

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR July 19, 2022**

In Attendance:

Commissioners

Dan Muth, Chairman
Oscar Miranda, Vice-Chairman (Absent)
John Freeman
Kay Hauser
Carey Dobson
Bobby Fite
Brad Peterson (Absent)
Traegen Knight
Brad Jarvis

Staff

Matthew Fish, Director
Shanna Pearce, Plan Reviewer
Tyron Jensen, Deputy Attorney

Working Lunch Session

Called to order at 1:00 p.m.

Item #1 Call to Order.

Chairman Dan Muth called the Special Meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Item #2 Roll Call/Determination of a Quorum.

Chairman Dan Muth determined a quorum was present, seven (7) Commissioners present.

Item #3 Call to the Public

Mr. Muth explained that each resident wishing to speak on an agenda item will be allotted three (3) minutes to address the commission and advised that commissioners may respond to criticism but not respond to comments, ask staff to review a matter or ask staff to place that matter on a future agenda.

Mr. Muth asked if anyone had an item that was not related to any agenda item.

Michele Iddings ACR 1324 and the contiguous properties addressed the commission with concerns that despite their efforts to serve the Greer community they felt that their joy was stolen by an oppressive worldview which resembled that of a socialist, communists thinking, a view that demanded them to forfeit the use of their private land for their public use of open space and views, the past and continued harassment of their family and the use of Apache County Government to enforce their demands, public collective ownership of property, the importance of writing laws to establish justice ensure tranquility provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare and secure liberty's and posterity. She provided a description of a socialist, communists community, violation of constitutional rights, collective distribution of property, shared part of the

United States Constitution Article 4, Section 4 and pleaded with the commission to take a parenting position of government to soberly and seriously gather the views of the rights and privileges from all of Greer residents and not just a selective few. (Copy of her statement was provided for the record)

Sam Iddings speaking on behalf of Hannah Iddings part of the Iddings Trust 73 ACR 1423 Greer AZ, concerned with the continued harassment of the family.

Sam Iddings speaking on behalf of George Joshua Iddings Jr part of the Iddings Trust 73 ACR 1423 Greer AZ, concerned with the continued harassment and undo added stress during family visits.

Sam Iddings speaking on behalf of Michael Iddings Jr part of the Iddings Trust. Mr. Muth questioned if he was Michael Iddings. Sam responded no. Mr. Muth if Gabrielle Kate Iddings was present. Sam responded yes. Mrs. Iddings advised that they were speaking on the behalf of trustees. Mr. Muth noted that there were a number of slips from the Iddings family and explained they needed to be present at the meeting to yield their time Mrs. Iddings and Mr. Muth discussed yielding time and speaking on behalf of someone. Mr. Muth explained that any party in attendance at the meeting may fill out the form and address the commission, if that party wished to yield their time, they could certainly do so, but the key was, they had to be present. Mrs. Iddings state that she had others from the community and questioned if she would be allowed to read those on their behalf. Mr. Muth stated they would need to be present today to grant her their time. Mrs. Iddings apologized for misunderstanding.

Gabrielle Iddings was not present.

Sam Iddings 73 ACR 1423 Greer AZ, concerned with the continued harassment, the common incidental use of RVs throughout Arizona and other states, and shared parts of the state's constitution. [system issue, stopped recording 1:13:35 p.m. to 1:13:44 p.m.]

Joseph Iddings was not present.

No further comments.

Mr. Muth closed the public comment.

Item #4 Approval of the minutes from the May 5, 2022 meeting.

Chairman Dan Muth opened for a motion.
Commissioner John Freeman motioned to approve.
Commissioner Carey Dobson second the motion.

No Discussion

Vote, 7 ayes to 0 nays
Motion Carried

Item #5 **PUBLIC HEARING**, discussion and possible recommendation of approval to extinguish Greer Phase I and fully implement Article 6 Greer ordinance and zoning map. Article 6 was adopted July 6, 2010 by the Apache County Board of Supervisors but was never fully implemented. The ordinance is available on the Apache County website at apachecountyaz.gov/community-development and at the Apache County Annex Building in the Community Development office, 75 W. Cleveland, St. Johns, AZ 85936.

Chairman Dan Muth introduced the item.

Mr. Fish provided staffs report, a brief history of Article 6, the Board of Adjustment & Appeals (BoAA) ruling regarding the use of RVs in Greer in January and the county's desire to amend Article 6 to address the issues, and the process of the recommended amendments presented today.

Mr. Muth opened the public meeting.

Commissioner John Freeman stated that it was important to understand that this ordinance and the work being doing today and the revisions to it are completely apart and separate from any other area unincorporated community, section, reservation, region, or character area of Apache County. This ordinance, A6 and its predecessor Greer Phase 1 were exclusive and specific to the Greer area as described in section 603 of the Article 6 ordinance or the Greer Phase 1 Assessors plat index on page 4. This ordinance and any change made to it or any enforcement, application, administration of its content was specifically and only directed to the region of the Greer area, its content was not meant to be imposed, prescribed, inferred or applied to any other area then Greer. There are many other areas within Apache County that have different views and ideologies regarding land use and are encouraged to develop those concepts as the residents and property owners see fit. It was hoped for and perhaps reasonable to expect that those folks and regions extend the same courtesy to Greer and its property owners, particularly if those folks are in the administration of Apache County.

Marcus Clarke 64 Osborne Rd., Greer AZ was worried about the future of his home and the generations of longtime families, new residents' investment and their ability to secure a little piece of their paradise, he's mostly concerned with the fate of the wildlife. He's concerned with growth and wanted status quo-controlled growth through zoning and proper enforcement. He requested that the proposed amendments be objected today and to pass the original version, referred to the survey regarding RVs. He commented on the work that had been done by them and discarded.

Gail Clarke yielded her time to Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Clarke continued and again requested that the amendments proposed today be thrown out as they are a fantasy and represent a future that would not happen.

Mr. Fish clarified that the amendments were made by the county and not by an outside group.

Mike Bragiel 90 Main Street Greer AZ supported the amendments written by the county and questioned if accessory building would be allowed if not site built.

Michele Iddings 73 ACR 1324 Greer, AZ appreciated the efforts made to govern this matter, [system error, recording stopped 1:27: 09 p.m. to 1:27:13 p.m.] as stated before the document needed to strongly include the individuals' rights and to protect the innocent people from being run over by the majority. She clarified that the working group developed the amendments not the community. The meetings are not open to the community, this is a private group that you have to be approved and pay dues, several residents that were opposed to the group did not do the survey. She felt that the group was biased, skewed and went against what the constitution protects from. She provided examples based on the prohibited table, private laundry facilities mean we can't have a laundry room in our house, or family invents. She stated that the table was clearly a business section and that several residents feel the same. She added that this table needed to be clear so that their suffering wouldn't be in vain.

