

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Date: September 14, 2004

JOSÉ M. SANCHEZ

Chairman

JOHN F. NELSON

Clerk of the Board

RONALD A. CHRISTENSEN

Vice-Chairman

By: Marilyn Brewer

Deputy Clerk

CRUZ SALAS

Member

Gila County Courthouse
Globe, Arizona

PRESENT: José M. Sanchez, Chairman; Ronald A. Christensen, Vice-Chairman; Cruz Salas, Member; John F. Nelson, County Manager/Clerk; Steve Besich, Deputy County Manager; Bryan Chambers, 2nd Chief Deputy County Attorney; David Patterson, Finance Director; Lionel Martinez, Legislative Liaison; and, Jo Johnson, District Services Coordinator.

PRESENT from the Gila County Provisional Community College District: Dr. Peter Kettner, Chairman-District 2; Robert Ashford, Member-District 4; Melvin Van Vorst, Member-District 1; Jorge Noriega, Member-District 5; Dr. Barbara Ganz, President, Virginia Baer, Director of Administrative Services; and, Nancy Moulder, Administrative Assistant.

OTHERS PRESENT: Lelani Dawn, Reporter KQSS-FM Radio, and Shirley Dawson, candidate for Supervisor of District 3.

The Gila County Board of Supervisors (hereinafter referred to as BOS) met with the Gila County Provisional Community College District (hereinafter referred to as GCPCCD) Board in a Work Session at 2:03 p.m. this date.

Robert Ashford led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Sanchez asked each person present to introduce themselves for the record.

Chairman Sanchez called on Steve Besich to give a brief review of the prior meeting held on August 20, 2004. Mr. Besich stated the entire focus of the meeting in Payson was to decide how we can best serve each other to benefit the County and the GCPCCD. He also stated that from that meeting Barbara Ganz drafted some suggested language for an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the County and the GCPCCD.

Dr. Ganz addressed agenda item 3 which is in reference to discussion regarding the IGA options for a) financial services, b) human resource services, and c) facilities management. Dr. Ganz passed out a packet of information which included a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Gila County and the GCPCCD, with input from John Nelson. Dr. Ganz then read Section A, Items 1 through 4, of the draft which pertains to Human Resource Services. The language contained in bold is as presented by Dr. Ganz, as follows:

A. Human Resource Services

- 1. Gila County (GC) will provide Human Resource Services to GCPCCD. Specifically, GC staff will review and analyze job descriptions and recommend to GCPCCD the grade and pay range, employ GCPCCD staff, and provide the same benefits package as other GC employees.**
- 2. GCPCCD staff and administration employed by GC will adhere to the rules and policies of the GC Merit System.**
- 3. Open positions at GCPCCD will be advertised on the GC job line.**
- 4. Screening of applications, selection of candidates, salary request, and recommendations to the GC BOS will be the responsibility of the GCPCCD.**

The following concerns were raised with regard to Section A, as follows:

- Mr. Besich questioned that since both parties are taxing entities; wouldn't it be better to have an IGA rather than a MOU? Bryan Chambers stated either type of document would be fine, but an IGA might be better. Mr. Besich stated that an IGA would be more formal and could be recorded. Dr. Ganz

suggested that perhaps it could be an Addendum to the current IGA, which it was agreed that could be another option.

- In reference to item no. 4 under Human Resource Services, Dr. Peter Kettner asked the following question: *“Would that cover the full range of everything that goes into human resource law about the hiring process, including Affirmative Action, advertising, and all of that? The GCPCCD Board needs County backup on that. I don’t know if the County has a checklist when you do hiring to make sure you’ve gone through all the appropriate processes; that you’ve advertised the job in the appropriate places; and gone through the screening. This sort of picks up at the point of screening of applications and there’s a lot of things that go on before that. I don’t know if that needs to be reworded to be more comprehensive or how can we include the full range of human resources processes in hiring?”* It was suggested that perhaps Dr. Kettner’s concerns could be covered in item 2 above. Mr. Nelson stated that the County’s Merit System only covers people once they are employed and how they act as an employee, but does not address the hiring process. Mr. Nelson advised that he will incorporate language into the agreement so the hiring process will also follow County practices. Mr. Chambers advised that the GCPCCD Board needs to decide whether it wants to follow all of the Gila County Merit System provisions, such as sexual harassment. He also advised that all human resource-related issues should be discussed with Susan Mitchell, Gila County Personnel Director. Mr. Nelson stated that GCPCCD employees of the college would be subject to all County rules and treated exactly the same as County employees. Vice-Chairman Christensen stated that the GCPCCD Board would have to formally adopt the County procedures and the GCPCCD employees would have to go through County training programs. He added that the GCPCCD Board would have to review the County’s policy to ascertain if there is any uniqueness in the structure of the college that would preclude adherence to those procedures. Lionel Martinez stated that because GCPCCD employees are working with Pima

