

ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
1300 W. WASHINGTON ST.
PHOENIX, AZ
JANUARY 20, 2005
MINUTES

Board Members Present:

John Hays, Chairman
Elizabeth Stewart
William Porter
William Cordasco
Janice Chilton
Gabriel Gonzales-Beechum (arrived at 9:45 a.m.)
Mark Winkleman (arrived at 9:12 a.m.)

Staff Present:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administration
Cristie Statler, Executive Consultant
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary

Attorney General's Office:

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Chairman Hays called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

B. PRESENTATIONS

1. Cachet Homes

Mr. Ream distributed the latest version of a proposed agreement between Cross Creek Ranch Community Association and Arizona State Parks (ASP) to the Board. He noted that Mr. Shelly, of Cachet Homes, appeared before the Board at its November 2004 meeting and advised the Board that he was interested in finalizing this agreement with ASP that provides private access to Red Rock State Park. Photographs were included in the Board packet of that access point. Cachet Homes would have liked to have this agreement signed while they were the majority holder of the Homeowners Association (HOA). Since the November Board meeting, the HOA has transferred to the homeowners so the Board is now dealing with the homeowners. However, Cachet Homes has asked to facilitate on the homeowners' behalf since Cachet Homes is local while the homeowners are scattered about. No homes have been built to date on the property.

Mr. Ream noted that there are two language changes from the draft included in the Board packet. Those changes are included in C.4. and C.5. and were made at the

request of the Board's counsel.

Mr. Ream discussed the highlights of the agreement. The HOA is required to inform the state of annual meetings with the Board's representative to attend. The purpose of that attendance is for the Board's representative to sell each member of the HOA an Annual Pass should they desire access to the park using that access gate. The access gate will be locked with a code provided only to Annual Pass holders. There also is a maintenance easement for the diversion dam of Oak Creek and the Armijo Ditch. This is something that needs to be done whether or not access is granted. Maintenance activities will be coordinated with the Park Manager; they will not enter the park for maintenance unless they first coordinate with the Park Manager who will, in turn, monitor the ditch and let the HOA or its representative know about any problems with the water flowing through it. There will be no bikes, dogs, or horses permitted through the access gate. Only Annual Pass holders will be able to use the access gate. The park will construct a connecting trail to an existing park trail. There is no off-trail hiking in Red Rock State Park. The parties agree to use arbitration to resolve any differences. There is provision for indemnification of the state.

Mr. Ream reported that the agency's issues with the agreement includes the fact that a precedent is being created by granting access to an "under development" association; it is the agency's standard operating procedure to fence borders of the park and limit access. Once granted, revocation of this kind of thing is almost impossible. This agreement expires in three years; however, once this type of agreement has been entered into it is very difficult to get out of.

Mr. Ream reported that Cachet Homes has already built a gate and trail. There was a letter from the Park Manager in February 2003 that stated his affirmation of the park's intention to work with Cachet Homes in developing access from Cross Creek Ranch. However, Mr. Ream sent a subsequent letter that stated that ASP must approve any direct access to the park. While Cachet Homes had an early indication of possible access, they did understand the final decision is really up to the Parks Board.

Mr. Porter asked what Cachet Homes' reaction was to the letter from Mr. Ream.

Mr. Ream suggested that question be directed to the representatives of Cachet Homes, who were present at this meeting. He personally received no response to that letter. He noted that his interaction with Cachet Homes has been very amicable thus far.

Ms. Stewart stated that she believes it is important that there be an agreement. She stated her concern about the terms of this proposed agreement. She feels that if the Board is going to permit this kind of access then the HOA must collect money from each member so that each member automatically has a pass as part of their Association dues. The Board is in a position where this would be like not staffing an entry station to the park and puts the Board in a position of having an unmanned gate with no policing of it. Signs that simply say "State Park" don't tell them it's a violation of law to enter without a pass. People don't always understand. She believes that the Board is heading down a road of potentially having strained relations in the future. She believes it is better to take a firmer position early on and clearly define rights and responsibilities

so that there is no misunderstanding. She believes that the Board should require that if they want to have a gate and they want to have this agreement, then every member must join and it should be up to the Association to collect the money and bring it to the park each year. They will then receive the passes, and neither side needs to worry. It would be predictable. Otherwise there will be confusion over who did and did not join. Not requiring membership make it difficult to monitor and be unfair to the general public. If they want a special privilege then it needs to be paid for.

Chairman Hays asked if staff thought this type of scenario could also apply to Rio Rico.

Mr. Ream responded that it applies in a variety of places. There already is wildcat access on many of the parks – Catalina has quite a few accesses. Catalina is a 5,000 acre park. Rio Rico/Sonoita Creek certainly has those issues. All of the parks do to a certain extent. They are, by nature, large. Any fence can be cut.

Mr. Cordasco noted that there was mention of taking this up in Executive Session and that he's not sure when the actual discussion on this issue will take place.

Chairman Hays stated that now is the time for questions and answers. No official action would be taken until later.

Mr. Ream noted that the Board has the opportunity to discuss this matter in Executive Session for legal advice on this agreement. The Board does not have to take action on this issue today. Staff can bring it back before the Board with additional information in February. Cachet Homes would prefer that the Board deal with it today; but staff want to ensure that Board has all the information they need before taking action.

Mr. Porter suggested that it may be appropriate, since representatives from Cachet Homes are present, to advance their presentation on this Agenda.

Mr. Travous noted that what starts out as a privilege in a park over time becomes viewed as a right. Another problem is a question of policy that the Board should consider. Our Park Managers are told that we want to be good neighbors. In so doing, the Park Manager here said that the park would be glad to work with them. The Park Managers need to understand that they do not have the authority to give someone else entry to the park. Policy guidelines need to be in place to ensure they know where the bounds are regarding outside entities.

Mr. Matt Cody, Cachet Homes, addressed the Board. He noted that, while they were surprised to receive Mr. Ream's letter, they certainly understand. This agreement is a culmination of about 2-3 years' worth of discussions between the park and Cachet Homes. They received a list of 24 items that the park would like to see incorporated into Cachet Homes' planning. Some were as simple as ensuring that all fencing is open to allow wildlife movement to as formal as prohibiting pedestrians from the shared riparian area. In an effort to be a good neighbor Cachet Homes accommodated all 24 items that ASP requested. They had the park's support as well throughout their planning process. Their reaction to Mr. Ream's letter was one of surprise, but they understand that until the agreement is signed there is no agreement. It has placed them in a predicament of representing to the 84 homeowners that this was something they

would be able provide. It is an awkward position for them to be in and if there are additional restrictions such as requiring every homeowner to have an Annual Pass, they will do everything possible to help the Board assist the homeowners.

Mr. Cody added that this is a unique situation. There is more than a mile's worth of a "drainage channel" that moves through the park and ultimately terminates on that property. It is quite expensive to maintain. The HOA is accepting the responsibility for that maintenance. It creates vegetation and wildlife activities. It isn't simply a one-way street.

Mr. Cody noted that if this access is something that needs to be tried and their residents prove themselves to be less-than-forthright, then it needs to be revoked. Perhaps the Annual Pass requirement would be a way to provide the Board the right to revoke that privilege.

Mr. Cody encouraged the Board to allow them to demonstrate they are worthy of the privilege. If it is abused, then the Board has the right to take it away.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the community is fully developed.

Mr. Cody responded that it is from the perspective that 84 lots exist, there is a private sewer treatment plant, a water company, etc. Over time those 84 lots will actually receive custom homes. There is restricted access into that neighborhood so there would be no concern about people deciding to get into the park from there – they can't get to the gate much less through the gate. It would be inclusive to that neighborhood and would help control some of the public access issues.

Ms. Stewart noted that it is frustrating to Cachet Homes for it to take this long. When working with any governmental entity, there are various layers that one has to go through. She believes that the Board wants to ensure that two or three years from now people do not have differing understandings of just what their rights and obligations are. She believes that it is appropriate for the Park Managers to work with the community to solve special problems; it then eventually comes to the Board who sometimes have additional concerns or ideas based on problems they have had in other areas or problems they anticipate. She believes that if there can be some kind of arrangement where, as part of their association dues, an amount is collected from everyone to pay for the annual park pass it will eliminate the issues of policing the access area and giving a special population a privilege not available to the rest of the public. She sees this as being different from some of the access areas at Catalina and other parks. This is something that was planned. It is an actual trail built by a developer or association of a housing development. Some of these others just happened. The Board probably has more of a responsibility to have a policy on this type of situation. She doesn't want Cachet Homes to think that her comments indicate a lack of enthusiasm for working through this issue. It will probably take the Board another month or two to come up with all of the details.

Mr. Cody responded that he believes Cachet Homes is prepared to allow the Board to add any additional teeth to the agreement they feel are necessary. Because the Board is dealing with an HOA, there is a greater responsibility versus dealing with a private

individual to hold them accountable to restricting access in the future. He is hopeful that this can be the start of a very nice relationship.

Mr. Porter added that one advantage to Ms. Stewart's suggestion of requiring every homeowner to buy a pass is that it would not be necessary for someone from the park go to their annual meetings just to sell passes. He believes that the Board recognize that they are doing something different here that will probably confront them again in the future. This is a good opportunity to form a good mechanism to work within. It's like forming a new kind of partnership and needs to be done right. He saw no reason why the Board couldn't take it up and act on it at this meeting with, perhaps, the provision of changes the Board has discussed.