Mr. Freeman commented and read the charter used, "to be an information gathering sharing body for the people of Greer both to obtain their wishes and wisdom on the future direction of Greer's growth and development and thus to translate into some sort of consensus. To seek and to share with the citizenry of Greer the pertinent areas of zoning ordinances of Apache County now enforced for the unincorporated areas of the county which includes Greer. To seek compliance with these regulations and encourage each person in Greer to act responsibly, to enhance and preserve Greer's unique characteristics and to assist Apache County Planning & Zoning Commission in formulating a policy statement for Greer's growth, to write guidelines to make changes in the ordinance provision which would be more appropriate to Greer's area and natural assets." He added that this was not unlike what he's seen for the Greer Coalition attempt to do things, this was from the Greer planning and use bureau James J. Abernathy chairman Sophie Majesky secretary Karen Applewhite and Dan Leads, presented and accepted by the Apache County BoS in the fall of 1985. He stated that when someone is looking for help, direction and knowledge for the commission they go to an organization or group of people that have had the expertise and knowledge and stated there was nothing amiss about requiring to help nor giving that group the opportunity to present their finding to the commission and public. He was aware of the makeup of the team; it's a cross-functional group consisting of regular working people, judicial people, Dr's, sales regular people that have lived in Greer and had an interest in Greer from a very positive perspective.

George Iddings 73 ACR 1324 Greer AZ found Article 6 ambiguous and going forward it's very important to make any legislation very clear, not written ambiguous and left up to interpretation giving power to self-interests groups to self-police and harass neighbors.

He hoped that the community meeting was clear that these self-interest groups do not speak for the majority of Greer. He was grateful for those community members who spoke up once they found out they might lose their right to have an RV and stood up for their property rights. He would rather see a document written and passed by the BoS upholding constitutional rights than to allow self-interest groups to write it and to try to get it passed in cognito with things left up to interpretation. This document needs to hold up the very values of our republic, what our country fought for. He would rather not have the document see Greer under Apache County ordinances. He noted section 602 Greer Agricultural zone the primary purpose number 2 to serve and protect open land use and to encourage orderly growth, he felt this was environmentalists' terms. B.1 Greer residential zone provide for single family residential development with adequate open space and separation of buildings to preserve the natural features of the land, he felt was undefined and sounded like CC&R's for environmentalists. He requested additional time to read letters they were wanting to read during the public meeting.

Mr. Muth advised his time was done and asked if Mary would like to yield her time to him.

Mary Iddings 73 ACR 1324 Greer, AZ spoke regarding the past and current harassment by those using Article 6 as an excuse and backup to harass them and felt they had been singled out. She felt Article 6 was very vague and personally would like to see it rewritten and to have a group that truly does stand for the majority of Greer. She thanked the commission for the efforts they had made in changing some of it. She quoted from one of the original constitutions of the state, "That all men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights of which when they enter in to a state of society they cannot by any compact deprive or divest their posterity, namely the enjoyment of life and liberty with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety. She would like the harassment to stop and their lives to return to normal.

Mr. Freeman clarified the comment made by Mr. Iddings regarding people being deprived of their right to an RV on their property and stated that his understanding was at this particular time there was no right to have and habituate an RV on any parcel or property within Greer. Mr. Muth agreed.

Richard Mosher 49 CR 1121 Greer AZ did not feel that any land use documents should be created by the Bos, the people of Greer should create the and use documents that govern Greer. He felt that most of the issues revolved around zoning laws and stated zoning laws exist for two (2) reasons.

1. To protect property values
2. Inhibit the ability to enjoy your property

[system error, recording stopped 1:40:14 p.m. to 1:40:19 p.m.] The issues revolve around the use of RV's and the mentality that people can do what they want to on their property, zoning laws exist to protect property values and to protect people's right to enjoy their property.

Mr. Freeman commented to his statement regarding the right of the BoS vs. the community writing ordinances and documents governing land use. He noted that there were six (6) different sections that delegated that authority to the communities beginning with the comprehensive plan of Apache County, “the comprehensive plan applied only to the unincorporated areas of Apache county does not apply to incorporated areas or land that is part of the Native American reservation. The Comprehensive plan does not further address the land covered in the area plans; those plans are the controlling planning documents for their areas. So, the comprehensive plan sets the condition by which the communities Alpine, Greer, Nutrioso, and Concho have the authority to generate and use their comprehensive plan”. In the zoning it states, “implement community land use plans through zoning ordinance along with creating community plans each community can also create their own zoning scheme to implement the plan”. This had been advantageous for Greer as any zoning ordinance only effects Greer instead of the entire county, making it more flexible to the current needs of Greer. Therefore, each community with a community plan is encouraged to implement its plan through its own specific zones.” There are more statements within the comprehensive plan.

Fred Fiastro 7 Becker Lane Greer, AZ President of the Greer Coalition (GCI) supported the amendments, supported code enforcement.

John Brooks River Springs Ranch east of St. Johns, the definition of Park Model was incorrect, must be hooked to utilities it’s not self-contained. Definition of RV is incorrect, does not have to be connected to utilities as they are self-contained, they may be at the owner’s discretion. These definitions are very important. RV’s have evolved to much more than just temporary living quarters.

Kimberly Owens representing the Herb Owens Trust Spade Ranch Greer AZ stated that her family did not support RVs in Greer, concerned with enforcement, supported the use of RV’s with permitting to help with enforcement. Also concerned with the term site-built being combined with nothing that could be built off-site, this caused concern with what you expect that to look like, they would like to see a better definition. She empathized with the Iddings family as they had gone through the same ordeal when they went through the land exchange 12 years ago. [system error, recording stopped 1:53:20 p.m. to 1:54:14 p.m.]

Mr. Freeman commented...more contemporary construction in keeping with the character of Greer may evolve with time, clearly an adopted set of architectural guidelines and controls would expedite that process and eliminate those concerns of tough shed like buildings. He encouraged her passion in that direction as well and agreed that is what the future did look like and what the manufacturing future looked like, it’s those controls to maintain that character of Greer that don’t exist because for a number of reasons, one of which is their too intrusive to have controls which he disagreed with. He thanked her family for the beauty they had brought to Greer.