County Community College District (hereinafter referred to as PCCCD) employees, it will be a unique situation with two processes working side by side. He further stated that job vacancies at the college would be advertised through the County and on the Gila County website, but that would not prevent the GCPCCD from also advertising those positions. Mr. Nelson stated there are minimum job posting requirements that must be met by the County; however, the GCPCCD Board could always do more. Dr. Ganz stated, *“The GCPCCD Board has passed a generic policy saying the employees will adhere to the employee handbook, or rules and regulations of their employer, which would cover the Pima employees; then the group that are Gila County employees would be required to follow the Gila County Merit System rules and regulations. So there is a generic policy that states the GCPCCD will respect and adhere to the policies of their contracting partners.”*

- The question was raised as to how a situation would be handled if a problem arose between a Pima County Community College District (hereinafter referred to as PCCCD) employee and a GCPCCD employee. Mr. Besich stated the PCCCD employee would answer to the PCCCD and the GCPCCD employee would answer to the Gila County Personnel Department. Chairman Sanchez stated that under this IGA, that would be covered under Gila County policies.
- Mr. Nelson stated that under the Human Resource Services section, one issue remains unresolved in the MOU which is that the ultimate authority for hiring and salary remains with the Gila County BOS. If there was a disagreement between the Boards, the Gila County BOS would prevail. Mr. Nelson stated that the hiring and salary decisions for employees should be made by the GCPCCD Board because he believes it is their responsibility; however, he could not find a way to make this work, so the only way he can see to alleviate that situation would be a 90-day-out clause. Mr. Nelson cited an example of the GCPCCD Board wanting to hire a particular person and the Gila County BOS not wanting to hire that person. In that instance, the

IGA or MOU could possibly be cancelled in 90 days. Vice-Chairman Christensen suggested that perhaps the IGA could state that after a certain number of days, an outsider arbitrator would be contracted to make that decision. Mr. Nelson stated he didn't think it would need to go that far and things could be resolved, but in the event the issue couldn't be resolved the Gila County BOS would have the ultimate authority because the GCPCCD elected to include its employees under Gila County's insurance plans. Mr. Besich stated: *"If the two Boards try to dream up every situation that potentially could happen you would have a document that is 900 pages long and so cumbersome. I hope that everybody is going into this, if we go into it, with some level of mutual trust. John (Nelson) is right, until the Board takes an action on a payroll authorization, nothing happens in finance, payroll or anywhere, and the Gila County BOS is the ultimate authority and there is no way to abdicate that."* Supervisor Salas stated that he felt in an IGA partnership, the Boards could work out issues.

Dr. Ganz then read Section B, Items 1 through 9, of her draft which pertains to Facilities and Maintenance, as follows:

B. Facilities and Maintenance

- 1. GC will retain the title to all facilities at the Payson and Gila Pueblo campuses.**
- 2. GC will waive any rental fees or the use of the campus facilities.**
- 3. GC will provide all of the liability, fire and casualty insurance on the property and buildings in the same manner and amounts as for other county facilities.**
- 4. Classes held off of either campus will be maintained under the insurance of GC in the same manner and amounts as for other County activity held outside of County facilities.**
- 5. GCPCCD will provide funds for custodial, landscape, and maintenance staff who will be supervised by a GCPCCD administrator. GC will**

provide senior staff members in an advisory capacity on an as-needed basis.

