

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD 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, December 5, 2023. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:37 a.m.

1. REQUEST FOR DRAINAGE EASEMENT

Staff recommends approval of a drainage easement to Tucson Electric Power Company, for property located along the alignment of the Santa Cruz River, lying within Section 26, T14S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, \$500.00 revenue. (District 5)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

2. CONTRACT

Borderland Construction Company, Inc., Hunter Contracting Co., KE&G Construction, Inc., Rummel Construction, Inc. and SMS Construction, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for a job order master agreement: flood control and drainage improvement services and amend contractual language, no cost (MA-PO-23-2) Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:52 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, December 5, 2023. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:37 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Lindsey Curley, Librarian, Valencia Library.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION

4. Presentation of the 2023 Small Business Commission Awards to:

- Vail Coffee Stop, Small Business Rural Award
- HEM & HER Bridal, Small Business Urban Award
- Sister Jose Women's Center, Small Business Nonprofit Award.

Janay Arenas, Chair, Small Business Commission, presented the awards. No Board action was taken.

5. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Shirley Requard expressed her concern with electric vehicles, the required cost to fuel them and the safety hazards that posed a danger to the public and the environment. She stated that the production of batteries for electric vehicles took a

lot of energy, used 2.1 million liters of water and created more hazardous emissions in the air.

Laurie Moore addressed the Board regarding welfare that is given to people that cross the border even though the U.S. had unmanageable debt. She also indicated that those that crossed were mostly men of military age and they received paperwork to appear in court 10 years from now.

Robert Reus spoke about his petition to run for the District 1 Supervisor position as an independent and stated that the petition was improper because he needed to supply six times the amount of signatures than an institutionalized party and his name would be referred directly to the November 2024 election without the need for a primary election. He also expressed concern with illegal voting.

Eileen Wilson expressed opposition to Minute Item No. 19 and asked if this was a way to track the homes and the individuals who owned a firearm. She stated that it should be public information on what the schools would be teaching their children about gun safety.

Sharon Greene spoke about Covid vaccine deaths and commented that vaccines were to prevent a person from getting the illness they were vaccinated against and to stop the spread of the illness.

Cory Stephens expressed her concerns with open borders and trafficking of individuals through catholic churches. She urged the Board to discontinue the acceptance of federal funds for illegal immigrants.

Don Hayles expressed opposition to Minute Item Nos. 10, 30 and 31, and explained that the Board was complicit in the border crisis and denied helping the homeless population.

Gisela Aaron stated that there was manipulation to number counts for the votes for the City of Tucson Mayor. She also expressed concern with Theelios's access to all voter and election information without any supervision.

Debra Ladden expressed her concern with open borders and how Fentanyl had affected the people around her and had caused the death of some of them. She urged the Board to close the border.

Jennie Grubel expressed her support for Minute Item No. 10 and stated that approval of the policies was fiscally prudent, as well as a moral action, and that systemic inequities were the root cause of generational poverty and the County ranked low in all childhood poverty indicators. She explained approval of the policies would help all children, families and communities.

Kelly Griffith read a quote from Ela Bhatt about poverty and Tucson paid a high price for poverty, which was \$2.2 billion a year and indicated that approval of Minute Item No. 10 could directly help the economic health of all County residents.

Penelope Jacks addressed the Board regarding her support of Minute Item No. 10 and stated that high quality preschools created jobs for educators, support staff and administrators.

Lauryn Valladares expressed support for Minute Item No. 10 and shared a story about a mother who financially struggled and the proposed policies would help struggling families.

Jim Hannley expressed support for Minute Item No. 10 and stated that small businesses faced difficulties accessing capital and the 13 proposed policies would help those businesses with better lending policies. He explained that approval of the item would make the County go on record to help the communities and stop generational poverty.

Liz Casey expressed support for Minute Item No. 10 and explained that in order for the Prosperity Initiative and proposed policies to work, the County should not expand on a new jail. She explained that incarceration led to more generational poverty.

Arika Wells, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, United Way, indicated that the United Way supported the proposed policies and Prosperity Initiative Report and stated they had interest in policies related to affordable housing, youth education, conviction prevention, including financial empowerment, home ownership opportunities and single caregiver households with children, black, indigenous, people of color communities and those that had been incarcerated.

