Board of Supervisors

Richard R. Searle
Chairman
District 3

Patrick G. Call
Vice-Chairman
District 1

Ann English
Supervisor
District 2

Michael J. Ortega
County Administrator

James E. Vlahovich
Deputy County Administrator

Katie A. Howard
Clerk

AGENDA FOR REGULAR BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, January 29, 2013 at 10:00 AM
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HEARING ROOM
1415 MELODY LANE, BUILDING G, BISBEE, AZ 85603

ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA IS OPEN FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

THE ORDER OR DELETION OF ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION AT THE MEETING

ROLL CALL
Members of the Cochise County Board of Supervisors will attend either in person or by telephone, video or internet conferencing.

Note that some attachments may be updated after the agenda is published. This means that some presentation materials displayed at the Board meeting may differ slightly from the attached version.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

This is the time for the public to comment. Members of the Board may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda.

CONSENT

Board of Supervisors

1. Approve the cost savings submission by Jack Holden and present $25 gift cards to Jack Holden, Mike Springer, Dave Estelle, Lee Sipe, and James Montoya as recommended by the Merit Board.

2. Approve the Minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of January 8, 2013.

3. Approve the appointments of the following persons as Precinct Committee persons for the Democratic Party of Cochise County: Precinct #6 BI Warren, Laverne Williams; Precinct #4 BI Bisbee, Rebecca Travis, Vicente Abril, and Carolyn Harris; Precinct #5 BI Don Luis, Tamara Birch; Precinct #13 Sunnyside, Leslie Stimac; Precinct #14 Greater San Pedro, Terry Reeves; Precinct #18 Naco, Richard Harold Corley; Precinct #21 Pomerene, Arthur Eugene Troutner and Maria A. Troutner; Precinct #20 Pirtleville, David Velasco; Precinct #22 Portal, Diane W. Davidson; Precinct #26 SV Avenida del Sol, Robert John Leach and Kenneth Davis; Precinct #28 SV Busby, Patricia A. Hickey; Precinct #31 SV College, Cynthia M. Leach and John F. Leach; Precinct #33 SV Estates, Joy R. Mims; Precinct #36 SV Pueblo del Sol, Roger B. Devries and Mark D. Lobner; Precinct #41 SV Village Meadows, Victor E. Walker; Precinct #43 SV Yaqui, Mark Snyder-Stonebraker.

County Attorney

4. Approve the proposed settlement of the tax appeal in Modestina Frascella v. Cochise County, Tax Case No. ST2012-000232 (Assessor parcel no. 302-07-003), now pending in the Arizona Tax Court, a division of the Superior Court of and for Maricopa County.

Finance

5. Approve demands and budget amendments for operating transfers.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Facilities

6. Present information and hold second of two Public Hearings for Fiscal Year 2013 Community Development Block Grant Application process for Cochise County to receive public input and to identify community needs in Cochise County.

REPORT BY MICHAEL J. ORTEGA, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR -- RECENT AND PENDING COUNTY MATTERS

SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS

Report by District 1 Supervisor, Patrick Call

Report by District 2 Supervisor, Ann English

Report by District 3 Supervisor, Richard Searle

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Cochise County does not, by reason of a disability, exclude from participation in or deny benefits or services, programs or activities or discriminate against any qualified person with a disability. Inquiries regarding compliance with ADA provisions, accessibility or accommodations can be directed to Chris Mullinax, Safety/Loss Control Analyst at (520) 432-9720, FAX (520) 432-9716, TDD (520) 432-8360, 1415 Melody Lane, Building F, Bisbee, Arizona 85603.

Consent 1.

Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting **Board of Supervisors**

Meeting Date: 01/29/2013

Cost Savings Submission Recommendation

Submitted By: Gussie Motter, Board of Supervisors

Department: Board of Supervisors

Presentation: No A/V Presentation

Recommendation:

Document Signatures:

# of ORIGINALS Submitted for Signature:

NAME of PRESENTER: n/a

TITLE of PRESENTER: n/a

Mandated Function?:

Source of Mandate or Basis for Support?:

Information

Agenda Item Text:

Approve the cost savings submission by Jack Holden and present $25 gift cards to Jack Holden, Mike Springer, Dave Estelle, Lee Sipe, and James Montoya as recommended by the Merit Board.

Background:

The Merit Board met on January 9 to consider the cost savings submission by Jack Holden regarding the regionalization of inspectors to reduce travel costs. Mr. Holden credits the efforts of all the inspectors in achieving an estimated cost saving of about $8,707 per year. The Merit Board concurred and recommends that all recieve $25.00 gift cards.

Department's Next Steps (if approved):

Present cards to the Mr. Holden, Mr. Springer, Mr. Estelle, Mr. Sipe and Mr. Montoya.