Mr. Shelly, Cachet Homes, addressed the Board. He noted that he had attended the Board's meeting in November and spoke to them about this issue at that time. He noted that Mr. Cody covered everything and that he had no additional comments at this time.

Mr. Cordasco asked if staff will bring a revised version of this agreement back to the Board in a month or two.

Mr. Porter responded that he would at least like the Board to consider taking it up today if an action could be taken conditioned upon certain items.

Mr. Ream suggested that Board members could E-mail their thoughts or ideas to him and he could incorporate them into the draft of the agreement, distribute that draft as a mid-meeting update, and take it up at the February Board meeting.

Ms. Stewart stated that she felt this issue is important enough that that Board needs to see the actual language.

2. Patagonia Lake Boating Restrictions

Mr. Ream presented a PowerPoint slide show. He noted that this item is for information purposes only. He stated that staff have made several attempts to resolve this issue over the past couple of years. The more staff worked on it, the more complex it became.

Mr. Ream reported that restrictions were placed on Patagonia Lake 14 years ago. Two years ago the Board participated in a boat tour of the lake where they witnessed the scene of a boating accident involving a high-speed boat where two people were hospitalized. It was very bad accident scene. As a result of seeing that accident, the Board asked for a report. The Park Manager provided a report and the Board directed staff to review safety considerations.

Mr. Ream reported that staff's first effort was to survey visitors in the park to get information on the types of uses at the park. The survey found that the most popular usages are sightseeing, hiking, RV trailoring, camping, and nature. Fishing, boating, and swimming are almost at the end, with personal watercraft usage near the bottom. Most of the people come to Patagonia for reasons other than watercraft recreation.

Ms. Stewart noted that boating was separated from water skiing. She noted that one needs a boat to ski.

Mr. Ream responded that because of the regulations established in 1989 after public

hearings, during the weekends there is no water skiing – it is only boating.

Mr. Ream referred to a slide that detailed research done in 1989. The lake was divided in half. It is a 265-acre lake; divided in half there is 136 acres on each side. One side allows water skiing, jet skiing, wake boarding, etc. The other side is a no-wake area.

Mr. Ream referred to a slide that detailed the additional regulations from the 1989 town meetings. Afterwards, research data was reviewed within the agency relating to concerns identified by the Park Manager in his report to the Board. Staff noted that none of the decisions were based on hard science. The Park Manager stood on the shore, noted problems, and made decisions to try to solve those problems.

Mr. Ream referred to a slide that detailed accident data for a 12-year period. This accident data does not support additional prohibitions. It shows that the prohibitions already in place are working. The accidents over the entire 12-year period would be a good weekend of accidents on Lake Havasu. One reason for the low accident rate at Patagonia can be attributed to the fact that there are five law enforcement officers at that park. Another reason is that while visitation is growing, it has not reached capacity.

Mr. Ream referred to slides detailing safety concerns from the Park Manager's report. Noise turned out to be a significant concern. The environmental impacts are a concern to the Resource Management Section as they work through the Management Plan for the Sonoita Creek Natural Area, just below the dam and downstream from Patagonia Lake.

Ms. Stewart noted that no mention had been made of the issue of the oil getting into the water.

Mr. Ream responded that he hesitates to talk about oil getting into the water and moving down in public meetings because staff have not done a study on that there.

Mr. Ream noted that the Executive Director asked the Southern Region Manager to speak about these safety issues. Mr. Furnish stated that, "You have to see it for yourself; it's not one issue; it is the mix." It is the recreation that makes it dangerous. It can't be captured on film. It's a combination of noise, swimming, boating, size of the lake, and increase of visitation that puts additional demands on the staff in other areas. When the environmental concerns are added to this mix it adds to the argument.

Mr. Ream reported that staff were asked to develop recommendations for watercraft at the park and a plan for public hearings and implementation. This plan should be ready for review by the March 2005 Board meeting. This plan could be a five-year plan; it could be a ten-year plan. Each recommendation has potential problems that can impede implementation, such as vocal user groups, equipment manufacturers, or visitors with older equipment who are often on a low income and use fishing as a supplemental food source. Safety data alone doesn't support any of these prohibitions. A well-thought-out Management Plan will be necessary to successful implementation and enforcement. This may include phasing in some of the prohibitions over time to allow users to find alternative recreation and venues and purchase newer equipment.

Mr. Porter noted that a request was made a few years ago to start to look at this issue.

He noted that he is not bothered that it's taken this long. Staff have started at a sort of "ground zero" in looking at something that hasn't been looked at for some time. He is very pleased with attention that has been given to it and is comforted by the figures. He is pleased with the fact that staff are now looking at establishing a longer range view of this issue and are trying to figure out what needs to be done, not so much with the existing problem but how to deal with the noise issues and the pollution issues.

Mr. Travous stated that he anticipates staff will bring a list of new restrictions in a sequence of order in March.

Chairman Hays asked if there is any way for staff to get public input from the users.

Mr. Travous responded that if staff do not find a way to get that input, the users will find a way to give it to staff. When the restrictions were put in place and the lake was cut in half in 1989 there were articles in the skiing magazines in California; people take this up as an issue. The jet ski community will take this up as an issue and people will come out of the woodwork because of that. Rather than talk about cutting it off, staff will talk about timeframes when it will be done in order to lessen the shock of it and give those people time to think about whether to buy the boat or the jet skis or find other places to use them.

Mr. Porter noted that what staff have gone through with this process over the past few years is a good initial development of a methodology that might be applied at other lake parks to counter issues over time as the system grows and the usage changes. It would not be a bad thing to perhaps begin a quiet application of this process once it has been completed at Patagonia and take the lessons learned and the methodologies and begin looking at the other lake parks to get a pulse of what may be developing in them.

Mr. Ream responded that training of officers in noise enforcement has already begun. It is a very difficult thing to enforce.

Ms. Stewart stated her agreement that staff cannot come up with a mathematical formula. However, staff can develop some standards and it appears some of that has been done. It is a combination of somewhat incompatible uses that are occurring in a small space. This lake cannot be compared with another lake because every lake is different in terms of the land, the shape, etc. While it is a problem, she believes the Board needs to stay focused on both the issues of safety and its impact on the Sonoita Creek Natural Area, which was purchased with Natural Areas money to protect the resource. She believes the oil and gas is a significant issue – or can be – as the usage increases. She understands that jet skis are being banned in a number of places because of safety and pollution issues. She believes that is a little easier to do and that the Board won't be the first to do it if that's what ultimately happens.

3. Friends Groups Development

Ms. Statler reported that the Board received the first draft of a Cooperative Agreement between ASP and Arizona State Parks Foundation (Foundation) that has been alluded to for a few months. Included as attachments are the Articles of Incorporation, By Laws of the Foundation, and the letter from the IRS regarding their 501(c)3 tax exempt status.

Ms. Statler reported that the purpose of this document is to establish a clear picture of the rights, obligations, and expectations that each organization has to the other. She asked that the Board take the time between now and the next Board meeting to review this document and call her with comments and/or questions relating to it. Also incorporated are expectations from Risk Management. Staff have worked very hard to make this as comprehensive as possible so that there won't be issues down-the-road. It is all about policy-making and creating clear expectations to avoid potential difficulties with potential partners 3, 5, or 10 years down-the-road. She stated that she was hopeful the Parks Board would consider this document for adoption at their February meeting.

Mr. Porter requested that the Board take up the discussion on the History Convention since the meeting was running a bit ahead of schedule and since the discussion is purely informational.

Chairman Hays then moved to Agenda Item F.6.

F. DISCUSSION ITEMS – The Board and staff will discuss and the Board may take action on the following: (some of these reports may be verbal)

6. History Convention

Mr. Porter reported that people from the ASP system will be making presentations and writing papers for this year's History Convention. He noted that a partnership has been entered into for advertising with Guidon Books, a long-time attendee of the Convention with a display and sales. They were looking for a partner to put out an advertising canvas tote bag that the convention-goers can use. It is usually funded by the party that is the focus of the convention and are rather expensive. One-half of that bag is an advertisement for Guidon and the other half is for ASP. There was an accidental overprinting of those bags resulting in enough extra bags that can be used for the Convention in Tucson in 2006. Guidon is picking up 1/2 of the \$1 per bag cost and the Convention Board is paying for the other half. It won't cost ASP anything for that free advertising.

Mr. Porter noted that Mr. Travous will be the Saturday luncheon speaker. This is the first time in many, many years that there will be a speaker at the Saturday luncheon. Mr. Travous will speak on the day ASP ran the Grand Canyon. It will be heavily publicized with a special mailing that will also publicize the Plenary Session which will be given at the Convention on Friday morning.

