PROCEEDINGS OF THE COCHISE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COMMUNITY OUTREACH MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2011 AT 4:00 P.M.
Sunsites Community (Senior) Center
1216 E. Treasure Road, at the corner of Treasure Road and Ford Street, Pearce, Arizona

Chairman Call called the Community Outreach Meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 4:02 p.m. All three supervisors were present: Pat Call, Chairman; Ann English, Vice-Chairman; Richard Searle, Supervisor. Also attending were Mike Ortega, County Administrator; Jim Vlahovich, Deputy County Administrator; Britt Hanson, Chief Deputy County Attorney; Terry Bannon, Deputy County Attorney; Tom Schelling, Elections Director; Patricia Viverto, Special Districts Coordinator and Katie Howard, Clerk of the Board.

Chairman Call opened the meeting, explaining that Supervisor Searle had suggested holding the meeting in Sunsites; he then introduced the Board members and staff. He then laid the ground rules for the meeting, asking everyone to be respectful of all speakers.

CONSENT
Board of Supervisors

1. Approve an application for temporary Extension of Premises liquor license submitted by Mr. Stephen B. Woolf for Mescal Bar & Grill located at 70 N. Cherokee Trail in Benson for the dates listed on the application.
2. Approve the appointments of the following persons as Precinct Committee persons for the Republican Party of Cochise County: Precinct #51 SV Ramsey, Steven Cory Campbell; #32 St. David, Kathleen (Katie) Miller; #37 SV Carmelita, Peggy K. Haines and Iris Lynch.

Finance

3. Approve demands and budget amendments for operating transfers.

Vice-Chairman English made a motion to approve the Consent agenda, items 1-2; seconded by Supervisor Searle and approved 3-0.

PRESENTATION
Elections & Special Districts

4. Presentation by Tom Schelling, Director of Elections & Special Districts, to provide background information regarding the formation requirements and the Impact Statement filed by the group proposing the formation of the Sunsites Park Maintenance District.

Mr. Schelling reviewed a PowerPoint presentation for the Board. Today's presentation, he said would review the formation procedures for a community parks maintenance district; review of the Impact Statement filed by organizers of the proposed district; include a Public Hearing and a determination by the Board of Supervisors. He reviewed the statutes governing the formation of the proposed district: Arizona Revised Statutes, Chapter 1, Article 10; A.R.S. § 48-261 (formation procedures); Arizona Revised Statutes, Chapter 8 Article 1 and A.R.S. § 48-1201 to 48-1214, which provide more detail about Community Parks Maintenance District. He then reviewed each of the requirements in A.R.S. § 48-261 which is a citizen-driven process, and stated that upon filing of an Impact Statement a date is set for a

public hearing on the Impact Statement; written notice of public hearing is mailed to all property owners and each household with a registered voter; Notice of Hearing posted in three conspicuous public places and published twice in a daily newspaper of general circulation in the area), and stated that the Clerk of the Board had complied with all of these requirements.

The Impact Statement, Mr. Schelling said, was filed with the Clerk of the Board on January 3, 2011 and the organizers also posted a bond of $2,000 to offset the costs of formation (mailing and publication of notices, etc.) as required by statute. An amended Impact Statement was filed on February 25, 2011, with additional information. Mr. Schelling reviewed the number of Notices returned to the Board office and the efforts undertaken to locate better addresses and re-send.

Mr. Schelling then reviewed a map showing the proposed boundaries of the proposed district and stated the assessed valuation of the properties in the proposed district are valued at $8,892,927 plus Centrally Valued Properties (amount not yet available from the Arizona Department of Revenue). He further explained that, based on information provided by organizers in the Impact Statement, the estimated change in property taxes is not more than 1.12% of the secondary assessed valuation of the properties. He added that the organizers estimated, in the Impact Statement, an average tax increase per year, based on proposed $100,000 budget: Land Parcel - $49.80 per year ($4.15 monthly); Residence - $104.32 per year ($8.69 monthly); Commercial - $250.42 per year ($20.87 monthly).

