

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 15, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair
Rex Scott, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:07 a.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Marana Unified School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Santa Cruz River Wildlife Ramp and Santa Cruz River Cortaro Narrows Training Structures, no cost/3 year term (SC2400002307)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

2. **CONTRACT**

Pima County Flood Control District and Pima County, to provide an Exchange Agreement and Quit Claim Deed to establish appropriate property ownership with the floodprone land vested in and managed by the District, no cost (SC2400002316)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

3. **Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plans**

Pursuant to Pima County Code, Section 16.30.050(B), quarterly report of District approved Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plans.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 15, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair
Rex Scott, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:07 a.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

BiblioCommons Corp., to provide for Content Management System (CMS) and catalog discovery interface, Library District Ops Fund, contract amount \$320,000.00 (SC2400002276) Administering Department: Information Technology on behalf of Library District

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva inquired if this was a no bid contract because it was already a state contract and if only one vendor provided the service.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5 0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 15, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair
Rex Scott, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:07 a.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

BrightView Landscape Services, Inc., to provide for Kino Sports Complex Field Re-Surfacing, Stadium District Funds, contract amount \$393,040.00 (PO2400009715) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 15, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair
Rex Scott, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:07 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgment Statement was delivered by Felipe Garcia, President and CEO, Visit Tucson.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

The Pima Animal Care Center showcased an animal available for adoption.

PRESENTATION

4. Vail School District's Annual Diaper Drive

Presentation of Certificates of Recognition to Mark Tate and Colin Jovanovic ~~Jovanovic~~ **Jovanovich** in appreciation of their efforts during the Vail School District's annual diaper drive for the Arizona Diaper Bank. (District 4)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Grijalva and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item, as amended.

Supervisor Christy made the presentation.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Rocque Perez, Executive Director, Metropolitan Education Commission; Allison Doty, Director, Grants and Program Management, and Lauren Delashaw, State Team Leader, Arizona Serve; Magdalena Verdugo, CEO, YWCA; Gabriel Garcia and Ashley Rodriguez, AmeriCorps Members, Pima County Teen Court and Daniel Armenta, Director of Organizational Development, Youth on their Own, proclaiming the day of Thursday, October 17, 2024 to be: "ARIZONA SERVE DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF POVERTY"

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Lee made the presentation.

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Cónsul Rafael Barceló, Consulado de México en Tucson, and Felipe Garcia, President and CEO, Visit Tucson, proclaiming September 15, 2024 through October 15, 2024 to be: "PIMA COUNTY HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH 2024"

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Chair Grijalva made the presentation. Felipe Garcia, President and CEO, Visit Tucson, read the proclamation in English and Rafael Barcelo Durazo, Consulado de México en Tucson, read the proclamation in Spanish.

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Dr. George F. Garcia, proclaiming the day of Wednesday, October 30, 2024 to be: "DR. GEORGE F. GARCIA DAY"

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Chair Grijalva made the presentation.

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Cesanee Johnson, Chapter President, Tucson Chapter, Jack and Jill of America, Inc., proclaiming the day of Friday, November 1, 2024 to be: "TUCSON CHAPTER JACK AND JILL OF AMERICA DAY"

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Chair Grijalva made the presentation.

9. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Raf Polo addressed the Board regarding his experience with being an immigrant. He stated that Marxism was destroying the nuclear family and spoke about hate speech directed at the Jewish community in the County. He also asked what the Board was doing to stop vandalism of Conservative candidate signage.

Cory Stephens asked why the Republican candidate running for Sheriff had been placed on administrative leave. She spoke about Sheriff Nanos and the investigations he was involved in, as well as jail deaths.

Susan Kelly spoke about the Sheriff Nanos investigation and his decision to place his political opponent on administrative leave. She also spoke about the growing population of homeless people.

Sharon Greene spoke about the values of the Republican Party and how they differed from the Democratic Party, and about taxpayer dollars that were used to house, feed and fund the illegal immigration.

Shirley Requard addressed the Board regarding citizen rights violations made by Chair Grijalva and that Chair Grijalva aided in the illegal immigrant invasion and continued to give benefits to immigrants that belonged to the citizens of Pima County. She also spoke about election violations.

Brook Doty spoke about the Board Rules and Regulations that must be adhered to during the meetings and that he had asked for a copy at the start of the meeting, but was not given one. He stated that the policy was in conflict with the constitution.

Silvia Doty spoke about Republican values, her opposition to abortion and that politicians were being paid by the Mexican Cartel.

Malinda Sherwyn spoke about individuals with unverified citizenship status who voted for the last two decades without detection and that October was vaccine injury awareness month.

Robert Reus addressed the Board regarding the current presidential candidates, immigration and poverty in Mexico that allowed the states to hire cheap workers.

Gary Frank spoke about Christopher Columbus and that the government destroyed children and the culture of the United States.

Isabel Garcia asked the Board to provide an estimate of costs to hire additional sheriff deputies for immigration training if voters were to pass Proposition 314 and the public should be aware of the costs associated with that proposition.

Kevin Kubitsky addressed the Board regarding the three employees who were put on administrative leave by Sheriff Nanos, for their stance on the upcoming election and stated that by doing this the Sheriff committed campaign interference.

* * *

Supervisor Lee requested that the County Administrator and Legal Counsel look into why three employees from the Sheriff's Department were placed on administrative leave and for Legal Counsel to let the Board know if there was a

breach of the law, if those employees were placed on administrative leave for political purposes.

Chair Grijalva cautioned Board members to be very careful and to provide clear direction and if there was a report it would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Heinz concurred with Supervisor Lee and stated that he would be providing his own request to the County Attorney's Office that Counsel be appointed to investigate this matter.

Chair Grijalva stated that was direction and the Board needed to be very careful with their requests.

* * *

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

10. Board of Supervisors Representative Updates on Boards, Committees and Commissions and Any Other Municipalities

There were no Board updates.

At the request of Chair Grijalva and without objection, this item will be placed on the second meeting of every month.

11. Meeting Schedule

Approval of the Board of Supervisors' Meeting Schedule for the period January 2025 through December 2025.

Chair Grijalva stated that there were two options available for consideration by the Board, Option A and Option B, and she preferred Option A.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Christy to approve the item for discussion purposes.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, requested clarification regarding which option was moved for approval.

Chair Grijalva stated that the Board was going to discuss both options.

Supervisor Christy stated that the proposed meeting schedule was for the entire year and at this time the Board should only approve the first quarter since there could be new Board members seated in January and they should have the opportunity to vote on the meeting schedule. He inquired why the Board was creating a meeting schedule so far in advance.

Chair Grijalva responded that for the last two years the Board had voted on a yearly meeting schedule and it was helpful to staff and departments for planning purposes. She indicated that when she was first seated on the Board, the meeting schedule was approved every three months. She stated that the Board could vote on one of the options and the new Board could reconsider and amend the approved meeting schedule, if needed.

Supervisor Christy asked if any new Board member would have the opportunity to reconsider and amend this schedule.

Chair Grijalva clarified that if any new Board member had an issue with the schedule approved by the current Board, they would have the opportunity to request an amendment to the schedule.

Supervisor Christy stated that his recollection was that in the past the Board approved a meeting schedule every six months.

Chair Grijalva responded that for the last two years the Board approved the meeting schedule for the entire year and it had gone well.

Supervisor Heinz stated that Option B had three meetings that were within one week of another meeting, which seemed strange to him and he favored Option A.

Chair Grijalva concurred with Supervisor Heinz and explained there was a request for a second option that did not have a Board meeting scheduled the day after a holiday.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve Option A.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. Climate and Sustainability Initiatives

Presentation of Climate and Sustainability Initiatives across Pima County Operations.

Scott DiBiase, Director, Pima County Department of Environmental Quality (PDEQ), stated that this was an update on the County's climate action activities along with the Sustainability Action Plan for County Operations (SAPCO) and its ongoing efforts throughout the years.

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administration, provided a slideshow presentation and debrief of the previous 13 months since the establishment of the Climate Action Executive Team (CAET) at the direction of the County Administrator in an August 28th memorandum with the SAPCO Annual Report. She stated the first CAET meeting was held in September, which included nine interdisciplinary department directors and with the support, dedication and commitment from Deputy

County Administrators across the enterprise of the County and had grown to 24 acting departments with the establishment of a Climate Action Advisory Committee. She stated that it was not just representative of department directors but also critical staff, subject matter experts and operational leads for several of the sustainability and climate action priorities. She stated that the group had over 60 staff members including Green Stewards which was an educational component. She explained that over the first three months they had surveyed a lot of these groups gathering a robust amount of subject matter expert feedback about how to build the county's sustainability initiatives, specifically for SAPCO, and how to grow their climate sustainability priorities in alignment with Board Resolution No. 2022-25, to grow their efforts into the Comprehensive Climate Action Plan for County operations. She explained that the team identified four critical areas; reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, extreme heat, water resources and invasive species and wildfire. She added that the fifth directive was to complete the activities of the current SAPCO of 2018 through 2025 in order to get data driven measurements on how to grow the County's comprehensive Climate Action Plan and in alignment with this interdisciplinary enterprise-wide approach, it underscored that none of them could do it alone. She stated that the interdisciplinary model ensured that any county department could be resourced to grow the department director group of 24, and it did not only include the Public Works departments, but included Health and Human Services departments and Central Services departments. She stated this ensured that they could align with the County's strategic direction and budget pillars to best identify priorities for sustainability and climate operations.

