 25, 1960, at Fee Number 93968, in the office of the County Recorder of Mohave County, Arizona, APN No. 339-14-157 vacant land located in North Golden Valley and approve the establishment of new boundaries of the Improvement District. – Public Works
57. **Sitting as the Board of Directors of the Mohave County Library District:** Accept monetary donations in the amount of \$3,913.73 and accept non-monetary donations in the amount of \$787.23 as detailed in the backup material. – Library
59. Appoint poll site election boards, all special election board members, and Deputy Elections personnel for the 2024 General Election and allow the Election Director to fill all positions through Election Day. – Election
60. Approve Mohave County’s participation as a contractor with the Local First Arizona, “Northern Arizona Good Jobs Network” grant, including the approval of the Agreement Between Local First Arizona Foundation and Mohave County, and authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign the Agreement. – Economic Development

61. Approve and ratify lifting the Outdoor Fire and Permissible Consumer Fireworks Prohibition, effective September 27, 2024, in all Fire Zones in the unincorporated areas of Mohave County, pursuant to A.R.S. Section 26-311 and Mohave County Ordinance 2013-04. – Risk
62. **Sitting as the Board of Equalization:** Approve the Board of Equalization Hearing Officer's recommendations regarding Petitions for Review of Real and Personal Property Valuation. – Clerk of the Board
63. Approve and authorize the Subgrant Award Agreement for the FFY25 Arizona Department of Public Safety Grant Agreement 2024-243, Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Victim Assistance Grant Program, Federal Grant #15POVC-22-GG-00705-ASSI, CFDA #16.575. The total amount for this project period 10-01-2024 to 09-30-2025 in fund 26910274 is \$288,653. – County Attorney
64. Approve Amendment No. Two of the Funding Agreement between the Chloride Domestic Water Improvement District (CDWID) and Mohave County, which would amend the Duties of CDWID to include the use of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds for replacing and installing new pumps and authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign the Amendment. – Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
65. Approve the Funding Agreement between Desert Hills Fire District and Mohave County for the allocation of \$156,748.66 in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds for the purchase of two command vehicles and authorize the Chairman to sign the Agreement. – Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
66. Approve the Funding Agreement between Mohave County and Lake Havasu City for the allocation of \$1.6 million in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds for the replacement of the Site Six fishing pier at Lake Havasu and authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign the Agreement. – Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
67. Accept the monetary donation of \$4,450 from Susan Pena on behalf of the Joanne E. Barton trust account and direct Finance to deposit in Org 27623916 – object code 47940, in order to track and ensure all expenses align with the intended purpose of the donation. – County Manager
68. Accept the monetary donations with an approximate value of \$786.00 for the Mohave County Animal Shelter. Accept non-monetary donations with an approximate value of \$797.00 for the Mohave County Animal Shelter. – County Manager
69. Approve the report of routine County business authorized by the County Manager for the time period of June 26, 2024, through September 23, 2024. Approve routine personnel actions taken during the pay period of August 24, 2024, through September 6, 2024, and routine Superior Court personnel actions taken during the pay period of August 24, 2024, through September 6, 2024. – County Manager

70. Approve an additional \$200,000 of Board of Supervisor's District 3 American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to increase contingency funding for Horizon Six Water System Waterline Replacement Contract No. 24-B-06 to allow for County Authorized essential work for a total construction budget of \$2,959,171. – Supervisor Johnson
71. Approve an additional \$3,700 of American Rescue Plan Act funds from District 3's allocation to purchase software that would enable County departments to electronically review, distribute and digitally sign Board Action Forms and backup documents. – Supervisor Johnson
72. Set a public hearing for November 4, 2024, for the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-208 to make amendments to the Mohave County Animal Control Ordinance, Mohave County Ordinance No. 2022-04. The proposed amendment includes adopting the "criminal negligence" element to the dog biting section of the Ordinance. – Supervisor Johnson
73. Approve \$10,000 of American Rescue Plan Act funds from District 3's allocation for technology enhancements for Mohave County's Procurement Department. – Supervisor Johnson
74. Approve a Special Event Liquor License for Autumn Boyle Robinson of the Boys and Girls Clubs of the Colorado River, I-40 Exit #2 Needle Mountain Road; Event Date: November 8-9, 2024. – Clerk of the Board
75. Approve a Special Event Liquor License for John Sanchelli of the Stop Overdose Addiction Resources (S.O.A.R.), at 1595 E. Joy Lane, Fort Mohave, Arizona 86426; Event Date: October 12, 2024 – Clerk of the Board
76. Approve a Special Event Liquor License for John Sanchelli of the Stop Overdose Addiction Resources (S.O.A.R.), at 1595 E. Joy Lane, Fort Mohave, Arizona 86426; Event Date: October 26, 2024. – Clerk of the Board

Chairman Bishop stated okay, those items do pass. Item number 18, this was pulled by Supervisor Gould.

18. Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-197 – A **REZONE** for Assessor's Parcel No. 241-15-008 from an AR/36A (Agricultural Residential/Thirty-Six Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to an A-R/8A (Agricultural Residential/Eight Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to allow for a minor land division in the Yucca vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. (**Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote**) – Development Services

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, Madam Chairman. I need to declare a conflict on Item 18, my wife was a real estate agent for the people that are applying for the rezone.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter and carried 3-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes with Gould recusing from vote.

Chairman Bishop stated item number 28 pulled by Supervisor Lingenfelter.

- 28.** Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-205 approving contract #524-25 Building Capacity & Continuum of Care (CoC) Planning grant between the State of Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH) and Mohave County providing grant funds in the amount of \$73,000 for the period of July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. – Community Services

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Madam Chair. I'm wondering if Director Smith is on the line or in the audience. If you could just discuss what this is.

Michael Smith, Community Services Director stated good morning, Madam Chair Bishop, Supervisor Lingenfelter, the Board of Supervisors. Item 28, this is for what we have in the community services, for our fresh start. It's for the COC continuum of care. So, this is where all the local charities come together to address homelessness. We received this grant last year was the first time we received continuance for this grant. I'll highlight a couple different things from this grant that came of it, besides the collaboration among the community, we'll take Kingman for start. On October 11, 2023, 191 community members came to Metcalf Park, they enrolled within our electronic community referral system, which is Atlas. From there, they received opportunities to apply for employment. We then, after that event, we also had another event, which was located in Bullhead City, which was on April 3 of 2024, 190 community members were assisted. 105 people registered for jobs. So we had an opportunity to provide that, and then we've also followed up with additional text messages to those individuals to make sure that they were receiving the services that they needed to be able to work in Mohave County as well, as well as we, like I said, we worked with the other local not for profits, really, to pull this off. This was not, this was not a Mohave County Community Services Department initiative. This was a COC, so continuum of care, and there's, there's over 100 Different agencies that participate in the continuum of care.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you Director Smith, so the name of the grant is building capacity doesn't actually have anything to do with building capacity. Is that accurate?

Director Smith stated Supervisor Bishop, I'm sorry. Madam Chair Bishop, Supervisor Lingenfelter. So, this does have to do with capacity building. So, the COC actually works through those local community members to do this. So when I mentioned this, that this was initiative through, through the COC, there was, there was, I don't have the exact number, but I can tell you, there was well over 24 different agencies that were represented, represented at the events across the county to build that so the agency, the COC, really worked through to build that capacity to make sure those things were happening, as well as to help with the referral process and navigation of individuals within the system.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you for the information Director Smith.

Motion was made by Supervisor Lingenfelter and seconded by Supervisor Johnson and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated next item is 58 pulled by Supervisor Gould.

58. Sitting as the Board of Directors of the Mohave County Library District: Approve a letter from the Mohave County Library District to Mohave County Economic Development issuing formal support for the establishment of a Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) Designation for Mohave County and authorize the Chairman to sign the letter. – Library

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, Madam Chairman, here we are again. The board has already voted to support the Foreign Trade Zone. We're going back through our other board positions that are taxing authorities to get them also to approve the Foreign Trade Zone. The problem is those folks are us. We've already voted other than me to approve the Foreign Trade Zone, and we haven't asked the people on the library advisory board what they think about the Foreign Trade Zone. Really giving Tami four more letters to shop around, I don't. I think is rather pointless. But I just go ahead and move denial.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, we have a motion on the floor. We do have one person that signed up to speak, Mr. Scotty McClure.

Scotty McClure stated Scotty from Bullhead. Now this is why people out here, what the heck is going on here? It was voted on a month ago, and to have every Tom Dick and Harry, that's you got 58 little offices here that you guys run, in charge of, or something like 85 or whatever it is, they all going to write letters for this. This is what's wrong with the government. Far as I'm concerned, there shouldn't be any more. Just keep this off the agenda. You already voted once on it.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Lingenfelter.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you Madam Chair. Is Director Ursenbach. I see here in the back; she can come down and explain this. Just an overview Tami.

Tami Ursenbach, Economic Development Director stated Chairman Bishop, Supervisors. Unfortunately, last time that we did this, two weeks ago or three weeks ago, the library was left off the agenda. So, we're just bringing this back. The idea is, unfortunately, every taxing entity has to show a support, or the or the FTC cannot move forward. So, it's just going through the normal process. We've been to the fire

departments, we've been the school district, to the college. We've been everywhere we can. This is one of the last letters we're waiting on.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated and again, in your in your view, as Economic Development Director, this is something that we're pursuing in, in support of increased regional competitive competitiveness in Mohave County.

Director Ursenbach stated it is specifically, if we don't by, by having the Foreign Trade Zone, we become more competitive nationally with the other businesses, but also competitive within international businesses. International businesses, their prices are so low that if we don't do this, we're losing business in the United States. So we're wanting to be able to support our local businesses nationally, as well as in our county, and this is a way to support them that we a tool that we don't have otherwise, and many of the counties and states don't have otherwise. So, there's only active, there's, there's just around 200 active Foreign Trade Zones currently.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated and this is a, this is a, this another tool that Mohave County Economic Development Director yourself and your department can use to market towards which target industry is, manufacturing, distribution, warehousing, those types of things.

