

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

Date: March 10, 2015

MICHAEL A. PASTOR
Chairman

MARIAN E. SHEPPARD
Clerk of the Board

TOMMIE C. MARTIN
Vice-Chairman

By: Laurie J. Kline
Deputy Clerk

JOHN D. MARCANTI
Member

Gila County Courthouse
Globe, Arizona

PRESENT: Michael A. Pastor, Chairman; Tommie C. Martin, Vice-Chairman (via ITV); John D. Marcanti, Member; Don E. McDaniel, Jr., County Manager; Bryan B. Chambers, Deputy County Attorney/Civil Bureau Chief; Marian E. Sheppard, Clerk of the Board; and Laurie J. Kline, Deputy Clerk.

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. Margie Chapman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item 2 – REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

A. Information/Discussion regarding Community Development Division programs.

Don McDaniel, County Manager, stated that a few weeks ago Supervisor Marcanti suggested that it would be beneficial to the Board of Supervisors, citizens and members of the press if County divisions/departments periodically presented an update on their division's/departments' activities. As follow-up on that suggestion, Mr. McDaniel advised that today's agenda items are an update on the Community Development Division and the Health and Emergency Services Division.

Bob Gould, Community Development Division Director, stated that in 2005, LL Decker & Associates, Inc. was hired as a consultant to review the services provided by the Community Development Division with the major focus on the Building Permitting Department. Some of the issues identified as a result of the study included delays in obtaining permits, confusing plan review and permitting process, poor communication between County staff and applicants requesting permits, and unrealistic customer expectations. Changes were

made and a One-Stop Shop Program was implemented to enhance the overall review process and to make it easier for customers. Mr. Gould provided a brief overview of the Division Update Report and he advised that staff would provide more detailed information.

Jake Garrett, Environmental Engineering Manager, provided an overview of the responsibilities of the Wastewater Department. He stated that Wastewater Department staff often act as a referee with regard to customer complaints and resolving issues. He advised that the LL Decker study includes 3 major changes that were made for the purpose of centralizing the review and permitting process (One-Stop Shop Program). The Wastewater Department assumed the responsibilities for plan review and inspection for private septic systems and permitting for new wells in 2006. The Department now consists of 2½ employees. The Department assumed the responsibilities for initial review for compliance with floodplain regulations in 2006. One additional employee was added to assist the Public Works Division with review for floodplain safety in 2006. The Code Enforcement Program was expanded in 2006, which resulted in 3 employees operating under this Program. The County implemented the contracted position of Code Enforcement Hearing Officer to hear cases for violations of various County ordinances. Mr. Garrett advised that the Department increased its fees for wastewater. Chairman Pastor inquired if there were complaints with regard to the fees increase to which Mr. Garrett stated that there have been none.

Scott Buzan, Chief Building Official, provided information regarding services provided to citizens, his recent professional development activities, and upcoming departmental projects.

Margie Chapman, Code Enforcement Supervisor, advised that the Code Enforcement Program began in 2006. As this was a newly introduced concept, she stated that the Board was more lenient on code enforcement during the first couple years of the program. On September 9, 2008, the Board adopted a Clean and Lien Ordinance. The ordinance allowed the County to clean up a property when a property owner refused. The costs to clean the property plus fines were then assessed to the property owner. When the ordinance was adopted, the Code Enforcement Department was given a budget of \$50K to enforce the ordinance, and a hearing officer was hired to hear appeals. Ms. Chapman advised that the Code Enforcement Program operated successfully between 2008 through 2012 because most property owners who were in violation of the ordinance were taking the ordinance seriously and were cleaning up their properties. The County used the \$50K to clean up those properties for those individuals that didn't comply with the ordinance. It was believed that the \$50K was established as a separate account that could be used to clean up properties and that any collected fines were also deposited into that account; however, it was later learned that all of the money was deposited into the County's General Fund so there currently isn't available

money to clean up the properties. Ms. Chapman advised that there were fewer cases of non-compliance in years past than there are at present because there are people that just ignore the warnings to clean up their properties. She expressed concern in not having the ability to enforce the Clean and Lien Ordinance due to a lack of funds.