Impact of NOT Approving/Alternatives:

No award will be given

To BOS Staff: Document Disposition/Follow-Up:

none

Attachments

Cost Savings Submission

COST-SAVINGS SUBMISSION FORM

To: Michael Ortega

Date: 12-13-12

Employee Name: Jack Holden

Department: Building Safety

☐ I do not wish to be publicly recognized if an award is granted for this suggestion.

Cost-Saving Idea & Description:
(Describe Current Process and Proposed Cost-Saving Process)

Regionalization of inspectors to reduce travel.
Inspection reporting method changed to reduce the use of carbon copy reports - $200.00
By the efforts of the inspectors this effort was successful.

If extra space is needed, you may attach one additional page for cost-saving idea and description.

Estimated Cost-Savings: $8707.70/100

Employee Signature: [signature]

(Anonymous submittals are not eligible for cash awards.)

Department Head Signature: Beverly Wilson

Date: 12.24.12

County Administrator/
Deputy County Administrator
Initial Review/Comments

Estimate of Cost -Savings:

Cost to Implement: $0

Detail:
(Estimate of Cost-Savings)

Prepared by:

Date:

County Attorney's Office Review (if applicable):

D OF SUPERVISORS OFFICE ONLY

[ ] unty Administrator)

Priority:

[ ] County Administrator)

Date to Implement:

[ ] es ☐ No

Amount:

Date:

OR PAYROLL OFFICE ONLY

Amount Paid:

Check #:

Jack requests that if there is deemed a $$ award - it should go to the crew Mike Spunger, Dave Estelle, Lee Sepe + James Montoya

RECEIVED
COCHISE COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2012 DEC 26 A 11: 38

ORIGINAL - Finance ONE COPY - Human Resources ONE COPY - Originating Department ONE COPY - Employee

Revised 6/2011

Process to get approval for regionalization

Cost saving Proposal for Building Safety Division May 5, 2011

After the County wide meeting with Mike Ortega presenting budget concerns and the concern over savings I want to propose a method where the Building Safety Division can save money on gas, vehicle use, paper, and provide better service. This proposal would decentralize the inspectors who would work districts that are arranged around their homes. The inspectors would come into the office only once a week and possibly once every other week when the system is working. They would be able to receive their assignments via email or by accessing our web page. They would perform their inspections and provide results via email that would be entered into the permit system without using paper. Inspection results would be both emailed to the builder and a single sheet of paper used at the site if there are items to be corrected. The inspectors would be more available as they would be on the road from 7 to 4:30 and not be required to drive to the office and leave their county vehicles.

This proposal has numerous benefits.

1. County vehicles would be driven less because the travel from the Bisbee location back to the inspection area would be eliminated or reduced. This would save gas and vehicle wear.
2. The inspector would keep his vehicle at a County site close to his home and would gas up during his inspection travel.
3. The use of email to plan and report inspection results would save paper and provide a record that could be pasted into the permit system easily. The cost of the multiple copy reports is very high.
4. The inspectors would spend more time inspecting and less time driving from Bisbee. They could actually do inspections up to 4:30.
5. The inspectors would save money on their own transportation. This would be in effect a raise for them and they understand that. Only one inspector who lives close to the Bisbee office would not benefit greatly.
6. The inspectors will still be connected through their cell phones and email.
7. The inspectors already have the laptop computers but may require more durable ones in the future.

One of the reasons this would work is that the staff right now is made up of people I trust not to abuse the system. They would spend more of their day inspecting and less driving to the office. They understand the benefits of this proposal and would work to ensure its success. The inspectors also understand the need to perform their duties within the work day.

When I discussed this with the inspectors we discussed the issues and we feel the benefit for both the county and the inspectors outweigh any issues. The office staff was quick to point out that this had been tried in the past with offices in Douglas and Sierra Vista with limited success. But I believe that not making the effort to improve will reflect poorly on us and our management of limited resources.

The benchmarks are in place now from our monthly reports. We know the mileage and time spent for inspections and violation investigations. We will see the benefits within the first month of using the new system. If those benefits are not what we expect then we can adjust or go back to the old model.

Individual items have been brought forward by staff and are addressed below. Below are excerpts from emails with specific concerns.

From Jim V:

- How do you propose to adequately supervise the inspectors when they are rarely in the main office? I realize that they are pretty much on their own now but some oversight/accountability needs to be factored in here.

  I would get a copy of all inspection reports and I speak to them by phone. Right now they operate in the field independently and are responsible for their own schedules and routes. We will continue having our once a week meeting and also distribute info via email.

- I would be more comfortable with the inspectors leaving their assigned vehicles as the nearest service center rather than at home. We've had issues in the distant past when we allowed inspectors to take their vehicles home and am not eager to repeat that history.

  The vehicles would be left at a County site. For the inspector living near the center of the county the Elfrida PW site or Fire Dept would provide a parking space and also access to office space. SV area the Foothills Drive office would be their base. In the future we may be able to save more travel by allowing the vehicles to be taken home to a secure area. I trust the current inspectors to respect the proper use of County vehicles.