Director Ursenbach stated specifically, manufacturing is the one that gets the most benefit of it. So that's the one that we're hoping and focusing on is specifically, yeah.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated when President Trump gets back into office, he's going to be pushing to reassure manufacturing, as he did the first time. I know, I watched a video recently where he just basically told John Deere, in no uncertain terms, that if they move their manufacturing to Mexico, they were going to get, you know, huge tariffs.

Director Ursenbach stated and that's right, and exactly we want to be able to bring more manufacturing here to our county. Doors are open. We're in the perfect location, or.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated close to California, that you know, this would be something that you think would help us to help those kind, those companies that are leaving in Max mass exodus from California and their horrible management policy.

Director Ursenbach stated exactly. The other thing is, I know there's a lot of concerns about growth in areas that some of the county doesn't want, but that's why we have these four magnet sites, so that those four magnet sites are going to attract the businesses to that area specifically, and not any not just leave it open, but we're trying to be very strategic in how that we move forward to help build the county at the same time, not have a manufacturing company or distribution center or anything else, just happen anywhere.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yeah, well, I think that's a good strategy. I mean, certainly we have a Board I don't think that is interested in raising property taxes and the remedy for that is you have to broaden your tax base, right? And you get as many companies as you can, as more jobs as you can, and that allows a taxing agency to lower its primary property taxes. That's the way I see it.

Director Ursenbach stated and the four magnet sites, none of them are around a lot of residents. They're all very, very isolated with, with the areas that we've chosen.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated appreciate your information, what you're doing. Thank you.

Director Ursenbach stated thank you.

Supervisor Gould stated Madam Chairman.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you Madam Chairman. So, Tami, so the school district, the school boards and the fire districts also have to approve this?

Director Ursenbach stated yes, they have.

Supervisor Gould stated in the in those four spots?

Director Ursenbach stated the only one's I'm waiting on are up in Colorado City.

Supervisor Gould stated let me tell you my big problem, is nowhere in the original backup did it say that property taxes inside the Free Trade Zone were going to be reduced to 5% nowhere in the backup did it say that, we had, I had to pry that out of you. That's concerning to me.

Director Ursenbach stated and I apologize for that.

Supervisor Gould stated that's very concerning to me. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, we have a motion on the floor to deny. Do we have a second? Motion dies on the floor. Do we have another motion?

Motion was made by Supervisor Lingenfelter and seconded by Supervisor Johnson and carried 3-1 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting no.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

SCOTT HOLTRY, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR:

77. Open a Public Hearing: Discussion and possible action RE: Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-200 – A **SPECIAL USE PERMIT** for Assessor's Parcel No. 120-05-110 to allow for a 110' telecommunication tower in a C-MO (Commercial-Manufacturing/Open Lot Storage) zone, in the Lake Havasu vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. (Commission recommended approval by 8-1 vote [Martin])

Chairman Bishop stated next item is under public hearings, going to open the public hearing.

Chairman Bishop Opened the Public Hearing.

Chairman Bishop stated we do have a couple people signed up to speak. Linda. Linda Grice is the applicant and has signed up to speak.

Linda Grice stated good morning.

Chairman Bishop stated good morning.

Ms. Grice stated thank you, Madam Chair, Supervisors and on behalf of the applicant, I would like to say this application is on behalf of Verizon Wireless. The location that they've chosen is at the intersection because it fits their network. This is the location that best fits their network. It's on a commercial piece. There's only two commercial properties at that intersection. One, this is the only one that the landlord was willing to work with us on. It's placed as far away from residential properties as possible, and it meets the criteria as set by the code. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated just for the record. Could you give us your name and city? Please?

Ms. Grice stated I'm so sorry. Linda Grice with Young Design, 10245, East Via Linda Scottsdale, Arizona.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you very much. Does Carol Rodriguez would be the next speaker?

Carol Rodriguez stated so I live in Lake Havasu City, and I live in Canterbury estates, which is the residential community that's adjacent to the storage lot unit that they want to build the superstructure 110-foot cell tower.

Chairman Bishop stated your name?

Ms. Rodriguez stated Carol Rodriguez and the reason that I'm here today is because is representing the neighbors that are within the 300-foot proximity to this cell tower. We believe that there is a cell tower low, there's a cell tower that is point six, six miles down the road on like on London Bridge Road that could accommodate Verizon's need. And that's in accordance with; I went into the Mohave County zoning ordinance, ordinance section 37R are the wireless communication states that it should maximize existing facilities on page 163 and in the general provision on page 164 it says commercial communication towers should be located away from residential properties. The location of this, the corner of London Bridge Road and Chenoweth with is, I believe, zone for residential, future residential. Right now, it's a lot of open space, but it's future residential. Okay, sorry, and then again, according to Mohave County zoning ordinance, ordinance, page 166b existing structures will be preferred over new structures. Page 167, c2, 3 and 5 talk about vehicle routes, and there that these cell towers are supposed to be away from landmarks or historical sites. This tower is going to be built right on the corner of the Arizona Freedom Trail, and it's also the connector on London Bridge Road to the London Bridge. So, this is how we get there. So, we encourage a co-location of the cell tower that's existing. I have a picture. I don't know how to use the. I have a picture of the cell tower, and it is on a do I show you somehow on here.

Chairman Bishop stated there's a little square right on the podium there. Just set it up there.

Ms. Rodriguez stated there we go. So, you can see that it's not around any residential homes. It's located adjacent to another storage unit. There's a lot of open space out there that doesn't impact the residents.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you very much.

Ms. Rodriguez stated, and we submitted with health. There's a lot of other reasons besides the zoning.

Chairman Bishop stated your time is up.

Ms. Rodriguez stated okay, sorry, thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated Mitchell Antalis. I'll let you pronounce your name. Probably do a better job.

Mitchell Antalis stated thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning. My name is Mitchell Antalis. I'm a Attorney in Phoenix. I am here today representing the owners of the existing cell tower that Miss Rodriguez just mentioned. That tower is located at 4622, London Bridge Road in Lake Havasu City. And as mentioned, it is point six, six miles away from the proposed location. The bottom line is, the new the new proposed location, doesn't provide any benefit to the residents of the county, because it's completely superfluous. I've attached or we submit a letter. I hope you all have that in front of you, if not, everything is laid out in there. But I'm going to go through the primary concerns, because I understand time is short. So, we've submitted a letter from the manager of SBA Structures LLC, which owns the existing tower,

and he has attested that that that tower has ample structural capacity to accommodate any wireless carrier interested, including Verizon. However, Verizon has made no attempts to reach out about Co-locating on the existing tower. Second, we've attached as Exhibit two to that letter a series of RF coverage maps, this radio frequency coverage maps showing that the new proposed location offers absolutely or virtually the same coverage as the existing tower, and so it will not improve coverage for anyone in the area. And at the end of the day, Mohave County has set up very specific guidelines under Section 37 of the zoning ordinance, and those are to maximize the use of existing facilities, to encourage the CO-location of facilities, introduce the number of new communication towers. The new proposed tower doesn't meet any of the criteria. Specifically, communication tower should be located away from residential properties. That is not the case here. The zoning ordinance suggests that favorable weight should be given by this board to the following criteria, existing structures will be preferred. The facilities not readily facilities are preferred if they are not readily observed from the adjacent Street. Co-Location is preferred, and the suitability of Co-Location, again, is a significant factor. The new proposed location does not meet any of these. In fact, they all weigh against it, and these are the supposedly heavily weighted criteria that the board is supposed to consider here. And then additionally, I just want to propose that the application is deficient. The application, per the zoning code, is supposed to include things such as coverage maps that show that there's a need here. And it's actually in the code that it's supposed to include a summary of any towers within two miles of the existing proposed location. The application did not meet those. It did not mention those. They're trying to sneak this in and flatly, like the board should deny this. There's no, There's no justification for it. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, that concludes our speakers. Is there anyone else that would like to speak in regard to this item? Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing.

Chairman Bishop Closed the Public Hearing.

Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Johnson to DENY and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

78. Open a Public Hearing: Discussion and possible action RE: Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-201 – A **REZONE** of Assessor's Parcel No. 306-07-201 from an A-R (Agricultural Residential) zone to a C-RE (Commercial Recreation) zone, to allow for an RV Park in the Golden Valley vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)** Arizona Revised Statutes § 11-814.D relating to County Zoning states that if twenty percent (20%) of the property owners by area and number within the zoning area file protests to the proposed change, the change shall not be made except by a three-quarter (3/4) vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors. Per this statute, 21% of owners oppose the rezone, representing 24% of the area.

Chairman Bishop Opened the Public Hearing.

Chairman Bishop stated I do have several people signed up to speak on this item. But before I do that, I'm wondering if it's appropriate for the Board to continue this item before we have our speaker since Supervisor Angius is not here.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated my preference would be to have the public hearing, and then if the board wishes to, they could continue it.

Chairman Bishop stated and continued after the speakers, okay. I will open the public hearing then, and Twyla Donaldson will be our first speaker.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated Chairman just to be clear, what I mean is allow the public hearing to take place, and then if the board wishes to continue it, they can. I don't want to say that you're going to I'm just.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you.

Twyla Donaldson stated good morning. My name is Twyla Donaldson, and I'm a resident of Golden Valley, and I'm here to represent my fellow neighbors in this rezoning area with opposition to this. And I know I gave you a lot of paperwork today, but also, just recently, they also gave me 72 more votes to go against this. So, that totally exceeds, we were already at 24% opposition, and now we're more at like 30 to 35 with the initial 70, 72 that I'm presenting. I did a survey. There's 45 RV parks between Bullhead City and Kingman, and out of those, 8 of them are located directly in Golden Valley. One is only two blocks East of this location, the other one is four blocks West, and none of them are at capacity. This is a congested area. It has congestion, as far as being able to turn left onto 68 and I would like you as the Supervisors to take that into consideration our neighbors and ability for this to not pass. Thank you very much for your time.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you. Next up will be Phillip Robinson, followed by Jennifer Esposito.

Phillip Robinson stated my name's Phillip Robinson. I live out in Golden Valley. I oppose this. I'm speaking on behalf of John and Francine of El Cafe. We don't care if they put in one acre lots, but this RV park, we're totally against. And I'd like to put this up on for the camera. I went down 68 from Aztec. The girl that was representing the people that own the property, she said that you can turn left off of.