Vice-Chairman Martin stated that at the inception of the program it was funded with \$50K and she didn't realize the funds collected from fines were not going back into the Code Enforcement Program, but are being deposited into the County's General Fund. She added that in order to maintain the integrity of the program, the fines collected from code violations should be rolled back into the program.

Chairman Pastor stated that Supervisorial District II is in "bad shape" and he hopes that by hiring, Hearing Officer Don Voakes, the Clean and Lien Ordinance will be enforced to the fullest extent. He also agreed that the fines collected from code violations should be rolled back into the program and that he would discuss this matter with the Finance Director and the County Manager.

Supervisor Marcanti inquired as to the distinction of the code violations. Ms. Chapman, Mr. Garrett, and Mr. Gould discussed with the Board the various types of violation issues. Mr. Garrett stated that the Division receives \$1K from notice of transfer fees and that may be earmarked as a septic replacement fund that can be used by citizens and repaid.

Jon Cornell, KQSS Radio, inquired if there is a mechanism in place to address abandoned homes in unincorporated areas of the County. Chairman Pastor stated that when he sees unsightly areas, he reports them to the Division to investigate for code violations. Mr. Cornell added that he is aware of contractors that would like to purchase abandoned buildings in the County to clean up.

Ms. Chapman stated that there are circumstances in which there is nothing the County can do to clean up a property because the land is owned by the State of Arizona and there are liens against several of those properties.

Don Voakes, Code Enforcement Hearing Officer, provided a brief history of his professional experience. He expressed his support of the Board and his commitment to enforce the ordinance. Mr. Voakes also commented that he, too, has observed homes in the County that are a hazard to the community. The Board agreed to put forth a concerted effort to enforce the Clean and Lien Ordinance.

Vice-Chairman Martin offered one last comment regarding building permitting requirements and she questioned the reason a taxing authority, such as a fire

district, would be required to obtain a building permit from another taxing authority (Gila County) for a building expansion. She suggested that the Board should hold a discussion on this topic in the near future, to which the other Board members agreed.

B. Information/Discussion regarding the potential purchase of a Mass Notifications Suite using the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Emergency Management Performance Grants Program 50/50 match funds that will be used by the Health and Emergency Services Division.

Michael O'Driscoll, Health and Emergency Services Division Director, stated that communication is a challenge in Gila County, especially during an emergency. The results of a survey conducted in 2013, show that 60% of people who own a cell phone in the U.S., own a smart phone. During a response, the County does not have the resources to make personal phone calls, so the County needs a product that ties all modes of communication together. Based on research conducted by the Health and Emergency Services Division, the recommended solution would be to purchase the Everbridge Mass Notification system. Mr. O'Driscoll provided a slide presentation entitled Everbridge, Solutions for Critical Communications and the highlights are as follows:

Everbridge was founded in 2002, and it serves over 2,000 clients; has 9 global data centers; manages 50 million contacts; and employs over 250 people. The County would be able to utilize the Everbridge system to send notifications to Gila County residents in the event of an emergency and during internal network failure.

Everbridge was instrumental in the following two examples:

Hurricane Sandy: Massive Scale

- 25.686 broadcasts/ 8.5 million messages
- 5.9 million people contacted
- 8 seconds median time to launch

Boston Marathon Attack: Dynamic & Tactical

- Boston, Waltham, Watertown, the MBTA, Boston Public Library, business, universities and hospitals used Everbridge to:
- Coordinate emergency response
- Orchestrate the manhunt
- Announce service suspensions
- Staff nurses and doctors
- Check on employee safety
- Broadcast shelter in place

Mr. O'Driscoll added that Everbridge is third in line following the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigations with the ability to send messages via the Federal Communications Commission. Chairman Pastor stated that considering all of the methods of communication available, he inquired, "What exactly does Everbridge do differently?" He also asked if the Everbridge system would be compatible with the County's communication system, to which Mr. O'Driscoll replied that Everbridge coordinates all of the communication systems into one response system.

