

**Minutes to the Special Meeting of the Board of Directors of the  
Sonoita-Elgin Fire District  
14 April 2015  
6 pm**

**Call to Order**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**Roll Call** - Chairman: The record will reflect three board members present, and we will move on to Item four, which is our first call to the public. There are a few things to say before we actually get to that and you might want to make some amendments. First of all, how does it work? I am glad to see all of you here. Many of you are probably not aware how this works. There is two parts of the sign in, okay? The first part of the sign in are for people that would like to address us concerning an agenda item. The idea here is that you would have an opportunity to talk to us before we made a decision. That is only if you wish to address us concerning an item on the agenda.

The second part is our last call to the public and that is provided so that you could talk to us about anything you would like to that is not in the agenda or on the agenda. But if you want to talk about something on the agenda, you want to sign in on the front. If you want to make a general comment, you need to be on the bottom, not here. So, that would come at the end of the meeting, all right. If anybody would like to change that before we get to it, well, when we call your name, you can say, "Move me to the bottom," and we will do that.

I also would like to advice everyone that the State Law does not require that we do this. Arizona Statutes does not require that we allow a call to the public. Some public bodies do not do it at all. This Board had made a decision to allow not only one but two calls to the public to give you an opportunity to talk to us, but it is not required by law. What we cannot do is we cannot engage with you. If you ask us a question, we cannot answer that question and have you answer and go back. We cannot engage in a conversation. The reason for that is mostly time, okay, because we do not want to be here all night long. You are certainly free to ask questions but do not expect an answer at the time you ask us the question, all right. Hopefully, if the question is pertinent, you will get an answer at some point during the meeting, all right, but, again, there is no obligation to answer that question. If you ask me how old I am, I am not obligated by law to tell you to answer that question.

But please feel free to ask questions because they may be pertinent to what we are going to discuss and we do take notes. So, when we see a question that seems to be something that is relevant, we are going to . . . most of us, I am going to try to answer it or somebody else will try to answer that. Now, we ask that you be civil. If you cannot be civil, then we are going to ask you to sit down. If necessary, we will provide law enforcement to enforce that. Civil, all right. Please be civil. No cuss words, no loud language, no threats, things like that. We talk about being civil.

Now, before we start, there is a rumor - I have received an email which is a rumor, okay, and that rumor says something like, I'm free to repeat the rumor because I have an email about it. The rumor says something like, "The Board has decided to limit the perspective candidates to three that we will interview and that Reverend Mike Wright will screen the applications and decide who gets interviewed." Now, that is not true because the Board has not decided how we are going to proceed with filling these vacancies. You will see on your agenda Item 6-E, which is on the agenda tonight. If you are going to talk about that, please don't. It is a rumor. It is not true. There is no use in

addressing this. If you want to make a general comment about how we ought to make this election, that is fine, but please do not talk about that rumor, okay. So, let's begin.

**Rinaldi:** Okay, so first we have David Bareiss, subject Item C.

**David Bareiss:** Hi, I am Dave Breese and I live in Sonoita. I would like to address the Board concerning Item C, carrying firearms in the fire station. Now, if you are concerned about people committing criminal acts with firearms at board meetings, I would like to reiterate the suggestion that I made in a previous session here about holding future board meetings at the Justice Court. This would accomplish two things, the first being that firearms are already not permitted in that building due to the expectation that criminals must frequently appear there for court sessions and such, and appropriate measures are in place to protect the public there by other means. No change regarding firearms would be needed.

Secondly, the Justice Court would provide a more comfortable, neutral setting for conservative citizens like me who no longer really feel welcome here in the firehouse given the way members of the Board and Speakers have recently been treated at these meetings. But if your intention is just to restrict the Second Amendment Right of individuals to bear arms because others do not like to see that right exercised, then I would like you to also consider restricting the exercise of the First Amendment as well and no longer permit the Fire Department chaplain to offer a prayer to start of meetings, since such prayer might offend atheists.

Moreover, since many individuals believe that the First Amendment guarantees the separation of Church and State, why does the Fire Department have a chaplain? Thank you. Oh, furthermore, one more thing. I think you should disperse with the Pledge of Allegiance as well, it being too partisan and disrespectful to those foreign nationals that own property in the district.

**Rinaldi:** Next is Linda Ford, Items B and C.

**Linda Ford:** My name is Linda Ford and I am a resident of Sonoita, albeit I live in the Pima County portion of the fire district as opposed to the Santa Cruz County portion, and I wanted to speak first of all to filling the Board vacancies, and I am proposing a process for doing that. The policy that has been passed by the Board, and that is the policy of the Fire Department, requires the chairperson to, and I quote, "Call for a discussion of potential replacements," as there may be a number of people who will submit their applications. The following procedure for revealing these applications and taking the vote for the two replacements is recommended, and I am sorry, I actually made you all copies so if you'd go and pass them around.

The Board members will review both online and paper applications prior to the meeting where the selection is to take place. Names will be posted at the selection meeting. No names or other information will be redacted. No prior screenings will have been made by any person or committee. No grading system will have been used, other than an individual Board member's own personal judgment based upon his or her belief as to whether a particular applicant will serve in the best interest of the Fire District and the Community. When the vote is to be taken, each Board member will be given a ballot with all names, and each member will vote collectively, as required by the Board policy, for two persons. Pastor Wright will count the votes and determine if any one or two persons receives at least two votes. If none does, the new ballots will be destructed and a revote required.

When one person receives two votes, his or her name will be announced and the chairman will call for a motion for that person to fill the vacancy for the voice vote then to be taken. That person's name will then be marked through on the next ballots distributed and this process repeated until two

replacements have been selected. Each Board member's vote on a specific candidate will not be known from the balloting but may be revealed upon the voice vote confirm, should she or he so desire. I believe this process will conform to both open meeting requirements, which do not include the selection of for replacement Board members as a subject for executive session discussions, and to the adopted procedures contained in the four our district Board policies. It also ensures that all candidates will be known and examined in the public view, as would be the case if this were a regular election of declared candidates.

And the other thing I wanted to speak to very briefly and this may be somewhat of a procedural thing, but it has to do with the account that was created at the . . . I think it was the Arizona Southwest Credit Union. And it would be my suggestion you close that account, because when I went back and looked through all of the various Board Minutes about setting up the three separate accounts or setting up a special account for some of these monies to be placed in, I found that resolutions were tabled or not on the agenda. There was a motion to create that was not approved. Then there was, at some point in time, there was a resolution and then it was to be rewritten and it was never brought back again.

And so the only thing that I can show that is actually, truly a resolution is this piece of paper that was signed with that particular credit union, which is just one of those standard forms that you can get when you go to the bank and want to sign and say that you got a resolution to do this. But I do not find that the corporate entity or the Board itself actually ever endorsed or approved actually opening this account or for ultimately opening it. And that is all I have. Thank you.

**Rinaldi:** Mike Wright.

**Mike:** I guess I am Mike Wright from Sonoita and I am addressing all the issues on the agenda because that is what I am going to pray for. Lord God, I do again ask your blessing upon this district, and all the work here, your protection over all the staff and volunteers. Lord, I pray for the Board members and your blessing upon their lives. May they just be overwhelmed with your blessing and protection in their lives. And, Lord, we also ask you for your blessing upon this meeting tonight and all the items that are discussed. I pray that you would honor Chairman Ron's [SP] desire that everything be done here civilly and that we are able to just discuss these things as responsible citizens in this community. Oh Lord, we just thank you for this district and what it does for us, such a blessing to us in this community. We thank you. In Jesus' name, I pray. Amen.

**Participants:** Amen.

**Mike Wright:** Thank you.

**Rinaldi:** Matt Parrilli.

**Matt Parrilli:** Matt Parrilli, Sonoita. I wish to speak about the issue of a firearm ban or a discussion about the other day, is the ban to happen or not. I hope you would tell us this evening what the issue is or what it is that you are concerned about that even brought the subject up in the first place. I personally think it is a wrongheaded solution to a non-problem. I view this as creating the dangerous situation where none has existed. Here's some of the things you need to consider. In order to vote this, you can invoke no policy more stringent than state statute, Title 13. You need to post a long locker or some kind of a locker device at the entrance door with a person who will take possession of firearms and a piece of identification, presumably put them into the locker together and that's how that goes. If you want to take possession of them loaded, perfect. If you don't, we are talking about a sand barrel outside, where a person can come out to the door, clear his weapon and give it to the attendant.

Record keeping of any sort with any latency whatsoever is strictly illegal. Everybody's guns are in the hall locker. Now, we can begin the meeting, or are they all in a wall locker? How do we know that somebody, one or two people in this room, don't still have a weapon in their possession? How do you protect the rest of the people who are in attendance? Metal detectors? TSA style frisking teams? You created, then, one of the most dangerous places in this country. That is a gun free zone. Think Denver, think Columbine, think Sandy Hook, think University of Virginia, etc. If something bad happens, you personally, under law, are not responsible, unless there is gross negligence. The two words lawyers love are diligence and negligence. They just . . . it makes their mouth water. In Arizona, there is darned little difference between negligence and gross negligence, in particular where personal harm or suffering is involved. There's been a lot of talk lately about reducing the animosity to a lesser level around here. This is a very large step in the other direction.