Mr. Porter noted that a grant was received from the McFarland State Park Advisory Committee (MSPAC) for the next three years running to sponsor the Plenary Session of the Convention and they requested that it be tied into McFarland State Historic Park. This session will be known as the McFarland Session from now on. This year it will be a three-man panel dealing with the problems and issues of conservation (history, land, etc.) to be chaired by Jack August, formerly a history professor from NAU and currently Executive Director of the Arizona History Foundation. The other members of the panel will be Mr. Winkleman, Board member and State Land Commissioner, and Mr. Jim Garrison, State Historic Preservation Officer at ASP. It should be a dynamite presentation. He thanked everyone who actively helped to make this work. He

noted that there were several people from staff (Ms. Liz Krug, RAM, and others) who put together the design for the program for the Convention this year. It has gone to the publishers. Salt River Project (SRP) underwrites that cost. The program will be centered on ASP.

Chairman Hays asked if anyone can attend the convention.

Mr. Porter responded affirmatively.

Ms. Stewart noted that the April Board meeting was set up so the Board will be right there. She hoped that everyone will stay. The Board meets Thursday morning. The vendors open Thursday afternoon. There is an event for the History Convention Thursday evening. Sessions begin Friday. Three ASP presenters will present during the break-out sessions. It is an opportunity to see those presentations. On Saturday there are more break-out sessions with tours planned on Sunday at a couple of the parks.

Mr. Porter added that this will be the first year registrations will be accepted online. Their website will also have the full program for this convention on it very shortly along with registration information. The website is www.arizonahistory.org

Ms. Stewart noted that there are a number of luncheons and plenary sessions. In order to promote ASP, Ms. Krug and Mr. Garrison are preparing "before and after" slides of various parks that will flash continuously. There will be a different series of slides running at each event so people will get a good sense of what the agency is all about and what it has gone through.

Mr. Porter stated he would bring a large supply of programs to the February meeting to distribute to anyone and everyone. He urged that those wishing to participate register early. They are expecting a large turnout at this Convention. There may be people who will not be able to attend some of the meal functions simply because of the number limitations. They expect the Homolovi tour to sell out quickly because it is very limited.

Mr. Travous noted that when the agency took over the Grand Canyon it included things such as communiqués from the White House that they were going to federalize the National Guard. He was called by the Governor during a Parks Board meeting and asked to go to the Grand Canyon. The Board's guidance to him was that he was allowed to go up there but he was not allowed to enter the Grand Canyon unless he was invited in by the Parks Service. That became an issue with the Governor and others. It was an intriguing period.

Chairman Hays called for a Recess at 9:52 a.m. He reconvened the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

C. BOARD PROCEDURES – No later than 10:00 a.m. – The Board may discuss matters of Board procedures relative to its meetings.

Chairman Hays noted that the Board should have received a letter from him. He researched ways and means for the Board to increase its efficiency and get its business accomplished in the time allotted. He opened the floor to discussion on this issue.

Mr. Porter commended Chairman Hays for starting a process. In discussions with Ms. Stewart he believes that, should she be elected Chairman later in the meeting, she

intends to follow-up and he will work with her to refine this process and find ways to make the meetings more efficient, shorter, and harder-hitting. This is a very good start. Today is an opportunity to experiment with it. Having said that, he suggested that the Board look very hard at utilizing the Consent Agenda much more intensely than in the past. Virtually anything that comes up that is not controversial ought to initially go on to the Consent Agenda. If items need to be pulled, fine. If it's not controversial it can be done and done quickly. He suggested there are other things that the Board can do to help make things move more smoothly and efficiently.

Chairman Hays noted that this is not original. He looked at several other entities (Central Arizona Water Users, Town of Florence, etc.) that follow this procedure. While it's not original at all, it does work for other very important agencies that have a lot of business to conduct. He would like to see the Board try it. If it doesn't work, then modify it or throw it out.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he likes it, too and asked if it would be appropriate now to make a motion to approve this process.

Ms. Stewart suggested trying it for a couple of months first. She noted that the Board already went outside of the agenda this morning. She believes it is better to have this as something the Board works on for a little while. She believes there are a lot of good ideas. She feels that a lot of the Executive Staff reports can be added to the Consent Agenda. If the Board can get the materials ahead of time then the meeting time can be limited to discussion. She spoke with Mr. Travous and Mr. Porter about continuing to have presentations, but each month selecting an item that the Board has wanted to discuss in depth relating to Board policies that there never seems to be time to discuss. She noted that there are a number of them, such as how to position the agency for the changing demographics; what the Board is going to do about State Trust Land. She suggested each month having one of those areas on the Agenda with a Board member assigned responsibility for conducting additional research in that area. Then the Board could focus their time more on those things rather than some things that are more routine if they had the information ahead of time.

Mr. Cordasco asked if this is what the Board is going to do for a while to see how it goes, whether it would be appropriate to make a motion to approve it through July. He would like to know that this is what the meetings are going to be.

Mr. Porter stated he would prefer to wait. He would be much more comfortable with doing that in February. He wants the opportunity to see how it goes the rest of the day. He believes that there are things the Board will want to add to it. Since the Board will be electing new officers later today, he suggested that the Board wait and take it up in February.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the meeting structure will be nailed down today.

Ms. Stewart responded affirmatively. She stated that she believes the Board absolutely needs to plan on meeting from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. She is concerned, however, about saying that the regular session does not begin until 10:00 a.m. because then people start thinking they don't really need to be there until 10:00 a.m. Without a quorum, the

Board cannot have the presentations. She believes that the Board needs to give some thought to those issues.

Mr. Porter responded that he wasn't sure that is totally true. As long as the Board is not taking action it does not need a quorum.

Ms. Hernbrode strongly recommended that the Board not conduct any business, including taking reports, without a quorum. Having said that, she has allowed groups to "straight receive" reports, such as receiving a mid-monthly E-mail without discussion and certainly without any consensus-building activities, without a quorum. She strongly urged that the Board not do that. It works better when there is a quorum of the Board present. Additionally, when the Board finally attains a quorum, it has to have the same discussion all over again.

Mr. Porter agreed with Ms. Hernbrode's recommendation.

Ms. Stewart noted that a couple of little things like that need to be worked on as well as ending with an Executive Session. She believes that the Executive Session should be strictly limited. She would like to do away with them, except for very brief things where it is absolutely necessary when the Board have a few specific questions. She would prefer to plow through the meeting without a break for lunch, end at 1:00 p.m., and let everyone worry about lunch on their own.

Mr. Cordasco asked if everyone is clear and if the Board members are saying they want to go with this process for a while.

Mr. Porter responded that he believes the Board are saying that at least the February meeting will probably be structured very close to this. There may be some fine-tuning.

Ms. Stewart added that she believes the Board are looking at conducting their meetings from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. On days when, like this morning, members of the public are present they may need to be heard at the beginning of the meeting. Depending on the meeting site, people may have traveled four or five hours to get there. For the Board to say they won't hear from them for another three hours may not be appropriate.

Mr. Porter added that he had a lot of discussions with Ms. Stewart, Mr. Hays, and Mr. Travous. Instituting this type of meeting process is intended to not only make the Board more efficient and effective, but to recognize that many Board members travel from distances or have other things they have to give their time to. The Board needs to maximize each Board member's valuable time. The whole idea will be to get these meetings back within a controlled time period with whatever fine-tuning may be necessary. The end result is to get a shorter, harder-hitting meeting where the Board members feel they can come, take care of the business that's important, and then get on with the things they need to do while being able to reasonably count on the time frame.

Chairman Hays noted that there needs to be time available sometimes for the multitude of questions. Some issues really stimulate questions that take time from others who can't afford to spend that time on them. He suggested 8:00-9:00 a.m. (before the meeting officially begins) as a time for questions and answers with no action being taken. Receiving information should not require a quorum any more than receiving an

E-mail requires a quorum.

Ms. Hernbrode recommended that the Board have a quorum when it is actually physically meeting. The Chairman is correct in that a quorum is not necessary if the Board is just receiving information, there is no discussion, and there is certainly no consensus-building.

Ms. Stewart noted that she would not be comfortable presiding over a meeting without a quorum.

Mr. Travous stated that he would be encouraged if the Board followed this process, even if it's just for another month, because the guidelines are not just for the Board – they are for staff. Staff have restructured the way they do what they are doing today to follow what they anticipate will be done. They are guidelines. The Board can always make changes at the next meeting with a Board vote. Staff literally begin working on the next Board packet next week. He encouraged the Board to adopt some guidelines.

Chairman Hays suggested adopting these guidelines for one more meeting, allow it to sunset, then either reinstate it or change it.

Ms. Stewart stated that she would like to change it to beginning the meeting at 9:00 a.m. She believes it needs to be a 9:00 a.m. time certain rather than an optional work session. She will not be willing to start a meeting without a quorum.

Mr. Porter added that he would like to delete any reference, *per se*, to lunch. The option of breaking for lunch always exists for the Board if they want it. If the meeting were going substantially beyond lunch, then there needs to be provision made. However, it almost encourages the Board to drag the meetings on by making lunch an incorporated part of the meeting.

Chairman Hays agreed - if the meetings will adjourn by 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Porter stated that he believed Ms. Stewart's goal and his, should he succeed her as Chairman, will be to begin the meetings at 9:00 a.m. and adjourn them at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Winkleman stated that four hours for a Board meeting seems too long. He suggested that the Board should adjourn at 12:00 Noon.

Ms. Stewart noted most boards meet four to six hours a week.

Mr. Winkleman disagreed. He stated that he sits on several boards and they don't normally meet that long.

Mr. Porter added that the more effective boards' meetings are much shorter. People become ineffective after three hours in a meeting. Any expert on the subject will agree.