Mr. DiBiase continued with the slideshow presentation, which showed the SAPCO success stories and stated that through the Board's vision over the years, the County Administration's direction, and the engaged leadership of the various departments in the County operations, these success stories had come to fruition. He stated that it was an opportunity to appreciate the County's ongoing efforts in their process and progress regarding being good stewards of its natural resources. He explained that the list included a very wide-ranging group of projects that were put in place by the County in various departments and achieved success regarding SAPCO metrics. He stated that the successes of carbon emissions reductions, as it related to County operations had been reduced over the last few years by approximately 40% through a multitude of department actions through County fleet and the transition to electric vehicles (EV) and hybrids. He explained that 21% of the total fleet was EV and hybrid vehicles, which had surpassed the SAPCO 2025 goals and that the next two largest sources of carbon emissions on County operations were through Wastewater and Facilities. He explained that both had ongoing projects that updated equipment which reduced significant amounts of energy emissions, energy usage for the County, as such reducing carbon emissions overall. He added they had met their SAPCO 2025 goal and exceeded it one year early. He stated that they were well on their way to succeed their 2030 target for County operation emissions.

Ms. Davis continued with the slideshow presentation and stated that recent National Weather Service data highlighted that 2024 was the hottest year on record. She explained that over the six-year SAPCO period, there was a cumulative average of

over 35 days, the equivalent of an extra month, of 100+ degree days, which had extended the summer period from April through October. She stated that had been evidenced, especially in the late September and early October weeks, by the 13 days of 100-degree days, four of which were over 105 and had broken records in the last two weeks of September. She added that in July of 2023, which they previously measured against in 2020 with the overall record, had the most extreme heat days and broke records and were continuing to see an average increase every single year of extreme heat days. She explained that as the climate action teams had done their new prioritization for the sustainability and climate action goals, they wanted to build upon the current existing mitigation efforts such as carbon reduction, landscapes, and workforce materials, all of which were key chapters identified within the SAPCO. She stated that it was a shared, underscored priority to shift into what the County could do to become more resilient and adapt to things like extreme heat. She stated that the Board had some monumental direction over the summer on how to grow their response effort to extreme heat. She explained that over the past year they had developed comprehensive plans for greenhouse gas emissions reductions and extreme heat planning, and invasive species and water working groups were coming up next, but they would discuss plans the Board had seen at the dais in terms of correspondence from their team on priorities, starting with the Pima County Priority Climate Action Plan, which was a regional partnership.

Mr. DiBiase stated that PDEQ was a recipient of a four-year planning grant from the Environmental Protection Agency for the Climate Pollution Reduction Grants (CPRG) Program with the first deliverable due on March 1st. He stated they had done an enterprise effort through the CAET and the advisory group, along with their coalition partners, City of Tucson, South Tucson, Town of Oro Valley and Tohono O'odham Nation. He added that together they developed over 25 distinct projects that would bring about 1.5 million metric tons of carbon emission reductions to the region. He explained that the initial effort was to apply for implementation funding, which had been done in April, but unfortunately the region had fallen short on that effort, however, the PCAP provided a foundation by which they could use to apply for future funding and also as a foundational document as the next deliverable for CPRG which would be their Comprehensive Climate Action Plan was due in December of 2025 with the EPA. He stated that the enterprise effort continued with dedicated staff and looked forward to ongoing coordination with their coalition partners.

Ms. Davis stated that in addition to the Priority Climate Action Plan in spring and throughout the summer, Pima County, sponsored by the Pima County Health Department, along with a regional network of over 25 partners, other municipalities, tribal partners, community based organizations, non-governmental organizations, emergency response teams, American Red Cross and the National Weather Service, deployed a cooling center network of over 40 cooling centers, which this year served over 15,000 people with a comprehensive communication strategy to address heat awareness and drew people to their Beat the Heat website. She explained that during the major storm on July 15th, their website had over 5,000 hits to find resources for cooling centers during extended power outages. She stated that the Health Department, in alignment with the directive from the Governor's

Office in March, deployed their Pima County Three Year Public Health Heat Plan to implement future years of heat respite across the region which included urban and rural partners and innovative strategies to bring cooling and resources. She stated that because the Board had passed the first Pima County Heat Worker Protection Ordinance, they had been able to develop a Heat Plan Guide for any business that wanted to use it to implement a Heat Illness, Injury and Prevention Plan that was wide reaching and comprehensive. She stated that what could be seen through the directives from the County Administrator and the Board over recent months was some comprehensive planning efforts to address invasive species and wildfire risk. She stated that the team was an interdisciplinary team of over 11 County departments to comprehensively address wildfire risk, and the role of invasive grasses and those priorities were to identify priority grasses where the region had priority zones, enhanced data GIS mapping that could be utilized across a comprehensive network of partners, supported the redevelopment of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan with an expanded invasive species section, and integrated planning for an administrative procedure to understand the County departmental role in addressing invasive species. She explained that they also had reactivated the Water Working Group, which would establish its new priorities, specifically addressing scarcity and degradation, exploring innovative ways to use water harvesting, alternate uses of water and collection opportunities, reducing the demand across County facilities and properties, and plug into other policy opportunities such as Pima Prospers and the Board would receive correspondence from each of those teams with comprehensive plans in the upcoming weeks to a month. She stated that for 2025-2030, things that could be expected were the development of the Climate Action Plan for County Operations (CAPCO), all the priorities highlighted had comprehensive plans and would be integrated into the County operations footprint. She explained that all of those had substantial feedback gathering to ensure that all their strategies met the needs of the community. She stated that they would comprehensively look at all of the strategies and their connection to public health impact, workforce development, and disproportionately affected or vulnerable community members. She stated they would assure that all of their projects were malleable and scalable, so that they could pivot if needed to respond to hazards appropriately, which were identified through data driven operational capacity and evaluative design to assure they also met their budget pillar commitment. She stated that they could not do this without the collaboration of their regional partnerships and County departments, and it was monumental that 24 County departments were actively engaged, and she underscored that most of this had been done with small grant seed funding and approximately 85% of this had been done out of the goodwill partnership that they had established across the community. She explained that they would continue to operate in that same strategic design model to ensure that any strategy deployed met their most vulnerable and disproportionately affected and could be scaled region wide.

Chair Grijalva thanked them for the overview and stated that she looked forward to the breakdown of the plans because the County had done a lot of good work and ongoing work that was not talked about enough. She requested that the Board be given a set presentation every other month where they could break down some of

those comprehensive plans and it would be helpful for people to understand what they were working on, because some of the cities around the County were vocal about what they were doing, and she wanted to be able to highlight how the County was also collaborating and helping.

Ms. Davis responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Lee thanked staff for their report and questioned what the County had done in regards to solar.

Mr. DiBiase stated that he left that out inadvertently as it related to Facilities, and they had an ongoing effort to increase the County's solar capabilities, and it had contributed to those carbon emissions reductions that were shown in the graph. He stated that it was an ongoing, dedicated effort on the County's part to reduce emissions and electricity usage that helped overall budgets.

Supervisor Lee suggested that information be included somewhere. She stated that she was impressed this summer with the cooling center in Ajo, with the help from the County Administrator, had received two COOLtainers from the State and that it was very innovative to have solar running it and being kept at 68 degrees. She stated that she had thought about neighborhoods and some of the low-income areas where there was a lot of poverty, and those households could not afford air conditioning. She stated that most of those communities had those and when electricity went down, that was when it was needed the most. She stated that she would love to see COOLtainers in some of those communities, be it with the City of Tucson partnership, but to have the ability when the temperature rose and they lost electricity, for example, the elderly could have a place to go to cool off.

Supervisor Scott referred to the slide regarding the Climate Action Planning that was over a five-year period and asked whether there was a rough timeline for them. He stated that he was most interested in when the Board might hear from the Water Working Group, because they had quarterly meetings with the Regional Flood Control District and some of the projects they heard about with regards to retention and detention of stormwater and uses for both irrigation and perhaps recharge of the aquifer had been of great interest to his team.

Ms. Davis responded that the water working group priorities should be developed and out for review before year end and that component would be the water chapter of their comprehensive planning effort for County operations and would also plug in nicely with the comprehensive Climate Action Plan, because there were many partners across the region that would engage in that. She explained that the plan was to have a draft Climate Action Plan for County Operations in late spring, early summer, because they had done so many of these planning efforts throughout the year and were building on the reprioritization. She added that solar and incentives was something they would address and the Comprehensive Climate Action Plan, which was the regional plan, would be out in December of 2025 and would meet deadlines, but the Board would receive correspondence in and around the water

priorities and the reestablishment of the Water Working Group in short order, with invasives being first.

Supervisor Scott stated that as a follow up to that, the County was going through revisions to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and the County was not a water provider, but asked, in conjunction with the Climate Action Plan and the overhaul of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, how it built into those regional partnership networks, and how the County would work with local water providers on these climate action planning steps and on the revisions to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that Tucson Water was notably the largest water utility in the region and the County worked directly with them, along with the Regional Flood Control District and the Wastewater Department and the strategies that Tucson Water applied in terms of water conservation and water sustainability were included in those discussions with the City of Tucson. He explained that the Development Services Department team was a member of the CAET and all those efforts, as Ms. Davis indicated, were underway by the County that had touchpoints with each other were highly integrated and more so in this space than ever seen previously. He stated that they would continue working directly with outreach to utilities and agencies in the water area, and then incorporate that into the Pima Prospers chapter on water and would continue to work with the water working group in a community-wide integrated fashion. He added that they would inform one another and align so that they did not have fragmented efforts. He stated they were leveraging the capacity of the different opportunities to come up with the strongest strategies and approaches to addressing things like water or any of the other topics the Board heard on this update.

