

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

PINAL COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
(PO NUMBER 233382)

Regular Meeting
9:00 a.m.
Thursday, March 17, 2016
EOC Room - Building F
31 N. Pinal St., Florence, Arizona

INDEX:

DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEM REPORT:

- Action Item Report - p. 1

REPORT ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION ON P & Z CASES - p. 1-3

- January 20, 2016
- February 3, 2016
- February 17, 2016 - No Cases
- March 2, 2016

REPORT ON TENTATIVE PLAT EXTENSIONS: Extension Report - pp. 3-6

PLANNING MANAGER'S DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Handouts: RTA PowerPoint, Site Plan Review and Building Permit Report - pp. 6-13

TENTATIVE PLATS:

- S-013-15 - pp. 13-24
- S-017-15 - pp. 24-33

CALL TO THE COMMISSION: pp. 34-42

ADJOURNMENT - p. 42

TRANSCRIPTION PROVIDED BY

Julie A. Fish
Quick Response Transcription Services
829 East Windsor Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85006
602-296-5178

ORIGINAL PREPARED FOR:
PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA

1 RIGGINS: (Inaudible) Planning and Zoning Commission
2 to order. And we have, first on our agenda we have
3 Discussions of the Action Item Report.

4 ABRAHAM: Thank you Mr. Chair and Commissioner
5 Members. Top o' the morning to you.

6 SALAS: Good morning.

7 ABRAHAM: Your Action Item Report was from January
8 and were there any questions on any of those cases? I guess
9 seeing none, I'll go ahead - well I guess an update would
10 probably in order too, that SUP-010-15 which was the Islamic
11 cemetery, that ended up getting approved by the Board o
12 Supervisors. The Arizona Public Service solar power plant
13 down there by Red Rock also got approved. On Board of
14 Supervisors Action, there's a number of actions cases since we
15 last met. Desert Rose Baha'i, they were proposing a radio
16 tower, that ended up getting approved. Dirt Brothers Land
17 Management was a race track/motocross facility, Stanfield
18 area, way out west, also got approved. And that was in
19 addition to the cemetery and the IUP, that's basically the
20 last month and half of cases.

21 HARTMAN: Mr. - Chair Riggins.

22 RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

23 HARTMAN: Steve, on that Dirt Brothers, there was
24 some comments by our Commission Members on that case, and I
25 notice that there was some votes against it by the

1 Supervisors, could you maybe talk about that just a second?

2 ABRAHAM: Sure, absolutely. The motocross track had
3 some substantial neighborhood opposition to it. Some folks
4 showed up, and also the applicant in the case was asking for
5 some waivers of some improvement requirements from our normal
6 course of business, and that was, I think that was part of the
7 location and the cause of the concern from the Board. It was
8 a three to two vote, I believe.

9 HARTMAN: Yes, 3/2. Now who were the two negative
10 votes if I might ask?

11 ABRAHAM: You know, I don't recall off the top of my
12 head.

13 SALAS: Yes you do.

14 ABRAHAM: Mark, do you know?

15 LANGLITZ: No, Mr. Chair. I recall the - one of the
16 issues was whether the applicant had to pave that one road,
17 and Supervisor Smith did not want them to have to do that, so
18 he made a motion, which it may have changed some of the other
19 stipulations, but it changed that one that they would just
20 have to apply dust suppressant. And I believe, I'm pretty
21 sure Supervisor Miller did not feel that that was warranted
22 and that's, I'm pretty sure he voted against it. And the
23 other Supervisor who voted against it, I think it was for the
24 same reason. They weren't against the concept of it, they
25 just weren't in favor of eliminating the stipulation that it

1 be paved. And I'm about 95 percent comfortable that that's
2 accurate. But I could be wrong, so -

3 HARTMAN: But the final vote's what counts. That's
4 interesting, though.

5 LANGLITZ: Yeah.

6 HARTMAN: Thank you.

7 RIGGINS: Thank you. And Chair will hold all
8 comments concerning that case too. Okay, any other questions
9 or comments on that? All right, we'll move right onto the
10 report on Tentative Plat Extensions.

11 ABRAHAM: Mr. Chair, there is an Extension Report,
12 and I'm finally glad we have an example to show you of what -
13 when we changed the policy a couple months ago, we have a
14 plat. So for example, this plat would be tentatively - or
15 extended, like you used to do, however this would be their
16 last extension. So this plat in particular that once - if
17 they don't, if they don't come back and start development and
18 continue with final platting, that plat will evaporate. So
19 that's basically what this is - this is what we were talking
20 about a couple months ago with the policy change.

21 RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

22 HARTMAN: Chair, Chair Riggins. Steve, would you
23 tell us who - give a name for the record of who that tentative
24 plat was given to? The extension?

25 ABRAHAM: Sure, this is going to be San Tan Heights

1 Parcels D1 and D2. The landowner is Gary Road Holdings, and
2 it was extended to December 18, 2016 - I'm sorry it's extended
3 to December 18, 2017.

4 HARTMAN: December 18th, okay.

5 ABRAHAM: Yeah, there's a typo in there.

6 HARTMAN: Now review us, if you would, who actually
7 does the tentative - are you one of the ones on the tentative
8 plat reviews?

9 ABRAHAM: Dedrick is our case coordinator on - and
10 Evan are case coordinators on the tentative plat reviews, but
11 yes. And then they're brought to Himanshu for sort of the
12 final approval.

13 HARTMAN: Okay.

14 RIGGINS: Okay and -

15 HARTMAN: Go ahead, I'm through.

16 RIGGINS: And so with our new system that we're
17 utilizing, this can't even be brought up again. This is done.

18 ABRAHAM: If they don't come back before December
19 17th - December 18, 2017, the plat is gone.

20 RIGGINS: Actually 16.

21 ABRAHAM: Right, that's a typographical error. Is
22 that right?

23 RIGGINS: Well if they got a one year extension that
24 would be right.

25 HARTMAN: It would be.

1 ABRAHAM: Okay, I'm sorry. I'll get my years
2 straight here. So yes, December 18, 2016, sorry.

3 RIGGINS: Okay, so we can anticipate that we will
4 start beginning to see some of these zoning cases that were
5 done back in the early 2000s, are going to start -

6 ??: All over again.