Amy Pettifer spoke in support for Minute Item No. 10 and how incarceration perpetuated poverty and in order to stop poverty the expansion of the new jail needed to be rejected. She also indicated that the Prosperity Initiative needed to be approved to help low income and struggling residents.

Taima Cannon expressed support for Minute Item No. 10 and stated that approval of both the Prosperity Initiative and the expansion of a new jail could cause funding and moral issues.

* * *

Supervisor Scott requested that staff follow-up with Mr. Reus regarding his concerns with his nomination petitions.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

6. Outside Agency Program Funding

Discussion/Direction/Action: Increasing the overall budget for the Outside Agency Program social services category grants (CWD grants) for FY25 from the current \$3.26M to \$3.86M, an increase of \$600,000.00. As we know, the pandemic

exacerbated long-standing inequalities in American society, including here in Pima County. Those who experienced the greatest hardship in terms of housing, employment, food insecurity and more, were those who already were among the most vulnerable in our community. The needs, therefore, for additional support for our community members who are low-income, elderly, disabled, and the young, are greater than ever before. The Outside Agency Program is funded through the General Fund. All programs are administered by nonprofit partners across the county through a competitive RFP process. (District 2)

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

Supervisor Heinz explained that the Outside Agency Program targeted economically disadvantaged and other at-risk populations, specifically it assured that support was provided to meet the basic needs and services in rural areas. He stated that programs like youth, young adult and family support, general services, emergency food and clothing, senior support and other community services programs were only funded up to 80 - 85% of their requested amounts. He stated that this was great that the Advisory Committee targeted low level funding for the programs to ensure that more programs could receive funds, but felt that it would make a huge difference if the Board encouraged the committee to fund the programs at the levels requested because applicants spent time figuring out what services to deliver, which included a program with budgets, at a specific level, for a specific population that were usually in rural areas. He explained that his request was for \$600,000.00 but it did not have to be that number and he was okay if other Board members requested a different number, and he felt this would be a good use of the County's assets to fund the programs for the next tranche of funding.

Chair Grijalva asked where the funds would come from, if it would be from the General Fund or another funding source, and whether it would impact any other programs.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that Supervisor Heinz' proposal suggested that it would come out of the General Fund. She explained that as the following year's budget was developed, they would add the \$600,000.00 and determine placement, whether it be from Contingency, other funds or other programs, but they had not reached that point in the budget.

Chair Grijalva appreciated this because she had also written for outside agency funding on a regular basis. She expressed her understanding of how tight it could be financially and how difficult it was to submit a proposal, but then being awarded 50% less of what was requested would require additional steps to be taken. She stated she would like the funding to go directly to Outside Agency and that the committee would continue with their normal recommendations without being specific to non-profits, but increasing their opportunity for funding.

Supervisor Christy wanted to offer a friendly amendment because the 200,000 people of District 3 were currently unrepresented on the issue of spending more

taxpayer money, and agencies would continue to provide important services in both rural and urban areas, which included Ajo, Arivaca, and Green Valley. He stated that Ajo and Arivaca were in the heart of District 3, however no representation was present on the Board to speak in support or opposition of this item. He expressed that it was a form of disenfranchisement.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy to continue the item until the District 3 Supervisor position was filled by the Board. The substitute motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was important to acknowledge that Outside Agency specially targeted rural communities and the funding was being developed for next fiscal year for the increased allocation. She explained that all Board members had representation on the Outside Agency Committee, and it continued to be consistent. She stated that the advocacy was there even with the District 3 Supervisor vacancy. She explained that it was the Board's responsibility to continue to move forward with what needed to be done in order to help move the County in the business of what had to be done. She expressed her understanding of Supervisor Christy's reluctance, but was comfortable moving forward with this item.

Supervisor Scott stated for clarification that this item would be for direction provided to County Administration for the next fiscal year of Outside Agency Funding. He questioned if County Administration had any recommendations regarding the item and asked how the \$600,000.00 amount was determined.

