

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE COCHISE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORK SESSION HELD ON
Tuesday, April 13, 2015 at 11:00 a.m.**

A Work Session of the Cochise County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, April 13, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. in the Executive Conference Room, at 1415 Melody Lane, Building G, Bisbee, AZ 85603.

Present: Patrick G. Call, Chairman; Ann English, Vice-Chairman; Richard R. Searle, Supervisor
Staff Michael J. Ortega, County Administrator; Jim Vlahovich, Deputy County Administrator;
Present: Karen Riggs, Highway & Floodplain Director; Gussie Motter, Deputy Clerk of the Board

Chairman Call called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Board of Supervisors

1. Discuss changes to the proposed amendment to the Public/Private Partnership Program.

After calling the meeting to order and introducing the subject of the Work Session, proposed amendments to the Public/Private Partnership Program (PPP), Chairman Call turned the meeting over to Karen Riggs, Highway and Floodplain Director.

Ms. Riggs reminded the Supervisors that she had been before them in September 2014 with proposed revisions and that they had requested some clarification and revisions. She then outlined the changes for the Supervisor.

- The entire road project must be part of the County Maintained Road System.
- Defined applicant's contribution for "cost of materials" to include base materials.
- Increased the application fee from \$100 to \$200 (to provide Brief Initial Analysis)
- Defined that substantial property owner support is a simple majority.
- Added BOS annual review to determine if a proposed PPP project should proceed.
- Added that a project may be reduced in scope due to exceeding statute (Title 34) monetary limitation.
- Added that the applicant may withdraw from the program if a project is postponed to a subsequent BOS annual review or a project is reduced in scope due to exceeding statute monetary limitation.
- Revised language to make the policy easier to read.

Ms. Riggs also presented a flow chart that explained the PPP process and offered to answer specific questions or go over the entire process point by point.

Vice-Chairman English noted that the flow chart is a good way to give the public a visual instead of just words.

Chairman Call pointed to the 30 day time limit in the first diamond of the flow chart and suggested that the number of days be increased to 90. He then asked Ms. Riggs for today's cost to improve a road from dirt to paved.

Ms. Riggs estimated that the cost would be about \$140,000 per mile.

Chairman Call then asked what the cost to the neighborhood in a PPP would be.

Ms. Riggs explained that currently, on a residential road with no drainage issues, the applicant would pay about one third of the cost and the County two thirds. Should there be drainage problems, the applicant would pay about one half. And for a road with heavy trucks, the applicant would pay over one half. Ms. Riggs went on to say that under this proposed policy, the Board has the option to look for other funds, such as the discretionary money each Supervisor has for his or her district. She did caution that she did not see the Highway Department being able to take on any new projects for another five years because of budgetary constraints.

Mr. Ortega interjected that staff would also include long term maintenance costs when making a recommendation regarding any PPP project.

There was a discussion regarding the expense of initially chip sealing a road versus grading a road several times a year. Ms. Riggs indicated that it was definitely more expensive to pave a road. She added that a road should be resealed every seven to eight years but now, due to budget difficulties, the department has had to stretch out the maintenance for as long ten years. If the maintenance is stretched too far, the department must go back to the base and reconstruct, which ends up costing more than the initial paving. She questioned why the County has the PPP program if the department can not afford to keep up with it.

Chairman Call asked why we would take the applicant's money if we could not guarantee that the County could maintain the road, adding that it was unfair to go back after 7 years and say, sorry, this is going back to dirt.

There was discussion about the need to look at the Highway System in its entirety to gauge the importance of a PPP project to the entire County. Each Supervisor had different thoughts on the proposed changes to the PPP plan or if the PPP plan should even be offered right now. It was finally decided that Ms. Riggs would get together with Supervisor Searle to incorporate his suggestions.

Mr. Vlahovich suggested incorporating language into the policy that clearly stated that some roads may have to go back to being dirt.

It was decided that Ms. Riggs would meet with Supervisor Searle and bring the policy back to the Board for a vote.

Chairman Call adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

APPROVED:

Patrick G. Call, Chairman

ATTEST:

Gussie Motter, Deputy Clerk of the Board

"PUBLIC PROGRAMS, PERSONAL SERVICE"