I was stopped here. Now I'm getting out off at six or Aztec going up 68. Can you put that up, please?

She misrepresented herself and the applicant by stating that you can turn left. You can't turn left off to hunt. There's only two legal ways to get back onto the freeway, turn left or right, going up here, going up here. You'll see the signs that say left only. The state's letting us turn around there and do a U-turn, but legally we cannot do that. We can't. She's saying that we can, legally we can't. She's misrepresenting. The only two places that you can legally turn left or right on there is at Aztec and Bacobi. She says down on Houck. I think it is H, O, U, C, K, you can turn left, you can't, you can only go right. That's a total. I don't

know what she's trying to represent, but that's totally wrong. We have enough wrecks out there. They're going to have to go all the way down to Chino to get to this property, because she, they're not going to want to put a road behind that's just a utility road. It's not a county road. But anyway, that's all I got. There's, have you guys seen? Seen all this, as you can see, where you can only turn left legally. But again, the state and the counties letting us turn do a U-turn on those left turn lanes only, which I think is cool. That saves me a lot of time, like driving all the way up or doing a U-turn in somebody's yard or lot. But anyway, thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated Jennifer Esposito.

Ms. Esposito stated thank you Madam Chairman. Jennifer Esposito; Kingman, property owner in Golden Valley. I took a day in the heat and I knocked about 20 doors in the immediate vicinity of this proposed rezone, because, although it's not near my property, I was curious. I just wanted to know what the actual residents had to say, and although some of them did say, I don't know. I don't care, like whatever they want to do. The ones, the people that did have an actual strong opinion were all opposed to it. But my concern with this is, as previously stated, is the debacle of a median that Mr. Elter's engineered for a dot and we put down the middle of the highway because I have an RV. I have several actually, kind of, kind of like those things, you know, I come from quartzite, where everyone has an RV. And I, when I judge dog shows, and I showed my dogs, I traveled in an RV all over this country, and so I know the difficulty it takes in navigating traffic obstacles with an oversized vehicle on the highway 68 right now, people trying to turn get in out, short size vehicles will pull to the center, even where they can get out. Right, and then, you know, as traffic clears, they'll go finish going all the way across to make their left-hand turn. You can't do that in an RV. It's way too long, especially a truck towing a travel trailer a fifth wheel. The problem just is the public safety issue for me, because then what's going to happen is you're going to have a lot of these extended length vehicles, and they're going to be going up and down unpaved, unimproved, rural dirt roads in, you know, areas where dogs shouldn't be at large, but they are, and children running and playing and crossing the street. And you're going to bring in, because this is not a long-term park. This is proposed as a overnight State Park. So, you're going to be bringing really long, big vehicles with no place to get in, no place to get out, trying to find a way in and out. I don't know if they're going to come in off of Agua Fria. I don't know if they're going to come the long way to I just see this. That's my main concern. So, if I'd be happy to get behind this, because I don't dislike RV parks or RV people in general. They're kind of my people, but blow up that median just, you know, have a talk with ADOT, get some letters together, you know, like the Foreign Trade Zone, and make it so you can get in and out over there before you actually talk about going forward with putting what looks like a public safety hazard in. Since the median was put in, I don't think we've reduced any traffic accidents. What we have, we have first responders having to go way down and make U-turns to come back the other way. You know, we have more accidents in other parts, maybe because people can't get in or out in certain areas. I don't think we've reduced any accidents in the valley, but I think this has the potential to increase accidents in the valley. So, thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated okay. Thank you. Mr. Mrs. Esposito, is there anyone in the audience here that signed the petition? Anyone that signed the petition do you want to come to the podium and speak? I believe you already spoke, Miss, Miss Twyla. You've had your, your three minutes. I'm sorry. Okay, then I'll call Kathy Tackett Hicks to the podium. She is the applicant. Okay, we'll call you up after, after Miss Hicks talks.

Kathy Tackett-Hicks stated good morning Honorable Chair, Supervisors. My name is Kathy Tackett Hicks. I'm acting as the owner's applicant. I certainly don't have a problem postponing this to the next meeting, or maybe two meetings. I can have the owner come down, and I'm happy to hold an on-site meeting with some of the surrounding residents. I think there's a lot of confusion this, and I think we also have a problem where people can present petitions that absolutely, there's no desire to address solutions or options or discuss developmental issues, adjacent properties, private property rights of the individual have to be respected as well. So, I see this as you know, kind of a bummer, but we see it all the time, and I do want to address it. I'm happy to do it if we can postpone it 30 days, you know, to the next meeting, I'm happy to hold a hearing out there and come back with a report. I will tell you that there are a lot of untruths. One gentleman talked about the left turn. He's correct. I made that statement. But further on the conversation, I said, oh, I'm wait. That was an error. I meant they can come out, or they can go from 68 onto there. So that was an error. But everything else is a little crazy. This site is absolutely a good site for development of this, this type. It has existing infrastructure. The water is served by Valley Pioneer Water and is adjacent to the site. There's adjacent power poles this site because it's limited to 28 or 29 RVs. I mean, that's it. This is not a big deal. This is an attempt for someone to come and invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in a small commercial venture which will increase property taxes to the fire district. It is within the fire district as well. It can get a septic wastewater permit and use the smallest one that we need so there's not as much nitrates going in. The property is 4.3 acres. It already has a commercial designation for the general plan. And if you're the private property owner and you want to do something in development for commercial, you have every right to be able to rely on that to some degree, that this is precisely what the county wants. Now things change. I mean, I'll come up next time with a reason why. You know, it needs to be changed on a different project. I understand that, but I am concerned about the lack of trying to get to answers and solutions for this. Petitions for people miles away, I'm sorry that is not to be brought into the public participation process. Those are opinions which are fine, but they don't address the private property rights of the individual who has it, who's proposing to invest in this area. And I want to delve into those issues a little bit more. I send letters around to 300-foot surrounding property owners. On that letter is my name, my cell number, my address. The county also puts in a piece of paper that says, if you have any questions, contact me. May I please have one more minute? I don't have to.

Chairman Bishop stated I'll call you back up Kathy, thank you. The gentleman that wanted to speak now, please give us your name and your location.

Anthony Knapp stated morning. Name's Anthony Knapp. I live on the corner of Houck and Mezadel that's going to be in my front yard. I am one of the owners over there. I have enough trash. I have enough dirt.

I have enough burnt home next to me that I have to look at. I'm an RVer. I've been an RVer for the last six years. I've been around the country. I've seen the good, I've seen the bad. It's all on how their management. I talked to this lady on the phone, Kathy. I don't know who's going to run it. He's going to have to pick somebody. It's not good enough answer. The trash, the transient, the dirt. We don't want it. We don't need it. We like the opportunity, but it needs to go some other place that is for agriculture, that is not for an RV park. So, thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated okay thank you very much. And with that, I'll close the public hearing.

Chairman Bishop Closed the Public Hearing.

Chairman Bishop stated Kathy, would you like to come back up and answer a few questions please?

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated Kathy Tackett Hicks again, I'm happy to answer questions. I think that there's, you know, confusion on what agricultural residential is. This could be split into four residential lots with the same type of vehicle traffic on commercial properties. At least you have oversight of the county of what development goes in there. To the gentleman I spoke with on the phone, and I was thrilled they actually called me, thrilled, because even though I give it out, that was the only phone call I had with Tony and Jenny. I assume that's who this is. So, commercial development is the only ability for the county to have oversight on it. And what I said concerning the on-site manager is that the owner did not have an on-site manager right now, but he has three other manufactured home parks where he does have on site management. They have contracts to ensure that animals that people have are small, no more than 20 pounds, that there are cleanliness issues, that the goal was not to have some sort of a flophouse, you know, RV Center, but that the fact is, since COVID, there have been a lot of people that are now taking up RV living. And his goal was to have long term tenants, not short term, that was the goal, and he's proven that by his manufactured housing parks, that's what he does. Now, I'm perfectly comfortable with people not agreeing with, you know, the vision. It's fine, but I do think that a lot of people signed a petition under half-truths, and I think that's unfortunate, but I see it. I've seen it numerous times out there. So, I just want to find solutions that work for everyone. So, if you can, please schedule another time for this to be heard. I can see if the owner can be here. I'll be happy to notify the 300-foot surrounding property owners notice of record that'll hold an on-site meeting to be, to walk through some of these issues, so at least they have an opportunity to ask me questions I can answer. And lastly, of the petition, I mean, the first one from last week that had, I don't know, 20 signatures on it, four of the signatures are not the owners of record. Okay, this is part of the problem. The accusations that letters were not sent out is inappropriate. Commercial sites out there can rent and even if they bounce their 10 years, if they don't own the property, they're not going to get a letter. The same with the residential, you know, surrounding property owners. So, I don't think this is a bad project. I think it's actually an awesome project in a great location. So, it meets the county requirements, the owner is willing to invest if we have a problem with surrounding property owners, not people that are 10 miles away. That vision does not get to be a burden on a property owner that wants to invest. I just think that balances needs to be looked at a little bit closer. I've been doing this

30 years. I'm happy. I love the public participation process, but I do want it to be designed to address solutions to problems, not I show up this morning and there's a big petition without one phone call. That's shady.

Chairman Bishop stated Kathy, you mentioned that the, the owner was.

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated that's what I said. Shady.

Chairman Bishop stated you mentioned that the owner was looking at long, long term tenants.

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated yeah.

Chairman Bishop stated in your opinion, would that help with the affordable housing problem that we have in in Mohave County.

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated well, I think what it does is offer more diversity of housing options for individuals. Some people through COVID and other things, without their job, have lost their home or chose to get out of the home and travel, and they need a place to call home. So, it's just another option. You know, I don't think it's nirvana. It's nothing great, but it is an option. And seniors, I mean, there have been huge increases in RV, RVers in the past four years. So, it's just an option.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you. Does the Board members have any questions of the applicant?

Supervisor Johnson stated Chair, I'd make a motion to continue this to the next meeting to have a full board.

Supervisor Gould stated second.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair, I'd have just a couple more questions, if I may.