7 RIGGINS: All over again.

8 ABRAHAM: Well, not the zoning part, just the
9 platting.

10 RIGGINS: Well if the plat is - well correct, the
11 zoning doesn't go away, but yeah, the plat.

12 ABRAHAM: You may see, yeah, them start to cycle
13 back through again. That's correct.

14 RIGGINS: Okay. Very good. Vice Chair Hartman.

15 HARTMAN: Steve, but this - I've been on the
16 Commission long enough to remember where staff did these
17 extensions years ago, and it actually worked pretty good. It
18 looks like this is the first one, so. All right. Thank you.

19 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Can I say - can I ask staff a
20 question?

21 RIGGINS: Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler.

22 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: About the zoning, sometimes the
23 Board of Supervisors sends that back - if nothing's done after
24 ten years, doesn't that revert back?

25 ABRAHAM: No. The cases that would come back for

1 reversion are ones that have schedules of development attached
2 to them, and there was maybe a dozen or two of those and we
3 got direction from the Board to get away from doing that.

4 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Oh. Because years back they did
5 some reversions.

6 ABRAHAM: They did, and long story short with that,
7 the County Attorney's Office gave us legal advice that unless
8 you attach a schedule of development to zoning cases, that the
9 automatic reversion doesn't occur. That is not in compliance
10 with State law.

11 RIGGINS: And I remember working on amendments to
12 zoning cases that were done in the 60s. So okay. Any other
13 questions or comments? None being, let's move onto the
14 Planning Manager's Discussion Items.

15 ABRAHAM: Okay. Some brief discussion items, and
16 this - a couple of these things came from Call to the
17 Commissions a couple months ago. The first handout you have
18 is the site plan review log that we use to track site plan
19 cases. This is in response to, you know, the what's going on
20 in the County question that we get from you occasionally, and
21 I wanted to kind of walk you through how to read that thing.
22 That it's an internal document, so it actually contains a lot
23 of information that kind of shows how the case is moving
24 through the process. So on the far left is the case number,
25 we have a case title, so that's kind of self explains what the

1 nature of the review would be. And then on the far right is
2 basically the approximate area. Now in the middle you have a
3 number of columns that show dates, and that shows how the
4 thing is sort of progressing through the review. On one of
5 the columns to the - on the right-hand side you'll see on
6 approved. That basically means that case has gone through our
7 site plan review process and they're free to submit for
8 building permits. Now the other half of that question that
9 the Commission had for me a while back is the building permit
10 report, and if I could have you take a look real quickly at
11 the screen. This is - I'm going to start sending you the
12 building permit report that the building division actually
13 issues to other reviewing agencies and folks who are generally
14 interested in how things go. I didn't print this out because
15 it ended up being about 115 pages in length, but the way that
16 this thing is organized, and when you get it, most of,
17 obviously most of the work that we do in the County is
18 residential-based - electrical permits, expansions, things
19 like that, but they title the log with different types of
20 permits. So as you move forward through this, you'll end up
21 seeing the different type of permits that were issued. Where
22 you'll end up when you're wanting to look at the concept - or
23 I'm sorry, the site plan review and the commercial permits
24 that are issued are towards the end of this document. So it's
25 going to be office, bank, professional buildings, non-

1 residential structures, you know, if you're interested in who
2 got a pool permit, that's also there as well. But then you're
3 going to be looking at all of the other types of construction
4 that is going on. So probably the best way to handle this is
5 if you're out there in the community and you see something
6 going up, look at that chart first. Always, if you have - you
7 have business cards, so if you have folks approach you about
8 what's going on, you can give them the card, they can call and
9 we'll be happy to help them. You can take a look at this
10 permit list as well, and compare and contrast, but I figured
11 you'd be most interested in the commercial and industrial
12 projects, so the site plan list is probably the most
13 significant one there, and that is also good to see who's
14 doing what, you know. A lot of Robson Communities is they're
15 expanding the recreation facilities down south. The APS
16 facility's on there. New bank, gas station, you know, so I
17 hope that helps. And we're also contemplating putting a
18 website together that shows when some of these projects occur
19 out in the community that we can have on our webpage for your
20 viewing as well. So that was the first handout. And I'll
21 email this to you after the meeting today and Frank, if you
22 want pieces of this, I can certainly give this to you on
23 print. The other one was the RTA PowerPoint that was
24 presented to the Board of Supervisors a couple weeks ago.
25 Now, if you're not familiar, the Board of Supervisors gave the

1 okay to put on a - on the next election, a transportation
2 authority that would set up a taxing district to fund regional
3 transportation projects. That handout was what the consultant
4 gave to the Board, it kind of gives the ins and outs and how
5 it's going to remain transparent, how the money's going to be
6 used, how the funds will be allocated if the voters obviously
7 approve it. And I think that's really significant because
8 that'll - one of our major issues in the County is funding
9 transportation projects, and of course, you know, Planning
10 staff's not really allowed to stump for, you know, bond issues
11 or other political things, but I think this is a good vehicle
12 to try to address some of those long-standing issues with
13 transportation in our County. But I thought you'd be
14 interested in that because that, you know, one, you being
15 County residents, will have directly affect you, and then
16 other things, it'll certainly maybe help the long-term
17 transportation issues in the County moving forward. Do you
18 know when that's going to be on the election? Is that - yeah
19 I don't know either. Okay. Well keep your ear to the ground
20 and if anything comes up new with that I'll let you know on
21 that, when that's going to be put on the election as a ballot
22 measure. Two more things that aren't on the agenda. Planning
23 staff has met with the Arizona National Guard, and if you're
24 not familiar, the Arizona National Guard and the Department of
25 Defense have four active military training facilities in our

1 County, and they have a process that they use to plan the
2 facility themselves, it's called a JLUS, which is short for
3 Joint Land Use use study, or Joint Land Use Study, and what
4 they do is - and this goes with the Department of Defense and
5 the Arizona National Guard eventually - is that they approach
6 local planning agencies that have these facilities in their
7 jurisdictions and create specific land plans and facility
8 plans to do a couple things: One is preserve the
9 functionality of the base or the site, or whatever
10 installation they have. And then also make recommendations
11 towards land use planning around the facility that, you know,
12 protect the long-term interests of the facility and keep them
13 viable. A good example would be some of the work that
14 Williams Gateway's doing with Mesa and Gilbert about limiting
15 certain noise-sensitive uses within the airport so that future
16 airport operations aren't compromised. The sites in
17 particular that the Guard and the Department of Defense are
18 looking at are Silver Bell Field down there at the Pinal
19 Airpark that we did the tour of the - about a year ago. There
20 is a airstrip south of Eloy that is being used as helicopter
21 touch and go operations. The Rittenhouse Airfield, which is
22 unused at this point, but it's located on Schnepf Road in San
23 Tan Valley -