Josh Beck, Emergency Management/Public Health Emergency Preparedness Manager, added that research was conducted prior to choosing Everbridge to try to ensure that the company was credible and had foreseeable longevity to manage the County's data.

Mr. O'Driscoll resumed reviewing the slide presentation and he highlighted some of the clients and different uses of the applications of the Everbridge system. He also stated that the Everbridge system can be used by all of the first responders and fire districts in the County that choose to participate. A communications committee was formed which includes staff from the Information Technology Department, Sheriff's Office, and Public Works Division. Monthly meetings have been held to discuss issues which include the implementation of the Everbridge system as a viable option for consideration by the Board of Supervisors. The data management was then explained by Mr. O'Driscoll and Mr. Beck.

Jon Cornell of KQSS radio inquired if the Everbridge system ties into the Emergency Alert System (EAS). Mr. O'Driscoll stated that any member of the community could participate in this notification system. Mr. Cornell asked if the data could be converted to radio format, to which Mr. Beck replied that it is a completely different system and can't be converted to radio format. Mr. Cornell asked how the system would work if there wasn't cell phone service or electricity. Mr. O'Driscoll replied that the Health and Emergency Services Division has a separate network system for emergency operation plans which has its own separate Internet system from the County's network system, and which is connected to a generator. Mr. Cornell asked for clarification as to how emergency communications would be conveyed to citizens who don't opt into the Everbridge system. Mr. Beck explained that the type of emergency would dictate the method of delivery of the communication; in some cases citizens would get the information if opted into the Everbridge system or not. Mr. Beck also stated that the data could be obtained using reverse 9-1-1 or public records. Mr. Cornell asked if there are any violations of privacy issues associated with this technology. Mr. O'Driscoll replied that Gila County residents could volunteer to participate in the provision of personal data for the purpose of emergency notifications. If electricity, Internet or telephone service went out, this particular system would not be effective to communicate in the local area; however, there are hand-held radios, ham radio (amateur radio

operator) and other communication methods for emergency communication to the residents.

Shelly McPherson, Human Resources Director & Risk Management, added that if residents are using a land line and do not have a wireless telephone, the land line “will not go down.” Telephone companies are mandated by the Federal Communications Commission to have generators in the central offices so that service is almost always operational to provide emergency communication. If there is a dedicated land line plugged directly into the land line wiring in the wall outlet, it can be reached by a satellite phone.

Don Voakes, Code Enforcement Program Hearing Officer, inquired if implementing the Everbridge system would adversely affect fire department radios, to which Mr. O’Driscoll replied that it would not affect the fire department radios at all.

Vice-Chairman Martin inquired as to the type of message that may be delivered using the Everbridge system. Mr. O’Driscoll replied that the County can decide upon the type of template to use in order to and either send a text message, voice message, or a voice to text message, or all three at the same time. She then asked if the County could host this service to fire departments, towns, etc., and, if so, the associated cost.

Mr. Beck explained that the Everbridge system is Internet based; therefore, the County would not need to have this system on the County server. However, the County can get as many groups with administrative privileges as necessary with Everbridge in order to accommodate fire departments, police departments and as many citizens of the County as possible. Vice-Chairman Martin asked if it would be more costly to have more administrative groups. Mr. Beck replied that the cost of the Everbridge system is based on population and it would not cost more to have more administrative groups. She then inquired what constitutes delivery confirmation. Mr. Beck explained that just as in the state emergency messages, it is required that the reader scrolls through the message and check something that indicates that the message has been received and the Everbridge system does require a response. The Everbridge system reporting has the ability to track if the message was picked up, how long the message was read, and that the message was confirmed.

Vice-Chairman Martin asked for the cost of the Everbridge system. Mr. O’Driscoll requested that this information be provided at the end of the presentation, and she agreed to allow him to finish the presentation prior to disclosing the cost.