Mr. Winkleman stated that this Board meets regularly. Four hours is more time than this Board ought to meet at a time.

Mr. Porter agreed. He believes that the Board can accomplish what they need to by Noon.

Ms. Stewart stated that she believes the Board can do it if they get written reports ahead of time. There were a issues today where the Board did not get the information

until today. She doesn't think Board members can really read through the material while someone is talking and make informed decisions or have effective discussions. She believes if staff can work with the Board and get this information to the Board so most of it can be pushed to the Consent Agenda, then it is possible to get through the meetings much more quickly.

Mr. Travous responded that staff try not to provide materials at the meeting that the Board needs to vote on. At the same time, if staff get feedback from the Board that they are OK with the information, then it can be placed on the Consent Agenda. Regarding lunch, staff will be prepared as best they can to be able to send someone out to bring in lunch if the meetings look like they will go beyond so the Board does not have to take time from their meeting to go out to lunch.

Mr. Porter stated that he did not believe the Board needed a motion at this time. He believed that staff understands the will of the Board is that they will continue this approximate format with those changes for at least February. In February he would like the Board to adopt something.

Ms. Stewart noted that she will meet with Mr. Travous to plan the Agenda and work on this process to refine it as things progress. She believes that this is the goal. There are some important issues that need to be discussed and time needs to be made available for that.

Chairman Hays stated that he reserved the right to bring up this issue in the form of a motion in the future if he finds that the Board meetings are dragging.

Ms. Stewart stated that she would like a month or so to have an opportunity for additional input. Sometimes things look good in writing. However, the Board already deviated from the Agenda this morning. We may need to work things a bit differently so that exceptions are not made every month.

Mr. Porter asked to be involved with setting the Agenda for the February Board meeting with Ms. Stewart and Mr. Travous.

Mr. Winkleman noted that he, unfortunately, will not be able to be present at the February Board meeting. He wanted the Board to know that it is his opinion that the Board really needs to figure out a way to keep these meetings to three hours. That is plenty of time for a board that meets this regularly. If the meetings start at 9:00 a.m. and adjourns by Noon it works well. He would like to participate on this Board as much as he can; it is difficult when it goes late into the afternoon. He feels very strongly that the Board ought to be able to get its business done in three hours.

Chairman Hays noted that it is very difficult for the State Land Commissioner to make the time to attend these Board meetings. He commended Mr. Winkleman for the outstanding job he has done in attending the Board meetings.

Ms. Stewart added that she spoke with Mr. Ream about the tours. One of the reasons the Board holds its meetings around the state is so that Board members have an opportunity to tour the parks. Those tours will occur later in the afternoon (2:30 or 3:00 p.m.) so that it isn't a full two-day affair. Hopefully more Board members will be

able to attend. However, if it turns out that the Board members cannot attend, then the Board should think about moving all of the meetings back to Phoenix.

Chairman Hays noted his preference for meeting throughout the state. It's the only time he gets to see the park system.

D. CONSENT AGENDA - The following items of a noncontroversial nature have been grouped together for a single vote without Board discussion. The Consent Agenda is a timesaving device and Board members received documentation on these items for their review prior to the open meeting. Any Board member may remove any item from the Consent Agenda for discussion and a separate vote at this meeting as deemed necessary. The public may view the documentation relating to the Consent Agenda at the Board's office, 1300 W. Washington, Suite 104, Phoenix, Arizona. (5 minutes)

- 1. Approve Minutes of November 18, 2004 State Parks Board Meeting**
- 2. Law Enforcement Commissions** – Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks board designate Brandon Baeuerlen as an Arizona State Parks law Enforcement officer, contingent upon his successfully completing the CARLOTA training.
- 3. Consider Approving the Maricopa Trail, Segment 10 into the State Trails System** – Staff recommends the Maricopa Trail, Segment 10 for inclusion into the State Trails System.

Mr. Porter made a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda. Mr. Cordasco seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

E. BOARD ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Marketing Budget – Diamondbacks** - Staff recommends that the External Affairs Division continue to explore and enter into marketing partnerships with private industry organizations, which may include the Arizona Diamondbacks or others, when those partnerships can raise the awareness of the agency, both its parks and programs in Arizona and beyond.

Mr. Ziemann reported that the Board and staff discussed this issue in July and November. He had nothing more to add.

Board Action

Mr. Cordasco: I move that the External Affairs Division continue to explore and enter into marketing partnerships with private industry organizations in an effort to effectively market Arizona State Parks.

Mr. Winkleman seconded the motion.

Mr. Porter stated that he is not antagonistic, per se, to continuing to do things with the Diamondbacks; but he is not in support of it yet. He is still looking for something that would give him a comfort zone that this is really doing something meaningful for the Board. He had asked for data relating to hits on the website and understands that the system was down for a period of time. However, the figures that were provided

certainly do not do anything because they don't show any significant pattern that would suggest the Board is getting any more activity on the website either on the days of games or immediately afterward than ordinarily. Perhaps, if full figures were available, there would be a pattern. However, it certainly doesn't show up in the data provided.

Mr. Porter added that he has asked for anything that would indicate a substantial number of coupons being redeemed at the parks. He isn't sure he ever got a clear response to that request. He understands that there is not a substantial number of those coupons being redeemed. He certainly likes the idea of having the agency's name as a sponsor for the camps; but he doesn't believe that really is doing very much of anything. He is not satisfied that just splashing our name in a ballpark is doing something – not for \$50,000.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he appreciates Mr. Porter's comments. His position comes from reading the information provided in the Board packet and previous discussions the Board has had on this issue. He stated that he is not a Marketing specialist. With that in mind, there is a point where the Board needs to appreciate the input that is given to them from Marketing specialists. The marketing firm of Blue Wolf was hired to analyze this. That's what they do – analyze and figure out strategies for marketing and where the biggest bang for the buck is. Clearly staff have had some experience and feel for what is going on that perhaps just can't be put in the form of data. That's why he feels that the Board could probably continue talking about this issue. He doesn't see the results, but at the same time the people who were hired to tell the Board what to do are saying this is what we should do.

Chairman Hays noted that they are experts in the Marketing field. He is sure they would have recommended other media outlets if they were equally as effective. They have not done so. He personally feels that these people are experts in their field. We are hitting the biggest potential media outlet.

Ms. Stewart stated her agreement with Mr. Porter's comments. She cannot support this motion unless it specifically says that there shall be no contract with the Diamondbacks without the specific approval of the Board. She believes that the Board are stewards of the state's money; they have very limited funds to spend on advertising; there are other areas where she believes there would be much more bang for the buck. A representative from Maricopa County spoke to the Board about doing some joint things with kiosks on trailheads where people are already out doing those things. There are magazines such as the AAA's *High Roads*. Those are people who travel and would like to see things. We can get smaller ads in those magazines. We can get a number of ads – there's *Phoenix Magazine*, *Arizona Monthly*, etc. She believes there's a lot of different ways to market the agency. If one compares Blue Wolf's information on the Diamondbacks and then takes it with the agency's marketing survey, it doesn't add up as the best way for the Board to go. Notwithstanding, she doesn't know exactly what Blue Wolf considers; however, the Board has an obligation as Board members. Based on what the Board has seen, she can't say it was necessarily inappropriate for the Board to have had the past relationship with the Diamondbacks. It may have made a lot of sense when the Board opened up the Big Room. She believes that now it is time to try something different and be more focused.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he appreciates Ms. Stewart's comments, but he is not sure what she is saying.

Ms. Stewart explained that she is saying that it's fine for staff to continue to "explore" but not to enter into any partnership with the Diamondbacks without specific authority from the Board. As soon as the Board votes on this motion, that contract with the Diamondbacks will be signed.

Mr. Travous stated that is not the case. Staff do not know if the Diamondbacks will offer staff the same deal.

Mr. Ziemann added that staff do not have any proposal from the Diamondbacks at this time.

Mr. Travous noted that this motion allows staff to explore options while there is still time to do so. There is no contract in the wings here. Staff have not even begun discussions with the Diamondbacks because of being in this limbo.

Ms. Stewart stated that she is concerned that this motion totally delegates the Board's authority to the staff. It says, "to explore and enter into marketing" relationships. She believes the Board has a particular concern about the Diamondbacks and would like the motion to say that staff should continue to explore marketing partnerships with private organizations but no contracts shall be entered into with the Diamondbacks without specific authority of the Board.

Mr. Winkleman stated that he did not understand why the Board is spending so much time focusing on the Diamondbacks. It is such a small part of the overall budget. He believes what he is hearing Ms. Stewart saying is that she is concerned that ASP is not being effectively marketed. Rather than line item this, and if it's a concern, then let's get Blue Wolf in here to explain their recommendation. They are the professionals. None of the Board members are professionals in the Marketing field. Get Blue Wolf before the Board and have them explain the entire package rather than just saying that the Diamondbacks don't seem to fit. He doesn't know whether they do or they don't. He doesn't believe any of the Board members know that.

Ms. Hernbrode reminded the Board that they have a time certain approaching and need to move on.

Chairman Hays noted that there is a motion on the floor and called for a vote on that motion.

The motion carried with Mr. Porter and Ms. Stewart voting Nay.