24 RIGGINS: It hasn't been used in my lifetime.

25 ABRAHAM: Yeah, it's very tough to see the runway.

1 It used to have a decomposed granite or a crushed granite
2 surface, and even that's coming to the desert, and what that's
3 occasionally used for, I understand from the National Guard is
4 that they practice filling dump tanks in the cap, and then
5 practice dropping the water on for fire suppression and fire
6 things out on that site, so I thought that was - I didn't know
7 that was occurring, but I thought that was actually pretty
8 interesting. And then the last sight is this, are this
9 facility north of town here, which is a really sprawling
10 facility that helps train maybe thousands of, you know, army
11 and marine guard folks every year for target practice and
12 desert vehicle training, and also I got a chance to tour the
13 site about a month ago. You know, if you haven't - it's kind
14 of - you can kind of see it as you're driving northbound, but
15 they've created a mock Afghany village out there for to
16 practice certain situations that they would find, and the base
17 commander made the comment that, you know, this area is more
18 like Afghanistan than Afghanistan is, which I thought was kind
19 of interesting. So it gives their folks an opportunity to,
20 you know, get their, get their boots dirty doing some things.
21 So those are the four sites that we're - we - we're currently
22 looking at possibly doing this JLUS study. There's some
23 paperwork that needs to be filled out with the office of
24 budget and management. We might be searching for some grants
25 to help fund this effort, but we got the go ahead from the

1 County Manager to at least being preliminary talks. So that's
2 a big thing. Any questions on that or, I don't know, we - I
3 think maybe we'll do some field trips in the future, try to
4 get familiar with some of those sites. Everybody's pretty
5 familiar with the site north of town here, but I might be able
6 to arrange a trip out to Picacho and take a look at that
7 airstrip to get an idea. Oh, lastly the impact fee ordinance
8 was adopted and will become effective on May 9th. There's one
9 more task - right, the ordinance is still going to the Board.
10 The impact fee schedule was approved and will become effective
11 on the 9th. Okay, so that's the last remaining thing is on the
12 30th is that the ordinance itself is hoping to be adopted on
13 the 30th. So that concludes my -

14 RIGGINS: Well the schedule certainly won't go into
15 effect if the ordinance hasn't been adopted yet.

16 ABRAHAM: True. I'm hoping for the best.

17 LANGLITZ: Yeah Mr. Chair, you're exactly correct.
18 It's timed out so that the ordinance will be effective either
19 at the same time as the fee schedule or immediately prior to
20 that. But you're correct, it's a timing issue. That's a good
21 catch.

22 RIGGINS: Very good. Vice Chair Hartman.

23 HARTMAN: Okay, Chair Riggins. Steve, what about
24 projections? I'm reading the paper, the County's going to cut
25 the budgets and everything for - and what, what's your

1 thoughts on your planning and development?

2 ABRAHAM: Well, all I can do is just repeat what I
3 heard at the Board work session yesterday, and they asked the
4 County Manager to prepare a number of budget cut scenarios,
5 and he'll be forwarding that to the directors to see what
6 impacts that'll have on their budgets. The high end, I
7 believe, was four and a half percent, and then the low was
8 two. So any kind of - just a couple different ranges and a
9 couple different possibilities there.

10 HARTMAN: But your portion, the planning and
11 development's not involved or -

12 ABRAHAM: Oh yeah, we would be involved. Himanshu's
13 crunching the numbers right now. A lot goes into those - the
14 final determination of what effect that would have on the
15 department because at the end of the year a lot of departments
16 have money that they actually give back to the general fund,
17 so that goes into that calculation. Not to get too much into
18 it, but there's still a lot of number crunching that needs to
19 occur.

20 HARTMAN: All right. That's good.

21 RIGGINS: Okay. Other Commissioners, questions or
22 comments? None being, we'll move onto the tentative plats.
23 First one we'll hear will be first tentative plat case S-013-
24 15.

25 BALMER: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Members of the

1 Commission. This is tentative plat S-013-15. The proposal is
2 approval of the Morning Sun Farms Units 5 and 7 tentative
3 plat. It's on approximately 60 acres in the CR-3/PAD zone,
4 and it's 207 lots combined between Units 5 and 7. It's
5 located on the south side of Skyline Drive, West of Gary Road
6 in San Tan Valley. Beazer Homes is the applicant, and Matt
7 Olsen with Atwell is the engineer. Into the County map we're
8 in the San Tan Valley area, generally close to Queen Creek
9 there. Zooming in a little closer, the subject property is
10 outlined in red. This is, well, one of the final pieces of
11 Morning Sun Farms, which is also CR-3 as I mentioned earlier.
12 The development standards, there's two minimum lot sizes, 5400
13 square feet, and 7200 square feet. The minimum lot width is
14 45 feet for the smaller lots, 60 feet for the larger lots.
15 Setbacks are ten on the front, five on the sides, 15 in the
16 rear for the smaller lots, and 25 and 20 for the larger lots.
17 Here's an aerial of the site. Also included in your packet is
18 a copy of the minor PAD amendment, which shows a couple little
19 tweaks from their original PAD. The previous slide was Unit
20 5, this is Unit 7. And if the computer cooperates, you might
21 actually get to see the plat. Maybe. Okay. So this is the
22 tentative plat for Unit 5. And here we have Unit 7. I did
23 take some pictures at the location. All right. This is
24 looking north away from the subject property. Next pictures.
25 East. South, this is actually into the subject property. And

1 the last picture will be west along Skyline. Have to take my
2 word for it. There we go. There are ten stipulations
3 included in - with this case, if the Commission elects to
4 approve it. The applicant is present to answer any questions
5 you have, and I think that will then conclude my presentation.
6 There are ten steps like I mentioned, they're included in your
7 packet and I'm free to answer any questions the Commission may
8 have.

9 RIGGINS: Commission Members. Vice Chair Hartman.

10 HARTMAN: Chair Riggins, thank you. Evan, on the
11 findings, where the proposed subdivision will have adequate
12 permanent access, it lists three different points of access.
13 Were any of those - were photos taken of any of those points
14 of access? And talk to us a little bit about - it seems like
15 at one time we kind of discussed access and I do appreciate
16 the three points of access.

17 BALMER: Sure, Vice Chairman Hartman. I'll let the
18 applicant address that a little more, but the photos that you
19 kind of saw on the presentation here, were actually on the
20 north side of the property very near the entrance shown off of
21 Unit 5.