- 6. GCPCCD will provide basic equipment and supplies for routine custodial, landscape, and maintenance tasks. GC may provide large equipment items and may charge a usage fee to GCPCCD.**
- 7. Modifications to any of the facilities amounting to less than \$1,000 may be approved by the President of GCPCCD. Modifications of more than \$1,000 or any substantive modification must have a recommendation of the GCPCCD Board of Governors and be forwarded to the GC Administrator for approval.**
- 8. GCPCCD will provide access to automotive maintenance services and fuel at GC maintenance sites. Expenses will be charged back to GCPCCD.**
- 9. GC reserves the right to inspect County facilities at any time for compliance with life and safety building codes and issues.**

Concerns were raised with regard to Section B, as follows:

- After a brief discussion, it was agreed that item 8 should be changed to read, as follows: **“GC (changed from GCPCCD) will provide access to automotive maintenance services and fuel at GC maintenance sites. Expenses will be charged back to GCPCCD.”**
- It was also agreed that item 7 should be changed to read, as follows: **“Modifications to any of the facilities amounting to less than \$1,000 may be approved by the President of GCPCCD. Modifications of more than \$1,000 or any substantive modification must have a recommendation of the GCPCCD Board of Governors and be forwarded to the Gila County Manager, and if over \$25,000 to the GC Board of Supervisors for approval.”**
- The question was asked about the \$25,000 limit and Mr. Besich stated that the limit for competitive bidding is set by State law. David Patterson stated that the statutes changed about three months ago increasing the competitive

bidding for purchases greater than \$25,000 to greater than \$35,000. Gila County's purchasing policy was revised to reflect that change.

- Chairman Sanchez asked where the operating expenses, such as the payment of utilities, were covered in the agreement and if it needed to be spelled out in the agreement. Mr. Nelson stated the payment of utilities would be normal operating expenses and would be covered in the section "Financial Services."
- Dr. Kettner asked in reference to item 5: *"Could the County help out GCPCCD with the expenditure limit by putting certain employees on the County payroll and not having it count against the GCPCCD expenditure limit? Gila County owns the buildings, and if Gila County employed the custodians and they were not on the college payroll, you could make a very logical argument for that with any auditor and it wouldn't look like we're trying to shift things around to make the books come out right, so I'm just throwing that out for consideration."* Mr. Besich stated, *"I am not sure that is possible because the college tax levy money is specifically earmarked for the college and it would have to go to the GCPCCD, and whether you're paying Gila County or someone privately it would still apply against GCPCCD's expenditure limitation."* Mr. Nelson advised that there is \$250,000 in out-of-county tuition savings from last year and \$250,000 for this year that could be used to pay for the maintenance staff. He further advised that the college could build the A.D.A. (Americans with Disabilities Act) bathrooms from capital outlay which is exempt from expenditure limitations. Mr. Nelson stated that this option would work temporarily. Melvin Van Vorst questioned if it wouldn't be the other way around because Gila County is the owner of the property. Mr. Nelson stated that because of the expenditure limitation, the college is only allowed to expend so much money per FTSE (full time student equivalent). He advised that number has been arbitrarily set by the Legislature and has been set very low. Mr. Van Vorst questioned whether the use of capital outlay to fix the bathrooms to be A.D.A. compliant would make more sense if paid out of the

\$250,000 out-of-county tuition savings rather than for routine custodial funds. Mr. Nelson replied that without expenditure limitations he would agree. Mr. Besich stated that the cost of renovations would be much lower than the custodial payroll.

- Jorge Noriega asked whether the Globe campus is A.D.A. accessible. Dr. Ganz stated that an audit was conducted which outlined specific areas that needed to be changed, and the restroom was one of the areas remaining to be completed. She advised that for the most part, the campus is A.D.A. accessible.

Dr. Ganz then read Section C, Items 1 through 7, of her draft which pertained to Financial Services.

C. Financial Services

- 1. GC will provide specific financial services to GCPCCD. These services include the use of a Gila County credit card, payments of expenditures, and real time information on budget, assets, and liabilities. Payments will be made in a timely manner in respect to the payment deadline of each transaction.**
- 2. GC will provide information and advice concerning, but not limited to, tax levy, tax rate, property valuation, and the expenditure limitation.**
- 3. GC will provide GCPCCD personnel with appropriate levels of security clearance to access the college's online financial information and reporting system, as well as the ability to print reports at a campus location. GCPCCD will provide the reporting formats necessary to comply with the Arizona Auditor General's Community College Reporting Guide.**
- 4. GC will allow access to GCPCCD financial information to individuals with appropriate levels of security clearance.**
- 5. GCPCCD will adhere to all policies and standard practices and utilize the forms approved by GC.**

- 6. Appropriate GCPCCD staff will receive training in the use of the GC financial information system.**
- 7. GCPCCD will pay to GC an administrative fee of ten percent of the total of all expenditures made on behalf of the College excluding all payments to the community college district providing the primary educational services.**

One concern raised with regard to Section C is as follows:

- Mr. Van Vorst questioned if item 7 referred only to the Pima Community College and not Maricopa Community Colleges where GCPCCD utilizes Maricopa's Nursing Program. Dr. Ganz stated that this clause could be any partner and the word "primary" could be deleted to now read as follows:
"GCPCCD will pay to GC an administrative fee of ten percent of the total of all expenditures made on behalf of the College excluding all payments to the community college district providing the educational services."