Supervisor Scott asked what some of the other examples of regional partnership networks were as described in the last bullet of that slide.

Ms. Davis responded that the Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP) was a monumental effort that started the regional climate action work. She stated that the development of this partnership network with the voices of everyone at the table prompted them to continue to model all their priorities in that same way and that through all these priority areas, there were a lot of organizations, local governments, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and community-based organizations that were doing this work that indirectly all fed into this. She stated that by providing them a forum by which to do it, it only bolstered that in the areas of climate and sustainability. She stated that when people thought about sustainability and climate, they tied it to public health, workforce development and economic vitality which expanded the partner area. She added that they were continuing to build on that approach to ensure that they had all the appropriate partners in the room. She explained that invasives was another great example of that, it was built on such a wide variety of outreach and volunteer efforts, and to have all different people involved helped develop a Wildfire Protection Plan alongside scientists and regional

wildland firefighters to assure everyone's voice was represented to benefit the PCAP, which was the establishment of that model.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, clarified that each of the types of initiatives had slightly different partnerships and would continue to do so. She added that when they had done the work on the heat initiative, they worked with the Chambers of Commerce, some of those business organizations and unions. She stated that with the invasive species, as mentioned by Ms. Davis, the various coalitions that dealt with buffelgrass and invasive from the University of Arizona, and with different grant opportunities and even with firefighters, so each provided a slightly different group of community partners.

This item was for discussion only. No Board action was taken.

CLERK OF THE BOARD

13. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), New Life Worship Center, Inc., has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, for Tax Parcel No. 130-05-5690.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

14. Pima County Local Workforce Development Area Plan 2025 - 2028

Staff recommends approval of the Pima County Local Workforce Development Area Plan 2025 - 2028 to submit to the Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity by their deadline for Workforce Arizona Council approval in November.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott requested an overview of the process for approval by the State, since it was his understanding that was the next step and asked how frequently the Board would be updated on the plan during its effectual period of 2025 - 2028. He stated that one of the things the Board discussed when the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) representatives were present was that while the current Board had been in office they had not received updates on the plan, and if they were fortunate enough to be seated in January, he would like to have regular updates on the new plan once approved by the State.

Chair Grijalva asked Supervisor Scott if he wanted that update now or at a later time.

Supervisor Scott responded that he wanted an overview of the approval process now and the preview from staff could be given at a later date.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had an opportunity to look over the presentation and was comfortable with it and assumed that her colleagues had looked it over as well.

Dan Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development (CWD), explained that the next step in the State's approval process was if the Board approved the plan, it would then go to the Workforce Arizona Council, which was the Workforce Board for the entire State, they would provide the County feedback and they were closely aligned with everything that was going on with the Workforce Council and anticipated a smooth process.

Supervisor Scott stated that he knew the document with the plan highlights was sent to the WIB before their meeting on Friday and appreciated receiving a copy of it when a member of his staff had watched that meeting and participated and hoped that this Board could be provided with regular updates on the plan and its successes. He stated that they had previously requested updates from Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi in terms of how the Workforce Development Area Plan impacted the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Supervisor Lee stated that it was the first time she had seen and reviewed this plan, and was very impressed.

Mr. Sullivan credited that work to his staff, Cassie Lundin, Director of the WIB, and Rhonda Pina, which had been about a year's worth of work that had gone into it, and he was proud that it was not a rinse and repeat document. He stated that it reflected the heart and urgency that moved forward on a daily basis at the Pima County One Stop. He added it highlighted that they were there to be innovative, to try new things, to be there for people on the worst day of their lives, and to serve people holistically, align with the Prosperity Initiative and the strategic budget framework. He commented that this was the best plan he had ever seen in his time with the County.

Chair Grijalva requested an abbreviated presentation since so much work was put into it.

Mr. Sullivan provided a slideshow presentation and highlighted the differences in the current to the previous plan which themed on innovation, alignment and collaboration. He explained that the funds they used were the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) Funds, which came from the Department of Labor, then to the State and finally to the County as the local area. He stated that they did not want it to be a perfunctory document that checked boxes, they wanted it to be customized to the unique needs of the community, be it somebody experiencing homelessness, to an engineer laid off, or to a business that may be in trouble of closing down. He added that it highlighted the alignment done with the Prosperity Initiative, and encouraged their case managers to continue to define that heart and urgency as intensive wraparound services. He stated that it was not only to

complete a secondary education to get into a dignified job, rather they were there to make people successful while they were in that post-secondary education and after. He stated that the definition of those jobs was not just the job to sustain, it was dignity of work that could provide for a family and for generational wealth. He stated that some of the innovation things done were the Navigators, which were growing and spread throughout the community and were reflected in this plan. He stated that a big shift from the previous plan was the emphasis on apprenticeship programs, on-the-job training, and paid programs for youth and adults. He commended their Pre-Apprenticeship Program stationed at Las Artes which was the first of its kind in the State and was already graduating cohorts of 15 on a regular basis, and those jobs were family sustaining jobs. He stated that the other key element was engagement with the community through their Business Services Team and they reached folks during layoff, not asking them to come to One Stop, but was a service delivery concept of meeting people where they were at, to serve them as best as they could either through Navigators or directly going to an employer with mass layoff.

Supervisor Scott requested when the Board received reports on the current plan, that it focused on those areas where there was a difference from the existing plan. He stated that it would be very revealing in terms of how the current plan was bearing fruit in the community.

Mr. Sullivan responded in the affirmative and stated that the sectors they were targeting were not random. He stated they worked with Economic Development and aligned with the State so they were aware that they were getting people into dignified, sustaining sectors that had jobs that would achieve mutual goals for employers and participants. He stated that it may be confusing on the side, of all encompassing of Department of Labor language and it included Health Sciences, Education and Health Services, Nursing, Phlebotomy, etcetera. He stated the next slide was very telling and that the Arizona Department of Economic Security through the WIOA, were mandated partners, but the other folks on the list were those that they chose to work with, they did not want to duplicate services, rather they wanted to enhance where they could and be as a value added to the community through collaboration. He added that this was not an exhaustive list of everyone they collaborated with and would continue to grow. He added that it showed they could not do this work alone, but it took a community to provide these services in a wholistic and right manner. He stated that it was an intensive touch and if they did not have the resources, they had the relationships to facilitate a warm transfer to others that did. He referred to the next slide and stated this was the wonderful work done by staff to ensure that the document was a relevant document to the current times. He emphasized that 120 businesses were contacted and ensured that all audiences, their customers and businesses were engaged in this process, including multiple departments, like Digital Engagement. He stated that it was a plan that had feedback and it brought in stakeholders.

Supervisor Scott referred to the slide regarding partners and stated that when the Board discussed the contract with JobPath, they received a letter from Mr. Sullivan and Dr. Greif about how JobPath and CWD were going to be working

collaboratively, and that the Board would be receiving some regular updates on the progress of that collaboration. He was unaware of a schedule for that, but requested that updates be shared with the Board, either related to this plan or other areas of collaboration and that it would be of interest to Board members.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

ELECTIONS

15. Election Board Worker Appointments

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-531(A), appointment of election board workers recruited and on file in the Elections Department for the November 5, 2024 General Election.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had lost his place during the meeting, but that Ms. Hargrove had done a good job with balancing the election boards, and it was a tough challenge. He questioned the locations that indicated, “party” and “other”.

Chair Grijalva stated that the Board had already taken action on this item and asked if Supervisor Christy wanted to revisit the item.

Supervisor Christy stated that he voted in support of the item, but had questions.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to reconsider the approved motion in order to include Supervisor Christy’s question.

It was then moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz, to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy asked what the terms, “other” and “unaffiliated” meant on locations under the party section.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, explained that those did not identify a party, so they were not the Green Party or the Libertarian Party, but they may have listed Independent or something else. She stated that for the department’s records, they were listed as “unaffiliated” or “other” and clarified that clerks were not required to be of one party and they were able to appoint them in those positions.

Supervisor Christy stated that upon reviewing the centers, staffing had roughly doubled, and even though there was roughly 50% fewer locations, the County purchased several electronics since that time. He stated that he wanted to forewarn them that as Board meetings progressed down the road, they would most likely be

requesting a cost savings analysis to compare it with the cost savings that had been presented in 2022.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

16. Monthly Financial Update

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a monthly financial update on the County's financial performance.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that the update consisted of the Period 2 August forecast. She explained that the County was implementing the Workday systems for most of the financial, procurement and budget systems with the go live for the financial and procurement portions in July 2024 and the other systems would be brought online as they made the progress necessary. She explained that the budget system, the system used for forecasting and creating the County budget, would come online at the end of the following week. She stated that when she last provided an update for August, it was a partial update, so she wanted to complete that update, and provide some information related to vacant positions, since that was an endeavor happening during the month of September. She provided a slide show presentation and stated that the current slide was a repeat of what the Board had seen on her last update which indicated that the County was on target for budget with regards to revenue projections and expenses. She went over the following slide regarding property taxes which showed property tax revenues received and what was projected for the year. She explained that the County was on budget, however, the actuals were low because the County did not normally receive property tax revenue until October, it would start to increase, but at this point they expected to meet their budgeted goals. She stated that in the future months they would be able to show a comprehensive report that included expenses at the department level, as well as revenues at detailed levels. She explained that in July the Vacant Position Policy was implemented, and at the end of August, memorandums had been sent to elected officials and department directors identifying what positions were currently vacant and would reach the 240-day threshold for vacant positions, so that the departments could have a chance to review and/or fill those positions by October 1. She stated that there were 156 in total, of those 39 positions were being eliminated, 46 positions were filled, 71 appeals were granted, and 11 General Fund positions were eliminated. She stated that meant that approximately \$340,000.00 of budgeted salary and benefit dollars would be removed from the General Fund departments and placed into General Fund Contingency for utilization as the Board deemed appropriate. She stated that the next slide represented an analysis of what kind of appeals were granted. She explained that there were 71 positions where the department directors or elected officials requested dispensation from the positions being eliminated and the various rationale for requesting those exemptions. She stated that there were two that stood

out as the highest dollar amounts, the first being positions currently in the recruiting process. She stated that those positions were in a status where lists of candidates had been pulled and interviews were being scheduled, but if those recruitments did not end with an applicant being hired, those positions were then subject for elimination. She stated that the other highest dollar amount was the first on the list which came out of the County Attorney's Office. She stated that last January, the County Attorney came before the Board and discussed how their Special Revenue Funds were eliminated from the budget, however, the Board returned the funding back in their budget. She stated that in this current fiscal year, the 21 positions were tied to those funds and the County Attorney asked for some dispensation because they had not had the opportunity to try and fill those positions in the previous fiscal year.