If these folks are accessing their computers after hours then we would need to compensate them for their hours or make it clear that they can only do work on county time.

We spoke of that issue and I mentioned the issue Mike O spoke about at the County wide info meeting where phone calls were made outside of normal working hours. This is the same type of issue and the inspectors would be limited to working hours for the performance of their duties.

From Rick C:

1. We need an employee (usually an inspector) to take plans and permits on a daily basis to Sierra Vista and other satellite offices as needed. So customers can pick up permits, leave plans or other items.

We can use the courier that already goes to the Foothills office on a daily basis. This was one service we could have used and were not. This alone added miles that were unnecessary. Facilities Department has been contacted about providing this service.

2. We don't have a Zoning Inspector and we have violations, hazards and other code inspections that have to be done normally on a daily basis and the inspectors need the documented material.

We will email the information to the inspectors. We currently take the cover sheet to the site and that can be scanned or simply pasted into an email. The results and photos we take will be emailed back to the office on a daily basis.

3. On commercial permits they need a copy of the commercial permit to do the inspection and the commercial permit packets with the requirements are quite large not normally can not be faxed or scanned.

The plans for commercial projects are at the site. We don't take plans out of the office.

4. If a commercial inspection fails a final inspection a letter would typically be sent out that day or the next. This could not be done until it was entered into New World.

If the inspection fails we leave a note at the site. All reports back to the office will be made daily via email. The results of the inspection can be cut and pasted into the letter to make the process easy for the office staff to formulate their letters. Also inspection sheets would not have to be returned to the office and handwriting interpreted and re-written into the letter.

5. Certificate of Occupancies would need to be done in a timely manner.

I will receive an email from Mike Springer with the CO as an attachment on the same day or next day of the final inspection. I will review and sign the paper CO and give to Dora to process.

6. Inspections and violations will need to be entered in the New World system on a daily basis. I don't believe New World has this capability. It would have to be entered into the system in the office.

The lead inspector will receive a daily report of inspections and enter the information from the SV office. All the inspectors will have the capability to enter the information into New World from their laptop computers when connected to the server.

7. How would the inspection schedule be done?

By email. In fact most communications will be done via email. This will provide written documentation of all activities. Comments contained in emails can be pasted into other documents and into the permit system. Photos will be transmitted in the same manner. We would not need to print out any photos if we have them in electronic format.

8. Stop Work Orders (SWO) documents would need to be received in a timely manner.

They would be done via a phone call and email the same as now.

8. It is my understanding that two inspectors would need offices in the Sierra Vista office. We have approved two employees from the Health Department to have office space in the Sierra Vista office and would not have space for the two inspectors.

The space needs of the health department needs to be reevaluated. We could use the room to lock up our equipment. We will function in the last remaining cubicle if we have to.

There are several other considerations we have discussed. The first is the new system would provide contractors with the same inspector for the majority of their project. In the past contractors have voiced concerns over consistency of inspections and the problems that it causes between inspections. The new system would keep the same inspector for the life of the project with changes only for vacation or illness.

For our Spanish speaking customers we still have the opportunity to send an inspector to the site when necessary. This is a fairly rare occurrence but we can easily adapt to the need.

If an inspector needs help or information we are still connected by cell phone. We can still adapt to emergency inspections and provide good customer service when needed. This program in the long run will reduce miles traveled and we expect it to provide more timely response to customers need because there will always be an inspector in each region.

We still need to verify that we have space in the Sierra Vista office to store our equipment. We also have to get keys to the storage facilities where we plan to keep the vehicles.

We will still continue our weekly meetings where the inspectors receive information and training. These meetings will in the future be reduced to bi-weekly.

I as the administrator will have a clear picture through the inspection reports and the connection through the senior inspector of how the inspections are progressing, the inspectors workloads, and trends in approvals and comments in the reports. This will actually improve this connection compared to the current system.

As a final note I want to give this idea a try and in doing so work out the bugs. There is a clear benefit by saving the cost of travel by establishing regions and we won't know the extent of the benefits until we try. We have an excellent staff that is willing to give this a chance to succeed and provide a fiscal benefit to the County.

Thank you for giving your consideration to this program change.

Jack Holden
Building Official

Jan

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
18		972		$272.16	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
17		850		$263.50	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
11		550		$170.50	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$706.16

Feb

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck: **Driver: Dave Estelle** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
15	810	$226.80

Truck: 196 **Driver: Jim Montoya** *This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
16	800	$248.00

Truck: 169 **Driver: Mike Springer** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
15	750	$232.50

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$707.30

March

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
17		918		$257.04	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
16		800		$248.00	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
17		850		$263.50	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$768.54

April

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
19		1026		$287.28	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
16		800		$248.00	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
17		850		$263.50	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$798.78

May

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck: **Driver: Dave Estelle** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
19	1026	$287.28

Truck: 196 **Driver: Jim Montoya** *This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
19	950	$294.50