Edwin Biggers did not comment.

Sheila Milette was not present, comments were to be read from Michele Iddings.

Dorothy Jill Nolan 178 ACR 1126 Greer, AZ recognized that amendments needed to be done her issues were how the input was gathered and how the processed worked, she was concerned that a meeting to vote on the amendment was scheduled prior to the community meeting being held. She also had issues that the county did not reach out to community for input or providing the draft document in a timely manner. She noted the GCI survey and felt that 15% of the respondents were businesses, visitors, business owners, and new residents that should not have had input. Her main concern was that she nor other community members did not receive a survey to provide their input and that she should not have to monitor a Facebook page to have an opportunity to have input. She stated that the county had all the property owner's information for Greer residents and should have conducted the survey, the matter of zoning is a property right and to exclude members of the community who own property was wrong. The GCI had received a draft of Article 6, regardless of how they got the draft it was not made available to the public website until July 12th which wasn't fair. Many of the recommendations for Article 6 were made by the Greer Coalition although most did not make the draft posting in the "I Love Greer" Facebook page directed people to their website to read the recommendations which they could not find on the county website. Although she appreciated the desire to make the changes, she felt that by expecting them to not know the information before the meeting was unreasonable.

Mr. Muth called a five-minute recess.

Mr. Muth called the meeting to order.

Lisa Clements Wood 41 ACR 1324 Greer, AZ spoke regarding the family long history in Greer, the value of preserving the uniqueness of Greer, the damage that had been done to their family's property, and the need to maintain the original wording of the Greer ordinances. She felt that by changing the ordinances to allow for more trailers and/or RVs would diminish the beauty of the village and negatively impact the entire town. She pleaded with the commissioners to understand that these changes would affect the towns character similar to how their family property had been affected. She shared how the neighbors use of their property had impacted their quality of life on their property and their property value had dropped 20 to 30K dollars due to external obsolescence caused by the Iddings family. She felt that most in attendance were concerned that what had happen to them may happen to them as well and indeed was happening all over Greer currently, she added that if any of the Greer Coalition members had this happen in their front yard, they would feel very different. She addressed the reasons why the ordinance should not be changed and left as originally designed, she realized the property owners should have the right to do what they want with their property they did not live on an isolated island where their actions effect no one else they are surrounded by other people and they must consider other people's needs as well as their own especially in a small narrow crowded valley, there are laws for people to dispose of their trash correctly, to build proper sewage disposal, and to build to codes so it was not unusual for government to write ordinances that insure the rights of adjacent property owners.

Ardis Schildkraut yielded her time to Mrs. Wood.

Mrs. Wood continued, she felt that the seven-day allowance for RVs was not enforceable and opened up a doorway for further violations and questioned how residents would ask for enforcement as they know that the county and sheriff was already overwhelmed, she stated this was not a viable option. She added that there are four other options for RVs, there are already established RV accommodations in Greer and one or two outliers should not be the base for change of the community as a whole. She expressed concerns with the slanderous claims made by the Iddings family against herself and others to Sheriff Padilla and against her family in previous meetings, she added that her sister was present and was not allowed to speak in their defense. She stated that they had also made liveliest claims on Facebook and wanted to go on record that these aquations are simply not true, she added that they have had longstanding great relationships and friendships in Greer for years. She stated that compromises were fine in some instances but changing longstanding ordinance that have served Greer for so long was unwise especially since it was just a few people that were trying to make these changes. Greer had a wonderful history a current beauty that is unsurpassed by any other Arizona town, but the future of Greer was in the county's hands, she pleaded to help them to maintain the treasure of Greer for future generations of families.

Mrs. Iddings requested to speak on their behalf as their names were specifically mentioned.

Mr. Muth stated that the comments made during the public hearing would be toward Article 6 only. He recognized the personal animosity regarding a lot of the issues and stated that this meeting would not be used to attack each other. He stated that decorum would be maintained, or they would be excused from the meeting, personal attacks would not be tolerated moving forward.

Claudia Williams 9 ACR 1009 Greer AZ spoke regarding family history and was extremely unhappy with the process to modify Article 6 and being forces upon the property owners of Greer. The modifications were still being written by the county less than 24 hours ago. The only formal meeting Apache County held in Greer regarding this matter was occurred this past Saturday w here 156 Greer property owners attended. The amendments were written by the county with no community feedback as they were written and still being modified less than 24 hours ago. They were handed the draft at the community meeting and the draft was not fully explained how it would affect Greer and they were told it would be voted on today. Had the p0revius meeting July 7th had not been cancelled there would have been not meetings held with Greer property owners to find out what their opinions were regarding this matt3er, which is quit disrepective3 and not even close to what most people consider to be a democratic process.

Mr. Muth paused Mrs. Williams time and address the issue with comments made that the July 7th meeting had been cancelled. He clarified that the meeting was not cancelled, the meeting had to be terminated when they found that proper notification of the meeting had not been done according to state law, which required that all public meetings be noticed to the public no less than 24-hours. Therefore, the meeting was terminated as soon as it was brought to the county's attention. The commission did not have a choice, it wasn't something the county did because they felt like it, the county followed proper procedures

as set forth by the state, the meeting was immediately terminated, and the meeting was rescheduled for today.

Mrs. Williams continued with her comments. She stated that this was another incident that Greer property owners were to be given proper notice of the modifications to Article 6. Apache County openly admits that they don't know how they are going to enforce these new rules proposed relative to RV usage, we already know they are unable to enforce the existing rules, we also know that there are those in Greer who have in the past and will likely continue to do in the future whatever they please irrespective of the rules that are in place, more liberal rules will result in increased violations particularly by these few that Apache County admits that they cannot enforce, therefore based on all the above she requested that the commissioners unanimously reject the proposed amendments to Article 6 and that the existing Article 6 the one already previously unanimously approved by the BoS and implemented by Apache County. The original Article 6 was openly supported by the Greer community over the course of 4 years of open public meetings.

Victoria Willis did not comment.

Laura Galipeau 6 ACR N1039 was not present, Mrs. Iddings had a statement from her, was not read.

