

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

Date: August 23, 2011

MICHAEL A. PASTOR
Chairman

JOHN F. NELSON
Clerk of the Board

TOMMIE C. MARTIN
Vice-Chairman

By: Marilyn Brewer
Deputy Clerk

SHIRLEY L. DAWSON
Member

Gila County Courthouse
Globe, Arizona

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

Item 1 – Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance

The Gila County Board of Supervisors met in a work session at 10:00 a.m. this date in the Board of Supervisors hearing room. Sadie Dalton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item 2 - Presentation/Discussion regarding redistricting of Gila County supervisorial and college districts and alternative redistricting maps. The Board may also discuss alternative Arizona state redistricting plans.

Linda Eastlick, Elections Director, stated that this work session would be to review the mapping alternatives provided by the Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC), which was appointed by the Board earlier this year. She advised that also present were Gila County's consultants Tony Sissons, President/Owner of Research Advisory Services, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona, and Bruce Adelson, Attorney at Law/CEO of Federal Contract Compliance in Potomac, Maryland, who have briefed everyone on all issues with which to be concerned as the redistricting plan is finalized. Ms. Eastlick stated that the discussion would begin with the statistics, outcome of the mapping proposals, the Voting Rights Act followed by more detailed information about the maps. Handouts of all the available information were provided to the Board. Mr. Sissons reviewed with the Board the progress made by the RAC up to the current time and noted that on August 15, 2011, the RAC presented 6 maps to the Board for its review, 3 for the supervisorial district and 3 for the community college district submitted by either members of the RAC using an online mapping system or by the public. This work session would be to review

in more detail all of the maps so the Board can eventually make a decision on which of the 6 maps will go forward to the public for public comment. Mr. Sissons then reviewed the supervisorial district plan statistics noting that all 6 plans are within the total population, one person-one vote tolerance. Mr. Sissons stated that the main concern is the ratio balance within each of the districts and he and Mr. Adelson have made some determinations as to the extent of racially polarized voting in various districts. Where they found generally that minority voters have been successful in exercising their electoral responsibilities and have been able to elect candidates of their choice, they have to make sure that the changes made to those districts do not lessen their ability to continue to do so. Mr. Sissons reviewed all of the statistics on a chart entitled "Gila County Supervisorial District Plans," which showed the current supervisorial district ratio proportions that exist in the districts today (noted under the "Current" column) versus the 3 supervisorial maps submitted and noted as "TAT01" (Tonto Apache Tribe map), "KLFSP016" (Kristine Feezor map) and "TJM01" (Tom Moody map). He stated that the current ratio proportions existing today will be the benchmark proportions that the Department of Justice (DOJ) will be looking at when it evaluates the degree of change proposed under the maps that the County adopts. The statistics provided for the Gila County Supervisorial Districts 1, 2 and 3 were for the following areas: Total Plan Population Deviation; Percent Voting-Age Total Minority Residents; Percent Voting-Age Hispanic; and Percent Voting-Age Non-Hispanic Native American. He noted that the shaded items indicate a situation where there appears to be retrogression or a diminishing in the minority proportion so those items were flagged as potential problems. Don McDaniel, County Manager, clarified that the figures under the "Current" column were based on the 2010 census population, not 2000. The next section reviewed from the chart of statistics was entitled "Gila County Community College District Plans" and provided the same information for the 3 community college district maps submitted and noted as "AZBanditCC02" (submitted by e-mail name only), "KLF06B" (Kristine Feezor map) and "TJM06" (Tom Moody map). Supervisor Dawson inquired about what the DOJ would consider as a significant drop. Mr. Sissons replied that it would first depend on the beginning current value and anything below a 20% change would probably not be of concern; however, any changes in the 30%-50% bracket would definitely be a level of concern because at that level minorities are able to certainly affect the outcome of elections to the extent that they can coalesce with other groups to be successful. Then changing a plan to basically drop about 7 percentage points would take it out of the category of being a minority/majority district. Mr. Adelson, who used to work for the DOJ, explained in more detail the problem with the drop in District 3, which currently consists of 2 large minority populations—Native American and Latino—that are determined coalition districts that could support many of the same candidates of choice under the Voting Rights Act. If minorities are able to do that, that ability cannot be weakened, reduced, diminished or altered in any way that changes that ability and a 7% drop would create an immediate red flag with the DOJ. Mr. Adelson