Truck: 169 **Driver: Mike Springer** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
18	900	$279.00

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$860.78

June

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck: **Driver: Dave Estelle** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
17	918	$257.04

Truck: 196 **Driver: Jim Montoya** *This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
18	900	$279.00

Truck: 169 **Driver: Mike Springer** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
13	650	$182.00

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$718.04

July

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck: **Driver: Dave Estelle** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
12	648	$181.44

Truck: 196 **Driver: Jim Montoya** *This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
15	750	$232.50

Truck: 169 **Driver: Mike Springer** *This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*

Inspection Days	Miles Saved	Cost Savings
11	550	$154.00

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$567.94

August

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
18		972		$272.16	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
18		900		$279.00	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
6		300		$84.00	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$635.16

September

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
19		1026		$287.28	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
17		850		$263.50	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
14		700		$196.00	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$746.78

October

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
18		972		$272.16	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
14		700		$217.00	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
11		550		$154.00	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$643.16

November

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
17		918		$257.04	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
16		800		$248.00	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
12		600		$168.00	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$673.04

December

Cost Savings Analysis

The following analysis reflects the cost savings earned by stationing inspectors in their respective inspection areas.
Inspections include Building Code Inspections, Zoning Inspections and Violation Inspections.
Cost savings are determined by actual Fleet costs for replacement value and maintenance/fuel costs.

Truck:	Driver: Dave Estelle	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value .*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
14		756		$211.68	

Truck: 196	Driver: Jim Montoya	*This truck based on an **8** cents per mile replacement value and a **23** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
15		750		$232.50	

Truck: 169	Driver: Mike Springer	*This truck based on an **7** cents per mile replacement value and a **21** cents per mile maintenance and fuel value.*			
Inspection Days		**Miles Saved**		**Cost Savings**	
17		850		$238.00	

Total savings of all vehicles used for Building Code/ Zoning and Violation Inspections.

$682.18

$ 8,507 70/100

Motter, Gussie

From: Vlahovich, Jim
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Holden, Jack
Cc: Riggs, Karen; Ortega, Michael; Wilson, Beverly; Rios, Arlethe; Morales, Julie; Motter, Gussie
Subject: RE: Cost-savings Proposal

Jack, the Merit Board has approved your cost-savings proposal and will authorize $25 gift cards to you and the Building Inspectors. Thanks for spearheading this effort. We appreciate your initiative and creativity as well as that of your staff. Please pass along our collective appreciation to them on our behalf.

From: Holden, Jack
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2013 8:00 AM
To: Vlahovich, Jim
Subject: RE: Cost-savings Proposal

Jim, we were discussing the idea at a meeting due to the running around issues that I noticed when I came here. Apparently the inspectors had spoken about this before and Mike Springer stated that he had made a suggestion in the past but it was not developed. When I wrote up the program we had a lot of negative feedback so I wasn't surprised that it never got off the ground before. So I would say it was a collaborative effort with everyone involved and making suggestions and doing the work necessary to schedule the work according to the areas I selected. I believe that no idea is exclusive when a team oriented leader relies on staff to have input in the operations of the department. I hope this helps jack

Jack Holden CBO
Cochise County Building Official
1415 Melody Lane Building E
Bisbee, AZ 85603
520-432-9268

From: Vlahovich, Jim
Sent: Sunday, January 13, 2013 4:04 PM
To: Holden, Jack
Cc: Wilson, Beverly
Subject: Cost-savings Proposal

Jack, the Cost-Savings Merit Board (Mike O, Julie and I) met last week to review your proposal. We had one question for you: was this your idea exclusively or did others assist you in coming up with this? Thanks

James E. Vlahovich
Deputy County Administrator
Cochise County Board of Supervisors
1415 Melody Lane
Bisbee, Arizona
520-432-9200

Consent 2.

Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting **Board of Supervisors**

Meeting Date: 01/29/2013

Minutes

Submitted By: Arlethe Rios, Board of Supervisors

Department: Board of Supervisors

Presentation: No A/V Presentation

Recommendation:

Document Signatures:

# of ORIGINALS Submitted for Signature:

NAME of PRESENTER: n/a

TITLE of PRESENTER: n/a

Mandated Function?:

Source of Mandate or Basis for Support?:

Information

Agenda Item Text:

Approve the Minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of January 8, 2013.

Background:

Minutes

Department's Next Steps (if approved):

Signed minutes routed for processing and posted on the internet.

Impact of NOT Approving/Alternatives:

n/a

To BOS Staff: Document Disposition/Follow-Up:

Send to the Recorder's Office for microfiche purposes.

Consent 3.

Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting **Board of Supervisors**

Meeting Date: 01/29/2013

Democrat Precinct Committee Members

Submitted By: Arlethe Rios, Board of Supervisors

Department: Board of Supervisors

Presentation: No A/V Presentation

Recommendation:

Document Signatures:

# of ORIGINALS Submitted for Signature:

NAME of PRESENTER: n/a

TITLE of PRESENTER: n/a

Mandated Function?:

Source of Mandate or Basis for Support?:

Information

Agenda Item Text:

Approve the appointments of the following persons as Precinct Committee persons for the Democratic Party of Cochise County: Precinct #6 BI Warren, Laverne Williams; Precinct #4 BI Bisbee, Rebecca Travis, Vicente Abril, and Carolyn Harris; Precinct #5 BI Don Luis, Tamara Birch; Precinct #13 Sunnyside, Leslie Stimac; Precinct #14 Greater San Pedro, Terry Reeves; Precinct #18 Naco, Richard Harold Corley; Precinct #21 Pomerene, Arthur Eugene Troutner and Maria A. Troutner; Precinct #20 Pirtleville, David Velasco; Precinct #22 Portal, Diane W. Davidson; Precinct #26 SV Avenida del Sol, Robert John Leach and Kenneth Davis; Precinct #28 SV Busby, Patricia A. Hickey; Precinct #31 SV College, Cynthia M. Leach and John F. Leach; Precinct #33 SV Estates, Joy R. Mims; Precinct #36 SV Pueblo del Sol, Roger B. Devries and Mark D. Lobner; Precinct #41 SV Village Meadows, Victor E. Walker; Precinct #43 SV Yaqui, Mark Snyder-Stonebraker.

Background:

Requested by the Cochise County Democratic Committee and verified as eligible by the County Elections department.

Department's Next Steps (if approved):

Send letters to those approved with copies to Elections and to Cochise County Republican and Democrat Parties.

Impact of NOT Approving/Alternatives:

Vacancies will exist in these positions.

To BOS Staff: Document Disposition/Follow-Up:

Send letters to committee members.

Attachments

Nominees 1

Nominees 2

Enclosure

Cochise County
Democratic Committee
Nominations for Appointment
to Precinct Committee 2013 - 2014

LastName	FirstName	Middle Name	Suffix	PrecinctName	Street No	Street Prefix	StreetName	Street Type	City	Zip5
Corley	Richard	Harold		Naco	3578	S	Quetel	Ave	Naco	85620
Davidson	Diane	W		Portal	1387	W	Piedra Blanca	Ln	Portal	85632
Devries	Roger	B		Sv Pueblo Del Sol	1450		Plaza Miura		Sierra Vista	85635
Hickey	Patricia	A		Sv Busby	71		Witt	Dr	Sierra Vista	85635
Leach	Robert	John		Sv Avenida Del Sol	5477		Mesa Verde	Dr	Sierra Vista	85635
Leach	Cynthia	M		Sv College	4643		Calle Cibola		Sierra Vista	85635
Leach	John	F		Sv College	4643		Calle Cibola		Sierra Vista	85635
Lobner	Mark	D		Sv Pueblo Del Sol	4910	E	Foothills	Dr	Sierra Vista	85635
Mims	Joy	R		Sv Estates	4464		Big Bend	St	Sierra Vista	85650
Travis	Rebecca	S		Bi Bisbee	85		Czar	Ave	Bisbee	85603
Troutner	Arthur	Eugene		Pomerene	6590	N	Cascabel	Rd	Benson	85602
Troutner	Maria	A		Pomerene	6590	N	Cascabel	Rd	Benson	85602
Velasco	David			Pirtleville	25	W	Ash	Ave	Pirtleville	85626
Walker	Victor	E	II	Sv Village Meadows	1708		Camino Rancho		Sierra Vista	85635
Williams	Laverne			Bi Warren	24		Mason Addition	St	Bisbee	85603

RECEIVED JAN 15 2013

OK
MR

1/8/2013

P. Fleming
Chair, Cochise County Democratic Committee

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME LAVERNE WILLIAMS

ADDRESS 24 MASON ADDITION ST

BISBEE AZ 85603

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #06 B1 WARREN

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 7

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 3

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME REBECCA TRAVIS

ADDRESS 85 CZAR AVE

BISBEE AZ 85603

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #04 B1 BISBEE

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 8

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 2

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME RICHARD HAROLD CORLEY

ADDRESS 3578 S. QUETEL AVE

NACO AZ 85620

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #18 NACO

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 4

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 1

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME ARTHUR EUGENE TROUTNER

ADDRESS 6590 N CASCABEL RD

BENSON AZ 85602

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #21 POMERENE

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 3

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 0

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME MARIA A. TROUTNER

ADDRESS 6590 N. CASCABEL RD.