Ms. Leshner responded that staff did not have any recommendations for the item. She explained that there had always been an allocation of funds from the Board for outside agencies and worked with the outside agencies to ensure the funds were distributed appropriately. She stated staff never calculated an exact number, but it was policy direction provided by the Board of how much to spend in any element of the budget.

Supervisor Heinz clarified that the \$600,000.00 was based on the level of underfunding that happened when the committee had allocated 75% - 80% of what the individual organizations had requested and to try to calculate a way to increase it to a more fulsome outcome.

Supervisor Scott reiterated that Supervisor Heinz stated the request for funding could be for a different amount and pointed out that the Prosperity Initiative Report indicated the County might look at new methodologies and approaches for determining Outside Agency funding so that they were aligned with the goals of the Prosperity Initiative. He asked if Supervisor Heinz would consider amending the item to not have a designated amount and direct County Administration to provide a recommendation of an amount based on the potential reconfiguration of Outside Agency funding.

Supervisor Heinz responded that he was open to that change.

Supervisor Scott seconded the change.

Chair Grijalva inquired if the funding amount would be for a minimum of \$600,000.00. She explained that the current agencies providing services regularly requested almost double or surpassed the amount the County could provide. She stated that the needs were clearly there and that perhaps there could be an opportunity for increased funding to change some of the social service categories for specific targeting. She recalled shifts being made in the past which caused confusion about where agencies fell in the categories. She stated that it would be important to receive feedback from the committee on where this could go. She suggested the item be postponed to the following meeting or January 9, 2024. She added that maybe the request might be for \$1 million, but that could be figured out and she did not want it to impact any other County funded programs because it was a risk that had been encountered.

Supervisor Heinz stated that the item could be postponed to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 9, 2024.

Supervisor Scott stated that if Chair Grijalva's suggestion to continue the item was in the form of a motion, he would second it because he did not want to attach a certain amount to outside agencies until more was known about the need and how their funding could be reconfigured based on the Prosperity Initiative.

Supervisor Christy commented that if the item would postponed until feedback was received, it should also be postponed until District 3 had representation.

Chair Grijalva clarified that both issues coincided with the January 9, 2024 meeting.

Supervisor Christy questioned what would happen with property taxes and the road repair priorities if it was passed. He stated that the County continued to spend more money and would request feedback on how much to spend without representation.

Supervisor Heinz commented that since his tenure on the Board, hundreds of millions of dollars had been spent on road repair. He explained that this item was for \$600,000.00 for 70 to 80 possible different organizations to do really great work within the community. He explained that much of the work was in District 3 and had previously been supported by Supervisor Bronson. He reiterated the County had funded an impressive amount of money for road repair even though it was not enough, and more was needed, but the amount being requested was not a huge amount that would take away from road repair.

Supervisor Scott stated that in addition to the points made by Supervisor Christy, he also wanted more feedback regarding how additional funding for outside agencies was aligned with the goals of the Prosperity Initiative and how the additional funding would impact the rest of the budget. He added that budgetary discussions were underway and more information would be available by January, but he felt that all these factors were something the Board needed to be aware of before they made a decision.

A substitute motion was made by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 9, 2024, until the requested information had been provided to the Board. Upon the vote, the substitute motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

7. Board of Supervisors, District 3

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding an update on the Board of Supervisors, District 3 vacancy.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that the following individuals submitted their letters of interest, resume, financial disclosure statement and conflict of interest form for consideration as a candidate for the vacancy for Board of Supervisors, District 3: Brian Johnson, Kristen Randall, Joe Machado, April Ignacio, Matthew Kopeck, Jennifer Allen, Edgar Soto and Sylvia Lee. She explained that the Recorder's Office verified that each candidate was registered to vote, resided in District 3, over the age of 18 and registered as a Democrat. She stated that the Human Resources (HR) Department was in the process of conducting background checks on all the candidates and each candidate had been notified that they must respond to the email from AccuSource in order to initiate the process and those results were pending. She explained that if requested, the Clerk's Office would work with the League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson (LWVGT) on an upcoming virtual public forum and that the information would be provided once it was available. She stated that the Board intended to make the appointment at their meeting on December 19, 2023, with the new Board member participating in their first meeting on January 9, 2024.