Lawrence Cortez 5 ACR 1032 Greer, AZ clarified some deficiencies [system error, stopped recording 2:19:06 p.m. to 2:19:18 p.m.] that speak to the development resorts, hotels, and bed and breakfasts. Over the span of 5 or 6 years many of the single-family cabins have become Airbnb's which have completely changed the demographics of the community and usage of the local roads and he felt that a complete demographic shift in the intended and prevailing land use needed to be further reviewed. He also pointed out that under the definitions the use formula under item 6 where the discussion were individual owners may store and use one RV, he felt that there was a big difference between the storage of and use of an RV, they were not a self-contained living unit and needed to be serviced and waste and grey water needed to be adequately dumped, there was no acknowledgment that this should be specially permitted. One of his biggest concerns was with the policy shift. RVs were separately dealt with the general land use plan at trailer parks and forest service facilities. He added that to allow their use for residential use of any kind in a single-family residence is an invitation to all kinds of health issues, impact issues and the obvious neighborhood disputes that should be avoided if at all possible.

Mitzie Heydt 38691 St. Rt. 373 Greer, AZ represented the trust of Ruth Cortez at 38691 St. Rt. 373 Greer, AZ recommended a compromise to the RV use be lot size specific due to some of the lot sizes in the village and the issue with meeting the setbacks. She stated that as a realtor all property owners should do their due diligence prior to purchasing property as this was very important to future enjoyment. She provided a history of her family in Greer and noted her concerns with the proposed use the modular kits and log cabin kits were approved.

Mr. Freeman clarified that the log cabin kit homes would be, in the proposal, would be excluded from the definition of manufactured housing, meaning that the log cabins kits would be something that would be an acceptable construction under this ordinance.

Mrs. Heydt questioned modular or site-built kits of other types of materials that are siding and such and asked if this was approvable as well. Mr. Freeman state he could not answer this question.

Mrs. Heydt added that views are not guaranteed to remain unobstructed when buying property and shared her experience when buying their property in Gilbert, AZ in 1985 and their views are now gone.

Randy Lay yielded his time to Steven Williams.

Diane Lay yielded her time to Steven Williams.

Steven Williams 9 ACR 1009 Greer, AZ advised that the only formal organization he was a member of was the Greer Area Trails Stewards, they keep 200 miles of trail clear in and around the Greer area for the residents and visitors, they are in agreement with the forest service to do this. He pointed out that he was not a member of the Greer Coalition that put the survey, but he was given the opportunity to participate, and he did, he added that his comments may go against what Mr. Fiastro said earlier. He was one of the original committee members who shepherd the Greer Community plan in 2017 to 2018, they help 11 open community meetings sending out over 700 post cards and posted meeting notifications all over Greer and created a website were citizen could make comment and see it and they went with what the public wanted during the public meetings then the map modified changes based upon the input from the community. The Apache County Comprehensive Plan, through its vision statement recognized that the Greer community needs are unique to the county and therefore required it own set of ordinances specific for Greer, he quoted from section 19 *"communities are encouraged to develop their own community plans and accompanying zoning ordinances to manage the local needs"*. This is was Greer was trying to say, they wanted to make sure they were included in the process the original Article 6 was debated in open public meetings for four years, 2006 to 2010, regular public meetings, people being informed as to what the results of meeting were for four years in coming up with the original Article 6. The modifications being asked for approval today were created from other people than staff but did not come close to what was done for the community plan or the original Article 6. The evidence for the interest in this, the community meeting on Saturday was 50 miles away and people weren't at work there were 156 people in attendance and there was a diverse group of people participated and voices their opinions and Mr. Fiastro asked for shows of hands regarding different things. The importance of the survey was there was 160 response, not all agreed 50% said yes to parking the RVs and 50% said no; of the 50% that said yes, 50% of those said they did not want to include any time in the RVs, equating to from the 50% that said no to RVs then added the other one, that's 125 people that said no time in an RV. He felt that some people needed the ability to store their RVs on their property because when you need the RV you're not going to drive down to the valley to pick it up and then go on a trip. He also felt that the problem with enforcement

was when you apply a limit to when they could use it on their property. He felt that the community would support the storage of the RV but to let the days go to a community meeting process where people could have their recommendations heard. One thing that bothered him was Temporary public outdoor events [system error, stopped recording 2:32:19 p.m. to 2:32:25 p.m.] from “A” back to “C” (use table). He felt enforcement was the big issues. He stated that if a change could be made to storage of RVs and let the community speak for the number of days, he could support the amendments but if not, he recommended to reject it and go back to Greer and let the community step up and go through the process again and have open public meetings, this would be the most beneficial way.

Chairman Dan Muth closed the public meeting.

Mr. Fish went through the amendments:

Page 2 section 601 Definitions and applications of Greer Zones, subset i Factory Built Homes include log cabin kits are excluded from the prohibition, assembled off-site disassembled off-site trucked in and assembled on-site included log cabin kits were excluded in the prohibition.

Mr. Freeman provided syntax probably excluded from the definition take peek at it and see what you think and move on, we don't have to do it right now.

Mr. Freeman clarified with Mr. Fish that in the language the log cabin kits are excluded from the prohibition that might be definition because that is what you are talking about, prohibition is on the last page; syntax, that's all.

Page 9 Section 605 just for clarification the laundry service is commercial not private.

Page 10 parks and playgrounds added “public” parks and playgrounds.

Page 10 Temporary public outdoor events changed to temporary “public” outdoor events; private family events would not be restricted.

Page 11 note 6 added individual property owners may store and occasionally use one (1) RV on their property if there is a permanent residential structure or an active building permit for the permitted residence. The county felt is was in harmony with Greer Community Plan if someone bought a vacant lot and never planned on putting a permanent residence on it they couldn't park and keep an RV there and go up and use it once a month.

Page 11 note 6 Personal storage of an RV shall comply with all setbacks contained in this ordinance meaning they would have to comply with setback rules to avoid anyone being vindictive and park an RV right on their property line and obstruct neighbors' view.

Page 11 note 7 Shipping Containers the county felt this would help secure and prevent the possible theft of owners' tools and materials during construction of a home; must have an open building permit and be removed once a certificate of occupancy was issued. Mr. Muth questioned the events large numbers, the amendment proposed that's an administrative review item Mr. Fish agreed. Mr. Muth asked that if the amendment was not accepted then would that make all large population events in Greer subject to a conditional use permit (CUP) such as Greer days or their Winter Christmas Festival. Mr. Fish stated that the original allows for administrative review of temporary events for Greer Residential, Greer Commercial, and Greer Commercial Resort, and the county felt they did not see why Greer Agricultural needed to be under a CUP therefore made them a blanket of administrative. He also pointed out that at anytime during the administrative review the county reserved the right to recommend the decision to the commissioner for a recommendation the BoS, similar to the CUP application process.