**Rinaldi:** Ed Schaefer.

**Ed Schaefer:** My time is up already, huh? I am Ed Chaser, I live in Elgin. How will the next Board applicant be chosen? Will the current members of the Board take Mr. Bianki's [SP] replacement and then Mr. Bianki's replacement will have a role in choosing Mr. Barry's replacement, or will the current Board be responsible for picking both replacements? And will you use the same pool of applicants for Mr. Barry's seat as was used for Mr. Bianki or will you use a new group? That's it.

**Rinaldi:** Don Irving.

**Don Irving:** I am Don Irving, Sonoita. Most of my concerns have already been covered something like this. The service on this Board is a public responsibility. It's open to the public. All applicants for this division, in my judgment, are to be open and available and part of the public record. Each member of this Board should be able to see each of those applications and exercise their own judgment and then each applicant should have an equal opportunity to present their position, their views to this Board and preferably in open session. Most of your decisions and discussions are in open session. That should be a very important part of an applicant's application. And finally, if there is a place for privacy or secrecy in this process, perhaps it is in the traditional American voting booth privacy. A private vote is not part of the process.

**Rinaldi:** Terry Plympton.

**Terry Plympton:** Good evening. Regarding the process for filling Board vacancies, in my notes on March 30th, [inaudible 00:17:13] recommended that applications be numbered and the names redacted, so that the applicants are judged fairly by the Board on their qualifications alone, and the Board will trim the applications down to a final three, based solely on merit before the interviewing process begins. I ask that the chairman or Board member please set the record straight on the process you will be implementing since applications are currently being submitted for the first Board vacancy. I believe the Board is doing its utmost to keep this process as impartial and fair as possible. On another agenda item concerning Board member appearances and participation at public gatherings, Arizona Open Meeting Law on Section 38-431 under Definition states the following under Item 4, "Meeting means the gathering in person or through technological devices of a quorum of members of a public body at which they discuss, oppose or take legal action, including any deliberations by quorum with respect to such action." Participating in a community meeting, even when the subject matter may pertain to the business of a public body, does not appear to violate any open meeting law, so long as the members of a public body are not directly in discussions with one another.

The Arizona Ombudsman's Citizens Aide website also addresses this issue in the following excerpt from their FAQs. Question, may Board members discuss issues or express opinions to the public outside of properly noticed meeting? The answer, yes. ARS 38-431.09 clarifies that if a member of a

public body individually expresses an opinion or discusses an issue with the public, for public broadcast or at a venue other than a public meeting, the member is not in violation of the open meeting law if the opinion is not directed at another public official and there is no concerted plan to engage in collective deliberation to take legal action. So, there appear to be no reason for a quorum of SEFD Board members to be prohibited from participating in any community meetings or events, so long as they are not actively deliberating among themselves nor considering any legal action of this public body.

Finally, regarding discussion about the need for a Board Treasurer, the evidence is inconsistent. Arizona State Statute titled 48-803 states the following, "The district board shall elect from its members a Chairman and a Clerk." However, the most recent SEFD Board policy manual states a different view under Board Officers/Duties Item 2, "The officers of the Board shall be comprised of a Chairperson, Board Clerk and Treasurer." The Arizona State Statutes are normally used as general guidelines for governmental agencies, in this case, stating the requirements for the operations of special taxing districts. Therefore, the policy as written in the SEFD Board policy manual should take precedence over state statutes [siren overwhelmed the vocal] to a local fire district and addresses the intent of previous SEFD Boards, which is to elect a Treasurer as an officer of the Board. Thank you.

**Rinaldi:** Thank you. Susan Archibald.

**Susan Archibald:** Susan Archibald. I am from Sonoita. Most of my concerns have been addressed. My main issue is to make sure that you use the policies and the procedures that you have in place. I have heard in the few, three or four months that I have been involved that we have to be reminded of that, both as a community and as a Board. So, my encouragement to you is please use what you have in place. Thank you.

**Rinaldi:** Thank you. Vicki Rutter

**Vicki Rutter:** I am Vicki Rutter, district resident. I just want to mention one thing that has mostly addressed. I want to bring to your attention that we did not receive the bank statement yet from the American Southwest Credit Union. The \$70,000 check was issued on February 13th and deposited February 17th. The paperwork looks like there might have been four accounts set up at the credit union. We currently have seven active accounts, not counting this new one. It looks like we could now have 11 separate accounts. Since you are discussing the special account tonight, under New Business, perhaps Jennifer could clarify to the Board, not asking to me, what was set up and if we really need all those accounts. I also bring this up because I reconcile all the bank accounts every month. The Chief is not a signer on these new accounts, so the only people who can get information on them, such as when bank statements are mailed, interest rates, etc. are Jennifer and, right now, Jerry, which makes it inconvenient to run them down just for basic information. Thank you.

**Rinaldi:** David Aho.

**David Aho:** Good evening. My name is David Aho, Sonoita resident, 28 years now. Most of the concerns that I wanted to address have been brought up by numerous community members and I guess the only thing I would like to add is first off, my hat's off to you for everything you're having to go through. It has been fun, to say the least. All I ask is that, when you are doing your job, remember, we are your constituents. We work for you or you work for us, I should say, and, when it comes down to it, a lot of the concerns that have been bringing up or have been brought up to you have not been addressed. So, a lot of people feel that their concerns are not being addressed. So, they do not know where their concerns stand. And I know how the rumors are. I've heard Mrs. Rinaldi earlier stating about the rumor and you, also, Mr. Chairman, about the rumor going around about how this election process is going to go on with the Board members.

If you are more open and you communicate and answer some of the questions, and I know it is your prerogative on how you do that, but I think it will solve a lot of issues and misconceptions with the community. The community believes in this fire district. Some don't. Those that have lived here for a long time understand the relevance and importance of the fire district, and, unfortunately, sometimes you have to pay more for public safety. All I ask is that you keep your constituents informed. Remember who you are working for and this is all about public safety. Thank you.

**Rinaldi:** And that concludes our call to the public, first section.

**Izzo:** Okay. We move on to old business. There is no old business. New business, Item 6-A, discussion, possible action, accepting the resignation of Anthony Berry and appointment process to fill the vacancy. So, we have received an email from Mr. Anthony Berry submitting his resignation effectively immediately. Sorry, I don't have, off the top of my head, when that was, but it was . . .

**Rinaldi:** Last week.

**Chairman:** Last week, and I may even actually have that here. Tuesday, April 7. Thank you, Chief. First matter of business is we need to accept this resignation. We need a motion, a second and a vote.

**Rinaldi:** I motion to accept the resignation of Anthony Berry.

**Judy:** I second.

**Izzo:** Okay, any more discussion? All those in favor?

**Board members:** Aye.

**Izzo:** Okay. The next part of that is just some discussion about the appointment, about the process we are going to use to fill that vacancy. I am going to open this up with thoughts that I have and we can discuss that and see what we might want to do. I would suggest that we fill both vacancies at the same time. In other words, use the current process that we have by modifying the public notice and the ad and now tell people officially, not that they do not know, but tell them there are two positions now. Then, when people apply at some point in the process, they would be given an option on which position. One expires at the end of the year, at the end of next year, and the other one is a four year position, so that they would have a choice to decide on which position that they fill.

**Neal:** Do we already have applications that have been submitted that they would not have had the opportunity to put that on?

**Izzo:** I was kind of thinking maybe the appropriate place would be at the interview. I do not know. I am just thinking . . .

**Neal:** Okay.

**Izzo:** . . . I am just thinking.

**Rinaldi:** Thinking out loud.

**Izzo:** Yeah. Yeah.

**Rinaldi:** I would think that at the process when you are interviewing people, you could ask them, and I think a lot of it has to do with who is in place now and what positions they have, and what would be carried on, such as the Treasurer. He is in for four years. So, whoever has thought about to replace the Treasurer, he should be in or she should be in for four years.

**Rinaldi:** Okay.

**Izzo:** Sound viable?

**Rinaldi:** Sounds viable.

**Izzo:** Okay. I do not think we need a motion or vote, we put on there. Anyway . . .

**Judy:** So, would you just recap that so I make sure I can [inaudible 00:27:11].

**Izzo:** This is only about the appointment process to fill Mr. Berry's vacancy. Item E is about the overall process when we get to that.

**Judy:** Okay. All right.

**Izzo:** It is just the idea that we would do this all together, modify the ads to do that and then they would make a choice at some point in the process. They would have to tell us which position. Some

people will not care, some will care, so how that would impact anything. It may not have any impact until we get down to the finalists.

**Neal:** Okay.

**Izzo:** Chief, any other comments on that?

**Chief:** So, you want us to change the apps to say two positions now. The application is on the website.

**Izzo:** Correct. And the ad in the newspaper and the public notice.

**Chief:** One is a four-year term and the other is a . . . it sounds like we have 14 months with out of this.

**Izzo:** Yeah. For one position . . . you mentioned earlier, one expires and then the other position expires.

**Chief:** Okay. So, we'll add the expiration in . . .

**Izzo:** Okay, we move on to Item B, Special Bank Accounts signature authority, and Jennifer, would you bring us up to date on that?