BENSON AZ 85602

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #21 POMERENE

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 3

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS Ø

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-2013 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME DAVID VELASCO

ADDRESS 25 W. ASH AVE

PIRTLEVILLE AZ 85626

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #20 PIRTLEVILLE

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 6

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS Ø

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-2013 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME DIANE W. DAVIDSON

ADDRESS 1387 W. PIEDRA BLANCA LN.
PORTAL AZ 85632

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #22 PORTAL

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 2

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS Ø

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME ROBERT JOHN LEACH

ADDRESS 5477 MESA VERDE DR
SIERRA VISTA AZ 85635

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #26 SV AVENIDA DEL SOL

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 1

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME PATRICIA A. HICKEY

ADDRESS 71 WITT DR

SIERRA VISTA AZ 85635

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #28 SV BUSBY

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 2

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME CYNTHIA M. LEACH

ADDRESS 4643 CALLE CIBOLA

SIERRA VISTA AZ 85635

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #31 SV COLLEGE

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS Ø

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME JOHN F. LEACH

ADDRESS 4643 CALLE CIBOLA
SIERRA VISTA AZ 85635

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #31 SV COLLEGE

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS Ø

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME JOY R. MIMS

ADDRESS 4464 BIG BEND ST
SIERRA VISTA AZ 85650

PARTY _____ PRECINCT #33 SV ESTATES

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS Ø

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME ROGER B. DEVRIES

ADDRESS 1450 PLAZA MIURA
SIERRA VISTA AZ 85635

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #36 SV PUEBLO DEL SOL

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 1

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME MARK D. LOBNER

ADDRESS 4910 E. FOOTHILLS DR.
SIERRA VISTA AZ 85635

PARTY DEM PRECINCT #36 SV PUEBLO DEL SOL

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 1

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME VICTOR E. WALKER II

ADDRESS 1708 CAMINO RANCHO
SIERRA VISTA AZ 85635

PARTY DEM PRECINCT # 41 SV VILLAGE MEADOWS

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED 5

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS 1

APPROVE APPOINTMENT X

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE 1-15-13 BY Martha L. Reynolds

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFICATION FORM

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

PARTY _____ PRECINCT _____

NUMBER OF PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS NEEDED _____

NUMBER OF CURRENT PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSONS _____

APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DO NOT APPROVE APPOINTMENT _____

DATE _____ BY _____

PRECINCT COMMITTEEPERSON VERIFCATION FORM

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	MIDDLE NAME	ADDRESS/PO BOX	PARTY	PRECINCT	# PC NEEDED	CURRENT # OF PC	APPROVE	DO NOT APPROVE	DATE	INITIALS
ABRIL	VICENTE	E	404 C MASON HILL PO BOX 803 BISBEE, AZ 85603	DEM	#04 BI BISBEE	8	2	X		1/16/2013	MKR
HARRIS	CAROLYN		404 C MASON HILL PO BOX 803 BISBEE, AZ 85603	DEM	#04 BI BISBEE	8	2	X		1/16/2013	MKR
BIRCH	TAMARA	R	215 HEREFORD RD P O BOX 1303 BISBEE, AZ 85603	DEM	#05 BI DON LUIS	7	4	X		1/16/2013	MKR
STIMAC	LESLIE	M	1861 E 21st ST DOUGLAS, AZ 85607	DEM	#13 DO SUNNYSIDE	6	1	X		1/16/2013	MKR
REEVES	TERRY	L	6365 S KINO RD HEREFORD, AZ 85615	DEM	#14 GREATER SAN PEDRO	4	0	X		1/16/2013	MKR
DAVIS	KENNETH	R	5404 W LOS CAPANOS DR SIERRA VISTA, AZ 85635	DEM	#26 SV AVENIDA DEL SOL	5	1	X		1/16/2013	MKR
SNYDER-STONEBRAKER	MARK	H	3716 E CHOCTAW DR SIERRA VISTA, AZ 85650	DEM	#43 SV YAQUI	4	3	X		1/16/2013	MKR

Consent 4.

Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting **County Attorney**

Meeting Date: 01/29/2013

Approve proposed settlement of a tax appeal

Submitted By: Sue Blanchard, County Attorney

Department: County Attorney

Presentation:	No A/V Presentation	**Recommendation:**	Approve
Document Signatures:	BOS Signature NOT Required	**# of ORIGINALS Submitted for Signature:**	0
NAME of PRESENTER:	N/A	**TITLE of PRESENTER:**	N/A
Docket Number (If applicable):			
Mandated Function?:	Federal or State Mandate	**Source of Mandate or Basis for Support?:**	

Information

Agenda Item Text:

Approve the proposed settlement of the tax appeal in Modestina Frascella v. Cochise County, Tax Case No. ST2012-000232 (Assessor parcel no. 302-07-003), now pending in the Arizona Tax Court, a division of the Superior Court of and for Maricopa County.

Background:

Taxpayer filed a civil action in Arizona Tax Court asking for a reduction in assessed value from $33,110 to $13,706 for Tax Years 2012 and 2013. The County filed a Motion to Dismiss Tax Year 2012 as being untimely (filed past the deadline) which the Court granted on 20 November 2012. After inspecting the property, reviewing the taxpayer's documentation and other market factors/comparables, the Assessor agrees that the property assessment for Tax Year 2013 should be lowered, and so recommended a settlement offer that lowers the full cash value to $22,000. The taxpayer accepted the settlement offer.