F. DISCUSSION ITEMS – The Board and staff will discuss and the Board may take action on the following: (some of these reports may be verbal)

- 1. Finances** - Update on current year revenue, expenditures, and projections.

Mr. Siegwarth presented a PowerPoint slideshow. He noted that he just received the information for this presentation on Tuesday and did not have enough time to provide the Board with information prior to this meeting.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that it's been six months since the Board has really talked about

numbers. He distributed a hardcopy of the presentation to the Board.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that revenues are looking good as far as interest is concerned. The Heritage Fund Interest is projected to rise to \$650,000 from \$525,000 in FY 05 and \$600,000 in FY 06. SLIF revenues are up about 5% and are on target. OHV is up 6.5% and on target. The Land Conservation Fund (LCF) interest is estimated to increase to \$1.7 million this year. By statute the agency is limited to \$500,000 maximum. Staff expect to spend about \$200,000-\$250,000 this year. Approximately \$1.4-\$1.5 million will go back into the corpus. Next year, that \$1.5 million will be added to the \$20 million. Next year the LCF is estimated to be about \$96-\$97 million. This issue may or may not come up at the legislative budget hearing this afternoon. Law Enforcement Boating Safety Fund (LEBSF) is up 7% - good news for the counties.

Ms. Stewart asked why the increase in LCF will raise concerns with the legislature.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that there is probably more in the Growing Smarter Fund than in the Rainy Day Fund. He thinks the legislature still believe that the interest on the Growing Smarter Fund is not voter protected. Their budget does not touch it at this time, but their budget still has a \$477 million hole. Their understanding is that they can try to raid it but taking that money must further the original purpose of the legislation. He does not believe that, as an agency, the JLBC is looking at anything specific.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that the Pubs Fund is doing very well; the Reservation Surcharge is down 7%. When this presentation was done last week the Enhancement Fund was actually up 1%; it is now down 1%. December was a bad month with revenue down 16% due to the bad weather. The break-even goal for the Enhancement Fund is to be up 25%.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that KCSP is down 12% (\$180,000) year-to-date. The Big Room opened last year. Staff expected it to be up \$150,000 this year. The rest of the parks are doing very well; they were up 9% through November. Unfortunately, December was a bad month system-wide (down 16%). However revenues at the parks excluding KCSP are still up 28% over FY 02. They could end up above 30% by the end of the year.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that the increased rainfall should help the lake parks and possibly create a wildflower season this year. Capital projects being completed at Catalina, River Island, Lost Dutchman, and Dead Horse should help in FY 06 and 07. Staff hope to have a KCSP internet reservation system in place by July 1. The agency's 50th Anniversary in FY 07 should generate some media buzz and result in increased revenues.

Mr. Siegwarth stated that, while he is hopeful, the agency is one or two years off from breaking even. He referred to a graph depicting KCSP FY01-05 revenue and attendance. He is concerned that the big spike was the opening of The Big Room. In December 2004, even with The Big Room open, revenue and attendance is dropping. Throne Room sales are off. This is cause for some concern. Staff track reservations 12 weeks out; they are only meaningful six weeks out. Reservations six weeks out are down about 1/3 from six weeks out a year ago.

Ms. Stewart noted that the public still believe that KCSP is sold out three or four months

out.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that staff have done extensive advertising. A meeting is scheduled in early February to discuss some of these issues. He believes that the Internet Reservation System will be a huge help. It will cost about \$70,000 to update that system.

Mr. Siegwarth referred to a slide regarding cash flow. He noted that the agency has been using its capital funds and not spending all that it can in order to address shortages.

Mr. Siegwarth referred to a chart depicting Enhancement Fund Balance for FY 05-06. He stated that of all the charts in this presentation, this is the one the Board should pay close attention to. The top line illustrates what would happen if the agency made what it spends. About \$2 million is needed to account for seasonal fluctuations (when revenues come in vs. when expenditures go out). The bottom line illustrates how the agency spends what it can (appropriation) but it only makes what it made last year (\$8.8 million). We are currently behind making \$8.8 million this year; but he believes we will end up around \$9.3 million.

Mr. Siegwarth referred to the middle bar on the chart. He believes that that agency will make at least \$9.3 million this year and next year. Staff will try to have at least \$500,000 in savings (not spend all of the appropriation). By doing that, it will be possible to hit FY 07 with \$2 million in the bank. That is very conservative. The goal for FY 07 was to be closer to \$3 million. This slide shows that over the last couple of years, the small daily decisions to save money (in the parks, delay in hiring staff, etc.) is what has kept the agency from going to the legislature this afternoon and requesting a supplemental in order to make payroll next July. That is where a lot of the energy of this agency has been going.

Mr. Siegwarth pointed out that the Enhancement Fund capital is the cushion that will take the agency into FY 07.

Mr. Siegwarth discussed how the agency will save \$500,000 this year. In looking at the gross numbers, one can see that most of it is in Personal Services and OOE (Equipment equals two fire trucks and a garbage truck). It is easier to see when it is viewed as a percentage of the total budget. Personal Services / ERE is 70% of the budget. P&O, Travel In, and Equipment (the garbage truck) are small numbers. Approximately half of the OOE (Other Operating Expenditures) cannot be touched because 17% is rent on the Phoenix Office building, land leases paid at other places; 9% is the Gift Shop merchandise; almost 20% goes to DOA; 3.6% is non-DOA rent; the entire Marketing budget is 13%; some savings might be generated in electricity (13%), but as more campers utilize hook-ups it will be difficult to lower that number significantly. The agency saves money by dragging its feet and hiring when it can. He hopes to generate more than \$600,000 this year. If revenues are only \$9.1 million there needs to be more in savings. In the overall context of this discussion, staff have underlying concerns in just trying to make the budget work.

Mr. Siegwarth referred to a slide relating to Capital Balances. The Enhancement Fund is \$0; OHV is \$0; SLIF, Heritage Fund A&D, Natural Areas do have some money (\$4.2,

\$5.4 and \$4.2 million, respectively). He noted that the \$4.2 million in SLIF is being spent; they are ongoing projects. It is not \$4.2 million just sitting there. To use some of that SLIF money the agency would have to stop construction on a park. There is some statewide money to handle ADA, DEQ, etc. Staff are reticent to begin any new projects.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that the same holds true for Heritage Fund A&D. The unallocated money is essentially for projects that are planned but not necessarily begun. Under Heritage Fund Natural Areas there is \$4 million unallocated. Because there is no additional money to operate or manage property, staff are not fiscally excited about taking on additional responsibilities since they are trying to save money the agency already has.

2. Budget - Discussion/ comparison of budget request, Governor's proposal, legislative proposal

Mr. Siegwarth reported that the agency requested an employee pay raise, restoration of General Fund, and correction of structural imbalances in Enhancement Fund and SLIF – basically to get the agency back to where it was two or three years ago (\$9.5 million). It includes no new operating money; it is just to get the Capital money back and get the OHV program funded.

Mr. Siegwarth referred to a slide depicting what the agency asked for and what it got. Staff asked for a pay raise of 5%. He noted that the state employees' retirement contribution is going up 2.5%. It appears the Governor will try to hold the employees harmless. Because the retirement contribution must be a 50/50 split, in order to hold employees harmless the Governor will probably try to give them a 2.5% raise. It isn't really a raise – take-home pay will remain the same. JLBC has a \$477 million hole and are not proposing an employee raise. Staff expect the Governor and the legislature to deal with this issue at the end of the session. Regarding the remaining agency requests, both the Governor and the JLBC have budgeted \$0.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that this is a two-year budget. Staff managed the agency the past two years to make it to this point in the hopes of getting additional money. Staff will now have to manage another two years. He noted that the agency can, through the budget, spend up to \$4 million SLIF. If staff did that, SLIF would go negative. Approximately \$300,000 was saved last year. To make the budget work into FY 08 those expenditures will have to be reduced from \$4 million down to \$3.5 million.

Mr. Siegwarth added that if revenues do increase, there is some capacity for the agency to spend what it makes. There is no out-of-state travel (problematic for SHPO and Computer Support staff). The agency still needs to make its target; it needs to make \$9.3 million this year, \$9.8 million next year, and \$11 million in 2007. Because there is still a structural deficit, spending in that area will need to be reduced just to not go negative. Staff are not touching the grant program – it will be fully funded. He is talking about using Capital SLIF and Operating SLIF money to make it into FY 08.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that staff worry about things breaking; the agency usually spends about \$1 million per year on something as far as Capital goes. There is some flexibility. It may mean stopping or redirecting projects. Staff are not excited about starting anything new. It may be possible next year to run specific legislation for specific capital

projects or acquisitions. Other funding sources may be identified.

Ms. Stewart noted that there is a fine line about what is Operating and what's Capital in infrastructure repairs.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that replacing lights would be Operational. Bringing in a new air conditioner could be Operational or it could be Capital if the purpose is to redo the system to save money in an energy conservation effort.

Mr. Siegwarth concluded by saying that the good news is that the agency can make it through FY 06 and 07 on either the Governor's or the legislature's budget. Depending on revenue, the agency may be able to do some things it has not done in the past.