Supervisor Christy asked how the process was proceeding for the December 19th date.

Chair Grijalva replied that there would be a forum before that date and that the LWVGT was concerned with the number of candidates because their forums usually lasted an hour, and they suggested splitting the groups into two forums of four participants.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the LWVGT would conduct the forum and if it would be conducted in the Board Hearing Room.

Chair Grijalva clarified the forum would be conducted virtually. She explained that the Clerk had requested extending the forum to an hour and a half so that all candidates could participate in one event at the same time. She explained that the LWVGT did not have the Information Technology capacity to run the forum so the County would utilize their platform to host the event, but the LWVGT would conduct the forum.

Supervisor Christy asked if the background checks posed a timing issue and if they would be conducted in a timely fashion.

Ms. Manriquez explained that HR had informed her that it usually took a week for the results, but it was dependent on the candidate initiating the process and also when the information was received from the other agency. She stated that it could take longer than anticipated.

Supervisor Christy asked if a candidate did not participate in or delayed the background check, and if it was not generated by December 19th, would that disqualify the candidate.

Ms. Manriquez responded that decision would be at the discretion of the Board.

Chair Grijalva explained that an email was sent to every candidate from AccuSource and the Clerk had also called each individual candidate and asked them to respond to that email so that the process could be generated. She stated that if the candidate did not initiate the process, then the Board could discuss that issue on December 19th. She stated that if the candidate delayed the process, it would take HR longer to complete their process. She added that there was ample time unless there was an outlying issue.

Supervisor Christy stated that there might be some candidates that indicated their intention of being a placeholder for the seat and asked if it would be more expeditious to separate the forums for placeholders versus actual contenders.

Chair Grijalva expressed her concern of splitting up the forum over two days because allegations could be made that it was not equal or not the same forum. She stated that it would be ideal if the LWVGT could extend their time to 90 minutes instead of 60 minutes. She explained that it would not be as robust, and they would not be able to delve deep into questions, but at least it would give the community an opportunity to hear from every candidate on how they presented themselves in public. She added that her office would individually conduct virtual 30-minute interviews with all the applicants. She asked if any other members would like to discuss their individual processes.

Supervisor Scott stated that he would follow the same process he used when the Board made legislative vacancy appointments. He explained that his office sent questions to candidates in advance and would be meeting with them individually. He explained each candidate could choose whether to have an in-person, phone, or online meeting. He stated the questions sent were general in nature as he indicated at the prior Board meeting and read them aloud.

Chair Grijalva added that she had also sent questions to each of the candidates since time was limited.

Supervisor Heinz stated that his office set up 30-minute remote, Zoom, or Microsoft Teams meetings with each candidate and would conduct two rounds of interviews and for those that succeeded would meet with him for 45 minutes to an hour. He stated that it was important for each candidate to know that every one of them could

potentially be voted for by all Board members. He stated that he was concerned with Supervisor Scott's concern if a candidate also wanted to run for a full term in the next election and he did not think the Board could restrict that. He stated that it was a first amendment right and that anyone appointed to the seat who stated they would not run could then change their mind and file their statement of interest. He explained that he had multiple other jobs, the candidates, Board members and their staff were all very busy and he did not want to waste anyone's time. He stated that if one or two Board members would not vote or refuse to vote for someone who had indicated they would potentially run for a full term then that information needed to be conveyed at this time. He felt that the time it would take to prepare for his own interviews would not be conducive if five of the candidates truly had no pathway to garner enough votes from the Board to fill the seat. He stated that potentially a motion could be made for a specific consideration because he felt there would not be a consensus of three or more due to the composition of the Board. He added that the Clerk also had a vote. He stated candidates should be informed because when he sought appointments in the past it was a very long and arduous process, and it would be disappointing to find out there was no chance in being appointed due to something they had limited control over.

Supervisor Christy stated that his office was gathering material and interest letters, reviewing information, and receiving feedback from other community members as to the individuals and would prepare questions to be asked at the December 19th meeting.

Chair Grijalva clarified that generally not all the candidates would attend the Board meeting on December 19th and asked who the questions would be directed to.