22 HARTMAN: Was there any change in the points of
23 access, the three? Was there only two at one time, I thought,
24 but maybe I'm going back.

25 BALMER: With this there are - if the computer would

1 work. We got - yeah, I believe there are three points of
2 access, two for Unit 5 and one for Unit 7.

3 HARTMAN: No, there's two and two.

4 BALMER: I apologize. There are two access points
5 for each unit, Unit 5 and Unit 7.

6 RIGGINS: There would need to be because there's no
7 interconnectivity between the two.

8 BALMER: That s correct.

9 HARTMAN: So there's only two instead of three?

10 BALMER: There are four total.

11 HARTMAN: Two for each unit.

12 RIGGINS: But each one, each one stands alone and
13 there's two for the eastern side and there's two for the
14 western side. There's no interconnectivity between
15 (inaudible).

16 HARTMAN: Thank you. That answers that question.

17 RIGGINS: Any other questions by the Commissioners
18 of staff? None being, let's go ahead and have the applicant
19 come up and explain your tentative plat to us.

20 MILOVANOVIC: Good morning, thank you Mr. Chair and
21 Commissioners. My name is Michael Milovanovic. I'm with
22 Beazer Homes. I want to thank you for your time today, for
23 your consideration for our tentative plat for Morning Sun
24 Farms Units 5 and 7. Just a little bit of a background -
25 sorry - little bit of a background on Morning Sun Farms. It's

1 a PAD since 2002. These are the last two parcels within the
2 planned area development at Morning Sun Farms. I believe we
3 came in approximately, I want to say 3, 4, 5 months ago for
4 Morning Sun Farms 4B. This - we are now completing 4B, Phase
5 II, we're under construction, so these we would like to
6 engineer this, get the final plats complete and then go into
7 construction with 5 and 7 as the market dictates. We had
8 minimum lot sizes of 45 allowed, and during the PAD we decided
9 like in 4B, we wanted to go with a little bit larger lots.
10 We're planning 35 wide product and 45 wide product. By
11 putting 50 wide lots and 60 wide lots, it allows our
12 homeowners to have larger side setbacks also, so we're kind of
13 bringing more of a benefit there also. We also have amenities
14 planned in the open spaces, kind of conforming to all the
15 stipulations from the original PAD of Morning Sun Farms. And
16 as mentioned, this is our last parcels, we're excited, but
17 it's a great community and fortunately I would say I'm kind of
18 sad too, it's my last two parcels. But thank you for your
19 consideration.

20 RIGGINS: Commissioners.

21 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I have a question.

22 RIGGINS: Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler?

23 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: In the history part of this packet,
24 it says 1350 lots have been final platted out of the total of
25 1578. And the PAD has 220 lots remaining which does not

1 include the 207, so I don't understand.

2 MILOVANOVIC: We did not use all of the capacity of
3 allowable density in Morning Sun Farms. For example, in
4 Morning Sun Farms 4B when we came in, I believe - and correct
5 me if I'm wrong, was it a year ago or 6-8 months ago? For the
6 tentative plat? The allowable density when they came - when
7 we came in was for 268 units. We came in and only did 252.
8 The reason being was we reduced the density to have larger
9 lots instead of the smaller lots.

10 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay, now can I ask staff a
11 question? So evidently this was 2000. It says here
12 originally PZ-008-2000. So in 16 years, have you made any
13 kind of changes or are they going according to their original
14 PAD or what?

15 BALMER: Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler, the original
16 PAD was from 1999 and it was amended a few times in 2000 and
17 2010. The PAD, the minor PAD amendment that this plat is
18 based on is a recent minor PAD amendment where they just
19 tweaked a few of the lots. To my knowledge there hasn't been
20 any large changes since the original PAD. They're pretty on
21 track with the original plan.

22 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: So the density would be under 3.5.

23 BALMER: I don't have the numbers in front of me,
24 but that would, I believe that's correct.

25 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay, thanks.

1 RIGGINS: Other Commissioners, questions?

2 RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

3 HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. Michael?

4 MILOVANOVIC: Yes sir.

5 HARTMAN: I always work on development standards is
6 one of my main things, and I'm sure you've answered this
7 question before, but front yard setback on the 5,400 square
8 foot lots is ten foot, tell me about the parking on that ten
9 foot.

10 MILOVANOVIC: That's for livable only, so the
11 parking on the ten foot front setback is for livable only. We
12 still have to maintain the 20 feet to the garage face. We
13 don't have a product that (inaudible). I think right now our
14 product right now most livable extends five feet, right? Four
15 or five feet. So I mean that'd be really close coming up, but
16 for right now, we don't have - and if you go through Morning
17 Sun Farms, we don't really get that close to that.

18 HARTMAN: I just - for several reasons I ask you,
19 one to be on the record, and two to satisfy my question,
20 because in our information it says the Commission may request
21 changes to the type and extent of improvements to be made. So
22 you know, that -

23 MILOVANOVIC: Now a lot of times with product, as
24 you know, and homebuilders we may develop new product.
25 Sometimes that's very beneficial when you have livable four

1 for side entry garages. Sometimes it's very beneficial when
2 you do have a the livable four it creates some nice character
3 through the communities. For right now we have a livable
4 four. The current product that we have that we're building in
5 Morning Sun Farms is I believe five feet only. That's what we
6 have today, it doesn't mean we won't come up with something
7 new in the future, because we're always trying to develop the
8 product and always looking at architecture and what the, you
9 know, market dictates for the consumers. We do meet the 20
10 feet face of garage. One of the other things in this plat,
11 you know, we have 20 foot rear setback also, so we try to
12 create as much space as we can for the houses. And that kind
13 of goes back to why we went to the 50s and 60s - larger side
14 yards, you know, kind of - and putting a 35 wide product on a
15 50 wide lot, and then a 45 on a 60, so you know, we try very
16 hard to create room and space and the demands.

17 HARTMAN: Thank you, Michael.

18 MILOVANOVIC: You're welcome.

19 RIGGINS: Other Commissioners, any other questions?

20 I have one, it's somewhat of an editorial question. A
21 decision here being made to increase your minimum sizes to a
22 higher size, is that indicative that your consumers are
23 wanting a larger lot envelope around their house, or are you
24 seeing that in the marketplace?