Mr. Porter stated that he would like staff to give presentation (or some variation of it) to the new Foundation. Once they get organized and move forward they may become a player. This is not the only entity involved in this. The Arizona Historical Society does the same kind of thing. They have a number of outside groups that began organizing several years ago that are out raising private funds to supplement (Friends of the Arizona Journal raises substantial money). They are beginning to gradually supplement some of the growth things they need to do from private funds. He doubts that looking even five, six, and seven years down the road there will be much difference in the budgets.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that people in government tend to view cuts as temporary and believe that when the money comes back it will be restored. Cuts really are not temporary; they tend to be permanent.

Chairman Hays noted that the problem is that there is so little control as to where revenues go from the appropriation due to mandated formulas for Education and Health. They absorb all extra revenue and then some.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that he recalls an article in the *Republic* a week or two ago that said AHCCCS needs \$75 million. JLBC is saying there will be a structural deficit based on that in FY 08. It will really be FY 09 before they deal with all the projections on caseloads.

Mr. Winkleman noted that in the Cabinet meetings they give the good news that revenue projections were up more than anticipated and it appears there is extra money. Then the media comes out with stories like the one on AHCCCS, prison construction, and expenses that cannot be controlled. It's actually less money. He does not believe there is any expectation that that will change dramatically in the next couple of years.

Ms. Stewart asked if Visitation and Revenue are both down overall.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that Visitation is actually slightly up. Most of the numbers for December were bad. Year-to-date Visitation is up 2.91%.

Ms. Stewart asked if Revenue is flat or down.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that Revenue is down 1%. He noted that KCSP has a fairly small visitation but it is a high money maker. The other parks are doing extremely well. They are up 9% over last year. They are up more than 30% this November from

November 2002. Some parks are still under construction. The other parks will probably go from making \$4.5 million a couple of years ago to about \$6.5 million. December, in and of itself, was bad because of the weather and was down 16%. It threw the year-to-date averages off. He believes that the parks will enjoy a dynamite Spring season.

Mr. Travous added that the first full year KCSP was open it had one day that it wasn't full – an afternoon tour on August 28. That day was known as the “slow season”. The shoulder season has now grown toward June and toward September/October. Staff need to be more aggressive in getting the word out. People don't know they can get tickets. However, when staff get the word out that tickets are available, so many people call that they can't get in. That information has to be “trickled” out. Staff are also seeing The Big Room robbing from The Throne Room. Staff need to look at, if the tours are not going to be at capacity all the time, marketing those shoulder seasons.

Mr. Porter noted that his understanding from the presentation is that the agency can survive as it is for a while but there won't be much room for any significant growth. He believes the Board must start looking to private partners. Once an agreement is reached with the Foundation, he suggested that there should be a joint meeting between this Board and the board of the Foundation to really have a heart-to-heart discussion about where the Parks Board wants to go so that they have a better understanding as to what the Parks Board really would like to see from them. He would like to see them try to provide the agency with revenue and opportunities to expand to do the things the Board wants to do to grow and improve the agency.

3. Possible Land Acquisition - Discussion/ comparison of Kelly Property, Santa Cruz River, Verde River Greenway

Mr. Ream reviewed a list of potential property acquisitions that was included in the Board packet. Unless stated otherwise, all on this list are willing sellers. He noted that the first five properties on the list are Verde River Greenway properties. The agency has been spending approximately \$25,000 per acre in that area or about \$2 million for these particular acquisitions. He noted that the Pickett Post House was Colonel Boyce Thompson's home next to the Arboretum. It is on the market. It was on the market for \$3 million and is currently down to \$2.5 million. The Barber property is 10 acres next to the entrance of Picacho Peak State Park. It can be seen from the Interstate and sits between State Trust Land and ASP State Trust Land under lease. It is available right now and could be purchased for \$100,000-\$200,000. It has frontage road access and would be valuable to the park. The Little Black mountain property is an inholding at Picacho Peak State Park.

Mr. Ream reported that the next property on the list, Blue Industrial Building, borders the parade ground at Fort Verde. It is up for sale at approximately \$210,000. The City of Camp Verde may be willing to buy it with a promise that some time down the road the Board will buy it from them. A copy of the IGA with Yuma was provided to them for their review. There is also an in-holding behind the Commander's quarters at Fort Verde that staff would like to acquire.

Mr. Ream reported that Ricketts Mine is just northwest of KCSP. It is an old mining activity that is on the market and owned by Phelps Dodge. There is time on this

property because they are not interested in selling this property to anyone other than ASP.

Mr. Ream noted that the Kelly Ranch is the property identified in the Pima County Bond election. They have \$2.5 million to put towards that property. ASP could probably match that \$2.5 million and purchase it. The problem is that the agency does not have \$2.5 million. NAPAC will look at that property. There are some natural and cultural aspects to that property. Staff have not been able to get onto the property to do those studies. Also identified in the Pima County bond election were State Land Sections 21, 22 and 23. They are not categorized under State Trust Land Reform. He doesn't know what will happen with those properties.

Mr. Ream reported that the Ross property at Tumacacori is available; it borders the river; it is not adjacent to any parks; it could loosely be part of Tubac or the area between Tubac and Tumacacori used as the Anza Trail. It is 20 acres at most in size.

Mr. Ream reported that the next four properties are the Rio Rico/ Avatar properties. These are the four phases that were approved by the Board for staff to look at. They are about \$10 million total. There has been no word from NAPAC on potential inclusion into their acquisitions list as possible natural areas. It includes the Santa Cruz River bottom, the San Cayatano Mountains, Josephine Canyon, and some trail connectivity to Sonoita Creek. Staff went with NAPAC in December and walked most of the Santa Cruz that day. A report on that trip was sent via E-mail.

Mr. Ream reported that the BLM Sections 24 and 25 are part of a 1995 MOU with BLM for the BLM to sell these sections to ASP. They are on Lake Havasu. Staff have been waiting for the Resource Management Plan since 1999 when BLM promised to begin on it. These sections are quite valuable but it does not look as though they will be identified for disposal in the current Resource Management Plan drafts. Staff continue to work with BLM staff on this issue.

Mr. Ream reported that the Archeological Conservancy property at Homolovi was purchased with a grant from ASP. They would like to turn it over to ASP. They want to recoup the money they have invested in that property. It would probably be acquired for less than \$50,000. As staff look at Homolovi and work with the Hopi Tribe and they need to consider properties in the area that are for sale.

Mr. Ream reported that the properties identified as desirable for acquisition are those that staff were able to get on the draft State Trust Land Reform and are still acquisitions staff would like.

Mr. Winkleman noted that there will be a bill introduced probably this week in the legislature. Unfortunately, it will be at best case urban with a little if anything outside urban areas. He would be surprised if any of these properties end up on the maps as part of this Reform Act.

Mr. Travous noted that there is \$4 million in the Natural Areas account for acquisitions. Approximately \$1.7 million will be added this year. As we go forward, the pros and cons of these properties need to be discussed. He met with the County Commissioner from the Rio Rico area who is supportive of the County trying to help the Board to

continue on in Rio Rico. They are willing to bring potential partners in to that area. The problem that staff are recognizing more and more is that if Natural Areas money is going to be used, NAPAC must say the property is worth pursuing and water rights need to be looked at. If the water does not come with the land and gets “sucked out” then there is no natural area value there.

Mr. Travous noted that staff met with SRP, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and others along the Verde River. Staff have letters of support from TNC and the Mayor of Fort Verde to continue on with the agency’s work on the Verde River. He referred to a map showing the flood plain of the Verde River and pointed out Dead Horse Ranch State Park and Fort Verde State Park. There are people who are interested in getting the Board interested in continuing on in the Verde River Greenway project beyond where we stopped to Beasley Flats. Staff did not want to speak to the Board about this issue without having support from the local community (primarily Camp Verde). The letter from the Mayor of Camp Verde states their hope that the Board can help them in their trails solution. The crux of the problem is that SRP can be a great partner with the Board in this. They have to buy land to mitigate the impact Roosevelt Lake had on the Willow Flycatcher. This is where they are looking at spending some money. They are under constraint to keep that area for the Willow Flycatcher. They don’t want to manage it. Staff briefly talked to them about a partnership where they could buy the land or the Board could even help them buy the land and they would contribute their money to operating dollars for ASP to operate it. It must be on SRP’s behalf. If hikers get in the way of the Willow Flycatcher, then all the money they spent was wasted. The Mayor has already said they want the Board to help them solve Camp Verde’s trail problems. Those are two competing interests on the land there. Staff are waiting to hear back from SRP. Staff believe this has water and lots of it. In the future he expects to see people involved in organizations such as TNC come to the Board to talk about purchasing water rights and cooperating with others to purchase water rights to ensure that there will always be water in the Verde River. If the Board can keep water flowing in the Verde River for a generation to come, their grandchildren and great grandchildren will be appreciative to them for that. There are issues that staff need to work out (trails for the local people and SRP); TNC has always been right there to help.

Mr. Travous asked the Board if they are interested in expanding the boundary of the Greenway from the Bridgeport Bridge to Beasley Flats, an additional six miles. He noted that this Board will not see it accomplished in their lifetimes. He explained that 10-12 years ago the Board gave direction that they wanted the Greenway to extend from one point to another point. As properties became available, the agency began acquiring them with Board approval. There are still gaps that need to be filled. It is a multi-generational project. Staff have always stopped at the Bridgeport Bridge because that was the point the Board named in their motion in 1988 or 1989.