Supervisor Scott stated that when the Board had discussed the vacancy policy, one of the things that had been pointed out were the grant funded positions, which made up an extraordinary number of the vacant positions, even though overall they were a smaller percentage of positions and it seemed like from this data, they were still trying to get a handle on grant funded positions. He stated they had 12 of them that were required to meet the terms of the grant and adversely impacted the General Fund. He asked if those positions were actively under recruitment. He stated that it seemed to him on a follow up memorandum, that they were still trying to get a handle on grant funded positions and how many still needed to be in existence. He stated that he was surprised that 71 appeals were granted and understood the reasons for the General Fund and Special Revenue Funds, but struggled with the grant funded positions.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that over the last couple of years, as they focused rather significantly on the vacancy savings, those numbers had decreased considerably, and with the understanding of exactly the purpose of the positions, how the funds were used and if there were vacancies, had been critical. She stated that the concern with the grants had not only been with the funding, but as discussed before, was with the completion of the grant appropriately. She stated that if they still had open positions that had not been filled, that was a flag to review it to ensure that they were adhering to all of the requirements of the grant because if the position was swept, there would be no benefit to the General Fund. She explained that those grant dollars would not be necessarily available, but they wanted to ensure they would allow for the grant to be continued. She stated that the 16 of the 21 positions remained in active recruitment, and there was concern of the last 12 of the grant positions, of how they were doing, what they were doing to get individuals hired, if they had turnover in those positions, and what was needed to ensure they were fulfilling the requirements of the grant. She stated that it was this very specific review, and if the Board was interested in each of those appeals, they included a memorandum that went with it that had been developed by the department, signed off by department directors, Deputy County Administrators and herself before they went to that process. She stated that they could provide all the granularity on each of those, but this were a summary of what they thought were the biggest drivers of why some vacant positions remained.

Chair Grijalva stated that when she voted in favor of this policy, this was the area she that concerned her the most with this idea that grant funded positions would be swept, even those that were a matched fund. She stated those were important, even the 12 that were likely a match and if they did anything to inadvertently impact these positions that she believed were needed in order to finish these grants, then they would have to send money back, which nobody liked. She wanted to ensure that there was not any pressure to try to sweep any of these because they wanted to assure that those positions were filled in order to be able to meet the grant requirements and they wanted to be in good standing with their funders. She stated that grants were a significant part of the budget and the vast majority of the positions, with exception of the 12, whether they were swept or not, were not going to positively impact the budget.

Supervisor Scott stated that the Board would consider the NaphCare item, and grant funded positions were within that, and he had similar concerns. He stated that his sense when the Board talked about the policy's implementation that grant-funded positions were still an area of some uncertainties and nebulousness for them overall because of their percentage of vacant positions that they represented and he felt like they were still trying to get a handle on all of these positions and their role within the County workforce and that it also seemed that having 71 appeals, this first go around, was probably a high number and perhaps the Board would not see that many moving forward. He asked if that was fair a statement.

Ms. Leshar stated that she was did not know because there may be a variety of positions that had yet to hit the 240 that may roll into that, but she believed that to be true over the last couple of years, as they worked considerably to continue to delete the number of vacant positions and this was the first they implemented this process. She stated that she believed it would decrease, but did not have the math to prove that yet.

Supervisor Lee stated that she was glad to see the number of appeals granted and if they were too rigid, it would hurt the departments. She expressed concern that the positions in the interview stage would be eliminated if a candidate was not selected, including their grants. She stated that if the candidates were in the interview stage it was obvious that it was a needed position. She stated that if the director was aware if they did not hire someone in this round, they would lose that position, so they were likely to hire anyone because they did not want the position eliminated. She stated that to her it seemed that it did not make sense for them to be eliminated if they were in the interview stage, and to give them another chance if the candidate was not right for them.

Ms. Leshar stated that indicated what they would be doing to adhere to the current policy and if they went through this process, those positions were set to be eliminated. She stated that the positions could still be appealed and reviewed, and they had been clear in the past, that if positions were eliminated because it had been vacant for so long, they could come back and request a new Position Control Number (PCN) and then it would be evaluated. She stated that their goal was to ensure that each and every department had the number of individuals they needed

to do their work, but that they were not using PCNs to provide contingency funds for the department, however, if there was still a need for the position and had a problem hiring, they would ensure that PCNs existed for the department.

Supervisor Lee stated that after visiting with departments and directors, one common theme was that if a long-term employee retired from the department, they had to find funding to payout that employee. She inquired about happening that matter.

Ms. Leshar explained that to address that issue, for the first time in the previous budget, they added \$1 million into a fund to allow for departments to be able to pay those considerable payouts, so departments had the opportunity to access those funds, then rehire and get individuals back in the workforce.

This item was for discussion only. No Board action was taken.

17. Quarterly Report on Collections

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending June 30, 2024.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

18. General Fund Contingency Request for Justice Court

Staff recommends approval for the use of \$50,000.00 from General Fund Contingency for the costs associated with a Green Valley Probation Officer position.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Christy to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott thanked Judge Carroll and his staff for the innovative work done by the Green Valley Justice Court. He stated that he had gone to the courts and watched a session of one of the extraordinary specialty courts operated by Judge Carroll and encouraged his colleagues to go to Green Valley and experience what it was like for the people that had to appear before Justice Court and the caring and empathetic reception they received from Judge Carroll and his team.

Raymond Carroll, Justice of the Peace, Precinct No. 7, Green Valley Justice Court, addressed the Board and stated that Ron Overholt, Superior Court Administrator, Presiding Judge Danelle Liwski and David Sanders, Chief Probation Officer, also supported this request and invited the other Board members to visit the court.

Chair Grijalva requested clarification if this was a one-time request. She stated that the assumption was that this was for a new position, and the Board would approve it as a one-time request with the hope that the courts would adjust their own budget.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that it would be for an additional Probation Officer and continued funding would be anticipated in the future.

Chair Grijalva expressed concern because the courts had a significant budget that the Board approved, and they also had some vacancies. She stated that she encouraged the innovative programs, but preferred that this be a one-time increase for this position and that the Board work with the courts to figure out consistent funding, otherwise, it would be coming out of the Contingency Fund every year.

Supervisor Heinz requested clarification whether it was ongoing as it was currently written or if it was a one-time request.

Chair Grijalva stated that was why she had asked, but the assumption was that it would be an increase to the court every year. She stated that her understanding was it was a one-time request and let the courts figure it out, because it was a new innovative program and she wanted to support it, but she did not want it to be an increase to the budget that would come out of Contingency or the General Fund every year.

Ms. Leshar responded that since the position was for a Probation Officer and there had been recent communication with the Board regarding State mandates, about increasing Probation Officers and what was needed, this was partially to assist with that.

David Sanders, Chief Probation Officer, Superior Court, explained that they currently supported the Justice Court in Ajo, and the Consolidated Justice Courts in Tucson. He stated that both courts funded a Probation Officer on an ongoing basis and that their budget was about \$21 million, and of that amount the State covered 54%, the County covered 32%, and the rest was covered by probation service fees that were paid by probationers, as well as State and Federal grants. He stated that the County's portion was 32%, but the County received all of them, so it was a good deal, but as long as the County funded a Probation Officer in Green Valley, they would have one and if it was a one-time allotment, then it would be requested again the following year.

Supervisor Christy questioned if all court funding came from the General Fund.

Ms. Leshar responded that the General Fund funded the courts, but not all of the funding for the courts came from the General Fund. She stated that more than half came from the State of Arizona, or had been, but they saw that amount decreasing, and there were also fees associated with it.

Mr. Sanders concurred and those were the primary fundings and the courts were often caught in the middle, when the State did something the County did not like it, or when the County did something, the State did not like it.

Chair Grijalva stated the Board approved overall budgets for all of the courts, but they could not dictate how that funding was spent and allocated. She stated that this

was an additional position, but there were vacancies in the court system, and she would support this item, but wondered why a long-term solution that did not involve a yearly increase from Contingency or the General Fund could not be found.