25 MILOVANOVIC: A little bit of both. You know, we

1 noticed the reason for our decisions to do that were over time
2 we've noticed, you know, we get the feedback from our sales
3 reps that are out there in the field and market research, and
4 you know, we noticed that people wanted to have space and they
5 want to be able to put things on the side of their houses.
6 Sometimes people want to have, you know, a boat or, you know,
7 something they want to store. Or they may have motorized
8 vehicles, and we just noticed with a little bit more space
9 they want a wider, you know, gate, an open, you know, bigger
10 gate opening. We've noticed that a little bit. We noticed,
11 again, I'm not a perfect market analyst by no means for the
12 record, you know, just some of the feedback.

13 RIGGINS: Just curious trends, curious of trends.

14 MILOVANOVIC: Yes. And we've noticed also that
15 sometimes people don't want it. So we try to, we try to find
16 that fine balance and that's what we've been trying to do is
17 find the fine balance. It didn't mean that we eliminated our
18 45 wide lots, you know, with our 35 wide product, we didn't do
19 that by no means. It's just we have that in 4C, you know, we
20 just sold out. We were now trying to meet in 4B with a small
21 - you know, a little bit larger lot in creating, you know,
22 some of the, you know, trying to respond to what the market is
23 kind of telling us a little bit. But it doesn't mean we
24 wouldn't do 45 wide lots at all. We may find that maybe one
25 of these parcels we need to come back and think about adding

1 20 more lots of 45s, or you know, or mix it back up. But for
2 right now, we've kind of seen that a lot of positive feedback
3 for us.

4 RIGGINS: I'm wanting a little positive feedback on
5 a little bit bigger lot. Okay. Any other questions
6 whatsoever? Vice Chair Hartman.

7 HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. Mitchell, is that right?

8 MILOVANOVIC: Michael.

9 HARTMAN: Michael I had it right at first. Okay.
10 On stipulation 7, it says the association - an association
11 including the property owners to be developed. You concur
12 with that? You know that the County doesn't have anything to
13 do with the Homeowner's association.

14 MILOVANOVIC: Correct.

15 HARTMAN: All right. So you concur with that.

16 MILOVANOVIC: Correct.

17 HARTMAN: And then number 9, the developer agrees to
18 contribute 50 percent of the total cost for traffic signals,
19 etc.?

20 MILOVANOVIC: Yes, so Mr. Vice Chair, the
21 stipulation on the traffic signal is, understanding, is we - I
22 believe this is all kind of passed onto Lester to kind of help
23 engage on this - that our original PAD had us, Morning Sun
24 Farms for Village to do a 50 percent contribution for Village
25 and Empire.

1 CHOW: Yes Chairman Hartman. In the original
2 traffic, it identified certain signals at certain
3 intersections. There was an amendment to that that stipulated
4 50 percent contribution of the signal at - it would be at the
5 Village Lane and the Empire signal. All the other signals
6 identified within that traffic part have been constructed - at
7 Village Lane and Hunt, and Gary and Skyline.

8 MILOVANOVIC: So we would post an assurance and work
9 with Pinal County at that time (inaudible) recordation of the
10 plats for 5 and 7 to comply with that stipulation.

11 RIGGINS: Okay, any other further, further questions
12 of the applicant? None being, thank you very much.

13 MILOVANOVIC: Thank you.

14 RIGGINS: And we'll turn it back to the Commission.
15 Any discussion, questions of staff or/and a motion. Vice
16 Chair Hartman.

17 HARTMAN: Chairman Riggins, Commission Members, I
18 move to approve findings 1 through 7 as set forth in the staff
19 report, and approve the tentative plat in planning case S-013-
20 15 with the ten stipulations.

21 RIGGINS: We have a motion from Vice Chair Hartman,
22 do we have a second?

23 SALAS: Second.

24 RIGGINS: Second from Commissioner Salas. All those
25 in favor, indicate by saying aye.

1 COLLECTIVE: Aye.

2 RIGGINS: Opposed? None. It passes unanimously.

3 MILOVANOVIC: Thank you. Have a wonderful day.

4 RIGGINS: Good luck with your project.

5 MILOVANOVIC: Oh, had a nice board prepared. So
6 yeah, 5 and 7, this will all be built out complete. 4B will
7 be completed out, and then we're going to move right into 5
8 and 7, which is right off of Gary and Skyline, which bisects.
9 Got to push this a little bit closer.

10 RIGGINS: There you are. Pardon me, did you get
11 signed in when you came up? Could you please sign and put
12 your address down? Thank you very much.

13 MILOVANOVIC: Thank you, have a wonderful day.

14 RIGGINS: Then all right. Let's go ahead and move
15 onto case S-017-15.

16 DENTON: Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of
17 the Commission. This is case number S-017-15. The applicant
18 is proposing approval of Laurel Ranch, and it's 41 acres in
19 the CR-2/PAD zone. It's a 63 lot subdivision. It's located
20 on the southwest corner of Magma and Gantzel Road alignment,
21 and the applicant is Highland Communities, and their engineer
22 is Allen Consulting Engineers. The subject property is
23 located in the northern portion of the County in the San Tan
24 Valley area. The subject property is zoned CR-2. It's
25 located south and west of Hunt Highway and this is within the

1 Johnson Ranch planned area development. As you can see on the
2 slide, it is surrounded by State Land, and to the north and
3 east is Copper Basin. The approved development standards for
4 this zone and PAD, there's a minimum lot size of 8,000 square
5 feet, a minimum lot width of 60 feet, and the setbacks are
6 front is 25 feet, the side is ten feet, and the rear is 25
7 feet, and all that is approved in the PAD. Aerial photo of
8 the subject property, currently it is vacant. That little out
9 parcel in the southeast corner is for SRP substation facility.
10 This is the approved PAD. It's the old bubble plans that we
11 used to approve in the old days when we had those zoning case,
12 or the zoning ordinance at that time. And this is the
13 applicant proposed tentative plat. They are proposing some
14 larger lots. They do have two points of ingress and egress
15 off of Magma Road, and you can see the general circulation
16 there and the big track in the middle is reserved for a power
17 line corridor, along with some open space functions for the
18 subject property. The photo location was taken on Magma Road,
19 and this is looking north and you can see that power line
20 corridor in the background. And this is looking east down
21 Magma Road towards Hunt Highway. And this is looking south
22 into the subject property. And this is looking west. The
23 houses in the background on the right-hand side are within
24 Johnson Ranch. And this case has 13 stipulations, and that
25 will conclude my presentation. I'm available for any comments

1 that the Commission may have and the applicant is present.

2 RIGGINS: Commission Members, any questions or
3 discussion with staff? Vice Chair Hartman.

4 HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. Dedrick, on the letter
5 from, I guess from Gilbert Olgin, Senior Planner, City of
6 Florence, expound a little bit on that. He says that that
7 does not meet the general plan for the City, is it density? I
8 notice that this density dropped from 89 to 63.