Mr. Muth clarified that the amendment would make all zones subject to an administrative review. Mr. Fish agreed and added that the only temporary event administrative review thus far had been for Greer Days.

Mr. Freeman noted that in the definition of administrative uses, page 10, the language had been stricken regarding *"Further, the Director will consider all other Apache County Zoning Ordinances the Apache County Comprehensive Plan and the Greer Community Plan while undertaking any reviews, making recommendations, or granting approvals."* He added that it wasn't necessarily there for you but rather there for you, your predecessors, Planning and Zoning Commission etc., and asked if he would consider leaving that exclusion brought back into the language that would provide a little more incentive to look at what the actual application is. Mr. Fish stated that if it was the recommendation of the commission. Mr. Freeman asked the commissioners. No response.

Mr. Freeman made a motion to reinsert the stricken language *"Further, the Director will consider all other Apache County Zoning Ordinances the Apache County Comprehensive Plan and the Greer Community Plan while undertaking any reviews, making recommendations, or granting approvals."*

Commissioner Traegen Knight asked why the language had been stricken. Mr. Fish stated that staff had received feedback that certain administrators did not like that sentence.

Mr. Freeman added that the intent was to make a robust document, Mr. Fish added that the intent from staff was that it was implied.

Mr. Muth clarified that the implication would be that the directors job description would precipitate to seek information from all those sources before rendering a decision. Mr. Fish agreed. Mr. Muth clarified that was the though behind striking this language. Mr. Fish agreed.

Mr. Freeman added that t would seem that by stating that in a public document that everybody sees is a trivial issue.

Mr. Muth called for a second.

Mr. Knight second Mr. Freeman's motion to reinsert the stricken language "*Further, the Director will consider all other Apache County Zoning Ordinances the Apache County Comprehensive Plan and the Greer Community Plan while undertaking any reviews, making recommendations, or granting approvals.*"

Mr. Muth opened for discussion.

Mr. Muth felt this was redundant language only because his job description stated he shall do that anyway; he did not have a preference either way. He added that he didn't know if it rendered any more credence to the document when it was basically implied. Mr. Freeman added that true implication, if it's simple straight forward and direct it becomes trivial, everybody can understand it, it's not in some definition somewhere, he wasn't looking to spend a whole of time on this and was hoping to make a document as open and straight forward as they possible could and felt that this went in that direction of the way it was originally structured. Mr. Fish stated that sentence was already in Article 9 of the ordinances.

No further discussion.

Mr. Muth restated the motion, to reinsert the stricken language "*Further, the Director will consider all other Apache County Zoning Ordinances the Apache County Comprehensive Plan and the Greer Community Plan while undertaking any reviews, making recommendations, or granting approvals.*"

Chairman Dan Muth called for the question.

Vote, 4 ayes to 2 nays

Motion carries, language is reinserted.

[system error, stopped recording 2:45:26 p.m. to 2:45:30 p.m.]

Mr. Freeman requested that the map and Article 6 be separated as they were vastly different.

Deputy Attorney Tray Jensen advised the commissioners that because the public was noticed that these would be implemented as one, he recommended not separating them, either vote on them as one or tabling them for a different meeting.

Mr. Freeman acknowledged that was how they were noticed and added that the method by which it was achieved was not prescribed. Mr. Jensen stood with his recommendation, the two (2) items were voted on together or tabled for another time.

Chairman Dan Muth called for a motion to adopt Article 6 as amended and the planning and zoning map.

Mr. Freeman motioned to adopt Article 6 as drafted in the amendments with the exception of the item related to recreational vehicles and would like to have a separate motion and discussion about that one-line item.

Mr. Muth questioned Attorney Jensen if this could be done.

Mr. Jensen clarified if that was the amendment of the RV. Mr. Muth confirmed and asked if they could vote on the amendment language of the RV separate. Mr. Jensen stated that the same process could be followed as with the stricken language.

Mr. Freeman requested more discussion before making a motion to specifically to go in one direction or another, if the chair needed that he would do that.

Mr. Muth stated they needed a motion before discussion. Mr. Jensen agreed.

Mr. Freeman motioned to retain the original version without amendment prohibiting recreational vehicle in Article 6.

Mr. Muth second the motion for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. Freeman stated that the survey showed, communication showed, the meeting today showed that the different perspective, he did not like the situation they were in, we being the Greer residents, property owners, community members, we are in a place of divisiveness and inflammatory even malicious but far, far, far, away from where they were in Greer at some point in time when there was harmonious activity working together. This change does not seem to be harmonious with the general character of Greer, these proposed changes have significant downside potential and the aggregate noise, congestions, visual clutter, junk, black water, sewage violations. The challenge then is to modify the ordinance or enforcement, enough to protect the interest of law-abiding Greer residents etc. He's been chasing this a long time, one way was to try and do this through enforcement, just simply say ok we are going to look the other way, we are going to keep everything prohibited unless it's egregious then we will not perform a violation administrative action and that's enforcement by complaint. The flip side was changing that, you do open that door and he asked the question Saturday, how many people would like to see an RV on every lot in Greer and there was a unanimous dead silence, crickets. You continue down that chain, 75% you go two or three people 50% you're in the middle, what an appropriate number and once the door is open how do you control it? How do you preclude all the potential damage, he's heard that word used here several times. How do you preclude all that damage as a responsible commission or responsible governance? He did not know the answer, no clue. He tried one (1) concept, to allow this change one per acre and everything that had habitation was hooked up to sewage and electrical so that you get out of that right away and a permit, an administrative permit that must be approved by neighbors, simple thing, check the box get the signature. Then he circled back around, even if you get neighbor approval or some sort of pre-approval in your application how do you manage the numbers that have the potential to damage that. He did not have an answer. He was hoping someone else would come up with that. That was the bases for his motion, he saw no way, no mechanism, no

promise, no approach that would constrain the kind of impact that could and likely will have.

Mr. Dobson noted that there was no enforcement in the National Forest, and he did not know how they would regulate or enforce the rules because there was a 14-day the Forest never got mandated and that was a government deal and he saw all the damage that was done, he realized that this was on private property. He was looking at enforcement and he did not know how this would get done, he sees blatant stuff all the time on forest permits.

Mr. Fite stated that Article 6 had been kicked around a long time and the biggest hold up were the RV issues. He felt that they could take the RV problem and let the people of Greer decide instead of the county being in the middle. How were they going to decide? He added that Alpine was going through the same issues. He felt that a decision needed to be made on Article 6, this had gone on too long.