Ron Overholt, Court Administrator, Superior Court, explained that they had an ongoing relationship with the Ajo Court where they paid for a Probation Officer and all its associated costs. He stated that Adult Probation was under the Superior Court, which was a separate budget from the Justice Court budget, so they had compartmentalized budgets, but Judge Carroll had asked him for the same arrangement as Ajo, and he agreed only if they were able to pay for the whole function of the Probation Officer. He added that he checked with Chief Sanders who supported overseeing a Probation Officer, but his issue was not where the funding came from, other than it was not a Superior Court function, rather it was a Justice Court function.

Chair Grijalva stated that within the Justice Court budget there were also vacancies and she was not trying to discourage new innovative programs, but was trying to figure out why this would continue to be a long-term adjustment.

Ms. Leshar responded that they could get back to the Board with different information, but when the Board approved the budget, there were three elements within the Justice Court's budget. She stated that the Justice Courts Tucson, Ajo, and Green Valley were separate, and the employees assigned to each of those PCNs were separate as well. She added that one thing being discussed with the presiding Justice of the Peace was if those positions could be reallocated, for example, if the vacancies in the Tucson Courts could be reallocated to assist in Ajo, or in Green Valley. She stated that they would continue to explore those elements and the concern with this was unique because it was a Probation Officer position and not additional court staff based on the services provided in this unique court.

Chair Grijalva asked if the Board could move the item to allocate this one time and it could be brought back in the next 2 to 3 months regarding what would happen moving forward. She stated that if it had to be revisited, it could be done that way. She asked if there were open vacancies within the Tucson system, why those could not be allocated to other courts if they had a healthy budget.

Supervisor Lee questioned if Family Court was under the umbrella of the Superior Court.

Mr. Overholt responded yes.

Supervisor Lee asked why it could not be looked at as a whole so that the Superior Court vacancies could help Family Court.

Mr. Overholt explained that they all had separate budgets that were funded separately. He stated Family Court was under the Superior Court, and Adult Probation was under the Superior Court, which was their budget and as Ms. Leshar

mentioned, part of the budget came partially from the State, fees and the General Fund, but in terms of budgets, they were separate entities.

Supervisor Lee stated that this was a creative program and asked why the County could not have creative budgeting since it was all part of the court system. She asked if there was a statute that prohibited Superior Court from assisting Family Court, and if not, then why Superior Court would not assist Family Court with budgeting.

Mr. Overholt responded that they did help with budgeting.

Supervisor Lee stated that the Ajo Court had come to Administrator Leshner and herself requesting a new position, and they had reviewed the vacancies, but she thought that was the role of Superior Court. She asked if funding could be moved within the courts.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, explained that the way the budget was created for the County was each department had its own separate budget and there were different types of money. She stated that General Fund money lived in a number of departments, but it would be up to the Board, with the exception of elected officials. She stated that once their budget was set, you could not tell them how to spend it or remove money from it unless by Board action. She added that they transferred money between General Fund departments routinely within the County in the non-elected, non-courts area. She stated that she believed it would be possible for monies to be moved within the courts.

Supervisor Christy asked if this position had been approved at the last Board meeting.

Ms. Leshner responded that she did not believe this position had been approved at the last meeting.

Chair Grijalva offered a friendly amendment to the motion that it be a one-time request and also ask Administrator Leshner to come back within this first quarter, to let the Board know if there was a possibility to transition this to one of the other PCNS, and then the Board could reconsider, if that was not a possibility.

Supervisor Christy accepted the friendly amendment, as the seconder to the original motion.

Judge Carroll stated that this was a big move towards meeting the expansion they received three years ago when Precinct No. 5 was eliminated and they absorbed 30,000 people from Vail, from Colossal Cave to the fairgrounds. He added those probationers had already been inherited from that precinct and he wanted the Board to know that they were working towards a solution to keep people safer. He stated that domestic violence had escalated and the spiraling of alcoholism attached itself to it. He stated that he would be happy to work with the County Administrator and was sure that Court staff could return to a future meeting to try to confirm that they

could have this ongoing, but certainly his background told him that this was necessary this year.

Chair Grijalva stated there was no argument about the need and trying to get people to be a part of diversion programs, to be monitored so the community was safe. She reiterated that was not the issue for her, it was that when reviewing the budget it had vacancies that were essentially under the same house, she wondered why those could not be reallocated and this was an opportunity for them to encourage that discussion.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the one-time situation and the potential limit on this position impaired hiring for the position.

Mr. Carroll believed it would not and Mr. Sanders had already indicated that they had a good opportunity currently to fill the position. He stated that they had no other vacancies in his court and there was no other available PCN.

Chair Grijalva restated that this would be short term, two months so information could be brought back and it would be helpful because she did not want to jeopardize the program.

Upon the vote, the motion to approve the item, as amended, unanimously carried 5-0.

GRANTS MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION

19. Tohono O'odham Nation State-Shared Revenue Program Funds

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 57, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve acceptance of Tohono O'odham Nation State-Shared Revenue Program funds and pass-through to the entities in Pima County selected by the Tohono O'odham Nation.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva commented that these were pass-through funds and thus far the Nation had donated \$1.36 million.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

HUMAN RESOURCES

20. Classification/Compensation

The Human Resources Department requests approval to create the following new classifications, associated costs will be borne by the user department from within its current budget:

Class Code/Class Title/ Grade Code (Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code

2063/ Psychologist Sheriff's Department/ 20 (\$117,545-\$176,318)/ 2/ E**

2066/ Public Health Evaluation Scientist/ 17 (\$80,508-\$112,711)/ 2/ E**

2065/ Facilities Safety Manager/ 15 (\$66,536-\$93,150)/ 1/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

21. Classification/Compensation

The Human Resources Department requests approval to create the following new classifications, associated costs will be borne by the user department from within its current budget:

Class Code/Class Title/ Grade Code (Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code

6038/ Data Center Engineer I/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

6039/ Data Center Engineer II/ 17 (\$80,508-\$112,711)/ 2/ E**

6040/ Data Center Engineer III/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

6041/ Database Administrator I/ 14 (\$60,487-\$84,682)/ 2/ E**

6042/ Database Administrator II/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

6043/ Database Administrator III/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

6044/ Enterprise Infrastructure Engineer I/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

6045/ Enterprise Infrastructure Engineer III/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

6046/ Geographic Information Systems Analyst III/ 17 (\$80,508-\$122,711)/ 2/ E**

6047/ Information Technology Network Engineer I/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

6048/ Information Technology Network Engineer II/ 17 (\$80,508-\$112,711)/ 2/ E**

6049/ Information Technology Network Engineer III/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

6050/ Information Technology Support Supervisor/ 17 (\$80,508-\$112,711)/ 2/ E**

6051/ Security Analyst/ 15 (\$66,536-\$93,150)/ 2/ E**

6052/ Security Engineer I/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

6053/ Security Engineer II/ 17 (\$80,508-\$112,711)/ 2/ E**

6054/ Security Engineer III/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

6055/ Software Developer/ 13 (\$57,607-\$80,649)/ 2/ E**

6056/ Software Engineer I/ 14 (\$60,487-\$84,682)/ 2/ E**

6057/ Software Engineer II/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

6058/ Software Engineer III/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

6059/ System Administrator I/ 14 (\$60,487-\$84,682)/ 2/ E**

6060/ System Administrator II/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

6061/ System Administrator III/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

TREASURER

22. Investment and Cash Balance Reports

Presentation of the Pima County Treasurer's report on the investment and cash balance reports for July 2024 and August 2024.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that following a situation which occurred in Santa Cruz County, discussion began about what they could do to work with the Board and the Treasurer's Office to ensure that there was complete transparency amongst and in between the different entities, including working with the Auditor General's Office. She stated that Treasurer Ackerley had come forward with some ideas that he would propose for his office about communication and reporting to the Board, even though he was a separate independent elected official.

Chris Ackerley, Treasurer, stated that as heard in the news, there was a neighboring County having difficulty locating some of their money, which had spurred some discussion and more would happen across the State among Treasurers and their Counties, and probably even at the legislature as they went through the coming year in response to that situation. He stated that this was a review of the Cash Balance and Investment Reports for July and August, which were attached to the item and were submitted to the Clerk of the Board's Office monthly and the Investment Report was also posted on the Treasurer's website monthly. He stated they would have to go way back in history to find a point where these were actually presented to the Board. He provided a slideshow presentation that was an overview of their process. He stated that as taxes were collected and jurisdictions received money, whether it was State payments, payments from other sources, or revenue generated internally, it all funneled through the Treasurer's Office and all the money was deposited in their office. He stated that they then pooled all those funds just like a bank and invested them. He added that all of the payments and deposits went through their servicing accounts, and they had a series of servicing accounts, whether it was accounts payable for the County, their main servicing account, incoming online tax payments or processing center tax payments, they all went through their servicing account. He stated that they then moved funds in and out of that account and matched up what they thought were going to be the needs to cover any of the payments that went in and out in the coming days, and they moved money in and out of those investment accounts to balance that off. He stated that they held between \$1.5 and \$2 billion on deposit at any given time and moved about \$100 million to \$300 million every week. He stated that all of those funds and activities were balanced each day and recorded on the Treasurer's Ledger where they kept track of where all the money was, which was basically a bank ledger. He stated that about half of the money held was school district money and the other was County money and there was a little chunk held for fire districts and special districts. He added that all of the County's transactions and the school districts transactions flowed through their office and that they held bond proceeds and debt service money for fire districts and other special districts. He explained that the actual tax collections received for those jurisdictions were then remitted to those jurisdictions on a periodic basis, and they used their own servicing account, particularly because some of the fire districts spanned across multiple counties. He stated that transactions were processed through their office like a bank and cautioned everyone that he could tell them exactly how much money they spent yesterday, but could not tell what it was spent on. He stated that their task to all of that information was either to an IT integration or there was a lot of paper in their office entered into the Treasurer's Cash Management System (TCMS) that was internally built and internally managed to keep track of all of the jurisdictions, like