Chairman Bishop stated yeah Supervisor Lingenfelter go ahead.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated first question is for Ms. Tackett Hicks, did you mention that the applicant has three more parks in this region, or?

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated not in this region.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated other places in Arizona or?

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated no, outside of the state.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated outside of the state. How do you know, how long he's operated those and kind of what the point I'm trying to get to is, has he had any complaints at those facilities? What I'm trying to do is trying to establish a record, in my mind, about how responsible of an owner he is with his other parks, or whether or not it creates a nuisance for the surrounding property owners in these other areas.

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated right? Good question. I did the same thing. I asked him he has one over 30 years, and he has generational families living there because they work. He also indicated he had. He has the benefit and blessing of having a really good on-site managers that stay there for a long time, you know, like 20 years. So, he's got that consistency. So, I wasn't trying to blow smoke up anybody by saying he wasn't sure, it's a new area. You got to find the right person for your on-site manager. But I do believe that one manufacturing has been over 30 years.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thanks, with these issues, we have to fully weigh both sides. And I think that the transportation mobility stuff that's come up is valid, but I don't expect your applicant to be responsible for what ADOT does. I mean, I think those concrete medians that went down 68 kind of inconvenienced a lot of different people, and I don't remember a whole lot of public process on that. Maybe I just missed it. But regard to the site planning process, what type of things is, are the applicant willing to do to make sure that it's a nice looking place, shielded from, from noise or landscaping or those types of things, to maintain property value.

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated right so he's already got, had an engineer on the property looking at stuff. We already have a site plan based on the first round of opposition. We looked at different ways to move it. I mean, he's even got, I mean, site plans from a local engineer, maybe moving the RVs closer to the commercial areas to keep it away for 100-foot buffer, buffer to the north on Mezadel. Those types of things, access can be either Houck or Hunt. On this particular thing it has to go through the county process. He did complete. He the engineer completed a traffic preliminary review, and it indicated that the peak traffic vehicle trips for this in the morning would be about six vehicle trips in the afternoon, on the, on the trip generation for the peak hour could be up to 11 that is not going to adversely impact the left turn issue, will redirect someone who wants to, they are going to have to turn right to come around to get back to Kingman.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you,

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated so does every other business.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yeah, I look forward to continuing the conversation.

Ms. Tackett-Hicks stated thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated any other questions? We do have a; we do have a motion.

Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Johnson to approve continuing item 78 to the next Board of Supervisors meeting and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated item number 79.

- 79.** Open a Public Hearing: Discussion and possible action RE: Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-202 – A **REZONE** of Assessor's Parcel No. 316-14-063B from an A (General) zone to an A-R/2A (Agricultural Residential/Two Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone, to bring the property into compliance in the Dolan Springs vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)**

Chairman Bishop stated I'll open the public hearing.

Chairman Bishop Opened the Public Hearing.

I have no one signed up to speak, so I'll close the public hearing and open it up to the board.

Chairman Bishop Closed the Public Hearing.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

REGULAR AGENDA

SCOTT HOLTRY, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR:

- 80.** Discussion and possible action RE: Approve the utilization of the OMNIA Partners' Cooperative Contract No. 01-115, Software and SaaS Solutions with Granicus, LLC, St. Paul, MN, for the purchase of Permitting Software on behalf of the Development Services Planning and Zoning, Flood Control, and Environmental Quality Divisions and Public Health Environmental Health Division. The cost for a five (5) year subscription is \$391,333.69, first-year cost will be \$132,748.20, second year cost of \$59,994.90, and increasing by five percent per year thereafter for up to five years. FY25 Funding for this purchase will utilize \$75,000 from 29812600-43100 (Professional Services) and \$57,748.20 from 29812600-47960 (Contingency). Subsequent years' costs will be included in the department's annual budget through the term of the agreement.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, we'll now go into the regular agenda. Item number 80. This will be a discussion of possible action approve the. I'm sorry, let's conversation going on, on the side. I'll wait a second before I continue. Scott Holtry is our Development Services Director. Can you tell us what this one is about?

Scott Holtry, Development Services Director, stated Madam Chair, members of the Board, thank you for this opportunity. On August 5, 2024 the Board directed staff to take a look at our permitting software to find more, more cost-effective solution. With that, staff went and looked at a few different options with the following three goals in mind. One, it obviously needed to be more cost effective than what we currently have, two that it's something that is user friendly for our employees, that's easy access, easily accessible and can be easily trained on, and three, that it's easily accessible for the general public, that they can be able to use it and not have any issues, and it also provides all of their needs and wants. One of the things that we did do was we looked at a few different jurisdictions. One was the Coconino county that's very similar to Mohave County, and what kind of software they're using. The other one was the City of Kingman. The City of Kingman went through a RFQ process right now to look for new software. They looked at several different software solutions and ultimately landed on the Granicus SmartGov Solution. That's the same solution that Coconino County is using. We went through several different presentations with SmartGov. Found it to be very user friendly and meeting, if not exceeding, all of the wants and needs for Mohave County, just to kind of go over some of the highlights. First, the cost. I do have a slide presentation, if possible. The, just looking at Accela itself right now, we're paying about 320,000 per year, with a 5% increase each year. With that, we're also paying for about \$30,000 for our city gov app, which allows the inspectors to schedule the contractors to schedule inspections, but also for our inspectors to work in the field. We're also paying another \$40,000 a year for our IVR system, which allows inspectors to call in and schedule inspections through an automated system. The smart, SmartGov solution, price would be \$57,000 per year, with a 5% increase all of the working in the field and scheduling inspection services are included with that. When we calculated it out approximately be about \$1.8 million over the next five years in cost savings, looking at the use with Accela Online Permitting requires a lot of configuration. One thing that we learned going through this process is Accela is a good program, and that's maybe why it's really expensive. You can almost do anything with it, but it requires you to configure it, and it takes a lot of time. A lot of times it takes consultants. And you have to know exactly what you're looking for. That also requires that inspection scheduling by a third-party vendor, and then we're limited on the amount of accounts that we can have with Accela. Looking at the SmartGov Solution, it's an off the shelf permitting software, so it's developed specifically for permitting, and it already has all of the things that it's gone through the process with several different jurisdictions, and it's already has all of the bells and whistles that we're looking for in a permitting software, especially with Online Permitting. So, it's already configured that way. One thing that we really liked about the SmartGov solution was that it has automatic notifications. So, it's automatically going to tell customers when the permits ready, when they have corrections, when, when they need to schedule inspections. So, it's very automated. It includes that inspection scheduling online. All the customers are able to go right online and schedule those inspections. And then we have an unlimited user accounts. So, it's not our fees, not based off of how many

licenses we need. We have unlimited on that. With that, we are very excited for this solution. It's going to save the county quite a bit of money, but also, I believe it is going to help streamline the surf the process with our permitting software and help improve the customer experience as well. With that, I'm open to any questions that the Board may have.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, thank you, Mr. Holtry. Any questions?

Supervisor Gould stated Madam Chairman.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated Madam Chairman, Director Holtry, we can get out of our Accela contract?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Gould, yeah, we looked into the contract. Looks like we're able to terminate at the end of our cycle, which is, I think it's on a yearly cycle. We have a seven year contract, but it's the end of the cycle is, I believe, at the fiscal end of the fiscal year, which is in July, we've looked through the contract, and believe we're able to get out of that. We're gonna, before we officially sign or send anything over to Granicus, we're gonna double check with Accela to make sure that we can get out of it as well. Looks like Tara might have a little bit more information about that as well.

Tara Acton, Procurement Director, stated good morning, Chairman and Supervisor Gould, so we have looked at the contract, and although the initial, the overall term of the contract says that we can only or terminate with cause, there is information in there regarding subscriptions. We did agree to a seven-year agreement, locking in the pricing for seven years. You are correct. The current subscription ends June 30 of 2025 so our intent is, if the Board approves this purchase, is to notify Accela that we intend not to renew for the remaining subscription terms. We will work with them to close everything out so that we make sure we're not in any kind of breach of contract. Once we've confirmed all of that, then we would move forward with the Granicus purchase.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you Ma'am. Madam Chair?

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Lingenfelter.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you. First of all, just want to say great work to you and your staff. To Nathan McDaniel, our IT Director, to Tara in Procurement and her staff. We've been talking about online plan submittal and review now for over a year, and now it's fully functional. That's good for Mohave County. It makes sure that you know, the development process is streamlined, that we get these projects built and on the tax rolls in a timely manner, times money for developers and people that are investing capital into the county. But this is phenomenal. This is just one software over a five-year period, we're going to be you know, saving the taxpayers of Mohave County an estimated \$1.8 million and this is in a

time when the county's general fund is facing structural imbalance. So, there's another item that's laid on the agenda that has to do with software. But want to say, great job. And this is what you know, if you have to have government, this is the type of thing that you want to see. So, thank you.

Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Supervisor Gould stated I just wanted to echo Supervisor Lingenfelter's praise. They did a good job. They were tasked with, we tasked them with doing something. They went out and did it. Good job Scott. Good job Tara. Good job crew.

Chairman Bishop stated I'll echo your echo. Good job everybody. All right, we did do the vote, right?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yes.

Chairman Bishop stated item number 81 brought to us by Ken Cunningham.

KEN CUNNINGHAM, HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR:

- 81.** Discussion and possible action RE: Approve the following exceptions to the General Fund hiring Freeze, approved on August 21, 2023: County Manager – Animal Shelter – Animal Shelter Technician Position; Temporary Animal Shelter Technician Position; Development Services – Planner Position, Combination Building Inspector Sr Position, Permit Technician Specialist Position; Financial Services – Administration Specialist Position, Accountant Senior Position; Probation – Juvenile Detention Officer Positions (5), Probation Services Assistant Position; Public Defender's Office – Office Specialist Position.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Gould to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

- 82.** Discussion and possible action RE: Approve the proposed language changes to Personnel Policies and Procedures Sections 6.1 correcting grammatical errors and removing private aircraft from a covered travel reimbursement.

Chairman Bishop stated item number 82 is a discussion to approve the proposed language changes to personnel policies and procedures section 6.1, correcting errors and removing private aircraft from the covered travel reimbursement. I do have one person signed up to speak. Jesse Roybal. I'm sorry, two people. I'd be followed by Scotty McClure.