explained the County's burden under federal law. He stated that under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, no voting change including a redistricting plan can be implemented or used without preclearance or approval by the DOJ. Since the County is the jurisdiction that has the burden of submitting the redistricting plan, it has the burden of proving that its plan is non-discriminatory and does not retrogress the rights of minority voters. In the preclearance process the DOJ has 60 days to review a plan and make its determinations and analyses. If the County does not meet that burden, the DOJ will not approve of the plan meaning that the plan has no value under federal law and cannot be implemented. The DOJ will then send a request for additional information, in which the County has 60 days to respond and if it doesn't meet that deadline, the DOJ will reject the plan. The DOJ also has the option to initially give an objection, which means the DOJ has found that the plan violates federal law and cannot be used and another plan will have to be drafted by the County. Mr. Adelson discussed the meaning of retrogression, or reduction. He used the example of Supervisorial District 3 stating that in that district there is no one minority group that has an absolute numeric majority, but is instead a coalition with 2 groups, Latinos and Native Americans, forming a narrow majority, who can elect candidates of choice by coalescing to support many of the same candidates. Once that ability has been established, it cannot be weakened or diminished. A reduction in the proposal by 7 percentage points would be a problematic retrogression under federal law because it would reduce the ability of minorities in that district to elect whomever they want and is prohibited by Section 5. He reiterated that the figures listed under "Current" are the benchmark figures from the last plan precleared by the DOJ and these new mapping figures shown are a comparison to the benchmark figures, which are the numbers that the DOJ will also use. Ms. Eastlick noted that on the community college district statistics in District 5, the percent of total minority residents was increased rather than decreased. Mr. Adelson explained that when the percentage is increased, the technical redistricting language is known as packing, which specifically means that if a district already has a substantial minority population and even more minority voters are added to that district, more than are needed for the minority voters to maintain that ability to elect, it is known as packing minority voters into one district and depriving minority voters in another district the potential to have the ability to elect. Packing a district can create liability issues for the County under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, which is a provision that prohibits the dilution of minority voting strength. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that Ivan Smith, Chairman of the Tonto Apache Tribe, called her this morning and advised that the Tribe had another meeting scheduled so they would be unable to attend today's meeting, but would be available later to answer any questions regarding the map they submitted. Vice-Chairman Martin also stated that she was contacted by a gentleman from Hayden/Winkelman who wants to be formally involved in this process and she is getting the indication that Hayden/Winkelman is in favor of the Tonto Apache Tribe Plan and wondered what the DOJ would think of a plan that is submitted by one minority and is supported by another minority. Mr.

Adelson stated that the DOJ would question why the citizens of Hayden/Winkelman are supporting it and what analysis does the County have to show that minorities in that district can continue to elect whomever they want? Just because people support something anecdotally will not be enough for the DOJ to preclear it. However, that does not satisfy the County's burden under federal law approving that something is retrogressive or not. The DOJ will take that into consideration and do its own investigation and speak to people in those communities, but the County would still have to prove that at 43% the minority voters in that district will not have their ability to elect the candidates reduced, diminished or weakened. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she advised the gentleman from Hayden, who wanted to be included in the redistricting conversation, that the maps would be available for public input in a couple of weeks. Mr. Adelson stated that it would certainly be incumbent upon members of the public to provide their various opinions; however, it is still the County's federal legal non-delegable, non-assignable obligation to provide the DOJ with analyses or support to show that its plan does not violate Section 5. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that the gentleman inquired if the County had absolute proof that the 10 minorities voted together because it was his opinion that the County did not necessarily have that proof. Mr. Adelson replied that coalition voting will not occur for every single election, but if it occurs for 1 or 2 elections or for 1 or 2 candidates where the minority voters in that coalition are successful in electing who they want, then that ability to elect has been established and if that is reduced it becomes retrogressive. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that another inquiry from the gentleman was if the County had proof that they were a coalition vote. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that in reviewing the information, she noted that the language for coalition voting was stronger under a U.S. Supreme Court Judge Sandra Day O'Connor opinion, which was overturned in the ratification of the new Voting Rights Act. Mr. Adelson stated that the case Vice-Chairman Martin was referring to was the Georgia versus Ashcroft Supreme Court decision, which the Congress reversed in 2006. However, in Bartlett versus Strickland, which was the subsequent Supreme Court decision, the Supreme Court did not go into a lot of detail about the Section 2 requirements for coalition districts. He stated that coalition voting is basically where there is a situation where there is no numerical majority of a minority group and there are one or more racial language minorities coalescing to some extent to support some of the same candidates. He explained that this is occurring in Supervisorial District 3 and although it does not occur in every election, it does occur in some. So once minorities have demonstrated an ability to elect, which they have in District 3, Congress has determined that cannot be weakened or reduced.