Mr. Schelling then reviewed the benefits of the proposed district, as listed in the Impact Statement by the organizers:

- Shadow Mountain Golf, Recreation and Events Center (GREC) and it's amenities have been the core strength and primary economic engine for Sunsites since inception
- Will shore up property values
- Need for homes and properties to remain economically strong depends upon preserving the Golf Course and it's park-like effect on the community
- Attractiveness, quaintness and appeal of Sunsites to residents, visitors and future home owners inherently tied to golf course
- Municipal Corporation will enable all property owners to equally share in the benefits and responsibilities that come with the conscientious care of community
- Status allows for more funding (grants and awards) from federal, state and county
- Entire community will determine its own future through governing board elections
- Formation of proposed district prevents future tax increases due to loss of property values
- Lease or ownership of GREC property will transfer to the Sunsites Parks Maintenance District

Then he reviewed the injuries from the formation of the proposed district (again as listed in the Impact Statement):

- Increase in property taxes
  - Per A.R.S. § 48-1210
    - Limited to 18% of the current appraised market value of proposed district
- Per A.R.S. § 48-1201
  - Taxes limited to only maintenance cost, not capital improvements

Mr. Schelling described the organizing board of the proposed district, listing those named in the Impact Statement to be appointed to the organizing board by the Board of Supervisors, if the district is formed:

- Lynn Christensen
- Linda Gorton
- Tim Heine
- Jyme Stoner
- Gary Brauchla

He also pointed out that the organizing board members are also named in the petition to form the district.

Mr. Schelling stated that this is a Public Hearing today and those in attendance would hear people speaking both for and against the proposed district. He stated that after the Notices were sent out, letters from property owners were sent to the Board. To-date, he said, 63 property owners have sent letters in favor; 18 of them own multiple properties. In addition, 90 property owners sent letters opposing the district; of those, 28 own multiple properties. He showed a map with the locations of those opposing and in favor of the proposed district.

He said the Board must determine whether the formation of the district meets public health, safety, necessity, convenience or welfare and whether the Impact Statement is sufficient. If the Board so determines, they must then approve the Impact Statement and authorize Petitioners to begin gathering signatures for the formation of the district. He outlined the signature requirements: one-half of the property owners of the proposed district; the signatures of persons owning collectively at least one-half of the assessed valuation of properties within the proposed district. Per A.R.S. 48-1206, the signature of one-half of the registered voters residing within the district is also required. He pointed out that this last requirement, for registered voters, is in conflict with A.R.S. 48-261 because of an amendment to 48-261, eliminating the registered voter requirement, in the summer of 2010. Since the statutes are in conflict, he said, the County is recommending to the organizing board that they also obtain the signatures of registered voters.

Mr. Schelling then outlined the issues in the statute and items not fully disclosed in the Impact Statement:

- Petition signature requirement conflict in statutes, acceptable to County for organizers to go forward with the requirements in 48-261 for property owners and assessed valuation. If organizers choose to do so, may collect signatures of a majority of registered voters and that is the County's recommendation.
- Per current lease agreement signed in 2008, lessees are responsible for property taxes from date of lease.
- Currently seven parcels comprising the golf course are delinquent and in back tax status in the amount of $105,984.51 as of February 23, 2011 and the terms of the lease state that the organizers are responsible for taxes from 2008 forward. He stated that the 2009 taxes had been paid but that the organizers are responsible for 2008 and 2010 taxes, in the amount of $60,198.61. He pointed out that the budget in the Impact Statement does not have provision for payment of back taxes and that special districts do not pay property taxes
- Insolvency of golf course owner and Judgment against owner

Mr. Schelling emphasized that, per statutes, the County does not provide legal representation to any special districts, except for Fire Districts.

In summary, Mr. Schelling said before making a determination today, the Board must determine if the Impact Statement meets the basic requirements of A.R.S. § 48-261. At the Public Hearing, if the Board of Supervisors determines the creation of the district will promote public health, comfort, convenience, necessity or welfare of the community, then the Board will accept the Impact Statement and authorize the organizers of the proposed district to begin to collect signatures on the Petitions.

Supervisor English asked about the sufficiency of the Impact Statement and whether it included a five-year budget or provisions for capital improvements; Mr. Schelling responded "no", that this was one of the deficiencies of the Impact Statement.

Chairman Call asked Mr. Britt Hanson, Chief Deputy County Attorney, to provide a legal overview and review what the action was before the Board and what the Board could, and could not do. Mr. Hanson said there were a couple of things: One is to make sure everyone is on the same page as to what the Board action is tonight; the second thing is that we received a lot of letters from opponents raising legal issues that we will address at the outset before the Public Hearing. Mr. Hanson stated that the Board is not here tonight to decide whether the district should be formed but to decide whether the Impact Statement is sufficient. Ultimately, whether the district is formed is a very democratic process that is premised on the idea that people have the information to make an informed decision—that's what the Impact Statement is about. It is a document that provides people the information to decide whether to sign a Petition or not. The Board needs to determine whether the legal requirements of the Impact Statement have been met. Mr. Schelling has touched on some of the things the organizers have done and some of the things that are deficient in the Impact Statement. The Board tonight can decide that other information is relevant to the Impact Statement and should be included; the Board can approve, deny or request amendment to the Impact Statement. The Board determines the sufficiency of the Impact Statement and also whether the public health, welfare or safety is met by forming the district. This is a very broad requirement, Mr. Hanson said. This does not mean the Board is saying the district should be formed.