9 DENTON: Yes, he did kind of respond that way, but
10 towards the end of the letter he did state that the City or
11 the Town is okay with the proposal.

12 HARTMAN: Okay. I'll ask the applicant maybe why
13 they decided to drop the numbers to that extent, because
14 that's quite a few.

15 DENTON: Yes, from 88 to 63.

16 HARTMAN: Exactly. Okay, thank you.

17 RIGGINS: Okay. Any other questions for staff?
18 None being, would the applicant please come up and would you
19 please remember to sign in and give us your address before you
20 begin.

21 PUGMIRE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the
22 Commission. My name is Mark Pugmire with Highland
23 Communities. Our address is 1425 South Higley Road, number
24 101 in Gilbert. I appreciate working with you, taking the
25 time. Appreciate Dedrick and his - and staff's work with us.

1 We think that we've got a project that at least fits what we
2 think is a better suited market application for what we think
3 is needed out there, and happy to not take too much of your
4 time, but answer any questions.

5 RIGGINS: Commission Members, any questions on the
6 tentative plat as proposed? Vice Chair Hartman.

7 HARTMAN: Chair Riggins, thank you. Mark, good
8 morning.

9 PUGMIRE: Good morning to you.

10 HARTMAN: Okay. Under development standards I see
11 you're setting back 25 feet, which is good from the front
12 line, property line. And then the - on the reduction from 89
13 to 63, would you explain that move? Normally developers try
14 to go the other way, but you're reducing.

15 PUGMIRE: There are so many jokes I can make about
16 that, but (inaudible).

17 HARTMAN: We're serious, no joke.

18 PUGMIRE: It really is a fact that we - we're a very
19 small builder. We've been building out in this neck of the
20 woods for 30-40 years, just a family operation, and our
21 success has been in a little bit larger lot. We're building
22 on some acre lots up in the San Tan Heights area right now and
23 we want to be able to take that same kind - we've had a number
24 of people that have come and asked if they could have that
25 same kind of a product, but not have to worry about a full

1 acre and a quarter that we have up in the other areas. So we
2 bought this piece of property, examined the engineering which
3 needed some, we thought, needed some re-engineering, and
4 thought that the market would be kind to us if we had lots
5 were 100 feet wide and 150 feet deep. Give people a chance to
6 put - if they wanted to put their boat back there and some
7 other things. We just thought, it's just a market question,
8 and we thought that we would be successful. We really can't
9 compete against Beazer on 45 foot wide lots, but we think we
10 can offer a product that people like on a little bit larger
11 lot, and there doesn't seem to be a lot of it in this area,
12 and we just think it's a good market choice. So.

13 HARTMAN: Well I look to further that a little bit.
14 Started in '97 and moved on, the last, I think - I saw the
15 last time that you were here was nine years ago, I believe, or
16 something like that.

17 PUGMIRE: Yeah, that was -

18 HARTMAN: Nine years?

19 PUGMIRE: At least the case was here nine years ago.
20 We weren't, the case was.

21 HARTMAN: Yes. Well, but that's good, well in my
22 opinion, it's good that you are still making lot sizes that
23 are livable. I know in some portions of our County, the
24 millennials say they don't - they want the lot so small their
25 kids can't bring anything over and put it in their yard, you

1 know.

2 PUGMIRE: I don't want to argue against anybody,
3 it's just that there are people like us that think a little
4 bit bigger is a little bit nicer, and it really is just a
5 market choice. We think it fits, it fits - it's just my - I
6 have three sons that work with me in the business, and it's
7 just the kind of thing want my grandkids living in a place
8 like that, rather than some place else, so that's why we build
9 them.

10 HARTMAN: Thank you.

11 RIGGINS: Any other questions Commissioners?

12 AULT: Yes.

13 RIGGINS: Commissioner Ault.

14 AULT: Just like to make a comment about the
15 decrease in density, the planned density of the housing, and
16 the preceding presentation that we received. It's interesting
17 to note and it's also encouraging from the standpoint lower
18 density housing on water consumption, looking into the future
19 that will - adds quite a bit to the quality of life
20 considerations within the County, not just inherent to this
21 one particular plan, but to the County in general. There are
22 considerable benefits to be derived in terms of increasing
23 quality of life and decreasing water consumption as we move
24 into a drier climate into the future.

25 PUGMIRE: I agree. We don't think we can really do

1 a lot to - in the big grand scheme, but we do a little bit and
2 it does - like I say, it just seems to fit. It's only just an
3 intuitive and instinctive feel, but it just seems like it's a
4 better idea for what we want to do.

5 SALAS: Mr. Chairman.

6 RIGGINS: Commissioner Salas.

7 SALAS: I would just like to applaud your efforts.
8 You know, that's the kind of thinking I have, a little bit of
9 more space, you know, and I've run into some of these younger
10 people here, and now millennials I guess you call them and
11 some of them want kind of like a maintenance-free place to
12 live, you know? They don't want to mow their lawn and do what
13 ever other (inaudible) kind of a balance that I've, you know,
14 seen and most of them, though, agree with a larger place,
15 elbow room so to speak.

16 PUGMIRE: A lot of it is a question of cost, you
17 know? They have a smaller lot because their finances require
18 a smaller payment, and what we're trying to get this dense so
19 that we can still meet the budget constraints they're going to
20 have and try and come in there, you know, in the upper - or
21 the lower, the lower 2's for a house so they can have a big
22 lot in the lower 2, and like I say, so the kids can have a
23 good time. A lot of these kids, they make - there are a lot
24 of millennials that want a big yard, they'd like to have the
25 land, and they just can't - it's hard to come up to the money

1 with it, and we're hoping we fit that here.

2 PUTRICK: Mr. Chair?

3 RIGGINS: Commissioner Putrick.

4 PUTRICK: Just a comment. I like what you're doing
5 also, because I think, I think we came through the last maybe
6 ten years of people looking at downsizing and reducing costs.
7 You know, I live in Sun City/Anthem and they did a whole
8 change of models and downsizing models and lot sizes so they
9 get more houses in and everything, but I think, I think it's -
10 we're climbing out of that. I think we're going to go the
11 other way. A little hitch in this is that our friends up
12 north of the border, the Canadian dollar took a big nosedive
13 and we have a number of homes for sale because Canadians can't
14 afford where they're living - some of them - but that's only a
15 - that's a little side note to everything that's going on.
16 But I think that what you're doing is the right thing to do,
17 because I think there's a big market for that kind of thing.
18 I like space. I like lots of plants and trees and things like
19 that, and that's my contribution to the alleged global warming
20 that we're looking at, so I have a story about that, but I'll
21 tell that offline. Thank you.