Upon inquiry by Vice-Chairman Martin if the consultants had made any changes to the map submitted by the Tonto Apache Tribe (Tonto), Mr. Adelson replied that no adjustments had been made to that map; however, some very minor adjustments had been made to the other 2 maps submitted. Ms. Eastlick stated that any adjustments made to the Tonto map would be done

upon instruction by the Board and could possibly be adjusted to meet the DOJ guidelines while still maintaining the initial intention of the proposer. No action was taken by the Board. She stated that the Kristine Feezor map (KLF) was actually a very good compromise of the Tonto map because it did not create the same issues that the Tonto map created. Also the small percentage of decrease in the Tom Moody map could easily be fixed. The Tonto map will require more movement because of that fairly large number of people creating that 7% change. Vice-Chairman Martin again requested that she be provided with an analysis of whether or not there was coalition voting among the minorities as requested by the gentleman from Hayden. Supervisor Dawson inquired if Ms. Eastlick had reviewed the Tonto and Feezor maps with the Tonto Apache Tribe to see if the Feezor map met with what the Tribe was trying to achieve. Ms. Eastlick advised that she had not met with them; however, they had been provided all 6 maps and the statistics and comments on their own map as to the reduction that occurred. She advised that meetings will be held with each of the tribal councils following the Board's adoption of the maps that will go forward for public comment. Ms. Eastlick requested that the Board direct staff as to what it would like done on the maps such as further analysis, if there are other ideas for implementation or answer any further questions so that the Board can actually adopt those maps at its next meeting on September 6, 2011, that will go out for public comment. Mr. Adelson added that it is very important to keep the schedule on track so that the preclearance submission can be made to the DOJ as timely as possible and so that it doesn't interfere with the County's election calendar next year. Chairman Pastor stated that he agreed with Vice-Chairman Martin that the consultants review the Tonto map and make those adjustments that are necessary since minor adjustments were made on the other 2 maps or to make further adjustments to all the maps if necessary. Mr. Sissons added one more comment about the Tonto map and the reasons that no adjustments were made to it. He stated that the resolution received from the Tonto Apache Tribe was very clear that their theory behind the plan was that since they had created a situation where there was sort of no retrogression for the Native Americans in district 3 and no regression for Latinos in District 2, they saw that as being philosophically a non-retrogressive plan. So in discussions with the RAC, they thought it may be unfair for the RAC to direct the consultants to make changes to that map that would move it away from the philosophy that the Tribe wanted basically to test. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that to have the consultants make those changes didn't necessarily mean that the Board would adopt them. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she would like those changes to be made as quickly as possible so they could be taken back through the Tonto Apache Tribe's process and see if they could agree or would like the changes made by the consultants. Chairman Pastor stated that he felt if the maps were going to be released to one group, they should be released to all of the citizens of the County at the same time so everyone would have the same opportunity to review them. Vice-Chairman Martin stated by releasing all maps, there could end up being 4 proposed maps and the 1 map for the Tonto Apache was purely for them to