**Rinaldi:** All we need to do is go to the bank with a motion. We need the minutes, the meeting minutes to change whoever is the co-signer. If we want to add another signer on the account, we just need to bring that up at a public meeting, have the minutes and go to the bank. That is all it takes.

**Izzo:** Is it your thoughts that we want to add another signer now or can we just leave it for now until we get the other positions filled? I am just asking your thoughts.

**Jennifer:** I think the public would like us to have the three signers on that account.

**Chairman:** Three?

**Jennifer:** Yes. It was originally just Jerry and myself, but I think the public would like another signer on that account.

**Chairman:** That means we have to go where?

**Jennifer:** All we have to do is make a motion, approve the motion, and then go to the bank with the paperwork that says that.

**Chairman:** Can each of us go separately?

**Jennifer:** Yes.

**Chairman:** I presume this is in Tucson or somewhere.

**Jennifer:** No. This is in Sierra Vista.

**Chairman:** Sierra Vista? Okay. No big deal. You want to make that a motion?

**Jennifer:** I motion that we put another signer on the account in Sierra Vista. Do I have a second?

**Chairman:** All three sign, all three of us. Is that your motion?

**Jennifer:** Yes.

**Chairman:** All three of us?

**Jennifer:** All three of us.

**Chairman:** I will second it. Any discussion? All those in favor?

**Participants:** Aye.

**Chairman:** Okay. I asked Chief to look into the possibility of the Board establishing a procedure concerning carrying of firearms here at the meeting. Just to answer the question that was asked, good question. The reason that it is on the agenda is because I asked Chief to look into it. That is the issue. Go ahead, Chief.

**Chief:** Okay. First thing, I have looked it up online. Mr. Parelli had it all pretty much lined out for us this evening. We do have to put lock boxes, but we do have to put lock boxes at both entrances, so we have to have one at the other entrance as well. We can't just say this side of the building is no firearms but that side of the building, you go in and have firearms. So, we have to post both entrances and put boxes at both entrances.

**Chairman:** And these had to be built into the wall or something?

**Chief:** You can lag them into the wall, build them into the wall, and they range anywhere from \$400 up on to \$1,400.

**Chairman:** Does a person have to be there to check them in?

**Chief:** I did not understand that. From what I was informed is, these have a key like at the post office and you open it, put your gun in, lock it and walk away with the key. And you have the only key to that lock box. Then, when you are done, you put the key back in, and pull your weapon out. I didn't find anything about unloading weapons or anything like that, so I am not . . .

**Chairman:** Okay.

**Judy:** I would say that if this is a huge issue, rather than purchasing these and looking at this procedure, if this is that important, that we not have weapons, that we consider moving our meetings to the Justice, to the court, that has already established their setup so it is not . . .

**Chief:** They have lock boxes there?

**Female:** No, but you cannot go into a court building.

**Judy:** Only when it is a court.

**Female:** No, it's operable.

**Chief:** I don't know the way it is.

**Rinaldi:** So they have lock boxes, at the court?

**Chief:** I don't know.

**Chairman:** They do. They do.

**Rinaldi:** Yes, they do. Barbara Batten [SP] says they do.

**Izzo:** Okay. Any more discussion on this? I just [inaudible 00:32:25] give a report, I don't know.

**Judy:** Okay.

**Female 3:** Yeah, I would say that going to the courthouse is the best solution, rather than spending money on this.

**Izzo:** Okay. We move on to Item D. Are you okay?

**Rinaldi 3:** Yep.

**Izzo:** PA system. And this one is on the agenda because I had some members of the public saying that they could not hear what was going on. So, I asked you to look into possibility of getting PA system for our meetings.

**Chief:** And we did work on it some. Our mikes won't handle recording plus broadcasting. We do have some speakers around? We, for a small, couple hundred bucks, we can convert our system to both. We would be able to have PA sound in the room and recording.

**Izzo:** \$200?

**Chief:** Right. A couple hundred bucks.

**Izzo:** And this microphone is for us? How is that going to work?

**Chief:** Yes, each table will have to have a microphone on it, and that'll have to have a microphone on it. So, we will still use these for recording and then a microphone to talk into.

**Rinaldi :** Are they portable?

**Chairman:** Yeah.

**Neal:** So, you are looking at microphones and speakers [inaudible 00:33:39] it?

**Chief:** We have the speakers and I'm not a tech guy, but we have the converter over there to do it with, somebody donated a month or two back to us. The only thing we do not have is the actual mikes. We have one but not enough to go around.

**Izzo:** Are those the speakers you are referring to?

**Chief:** Yes.

**Izzo:** Is that adequate?

**Chief:** Oh yes. We will mount them up on the ceiling and you can hear very clearly with it. And actually, I have four of them. If it doesn't come out to where it is loud enough, we can add a couple more. But I guess from sound, you have to worry about feedback where you put the speakers at.

**Izzo:** Any more discussion? We can defer this and talk to our people, we can make a decision tonight. Some people came to me and said they could not hear us. That is why it is on there. That is all that happened.

**Rinaldi:** I think it is worth doing. It is not that much money, and it is a simple fix.

**Izzo:** I don't think we need a motion. We just do it. Chief, at 200, we're expecting \$200, Chief.

**Rinaldi:** It is less than the amount.

**Neal:** Since we do have possible action, could we do?

**Izzo:** You want a motion?

**Rinaldi:** Yes, me too.

**Izzo:** Go ahead.

**Neal:** You want to make the motion, Susan?

**Rinaldi:** Sure. I make the motion that we go ahead with the upgrades to the PA system.

**Neal:** I second.

**Izzo:** Okay. Any more discussion? All those in favor? Aye.

**Board members:** Aye.

**Izzo:** Item E, which is scoring criteria and procedure for ranking candidates and so I am going to throw something out and this is the process that we might use. I would like us to decide how we are going to do this, either tonight or at some point soon, and it is on the agenda, so we can actually make the decision tonight. What I am thinking - and these are just thoughts - that each of us would evaluate and rank the applications that have been submitted. Whatever process we each choose to use, but the end result would be a ranking. So if there is 15 applications, I would have them ranked one through 15. And we might have an objective criteria, I am thinking like 10 points for each area and I think there is 12, and you might have some other criteria. But the point will be that you would have to end up with a ranking of those candidates.

We will call a special meeting soon. This is not a rumor. I am just talking, okay, so nothing has been decided here. So we would have a special meeting and we would then determine the rank order by adding the scores. So, if there are 15 applications, then the least possible score, which is number one would have three points, all right? Each one give it one, and the maximum number would be 45. That would be the last one. So, we would just add up the rank numbers and that would give us an overall ranking of all the applicants.

Now, once we look at that overall ranking, we would decide on what number to interview and I am recommending an oral interview in this, as I am discussing this. There would be a logical cut off point. I am not saying 3, 5 or 6, but when you look at the scores, there should be a logical cut off point. Personally, I have no problem with 7, but you would look at that and see if there is a big gap. There's like 20, and then the next one is 35. That might be the cut off that we might look at. But we would not decide what that number would be until we added up all the ranks, rank orders and then we would decide how many we could interview.

So, then at the special meeting, we would each bring five . . . just bear with me here, it is kind of involved, five questions for the oral review board. I think 15 questions is kind of a lot, but the reason I would say, we would bring five questions is we probably would have duplicates. I want to know - even though they have it on the application, I want to hear them tell me why they want to be on the Board. You might all have the same thing. So that way there, we could end up with a reasonable number of questions. If we each brought five, we will be prepared for that.

**Rinaldi:** Let me clarify something. Would these interviews be conducted one on one or as the whole Board sitting here and that person's having to answer that question twice?

**Izzo:** No. The interview would be the whole Board asking the number of questions, 10, 12, whatever we end up with. But we would be meeting and we would come to this meeting with five questions for the oral board, each of us. Now, we go into Executive session and we would discuss those questions. The reason is, we don't want the candidates to know what those questions are. So, we go into Executive session to discuss the questions, and we also would want to know. If I have a question, I would want to tell you what I think is a good answer. If you have a question, you want to tell me why you want that, so that . . . because I am going to score that, too. We are scoring all the questions. So, I would want to hear about the rationale behind them. Then we consolidate those questions to a reasonable number, 10, 12, whatever the number that we decide. That is what I am proposing. Any thoughts?

And again, we do this soon. I think we could do this soon. The cut off is the 22nd. I would think that I could have them reviewed, the applications reviewed, in a day or two, and I would like to fill these vacancies as soon as we could.

**Neal:** And we are talking about doing the interview in an open session?

**Izzo:** I did not mention that.

**Neal:** You did not mention that.

**Izzo:** Okay. Personally, I prefer an open meeting for the interview. I know it is a little clumsy so the thing here is, you really do not want the other candidates to know what the questions are ahead of time because that would give them an edge. So, you could ask them to be excused - I do not know if we could isolate them somewhere, lock them in a room and then, the first candidate does not have a chance to talk to the rest of them. I don't know.