22 PUGMIRE: My wife and all my grandchildren certainly
23 hope you're right, so.

24 RIGGINS: Commissioners, any other questions?

25 GRUBB: Sure.

1 RIGGINS: Commissioner Grubb.

2 GRUBB: I'll also applaud your efforts. The - you
3 know I've been around the San Tan Valley's developments since,
4 you know, if you know anything about the area, the pre-Circle
5 K days, and have watched it go from an adult community to a,
6 to a let's build as many houses as we can because we can sell
7 them for three times what we were selling them for two years
8 ago economy, and then the bust. But I think that having a
9 range of homes for people to select, makes it very attractive
10 for people to come here, and we need those people to bring the
11 economic development to the County. We need the highly
12 educated people, we need the engineers and the people that are
13 available to the companies that are looking to locate, and
14 they want that kind of people here. And you can't find it
15 when you have cracker box housing. And so I do applaud you
16 for doing this, because it's part of making our County a more
17 attractive magnet for economic development, which we
18 desperately need here. And I've seen your product, you build
19 beautiful homes, so thank you.

20 PUGMIRE: Really, thank you very much, and as far as
21 my experience in the County, I was working for the builder
22 that first had to (inaudible) haul the sewer at Johnson Ranch
23 all the way down to Florence, so I think we've been here and
24 watched it go from nothing to -

25 GRUBB: Yep.

1 PUGMIRE: Anyway, maybe I shouldn't have brought
2 that up.

3 RIGGINS: Any other questions or comments? None
4 being, thank you very much, sir. I'll turn it back to the
5 Commission for discussion or a motion.

6 HARTMAN: Chair Riggins.

7 RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

8 HARTMAN: I would like to make a motion to approve
9 the findings 1 through 7 as set forth in the staff report and
10 approve the tentative plat in planning case S-017-15 with the
11 13 stipulations as so submitted.

12 SALAS: Second.

13 RIGGINS: We have a motion by Vice Chair Hartman,
14 and we have a second by Commissioner Salas. All those in
15 favor signify by saying aye.

16 COLLECTIVE: Aye.

17 RIGGINS: Opposed? Passes unanimously. Good luck
18 with your project and -

19 PUGMIRE: We'll take all the luck we can get.

20 RIGGINS: There you are.

21 SALAS: Think open space.

22 HARTMAN: Commissioner Riggins?

23 RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

24 HARTMAN: Commissioner Grubb, I thought you'd say
25 something about fire protection. I mean my gosh that was the

1 perfect opportunity.

2 GRUBB: Well, I think it's been pretty well
3 addressed in that area for now. You know, with all the other
4 discussion that's going on in the San Tan Valley, on the
5 incorporation law that's working its way through the
6 legislature and those kind of things, I thought that it was
7 better not to bring that up at this point.

8 HARTMAN: All right, well I know that you're
9 concerned like the rest of us.

10 GRUBB: I am, and you know, I actually drove through
11 both of this properties last week when we first got
12 information on the packet, I went out and drove through the
13 properties and took a look to see if I would have any
14 concerns, and I really didn't see anything of significance
15 that would cause a problem for the current provider to do that
16 service.

17 RIGGINS: Okay.

18 SALAS: (Inaudible).

19 GRUBB: It's a big area.

20 RIGGINS: We'll go ahead and go on the agenda, we'll
21 go to Call to the Commission, and I'm going to go ahead and
22 use this. To begin with, we have two new Commissioners here
23 at the table this morning. I'll call first on Commissioner
24 Shearer to kind of tell us who you are and what Supervisor
25 suggested you come over here and anything at all you'd like to

1 say.

2 SHEARER: My name's Clint Shearer and I'm from the
3 Casa Grande area. Born and raised, been in that area for all
4 my life, so 42 years. Supervisor Miller recommended that I
5 come to the Commission, and I'm a homebuilder, along with a
6 developer and mostly all construction business.

7 RIGGINS: Very good.

8 SALAS: Welcome.

9 SHEARER: Thank you.

10 RIGGINS: And also over here we have Commissioner
11 Ault.

12 AULT: Thank you very much, sir. It's my pleasure
13 to serve with you folks. I am a newcomer to the Valley, and
14 ultimately a new person as far as a resident. I moved here in
15 2013, I have - after retiring from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
16 Service after a 30 year career working on the natural resource
17 issues all over these United States, including the State of
18 Arizona. I was very active in a variety of projects in the
19 1980s in this great state, some - somewhat juxtaposed to Pinal
20 County itself. I (inaudible) land development, land use
21 planning, those sorts of things. I have an extensive amount
22 of experience working with all levels of government on
23 addressing land use issues, including residential, commercial
24 developments and what have you. And I have a great interest
25 in doing what I can to sustain the beauty and integrity of the

1 State of Arizona for the people that live here and those that
2 are yet to come. It's my pleasure to serve on this
3 Commission.

4 RIGGINS: Welcome. Okay, it's Call to the
5 Commission. Any Commissioners have any pressing desire to
6 discuss anything whatsoever?

7 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Nothing at all.

8 RIGGINS: Anything we can do to upset our attorney,
9 I mean -

10 DEL COTTO: I might as well take the lead then here.

11 RIGGINS: There we are.

12 DEL COTTO: I was just wondering in regards to the
13 tiny house that we've been talking about, if there are any
14 current regulations or if they're just house size. I - like
15 we talked about earlier with this last gentleman, it's just a
16 great model to have, I think, in today's world anyways a
17 little bit of house and a lot of land, and I think people come
18 to Pinal County for that, and we see it a lot in western Pinal
19 County. Our winter visitors are literally just kind of laying
20 their heads down and getting up and getting on their horse and
21 then getting back to bed and so on, and so forth, so I just
22 think it's a great model and I just wondered if there were any
23 guidelines and/or restrictions in regards to the tiny house.