review the changes made to their own map. Chairman Pastor inquired of Mr. Sissons if the changes to the Tonto Map could be made within the next 2 weeks before the next Board meeting. Mr. Sissons replied that he could make those adjustments, but he also reminded the Board that the adjustments would not be minor with that 7% gap, which would be a lot of people to move around. He noted that the changes made in the other 2 maps were very minor. Chairman Pastor directed Mr. Sissons to make the necessary changes to the map for the Tribe's review or any other changes to all maps and to present all maps for review by the Board at its September 6th meeting. Mr. Sissons then advised the Board that the printed maps passed out were very small and did not show much detail so he had the computer set up to review with the Board all the maps that could be zoomed in for a close detail review of all the neighborhoods where redistricting changes were being made. Before Mr. Sissons began his detailed review, Chairman Pastor opened the meeting to the public for any comments. Jerry Ellison, a Globe radio reporter, questioned to Mr. Adelson, "You start off with assumptions that there's a coalition between the Tonto Apaches and the Latinos in the community, but the request from the Tonto Apaches doesn't that pretty much put the kibosh on that idea?" Mr. Adelson stated that he was not suggesting that there was a coalition between the Tonto Apaches and all of the Latinos in the district. He stated, "The Voting Rights analysis goes to the level of every voting precinct in a district to determine that voting behavior of people in those precincts. There are precincts in District 3 that are heavily Native American and if not plurality then majority Latino. He advised that analyses could be done to determine what candidates those precincts supported and whether or not those candidates were successful. Under federal law, Gila County is required to provide the DOJ with statistical information and other proof that whatever it is you are proposing is nondiscriminatory. If you cannot prove that you are complying with federal law, then you will not have a redistricting plan whether it's whatever plan we're talking about now or whatever plan there is in the future. So this coalition analysis as well as all of the other voting analyses that we've done and that the DOJ will do, goes down to the very core of the County, the voting precincts, to see the behavior of voters in each precinct and in each district. In District 3, we did that analysis to determine whether or not on some, all, a few, a little bit of elections, Latinos and Native Americans joined together to support some of the same candidates who were successful. As I said earlier, it doesn't have to be all the candidates; it doesn't have to be 5 elections or 3 elections. Once that pattern has been established, once that ability has been established, if you reduce that it is illegal under federal law." Mr. Ellison then inquired if the DOJ will solely look at candidate issues or will they look at specific issues that might affect it? Mr. Adelson replied that the DOJ under Section 5 looks at one issue and that is whether minorities in a given district can elect whom they want and is the redistricting plan reducing, weakening or diminishing that ability. If the latter is true, the County would have to explain the reason, and if the explanation does not satisfy the DOJ, they will not approve the County's plan. Mr. Ellison inquired if a political issue itself has ever been used. Mr.

Adelson replied that the DOJ does not look at politics, partisan issues or propositions. Vice-Chairman Martin thanked the consultants for their perspective to ensure the maps are approved by the DOJ and state that it has helped her understand more about the state's redistricting process as well. Mr. Adelson thanked Vice-Chairman Martin for her comments and requested that any written comments she receives from the public be passed on for review and to be made a part of the record that Gila County is compiling to submit to the DOJ. Attorney Steve Titla, a resident of Globe and speaking on behalf of the San Carlos Apache Tribe, inquired if there was a deadline to submit a map from the Tribe as he understood they were already "behind the ball as far as submitting maps." He stated that Ms. Eastlick and staff made a presentation to the Tribe last week, which started them thinking about submitting a map. He also wanted to make a comment about the minority/majority in District 3 and noted that there is not only the Tonto Apache Tribe, but also the San Carlos Apache Tribe and the White Mountain Apache Tribe and if there was a coalition with the Hispanic groups, then they would have an opportunity to get together. He believes that the Hispanics and Apache Tribes are beginning to recognize the strength and value in coalitions, which would be an advantage to both and they need to work together even though their historical relationship has not been the best in the past. Ms. Eastlick advised that the current timeline is that on September 6, 2011, the Board will be selecting the maps that will be going out to the public for further public comments. Ms. Eastlick stated that although the RAC has completed its work, she was sure the Board would be interested if the San Carlos Tribal Council wanted to submit ideas or thoughts; however, "We're getting late in the game to start with a new map. It would put the Board into the position of having to make a decision as to whether that map would be considered as one of those that would go out for public comment. We would really need something very, very shortly in order for there to be time for the consultants to analyze it and in order for there to be time for the Board to even consider it appropriately along with the other maps that have already been considered." Ms. Eastlick noted that she had previously mentioned to Mr. Titla that any maps wanting to be submitted by the San Carlos Apache Tribe should have been done so by last Friday so it could be discussed by the Board at today's meeting. Any timelines beyond that would put everything in a bind with the Board having to make the necessary decisions within its deadlines. Supervisor Dawson stated to Mr. Titla, "The Board has before it 3 really good maps and I would think that the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council could look at these 3 maps and issue support of 1 of those maps expressing why they agree with it. Last Monday when we met, I was under the impression that the Native American tribes throughout the state of Arizona are justifiably concerned about the congressional district maps and those are the ones that I believe we get into some real questions of is there gerrymandering going on. Is there a definite effort to negate the Native American vote or weaken it? So those are the maps that I'm more concerned about as far as the Native Americans being given strength to maintain their voting rights. I think that each one of these County