Ms. Stewart noted that the Board was to have gone on a tour there yesterday. She suggested that the Board could tour that area in April since that Board meeting will be in Flagstaff. The tour could be the day before the meeting. That would be a good time for this issue to be an Action Item on the Agenda. The concept sounds good, but it’s good for the Board to be out there and be able to visualize it.

Ms. Stewart stated that this brings up how important it is for the Board to really come up with a plan of where it wants to devote its money. Based on Mr. Ream's presentation, obviously the Board is not likely, in the near future, to have the funds to purchase all of the properties on the list. The Board probably needs to look at where it wants to go with the limited funds it will have in the future. The Board will probably have to say, "No" in some areas or come up with other kinds of partnership arrangements. She believes this will need to be a continuing discussion. She also believes that the State Trust Lands need to be brought into this discussion as well because some of those lands, if they were sold, would destroy parks as we know them today. She believes one of the most important things the Board needs to do in the next couple of months is try to focus where it wants to focus the money it has now and to come up with strategies for locking down some of these properties it feels are key to continuing and protecting the existing properties.

Chairman Hays stated that the Board should consider endorsing the concept of going down to Beasley Flats. This is a much grander scheme than ever dreamed of when the legislation was passed creating the Verde Valley Greenway in 1988. He, personally, would like to see it expanded the full length.

Mr. Porter stated that he would like to see the area. He is not as familiar with that part of the state as he would like to be.

Ms. Stewart stated that she did not believe it would not prevent continuing discussions; it is obviously something the Board is interested in. As far as taking a formal vote, she did not see any urgency. She believes April is soon enough. In the next 10 months the Board ought to look at how it will do all these things it may want to do.

Mr. Winkleman asked if part of the Foundation's plan is to raise money for acquisitions.

Ms. Statler responded affirmatively.

Mr. Winkleman asked if there is any expectation that they will have anything significant.

Ms. Statler responded that that remains to be seen.

Mr. Winkleman stated that things like that need to be looked at. He noted that an area that is becoming more common is the 404 Permits under the Clean Water Act. Developers develop areas and disturb washes. They have to perform mitigation. The Land Department was approached by a developer last week who had to find mitigation. They contributed money to TNC for acquisition of land near Wickenburg. He believes that these mitigation situations will arise more and more. He asked if staff had sat down with anyone from the Corps of Engineers to discuss whether ASP can play a role in that. There is State Trust Land that would be appropriate for mitigation. The State Land Department is not a management agency. He doesn't see why ASP couldn't fill that role. It may be an opportunity to acquire land without the cost.

Chairman Hays asked whether ASP can operate a park in Maricopa County under its enabling legislation.

Mr. Travous responded that ASP can operate a park in Maricopa County; it is policy

to not compete with Maricopa County. He added that it is the announcement of the Board's interest in this new vision of the middle part of the Verde River that gets it into the newspapers.

4. Legislation - Update on proposed legislation and committee assignments pertinent to Arizona State Parks

Mr. Ziemann distributed a document listing bills of interest to the agency for the 2005 legislative session. He noted that it is early in the session. January 21 is actually the deadline for House members to introduce House Bills without the special permission of the Speaker. Apparently there are 564 pieces of legislation in the House; there have only been 206 pieces of legislation introduced. The Senate's deadline for introducing bills is a couple of weeks from now.

Mr. Ziemann referred to HB 2048 and HB 2110. Both are technical correction bills. Technical correction bills have become a pet vehicle for legislators to move a piece of legislation through the system without having to go through committees. They typically are assigned to Rules and then go to the Floor. At that point in time, the language can be stripped off and new language appears. They try to make sure that the new language that shows up is germane, but that tends to get stretched as the session progresses. These technical correction bills need to be followed. What comes out in the final version will not be what appears on those bills now. More than 150 of this type of bill are in circulation.

Mr. Ziemann reported that HB 2180 (Spur Cross Ranch) is the identical bill that ASP introduced last year. That bill was never assigned and never moved. This is really another technical bill. When the legislation was put in place that allowed the state, Maricopa County, and the municipality to purchase Spur Cross Ranch, it included a termination date. Leg Council became aware of that date and sought to have this legislation introduced. This bill simply makes that acquisition permanent and more accurately reflects what actually occurred in the negotiations for final disposition of that property. In essence, it says that ASP will hold conservation easements over Spur Cross Ranch rather than it being "Spur Cross Ranch State Park", which is what the original legislation said.

Mr. Ziemann reported that there is a state salary adjustment (HB 2321 and HB 2333). Staff do not anticipate that those bills will go anywhere.

Mr. Ziemann reported that staff will be talking about the Lottery Distribution Bill (HB 2440) in the coming months. He explained that currently the disbursements from the Lottery are tied to the game that generates that revenue. The Heritage Fund receives no PowerBall revenue; PowerBall revenue goes to the General Fund. Other beneficiaries receive money based upon which game they are tied to. This bill would do away with all of that. All of the Lottery revenue would come into one "bucket" and be disbursed. As the bill is drafted, ASP is third in line to receive money in the same manner that it is third in line in the current statute. In the new bill, \$23 million would first come out for local transportation; second in priority is \$7,650,000 for County Assistance; the Heritage Fund is third in priority (\$10 million for ASP and \$10 million for Game & Fish).

Ms. Stewart asked if ASP would be more likely to get \$10 million every year.

Mr. Ziemann responded that is true if the priorities and order remain as they are now. That will be key in this bill. As drafted, this is a good bill. At some point in time the legislature could come to the Governor and use this bill as trade-off for one of the bills she really wants. He has been assured by the Governor's Office that one bill will not be sacrificed for the other.

Mr. Ziemann added that he has been told that the package on State Land Trust Reform will be introduced in the House. There will likely be one other bill that may not be as well received. There will likely be competing bills going through the legislative process on this issue.

Mr. Winkleman noted that he doesn't believe that at this point there is a State Land Trust Reform bill. Different legislators have their own ideas. He agrees that there is a strong likelihood there will be more than one bill, perhaps up to three bills, introduced by various people. He suspects the first bill may not be very attractive to the Board. He does not believe it will be the only one.

Mr. Ziemann reminded the Board that a budget hearing is scheduled at 2:00 p.m. this afternoon. As Mr. Siegwarth stated earlier, there is virtually no difference between the Governor's numbers and the legislature's number. There really isn't anything to discuss before the Committee other than to answer some questions and have the Board seen.

Ms. Stewart asked if a bill relating to concessions operated by the blind will be introduced.

Mr. Ziemann responded negatively. He noted that a proposal was sent to the Governor's Office. The Governor's Office spoke with staff at DES and received some assurances that it would no longer be a problem.

5. Department of Conservation

Mr. Travous reported that he has nothing more to add. The meeting with the Governor has not taken place yet. This issue was not addressed in her State of the State Address. He does not know where she stands on this issue. He noted that most people in the organization are looking forward to working on the new Vision. There are two things going on: the PAMS group is working on an update and a combined meeting of the Chapter 11 and Chapter 7 groups to be held after the meeting with the Governor. If the Governor indicates she is not going to indicate anything, staff will come back with a different proposal. The meeting with the Governor is scheduled for February 1.

Ms. Stewart stated there should be Board discussion on this issue. She is still concerned that the Board has never said that it wants to change. There have been discussions that they want to emphasize the management part and to be the best resource management agency. She, at least, feels that becoming a Department of Conservation is a different issue from what the Board decided. She is concerned about asking the Governor if she supports it and then the Board deciding it is not the best way to go. She feels meeting with the Governor before the Board has endorsed the concept is problematic. She believes there are political issues involved in doing it, as she mentioned before. "Conservation" is not a popular term with a lot of the legislators. She is not sure there is a need to change the agency's name. In reading the statutes that are in place,

the Board can do everything it talked about doing in terms of refocusing its Mission without becoming a Department of Conservation. She is still puzzled as to why the Board needs to do this.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the terminology is the problem – the word “conservation”.

Ms. Stewart responded that she does not see why the Board needs to change from what it is because it is able – in fact, charged – to do all the things it talked about doing under the current law. She is not sure why there is a need to put a lot of effort into something that could be risky.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the word “conservation” is the problem. He understands that the effort being discussed is basically presenting the new Vision to the Governor and explaining how the Board will enhance itself in certain areas and become a resource opportunity for whomever in different areas.

Ms. Stewart responded that it’s being called “Department of Conservation” that concerns her. She feels that there isn’t anything wrong in remaining Arizona State Parks because currently the Board is charged with doing all these things. Simply putting more emphasis on that part of the Board’s responsibilities can be done under the current name and structure. She is concerned that a lot of energy is being put into changing the name. It is not necessary; it takes time; it takes energy; and it raises red flags. She doesn’t see what the Board gains by that. She believes that, in reading our current statutes, the Board is already charged with doing all these things.

Mr. Travous responded that not a lot of energy has been put into this yet. A lot of energy will need to be put into it in the future. It might end up that we call ourselves “Arizona State Parks” but add a tag line, “the conservation people” or something like that. The primary point is that the way to move an organization forward is that the flag is not planted in the middle of the organization and have everyone gather around it. The flag is planted on the edge or on the outside of the organization and have the employees move to it. By calling the agency something different or adding a tag line, the flag has been moved to the edge, while still being within the realm of what we do, but it is an anticipation and an excitement that he has already observed organizationally. He does not want to lose that.