Mr. Hanson next turned to address the legal issues raised by opponents. The first issue is that statute says you can only form district if there is an existing community park. The existing community park, in this case, would be the golf course. What the legislature intended is that there be an existing facility—the second point is that the community park district cannot exceed 160 acres and must be dedicated by a city, town, county or private entity for unrestricted public use. The proposed district does meet that definition.

The second issue pointed out by opponents is that there are deed restrictions on the golf course that require the golf course remain in use as a golf course. That does not mean it cannot be used as a community park.

The third issue raised has to do with net assessed valuation of the property within the district. There is a statutory requirement that the budget amount of the district shall not exceed 18% of the appraised market value of the community park area of the district. The question was whether that includes all the property within the proposed district boundaries, or just the golf course itself—and it would be just the golf course.

The fourth issue raised was whether the money raised by the district if it is formed could be used to pay the back taxes and yes, it could be considered an operating expense. He added that he was not saying that this was the intent of the organizers, but that the expense would be allowable.

Mr. Hanson continued, saying the next question, which Mr. Schelling pointed out, was whether the district needed to be approved ultimately by registered owners or by a percentage of property owners. The statutes conflict. The legislature changed one statute within the last couple of years to give the ability to approve, or not approve a special district, in the hands of the property owners and not in the hands of registered voters. However, they did not change the second statute. We believe the legislature's intent was to put this in the hands of property owners, and not registered voters. We have advised the organizers that to allow for every possibility, they are advised to get signatures from both property owners and registered voters. Mr. Hanson pointed out that they are not required to do so, but in the event of a legal challenge, it would be better to have signatures from both groups. That, he said, is up to them; we are not requiring them to do so.

Another issue deals with the ability to pay taxes owed and other questions relating to the financial viability of the proposed district. The Impact Statement should disclose this information to those being asked to sign Petitions so they can make an informed decision for a thumbs-up for the district, or a thumbs-down; the only question before the Board tonight on this issue is whether the relevant financial information is in the Impact Statement.

Mr. Hanson addressed two other things: One is that the LLC that owns the golf course and signed the lease has had its charter revoked in Nevada. It is no secret that the people who own the golf course are in financial difficulty. That requirement, that a charter be obtained from the state and kept current, is in place to prevent corporations from profiting when they haven't met legal requirements. They are not in place to prove authority to enter into a lease. In our opinion, this does not affect the ability to form a district or to operate under the terms of the lease.

Mr. Hanson stated that the last thing he wanted to address is that the ultimate duty of the County Attorney's Office is to advise the Board tonight. We have met with the organizers and with opponents but we do not advise them.

Mr. Hanson then reviewed the choices before the Board tonight: One is to accept the Impact Statement and authorize the organizers to begin gathering signatures; a second is to deny the Impact Statement and a third is to require amendments to the Impact Statement.

Supervisor Searle asked two questions of Mr. Hanson: The first is a clarification on the signature requirements. Mr. Schelling presented the recommendation that all three thresholds be met; you said only two are required.

Mr. Hanson responded that he agreed with the recommendation that they gather signatures on all three thresholds, but added that if they come to the Board with signatures of one-half of the property owners and one-half of the assessed valuation, he believes the Board would be legally obligated to approve the formation of the district. If the organizers want to make sure, to avoid possible challenges, they should collect all three.

Supervisor Searle continued: Because there are time requirements for public hearings and meetings, if the Board feels that there need to be amendments to the Impact Statement, to provide additional

information, how much time is there to do that and would we have to have another hearing? Mr. Hanson responded that there was a deadline to hold this hearing, but there was no other deadline. He said it could be tabled for a week, two weeks, a month or two—it is at the discretion of the Board.