maps has a strengthening point for Native Americans and so I would think that the Tribal Council could sit down with what we have and show support for a particular one. Maybe there's some minor variation that you, too, would make a suggestion to, but because time-wise as far as County maps go, we need that this week at the very latest." Vice-Chairman Martin agreed with Supervisor Dawson's comments about the legislative and congressional district maps and noted that there is still time to provide maps to the state in that conversation. Mr. Titla thanked Supervisor Dawson for her comments and would relay same to the Tribe. He stated that they would also want to meet with the Tonto Apache Tribe so as to not offend them with any comments because of the many family ties between both tribes. Chairman Pastor thanked Mr. Titla for his comments and stated that if the San Carlos Apache Tribe was going to submit a map, it must be submitted by this Friday and if they wanted to review the other 3 proposed maps and make comments that might be a better resolution to the problem. The Board then moved on to a detailed review by Mr. Sissons of all 6 maps that were submitted for both the supervisorial districts and the Gila County Community College District (GCCCD) reflecting the redistricting changes made. Mr. Sissons began with the Tonto Apache Tribe supervisorial map, which had 2 technical adjustments made because part of reservation in the Christmas precinct was left out and since there is no population in that area, it was simply added so the tribal area would be complete. Also a portion of the Tonto Apache Tribal area was left in District 2 because it could not be seen without zooming in so that was moved back into District 3. Mr. Sissons then reviewed the other 2 supervisorial maps in detail answering questions of the Board about where various splits were made in the precincts. Ms. Eastlick and Sadie Dalton, Recorder, also discussed with the Board about the need to remain on a strict timeline to ensure time for the Recorder's Office to make all the necessary precinct changes for voting purposes for not only the supervisorial and community college districts, but also the Arizona state congressional and legislative districts. Ms. Dalton estimated it would take her office at least 2 months to make those changes. Mr. Sissons moved on to review in detail the 3 maps submitted for the community college district and noted where some of the redistricting changes were made. Mr. Adelson stated that there were fewer Section 5 issues to deal with compared to the supervisorial maps. The biggest issue with the community college district was in District 5 with the packing issue and noted that was one issue the Board may want to discuss as to whether it would want to make more significant changes and move a larger minority voting block or minority voting population to other districts because now would be the opportune time. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that also in conversations with the gentleman from Hayden, he also recommended either map 1 or 2 for the community college district map because it added the Hayden-Winkelman area to the Globe-Miami area as communities of interest. After completion of the review, Chairman Pastor thanked the consultants for their presentation and stated that although the Board would not be taking any action today, he felt that the consultants had been provided direction on what still needed to be done as far as making

mapping adjustments to get everything in line with the DOJ before the Board takes action at its next regular meeting.

Mr. McDaniel requested that the Board hold a brief discussion on the proposed Arizona state legislative and congressional redistricting maps because he was going to be attending a meeting with Eastern Arizona Counties Association regarding same. Ms. Eastlick reviewed with the Board the 2 state legislative district maps circulating throughout Arizona along with some detailed information that was pertinent to the local area, which were received from Shirley Dye; however, it was unknown if these maps had been submitted to the Arizona's IRC (Independent Redistricting Commission). The next set of maps reviewed and being circulated around the state were state congressional district maps with justification notes that came from a man known only as "Don." The third map on congressional districts came from the Pinal County Government Alliance and it included statistics with a proposal. The final set of maps came from the IRC and included both legislative and congressional maps; however, it was Ms. Eastlick's understanding that these maps are not proposals, but rather are being referred to as grid maps because according to IRC's website, the Arizona Constitution mandates that redistricting begin with a grid map to ensure that each IRC starts from scratch. Ms. Eastlick noted that these grid maps reflected only 2 of the 6 criteria that the commissioners are required to consider and did not show that anything had been done in regard to the Voting Rights Act, communities of interest, etc. so these maps are probably not close to being what will be proposed. Mr. Adelson stated that he had made a presentation to the IRC yesterday and discussion was held on the many issues that the IRC is facing. These grids maps are the very early stages of what the IRC is working towards under state law. Mr. Adelson stated that he believes the IRC is very interested in hearing proposals, seeing proposed maps, and is encouraging people and organizations around the state to make proposals. He encouraged the Board to contact the IRC today and inquire about an IRC meeting scheduled for Thursday in Casa Grande, which the Chairman has designated as a meeting to entertain and receive submissions from the public. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she would follow up on the upcoming IRC meeting and would also provide updates on the state's process. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she thought the Board should have a work session to review the legislative district and congressional district proposed maps. Chairman Pastor suggested that the Board wait to get information from Vice-Chairman Martin regarding the IRC meeting and then it could call a special meeting next week to review these maps, which was agreeable to the Board.