Mr. Besich called on David Patterson to explain how the County's new accounting software program currently being implemented will benefit the GCPCCD Board. Mr. Patterson advised that the new system will be web accessible, in real time, to allow the pullout of information. He advised that the problem with the old system was that once new information was input, the latter information would disappear. The new system has the ability to sort information by report, by date, or specific periods. Mr. Besich stated that because the GCPCCD will eventually have multiple funding sources, GCPCCD employees will be able to work with Mr. Patterson to set up those sources and monitor them. Mr. Patterson said the new program is Solomon, is supported by Microsoft, and will be password protected, so the GCPCCD campuses can also perform data input. The expected launch date will be January 1, 2005. Mr. Nelson stated that Mr. Patterson will need direction from the GCPCCD Board on who is authorized to make payments and up to what amount, so he can put his controls in place.

Dr. Ganz then read Section D, Items 1 through 3, of her draft which pertained to Mutual Understandings.

D. Mutual Understandings

- 1. The term of this agreement is November 1, 2004, to June 30, 2007.**
- 2. This agreement may be amended. Mutually agreeable amendments will be recorded in writing within three (3) months of the conversation creating the amendments and signed by both parties.**
- 3. Either party may terminate its participation with ninety days' written notice to the other party. If/When the agreement is terminated, the financial and human resource records will be copied for GPCDD.**

Mr. Besich stated that after the contract language is "cleaned up", and changed to an Amendment to the IGA, it should be sent to the County Attorney for approval as to form. The Amendment will be signed first by the GPCDD Board, forwarded to the Gila County BOS for approval and then it will be recorded.

Concerns raised with regard to Section D are as follows:

- Mr. Ashford addressed the Amendment to the IGA, as follows: *"Seeing it will be amendable and either party can terminate it within 90 days, I think it might be beneficial to have it for a longer term from 2004 to 2012 so we don't have to come back and readdress this."* Mr. Besich advised that it could be run through 2009 because the law sunsets in 2009. It was agreed by both Boards to change the contract term of Item 1 from June 30, 2007, to June 30, 2009, as follows: **1. The term of this agreement is November 1, 2004, to June 30, 2009.** That completed the overview of the draft. Supervisor Salas stated that he hoped the ultimate goal is to get the GPCDD Board and the college "standing on its own two feet" to ultimately take full responsibility for running the college. He stated, *"If that is not the ultimate goal, you have another agency running it for you, which was not the intention when the Board, which was set up from five districts, was formed."* Mr. Van Vorst stated that

at this time it is a goal; however, the goal is not realistic as the costs for the GCPCCD would be astronomical without County assistance.

- Mr. Noriega asked whether the BOS is the ultimate authority. Mr. Nelson stated that the GCPCCD Board has its own powers. **(A copy of the Draft of the Memorandum of Understanding is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' office.)**

In addressing agenda item 4, Dr. Ganz passed out a two-page summary of Feasibility Study Options to be explored for the future of the GCPCCD. Dr. Kettner stated that the GCPCCD began by looking at requirements for becoming a fully-accredited college by North Central standards, but the GCPCCD Board realizes that GCPCCD is not ready for that level of a study, so they are proposing a much simpler feasibility study and would like input from the Gila County BOS. Dr. Kettner read through the Feasibility Study Options, as follows:

Part I: Using data from other Arizona community college districts to estimate costs of Gila County Provisional Community College District becoming an organized and accredited district.

A. Develop a spreadsheet that illustrates 2003-2004 expenditures for each of the organized districts in Arizona (plus Gila County) in the areas of:

- 1. Instruction**
- 2. Student Services**
- 3. Instructional Support**
- 4. Institutional Support**
- 5. Maintenance, Facilities, Land, and Property**

B. Develop a spreadsheet that illustrates 2003-2004 figures for each of the organized districts in Arizona (plus Gila County) in the areas of:

- 1. Head Count**
- 2. Full Time Equivalent Students (FTSE)**
- 3. County Population By Decade (18-19; 20-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60 and over)**

- 4. Tax Levy**
- 5. Tax Valuation**
- 6. Tax Rate**

C. Using the above figures, calculate what would be required for Gila County to be an organized and accredited community college district in terms of:

