PROCEEDINGS OF THE COCHISE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORK SESSION HELD ON
Tuesday, July 8, 2014

A work session of the Cochise County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, July 8, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Executive Conference Room, 1415 Melody Lane, Building G, Bisbee, Arizona.

Present:	Patrick G. Call, Chairman; Ann English, Vice-Chairman; Richard R. Searle, Member
Staff Present:	Michael J. Ortega, County Administrator
	Jim Vlahovich, Deputy County Administrator
	Britt W. Hanson, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
	Peter Gardner, Planner I
	Gussie Motter, Deputy Clerk of the Board
Attendees:	Jim Lynch
	Mark Apel

Chairman Call called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.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

Community Development

Discussion and possible direction regarding proposed major update to include revisions and amendments to the Cochise County Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Call opened the meeting and invited Mr. Vlahovich to give an overview of the Cochise County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Vlahovich reminded the Supervisors that a number of years ago the County went through a lengthy process called Envisioning 2020, designed to garner information from the public to update the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has been working on that and is now ready to bring updates forward. There is a mandate from the State to update the Comprehensive Plan every ten years but that deadline has been extended until July 2015. Mr. Vlahovich apologized for not introducing Mark Apel and acknowledging his help with the update of the Plan. Before joining the University of Arizona Cooperative Extension, Mr. Apel was the Planning Division Manager for Cochise County and is very well versed in the Comprehensive Plan. H

Mr. Peter Gardner, Planner I, introduced a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Comprehensive Plan, explaining that staff was seeking direction from the Board on the contents of the plan and on the proposed strategy to present the document to the public in an outreach effort. For background information, Mr. Gardner introduced Arizona Revised Statute 11-805. This Statute directs the Board to:

- Adopt a Comprehensive Plan as an official guide for development of areas in the jurisdiction.
- Consult with, advise, and provide opportunity for official comment by public officials and agencies as well as property owners and citizens.
- Confer with other governmental agencies to ensure coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development to provide present and future needs of the County.
- Re-adopt the existing plan or adopt a new plan prior to 7-1-2015.

Staff has used this to update the plan by eliminating regulatory language and completed tasks; incorporating public input gathered through Envisioning 2020; and improving readability through formatting and improved language.
The Envisioning 2020 process was conducted in the 2007 through 2008 timeframe with 13 meetings held throughout the County. The following are what we heard from the Public:

- Changes are expected through loss of agricultural land, water availability, and population growth.
- We want no change to rural character, water availability and rights, protections to the San Pedro River, and dark night skies.
- We hope for improved infrastructure and services, protection of rural character, managed growth, economic development.
- What we fear are unmanaged growth and habitat loss.

There are four new elements proposed to be added to the Comprehensive Plan. The first is renewable energy, a required element due to the county's population. Rural character is another element as is agriculture and ranching. Finally an economic development element will be added. Staff plans to collect public input in several ways, including the County Facebook page, and an online survey. Staff will also hold five public open-house type meetings to explain the changes to the plan and answer any questions attendees may have. The meetings are scheduled from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. The proposed schedule follows:

- July 15th – Bisbee, Board of Supervisors' Lobby
- July 17th – Douglas, Douglas Regional Service Center first floor
- July 22nd – Willcox, City Council Chambers
- July 24th – Benson, Benson Service Center Lobby
- July 29th – Sierra Vista, Foothills Complex, large conference room

Vice-Chairman English suggested that the Comprehensive Plan updates be tied more closely to the County's Strategic Plan. She would like to see an articulation of the effort to form larger parcels rather than smaller ones in the Plan. She would like to see Baseline water inventories included that can be used for comparison purposes. She also pointed out that the Board has allocated money and resources to clean up dump sites and our citizens should know about that. Vice-Chairman English asked how the plan gets used and who does it and to whom does it speak.

Mr. Apel responded to Vice-Chairman English's question noting that the Plan is supposed to be the buttressing of all the decisions made at the Board and Commission levels on down. It should be used by staff when they bring a recommendation to you. He agreed with Vice-Chairman English that the Comprehensive Plan should be tied to the Strategic Plan wherever possible.

The Board was assured that the Comprehensive Plan would come back before them in a work session after the public input meetings. Mr. Apel suggested that the Board and the Commission have a joint work session an hour before the next Commission meeting begins.

Supervisor Searle had some questions regarding specific lines in the Plan. He went to page 5 in Land Use Elements and drew attention to Section f, asking what exactly that meant.

Mr. Vlahovich explained the meaning saying, do not allow a rezoning that will affect the neighbors ability to develop their property but agreed that the statement should be clarified.

Supervisor Searle then went to Section d: Statutory exemptions and non-conforming uses should be permitted to the full extent required by state law, but should be otherwise discouraged through a strict interpretation as to their existence and extent. He stated that he would like to see the "but statement" removed as strict interpretation usually causes problems. He next moved onto Section i, which talks about all proposed land uses involving hazardous materials. Supervisor Searle declared that he agreed with this section in general but that he did not want to make our regulations more onerous than they are now.

Mr. Gardner explained the use of should rather than shall gives more flexibility to the statement. He suggested the wording "if necessary" could be added.

Chairman Call remarked that many of the statements simply reflected the state and federal laws that would come into play anyway.

Supervisor Searle turned his attention to page 9, goal 3 and the policy regarding creative funding mechanisms. He asked why the document would mention impact fees when this Board has voted against them before.

Vice-Chairman English and Chairman Call disagreed noting that this document will cover a ten year span and that it seemed very open ended. There may be another Board that would want to consider impact fees.

Supervisor Searle went to page 16, the endangered species protocol, saying that the language seems to have been softened in this section.

Mr. Apel and Mr. Gardner assured him that the endangered species language is exactly the same as the Plan.

Supervisor Searle called attention to page 17 d, Public Access RS 2477 Roads. He asked if "ii" in that section used the same wording as the last Plan and he was assured that it did.

Supervisor Searle went to page 22, goal 2, about preserving the dark night skies, and remarked that Policy "a" should add lighted after new and before billboards. He also pointed out Policy "e" on the top of page 22, remarking that the County currently has no standards for dirt roads.

He asked for clarification Policy "c" which mentions lots size of one-acre or larger. It was explained that an individual homeowner with a one-acre lot would not be considered a development.

Chairman Call asked for comments from anyone else in the room.

Mr. Lynch asked about the Commission's role in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan will go before the Commission before coming before the Board. Mr. Gardner explained that staff's intent is to have the public meetings first and bring those comments to the Commission.

Mr. Apel explained that the Commissioners do have a copy of this document and he suggested that after the public meetings a joint work session be held with the Board and Commission members about one hour before the Commission meeting as it is often difficult for Commission members to get to a regularly scheduled work session.

Mr. Lynch asked for a list of substantive changes in the Comprehensive Plan as it makes the Commissioners aware of where to look for the changes. He was promised that they would have the list ahead of time.

Chairman Call asked that the Board also get that list before the joint work session.

Chairman Call adjourned the meeting at 2:19 p.m.

APPROVED:

____
Patrick G. Call, Chairman

ATTEST:

____
Gussie Motter, Deputy Clerk of the Board