Mr. Dobson stated that he has an RV used on permits to provide protection for his animals from the grey wolves. He must get a special use permit from the forest service to keep it there for 40, 50, 150 days and felt that would be a good idea to kick it back to the community and hopefully they could work it out. He did not see any easy conclusions.

Mr. Jarvis stated that the commission had inherited this, it had already been passed. He assumed that staff and the administration had listened to and taken these things into consideration and that Mr. Fish could provide some clarification. He felt that staff had taken into account the residents' feedback when creating the proposed amendments. Mr. Fish agreed and stated he had taken a lot of feedback from individuals, groups in Greer, staff and county leadership and added that currently you could not have, keep or store an RV without a CUP in Greer. [system error, recording stopped]

Mr. Knight clarified that you could not have an RV in Greer without a CUP. Mr. Fish agreed.

Mr. Knight questioned that there was an avenue to get an RV through a CUP. Mr. Muth disagreed and explained the CUP language was part of the Greer Phase I, Article 6 removed the CUP process for RV's and made it a strike prohibition, the language would need to be inserted into the use table. Mr. Freeman agreed.

Mr. Jarvis clarified that if the amendments were not passed today that everyone in Greer that had an RV at this time would then be in violation under Greer Article 6.

Mr. Muth explained that once the map and Article 6 goes before the BoS at their next regular meeting, everyone that had an RV parked on their property would be out of compliance. Once the map was adopted the original Article 6 become effective from 2010 which meant no RVs unless amendments were made today and proposed those amendments with the map.

Mr. Dobson asked if this also applied to the agriculture. Mr. Fish responded that it was for the entire Greer area. Mr. Freeman agreed. Mr. Dobson did not know how that would work for those with a lot of acreage and livestock and would have to have herders.

Mr. Freeman stated he thought that the Owens family preferred RVs were not allowed. Mrs. Owens stated it's been allowed with a CUP; they see themselves out of the village rarely visiting the village.

Mr. Dobson stated they are under those regulations that's why there was a lot to look at.

Mr. Fish advised that the county had to be careful in selective enforcement, we enforce an ordinance or not.

Mr. Freeman stated that for 25 years there was 25 years of harmony. Mr. fish cautioned not to go into the weeds. Mr. Freeman continued they had that time of enforcement that worked and then they had to change their outlook that had been forced upon them to make this decision and was a tough one. He added that there were other options, revert this back to the BoS since they let this dangle for 12 years if this had been done 12 years ago, we would not be having this meeting, reality was it wasn't. Now it was a political thing and if they were just to do this based on zoning the mandate that the commission had was to do no harm, to prevent no harm to be done. So, we have property rights and rules and restrictions to prevent harm use your property the way you want however you want until you do harm, that's the bases for zoning. He had heard enough compelling concern, verified by half the population in Greer that this will cause harm, we've already heard one report of a new nation of property values of 20, 30 some thousands of dollars. He felt reluctant to change the 12 years old actual language to modify for the use of RVs in Greer.

Mr. Fish pointed out that we did not know if half of Greer didn't want RVs in Greer. Mr. Freeman preferred that miss information and false information not be propagated. Mr. Muth gave the floor to Mr. Fish.

Mr. Fish continued; Mr. Freeman had stated that half of Greer said they did not want RVs. Mr. Fish states that we did not know that. Some of those in attendance agreed.

Mr. Freeman asked if he had any supporting documentation and requested to see the data that validated his statement that half of Greer did not want RVs. Mr. Fish stated that he was not going to debate this. Several members in the room talking.

Mr. Muth called the room to order.

Mr. Freeman stated he had a survey that was conducted with statistical significance and stated that if you didn't understand that science nor had any other contradictory data he didn't understand that he could take the position that opposed the results. The statistical data showed that half of the people in Greer want to allow an RV and the other half did not and statistical data said that of the population surveyed of 1,000 with a plus or minus 6%, 52% of those people are opposed to RVs with a 90% confidence level. He asked that

anyone with any data to contradict this to present it and added that if anyone had any bases other than emotions and personal feelings as to why that survey was not accurate to present it otherwise, you had to relay that to fantasy your particular proclivity. He wanted to see the data.

Mr. Jarvis commented that the beautiful thing about statistics was that you could get on the internet and get statistics that would support any stance he wanted to take on this and added that they needed to be very careful as to where the statistics came from and compiled. He asked Mr. Freeman where that statistic came from.

Mr. Freeman stated that they came from Greer community organizations using 300 email addresses they got a 164 responses, that data has been shown to the commission before but that data is representative and not from a biased sample and if you looked at the survey results you would see biased means that you cherry pick monolithic groups and those responses will always fall in line based on the biases in the monolithic group, the fact that this survey is self-consistent that their results on timely enforcement of ordinance showing 90% response for the community using the math in enforcement and that could be a monolithic group of it could be the way everyone in Greer felt. Then another question is are you in favor of prohibiting factory-built houses, should be definition, 75% of the people responded for the community feels that they prohibit that, that says ok maybe that is a monolithic group they are all biased to that protect Greer conserve Greer they were cherry picked to have that response. However, when you come to the question of RVs in Greer it splits in half, same populations same representative group, that puts the lie to biased. If it were biased instead of 50/50, you'd have 75/10, your 95/5 distribution out of that monolithic group. He stated that there was no bias and it was representative. He apologized if you didn't understand the statistics, but they were fact.

Mr. Muth asked Mr. Fiastro to approach the podium, he confirmed that he was the president of the Greer coalition and speaking on their behalf. Mr. Fiastro agreed. Mr. Muth confirmed that he spoke earlier that the Greer Coalition was willing to support the RV amendments as proposed in the document. He agreed and added that he didn't have a chance to expand on this point and that if it was going to be a decision point, he requested to have that opportunity. Mr. Muth stated that he had the opportunity two (2) weeks ago. Mr. Fiastro agreed. Mr. Muth stated they would stipulate that those comments had been made even though not officially. Mr. Fiastro added and not on the record. Mr. Muth agreed and added that he had offered the survey Mr. Freeman spoke of. Mr. Fiastro agreed. Mr. Muth asked if he stood behind the results. Mr. Fiastro agreed. Mr. Muth asked that even though the results of the survey did not necessarily support the creation of the amendment, GCI was willing to stipulate to the amendment as proposed. Mr. Fiastro agreed, as you can imagine it was heavily debated and as he stated earlier you had half the people that did not want to make a change and as he had stated in his previous presentation and handed to the commissioners, the people of Greer take changes and Article 6 very seriously and to make a change, actually the GCI informed by the survey and supported by the survey would have made several more [system error, recording stopped 3:11:42 p.m. to 3:11:42 p.m.] but they had problems with all the unenforced violations throughout Greer and haven't heard a good pathway forward. Several people have suggested to survey all of Greer through an Apache County official survey, much

more detailed about what the community wanted to do about RVs and make a decision based on those results. He added that their survey was intended to give them a bases to make a recommendation and did make that recommendation, but it was mess. They had been told by the county that if a compromise wasn't reached today that people would be in line with CUP's and could torpedo the timely adoption of Article 6. What he was hearing today was maybe there was a will to get Article 6 adopted and take out the RV issue and study more carefully, he felt his board would support that, but the question presented to them was amendments or the original Article 6. They were advising the county based on the question they were given, but it was complicated matter.