- 1. Costs of Instruction**
- 2. Costs for Student Services**
- 3. Cost of Instructional Support**
- 4. Cost of Institutional Support**
- 5. Maintenance, Facilities, Land and Property**
- 6. Head Count**
- 7. Full Time Equivalent Students (FTSE)**
- 8. Tax Levy**
- 9. Tax Valuation**
- 10. Tax Rate**

D. Project the potential growth of students in terms of head count and FTSE over the next 5 and 10-year periods for the following:

- 1. Payson Campus**
- 2. Gila Pueblo Campus**
- 3. San Carlos Campus**

E. Calculate sources and amounts of revenue necessary for Gila Community College to function as an independent district:

- 1. State Aid**
- 2. Local Tax Revenues**
- 3. Tuition**
- 4. Other Sources**

Much of the other information identified above should be available from the Auditor General's office, from Arizona Taxpayers Association, and from census data.

Dr. Kettner stated that Part I is intended to focus on what it would take for the GCPCCD to become a full-fledged community college district and in order to take a realistic look at that option, it would require using data available from the sources as noted above. Mr. Besich corrected one item in the sources noted that states as follows: **“Much of the other information identified above should be available from the Auditor General’s office, from Arizona Taxpayers Association, and from census data.”** **“Arizona Taxpayers Association”** should read **“Arizona Tax Research Association.”** Mr. Martinez stated that in order for the GCPCCD to become a full-fledged community college, Arizona needs some legislation that would allow that to happen. He also mentioned other considerations such as the cost per FTSE, a reliable good source of revenue for the college, and qualifications of the staff, etc. Mr. Besich stated: *“The thing that I think we really have to never lose sight of is we are what we are and I don’t think we’re big enough alone to be a stand-alone, one-county community college district. Unless I’m missing something we need to be a partner with somebody...”* Dr. Kettner stated that he would like these items answered in the feasibility study so the GCPCCD Board could answer questions before trying to do anything politically because it is unknown whether this effort is in Gila County’s best interest at this time. He further stated that perhaps a partnership with another county is more realistic. Dr. Kettner advised that the GCPCCD Board believes that data should be made available to the community outlining the reasons for not supporting a full-fledged community college. Mr. Noriega questioned if Gila County is losing or gaining in population. Mr. Nelson stated that the population is increasing and projections for the next fifty years are for continued growth. Vice-Chairman Christensen asked in what age group Gila County is growing, retirement age or younger people? Mr. Nelson replied that the population is growing by 2.5% to 3% every year. Mr. Nelson further stated, *“Arizona’s post-secondary education is going to change, and when that change occurs we better have that information available to know how we want to fit in that change and whether we want to be a full-fledged, stand-alone*

community college.” Mr. Besich stated that the next 28 months will be critical with the upcoming election in finding who supports education and who doesn’t. Vice-Chairman Christensen stated: “The U of A (University of Arizona) did a study for Gila County which showed alarming numbers. It showed that 45% of the people surveyed in Maricopa County would rather live somewhere else and will look to rural Arizona, which will affect the educational system, the transportation system, and whether we have the resources to accommodate that kind of a movement. With Gila County sitting here with 97% involved with land, its going to be a big question as to how the government will look at this particular mix of private and land that now exists, because the land exchange programs have been very much curtailed under previous administrations, and whether they open that back up again to some extent to try to accommodate this shift, because there will be a lot of political pressure, with in the next 5-10 years, on the government to spread this population some way out to make this work.”

Chairman Sanchez stated that it seems a consensus, with no action being taken, shows that this outline would be the way to continue. Dr. Kettner then continued reading the items under Part II of the Feasibility Study Options, as follows:

Part II: Benefits and disadvantages of various models of partnership from the perspective of the partners and others affected.

A. Through interviews and other means, identify the pros and cons in terms of the quality of the academic experience, operating the institution, financial considerations and political considerations of each of the four (4) models currently operating in the state, and of other possible models known to North Central that may exist in other states:

- 1. The Apache/Navajo Model – Navajo County manages all funds, allocates all resources and essentially runs the institution for both counties.**

- 2. The Cochise/Santa Cruz Model – Cochise County will attempt to determine the cost of services to Santa Cruz and will charge them what it costs to provide each service.**
- 3. The Pima/Gila Model – Gila County prepares a request for proposals and is free to contract for services with the bidder that most closely meets the needs of Gila County.**
- 4. The Yuma/La Paz Model – Two counties make up a single district, presumably with both having equal rights, authority and responsibilities for managing the district.**

B. Based on findings, make a recommendation as to what model appears to the researchers to be in the best interests of Gila County, given the information uncovered in the overall study.