Mr. O’Driscoll stated that the Everbridge system allows for the dissemination of messages in three to four clicks of a mouse. Templates can be set up in preparation for fire or flood season which would then make it possible for a

message to be sent in 5 to 10 seconds and it would reach entire communities; thereby, the County could be prepared for emergencies that have historically happened as well as new threats that come into the County. He added that the Everbridge system is very easy to manage. By using this system, messages can be sent to entire communities or individual neighborhoods. Another feature beneficial to the County is that it doesn't use a lot of bandwidth because it is Internet based. Mr. Beck added that it would be beneficial to use Everbridge because customer support is available 24/7.

Mr. O'Driscoll stated that the system would be easy to implement as representatives from Everbridge would assist with the setup; there are also over 90 online training courses available. He stated that the Everbridge company will offer a discount of 10% if all counties in the Eastern Region participate, which include Gila, Pinal, Graham, and Greenlee Counties. The cost to Gila County would be approximately \$17,000 to \$18,000 per year. Pinal County's cost would be approximately \$70,000 per year because the cost is based on population. He stated that the Emergency Performance 50/50 match grant could be used to save 50% of Gila County's cost of approximately \$9,000.

Vice-Chairman Martin believes that purchasing the Everbridge system would be a good investment for the County if the price includes all of the aforementioned features and she is glad the proposal includes all of the County partners; she added that she hopes that nothing was missed in the planning of the project. Mr. O'Driscoll affirmed that the information presented today would be included in the price as stated above and added that the County's regional partners are on board with moving to the Everbridge system. Mr. Beck then stated that Navajo County has a request for proposal submitted to Everbridge as well.

Vice-Chairman Martin asked if implementing this system would require additional staff, to which Mr. O'Driscoll replied that it would not.

Supervisor Marcanti stated that last year the surrounding towns had issues with the 9-1-1 dispatch information being incorrect, and he inquired if the Everbridge system could assist with this communication. Mr. O'Driscoll deferred to the Sheriff's Office staff. Mike Johnson, Undersheriff, replied that he thought it would be a benefit to the Sheriff's Office to be able to utilize the Everbridge system to assist with taking and sending pictures as well as the transfer of information to the Sheriff's Office Dispatch center. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired if additional staff would be needed in the Sheriff's Office Dispatch center. Mr. O'Driscoll replied that he would take that inquiry to the communication committee. He advised that, thus far, only the Pine-Strawberry Fire Chief has expressed interest in using the Everbridge system.

Chairman Pastor stated that the presentation was good and he would speak with Mr. McDaniel regarding discussing it further on an upcoming Board

meeting agenda. He inquired as to the length of time Mr. O'Driscoll would need in order to present additional information to the Board. Mr. O'Driscoll replied that he is still working to get the other counties on board with the system, so it may take two or three months to prepare a formal presentation to the Board for consideration.

Supervisor Marcanti inquired if all the fire departments, cities, and towns are required to sign up with the Everbridge system or can they be under the County? Mr. O'Driscoll replied that it depends on their usage and the Emergency Management Department would send out messages, regardless if the individual entities are on board or not.

Vice-Chairman Martin inquired if the school districts would be included in the mass notification system. She added that across the board, the residents of the County are constituents regardless of where they are located and it shouldn't be a factor in deciding whether or not to proceed with this conversation. She stated, "It is a marvelous service at a very small price." Mr. O'Driscoll confirmed that the school districts would be included in the notification system.

Each of the Board members expressed that it was a good presentation. Chairman Pastor thanked Mr. O'Driscoll and Mr. Beck for the presentation.

Item 3 – CALL TO THE PUBLIC: Call to the Public is held for public benefit to allow individuals to address the Board of Supervisors on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. Board members may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to Arizona Revised Statute §38-431.01(H), at the conclusion of an open call to the public, individual members of the Board of Supervisors may respond to criticism made by those who have addressed the Board, may ask staff to review a matter or may ask that a matter be put on a future agenda for further discussion and decision at a future date.

There were no comments from the public.

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

Each Board member presented information on current events. The County Manager had no comments at this time.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Supervisors,
Chairman Pastor adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

APPROVED:



Michael A. Pastor, Chairman

ATTEST:



Marian Sheppard, Clerk of the Board