**Chief:** We'd have to check into that, because it's a public meeting.

**Neal:** It is a public meeting.

**Izzo:** Well, yeah.

**Chief:** I don't know if we could ask them to do that.

**Rinaldi:** Couldn't you just do an interview one on one with each of the Board members and the applicant coming in and speaking to you and then 10 minutes later . . .

**Judy:** Right. I did contact the Ombudsman office and I talked to Kathryn Marquoit who is, I think, Head of the Legal Department of the Ombudsman office and so, some of the information that I asked from her was basically what is public record, when it comes to the applications and the process. According to her, the public record is that you release the finalist information and she says that it is not defined in statute but it has always been interpreted to mean whoever gets an interview. That is information for all the Board that, if we do interview in Executive session, then everyone has to be noticed. They have to be given the 24 hour letter and they have to, in that letter, you are given the option of whether you want your interview to be conducted in Executive session or in open session. So, any candidate could choose open session, no matter what we choose as a Board to do. They do have that option that, if we do this in a public meeting, then there is no letter and all, but as far as how we would manage to keep it fair to all the candidates, so that the first candidate doesn't know the questions and the others are sitting out in the audience and would know all the questions and have time to prepare, that would be something we need to check into. I do not know if we could require them not to be present because of compromising them.

**Chairman:** Okay. Regarding the applications, is it our understanding the applications themselves are not public record and we are required to release them?

**Judy:** Yes. You release the finalist information, which is the name and you can give some general information about the finalists that you are going to interview, but all of the applications that are received, say we receive 20 applications and we decide to interview five people. For those 15 that we did not interview, it is not a public record.

**Chairman:** The names of those?

**Judy:** The names, nor their applications.

**Chairman:** And the applications of the ones that we decide to interview?

**Judy:** I did not specifically ask her. It was about releasing names,

**Chairman:** Okay.

**Judy:** And that is what generally the practice is, and I do not know what the Ombudsman's office would say is that you release the names of the finalists of the people you are going to interview.

**Chairman:** Okay.

**Judy:** I can call her back and ask her about the application itself.

**Chairman:** I am presuming from this that it is going to be our intention not to release any of the applications. They have personal information and other stuff on there.

**Male:** Right.

**Chairman:** And Chief, tell us, if somebody applies for a job here?

**Chief:** We do not release any application with any information on it at all. It is a privacy. Education, nothing like that at all. It has to be pulled off. If somebody were to come in and ask who worked here, we can give them their name and that is all.

**Chairman:** Okay. So, once we are on the Board, everything is fair game.

**Judy:** That is correct. That is correct.

**Chairman:** But coming up the Board. Okay. So again, are you thinking okay about ranking the applications to come to a number?

**Female 3:** I think ranking is a great idea. I think that standardized questions would be less clunky. I think there's still going to be an open enough relationship with the applicant to be able to ask your own personal question if need be, but perhaps a standardized question . . .

**Chairman:** That is what I am talking about. They would be standard. It is just that I would recommend some and you would recommend some and Judy would recommend some. They would be the same questions for every applicant. Of course, you can ask follow up questions.

**Female 3:** Exactly.

**Chairman:** But they would be standard. Every applicant would get the same questions. And I am thinking we would interview them all at once and you were thinking individually? I just wonder how we might do that.

**Female 3:** Would the format be like it is today, here, where they would come up to us, and the tables would be set like this? How were you thinking to set the room up?

**Chairman:** I wasn't thinking how to I would set the room up. I think I would like to have a bright light.

**Female 4:** No water?

**Chairman:** Yes, something, a table would probably try to make you a little bit more comfortable.

**Female 3:** Right.

**Chairman:** Where the three of us could sit at a table and then have them right in front of us, so yeah.

**Judy:** So, you are thinking about a group interview, when you are saying, if we are going to interview five people. Did I understand you? We would have them all here at one time. Are you talk [inaudible 00:45:58]?

**Chairman:** No, no. They would each come in individually and I'd try to isolate that are not, so they would not have an advantage of knowing the questions ahead of time.

**Judy:** Right. Okay. Well I guess, if an applicant would refuse to leave and would want to know the questions ahead of time to give them advantage, that would tell you something about that applicant.

**Female 3:** Something about that applicant, I'm sure.

**Chairman:** Are you going to contact them and ask follow up question on it?

**Judy:** Yes. I would.

**Chairman:** Could you ask them about, that we are thinking right now about interviewing them in the public, here, and that can we isolate the other candidates, exclude them from hearing the interviews with their competitors?

**Judy:** Okay.

**Chairman:** So you are thinking that could be an issue.

**Female 3:** Okay.

**Chairman:** So, I guess I could make that as a motion? Is that what you want? I guess we have to.  
Judy: Sure.

**Chairman:** Do you understand what we are going to do? Can we put some dates, timelines on this?

**Female 3:** Why not?

**Chairman:** Somebody have a calendar? So the 22nd is what?

**Chief:** It is a Wednesday.

**Judy:** And then we have a meeting the following Monday?

**Chief:** A regular Board meeting on the 27th.

**Judy:** So if the deadline is 5 p.m. on the 22nd, is there a reason we cannot get their applications on the 23rd? To go through them and rank them?

**Chairman:** Have them ready and throw that in on the 27th for us to come up with the numbers?

**Female 3:** Right there.

**Male 2:** What is the question?

**Judy:** If the deadline for receiving applications is Wednesday, the 22nd at 5 p.m., would it be reasonable for us to expect to get the applications with the names redacted and all on the next day.

**Male 3:** I'll have them to you that evening.

**Judy:** Okay.

**Chairman:** So, might we do this on the 27th? The only other old business, Chief, is your contract, that one clause that I know of. We have the financial reports, we have the contract,

**Female 3:** Yeah. I actually have a bill from . . .

**Chairman:** Okay, but I was thinking the only thing for the 27th is our regular financial report and this contract right now.

**Female 3:** Right. The contract, yeah.

**Chairman:** So, we could do this the 27th .

**Female 3:** Right.

**Chairman:** Okay? So we would have our rank order, we would bring our questions, we will add up the scores and determine the rank order, overall for everybody, decide how many people we are going to interview, go into Executive session and what kind of questions. Sound good?

**Judy:** Yes.

**Chairman:** That's one motion.

**Male 3:** On the 27th?

**Chairman:** On the 27th.

**Male 3:** Okay.

**Chairman:** And interviews, and we continue the motion. When could we interview? If we did all of that the 27th, I don't know why we have to take too long. When are we going to approve the draft budget?

**Female 3:** It is right here.

**Chairman:** Draft budgets scheduled for the 27th. What happens if we move that out a few days?

**Male 3:** You can move that out or you could move the interviews out, right.

**Chairman:** What I am thinking, I am just telling you. Personally. It is just personal thought. How do I tell the position has filled, for the budget? Now, they may not know as much but at least they would have an opportunity to have some input.

**Female 3:** If they have been here, they will know quite a bit.

**Female 4:** Yes.

**Chairman:** So, if we could move that out until when, and then schedule the interviews later that week, the 27th.

**Male 2:** Look, we need to do the draft budget, the 28th, 29th or 30th.

**Chairman:** Okay, so we got 30th. That is the last that, do you think . . .

**Male 2:** Do you think we think we have to post it by the 4th in order to get out further reason.

**Chairman:** One, two, three - that is Tuesday, the 4th, isn't it?

**Male 2:** Monday is the 4th.

**Chairman:** Okay.

**Male 2:** And that is my last date to get it in the paper, too.

**Chairman:** The 4th, Monday? So Friday, what is the date on Friday?

**Male 2:** The 1st.

**Chairman:** Okay. So that is the last day?

**Male 2:** Yeah.

**Judy:** If we interviewed after the 27th, they're not going to have time for input if we got to pass the budget, I mean, the proposed budget.

**Male 2:** Yeah, just proposed.

**Judy:** Yes. But we have to pass the proposed budget.

**Male 2:** You have to approve the proposed budget.

**Judy:** Right.

**Female 3:** Right, right. But then you will have the public meeting on the 8th and there is the chance for final approval there.

**Judy:** They could certainly be on board for the public hearing and to have the input for the final budget.

**Female 3:** So this is your aim, to change things?

**Judy:** Yes.

**Chairman:** Well not much, because we could not increase the budget.

**Female 3:** No, no.

**Chairman:** And again, why couldn't we do this all the week of the 27th? We could have interviews on the 29th, 28th, 29th?

**Female 3:** Sure.

**Chairman:** We could have them on the 28th, couldn't we? Is that enough time for, the 29th would give them a couple of days to be present.

**Female 3:** Yeah.

**Chairman:** Are you okay with that? Okay.

**Judy:** So we are looking at . . . On our April 27th meeting, that we will have rank ordered the applications and have our questions, and we are will go to Executive session to finalize and put together the final questions, and then we will interview the finalists on when?

**Chairman:** The 29th.

**Judy:** The 29th. Are we talking about in the evening?

**Chairman:** That is a good question. We always meet in the evening. We don't have to, a lot of boards don't. Somebody here works. I work too, but . . .

**Judy:** Yeah. And some of our candidates may work, so . . .

**Female 3:** I think your evenings are the best bet.

**Chairman:** Okay. So I can't really consolidate in here. So, on the 27th we need to adjust our budget schedule. There will be an item for the 27th.

**Chief:** And the budget.

**Chairman:** Yeah, the budget schedule.

**Chief:** Oh adjust the budget schedule.

**Chairman:** Yeah, because we decided to do that. Okay. That is my motion.

**Female 4:** Would you like to recount that?

**Female 3:** It looks like a sign fell.

**Judy:** Do you want to repeat it?

**Male 2:** Okay.

**Male 3:** Together we would appreciate it.

**Chairman:** So, each of us will receive the applications electronically by the 23rd, is that true? They can be sent to us with the information redacted, other information . . . some sort of code. On the meeting on the 27th, we will come to the meeting having ranked all the applications from one to whatever they are, in order. We will add those scores up and determine how many people we will interview. We will bring five questions each for the oral review on the 27th. We'll go into Executive session and discuss the questions and consolidate the questions to a reasonable number. We will schedule the oral interviews for the 29th. It will be done in open public meeting, all three of us together with each candidate and we will look into our ability to isolate candidates. Judy will look into that.

**Judy:** Yes, I will. I will ask about that now. I understand the rank order, but are we assigning a score to each question and are we just doing the rank order? If we receive 15 applications, we bring them rank from . . . this is our first choice down to 15?

**Chairman:** Since we are doing that individually, it is my recommendation that we do that individually. However, I said I am going to assign numbers, but I am a number guy. But you can do it any way that you want to because I have to defend that.

**Judy:** I know but I need the scale. For example, the highest you can score is 100 total points or . . .

**Chairman:** The highest in the score is rank number one.

**Judy:** Okay.

**Female 3:** So it is one through 15.

**Judy:** Okay. That is what . . .

**Female 3:** Put them in the order that you like. Assigning numbers.

**Judy:** That is what I needed to know, are we just ranking them but we are not assigning the . . .

**Chairman:** Score.

**Judy:** Okay. It is good in that. Okay.

**Female 3:** From what you led us to believe, the scoring would be done during the interview.

**Chairman:** Correct. We need to meet on that, and then decide points . . . I think we have to decide points for the interview, because the questions has to be standard. So then there is going to be some scores.

**Judy:** All right.

**Chairman:** Somebody please second that or . . .

**Female 3:** I will second that.

**Chairman:** . . . make another motion or something. Any more discussion? All those in favor? Aye. Participants: Aye.

**Chairman:** Okay. Clear as mud. Okay, we move on to Item F and this is mine again. I should put my name by it, but you have to forgive me for that. I just want to make some comments and I trust that each of you will challenge me on this and talk to the Ombudsman or read up on the open meeting law. I appreciate what Terry had to say and that my concern is that not that we violate the open meeting law by going to a public gathering - because we certainly don't. As I recall, there was a Christmas celebration one year when there were four Board members present. So we can go to any public gathering that we choose to. That is not a violation of the open meeting law. If we begin to discuss business of the district, then that is the violation. And certainly, we go to the ElJun [SP 00:57:37] club and church events together and we do all that stuff. We have to be really careful that we don't discuss any business in that environment.

There are ways that we, as Board members can get public input. One is to just contact people and ask them. In other ways, as individual Board member, I could hold a town hall meeting. During that town hall meeting, I can have dialogue with you back and forth and you can ask questions and I can answer them but the town hall is going to be just my town hall. It is for me and I am the only one that is interacting. The other ways we can get public input is, we can have a hearing. We, as the Board, can have a public hearing, so then we can have some dialogues and let people talk to us and that would be the purpose of the meeting.

But when you have a public gathering that is only for the purpose of discussing Board business, and we have a majority of Board members present, it is very easy to step over the line. And I'm just talking about me. If I am in a meeting, like I was a couple of weeks ago, and I hear something that is not true, I want to say something. So, if I say something, another Board member might say something, another Board member might say something and we have crossed that line right there. For me, personally, I am not going to go to any more of those meetings, because I cannot keep my mouth shut. That was as far as I can go and it doesn't mean that I do not care. It just means that it is too dangerous for me to be at those meetings. We had the majority of the Board at that meeting, so it would be very easy to step over the line.

Personally, I would rather see that group continue to meet, come up with something and come back to the whole Board or if any of us would like to try to cement that division in our community, then we would individually hold a town hall meeting. We would call people together and we would have that, but that meeting that we had just scared me a lot when I left. So I just want to bring that up and I would challenge each of you to read the law, talk to the Ombudsman and see what we can do or cannot do. But as for me, I am not going to tell them and I am just really scared that we could step over that line, too easily, by being there. So that is all. It is just a statement that I have. Do you guys have any discussion on it?

**Female 3:** I have a comment. Two of us can be at that meeting and address comments by the public, but not address comments to each other. And that is perfectly okay - from what I read, anyway. That is absolutely fine. I guess if a third person comes, they have to realize they can't say anything.

**Judy:** And that is when we have a five member Board. Right now, we're in a situation.

**Female 3:** Right, where the two of us . . .

**Female 4:** Three of us. The three of us in the room.

**Judy:** All right.

**Chairman:** But the question . . . but the thing that happens is so somebody says, "Why did you establish this secret bank account?" And then one Board member answers the question and says, "It is not secret. We did this and we did that." And then another Board member says, "Well, because people are concerned about it, we ought to not have it, a separate bank account." We just violated the law right there. It is too easy with two people. I'm saying it is too easy to . . . you cannot think about everything you say. Even though you are addressing it to somebody, now you have actually discussed business.

**Judy:** And I did discuss that with the Ombudsman that I talked to earlier and she did say that if we participate in the meetings as a quorum, then we have violated the open meeting law. Now, participation is speaking and trying to convince other Board members or other Board members are sitting there and it could be construed that we are trying to sway them or convince them of our point of view. So she cautioned very strongly that we be real careful.

**Chairman:** Does your understanding that, like Jennifer just said, two people could do this?

**Judy:** You mean discuss that . . .

**Chairman:** You have less than a quorum.

**Judy:** We did not discuss that.

**Chairman:** Yeah. Because I think even with two, we would be setting ourselves up for discussing business.

**Judy:** Yeah. She did say if you have less than a quorum, it's not a violation by board members being there, certainly. But if you have a quorum, then you just don't need to participate.

**Chairman:** Okay, anything else on it? Okay, concerning the treasurer, this is my agenda tonight. Although, forgive me or you can come up and chew me out afterwards. I wanted to have some discussion that's preliminary. We do have a board policy that requires us to have a treasurer, alright? However, it's come to my attention, there are 156 fire districts in the state of Arizona and only four have treasurers and the other three are big districts. It made me question to myself, I've been here so

I was involved in deciding who would have a treasurer and everything else. So, I kind of asked myself "Why did we have a treasurer?" Well, it was a holdover from the volunteer organization which is called CC head of treasurer and that board managed its funds separately. I mean, it was my understanding. So, when I looked at the policy that we adopted, it's said, "The treasurer shall review all monthly budget reports with fire chief and report the status of such budget to the board." And for the last five, four years, that hasn't happened.

So, I'm questioning the need for a treasurer and I'd realized and my thoughts are that I would present a revision to our board policies and do away with the treasurer position. So, I just want to open discussion on it. We're not making any decisions, I just wanted to talk to you about it in the public, let you know what I was thinking. As in, if we haven't had a treasurer that did what the policy said for four years, I just want to know what the treasurer's going to do and then we should revise the policy accordingly, if we have something for a treasurer to do.

**Jennifer:** Well, I have concerns about doing away with the treasurer position. Being new, I can't really speak to what the role of the treasurer has been in the past but in going to the training that I went to in January, they really stressed the new laws about the obligation of the Fire District board and the liability that we take on regarding the budget. And I think that all across the state that there has been, evidently, from what they presented, numerous incidents where there was either alleged mishandling of files or it was proven. I think that was the impetus for the new legislation being passed. So, maybe these other Fire Districts need a treasurer position. You can look at it like that also. But when you look at the advanced finance information that I gave you a copy of for Fire Districts and the obligation that we have and all, I'm just really uncomfortable doing that at this point and add to that that we have numerous accounts and other Fire Districts also keep their monies in the county with the county treasurer and they do not handle the cash that our Fire District does.

The other districts, under statute, the money is collected and maintained at the county. If you have a bill, you issue a piece of paper and send it down there, they produce the check. They send it to you and you put it in the mail and on payroll. You put your payroll in, information send it to the county, they process the checks and they write the checks. So, there is never any cash that is sent from the county to other Fire Districts. That is not true for our Fire District. So, for those reasons, I feel that we maybe need the treasurer. We've had one. I don't know why it was established in this Fire District but we've had one since the conception of the Fire District and maybe the better question would be as defined in the role of the treasurer and the job the treasurer should be doing as a part of the board.

**Woman 1:** And I would add to that, as a board member, you're putting your name on the line saying that you know every single thing financial that's going on in this district. You're responsible. We are all responsible for it. And I really would like a second set of eyes on the paperwork to know what's going on.

**Chairperson:** Of course, it's not a defense that we had a treasurer. I looked at it.

**Woman 1:** No, it isn't, but a second set of eyes does a lot. Mistakes are made innocently a lot of the times.

**Judy:** Right, but a defense is if you have done your due diligence and you're lack of doing due diligence is what gets you in trouble and will that get you off the hook totally? No, but it will go a long way to helping you not be cellmates with someone.

**Man 1:** With what Judy is saying is, and I really want to make a known is, it's not the Sonoita-Elgin Fire District that does not keep our money with the county. It's all Fire Districts within Santa Cruz County. Santa Cruz County handles their money different than any other county in the state. So, we're not doing something independently. It's the county that is doing it independently.

**Chairperson:** Okay. Thank you for your input, I appreciate that. Are there any more questions on that, before we move on?

**Judy:** No.

**Chairman:** Okay, audience comments?

**Judy:** Okay. We have Michelle Cardello [SP].

**Michelle:** Hi. This is my . . . I think my first time to ever speak in front of the board and my name is **Michelle** Cardello, and I have lived here since the fall of 2005. I would like to address the rumor that certain individuals in this community wish to do away with the Fire District. It is becoming ridiculous. It's not nice, whoever is perpetuating it. The person that's perpetuating it is definitely causing a divisive action in the community. You cannot do away with this fire district and I don't mean that in the sense that you just simply can't. You can't do away with the Fire District. It's a district. When we came here in 2005, we had a visit from Pete Daniels. We wrote him a check. At that particular time, I can remember asking Pete if everybody paid this money. And he said "No, all of the people don't pay the money. Some people take their chances." Okay, based on that statement, my husband and I were 100% for this becoming a Fire District from the get go. We voted for it to be a district. We wish it to remain a district. I do not know anyone and I do swear to you, not anyone, that was originally against this being a Fire District that has perpetuated thoughts that they wish this to not be a Fire District any longer or have a plan to make it happen.

Everyone that I know has fully accepted that this is a Fire District and it's going to remain a Fire District. I could give you all the reason why we want it to remain a Fire District, first and foremost your insurance cost. There's a lot of other things that if we suddenly become a volunteer district again, all of these well trained people are going to leave. Why wouldn't they? Why would they stay here to be a volunteer? That is ridiculous. Most important of all is that fact that if this Fire District goes away, so does all the equipment. So, it doesn't just going to happen. So, the person that is perpetuating this fraudulent scare upon our community needs to knock it off and I would suggest that the board start putting that out. Stop it.

In this very meeting, you talked about one instance and then in the very next subject, first, we talked about moving meeting down to the court house because you didn't want to have guns present in the room. I don't know anybody in this room that's going to shoot anybody. Protect, yes, shoot, no but first you talked about moving it down to the court house and then, in the very next step, you talk about putting in a PA system here to conduct meetings. Make up your mind. Put things in order. Don't put the cart before the horse. Either you want to beef up the PA system or you want to ban guns. So, please get in order and thank you for time.

**Female:** Kurt Balche [SP].

**Kurt:** Kurt Balche[SP], Sonoita. I've been here since late 1981, so a little while. I had a few comments. Actually that was a good segue. I've heard that rumor. I've heard a lot of rumors. I've also seen some things that had been forwarded to me that have come out on the e-mail. There's a graph that's showing the budget and how much its increased and that. I have no idea if those numbers are correct or not but, when I looked at it, it begs the rest of the story. And so, you can't urge the public like she asked. I mean, you can talk to people and that but I think both sides and I'm afraid the divisiveness is continuing. Both sides really need to make sure they put factual information and all of the facts, just not some.

Quick comments. Firearms, to me, is a non-issue. The person that leaves a firearm in the box at the door is not your problem. They're not going to be a problem and you can't tell if somebody has one and that was brought up before. To me, firearms is a non-issue and the applications. I don't know how you guys or how Pastor Light, this is going to be tougher than trying to convert an atheist, I think. Trying to anonymize an application because so many of the things listed in the application, and I looked at that process, are going to tell you exactly who exactly who that person is.

I trust the board not to try to have an ax to grind or something like that. I would encourage you to just go ahead and leave the names in there. Also, something you might ask the Ombudsman is the notes taken by the board during the interview, what you have to do with those because I know when I was on the interview panels, you had to have them all collected and I don't where they went after that. Also, I strongly, strongly, strongly urge, do not do the interview in an open public meeting.

First of all, scheduling maybe a problem and if you have a public meetings, not everybody who's in the application may be able to make it, so then you're going to have to have another public meeting, and another one. I would strongly suggest that, like any hiring process, that you do it on the individual basis. I mean one person, one candidate and the three board members taking notes. Thank you and also bless you for doing the job. I know this is not easy [inaudible 01:14:46].

**Female:** Linda Ford.

**Linda:** Linda Ford of Sonoita. I just have a few questions and comments here. First of all, it has to do with the signers on the account. While you're looking at your policy, to do any kinds of revisions on those policies, you need to take a look at the fact that the policies specifically say that the chief or the clerk have to be the signers on the account. And so I think you need to take a look at that because, if you're all planning to do it differently, then it's not in keeping with the policy. And I think it's very important, particularly in the light of how much public interest there is in what's going on here that you do, in as much as possible, adhere to the policies. And also, it has to do with these separate accounts and what the county is doing with the money. I think the statutes do say that the money that has to be kept with the county, even though Santa Cruz County doesn't do it, is your capital accounts. That you can have separate bank accounts outside with an approved financial institution for things like payroll and ambulance income, those kinds of things. So, I don't think we're so far off base, even though the county won't necessarily cooperate with us on that.

And another thing I wanted to say is that I'm hoping you all are not making this application process, the interview process too complicated. And Judy, when you are talking to the Ombudsman, please find out specifically whether interviewing of applicants for replacement board member is actually a suitable, approved subject for executive session because I believe the statutes are very specific as to what can be done in an executive session and when the statutes are written to give permission to do those things, that's the things are permitted. Other things outside that are permitted. So, if you could check on that, I would very much appreciate it.

And then just one final comment to this room at large, unless you're like me reside in Pima County. I live in Pima County, so naturally my property taxes are not as high, per hundred, as they are for those of you who live in Santa Cruz County. If you can get that kind of effort that has gone in to all of this discussion and all of the things that are going on around here with this Fire District and you can get together and you can put that kind of emotion and power or whatever behind talking about taking your property taxes down, everybody might be happier. Because we get a direct benefit, we get a direct benefit from the Fire District tax and I'm not so sure that you always get a total direct benefit from everything that is charged just by the county at large. So, bear that in mind.

**Jennifer:** Suzanne Jenkins.

**Suzanne:** Suzanne Jenkins, Sonoita resident. For those of you who don't know, I had a 28 year military career. Two years of that time was spent working with businesses, academia, military to develop a guide to help other soldiers, especially with things like leadership issues. And, after a lot of work, we came up with a thing called LDRSHIP, Leadership. It start off with loyalty, your true faith and allegiance to the US Constitution. You're of office, your board responsibilities. Bearing true faith and allegiance is a matter of believing and then devoting yourself to something. A loyal soldier is one who supports the leadership and stands behind for fellow soldiers or fellow board members. Duty, fulfill your obligations. Doing your duty means more than carrying out your assigned task. Duty mean being able to accomplish tasks as part of the team. A team is complex combination of missions, tasks and responsibilities, all in a constant motion. Our work entails building one assignment on another. You're fulfilling your obligations as part of your team every time you resist the temptation to take shortcuts that might undermine the integrity of the final product. Respect, treat people as they should be treated. The soldier's pledge. We pledge to treat others with dignity and respect while expecting others to do the same. Respect is what allows us to appreciate the best in other people. Respect is trusting that all people have done their job and fulfilled their duty and

self-respect is a vital ingredient [inaudible 01:19:36] of respect, which results from knowing you have put forth your best effort.

Selfless service. Put the welfare of our community, the nation, the fire fighters, your teammates, your subordinates before your own. Selfless service is larger than just one person. In serving, you are doing your duty loyally, without thought of recognition or gain. The basic building block of selfless service is the commitment of each team member to go a little further, to endure a little longer and look a little closer to see how he or she can add to the effort. Honor, live up to the community's values. Honor is a matter of carrying out, acting and living the values of respect, duty, loyalty, selfless service, integrity and personal courage in anything that you do. Integrity, pretty simple. Do what's right, legally and morally. Integrity is a quality you develop by the adhering to moral principles. It requires that you do and saying nothing that deceives others. As integrity grows, so does the trust others place in you. The more choices you make based on integrity, the more this value will affect your relationship, in this case, with the community.

Personal courage, face fear, danger or adversity. [inaudible 01:21:05] Personal courage has long been associated with Fire Departments. Physical courage is a matter of enduring physical duress and, at times, risking personal safety. Facing moral fear or adversity may be a long, slow process of continuing forward on the right path, especially if taking those actions is not popular with others. You can build your personal courage by daily standing up for and acting upon the things that you know are honorable. Thank you.

**Jennifer:** Nat Parelli [SP].

**Nat:** Nat Parelli, Sonoita. Let me follow on to what Michelle is saying or what Jeremy was saying a moment ago. I too have heard the talk about those people wanting to dissolve the Fire District. It's very reminiscent of, as Michelle pointed out, when this business began, the fear mongering that went on during the establishment process. The statement they are making could not be further from the truth. The issue's had been decided, the people voted. The issue is and always will be about money, as translated to taxes, which are burdened to the citizen of this community.

The budget has tripled in seven years, tripled, and, by the way, there's a portable PA system available at the fairgrounds but I'm sure they belong to. Those that fear the demise of the Fire District are offering the very recipe that will lead to its collapse and that is continued profligate spending.

Actually, those people that show up here bash new folks periodically and sometimes all the time, have tried to prevent the demise of the Fire District. Every time there's a significant boost in the budget, get outside the building, fans. More and more folks turn into critics and enemies of the district and process and the people that run it. Before long, you hit the tipping point, where there will be enough unhappy people to truly threaten the existence of the Fire District and, you know, it's doable. It just takes a petition with enough signatures.

Lastly, I'd just like to say I do agree that, if I may, that conducting interviews in an open session is really not a good idea. The main reason, I mean, the crowd reaction is enough to unsettle the candidates, influence the decision makers and all that. So, thanks.

**Jennifer:** Ed Shafer.

**Ed:** Ed Shafer, Elgin. I'm going to table a lot of what I was going to say tonight. It's been really nice to come to a meeting and have it be peaceful and to feel like people are contributing things and not attacking each other. And I have to add on to what everybody else is saying. No one here that I know wants to dissolve the Fire District. We voted, it's here, we're living with it, end of story. I can't leave the mic tonight without saying one thing. I am appalled that someone attacked that lady. There is no excuse, none.

**Jennifer:** Don Irving.

**Don:** My general comment had to do with the role of the volunteer and board procedures. That issue has been adequately discussed and covered. Thank you.

**Jennifer:** Bill Shock.

**Bill:** Thank you. Does this go out to the room or do I have to really yell loud? My comments are these. I want to thank the board from the bottom my heart. What you people do for us really means a lot to all of us. I wish I was speaking to all five members. I'm immensely disturbed that I'm not. You were elected by our community because we wanted you to represent us, all of you and the other two, and they're gone now and I don't know why. I missed the meetings. I was blindsided, you might say, and I'm sorry but I would have been here.

We're going to go through a process to select two new board members. They will not be representatives of the community, no matter how you vet them because they were not elected by the community. The community that I live in and I talk to, we're really behind you guys. For the first time, we saw you actually looking like you were going to reduce the budget. In other words, you were going to spend money, commensurate with the economic health and viability of this community and we appreciate that. My taxes have tripled since I came here and it's starting to hurt but I know a tremendous number of people in this community who don't have very much money and income but have property and houses that they lived in forever. They are now being valued pretty high and these people are having to make decisions about what they can and can't afford and we appreciate you doing things like that. I think I'm out of time. Is that it?

**Ron:** The batteries. The batteries are going dead.

**Jennifer:** That's why.

**Bill:** Okay, and I don't know what lead to this, what kind of confrontation, but all I wanted to say is that the problem here is not that the community has a problem with the board. The community elected the board and we're behind you. Unfortunately, many of us are not confrontational and we don't show up to be confrontational. Ron said that everybody knows all the rumors. I can tell you right now, today, I asked five people if they knew this meeting tonight and none of them did. Three of them didn't know any of the board members had quit. You've got a problem with communication with the community and I suggest that you set up some kind of an e-mail type system because I don't want to find out about this from the Tea Party. Although, I think they're good people and they're doing a fine job. I'd like to know from you.

I do the same things you're doing. I have a five member board and we send out emails to all of the people we can. Some don't have an e-mail. They don't get it but at least a whole bunch do and I don't go to my computer every day and try to look and see what's happening in the Fire District. I got a ton other things that I got to think about. But I appreciate, from the bottom of my heart, again, what you're and what you're doing for this community, I really do. And, again, thank you. Oh, by the way, I have one other thing. If you only have two applicants, does that mean you have to accept both of them? No matter what their score is?

**Jennifer:** Terrie Pennington [SP].

**Terrie:** Terrie Pennington [SP], Hilton [SP], Arizona. This has certainly been a different meeting tonight. There's been a different feel in this room and I've got to say, it's been quite refreshing. Mr. Chairman and members of the board, hindsight is an elusive phenomenon and, during the past few months, a glimpse into the future may have altered the tenuous situation in which you now find yourselves. Your actions and, at other times, your inaction have been instrumental in creating the current state of this board. I certainly hope you have reflected on how to repair the damage [inaudible 01:30:27] now represent as it may be a long road back to a healthy board.

It is the public's right and duty to monitor the board's actions and to bring issues to its attention in a civil, fact based manner. As property owners and tax payers, we foot the bill for the majority of the funds to operate this district and we have elected board members as our representatives to protect our financial interest. The board, however, is not the only sector within this district which needs monitoring. To the Chief, the Fire Department personnel need to be reminded that neither the board nor certain members of the public are their adversaries. We may express different views on how the district should be managed but no one, and I mean no one, is suggesting an end to this organization.

There's an official code of conduct for all on or off duty district personnel of which everyone needs to be reminded. If you have not previously been aware of the issues raised during previous meetings, then you have now been advised and your job is to see that your department behaves in a more respectful, professional manner.

To members of the public, the SEFD board has been the target of unwarranted personal and derisive public comments over the past three months. The board does this, the board doesn't do that, and on and on and on. There have been a few valid points raised by some of you. However, they have been overshadowed by the excess of the less complimentary comments. Jerry Bianchi, one of the primary architects and supporters of the formation of this Fire District, was repeatedly maligned and insulted and he finally left in disgust. In the process, I believe that the vocal faction that has come to some of these meetings has played a role in the departure of another board member, Tony Berry, who has always been supportive of the district and of the Chief.

[inaudible 01:32:15] to one of the things that Michelle Cardello mentioned and something that Matt mentioned, and something that I think we have got to finally get to the bottom of and that is one of the continuing refrains of some of the public members and some the things that are coming around in e-mails that have been circulated is that there's some fictional group within the community that's going to swoop in, take over the board, and dissolve the Fire District. First of all, if you know anything about the process, you would understand that the board has no power to do such a thing and second, if such a faction exists, they do know state laws governing dissolution and would not seek a position on a powerless board. Please talk with the chief, who is part of a group that successfully lobbied the state legislature to toughen the process for the dissolution of the Fire District. This was accomplished in 2010 through SP1253 and the Chief is listed a supporter of this bill or, better yet, read Arizona Revised Statutes Title 48, Chapter 5, beginning with article 48-815.01.

Dissolving a Fire District is next to impossible to do and, honestly, what purpose would it serve other than the fracture this community again and leave us without emergency services. My guess is that the perpetrators of this misinformation already know all this but choose to use the scare tactic as a means of rallying support to further their cause and to label anyone who disagrees with their ideology as the enemy. It's time to stop spreading this propaganda. The Fire District has been a contentious entity since its inception and, if we do nothing to confront and address all of these unresolved issues in a straight forward, civil manner, we will continue to have a rift within our community and we'll have no one to blame but ourselves. Thank you all so much.

**Jennifer:** Richard Cardello.

**Richard:** Richard Cardello, Sonoita. During the course of the discussions on the process for finding new board members, one of the current board members made a suggestion that part of the process would be to find somebody to take the treasurer's place. Well, I'd like to remind the board that this process is a substitute for the general election and no one currently sitting on the board or has recently left ran to be a particular officer on the board. They simply ran to be a member of the board. Members of the board, once selected by the public or, in this case, by the board, will then have an opportunity to take part as an officer. If you restrict your examination of applications based on the said individual's particular experience with this thing or that thing, you're not going to be fair to any everybody else. If you want to have an application simply for the treasurer, then don't couch it as an application for a member of the board.

You cannot, in good conscience, and my feeling is, you cannot in good conscience look out to the community and try to select individuals who simply meet a certain criteria. If you are going to do that, please post that criteria on the website so that those who may want to apply know what the restrictions are before they get started. And as far as, holding the all of board's in a public meeting, you can do that and there will be a lot of problems with doing it, as Ms. Neil said. Farther one, applicants will know the questions. I do not believe that, when you check with the ombudsman, that you're going to find that you can restrict attendance to an open meeting by anyone, regardless of

whether they are running for a position on the board or not. So, you really want to rethink about doing that in an executive session. Thank you.

**Ron:** Is that it?

**Jennifer:** Yes. That ends our public comment section.

**Ron:** Okay. Thank all of you. We'll move on to board comments made in some . . .

**Jennifer:** Actually, Mr. Hedrick wanted to speak.

**Ron:** Did he sign in?

**Jennifer:** No, he did not.

**Ron:** Sorry.

**Woman 1:** You took away the paper and then people that decide they want to speak can't. It should be left where we can see it throughout. You should allow the man to speak.

**Ron:** So, you want to reopen public comments.

**Jennifer:** I'm fine.

**Ron:** We're only going to reopen everything. If we allow him to speak, everybody has to be reallocated.

**Jennifer:** Is there anyone else that wants to sign up?

**Ron:** Okay. Go ahead.

**David:** David Hedrick, Sonoita. First, I just want to thank all of you for the work that you do for our community. I know all of you have good hearts. I've watched you all over last couple of months and you're all good people and I just want to pray that, as you select additional members to be on this board, that they have they have the same heart that you all do, that they care about people, they care about community. I think it's important to understand that it is about people. It's about saving lives. It's about protecting our fellow citizens. We can save money by buying just the new wheels for the ambulance but that's not going to save somebody. The Fire Department saved a young girl [inaudible 01:38:09] house and I credit them, I credit the chief for the training, for the equipment. It's about people's lives and I just want you all to understand that. When they asked her, do you want--

**Ron:** Excuse me, folks. We have somebody talking. Thank you.

**David:** It's \$30,000 for a helicopter flight but the girl couldn't breathe. Now, she would have paid the money if she needed it but she chose not to. Again, it's not about the money, it's about lives. Sure, we want to save money. I'm on food stamps. I'm on Medicaid. Frankly, this is the biggest bill I have, is paying taxes. So, I'm as concerned as everybody else, but I come down, ask the Chief what can I do to help out around here, so that we can keep the taxes down. There's lots of things that we do to help our community. I just hope that you all have a good heart when you pick people to join you and that they think about our community as well. Thank you.

**Ron:** Thank you.

**Jennifer:** That closes our general comments.

**Ron:** Okay, board comments.

**Jennifer:** Ron? Do you have any board comments?

**Ron:** Yeah. Board comments. So, I know one thing I heard tonight, so maybe just kind of accidentally, we might make that two lists, two separate lists. So, we pick up one and leave the other one, so people could come in at the last and do that. So, anybody have anything else?

**Woman 1:** During this past week or so, I, like many of you, have expressed tonight, I've received e-mails or people have forwarded e-mails to me that was totally false, wrong information and it really saddened me to, as a new board member and I've been really disappointed in that, what I've witnessed happened at meetings, but I agree with many of you. Tonight's meeting was much better, to feel in the room is that we are here as a community. And someone asked me recently about my new tenure on the board and how I was feeling about and I told them how disappointed I've been in our community and how we had treated each other and been with each other. So, many of you, I recognize your faces and I know you've been here most of the board meetings and that's great. And

so I'm not going to go and rehash things we've all witness that we should not have witnessed, but I will say that we need to learn to be civil to each other.

I disagree with people all the time and I'm sure there's a lot of people that disagree with me, my husband does daily. But, it doesn't mean that we are going to personally attack each other and that we are going to do things and not speak to each other when see each other at the post office or wherever. We're in this community and we're what makes this community. It's not our houses, it's not the cattle that's out in the pastures, it's not the buildings. It's all of us. And we can either make it a great place to be or we can make it a miserable place to be. I don't know about you but I'd rather it to be a great place.

Now, I will tell you, as a Fire District board member, I know that I have a huge responsibility and I do take it very seriously. I know that the business that goes on in this fire district is important to all of us and I agree with people who have gotten up and spoken tonight, that no one in this community has had a conversation that I'm aware of, with me, about trying to do away with the Fire District. That is old news that needs to be put to rest and, if you feel so compelled to put out a mass e-mail with factual information, please check and make sure it's correct information. Because you may think that you're doing a service to the Fire District but you're doing a disservice to this Fire District and to this community.

Any information that you choose to put out, we have the freedom of speech in this country and I'm proud we do, but please make sure it's correct, because you are doing a disservice. And so, I hope that as we move forward, and we've got a lot of serious work to do. We've got board members. We've got to get this board back to five members. We have a budget coming up and that's important. I pay taxes too. It hurts every year, tremendously. And I'm just like you. I get these valuation notices where my property value continues to increase. If I try to sell it, I doubt that it would increase in the resell value.

But there are issues with the county with that I think and I'm going to go there tonight, because I'll have an all night meeting on that issue. I did want to want to respond to a couple of things. When I talked to the ombudsman this week, I did talk to her regarding having the interview process in executive session or open session, which we, as board, do have the option. What the open medium law tells us we have to do is, if we have five people that we're going to interview, we release those names. We also have to give them a letter 24 hours before, if we choose to do it in the executive session, a letter 24 hours prior. They have the option, then, to request that their interview be done in an open session and if they ask for that, then we would have to do that, honor that. If not, then we can interview them in private, in an executive session, if we so choose. So, that is a decision that the board will have to make and I also want to clarify that, as far as the treasurer position, I don't think anyone on this board has the mindset that, as we interview people, that you're going to join the board and you'll be the perfect person to do this or be that office or be on that committee. It's just like when were elected. You are the best person that we think to join this board to make us a functioning board and that is going to be important, that we have a board that function together and work together and, hopefully, do the best business for this Fire District. Thank you.

**Jennifer:** I have a couple of things I want to address. First of all, my book is open to executive sessions. The very first item is about the discussion and consideration of employment and that that is an absolutely legal issue to be discussed in executive session. You can look this up online. You can go to the county and find this. It's very easy to find and definitely read it yourself. I won't waste your time reading it out loud.

Second, I wanted to address Vicky Rudder[SP] and the four different sections of that account. One is for PPE, one is for equipment replacement, one is for scuba and one for living quarters. Four, yeah. PPE, equipment replacement, scuba and living quarters. That's four. And then, lastly, it is with great regret that I inform all of you tonight that I have decided to resign as clerk of the board effective immediately from the Sonoita-Elgin Fire District. Being a public servant has been very rewarding at times and I mean that. Our last year's budget cycle, I was proud of it. I was proud of

how we worked together, but now this whole process has become destructive, both in my public life and mostly in my home life. I'm deeply saddened that a culture of mendaciousness and contempt has been allowed to seat itself within these walls and I pray daily that this will change and tonight gives me hope.

I will continue to work with Pastor Mike to find common ground at our meetings at his church and I will be available for all of you here. I thank you, all of you who have supported me over the years and I'm sorry to let you down but, at times, life is so much more important than all of this. Thank you.

**Ron:** We're not quite done. The meeting is still going on, we haven't called adjournment. Excuse me, we're still conducting the meeting. So, next thing that's happening is we are beginning our work on the budget. So, we have a meeting Monday at 6:00 here. It is a study session. All of our meetings are posted at the post office, per state law. They're also listed on the website the Fire District has. Now, as a study session, we typically do not permit public comment because we're not making a decision. There will no decisions made. So, apparently two of us will sit around the table and discuss the budget. This is in preparation for adopting a draft budget and I kind of want to go over the process for those of you that don't know what it is, so you understand. So, the board meets in a study session where we have discussion amongst the board and with the chief in preparation for a draft budget. The next meeting concerning the budget, which we now are talking about rescheduling to first, will be a meeting where a decision will be made to adopt a draft budget. So, the board adapts a draft budget. That's not the budget, it's a draft budget that we publish and you would an opportunity to speak at that meeting, but the real budget speaking opportunity is at the hearing. So, the next thing that happens is the draft budget gets published and then we hold a public hearing. That is only for one purpose and that is for the public to comment on the budget. No decisions are made, nothing else is done. It's just the purpose is to hear what the public has to say about the draft budget. And then there's at least one more. Well, there is a final meeting to adopt the budget, where the board makes a decision on the budget. So, that's the process. Don't think next week, we're going to adopt a budget. We won't. We're going to start talking about the budget and then, the next meeting concerning the budget would be to adopt a draft budget, then a hearing, and then a final budget. So, I just want to let everybody to know that. And is there a motion for adjournment?

**Woman 2:** I have a question. Is it possible to ask it? It's about Jennifer's resignation. I mean, right now, we're kind of ball up in the air.

**Man 2:** I think we all have the same question.

**Woman 2:** Exactly. What happens now? Now that there's only two of you, what happens to this process? Do you have to go turn it over to the county supervisors? What happens now? That's my question. I'm think I'm asking it on the behalf of everybody.

**Ron:** Well, I can assure you that we have a quorum. We have two people that require quorum. One of us is not a quorum. So, we still have a board, it's just a two person board.

**Woman 2:** But that's not a quorum.

**Ron:** Of course it's a quorum. It's a quorum. It's a 100%. It's a quorum. So, well anyway, I'm not going to continue the meeting with the discussion. Is there any call for an adjournment?

**Jennifer:** I call to adjourn.

**Ron:** Thank you.

**Woman 1:** I second.

**Ron:** All is in favor? Meeting is adjourned.