Jesse Roybal stated good morning, Madam Chair and Supervisors. My name is Jesse Roybal. I reside at 2500 North Summerson Road, and I've been a resident of this County since 2002 and I'm currently a division Supervisor with the County. I'm here today to speak in opposition to this policy revision, which proposes to eliminate the use of personal aircraft for business travel. The proposal appears to be an overreaction to concerns that may arise from either a lack of knowledge about aviation or misunderstanding of FAA regulations, and I believe it could be an unintended negative consequences to the County. First, I am confident that I am the reason this agenda item is being brought before the Board. This issue began when I submitted a request to HR on July 29 to use my personal aircraft to fly to Las Vegas for a training seminar. I followed policy and completed all the necessary paperwork, but I was later told by my Director that Risk Management didn't have enough time to process my request, and I was required to drive instead. As a result, a trip that could have been completed in 35 to 40 minutes each way ended up taking me eight hours of driving, two days. Recently, I was asked to assist in a project that required travel through St George, Utah. Due to the limitations placed on me, I drove over seven hours for a round trip that could have been covered in one hour each way. Recently, I was asked to, excuse me. Let me emphasize that, flying a personal aircraft is not a luxury, but a tool that offers flexibility, efficiency and safety for trips to locations like Phoenix, a personal aircraft could eliminate hotel and meal costs. Driving, on the other hand, possesses its own risks like driving fatigue. The current policy already outlines strict guidelines for using personal aircraft on county business, including certification requirements, medical certifications and insurance requirements. I have complied with all of these requirements, just as other pilots would. The existing policy is in line with both public and private entities, including the State of Arizona and my previous employer. The main reason stated for me for this change would be the liability if something happens. Well, that's exactly what insurance is for and why I carried a million dollar in coverage, million dollars in coverage, which is exactly what's outlined in the policy. I've even offered to add the County as additionally insured on my aircraft policy to alleviate these liability concerns. I already have the City of Kingman additionally insured because I have an aircraft hangar at the Kingman airport. In conclusion, I urge the board to consider the full impact of removing the use of personal aircraft for business travel. It is not just about me, it's about a broader implications for efficiency, cost savings and safety. I am more than willing to work with anyone to address any concerns, but a blanket restriction would be a disservice to the county, its employees. I'd also like to recognize the numerous private pilots aiding in the hurricane Helene relief efforts that will be open any questions, if you have any. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated thank you. Scottie.

Scotty McClure stated Scotty from Bullhead. Well after here and his uh thing here, I've kind of changed my mind on this. I didn't know if we ever had private aircraft try to bill us before. Really doesn't matter. Like, like he says they're down there in Hurricane Katrina. And what's happening now, hopefully we're able to get some private people bringing in supplies and stuff. So maybe, if you can work something out with the insurance or whatever this came. This was put on the agenda because of number 83 I think what happened to Valerie and Judge Williams? You're trying to correct a bunch of policies. And. And I'm kind

of for this one, didn't we have a person that was running for Senate using her airplane run for and of course, she lost. Used to be a pilot, a jet fighter pilot. There should be certain you remove this, then you're not going to have a plan for Colorado City or something that happens. I don't know that's just I've changed my mind on this.

Chairman Bishop stated can we have a representative from HR.

LeeAnn Lewis, Human Resources Manager, stated good morning. I'm actually going to refer back to Director Dorner, as he's the one who brought this up to our attention, so I want to let him speak on this

Chairman Bishop stated okay thank you.

Joe Dorner, Risk and Emergency Management Director, stated good morning, Madam Chair and Supervisors. I was the, I was the initiator on this, and I'll give you a little bit of background on it. We received, received a request available for reimbursement, travel reimbursement involving aircraft. And is, is Jesse's. And hope I don't butcher your name, but Roybal has stated he was the one that submitted that in. Review of it, review of it caught my eye as it was going in, and the actual form goes in and it requires a signature and approval at the department Director level, and then also the by the Finance Director. And as I went through there, that request is actually a request for authorization to use private and rental aircraft for County business. And so, the while it is under that policy, that is the form that is referred to from that standpoint. The reason that it caught my eye was because I was aware of a an exclusion, a general exclusion, that's written in through our ACIP insurance policy, which excludes any coverage for and I'm just going to read this real quick. I can put it up here if you'd like to see it for ownership, maintenance, use and trust or entrustment of others to any aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, including drones, airfields run, runways, hangars, buildings or other properties in connection with aviation activities other than premises. Which means if something happens on site. I was familiar with this because I've dealt with a couple issues over the last year that have involved different types of aircrafts and some things that we had going on with the County. That occurring I did go ahead and reach out to our insurance representative at ACIP, specifically the loss control manager for them, and I wanted to make sure that I was interpreting the, the exclusion correctly, which that was confirmed. In addition to that, I've had a couple different conversations with that same person and ACIP strongly encourage us not to allow these types of activities, because we do have an exclusion on our insurance. And so, if there is something that's associated with the use or entrustment of a private aircraft there, they are not going to provide any liability coverage for us. That was really the crux of it. In reference to reviewing that, the initial review I did ask, I did, I did reach out to the department director, and I, and I advised him, you know, I need to research this, and I need to touch base with our insurance, because I'm relatively sure that this, that there is an exclusion that's that occurs, and the, the proposed initial travel, and what the request would and for was for the following week, and it was for a couple flights over To Henderson, Nevada, and I, and I just simply ask if we have the ability to give them to provide a vehicle for that person to make that travel, can we please do that? And I was assured that would be able to occur. There was some indication that there may be a potential future

travel as well. So, I knew that we were going to deal with that. We do not have, we do not currently have another policy that addresses this in another fashion. And so a little bit of research that I had done as well to find out how long this policy had been effect, and I can only trace it back to the county policy to 2008 just because of how record keeping is, I will tell you that the form that goes along with this was created 26 years ago, at least 26 years ago, and in two of 1998 and so it's, it's been in there for quite a while. The ACIP exclusion, has been in place since 2004 and so. It's, it's, it's not like either one of those have are something that's new. However, I could not find personnel that could tell me when the last time that this, this, this issue had or requests had been made. So that's the background information on it. I feel is as the Director of Risk and Emergency Management, I, I feel a strong obligation to tell you that I strongly discourage it based upon that exclusion and the potential exposure that we have out there. If you are curious, because that may come up do, because we do have a couple planes that the sheriff's office has, those two planes and two pilots, they are insured specifically with a separate binder, so that is underwritten each year and, and they have specific requirements and specific pilots that are carried under that. Those, that policy there. It's, it's not a cheap policy. It's something that we separate out, and that's how we provide that coverage. So, if you're wondering about that, and at this point, I'll open that if you got any questions for me,

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair. I've had a problem with our policy regarding travel for a long time, and it seems like I, I never get the answer that I'm looking for. When somebody takes a car, they say, okay, I'm using my private vehicle. We're not additionally insured, are we?

Director Dorner stated No, no, absolutely no, no. Do we require additionally insured? Even in this policy right here, it, it doesn't require an additionally insured under the current policy,

Supervisor Johnson stated right. We really don't care. We really don't care if a guy's in a car, if we have liability over him, because we don't require them, even though it's business, and as a business, we should be requiring them to insure us or we furnish them a vehicle. I don't see the difference. And I guess we don't even require them to show us proof of insurance. We don't have insurance forms on file for employees that use their personal vehicles. So, the more I think about it, let him fly his plane. What do I care? That's all. Madam Chair.

Supervisor Gould stated Madam Chairman. It's probably more of a question for HR. When we're reimbursing people for flying aircraft, what? How do we reimburse them? Is it at the same rate that it would be if they were to drive an automobile?

Manager Lewis stated um, I'll be honest on that one. I am not 100% sure. This is the first time I've experienced one of the FSD fives, which is related to the aircraft. So, if you'll bear with me just a moment. I think we have one on hand and if not, I believe that Director Mournian is also on the line and may be able to supply that.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated I may be able to answer that, just the policy states for both personal and rental aircraft, pilot shall be reimbursed the cost of a trip based upon the current personal vehicle mileage rate. The mileage used shall be the distance traveled had the pilot driven to the destination with a maximum one-way mileage being 500 miles. So, I think what you do is you take what the rate would be for driving a vehicle and you get reimbursed that.

Supervisor Gould stated so, did they reimburse them as if they drove on a road? Or is it as the airplane, aircraft flies.

Mr. Roybal stated the way it is with most entities, they give you your mileage as if you were driving. It's based on the miles driving, because that pretty much compensates for the different costs in fuel. Fuel for a plane is a little bit more. It's actually pretty interesting, because they weigh out about the same. The amount of fuel I burn flying one way somewhere is about the same amount of cost as it is to drive it in a car. It's just you get time saving.

Supervisor Gould stated depends on the aircraft. The twin turbo prop aircraft that an individual has burns a lot more fuel than.

Mr. Roybal stated yeah, definitely. I believe the county plane run somewhere around 20 gallons per hour, where my planes, two seater, go six, six gallons to the hour.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, sir. Thank you, Chairman.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Lingenfelter go ahead.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Joe, to Supervisor Johnson's point, the County doesn't insure private cars, right?

Director Dorner stated that is correct.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated so, I mean, we're one of, what, fifth largest geographically in the County or in this Country, as far as land area, whether it's a private car or a private plane or what if it's even a private boat, you know? I mean, we don't insure any of those, right. If they use one of those to get the work, how do we, why don't? Why aren't all vehicles treated somewhat the same?

Director Dorner stated well, I'll try to answer that, when you, if they're using a private vehicle, and I am going to separate them out, because you use the term to work, if they're using it for county businesses, it goes out there. There is some excess insurance, some excess liability insurance that they do provide for,

for vehicles, our insurance carrier that is not, that is not covered for, because there's a general exclusion on the aviation and so when you have that, there is a requirement that they maintain. At least what's required by state level. And then this is, this is going to be a little bit soft, but I'm trying to answer your question, if you do have a, if you do have a car accident, you know, while they, you can see statistics that talk about them, possibly, you know, be more frequent than, than auto and those are sheer numbers. There's a lot more on the road. But in addition to that, they don't necessarily have the magnitude if you have it, if you have an aircraft issue, there's potential that people are not going to be alive any longer, including pilots, including anybody that potentially could be on the ground, and anything that it can send out there. And then, while I know that a million dollars sounds like, like a lot if a plane goes down someplace, I just want you to understand the magnitude from that standpoint. In addition to that, there's a comment made regarding this being a common policy around another question that I did ask our insurance provider, was if there was any other, if there was any other counties that were allowing that and that have policy that which you know, had that practice in place, and he, he told me no, none. So, I just.