24 ABRAHAM: Well, in our current code now you - as far
25 as zoning is concerned the concept of a tiny house doesn't

1 really exist. It's basically, to call it a dwelling you need
2 a bathroom and a kitchen, and your, you know, your bedroom
3 could be in the bathroom as far as zoning is concerned, so
4 it's one dwelling per lot, unless you have multi-family
5 zoning. The building code, though has some specifications on
6 how these dwellings need to - what size they need to be based
7 on, you know, moving inside of the structure and fire safety
8 standards. So, the tiny house sort of phenomenon - we had a
9 movie on it a couple months ago that I think kind of showed
10 what some of the mortifications, at least for that, you know,
11 kind of the far end of that movement would be. But, you know,
12 as long as it's conventionally constructed, you know, you
13 could put that in a residential zone. That's really where
14 it's at right now. We don't prohibit it, we don't encourage
15 it, it's just sort of there.

16 RIGGINS: Any - Vice Chair Hartman.

17 SALAS: No.

18 RIGGINS: Oh, Commissioner Salas, I'm sorry. I
19 heard - maybe it was a digestion (inaudible).

20 SALAS: I don't know whether this would be
21 appropriate (inaudible) to discuss this, but we had a town
22 hall type meeting in San Manuel here the other day, and the
23 Supervisor was there and listened to a number of complaints as
24 that goes all the time, you know, and so (inaudible) out their
25 grievances, but one of them that was kind of more pressing for

1 the Town was the fact that my garbage service was moved from
2 the utility lanes in the back, you know, the alleys to have
3 our garbage cans or bins, whatever, out in the street area.
4 And so we had always used the utility alleys for that type of
5 service since we've been a Town. Of course it was a private
6 town at the time, it was built for the miners and the company
7 had those utility alleys for those purposes - the electrical
8 and whatever other utility. Waste Management came in and they
9 had been utilizing that area, the alleys, for that particular
10 purpose. However, during the last storm that we had, some of
11 the areas got hit pretty hard and it washed some of the alleys
12 kind of bad and the County had to come in and level them off
13 and get them going again. In the interim, we had to move our
14 garbage cans out on the, on the streets. Now that
15 everything's been fixed up, Waste Management has said no,
16 we're not going to go back there. There's been a request for
17 them to do that, it's been an inconvenience, we have a lot of
18 seniors in the area, and it's an inconvenience for a lot of
19 them to roll their bins from the back up there to the street.
20 So I don't know what kind of help our staff can get us or
21 whatever regs we have concerning that, because they're not
22 County alleys. Like I say, the Town was a private town and so
23 I don't know what regulations could be used in order to maybe
24 give consideration to the fact that it is not a safe practice
25 to do that, to put our bins out, and especially when you're

1 exposing your kids to do it - a lot of young kids do that for
2 their parents or their grandparents or whatever. So our
3 Supervisor Rios made the request, from what I understand, of
4 hat Waste Management to go back to the utilization of our
5 alleys and I understand that they said no, so what do you do?
6 You know we pay for our garbage service because the County
7 gave up the garbage service at one time because of the cost
8 and what have you, so they contracted it out. It would be
9 nice if the County could say okay, return to this, you know,
10 using the alleys. But they can't, because we pay for our
11 garbage service.

12 RIGGINS: I will give you a parallel. I have a
13 house in Tucson that's built on an 1880 lot and the entire
14 neighborhood, which is the West University Historic District,
15 all has very, very good service alleys. They were all
16 designed with service alleys, and every bit of the trash
17 pickup is off the streets by the City of Tucson, because it's
18 easier, and it is not better for the residents in any way,
19 shape or form, and I guarantee you in Tucson, at least, it
20 will never go back because they've got it done, and they won't
21 go back because they, they like doing it better. So I don't
22 know if there's anything in the County that can (inaudible).

23 SALAS: The other thing is, you know, it doesn't
24 make our Town look prettier, because any time you have trash
25 being picked up, you're going to have papers flying around and

1 -

2 RIGGINS: It's terrible. And there's always people
3 that don't take their trash cans back in.

4 SALAS: That's right.

5 RIGGINS: Yeah.

6 SALAS: So, you know, I was wondering if there was
7 anything that's in the County regs that could say okay, you
8 know, this is an ordinance that's has to be followed, I don't
9 know.

10 LANGLITZ: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Salas, because
11 it's in incorporated Mammoth, there really isn't anything the
12 County can do, but I'd take a look at the contract with Waste
13 Management - I think is it Steven Cooper? Does Steven Cooper
14 represent Mammoth? The attorney? Have the Town Attorney take
15 a look at that. I'd be surprised if there wasn't some
16 leverage or something that the Tow -

17 SALAS: (Inaudible) incorporated, you know that.

18 LANGLITZ: Yeah, but in the - the Town will have a
19 contract with Waste Management. I'd ask the Town Attorney to
20 take a look at that. I think it's Steven Cooper, I'm not
21 sure, and say hey, you know, what can we do here to force them
22 back in, and maybe a local ordinance you can do, but
23 unfortunately because it's in Mammoth, there isn't probably -

24 RIGGINS: San Manuel.

25 LANGLITZ: Oh, San Manuel, I'm sorry. Okay.

1 SALAS: They're not a city.

2 LANGLITZ: Oh, San - oh okay.

3 SALAS: They're unincorporated and the contract was
4 handed over to Waste Management by our county. We used to
5 have county services.

6 LANGLITZ: Oh, okay. Boy, I -

7 SALAS: That contract was just given to Waste
8 Management. I don't even know if there were any other bids to
9 go for the service, but it was handed over to Waste
10 Management.

11 LANGLITZ: Boy I blew that one, huh? I kind of set
12 myself right up. Let me - yeah, we'll take a look at the
13 contract with Waste Management and see.

14 SALAS: You know, you'd think that we could say
15 okay, you better turn this right, or you're out of here. Or
16 bring in somebody else that would give a better rate.

17 LANGLITZ: Okay. Mr. Chair, the County Attorney's
18 Office will take a look at that contract.

19 RIGGINS: That would be appropriate.

20 LANGLITZ: All right, and probably get back to
21 Supervisor Rios.

22 RIGGINS: Okay.

23 LANGLITZ: Okay.

24 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I have one more question.

25 RIGGINS: Go right ahead.

1 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Are we going to have a meeting next
2 month?

3 ABRAHAM: We are.

4 RIGGINS: That's affirmative.

5 ABRAHAM: Correct.

6 RIGGINS: Okay.

7 AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Are you asking for adjournment?

8 GRUBB: Mr. Chair?

9 RIGGINS: I'm looking for a motion.

10 GRUBB: I move we adjourn.

11 RIGGINS: We have a second.

12 PUTRICK: Second.

13 RIGGINS: We have a second by Commissioner Putrick.

14 All in favor, signify by saying aye.

15 COLLECTIVE: Aye.

16 RIGGINS: So we can go.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