Fiscal Impact & Funding Sources: Not applicable, no funding sources are required. Fiscal impact will be a slight reduction in the tax base.

Department's Next Steps (if approved):

Upon approval by the Board, Counsel for the County will sign a stipulation for entry of Judgment that has already been signed by the taxpayer, and will submit a form of Judgment to the Arizona Tax Court disposing of this matter pursuant to the settlement terms.

Impact of NOT Approving/Alternatives:

Additional litigation for the County, with the risk that the Arizona Tax Court would rule in the taxpayer's favor, reducing the assessed value of the subject property and subjecting the County to paying the Plaintiff's fees and expenses.

To BOS Staff: Document Disposition/Follow-Up:

Advise County Attorney's Office - Civil Division upon Board's approval.

Consent 5.

Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting **Finance**

Meeting Date: 01/29/2013

Demands

Submitted By: Arlethe Rios, Board of Supervisors

Department: Board of Supervisors

Presentation:	No A/V Presentation	**Recommendation:**	
Document Signatures:		**# of ORIGINALS Submitted for Signature:**	
NAME of PRESENTER:	n/a	**TITLE of PRESENTER:**	n/a
Mandated Function?:		**Source of Mandate or Basis for Support?:**	

Information

Agenda Item Text:

Approve demands and budget amendments for operating transfers.

Background:

Auditor-General's requirement for Board of Supervisors to approve.

Department's Next Steps (if approved):

Return to Finance after BOS approval.

Impact of NOT Approving/Alternatives:

Board of Supervisors will not be in compliance with State law.

To BOS Staff: Document Disposition/Follow-Up:

Return to Finance after BOS approval.

Public Hearings 6.
Facilities

Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting

Meeting Date: 01/29/2013

Second FY 2013 CDBG Public Hearing

Submitted By: Lisa Marra, Facilities

Department: Facilities

Presentation:	PowerPoint	**Recommendation:**	Approve
Document Signatures:	BOS Signature NOT Required	**# of ORIGINALS Submitted for Signature:**	0
NAME of PRESENTER:	Lisa M. Marra	**TITLE of PRESENTER:**	Grants Administrator
Mandated Function?:	Federal or State Mandate	**Source of Mandate or Basis for Support?:**	24 CFR 91.115

Docket Number (If applicable):

Information

Agenda Item Text:

Present information and hold second of two Public Hearings for Fiscal Year 2013 Community Development Block Grant Application process for Cochise County to receive public input and to identify community needs in Cochise County.

Background:

Cochise County is expected to receive approximately $170,000 in FY 2013 Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the Arizona Department of Housing Regional Account. The entitlement funds originate through HUD and are distributed to the State with a partnership through SEAGO on a rotating basis every two years. In 2013, Cochise County, City of Bisbee, City of Sierra Vista, and the Town of Huachuca City are anticipated to receive funding. The County may also apply for the next or all future State Special Project (SSP) or Colonias funds should those become available. CDBG and SSP Funds must be used to benefit low-income persons and areas, alleviate slum and blight, or address urgent need. Samples of projects that can use CDBG funds include: Public Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Housing, Public Services, and Economic Development. Due to recent changes in HUD guidelines, it is suggest that one project be funded instead of splitting the funding between projects. Cochise County has a very successful track record of receiving funding and completing projects throughout our community through this grant cycle.

Department's Next Steps (if approved):

Conduct Work Session with BOS in February to discuss public and staff input.
Bring the results of Work Session back to a Regular Board Meeting in February or March to approve and adopt a Resolution in order to complete the grant application.

Impact of NOT Approving/Alternatives:

Required by Federal guidelines to receive funding.

To BOS Staff: Document Disposition/Follow-Up:

Grant Administrator will:

Provide back up material for the BOS.
Have published in several newspapers throughout the County and on County Website.
Send notification for publication to County offices and Public Facilities throughout the County.
Provide PPT presentation for use at this hearing.

Attachments

CDBG Public Information Packet

CDBG Public Notice

Community Development Block Grant
Funding Cycles
For
Cochise County

Public Information Packet

Source of CDBG Funding

- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) ↓
- State Community Development Block Grant Program ↓
- Arizona Department of Housing CDBG Program ↓

Partnership with regional Councils of Governments (COGs):

Southeastern Arizona Government Organization (SEAGO) development a Method of Distribution of CDBG monies for the counties of:

- Cochise
- Graham
- Greenlee
- Santa Cruz

SEAGO sub-region funding rotation:

FY11
Cochise County
City of Bisbee
City of Sierra Vista
Town of Huachuca City

FY12
City of Benson
City of Douglas
City of Tombstone
City of Willcox

CDBG funding amount available to Cochise County in FY13:

Approximately $170,000

Activity must meet one (and only one) of the following three National Objectives:

1. LOW-MODERATE INCOME BENEFIT

Area wide Benefit: Service area is primarily residential (at least 60% of the structures are residential) and at least 51% of the residents are of low to moderate-income. Low to moderate income figures derived from the 2010 Census by HUD and broken down by Census Tracts and Block Groups, which defines the service area (area wide benefit) and proves the area contains at least 51% of low to moderate income persons.