Manager Elters stated Madam Chair. I'd like to jump in as well. Simply, the difference is, with car travel for County business, is we offer a vehicle for any employee, and we have a, we have a carpool option where we say, you're traveling on county business. Here's a vehicle that is available to you. It's insured, it's covered, and you use it. If you choose not to, for whatever reason, then you're you sign a waiver form and you understand the risk associated with it. That's not the case here. That is simply the biggest difference. And as far as ACIP and as a Board of Trustees member of ACIP, the exposures to the County when, when a use is excluded specifically, is really, I think, higher and more substantial than the county should be willing to take on and that's really where this, we understand. I understand Jesse's wishes and concerns and respect them. It's really more of risk to him as a person, as an employee, because he would not be covered under ACIP, and it's exposure for the County as well. That's really the two points that I wanted to share with the Board. Thank you, Chair.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated to your point. Manager. Elters, so if the County offers a County carpool vehicle, and they refuse, and they want to take their own, and they do, are they covered by a ACIP at that point, if they, if they opt to not take the county car pool vehicle, and they take their private vehicle and they get an accident, are they covered by ACIP?

County Manager Elters stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Lingenfelter, my understanding is, by signing the waiver and proving that you have insurance and it covers you, your insurance is, is responsible. Basically responsible.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated so, if we have a meeting for them to go to, and we offer a County carpool vehicle, and they refuse it, and they instead fly their private plane, with which is privately insured, what's the difference? They're not covered by ACIP either?

Manager Elters stated no. So, well, true, aside from the, the cost associated with an incident in one or the other. In with a county vehicle, we offer we have an option for them. In fact, that is the preferred that's what we tell our employees. You're on county business. Use a County vehicle. For whatever reason, whether it be in personal or otherwise, they choose not to, and they choose to use their own vehicle and then we take necessary measures to ensure that they're covered. They're insured, but we have an option to offer them, is my point. We don't have an option of an airplane. So, it's, you know, it is, it is simply risks associated with the ways of travel and conducting and completing the county business. That's all I'm saying. But it is excluded and as, as, a, you know, as, as a coverage that ACIP has specifically removed and, and is not covering, I and as the County Manager, it's not something that I would take lightly of an exposure, and that's my recommendation to the Board. And that what it's based on.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I think I understand what you're saying. In all cases, we're offering a carpool vehicle to go to a meeting. In all cases, if they refuse and they use a private vehicle, whatever it is, it's on their insurance. It's on them. It's not on the County anymore. Am I mistaken, or am I still confused? I don't understand this thing.

Manager Elters stated Madam Chair, Mr. Supervisor Lingenfelter, no, you understand. Understanding what I'm saying. That is what I'm saying.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Johnson I think the problem is, unless I misunderstood, Mr. Dorner, you're saying that somebody who drives a vehicle ACIP is still spending, or we're expending monies on that vehicle to cover them?

Director Dorner stated not spending money on the specific vehicle, but there is some excess liability.

Supervisor Johnson stated okay, I guess that's what gets back. What I brought up before, we're letting somebody pick a vehicle, and I could ask right now, to show all the insurance, current insurance of every vehicle somebody's personally driving for County business, and you cannot show me. I know that's true because I've asked before to say, hey, show me this. Anybody who's driving a personal vehicle does not have us as additionally insured. I've never been to a place where that's not. If you're going to do it. And I know the rates, and they don't do it because their insurance rates will go up, so they don't want to do it, but if we're not going to require the people with vehicles to have this insurance, and unfortunately for Jesse, he has to have a yearly inspection, he has to have physicals, his vehicle is probably in a lot better shape than ours. We require none of that of the people that are charging us mileage so well, I understand what the Manager's saying. Is the personal point to me that if we're not requiring the others, why should we pick on Jesse?

Director Dorner stated I'm going to throw one more thing out there, because I just want because I know it's been asked, what is the difference? And in a minute, tell you that the difference is that ACIP does not exclude the practice of us allowing people to be able to utilize private vehicles if they choose to do so, and there is some excess coverage. And so, at the end of the day, that's, that's the difference.

Supervisor Johnson stated the County's responsibility, going to be the County's responsibility anyway, the responsibility of beyond the County's offers.

Director Dorner stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Johnson, that's, that's correct, and I want, I just want you to understand that that liability, that liability is out there, and it's for the County, versus what our insurance. We do. There's, there's different ways of addressing risk, if you do have an exposure, this is obviously a significant exposure, as we see it written into an exclusion, you know, you we can turn around, we can transfer risk. We try to do that through insurance. Is there some transfer of risk over there, in having the employee have, have an insurance policy on that? Yeah, there is, but we do not have anything with us. So, there's not complete, there's, you know, there's avoidance. And avoidance means that if you don't have that practice, then you don't have a concern over there on that. This is not a frequent. This is not a frequent. And we have 1,160 employees, and you're talking a small, small group. But we do accept that exposure from that and when I say small group, I couldn't find anyone in the County, unless you went far back, where anyone even realized that this policy or this had ever been a question in amount. So that's a small, small number over there from that standpoint. So, I just want to make sure that you're aware of that, that if, if that's allowed, then, then Mohave County accepts that responsibility for the liability.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair. I could tell you that I, in the past, used private small planes, where I rented them with a pilot obviously, the fly I never had any problem with reimbursement, but with, I'm guessing, especially with airplanes, because they have more strict requirements. We have employees who are driving vehicles who are getting reimbursed that have multiple car wrecks in our County vehicles and we don't we just keep paying them, so that's the last I have. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated so, one thing that is concerning to me is anybody can go and do the ground school, take their flight test and get a pilot license, if they have the desire to put in the time and effort. So, there's no difference once you get that pilot license from a pilot that's got, say, 40 hours, as opposed to a pilot with 400 hours. Big difference there as far as experience. If we make this a policy, we don't have any way of knowing how experienced this pilot may be, because this is going to be a County wide policy, what kind of plane this person may own, who does the annual inspections on it? I mean, it's there's a lot of complexities involved in aviation rules and regulations and you're right, a million-dollar insurance policy. Really, if it comes to a serious accident where life is lost. I mean, how much is a life worth ? That can happen in an automobile as well as an airplane, except an airplane can take out a commercial airliner or a residence that has a family living in it, or it could just, you know, there's just so many possibilities more so than driving a vehicle, is what I'm trying to point out. I don't know what kind of plane Jesse flies, but it really doesn't matter, because if we make this a policy, then it's going to go, it's going to cover whether

it's a 150 Cessna or, or a big turbo jet. I mean, it's, there's just too, too many unknowns out there for me to be comfortable with it and with me being a pilot, I think I understand, probably as good, if not better than, than most people on the board, how things can go wrong when you're up at 10,000 foot, right Jesse?

Manager Elters stated Madam Chair, one additional thought, if I may. As far as our motor pool is concerned, those vehicles are reported to ACIP annually and they're covered. And as you know, we have tiers of coverage, so we're covered to certain point, through ACIP, and then ACIP secures additional coverage for incident instances, for events where it may exceed that, but the County will exposure will be, will be limited. If we, in this case, because it's specifically excluded from coverage, any, any exposure to the County would be borne by the County. And that is really what I'm also what I'm concerned about. I understand fully what you all are saying, Supervisor Johnson and Supervisor Lingenfelter and yourself, as far as the requirements of aviation and what that require. And those incidents do not happen very often. However, they do happen, and when they do happen, it could be an exponentially higher risk for the County than otherwise, and that's what we're trying to manage and protect against. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated so I would be more inclined to support this if this was can, had some kind of control from our Aviation Division, with our chief pilot, having some kind of input or control, or whatever, with these various pilots that may come out of the woodwork, if we, if we approve this, because I know that Jesse and I are not the only pilots that are civilian in, in the employment of Mohave County.

Supervisor Johnson stated could we just do a waiver.

Chairman Bishop stated we could, but the insurance, once the loss is capped at a million, then they're going to come after the County. So, I don't think a waiver is going to protect the County.

Supervisor Johnson stated why?

Chairman Bishop stated I don't know they always go after the deep pockets first, but you know, a million dollars.

Supervisor Johnson stated have a good enough waiver that whoever's going to fly a plane. If we say, hey, we're paying you 80 bucks to go to Vegas and back. How you get there? I could care less. He just puts in for his 80 bucks and doesn't tell me he's flying a plane. I don't care.

Chairman Bishop stated I don't know. Might be kind of fun to be the first County to have a policy like that and see where it goes. But I'm retiring, so.

Supervisor Gould stated apparently, we already have a policy like,

Director Dorner stated if that's something, Madam Chair, if that's something you'd like me to look into, I can. I did have brief conversation. You know, the potential to completely separate, to separate the employee from the County in those circumstances. I don't have an answer for you right now, but that's something that I can take a look at. But it really doesn't change what's going on, because when, when we do this, this is not only not separating, that's endorsing that, that person to be able to do that as a County representative, and go back to that, that's where we do not have any level of coverage for the County for that circumstance.

Chairman Bishop stated I do think we need more information and also I'd like to know, I'd like to know once, once this private aircraft lands at the destination are then, will be required to reimburse for a rental car so they can get from the airport to the location where they need to do County business. Now that's, that's not clear as well.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair, no they only get that time. Good part is we're getting back to work in two hours, like a lot of us, like Lingenfelter he's taking a plane at Colorado City. In those places I know because they've hidden time. I think if you're going to look at something, really need to look at our vehicle policy, that's the one that's scary to me as it could cost a lot of money.