checking accounts. He stated that every month they had to match all the money to what they had assigned to everyone's checking account, which was a major process to do and had to balance them. He added that from the Treasurer's ledger they generated an Investment Report and posted it online and from TCMS they generated a Cash Balance Report for all of the jurisdictions which was filed with the Clerk of the Board monthly. He referred to the slide that showed the Investment Report and it summarized where all the money was and currently they had about half of their funds on deposit with the State Treasury and what they called Local Government Investment Pools (LGIPs), which about a third of the money was invested in some large denomination agencies and bonds, 4% of that was in corporate bonds and the remainder was held in money markets and Certificates of Deposit. He proceeded to the slide that showed the Cash Balance Report and stated that what was included in the materials were the account numbers that were filed with the Clerk of the Board monthly, but the slide only showed information for the County section, and this was the Board's checking account balances at the Treasury. He stated that the troubles with their neighboring County had sparked some discussion and there were some important considerations. He stated that the character of the person was a big issue, but as far his operations went, the important considerations and internal controls they had, the transparency and accountability, which the Board and the County Finance Department played a part in, including auditing with the internal auditors of the County and then also the Auditor General's Office came into play. He stated that the internal controls and that as Treasurer, he did not initiate payments to vendors, which appeared to be the case in Santa Cruz County. He stated that all transactions that went through their office required multiple steps and involved multiple people. He added that someone initiated, a different person approved it, someone else balanced it and someone else reconciled it. He stated that there was a lot of paper in their office and all transactions had a physical paper trail in one form or another. He explained that as far as the general operation scope, one of the things was that all of their investment accounts were tied to their servicing accounts. He stated that they could not wire money from their investment accounts to the outside world because the money first got wired to their servicing accounts and then moved to where it needed to go. He stated that all of the incoming and outgoing flow from the investment accounts went through their banking reconciliation process, which involved multiple people, and not one person was in charge of the entire process. He explained that they had a yearly audit completed by the Auditor General's Office which audited their office and the County, although many of the other major jurisdictions, and a lot of the fire districts were audited by independent firms and they interacted with them. He stated that recommendations in areas for improvement as far as their internal controls where they had already been informed that the Auditor General's Office was going to review and revise their operating manuals for Counties and the Treasurer's departments, but they would take that process and would review it. He stated that the Auditor General had already reached out to the County Treasurer's Association for input on a timeline to review the internal processes they all did and since the County was going through an ERP conversion and potentially next month the School Superintendent's Office would go through an ERP conversion themselves to review their internal processes and ensure that the way they transferred information actually made the best sense and that those internal controls were involved. He

added that the County's Finance Department made a recommendation to provide, as far as accountability and transparency, periodic reports to the Board and that assured the public that not only was he filing the reports, but also someone was reviewing them and that they had an opportunity to engage in questions with constituents, board meetings, and collaborations, He stated that he would continue to attend Board meetings for most of the jurisdictions that they served, and interacted with their boards and their finance directors. He added that they needed to look at revising some of the reports to make them more understandable to the public and finally, perhaps the most important was the auditing process and as recommended by County Finance and the Attorney General's Office was to make the financial institution statements directly available to the auditors without needing to request them and also work with the Auditor General's office, which would be part of the process this year, and part of the legislation that would probably move through the legislature for a more robust review of the operations of Treasurer's Offices in the Counties.

Supervisor Christy stated that it was important what Mr. Ackerley provided to the Board as far as the controls he saw were necessary to be either refined, upgraded, enhanced or put in place. He stated that one of the things he had previous experience in was to understand how the situation to their friends down south happened in the first place. He asked whether Mr. Ackerley had studied what they did and if he could address it, or if he would prefer not to because there was an ongoing investigation. He stated that in any event, it was important to know why and how they did what they did and be able to transform that into the County's situation to ensure that what they did down there, could not happen in Pima County.

Mr. Ackerley responded that he only had information that was in the media reports and had not been involved with that office, but if the accusations were true, it was pretty obvious that the fault included them not having the internal controls in that office or they ignored them. He stated that the oversight by their County Finance and their Board of Supervisors lacked and that the Auditor General's Office needed to be a little bit more robust in their oversight.

Supervisor Christy stated this had been going on for a number of years, so there had been a lot of lack of oversight.

Mr. Ackerley responded in the affirmative and it appeared that it was going on for more than ten years.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the Auditor General reviewed the County's Finance team's documents, specific bank account statements or investment statements during the annual audits.

Mr. Ackerley explained that the Auditor General audited the County which was a robust audit, they asked for sample items and ensured that all accounts balanced. He stated that they requested information from his office, and it is passed to them through the internal audit team for all of the financial statements and other records. He added they also completed an in-depth audit of IT systems, and the process

went back and forth between the jurisdictions in the Treasurer's Office. He stated that part of that accountability was that their system was separate from the County system and was separate from the School Superintendent system, and separate from what the fire districts were using or some of the independent school districts. He stated that the way the County had access online to checking accounts, those went through and balanced their systems to the checking account balance and if there was an issue, they had to resolve that issue. He stated that what he thought one of the missing pieces in Pima County was while the County reconciled their checking account, and the school district reconciled their checking account, and the Superintendent's Office reconciled their checking account, fire districts reconciled theirs, he was not sure that anyone took that all in aggregate and compared it to what was in the office, and he thought that might have been part of the ability in Santa Cruz County for that to fall through the cracks. He stated that he imagined that part of the revisions to the Auditor General's policies and potentially legislation was going to be the mandate that they review the aggregate and compared it to the Treasurer's books.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the bank the County used was Bank of America.

Mr. Ackerley responded yes.

Supervisor Heinz asked if there was any particular reason why the County used Bank of America and not other banks like Chase, Wells Fargo, or National Bank of Arizona. He stated that he was curious because when they had \$1.5 billion, that was a lot of points and miles, but seemed like it probably could not be utilized as a government entity, but there had to be some sort of incentive for them to move \$1.5 billion to a different bank, maybe for a half percent better rate. He asked if that was occasionally done because it seemed the Treasurer had the ability to make the people's money of Pima County work a bit better for them.

Mr. Ackerley responded in the affirmative and stated they would have that fund next year because their contract went through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process, which would be upcoming and they would be critically evaluating those concerns addressed by Supervisor Heinz. He added that it needed to be understood that there were very few banks that could handle the County, because there was a requirement that all of their funds that were on deposit be over 100% collateralized because they were government money, so they were limited to big banks. He added that there were several integrations built into Workday, the County's ERP system and Bank of America, and if they moved from one bank to another, this would be a heavy consideration as they went through the RFP, the cost and labor, complexity and disruption of breaking all of those IT integrations and rebuilding them with another bank was a very serious concern.

This item was for discussion only. No Board action was taken.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Attractions and Tourism

23. Ajo Community Golf Course, d.b.a. Ajo Country Club, Amendment No. 1, to provide a Cooperative Agreement for Ajo Community Golf Course, extend contract term to 10/31/29 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$50.00 (\$10.00 per year) revenue (CTN-ED-20-65)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Community and Workforce Development

24. Family Housing Resources, Inc., to provide for an Affordable Housing Gap Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for the Emery Park Place Project, General Fund, contract amount \$750,000.00 (PO2400004774)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the item.

25. Sahuarita Food Bank, d.b.a. Marana Food Bank & Community Resource Center, to provide for emergency food for Marana and Unincorporated Pima County, General Fund, contract amount \$200,000.00 (PO2400007429)

Chair Grijalva requested confirmation that this would be the last time there would be a one-time distribution of funds to the vendor and after this they would go into the cycle to apply for grant funds.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

26. Arivaca Coordinating Council/Arivaca Human Resource Group, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Facility Improvement Project, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (PO-CT-24-113)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

27. Habitat for Humanity Tucson, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Connie Hillman Urban Construction Knowledge Center (CHUCK) facility improvements, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (PO-CT-24-181)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Detainee and Crisis Systems (formerly Behavioral Health)

28. NaphCare Arizona, L.L.C., to provide for the opioid abatement funding coordinated reentry planning services programs at the Pima County Adult Detention Center for participants in the INVEST Program and the Community Reentry Program, Attorney General State of Arizona Opioid Abatement Grant Fund, contract amount \$685,550.40 (PO2400005135)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott read from the background material regarding the memorandum from Ms. Everett to Ms. Leshner which referenced warm handoffs, jail releases, overdose rates and the need for more release planners. He stated the memorandum indicated that it had become possible to add five release planners and one supervisor through additional grant funding and asked if there was a plan in place to keep the release planners and supervisors after the grant funding was depleted.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that grant funded programs were reviewed on an individual basis and currently there was not a plan to automatically transfer any grant funded position into the general fund.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that at this point there was no plan to come up with resources for those from the general fund. He explained that the County had a contract with NaphCare that came out of the general fund for County services that were provided at the facility. He stated this item was a separate grant funded contract for a very narrow scope of work. He stated that part of the challenge that the County faced was that approximately 30% of the individuals in the facility participated in some level of medication assisted therapy which was an unprecedented number, but that was also what kept those individuals alive and was part of the reason why there were no overdose deaths in the facility for over a year.