Dr. Kettner stated that if a partnership is the way to go, then the question is to partner with which County? He stated it might make more sense to look at a model of a partnership. A consultant hired by GCPCCD could set up interviews at all of the campuses listed to get pros and cons so the GCPCCD Board could study the recommendations given by the consultant. Dr. Kettner stated that in conversations with North Central, it was found that partnerships between counties are becoming very common. Mr. Besich stated that in the end, the State may be involved and have an option, so that is why it is important to conduct the study and have the information available which outlines options that are not good for Gila County. Mr. Noriega inquired as to who the GCPCCD Board would hire to conduct this massive feasibility study. Mr. Besich stated that there are many firms that could conduct the feasibility study. Mr. Martinez stated that what happens at the Legislature will also have a big influence. Vice-Chairman Christensen stated that the Legislature is going to have to look at the roles of community colleges and how the colleges are funded for rural Arizona. Mr. Besich stated that 67% of the population of Arizona is in Maricopa County. Dr. Kettner stated, *“The Legislature has made the decision about who they are going to hire as a consultant to study the community college*

system, but GCPCCD is really the only provisional community college district which makes our County very unique, so it will be very easy for this whole study to take place, without even considering Gila County.” Dr. Kettner stated that Dr. Ganz will be contacting Representatives Bill Konopnicki and Jake Flake, and Senator Jack Brown to ensure that Gila County’s issues are addressed in the feasibility study. He further stated that Dr. Ganz personally knows and will contact the lady who will be doing the consulting for the State. **(A copy of the Feasibility Study Options is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors’ office.)**

In addressing agenda item 5 which is a review of the Governing Board actions for the GCPCCD Regular Meeting of September 9, 2004, Dr. Ganz stated that a couple of issues discussed are as follows: 1) an administrator at Gila Pueblo and San Carlos campuses is needed to take the leadership role, so a position will be opening for a Campus Dean. The position job description is listed in a handout; 2) three options for a Wellness Center for Southern Gila County are listed on another handout. Dr. Ganz stated that the equipment that was purchased for the original Wellness Center is not available, so three options were presented with approximate costs, as follows: A) purchase new equipment at \$80,000, hire staff at \$17,000, and purchase a facility with the cost to be determined with a possible modular lease or lease/purchase; B) rent the Jungle Gym Fitness Center for a fixed rate for a maximum number of students; C) charge a fixed rate of \$15.00 per month which would go directly to the Jungle Gym Fitness Center; however, their charge is \$15.00 per month for senior citizens so the fee for people of other ages is presently unknown. Dr. Ganz stated that options B and C were not supported by the GCPCCD Board. For option A, a facility is the big issue, but suggestions have been made about utilizing a modular building at the Globe campus either through a lease or lease/purchase. These options have not been looked at by the Board at this time. Dr. Ganz stated that on the other hand as a public entity, there should be a concern about not competing with local businesses. She stated that the

services provided should be educational and different. Mr. Besich and Mr. Ashford stated they feel the GCPCCD Board needs to look at programs on the campus that will draw people to the campus. Mr. Martinez stated that back in the 1980s when colleges opened fitness centers, the population at the campuses increased. Chairman Sanchez asked if the Payson Wellness Center on the Payson campus is well-equipped. Dr. Ganz stated that it is well equipped. Mr. Ashford stated that the Center should be referred to as a wellness center, not a gym or fitness center. Dr. Ganz stated she is looking at options for citizens 60 years of age or above, in cooperation with the academic contract provider, taking classes at perhaps a reduced tuition; however, she stated that option is not ready to be presented at this time. **(A copy of the Campus Dean Job Description and the Wellness Center Information is permanently on file in the Board of Supervisors' office.)**

Under agenda item 6, in reference to other issues of mutual concern, Dr. Ganz stated she had some issues regarding cost of living increases in salary for employees who had reached the cap in their pay grade, but Bryan Chambers stopped the conversation and stated that since that item is not specifically listed on the agenda, the Boards would not be able to discuss that item.

It was agreed that the next meeting with both Boards would be scheduled as needed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Ronald Christensen, Acting Chairman

ATTEST:

John F. Nelson, County Manager/Clerk