Chairman Bishop stated so maybe we should continue this and bring it back after looking at our travel policy in general.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair, I would agree with Supervisor Johnson's comments regarding where the real liability threat is regarding the private vehicles. I don't think that this is as big of a threat to us personally,

County Manager Elters stated Madam Chair, if it's acceptable to the Board to direct us to go back and look at travel at large and come back with some options, and if indeed, to continue to allow aviation with a certain waiver, we can work on the language of that to ensure that we're accommodating, but we're protecting the taxpayer of Mohave County. We'll be happy to do that if the Board wishes to direct us in that direction.

Chairman Bishop stated I will put that in the form of a motion, and I'd also like to have our chief pilot be a participant in the policy when it comes to aviation. So, I do that in the form of motion.

Supervisor Johnson stated can you tell us what the motion is?

Chairman Bishop stated to, to continue this and have staff relook at our travel policy,

Supervisor Johnson stated but can the employee fly now, until we get it done that we were allowed before?

Attorney Esplin stated my position, at least from our perspective, would be the yes, because there's still policies in place, you know, until it changes.

Supervisor Johnson stated fine with me.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bishop and seconded by Supervisor Johnson to approving continuing item for staff to review travel policy and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Supervisor Johnson stated didn't have these problems with the last Flood Control Director, did we?

Chairman Bishop stated okay going on to the next item number 83.

- 83.** Discussion and possible action RE: Approve changes to Personnel Policies and Procedures Section 6.2 Vehicle Use Policy subsection 6.307 Assigned Vehicles policy.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated next item is approve changes to personnel policies and procedure sections.

- 84.** Discussion and possible action RE: Approve changes to Personnel Policies and Procedures Section 3.1.B, 3.1.F and 3.10 Paid Time Off (PTO) policy.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated item number 85.

- 85.** Discussion and possible action RE: Approve changes to Personnel Policies and Procedures Section 6.9 and create new Section 6.9 Claims by Supervisors.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair, I have a question. This is in statute why is this even being brought to us?

Chairman Bishop stated I don't know.

Supervisor Johnson stated we have a motion and a second Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated yes, we do. And who's on the line?

Luke Mournian, Chief Financial Officer, stated this is Luke Mournian, Chief Financial Officer.

Chairman Bishop stated what do you got?

Director Mournian stated I asked HR to put this on the Board agenda. The reason being, we, looking back, looking back through the County's records over, you know, the last four or five, six years, there's been some inconsistent application of this. You know, the state statute is exactly the language that we have used for the, the proposed policy. It's always good to have our policy be consistent with state statute. I just wanted to make sure that all the Board members were aware of this. Finance is going to you know. This was brought to my attention during the discussion with other Finance Directors around the state, and so looking into it, realizing that we have not been consistent here in Mohave County with enforcing this I wanted to make sure that the entire Board was aware of it. What's proposed today makes sure that the County's policy is consistent with state statute, and that any personal claims by members of the Board against the County would require the signature of another Board member and that of the County Treasurer. Now I just want to make sure everybody understands that most of the claims by Board members or by their districts are covered by other portions of County policy, such as our P card policy or the existing travel policy. What this applies to is, is only those claims which are for personal reimbursement to a Board member, and that would be something like a travel advance. It would be request for mileage reimbursement if a supervisor does not have a County assigned vehicle, and they're using their personal vehicle for County business, things of that nature. So, it's really just administrative in nature, making sure that the County policy is completely in alignment with state statute.

Supervisor Johnson stated once again, this is, this is finance's job. Has nothing to do with us. Finance hasn't been doing your job. Haven't been, haven't been getting forms that are submitted and signed off. That's not the Supervisor's fault. We have a motion and a second.

Chairman Bishop stated I have one person signed up to speak on this that I need to recognize, Scotty McClure.

Scotty McClure stated it's a little late I signed up for 83 and 84 also.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to DENY and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated item 86.

BUSTER JOHNSON, MOHAVE COUNTY SUPERVISOR, DISTRICT 3:

- 86.** Discussion and possible action RE: Authorize funding, not to exceed \$23,000, towards the State of Utah's landmark public lands lawsuit with the U.S. Supreme Court and authorize the Board's support of Utah's legal action by signing on as a co-signor of the Amicus Brief to be filed at the U.S. Supreme Court by the American Lands Council.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Johnson.

Supervisor Johnson stated thank you, Madam Chair. Everybody here is quite aware of the Federal issue we have. I think if Utah is successful, it will really help Arizona and Mohave County and, and all of us have dealt with the Utah people. So, there aren't any questions, I'd make a motion to approve with money coming.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Gould to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

RYAN ESPLIN, DEPUTY CIVIL COUNTY ATTORNEY

- *87.** Receive legal advice and an update regarding the current litigation in Charles De Shazer, et al. v. County of Mohave, et al., (3:24-CV-08147-DWL). Further, consider the County's position and possible settlement options, and direct the County's attorneys regarding how to proceed with the litigation.

Chairman Bishop stated next item, it's brought to us by our Civil County Attorney. This would be for legal advice regarding current litigation. I don't believe there's any action required on that.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated I'm sorry, Chairman, if I actually, I thought of something if the if the Board could take a motion to direct the County's Attorney so our attorney to proceed as direct, as discussed in Executive Session. That's kind of the practice that we should be following.

Chairman Bishop stated so, I'll make that as a motion.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bishop and seconded by Supervisor Gould to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated next item from Supervisor Lingenfelter to discuss excess County owned parcels.

TRAVIS LINGENFELTER, MOHAVE COUNTY SUPERVISOR, DISTRICT 1:

- 88.** Discussion and possible action of all excess County-owned parcels on which properties to retain and which properties to immediately list for sale to get them into private sector control and generating new property taxes to assist with future County FY budgets.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Madam Chair. This was something that we placed on the agenda earlier this year in May, with 60-day turnaround. Seconded by Supervisor Gould and just wanted to put it back on the agenda to the County Manager.

Manager Elters stated Madam Chair and Supervisor Lingenfelter, if I may. Thank you for bringing it back. It's been ready. I've waited a bit. I'm going to give you a brief update, really quick. We we've conducted the, the review that the Board approved and requested. It really involved multiple departments, the Assessor, Assessor's Office, was tremendous help as we went through a couple of iterations to identify the number of parcels first, and then from there, determine those that have improvements on them, those that have buildings, those that are needed for right of way purposes, those that are in a floodway and so on. And then we reduced it down to the number of parcels that we feel we can recommend to the Board. So, we started with about 336 parcels in total that the county owns. And we reduced that down to about an 180 that we feel that we can recommend to the board for disposal. The reason I had not brought it back is I also asked to meet with departments including Treasurer, Recorder and Assessor, as well as the County Attorney's Office to put together a plan and bring it back to the Board related to how we dispose, how we complete these transactions, whether with appraisals, and if so, how we do it. And because cost can become a factor for these appraisals. So, we are working on that. We've had one meeting already. We got one other meeting coming up with these various departments, including Procurement, and I would hope to come back to you in about a month, maybe a couple of board meetings to present to you, not only what I just shared with you, but also a suggestion or recommendation that you can direct staff with many of those parcels are nice and big and have either rectangular and or square shapes, but some of them are very small and some are slivers. The Treasurer has offered to reach to identify the slivers and maybe begin by contacting property owners to ask if they're interested. So, we're on it. Just need a little bit more time to bring you a plan that we can present to you to get some direction.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated go ahead.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, County Manager. The item did say, bring that back to the Board within 60 days. But hearing that, I'm thankful, thankful for the work that you and everybody has been doing. So, you're saying that it'll come back to this Board review and possible approval of some sort in maybe November.

Manager Elters stated I would, I would hope in November, if, if the November Board meetings are loaded, for some reason, I will commit to you to bring it. I believe we're going to have at least one meeting in December. We'll bring it either November or December, but no later than that Supervisor.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair, I'm not requesting any action on this.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, we'll go on to item number 89.

- 89.** Direct the County Manager to bring new County policy to the Board within 30 days' time, directing to competitively re-compete all legacy software solutions that the County of Mohave utilizes at least every seven (7) years to assure that county taxpayers are receiving both the best service capabilities and maximized value for every public dollar spent.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Madam Chair. I placed this on the Board. I want to give another kudos and shout out to the county's Information Technology Director, Nathan McDaniel. As we saw previously in the agenda, just by reviewing and competitively looking at what's best for the for the customers, or citizens and the taxpayers, just by looking at one legacy software solution, we're going to be saving over \$1.8 million over a five year period. And that really got me to thinking, how many other legacy software solutions or types of things like that are out there where there might be some cost savings. I mean, \$1.8 million in a structural deficit is big money. It saves way more than we did on the hiring freeze. It saves way more than we did, well, maybe not the hiring freeze, the travel freeze. So, this is just, you know, bringing before this Board contemplating a new county policy that would basically say that the county has to competitively, re-compete all of our legacy software solutions, you know, no less than every seven years, just to assure that our County taxpayers are receiving both the best service capabilities and maximize value for every taxpayer dollar spent. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated we don't need any action on that?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I'd make a motion and to direct staff to bring that policy back to this Board within 30 days' time.

Supervisor Gould stated Chairman?

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated the only rub with doing it every seven years is if you end up in the middle of a contract for that software. So, you might want to look at if there's a renewal that's shorter than that, that they we're competed at the at the renewal day.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Gould, actually, when I put this on the Board, that's a really good point. I think that I see Tara coming down. Maybe she come to the podium. Tara, I know software sometimes is a little different, but I know that our Procurement Code says this. I know that

the State Code, Procurement Code says you don't really want to have a contract for more than a five-year period without a without a Procurement so.

Director Acton stated thank you, Supervisors. So, my recommendation would be that we would look at legacy software and then make a recommendation to possibly re solicit. I've got concerns with saying formally compete, because we don't generally do our own competition for software's. So, I think understanding what the board's direction is here, I think Nathan and I could work together and make a recommendation to the Board, understanding, really the goal is to look at things no more than every seven years and determine, does it make sense for us to stay with that software and keep moving forward off of whatever vehicle we use to purchase it, or should we look at other options?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Tara, staying true to our own County Code, Procurement Code and the State Code. Should we? Should we really leave that at five years or, I mean.