Supervisor Scott stated that he understood conceptually the necessity for examining positions and whether the County wanted to commit general funds to them after a grant ran out. He stated that after reading through the background on this item and he saw the admirable expansion of this program. He explained that initially it affected pregnant women, but had been expanded beyond that. He reflected on a conversation he had with Dr. Garcia regarding the importance of warm handoffs as people were released and the dire circumstances they sometimes faced during that period and that these positions seemed to be of critical importance, not only to the program, but to the well-being of those releases.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he thought they should be in-house and that the County should not work with NaphCare. He believed that the County could work on getting everything that they were currently doing in the correctional area in-house

instead of outsourcing. He stated that the County held individuals in jail for some reason, and it was incumbent upon the County to take care of them. He stated that it was the County's responsibility to properly oversee this process and hoped staff could figure out a way for those incredibly important positions to be moved in-house and eventually when the grant money ran out those positions should be made as part of the general fund expenditures.

Supervisor Lee concurred with the comments made by Supervisor Heinz and believed these were incredibly critical positions. She stated that if the County did not pay for it now, they would pay as a community later and supported these positions being funded from the general fund.

Chair Grijalva stated that she shared the same beliefs, but understood some of the constraints. She stated that whenever the County could move people from contracts to in-house county employees was a good move overall.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

Elections

29. Town of Sahuarita, Amendment No. 1, to provide for election services and amend contractual language, contract amount \$47,758.00 revenue (CTN-EL-22-118)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Facilities Management

30. Friends of Robles Ranch, Inc., to provide a lease agreement for a new facility located at 16150 W. Ajo Highway, for the distribution of clothing and food to the general public in need of assistance, no cost (SC2400002278)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Grants Management and Innovation

31. MGT of America Consulting, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide for indirect cost allocation plan development to determine the proportional allocation of central service costs to departments, extend contract term to 8/31/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$80,000.00 (PO-CT-21-198)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that in the background material the indirect cost rates were used to recoup central service costs from federal funders through either the use of the de minimis rate or negotiated indirect cost rate agreements. He explained that

the County currently used the de minimis rate which had increased, but the negotiated indirect cost rate agreements would allow for more recoupment of indirect costs. He stated that the County submitted a proposal, but it was initially declined and asked if the County had always used the de minimis rate, and if it was a new suggestion that the County move to the negotiated indirect cost rate agreements.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that she would need to look back to find out exactly when this had all started and that the change to evaluate the County's entire grants program and how much they received in indirect costs began when the County started the Grants Management Department. She clarified that it had been within the last 5 to 6 years when the County began to look at what could be administrative overhead charges, and how to move from a de minimis rate, which required some significant work. She stated that there was a need for a consultant as the County moved into looking at how those dollars could be allocated for costs.

Supervisor Scott requested a breakdown of what the County was expected to recoup if they moved to this as compared to what they would be expected to pay if they stuck with the de minimis rate.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Lee was not present for the vote.

Pima Animal Care Center

32. Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, Amendment No. 2, to provide a master cooperative agreement for philanthropic support, extend contract term to 6/5/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400002321)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Lee was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

Procurement

33. iSX Construction, L.L.C., d.b.a. Infrastructure Industries, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide for Sierrita Mountain Road two-way left turn lane: Hilltop Road to Viking Street, extend contract term to 7/31/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-24-209) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva inquired if this item was for an additional left turning lane and if the project was located in District 3.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

34. Workday, Inc., to provide a professional services agreement for post Go-Live development services, Non-Bonds Projects Funds (Capital Project Funds), contract amount \$100,000.00/14 year term (SC2400002320) Administering Department: Information Technology

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

35. The Ashton Company, Inc., Contractors and Engineers, to provide for Mission Road Overpass at the ASARCO Mine Haul Road (4MSSRD), U.S. Department of Transportation FHWA OSB (94.3%) and HURF (5.7%) Funds, contract amount \$382,800.00 (PO2400007600) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

36. EX2 Technology, L.L.C., to provide for Design-Build Services - Pima County Regional Middle Mile Project (PCRMMP), Non-Bond Projects Funds (Capital Project Funds), contract amount \$4,187,734.29/4 year term (PO2400008167) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

37. HDR Engineering, Inc., to provide for design engineering services for: Madera Canyon, Medium Wash Bridge Replacement (4MADMB) and Madera Canyon, Florida Canyon Wash Bridge Replacement (4MADFL), U.S. Department of Transportation FHWA OSB Funds, contract amount \$1,469,551.13/3 year term (PO2400007958) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Real Property

38. Pima County Flood Control District and Pima County, to provide an Exchange Agreement and Quit Claim Deed to establish appropriate property ownership with the floodprone land vested in and managed by the District, no cost (SC2400002316)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

39. Hazen and Sawyer DPC, Amendment No. 2, to provide for wastewater reclamation data analytics support, extend contract term to 10/30/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$54,000.00 (CT-23-44)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

40. Arizona Board of Regents on behalf of the University of Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for membership in the Water and Environmental Technology Center and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$30,000.00 (PO2400007821)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

41. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

Arizona Department of Public Safety, to provide for the Victims of Crime Act Victims Assistance Grant Program/Strategically Enhancing Victim Services in the Age of APRAIS RENEWAL, \$848,030.00/\$212,008.00 General Fund match (G-PCA-70376)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that the grant jointly supported expanded victim services with satellite offices in Green Valley, Sahuarita, Oro Valley and Marana, and inquired about the exclusion of Vail and Ajo.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the grant allowed for expansion into those satellite offices and the other areas were not part of this expansion, but could be part of a future expansion.

Supervisor Christy stated that he would like those areas to be put into consideration in the future and asked how often the areas came under consideration.

Mr. Brown responded he was unsure, but would look into it with the County Attorney's Office Administrator.

Supervisor Scott stated that near the beginning of this Board's tenure that were some concerns raised, specifically from Green Valley and Marana, about victim services in those areas and it sounded like this grant would help address some of those concerns.

Mr. Brown clarified that those concerns had to do with victim services staff having to drive and were not able to provide as much services or as efficient services as possible. He stated that his office could look into other areas as well and see if there was available funding.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

42. Acceptance - County Attorney

City of Tucson, to provide for the Pima County Attorney's Victim Services Division, \$24,900.00 (G-PCA-73468)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

43. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 58, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the continuum of care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for Coalition Assisting Self-Sufficiency Attainment, \$989,714.00/\$247,428.50 General Fund match (G-CWD-70934)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

44. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 59, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the continuum of care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2024 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for Homeless Management Information System Consolidation, \$421,492.00/\$105,373.00 General Fund match (G-CWD-70938)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

45. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

Connie Hillman Family Foundation, to provide workforce development for veterans, \$5,000.00 (G-CWD-74687)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

46. **Acceptance - Elections**

Arizona Department of Homeland Security, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the 2023/2024 Elections Department and Recorder's Office Elections Security Grant, extend grant term to 12/31/24 and amend grant language, no cost (GA-EL-69933)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott asked if these were competitive grants from the Arizona Department of Homeland Security, or if the legislature designated who would receive these grant funds.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, responded it was a competitive grant with the State Department of Homeland Security.

Supervisor Scott asked how the scope of the grant request was determined, and he realized he was asking Ms. Hargrove to speak on behalf of her department as well as the Recorder's Office.

Ms. Hargrove explained that they had to submit a plan of what they wanted to do in their departments, and the money was split that way. She stated that the Recorder's Office and the Elections Department submitted it as a group and that was the grant amount they received.

Supervisor Scott asked what the legislature's intent was when they created this grant program and allowed counties to compete for the funds.

Ms. Hargrove responded the Federal government created it and it filtered through the State Department of Homeland Security to dispense.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that she would provide the Board with a follow-up report that explained the genesis of the funds and how they came to the State and into the County.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

47. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

United States Environmental Protection Agency, to provide for the EPA-CEP-01 EPA mandatory grant programs, \$539,065.00/\$781,000.00 PDEQ Air Quality Minor Source Permits Fees/Air Quality Permit Fees Fund match (G-DE-65957)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

48. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 2, to provide for immigrant emergency care and testing and amend grant language, \$1,080,000.04 (GA-HD-66108)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy expressed his opposition to this item and that the County should not be in the asylum seeking business. He stated that this was the responsibility of the federal government.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the program goal was to provide the County with emergent health care and infectious disease testing to immigrants, medical clearance exams, expand access to testing and testing sites availability, provide isolation and quarantine, and associated wraparound services for immigrants testing positive for an infectious disease. She stated that these services fell well within services that should be provided to those coming into Pima County.

Supervisor Christy asked if the County would provide these services as opposed to the federal government.

Chair Grijalva responded in the affirmative and the funds were intended to help and compensate counties along the border with Mexico.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

49. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Healthy People Healthy Communities Project and amend scope of work, \$1,437,819.00 (GA-HD-70302)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

50. **Acceptance - Justice Services**

Arizona Housing Coalition, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Bolstering Supportive Housing Now; High Impact Rural Supports & Statewide Capacity Buildings, no cost (GA-JS-65860)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the item.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

51. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 301852, Amy S. Nations, Fuchsia Spa, 2905 E. Skyline Drive, No. 123, Tucson, Series 7, Beer and Wine Bar, Location Transfer and Owner Transfer.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that the primary use of the space was for a spa and not a bar, so the zoning standards were met.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Lee voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

52. Hearing - Bingo License

24-04-8048, Edward Gold, Green Valley Sahuarita Lions Foundation, Inc., 1111 S. GVR Drive, Green Valley, Class A - Small Game.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Revenue.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

53. Request of Sheriff Nanos for Response to Possible Rules Violations

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the request by the Board of Pima County Sheriff Chris Nanos to respond to the possible rules violations noted in the report transmitted by the County Administrator's memorandum of September 4, 2024, entitled "Response from the Attorney General's Office regarding Request for Independent Investigation". (District 4)

Chair Grijalva stated that Sheriff Nanos was not in attendance and had sent a communication to the Board.