Mr. Travous added that the white paper was given to the Governor. The discussion was that the Board has all of these options. The reason he put “Conservation” on it is that the Governor has on three or four occasions discussed creating a “culture of conservation”. He is desperately trying to get this agency recognized by the Governor’s Office on what we are already doing so when we go into our budget issues she already knows we are partnering with her on those conservation types of efforts. He believes there is a lot of anticipation that we are going to do a lot of things. He has a stack of messages from employees with suggestions of things to look at. Internally, it is placing the flag at the edge or outside of the organization. Employees said they wanted a clearer vision; this gives them that clearer vision.

Mr. Travous noted that if this agency cannot talk about conservation within this organization, then we’ve already lost the battle.

Ms. Stewart responded that she isn't saying we should not talk about conservation. She sees it as the Board changed the Vision and it can change its Mission. She believes the organization can be moved to the edge by doing that. She believes this agency is more than "conservation". She doesn't have a problem talking about conservation and being involved in conservation. She believes this agency is so much more. She personally believes that Resource Management is broader. A lot of people she's talked to in the community feel that way, too. She doesn't disagree about doing all the things the Board has talked about. She sees no reason to change the agency's title. She believes that would be something that would be done later. Changing the Mission and the Vision can energize people and the agency can do all the things it needs to do. She is concerned that too much focus then gets placed on a superficial part of making the transition in the agency.

Mr. Cordasco noted that he believed it is an issue of terminology and preserving the title that ASP has now. Yet, at the same time, he certainly appreciates what the Executive Director is saying. The boundaries have to be stretched in order to get to where the agency wants to be. To do that, often times it requires re-labeling something even for cosmetic purposes to create that potential – whatever that may be. It just doesn't matter. But, at the same time, the Board certainly want to give the Executive Director the signal to get involved with the Governor and get on with the new Vision. PAMS, the energy staff have, the Red Rock State Park Assessment, etc., are certainly things that need to get to the Governor and they need to be packaged in a way that she understands it's fresh, energetic, has momentum, and that it's leading the rest of the state agencies and other landowners in a way that is rather extraordinary for not only the Governor, but for the state as well. He would hate to be the horse pushing the cart on it. If it does get some energy, someone else will pick it up and want to run with it. It is clearly a State Parks function to do this for the state.

Ms. Stewart responded that she is not saying the agency shouldn't do these things; she is saying that the business of changing the agency's name to the Department of Conservation should be left off for now.

Mr. Porter stated that he agreed with both Board members. He doesn't think the name of the agency needs to be changed. He agreed that it is sad that the Board has to be concerned about it, but unfortunately we do have to be concerned about people who react badly when they even hear the word "conservation". He believes the Board needs to be careful not to prod a hornets' nest. Having said that, Mr. Cordasco is correct. The Board has changed the direction the agency is going. He is excited that the entire staff of the organization are excited about moving in that direction. He believes that there is a need to go to the Governor and signal to her that the Board understands where she is coming from and agrees with her and are changing the thrust of the organization internally (the Vision and the Mission) and are moving more and more in this direction. He believes that can be done without saying that we need a name change. He does not disagree with the change in thrust; he believes staff are moving in exactly the right direction.

Mr. Beechum asked who changing the name of the agency is for and what is the

purpose. He noted that it is similar to when the Department of Recreation changed its organization structure and became Community Services. When that transition is made, the organization loses what it stands for. It takes a long time for people to understand what a Community Services department is unless there is a large media campaign to explain it. He noted that, according to a recent study, a lot of the users felt ASP was not well-recognized. He noted that a name change could further complicate that problem.

Mr. Travous responded that he understood Mr. Beechum's concerns. The agency has a lot of image built up in its logo that says ASP. As far as he knows, the Governor doesn't like the idea at all. He anticipates that she wants to talk about it in some way, shape, or form. He is certainly listening.

Mr. Cordasco noted that his company was referred to as "Babbitt Ranches". At meetings, people understood who they were and what they did. Over the last 10-15 years much of the company's effort was actually along the lines of ecology, science, and conservation. With the title of "Babbitt Ranches", it didn't matter what they really did, they were a ranch. Even among the owners, there was some of that, too. Eventually, Babbitt Ranches became the Coconino Plateau Natural Reserve Lands. Then, when he went to a meeting, even though he was the same person representing the same company, everyone thought they were something quite different. Both names have tremendous opportunities for the family. They did not, however, have the same effect separately – combined, they did. They now are Babbitt Ranches Coconino Plateau Natural Reserve Lands. With all that being said, it is still the essence of the organization that is most important. The terminology – whether it be Department of Conservation or Natural Resources or whatever – is just handy for the organization to know what it is talking about. Where the agency ends up down the road will all evolve. He believes that staying focused on the Mission, the Vision, and the energy being developed is more important than what the agency is called.

Ms. Stewart stated that she wanted to ensure the focus is on making substantive changes rather than a name change. The change in the Vision is what's important.

G. EXECUTIVE SESSION – Upon a public majority vote, the Board may hold an Executive Session which is not open to the public for the following purposes:

- 1. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel for legal advice on matters listed on this agenda pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), including:**
 - a. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**
 - b. Legal Advice regarding the permissible scope of interaction between the Arizona State Parks Board and the Arizona State Parks Foundation**
 - c. Legal Advice on Trail Access to Red Rock State Park**
- 2. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel in order to consider its position and instruct its attorneys regarding the Board's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(4)**

- a. **Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**
- b. **Legal Advice regarding the permissible scope of interaction between the Arizona State Parks Board and the Arizona State Parks Foundation**
- c. **Legal Advice on Trail Access to Red Rock State Park**

Ms. Hernbrode noted that unless the Board felt they needed an Executive Session she had nothing to report in Executive Session.

Ms. Hernbrode reported that the 10th Street Bridge is still standing, providing access to the Mabery property. The Maberys were not forced to use Tuzigoot Road to get out of their property during the recent rains.

Ms. Stewart noted that she did have questions on Item G.1.b and G.2.b., Legal Advice regarding the permissible scope of interaction between the Arizona State Parks Board and the Arizona State Parks Foundation. She specifically wants to know what things the Board can do with the Foundation and what things staff can spend their time on and what things they can't spend their time on. This is the area that the public will question the Board. Once the Foundation begins functioning and doing things, people will want to know about the relationship.

Ms. Hernbrode responded that she preferred to always provide legal advice in Executive Session.

Chairman Hays called for a Recess at 11:55 a.m. The meeting was reconvened at 12:05 p.m.

Ms. Stewart made a motion that the Board go into Executive Session. Mr. Porter seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously and the Board went into Executive Session.

Chairman Hays reconvened the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

H. ACTION ITEMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 1. **Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**
- 2. **Permissible Scope of Interaction Between the Arizona State Parks Board and the Arizona State Parks Foundation**
- 3. **Trail Access to Red Rock State Park**

There was no action necessary following the Executive Session.

- I. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC** – Consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Board must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study or reschedule the matter for further consideration at a later time.

There was no public present who wished to address the Board.

J. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Cordasco made a motion that Ms. Elizabeth Stewart be elected the new Chairman of the Arizona State Parks Board and that Mr. William C. Porter serve as the new Vice Chairman of the Arizona State Parks Board for the 2005 calendar year. Mr. Winkleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Travous presented Mr. Hays with a plaque on behalf of the Parks Board and the staff in appreciation of his leadership and support of the agency over the past year. He noted his personal appreciation to Mr. Hays for his support during both his time serving on the Parks Board and his service in the legislature.

At this time the gavel was passed from Mr. Hays to Chairman Stewart.

Chairman Stewart stated that she wished to second Mr. Travous' comments. She believes that the word "statesman" really embodies what Mr. Hays is all about. The number of years that he has devoted to preserving the lands and culture in this state is phenomenal. There are few people who have not only had that involvement and put their actions behind their words but everywhere Mr. Hays goes he knows everyone important. There probably is not another person who is so well respected in those areas. It has been her pleasure serving under his chairmanship.

K. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Staff is recommending that the next meeting be scheduled for February 17, 2005 in Florence, AZ.**

Chairman Stewart announced that the next Board meeting will be February 17 in Florence.

- 2. Board members may wish to discuss issues of concern and request staff to place specific items on future Board meeting agendas.**

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Beechum has requested that the issue of what can be done to improve visitation at McFarland State Historic Park be discussed. It is also important to tour McFarland while the Board is in Florence in light of the building assessment report.

Chairman Stewart noted that she and Mr. Porter will meet with Mr. Travous to work on the Agenda for the February meeting and will work on the procedures and on setting a tighter Agenda. She believes discussions regarding State Trust Lands need to begin, as well as an overall plan for spending what money is available for acquisition. Since Mr. Winkleman won't be able to attend that meeting, she requested a representative from the State Land Department be available to give an update on where things stand in the legislature.

Mr. Porter noted that it appears this meeting will adjourn almost 40 minutes before scheduled.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Porter made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Cordasco seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

SUBMITTED BY:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

APPROVED BY:

Elizabeth Stewart, Chairman