Director Acton stated I think if you'd leave it open to us to look at what that makes sense, we can bring that back as part of the policy as well.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I'm going to make a revised motion that's a little more open ended, to just ask County staff to bring back a policy to this Board within 30 days regarding Procurement of software.

Clerk of the Board Laura Skubal stated may I make one more suggestion, if you might place our 30 days, the first meeting in November is going to be a heavily is a heavy agenda, if you wouldn't mind just moving. I'm just trying to look at what you guys.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated anything for you Laura, of course. 45 days. 60 days. What do you think?

Clerk of the Board Laura Skubal stated 45 would be great?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated 45 days. Thank you.

Chairman Bishop stated okay 45 days. We've got a second.

Motion was made by Supervisor Lingenfelter and seconded by Supervisor Johnson to Approve bringing back in 45 days and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated okay next item brought to us by Supervisor Johnson, presentation from the Mohave County Department of Public Health regarding medical provider coverage estimates for 2024. Hello, Melissa.

BUSTER JOHNSON, MOHAVE COUNTY SUPERVISOR, DISTRICT 3:

90. Discussion and possible action RE: a presentation from the Mohave County Department of Public Health regarding medical provider coverage estimates for 2024.

Melissa Palmer, Public Health Director, stated good morning, Chairman and Board of Supervisor members. Give me just a moment to pull up the presentation. Okay, so this is bringing back the from the 2020 numbers that we provided to the Board in September. This is bringing the 2024 numbers. So, this slide shows what I presented at the last meeting. So, this is from the 2020 numbers. Oh, no, this is the wrong presentation. Hang on, just a moment. That's not it either. There it is. My apologies. It was a different screen that I'm used to at the podium. Okay, so this is the 2020 numbers. And for this presentation, I need to thank Arizona Department of Health Services and Dr. Santarelli at KRMCMC. Arizona Department of Health Services provided the numbers, and then Dr. Santarelli created the table of the 2024 numbers and comparing them to the 2020 numbers, which is what I provided to the Board of Supervisors in September. The same categories are highlighted as needs within Mohave County. Family Practice numbers increased, internal medicine numbers increased, however, for OBGYN, last in 2020 the number was seven to meet the minimum, and now we need eight to meet the minimum. Pediatrics actually decreased by three, so now we need two to meet minimum. So, Gastroenterology is the same at two, it was two in 2020, it's two now. Ophthalmology is another one that increased, so instead of seven, we now have eight that we need. Otolaryngology is decreased by one. So, it was three last time. Now it's two. Pathology is the same. And then Psychiatry has increased to seven that we need to meet the minimum overall. Taking all of the numbers for all of these providers into consideration, Mohave County has improved by 41.6% however, it's going to be again in the family practice, internal medicine and some of the other categories, not necessarily in those areas where we already had a need. I included in this presentation the hospital rankings for each of our four facilities within Mohave County. There are two areas that we pull it from; US News does a report for hospitals and publishes it annually. This is from that entity, so all four are considered high performing, but in different categories. So, Havasu is high performing and heart failure, COPD and pneumonia care. KRMCMC is high performing in heart attacks, heart failure and COPD and pneumonia. Valley View is high performing and hip fractures and Western Arizona Regional Medical Center is high performing for heart attacks, kidney failure and COPD. I also went to medicare.gov and pulled the hospital rankings from there for this report, I did screenshots of what they had, just to provide a nice visual. The heart on each of those means that they are birthing friendly, so they're going to have delivery options at the facility. If you were unaware, Western Arizona Regional Medical Center closed their Birthing Unit, so they do not have the heart. Overall rating is based on how well the hospital is performed across different areas of quality, such as heart attacks, pneumonia, readmission rates for care and safety of care. The patient survey rating measures patients experiences of their hospital care. So, recently discharged patients receive a survey. They get to fill it out on topics such as how well the nurses and doctors communicated, how responsive, responsive hospital staffs were, staff were to their needs and cleanliness and quietness of the facility. And then last I pulled the what we know as JCO, or the Joint Commission's Accredited Hospitals. We have three out of the four that are accredited,

and that's going to be WARMC Havasu Regional Medical Center and Valley View Medical Center. This is optional. A facility does not have to be accredited. It usually involves payment to the JCO entity of a fee of some sort, and then proof that they're meeting additional standards. Any questions?

Chairman Bishop stated thank you, Melissa. Any questions?

Supervisor Johnson stated Chair?

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Johnson.

Supervisor Johnson stated the reason I asked her to ask the Health Department to bring us up is I don't think that people are understanding the limited amount of medical attention that we have in the County and it affects our economic development and growth. We've had people on the Board talk about air flights, average cost, between 25 and 35 usually get two bills. Medicare will cover air ambulance service and very limited set of circumstances, but most people in Mohave County aren't covered. When you look at your trauma center organization, KRMC is a level three. Our HRMC is a level three. KRMCs level four. WARMC is a three. Valley View we couldn't find that. But trauma one is the, level one is the highest. The best we have is a level three, which means more people have to be shipped out of Mohave County to receive medical service. Some of the numbers that were given by the Health Department are a little misleading, because, like, Havasu has one neurologist, but he's only there twice a month. But while we have one, you can't get in to see him. I think it's something that, you know, the County should work with the cities or something say we need to bring up our health services because, I mean, when you look at what he was saying, how good we are with COPD, it looks like we can take care of that anywhere in the in the County, but I don't know if that's going to help you with liver failure or these other things. I just wanted to bring it out so that the Board knew and maybe, as time goes on, it might be something that they want to look at to ask the hospitals. And you know, what is stopping this? Because I know a lot of them, especially in the Havasu region, everything's being bought up by one outfit, so they're stopping new people coming in.

That's all. Thank you.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Bishop stated Supervisor Lingenfelter.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you Madam Chair. Director Palmer, with the data that you've collected on the different healthcare services specialties and the shortages that are being forecast. The first question that comes to my mind is, you know, what are we doing with that data? Is there any sort of healthcare services sector strategy in Mohave County to address these medical shortages. I mean, are all of the stakeholders, the hospitals, Public Health Department for the County, and possibly others, are they

all organizing and binding together to collaboratively tackle these forecasted shortages, or is this something that's just being handled in a really atomized fashion.

Director Palmer stated the healthcare provider situation is a multifaceted situation, so we not only have the recruitment of individuals that are qualified to fill those roles, but they are also bringing families with them. They're bringing spouses, they're bringing school age children, and so they're looking, when somebody's qualified at that level to practice medicine, they hold the cards. So, if their family's looking for something specific in the area doesn't have that they are going to go look elsewhere for wherever they're going to relocate their family. That being said, our Community Health Needs Assessment, one of the items working items that came out of that is a coalition County wide to look at what the what can be updated, changed, what are the needs? Where can we be effective? And then Bullhead City already had a coalition going that is working on health care type items, and so it's just getting everybody on the same page moving forward.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yeah, that's kind of what I'm trying to get to. I'll use the manufacturing sector in Mohave County, for instance. You know, rather than everybody advocating individually for what they needed, there was a lot of commonalities that were going to benefit all manufacturers. So, what they ended up doing was forming a Manufacturing Association, the Kingman and Mohave, Kingman and Mohave Manufacturing Association, so they could collectively organize and address things like inbound, outbound, shipping costs, the cost of electricity, whatever else. Right? Is there anything like that existing right now with healthcare services? I understand what you're saying, you know, with families and things like that for healthcare services providers, but, but are they all getting is everybody getting together in like a healthcare services sector strategy to say, hey, look, this is affecting all of us, and what are we going to do about it? And so, all of us can be more successful in recruiting professionals. Is anything like that going on? I know that you do a survey, but what happens with it after that?

Director Palmer stated we have follow up meetings afterwards. So, its Community Health Improvement Plan groups is what happens after that. And they either meet monthly, sometimes they meet quarterly, depending on what they're working on. And those are the groups that we're launching right now. So, we have a meeting coming up in Lake Havasu City. We have one in two weeks in, it might be next week, my apologies. We have a meeting coming for Kingman Regional Medical Center next week. And then Colorado City is going to be November 22 is when we're going to be up there meeting with them. We do not yet have a meeting for the Bullhead City area, but it's to get everybody on the same page, and then once we have that initial meeting, then we can launch into the actions after that.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yeah being on the board for four years, I've only been to one meeting where you had all of the hospitals represented in one room. And that's just like, mind boggling to me. I mean, are these guys so busy that they can't even get together, even quarterly, like one time, you know, every three months to say, let's stay on the same page. Let's organize. It's better for everybody, all of us, if we

just stay organized on these things, and we push with a collective voice. I don't see that happening. I wish it would.

Director Palmer stated I wish it would also. We have an emergency; our public health emergency preparedness team has a hospital meeting quarterly. And more times than not, it's two out of four that attend, and sometimes it's three out of four. Last time I was three out of four that attended, and I thought that was a win.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, Madam Chairman. Melissa, do we know where are they going? In Bullhead City to give birth now?

Director Palmer stated they are usually driving to Kingman. They can go to Valley View though.

Supervisor Gould stated interesting.

Director Palmer stated yes.

Chairman Bishop stated or Needles. Do they still go there?

Director Palmer stated it depends on if the woman is in full active labor, whether or not they're going to go to Needles versus Valley View.

Supervisor Gould stated and I'm guessing that this is from the low reimbursement rate from AHCCCS, since AHCCCS pays for the birth of about 80% of the children in the State of Arizona.

Director Palmer stated I'm not exactly sure what happened there. I do know that providers were a concern. They didn't have the provider there to run their OB unit, and financially, that might have been a factor, but I'm not aware of anything specific that I can speak to.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, ma'am. Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman Bishop stated any other comments? Questions? Okay the last item for this meeting.

- 91.** Authorize a Board of Supervisor's District 3 project to use American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds in the amount not to exceed \$100,000 to purchase technology infrastructure components that would further enhance county-wide operations.

Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to Approve and carried 4-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.

Chairman Bishop stated okay, this meeting is adjourned.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Supervisors this 7th day of October 2024, **Chairman Bishop adjourned the meeting at 12:13 P.M.**

MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hildy Angius, Chairman

ATTEST:

Laura Skubal, Clerk of the Board