Supervisor Christy stated that on August 29th, a letter was sent to the County Administrator from the Office of the Attorney General and he read as follows, "*In response to your request for the Arizona Attorney General to review the actions taken by Sheriff Nanos in his department's review of an alleged sexual assault of a female deputy in December of 2022, investigators within the Attorney General's Office have conducted a review of the investigative materials developed in that case and provided to us by the Pima County Sheriff's Department. We note that an Internal Affairs (IA) investigation into this incident has yet to be completed, and that*

Sheriff Nanos has indicated a plan to wait until the end of the criminal trial to begin the IA investigation. We found no criminal wrongdoing in the investigative process; however, based on our review of the materials, we are concerned about the following possible violations:" He stated that the Attorney General listed four possible violations, and they were outlined quite extensively. He stated that this prompted his office to place an item on the September 17th meeting agenda, an opportunity for the Sheriff to address the four possible violations as outlined by the Attorney General's letter. He added that Sheriff Nanos had not attended that meeting and the Board voted 3-2 to respectfully request that the Sheriff appear before this Board or provide a written response to the Attorney General's concerns. He stated that after that meeting, Sheriff Nanos was questioned by a news reporter, and stated that he would have attended that meeting if he had been asked, and he read as follows, *"We spoke with the Sheriff after the meeting who said he would have attended if asked. As for the request, he said, 'I'll be there."* He stated that after the passing of a month with no written response from the Sheriff, there was a request made and upon the receipt of the invitation, Mr. Nanos responded and he read as follows, *"Unlike certain members of the Board, I will not revictimize this young lady and allow politics to further their agenda. Mr. Christy's timing is rather suspicious. I will answer any and all questions after November 6th in executive session."* He asked his colleagues how they wished to proceed.

Chair Grijalva asked what the Board could do since the Sheriff was a duly elected official and he indicated that he felt that the motives for this request, because of the timing, that he did not want to speak about those issues at a Board meeting. She stated that she did not feel like there was anything that they could do as a Board and she wanted to ensure that they talked about it before they had a discussion because she was also concerned about any perception that the Board was using their County meetings to try to influence an election.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, explained that question was broad, so it was hard for him to answer because he did not know where the conversation would go, but there was certainly a possibility that this conversation could go in a place that needed to be stopped. He stated that he would caution Board members, and that they were aware that he would interrupt them for that purpose, if needed. He added that the County Attorney's Office represented both the Sheriff's Office and the Board, so the answer could become one that he could not provide, or that would be more appropriate to be discussed in Executive Session.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that in a separate article, the Attorney who represented the deputy in her lawsuit stated the Attorney General's ruling had little bearing on his client's case, in fact, it might speed things up. He stated that if there was any question about politics or involving any kind of intervention in a case, the individual involved, her own Attorney stated that it would not have any effect, and it might speed the whole process up, which he thought was an important item to bring up.

Supervisor Heinz stated that it was important that the Board had talked about the letter from the Attorney General, but it was also important for everyone to hear exactly what quite possibly the Sheriff did not do. He stated that the specifics of the letter included failing to provide help to a deputy in danger, failing to act in an official capacity, failing to document staff involvement, and failing to properly secure evidence. He stated that this was incredibly troubling and when he talked to counsel, there were other boards that had conflicts with Sheriffs and there were some legal avenues that could be pursued with outside counsel since the County Attorney's Office represented the Sheriff, as well as the Board and he thought that would be the first thing that needed to be considered. He asked if he could propose something at this time or if it had to be at future Board meeting.

Mr. Brown responded that it would have to wait, and he cautioned the Board that discussion should only be on the agenda item, which was the Sheriff's response or possible lack of response to the request from the Board, since the subject matter of the Attorney General's letter was not agenda item.

This item was for discussion only. No Board action was taken.

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

54. Pima County/Tucson Women's Commission

Appointment of Molly Ring. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 1)

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

CONSENT CALENDAR

55. Approval of the Consent Calendar

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety.

* * *

SPECIAL EVENT LIQUOR LICENSE/TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PREMISES/ PATIO PERMIT/WINE FAIR/WINE FESTIVAL/JOINT PREMISES PERMIT APPROVED PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION NO. 2019-68

1. Special Event

- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Plaza, 15 and 38 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, October 18 and 19, 2024.
- Scott Thayer Somers, The Rotary Club of Green Valley, Historic Canoa Ranch, 5375 S. I-19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, October 12, 2024.

ELECTIONS

2. **Precinct Committeemen**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-821B, approval of Precinct Committeemen resignations and appointments:

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Elaine Aldrete-021-DEM, Tanya Tassi-141-DEM, Elvis Thompson-224-DEM, Michael Lesperance-004-REP, Robert Hobson-005-REP, Serina Hernandez-006-REP, Larry Marks-009-REP, Crystal Flores-011-REP, Steve Loster-014-REP, Helen Hritz-017-REP, Lois Boehl-021-REP, Alice Bever-024-REP, Victoria Medina-039-REP, Joseph Smith-047-REP, Charles Eaton-053-REP, Joel Staley-057-REP, Alan Harwell, Jr.-067-REP, Dana Goodge-073-REP, Michelle Whitehead-075-REP, Brent Michelson-077-REP, Tim Wardell-079-REP, Mona Jenkins-082-REP, Jacqueline Poellot Bargman-082-REP, Kristy Knight-090-REP, Frederick Bledsoe-096-REP, John Kelsey-096-REP, Michael Seno-104-REP, Jane Weiss-107-REP, Frank Ekonomo-108-REP, Anna Brimmer-109-REP, Joanne Bergeron-117-REP, Juliann Huerstel-117-REP, Cathy Blake-120-REP, Donna McFadzean-127-REP, Sharon Muelchi-127-REP, Janet Whitemore-127-REP, David Bossack-132-REP, Julee Baxley-142-REP, William Simms II-142-REP, Martha Alvarado-146-REP, Richard Johnson-158-REP, Marc Hammond-161-REP, Rosita Campbell-171-REP, Alan Kacic-171-REP, Chris Feldmayer-174-REP, Sandra McPherson-174-REP, Arlene Westphal-174-REP, Josephine Lamb-176-REP, Francesca Brown-179-REP, Richard Brown-179-REP, Lisa Nicholson-183-REP, Robert Nicholson-183-REP, Glen Voyles-183-REP, Monty Wallace-187-REP, Elizabeth Ivanov-189-REP, Patrick Blair-195-REP, Gilbert Maestas-195-REP, Kyle Morrison-200-REP, Keith Hedges-201-REP, Darren Venters-207-REP, Leonor Peterson-214-REP, Yumi Wong-218-REP, Albert Armour-221-REP, Alexandra MacPherson-Munro-223-REP, Thomas Holz-227-REP, Santiago Inclan-233-REP, Shelley Reid-237-REP, Avi Kulawy-238-REP, Brenda Lynch-252-REP, Philip Bryson-262-REP, Catherine Preble-262-REP

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

3. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

Icon on Park, L.L.C. \$1,309.00; Pima County Ajo Justice Court \$500.00; Arizona Community Health Workers Association \$5,336.49; Language Locus, L.L.C. \$2,574.00; Villa Sorrento, L.L.C. \$1,099.00; 7950 E. Stella Rd., L.L.C.-Alias/DBA Copperhill Apartments \$1,522.77; Pauline Maria Kousoulas \$60.00; Staples Contract & Commercial, L.L.C. \$229.90; Ruby Brown Construction Corp. \$59,889.42; Ruby Reyna \$195.66; OrangeBoy, Inc. \$27,500.00; Arizona Community Health Workers Association \$3,435.19; Maritza Roberts \$200.00; Banner-University Medical Group \$673.89; Keller Electrical Industries, L.L.C. \$8,089.03; Yvette Urias \$92.00; Green Valley-Marana Auto Supply, Inc, \$1,233.33; Patricia Lopez \$40.00; Taylor W.

Fox, PC \$2,386.25; Harrison M. Alvarez \$144.72; Toshiba American Business Solutions \$5,978.11; Toshiba American Business Solutions \$14,605.57; Jessie Martinez Blanco \$500.00; Pima County Bar Foundation \$1,875.00; Arizona Department of Public Safety \$67.00; Arizona Department of Public Safety \$67.00; Anthony Jay Williams \$96.74; Kittle Design and Construction, L.L.C. \$55,014.00; SREIT Las Villas De Kino, L.L.C. \$1,415.00; Green Leaf at Broadway Blvd. \$830.00; 410 N. Grande Ave., L.L.C. \$1,938.00; Cabo Del Sol Apartments \$5,000.00.

SUPERIOR COURT

4. **Fill the Gap**

Staff requests approval to submit a Fill-the-Gap Application to the Arizona Supreme Court Administrative Office of Courts for Fiscal Year 2025.

TREASURER

5. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$61,387.53.

TRANSPORTATION

6. **Permission to Advertise**

River Road - La Canada to +/- 1912 Feet West
Road Establishment No. 3039
October 18 and 25, 2024 (District 3)

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

7. Minutes: August 13, 2024

* * *

56. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK