

**City of Cottonwood
Judicial Review and Appointments Advisory Board Meeting Minutes**

The City of Cottonwood Judicial Review and Appointments Advisory Board (JRAAB) met Thursday, January 17, 2013 at 4:00 PM in the Cottonwood City Hall Conference Room, 827 N. Main St., Cottonwood, Arizona.

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Virginia Duncan, Attorney		X
Mary Eichman, Citizen	X	
Randall Garrison, Citizen, Vice Chair	X	
Bobbie Gooslin, Citizen		X
Shiloh Hoggard, Attorney, Chair	X	
Lindsay Odell, Attorney	X	
Deborah Schaefer, Designee of Presiding Judge of Arizona Superior Court, Yavapai County		X
Iris Dobler, Employee/Recording Secretary	X	

Items of Business

- I. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Shiloh Hoggard, at 4:04 PM.
- II. Roll Call – A quorum of the membership was present.
- III. Approval of Minutes of March 27, 2012 Meeting – Randy Garrison moved and Lindsay Odell second the minutes be approved and accepted as written. Motion carried unanimously.
- IV. Call to the Public – No one from the public spoke.
- V. Discussion on the future of the JRAAB – Recording Secretary Iris Dobler told the members that Bobbie Gooslin had recently resigned. Also, that two members' terms expire January 21, 2013. Those members are Lindsay Odell and Randy Garrison. In addition, Deborah Schaefer no longer works in the Yavapai County court system, and had not been attending meetings in the past due to a possible conflict of interest. Therefore, all four positions will need to be filled, if the JRAAB continues as a board.

Iris explained that Mayor Diane Joens had discussed that the Council was considering disbanding the JRAAB. There were several reasons mentioned: Council is reviewing several boards and commissions to see if they are really needed; the four current JRAAB openings that need to be filled -- it is increasingly difficult to fill seats on boards and commissions; and since the Council makes the final decision regarding matters pertaining to the Court staff, perhaps the JRAAB isn't needed. The Mayor stressed that

the JRAAB has been doing an excellent job in fulfilling their duties, and their dedication and hard work was very much appreciated.

The members discussed pros and cons about the idea of disbanding the Board. Comments included the following:

- What happens if a new judge is needed for any reason, would a new board have to be re-established? No, the Council wouldn't need to establish a new board if they decide to disband the JRAAB now. No strong feelings either way.
- Feels the magistrate should be evaluated by the court staff and volunteers—those who work with incumbent. Also, survey forms could be used to get input from others.
- The purpose was to lift a burden off the Council members. Has that changed? Also, he felt the board brought a unique insight from interviewing a judge that Council didn't have; attorney insight would be missing if JRAAB is disbanded. Feels the board give a cushion/separation between the court staff and City HR -- as it should be – if the board reviews and makes recommendations of candidates, as well as on the performance evaluation of the incumbent.
- The Council set up the JRAAB as an advisory/recommending board only; not a need for the board if Council doesn't see a need for it. However, if the Council pays attention to the board, it could be very helpful – the board gets to know the applicants or incumbent better during the meetings it holds with them.
- If he was a Council member, he wouldn't want to have to do the JRAAB's duties in addition to being a Council member. Prefers the board to remain active. Whenever a new judge is needed, Council would probably set up the board again. Feels there's a liability for Human Resources to do the work the board now does, since the magistrate position falls under a separate branch of government. Feels there is a need that the board is filling – it's a valuable third, independent party gathering and giving information. Rules/regulations for the board could be re-written, to make the term four years instead of three, so seats don't need to be filled as often. Keep the 2-term limit, with members having to take one term off before applying to serve again.
- The board can sift through lots of information before it goes to Council. Attorneys' input is important – they may have appeared before the magistrate, and have information from that interaction that the Council wouldn't have. Feels there's a need that the board is filling.

Iris told the board members she will be sharing their comments with Mayor Joens, so she and the Council know their thoughts.

VI. Adjournment – Mary Eichman moved and Lindsey Odell seconded the meeting be adjourned; motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 4:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Iris Dobler, Recording Secretary