At 12:34 p.m., Chairman Pastor called for an hour lunch recess. At 1:37 p.m., he reconvened the work session.

Item 3 – Review and discuss 4 new proposed County-wide policies.

Joe Heatherly, Finance Director, stated that the County is looking at adopting some new policies and revising some of the current policies, which will be placed on the County's website so they are available to all departments as well as the public. This is being done to address some of the issues that have been raised both in past and current audits to ensure that the County is in compliance with the Internal Revenue Service and to establish consistency in the County's policies and procedures. Another reason for the policies will be to establish some levels of authority, identifying specific areas of responsibilities and accountabilities. Mr. Heatherly advised that he, Mr. McDaniel and John Nelson, Deputy County Manager/Clerk, had met with all department heads, elected officials and the Courts and reviewed the policies; however, with the Courts, they are required to follow state jurisdiction, but will try to follow County policies when possible and if not possible, then the Judge has the authority to follow the state guidelines. Mr. Heatherly then briefly reviewed the 4 policies with the Board, which he explained deal with departmental bank accounts, payroll authorizations and 2 policies regarding procedures for contracts and for purchasing. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that in speaking to management, as these policies are implemented to become more efficient, she is concerned that the County becomes more effective. Vice-Chairman stated, "For me it's as important for us to be effective as it is efficient. One thing I've asked as we go through here are ways to measure that because I think that as humans we tend to decide to do something and when we take that action we assume we are right and never look back. I would like for us to assume that we might be wrong and have some measures in place to make sure we are measuring ourselves." She also noted that there were some editing changes needed and reviewed those with Mr. Heatherly. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired if the Board wished to discuss the Board's handing part of its decision-making authority over to management at a level that has not been done in the past. Supervisor Dawson stated, "I feel we are handing responsibility, not authority. Yes, they are responsible for what we direct." Supervisor Dawson also stated that implementation of these policies should help clean up the audit findings each year that she has been harping about for the 7 years that she's been on the Board. She concluded by stating, "I think the Board of Supervisors holds the ultimate authority and responsibility, but we are delegating some of that and holding the right people responsible for doing the right things." Vice-Chairman Martin began a discussion with the Board by requesting that monthly reports be provided to the Board on those items that are being delegated to management that previously were brought to the Board. Chairman Pastor stated that he, too, had made a note to request updates for the Board. Chairman Pastor noted some specific terminology in the new policy that stated that the County Manager "may" make a decision or "may" have the authority to do something, which infers that he "may" do that, but it also infers that he will also report it to the Board. So he would like the policy to state that the Board will be given a routine report. He also reviewed the policy's Section 8 where it states, "If a departmental bank account has not been properly authorized or is being used for purposes deemed inappropriate by the Finance

Director, the County Manager will be notified and corrective action taken.” He requested the addition of “and the Board will be notified,” to that Section 8 as well. Mr. Heatherly stated that initially the intention was to make reports every 2 weeks to the Board, and there was previously wording in the policy to that effect; however, it must have been mistakenly removed. He stated that there will be reporting on the activities regarding contracts that will include a schedule highlighting every contract, the parties involved, a short scope of the work, the contract amount and duration. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that will be good because it will keep the Board informed of what is factual. Mr. Heatherly stated that the new procedures, although he wasn’t sure how they would be measured, will streamline the processes and make the departments more effective. This will also allow the County Manager to take what the Board has approved in the fiscal budget and approve items cutting out a lot of the lengthy timing process of placing items on the agenda. Vice-Chairman Martin recommended that the Board put the policies in place once they are officially adopted and see how they work. Chairman Pastor stated that he’s had some comments made to him “we’re going back to the old system where the County Manager runs everything;” however, he believes there is a team in place that is reviewing everything for the Board and they are doing what needs to be done the right way. He stated that as the processes move on, in the end it will benefit the County tremendously. No action was taken by the Board.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Supervisors, Chairman Pastor adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

APPROVED:



Michael A. Pastor, Chairman

ATTEST:



Marian Sheppard, Chief Deputy Clerk