Chairman Call called on Lynn Christensen and asked him to address the Board. Mr. Christensen told the Board that the organizers of the district are also the LLC of the golf course and currently operate the golf course. He reviewed the difficult history of the development, financing and operation of the golf course. Plans for a sewer treatment plant fell through and the developers ordered the golf course to be closed. The response of the community was to lease the golf course. Sunsites Community Golf has operated for two-and-a-half years with private donated funds and with hundreds of hours of volunteer labor. It is evident, he said, that the golf course will never be self sustaining. Attracting outside development is doubtful because of the cost of development of a sewer treatment plant, estimated to be approximately $15.0 million. The organizers, he said, filed the Impact Statement to give the citizens a chance to determine whether to form a taxing district. He assured the Board and the public that the statements in the Impact Statement are true and accurate, to the best of their abilities.

He added that based on information received, Cochise Holding L190-2 (holder of the deed to the golf course) is defunct and they will no longer be able to operate. Bingo Investments holds all of Cochise Holding's assets. There are several layers of cross-collateral among the golf course, and it will take years to sort this out. He said the LLC has a valid lease and has two-and-a-half years left on the lease, so the Park Board would have time to arrange for ownership of the golf course.

Regarding the back taxes, Mr. Christensen said the LLC elected to hold off on paying the back taxes until ownership issues are resolved. He described tentative plans for paying that debt.

PUBLIC HEARING

5. Public Hearing regarding the proposed Sunsites Park Maintenance District.

Chairman Call laid out process to be followed and opened the Public Hearing at 4:45 p.m.

Multiple speakers addressed the Board both in favor and opposed to the district. In addition, numerous people chose not to speak; however their names were read aloud as well as their position on the proposed district (in favor/opposed). The names of those who completed Speaker Request Forms are listed at the end of these Minutes.

<u>Proponents of the district argued that:</u>

- Sunsites was conceived and founded as a golf course community – there is no town without the golf course. The golf course is an anchor for the community.
- The golf course needs to be operational to sustain property values and local businesses. The golf course is a financial driver for the community.
- Without the district there will be no golf course; without the golf course, there will be no community
- The golf course has a stabilizing financial effect on the housing in Sunsites
- A functioning golf course could be used to attract younger residents to the area
- The past two years are the best the golf course has seen; would like to support that continued effort via a special district
- Enjoy the environment and the park in Sunsites; would lose the water fowl if golf course closed

- Condition of the golf course will deteriorate if not kept open; will not have a place to walk
- The golf course will be a municipal corporation with taxing powers and condemnation powers

Opponents of the district voiced concerns:

- Whether the organizers had presented sufficient information in the Impact Statement
- An additional tax burden for Sunsites residents, especially those living on a fixed income
- Cannot / should not use a special district to subsidize golfers
- Ownership of the golf course is unclear
- Financial details are vague
- There needs to be a clearer plan
- Whether the golf course exceeds the 160 acre limit for a special district
- Other options have been presented to the organizers and no response has been provided; no indication that those options were seriously considered
- The golf course should be sold to an entity with experience in running a golf course
- Benefit of the golf course to those living further away is minimal
- Unfair to tax those who do not golf
- Upset by friction and divisiveness within the community since this idea was formed; not good for the community
- The deed restriction is a legal document that requires that the golf course be a golf course—this is not the same as a community park with unrestricted public access
- Proponents have not been truthful and have been arrogant
- Golf course does not add much value to the home values
- What effect do home sales have on the proposed district—what impact is there to the district, if formed and a property changes hands
- Suggest downsizing golf course to 9 holes and using remainder of land for a park, to better benefit everyone and to lower operating costs

Chairman Call closed the public hearing at 5:48 p.m. and thanked attendees for their conduct and respect.

Chairman Call then re-stated the various questions that had been raised by attendees and asked staff and the organizers to address them.

The first question was whether the Impact Statement was adequate. Supervisor Searle asked Mr. Hanson if it was his opinion, as the attorney representing the Board of Supervisors, that the Impact Statement is valid. Mr. Hanson responded that the County Attorney's Office had consulted with Mr. Schelling before this meeting and we feel that there are things that should be in the Impact Statement that are not there. We would advise, he said, that the Board should require additional information in the Impact Statement in order to approve it. He pointed out that there is no way to bring this discussion to the Board until you have this kind of hearing.

Chairman Call repeated the question about the 18% limitation for budget purposes. Mr. Schelling explained that this limit was 18% of the value of the community park properties only (the golf course) not of the entire district. He clarified that the 18% of the appraised market value is the budget limit and the appraised value provided by the Assessor is assumed to be the market value. The amended information filed by the organizers, included appraisals and the value was provided with those as $147,671—so we know that the proposed budget of $100,000 is within the 18% limit. He added that

$823,690 is the value provided for the golf course parcels. 18% of that amount is $147,671 and the organizers submitted a budget of $100,000, which is less than 18%. Mr. Christensen stated that organizers used the Arizona $500 per acre + a value for every round of golf played during the year and provided that information to the Assessor. To establish the value, they used the lesser value based on the statutory requirement.

Chairman Call asked Mr. Christensen how big the golf course is. Mr. Christensen stated he was not sure in terms of number of acres.

Chairman Call asked Mr. Hanson regarding the reference to the deed restriction, requiring use as a golf course. Mr. Hanson stated that the use as a community park is within that prescribed use.

Chairman Call recounted the question: how many properties does the County own within this district? Supervisor Searle explained that currently, when property taxes are not paid, the County Treasurer sells tax liens on the property to investors. It is only if those liens are not purchased does the property revert back to the County and the County then auctions those out. It is my understanding that most of those tax liens have been purchased.

Supervisor Searle stated that he did not hear the answer on the acreage. Mr. Schelling stated that in statute, it states that the community park cannot exceed 160 acres. If the entire district is 160 acres or less, then the Board of Supervisors sits as the board for the district. This district exceeds 160 acres and so would have its own board. Mr. Christensen stated that the community park area is approximately 139 acres.

ACTION
Board of Supervisors
6. Consider and approve, amend or deny the District Impact Statement filed to form the Sunsites Park Maintenance District and, if approved, authorize the persons proposing the District to circulate Petitions pursuant to A.R.S. § 48-261.

Chairman Call announced the item and asked Supervisor Searle for comments given that this is in his district. Supervisor Searle stated that he was surprised that the Impact Statement does not meet the requirements because for the past week, he had understood that it did. That will definitely affect my recommendation on what we do tonight. He then asked Mr. Christensen to confirm that if this effort is not successful tonight, the LLC that is currently operating the golf course will close by May 15th? Mr. Christensen confirmed this. He then confirmed with Mr. Hanson that his opinion is that the Impact Statement is not valid and for that reason the Board could deny it, or ask for amendments?

Mr. Hanson responded, saying that the Board could request the organizers to amend it, or you could deny it. Supervisor Searle asked then if the Board could approve it, being that it is invalid? Mr. Hanson stated that they cannot approve the Impact Statement since it is invalid.

Supervisor Searle offered the following comments: My opinion all along is that this decision should be made by the community and not by someone else, because the people that live here are going to be affected by it, one way or the other, whether the golf course survives or not . I think that the process for forming a district is very fair if all three thresholds are met. I think that is the most foolproof way of saying whether this should go forward or not. I propose that we give the organizing board time to amend their Impact Statement to meet the legal requirements. Supervisor Searle continued, saying that

he has lived here since 1971 and Sunsites has always been special and unique because of the trees and green space. Without the golf course, we could save water and costs; but would not be the same community. Think this decision needs to be made by the community.

Vice-Chairman English stated that she came to the public hearing with an open mind. I understand that there are emotions on both sides of this issue. When forming a new district, it is to support health, safety and welfare of the community, and I didn't see that addressed. I know they are trying to address economic issues in the community. After looking at all info before coming to this meeting, I wouldn't have felt good about voting for it. I hope everyone here has learned something tonight and hope the organizers have learned enough to make the necessary revisions to the Impact Statement. I do not feel that the Impact Statement is complete and would have to vote against it tonight.

Chairman Call said that it is his understanding that if the applicant only gets signatures from property owners, the district will go through. The owners control a great deal of those parcels. Supervisor Searle stated that there are three different thresholds and a property owner may own ten lots but they only have one vote on the number of property owners. Those who hold more property would have an advantage for the threshold for assessed valuation. He said they have to have over 50% of the property owners and 50% of assessed valuation to sign. Especially with the 50% requirement of registered voters, it is a very level playing field.

Supervisor Searle commented that there was a lot of effort that went into this meeting tonight and he would really like to make a decision tonight, but we are in a position where we need to give the organizers some time. He then made a motion that the Board give the organizing board two weeks to amend their Impact Statement to meet the legal requirements. Vice-Chairman seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

Chairman Call then clarified with Mr. Hanson what the next steps are. Mr. Hanson stated that the Board would hold another hearing in two weeks just to consider any additions/changes to the Impact Statement.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS

The Board members chose to forego their summary of current events.

There being no further business before the Board, Chairman Call adjourned the meeting at 6:12 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Patrick G. Call, Chairman

ATTEST: _____

Katie A. Howard, Clerk of the Board

LIST OF PERSONS IN FAVOR OF, OR OPPOSED TO THE SUNSITES PARKS MAINTENANCE DISTRICT
(FROM 3/1/11 MEETING)

Persons who wished to address the Board, live in the district and are in favor of the Parks District:

Anita Brownlee
Diane Dunn
Lynn Christensen
Linda Gorso
Norma Sue Griffin
Chick Kishbaugh
Phillip R. McKain
Bret R. Allard
Ray Harrison
Sandra Gustin
Robert L. Gustin
John Cameron
Tom Kelly

Persons who wished to address the Board, but do not live in the district and are in favor of the Parks District:
Robert Fino
Raymond Klumb

Persons who do not wish to address the Board, live in the district and are in favor to the Parks District:
Jane Moore
Glenn Shepherd
Peggy J. Mory
Gary Brauchla
Shirley Shpeherd
Anna M. Nickell
Timothy Heine
Candace I. Roll
Andrea Williams
Ellis Williams
James H. Paterson
Jeannine Paterson
Ardith Crawford
George L. Grassell
Karen K. Grassell
Clinton O. Scott
David Hinbr
Dorothy L. Rogers
Irvan Christy
William Brownlee
Paul Stenholm
Nancy Edmiston
Don Swinney

Margaret Ann Whitsitt
Jerry A. Whitsitt
Perry & Mary Powell
Naaman Nickell
Thomas L. Welsh
Kathy Blackard
Janice Elizabeth Henning
George Kolendosky
Alice Marrice
Diane Kolenosky
Virginia S. Fischer
Melba Heine
Sandra L. Harrison
Tom O'Connor
Sharon O'Connor
Tanya Stiegemeier
Eric Stiegemeier
Deanna Allard
Robert Jergate
jonathan Frederick Williams
Ron Lynde
Virgina Lynde
Deloras V. Rock
Janet Schwiegn
Dorthy Jean Hake
Theodore L. Hake
Edward Jack Molkey
Jacob E. Gessner
Arthur Earl Kincaid
Linda Harper
Lyle Donoven
Edward Koller
Cheryl Schmidt
Kathleen Brauchla
Benny Travis
Judith Smith
William Stacy
Lloyd Barling
James Crramer
Douglas Payne
Roma Payne
John Sawtopadre
George Wolliver
Carolyn Clark
Vaughn Clark
Frank Kievitt
Candi Mayer
Claudette Bennett

Joseph Bennett
karen McKain
Phillip Meredith
Wally Piekarczyk
Christina Piekarczyk

Persons who do not wish to address the Board, live outside the district and are in favor to the Parks District:
Arven Neal Vondy
Carol Maxine Vondy
Ali Ruth Wilcoxson
Jack Weller
Cynthia Weller
Robert Schwieger
David Lloyd
Peggy Brock
Jessica Hernandez
Keith Brock

Persons who wished to address the Board, live in the district and are opposed to the Parks District:
Victoria Thacker
Ray Hooker
Mary Kasten
Gregory D'Angelo
Anne
Larry Dean Leetch
Irene Allaire
Louise Lance
Linda L. Duden
Ellen Clugston
Roger Lance
Gerry Hamner
Alan W. Loy
Donald Lewis Ford
Nancy L. Ford
William W. Duden
Jim Adelman
David Henry Vanderpool

Persons who do not wish to address the Board, live in the district and are opposed to the Parks District:
Robert Rule
Jean Harper Stoltz
Sally A. Newland
Eleanor Stanford
Ronald E. Heilman
Delores Heilman
Duke Spayler
Vriginia Bettis

Walter & Joan Sherman
Robin Cruickshank
William & Marilyn J.
M'Laughlin
Ellen Bush
Donald R. Bush
john T. Carbone
Cynthia Lyn Waldmann
Don & Darlene Burnett
Linda V. Carbone
Dorothy A. Vondenbrink
Alma Vondenbrink
Rudy G. Salas
Edith J. Salas
Connie M. Sherron

Persons who do not wish to address the Board, do not live in the district but own property in said district, and are opposed to the Parks District:
Raymond Ruegg

Persons who do not wish to address the Board, do not live in district and are opposed to the Parks District:
Vicki Small
Duane Small
Veronica Paradee