Mr. Muth pointed out that code enforcement was outside the privy of the planning and zoning commission, they had no delegated authority from the BoS to abroach any of those issues and they came through law enforcement not through the commission. The administrator made the recommendation to law enforce and then executed the order, the commission had nothing to do with code enforcement, they were only policy advisors to the BoS.

Mr. Fiastro stated that they had the authority to grant a recommendation for CUP's which the county was prepared to do on the RV issue which brought this issue forward. Their concern was that there was a long line forming to apply for a CUP to allow for an RV and they anticipated that they would be approved; the commission had that authority, and they were concerned it would get out of hand.

Mrs. Hauser asked what motion was on the table. Mr. Muth noted that the motion was to revert to the original language concerning recreational vehicles. Mr. Freeman agreed.

Mr. Hauser asked whom had second the motion. Mr. Muth said he did for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. Freeman stated that the bases was when we're in such a quandary, going back and forth and how long this had taken, the result of 12-years of neglect. He felt that the fundamental premise that the commission had to follow was to do no harm and by making a change we do harm. It may be further study was needed; it may be that the BoS in their enlightenment had clarity that the commission cannot yet achieve in this meeting but felt it was incumbent on the commission; and it stood now it says further the intent of the ordinance, but it was more important to do no harm with any action the commission took, that would be to leave status-quo.

Mrs. Hauser called the question.

Vote, by raise of hand to strike the recreation vehicle language and reverting back to the original RV language in Article 6 as adopted in 2010.

1 aye to 6 nays

Motion failed, recreational vehicle language stays in the amended document.

Mr. Freeman motioned given that we cannot revert, and we want to minimize our negative impact.

Mr. Knight clarified that when Article 6 was implemented, someone would be allowed one (1) RV on their property. Mr. Fish agreed, with the amendments. Mr. Knight clarified that if this failed, Article 6 would still be implemented with no amendments and that no one could have RVs on their property. Mr. Fish agreed. Mr. Knight clarified that even if there was no avenue for a CUP's. Mr. Fish stated not unless the commission made an avenue for a CUP and that would involve changing the table.

Mr. Jarvis clarified that the proposed amendment was worded that one (1) RV per parcel. Mr. Freeman agreed. Mr. Jarvis asked if the owner owned three (3) separate parcel and if there were improvements on the parcel there was a stipulation that it was per parcel. Mr. Fish stated with a permanent dwelling.

Mr. Knight was concerned with even if someone had two (2) or three (3) parcels with a total of 200-acres they were limited to two (2) or three (3) RV's and sked if someone with a half an acre on three (3) different parcels could have three (3) RV's on each half acre. Mr. Fish stated agreed and added that was a hypothetical. Mr. Knight noted that it has been recommended to based it on lot size and he felt that sounded more logical or address these through a CUP giving the community and county the ability to approve of not. Mr. Fish stated hypothetically yes.

Mr. Freeman explained his motioned given where we are today, the consensus seemed to be modifying the RV prohibition in residential and aging to allow one (1) RV stored on a property greater to or equal to a one (1) acre, there are some sub acre lots that if you tried to store an RV you wouldn't want to do that and used by the owner and/or guest for no more than seven (7) days per month noncumulative with sewer and power hook ups for any habitation, no generator use allowed except in residence construction. This use is to be granted with an administrative use permit in conjunction with approval from the majority on the neighbors, eligible to be renewed every two (2) years without a complaint history, revokable upon complaints by the majority of neighbors, an owner may schedule time to bump one (1) month into another month for 14-days. Pros/Cons, it's probably ok for Greer and timeframes were probably ok, it added up to 84 days per year, requires neighbor to neighbor cooperation, the divisiveness, acrimony, and hard feeling needed to stop, this pushes people together. He added that if you wanted an RV on your property to be a good neighbor, consult your neighbor, and do not harm.

Mr. Muth asked if Mr. Freeman was making a motion.

Mr. Freeman stated he did and apologized he should have framed it that way. For clarity, Mr. Freeman motioned 1. to modify the RV prohibition in residential and AG to allow one (1) RV stored on a parcel of property greater than, equal to one (1) acre and used by owner and guest no more than seven (7) days per month noncumulative with sewer and power hook ups for any habitation, no generator use allowed except in the residence. 2. This use is to be granted with an administrative use permit in conjunction with approval from the majority on the neighbors. 3. Said permit eligible to be renewed every two (2)

years without a complaint history, permit revokable upon complaints by the majority of neighbors, an owner may schedule time to bump one (1) month into another month for 14-days.

Traegen Knight second the motion.

Mr. Knight clarified that the motion was one (1) RV for lots greater than one (1) acre. Mr. Freeman agreed.

Mr. Fite did not agree, one RV per parcel per acre compared to someone with 50 to 60 acres, he could only put one (1) on his 50-acre and felt it should be considered through a CUP on a case-by-case bases, not throwing everyone in the same bucket. He explained that if someone had 50-acres on separate property's he could have 50 RV's per acre. The Article stated now was per parcel he could only put one (1) per parcel on 40 or 50 acres, he didn't like this. [system error, recording stopped 3:24:53 p.m. to 3:25:07 p.m.]