Limited Clientele Benefit: Activity benefits a specific target group, of which 51% consists of one or more:

- Low to moderate Income
- Abused children
- Elderly persons
- Battered spouses
- Homeless persons
- Adults with severe disabilities
- Illiterate persons
- Persons living with AIDS
- Migrant farm workers

2. PREVENTION OR ELIMINATION OF SLUMS OR BLIGHT

An activity that will prevent or eliminate slums or blight in either a specific target area or on a spot basis, which includes code enforcement, commercial rehabilitation, and public facilities improvements. The area must be formally declared a slum and blighted area through formal resolution.

3. URGENT NEED AND HEALTH HAZARD BENEFIT

The activity poses a serious immediate threat to human health and welfare: Factors of determination:

- The activity is located within a disaster area as declared by the President of the United States or the Governor of Arizona, <u>or</u>
- There is a letter signed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Regional Director or the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) Director attesting to the fact that an urgent need or health hazard exists.

Activities Eligible for CDBG Funding:

- Public Works & Safety Activities
- Public & Privately Owned Water System Improvements
- Public & Privately Owned Wastewater System Improvements
- Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Equipment
- Road/Street Improvements
- Parking Facilities
- Flood and Drainage Improvements
- Fire Protection Facilities and Equipment
- Community and Supportive Housing Facilities *(Parks, Libraries, Community Centers, Shelters, Group Homes)*
- Public Service *(Child Care, Health Care, Job Training, Recreation Programs, Services for Senior Citizens, Literacy Training and English-as-a-Second Language)*
- Neighborhood Revitalization and Redevelopment
- Housing
- Job Creation or Retention

CDBG Past Funded Activities and Projects within Cochise County:

- Elfrida Community Center Improvements and Library Development
- ADA Improvements – County Facilities, Old Bisbee High School
- Bowie Clean-Up Program
- Fry Town Site Curb and Drainage Improvements
- ADA Improvements – County Facilities, Douglas
- Lower Huachuca City Capital Improvement Plan
- Emergency Home Repair Program
- Contribution to the City of Bisbee for Revitalization of the Saginaw Area
- Fry Townsite Street Improvements
- Sunsites Senior Center HVAC, Windows/Doors
- Elfrida Community Center Improvements
- Fry Drainage Way Improvements
- Lead Abatement Program
- Wesleyan Preschool Playground Improvements
- Bowie Fire District Emergency Equipment
- Fry Fire Station ADA improvements
- Owner Occupied Emergency Home Repair

PUBLIC NOTICE

Cochise County
Public Hearing Regarding Use of Community Development Block Grant Funds (CDBG)

Cochise County is expected to receive approximately $170,000 in FY 2013 Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the Arizona Department of Housing Regional Account (RA). The County may also apply for the next or all future State Special Project (SSP) or Colonias funds. CDBG and SSP funds must be used to benefit low-income persons and areas, alleviate slum and blight, or address urgent need.

Two public hearings will be held to gather citizen input on the use of CDBG funds. The public hearings will be held on the following dates and times:

Tuesday, January 8, 2013
10:00 a.m.
Board of Supervisors Hearing Room
1415 Melody Lane, Building G
Bisbee, AZ 85603

Tuesday, January 29, 2013
10 a.m.
Board of Supervisors Hearing Room
1415 Melody Lane, Building G
Bisbee, AZ 85603

Samples of projects that can use CDBG funds include:

1. Public Infrastructure (e.g., water, wastewater, street improvements);
2. Community Facilities (e.g., fire and police facilities; senior or homeless facilities);
3. Housing (e.g., owner-occupied or multi-family rehab, utility connections on private property);
4. Public Services (e.g., fair housing services, services for seniors or homeless, lead hazard screening); and
5. Economic Development (e.g., job development or retention)

For more information about the hearing, grievances, the CDBG program, or to receive assistance in formulating prospective project ideas for presentation at the hearing contact the following:

Lisa M. Marra, Grants Administrator
1415 Melody Lane, Bldg C
Bisbee, AZ 85603
Phone: (520) 432-9742 FAX: (520) 432-9758
Email: lmarra@cochise.az.gov

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Cochise County does not, by reason of a disability, exclude from participation in or deny benefits of services, programs, or activities or discriminate against any qualified person with a disability. Inquiries regarding compliance with ADA provisions, accessibility or accommodations can be directed to Chris Mullinax, Safety/Loss Control Analyst at (520) 432-9720, FAC (520) 432-9716, TDD (520) 432-8360, 1415 Melody Lane, Building E, Bisbee, AZ 85603.