Mr. Freeman ...direct inevitable growth while preserving the natural aspects of Greer that attracts residence, business owners and visitors to Greer, this ordinance clarified land use to ensure critical characteristics, the application of this ordinance promote a community healthy residential base, stable property value, economically sustainable business environment, and preservation of these characteristics as established by multiple surveys, residents and property owners perceive the Greer area as a very special place in terms in visual image, scenic quality, character and environmental resources, these qualities attract visitors, tourists and investment. Their preservation ensures residents and property owners property rights of use and enjoyment, preservation of property values, and to appropriate growth economic best interest of Apache County. He felt that you need control, to open that gate you need control and felt his motion provided that control and hopefully, although he didn't see how, prevents unlimited recreation vehicle placement throughout Greer, destroying esthetics although most people agree that RVs are not esthetic.

Mr. Knight called the question and encouraged the commission to vote against the amendment and then provide an amendment that gave the county the ability to approve CUP's, whether it's one (1) RV or 50 RV's on 100-acres or whatever it may be but that gave the county total control. He realized there may be several CUP's but felt it was the only reasonable administrative process to address each individual issue.

Vote, 1 aye to 6 nays
Motion failed

Mr. Freeman explained that the purpose of the commission was to take care of Apache County and to further their interests and to no put themselves in a position where they apply their specific cultural views an outlook. They are supposed to represent the community of Greer and their wishes and do no harm.

Traegen Knight motioned to make an amendment to the Article 6 amendments that the county allows RV's per a CUP application.

Carey Dobson second the motion.

Mr. Muth restated the motion to amend Article 6 RV amendment to allow RVs by CUP or by conditional use permit.

Mr. Freeman asked Mr. Knight if he recalled the past discussions of 1107, the conditions by which a CUP could be allowed and yet in the past when the county had those conditions that referred back to the community plans and the comprehensive plan for guidance and yet we've seen where as the commission does not follow that law, where they followed their own particular view points and instincts; that did not mean something negative that just meant that was the conditioning, the intuition, the cultural bias that existed. He asked Mr. Knight what insurance he had to offer the community that those interpretations would not continue when it came to CUP's.

Mr. Knight hoped that the interpretation would continue as he felt that was the commissioners job and that was why we live in a republic and not a democracy. He added that it was the job of the commission to not only weigh what the citizen were feeling at the time but also how that lined up with the American constitution. He felt that this was the only possible avenue to tackle the issue and move forward with Article 6.

Mr. Freeman state that was the worst nightmare scenario of any commission that was ordained, commissioned, and contracted to follow the law, each member on the commission took an oath to uphold the laws of this country, the state, and the county. There was a directive within the purpose for the commission is to further the intent of the ordinance not to impose their own personal values, and for a commissioner not to follow the law and to suggest that the commission should not follow the law was disturbing to him. He added that he did not mean this personally towards Mr. Knight.

Mr. Dobson believed that the commissioners were capable to listen to the facts presented and hoped that neighbors' could get along and listen to each other and figure this out there was something wrong and for Mr. Freeman to say that the commissioners couldn't do this was wrong. He believed he could listen to what anybody had to say and make a good judgment call, every member of the commission was able to listen and make good judgment calls for everyone. He believed that they had to have this amendment, otherwise there would be a lot of problems as there were a lot of people with a lot of property and it wasn't fair, especially with agriculture some of these things were need. He's not saying to put it at a resort nor would any other commissioner. The commission was capable to listen to applicants, they had a right to it if you had it and everyone agreed to it and neighbors could get along to get the Article 6 passed.

Mr. Freeman agreed and added that he completely supported the lawful application of a CUP, his problem was that when interpretation of value and judgment exceeded the legally required actions. If indeed 1107 was followed this discussion would not be needed. He feared that history would repeat itself as it had in the past and based on the dialog today, he did not see any insurances that it would not.

Mrs. Hauser requested clarification of the motion and called the question.

Mr. Muth restated the motion to amend the use table to allow recreational vehicle by CUP.

Vote, 6 ayes to 0 nays
Motion passed.

Traegen Knight motioned to accept staff's recommendation with all the amendments to Greer Zone Article 6 along with the amendment to allow for RV's through the application of the conditional use permit and the community development map.

Bobby Fite second the motion.

Mr. Freeman moved to amend that the motion to exclude from the map county parcel **102-08-020B** for these reasons, there are conflicts, in fact unlawful steps that this parcel did not comply to for a lawful GCR zone. Article 6 GCR zone requires the lot area to be a minimum to be of one (1) acre and for the use stated by the owner as a single-family residence; the lot size is .72-acres and as it does not meet the legal statutory requirement to become GCR it needed to be extracted.

Mr. Muth asked for a second.
Motion for amendment died for lack of second.

Mr. Freeman stated which followed the previous discussion the commission lawfully followed the law, it added an explanation point that the commission needed to have some education or perhaps to change the whole tenor of the commission, a comment not directed towards any commissioner personally but of their inability to fill their charter to follow the law and fulfill their obligations in accordance with law.

Opened discussion on the original motion.

None.

Mr. Muth called the question on the motion to adopt Article 6 as amended both amendments presented and amended by today's meeting and the map. Moved and seconded.

Vote: unanimous
Motion carried.

Mr. Freeman commented he would vote in favor for the larger good with a note to the BoS that this commission had authorized an unlawful parcel and that the BOS should carefully look at the impact of having an unlawful parcel contaminating and perhaps impacting the lawful passage of the very, very important article.

Item #6 Report from Staff to the Commission

[system error, recording stopped 3:38:32 p.m. to 3:38:41 p.m.]

Mr. Fish advised the commission that it had been discussed to eliminate the work session from the meetings and requested the commissioners opinions. He advised the commissioners that anything done in the work session could be done in the public meeting with no action being taken.

Commissioner Kay Hauser supported the work session, she felt they were beneficial but didn't feel that it was needed at every meeting, she also noted that she felt the work sessions were better conducted on-site and recommended that they were determined as needed.

Commissioner Carey Dobson agreed that they were beneficial, they were able to discuss items more thoroughly and also supported on-site work sessions.

Commissioner Traegen Knight agreed with Mrs. Hauser, occasionally for specific controversial issues otherwise discuss items in the regular meeting.

Commissioner Brad Jarvis agreed with Mr. Knight, when there is a specific need or something the commission needed to be made aware of.

Commissioner Bobby Fite agreed the work session would be important to have for discussion regarding hot topic items and like the site-visit for controversial items to see the issues firsthand.

Commissioner John Freeman felt they were valuable and that the commission needed some focus on items before it proved to be a liability to the county. He felt each commissioner was honorable but believed the educational process, the background, and the function the commission was supposed to perform had not been sufficiently transmitted.

No further discussion.

Item #7 Adjourn.

Adjournment 3:45 p.m.