Supervisor Christy responded that if an opportunity arose where a specific candidate was favored by other Board members, he could ask his colleagues on the Board questions which would be helpful. He explained that he had not been approached by any of the applicants, but took interest in those who would contact him and would reach out in various ways to make a decision or not.

Chair Grijalva stated that historically Supervisor Christy had not voted on appointments that had been Democratic. She asked if Supervisor Christy had not committed to voting.

Supervisor Christy responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott stated that he had never indicated from the dais, nor in any other context that he would not consider candidates who sought interest in a term in their own right, but he would ask the question. He felt it was a question the Board should consider but that was not his position, and he would not meet with candidates if he would not consider them for the appointment.

Chair Grijalva indicated that she hoped the LWVGT would agree to extend their forum to an additional 30 minutes so that the Board could have one evening with all candidates. She explained that the questions would not be delved into too deeply

and that each candidate would get a few minutes of introductions, closing statements and time to answer questions from Board members and the public. She stated that the Clerk would provide information to the Board once she had a confirmed date for the forum.

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

8. Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona Presentation

Presentation by Malea Chavez, Chief Executive Officer of the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona, to provide an update on the Community Food Bank and an overview of the services it offers. (District 5)

Malea Chavez, Chief Executive Officer, Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona, stated that she was joined by her entire team and other colleagues and partners such as Tom McKinney from Interfaith Community Services (ICS) and Carlos Valles from Sahuarita Food Bank. She provided a slideshow presentation and explained that the food bank had been around since 1975 and were one of only two hundred nationally recognized food banks as part of the Feeding America Food Bank Network. She explained that being part of the network required certain criteria and expectations such as size, warehouse space, fleet, and their ability to move food throughout a whole region. She stated that in Arizona there were four Feeding America recognized food banks. She stated that the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona covered the five southernmost counties of Arizona, St. Mary's Food Bank in Phoenix, United Food Bank in Mesa and the Yuma Community Food Bank. She stated that in 2018 the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona was named the Feeding America Food Bank of the Year and hoped they could get there again. She highlighted figures, which had also been discussed in the Prosperity Initiative and stated that 1 in 10 adults and 1 in 7 children in Arizona faced hunger insecurity adding that current numbers showed that it was 1 in 6 children, which had not yet been published by Feeding America. She stated that Arizona was tied in the nation for ninth place for food insecurity for children and expressed concern that the numbers were very disturbing and also part of the reason they continued to provide services. She explained that in Arizona about 750,000 individuals experienced food insecurity which impacted 260,000 children. She stated that over the last year Pima County had an increase of 25% in food insecurity. She explained that they were moving toward a very data informed culture and ensured they were tracking the information as best as possible so that they could be strategic in how to attack these issues and meet the communities. She explained that their locations encompassed five counties, including Pima, Santa Cruz, Cochise, Graham, and Greenlee which were the Marana Food Bank, the Tucson location with several other locations including the Caridad Community Kitchen, Green Valley, Amado, Nogales and Wilcox. She added they also had mobile distributions which impacted the entire five counties and highlighted their bulk distributions made up mostly of rural communities and they had 6 to 8 mobile distributions in Pima County. She stated that they had almost 400 partner agencies and were adding additional partners for their Child Nutrition Program and local pantries, school embedded programs and new mobile distributions. She provided an overview of the Pima County Outside

Agency Grants they received which mostly focused on emergency food relief, child nutrition programs based in food pantries at schools, libraries and after school programs. She added they also had central meal kitchens and a culinary arts training program. She stated that the decision to cut ties with the location in Marana was shown in the numbers and it had been under discussion for four years and especially as they started to look at meeting people where they were. She explained that they looked at the overall numbers served throughout the entire County and then they looked at the numbers that they served in Marana City proper as well as the surrounding areas. She stated that Marana's heat map showed the most concentrated numbers of families and households there were coming for services were in Marana, Avra Valley, and Picture Rocks. She explained that based on their analysis of who was served, how many served and what was needed throughout the community, it was determined that it was better for them to reach people where they were which included a mobile distribution model. She stated that moving towards that model meant providing mobile distribution in Avra Valley and Picture Rocks. She stated that their initial plan was in partnership with ICS, to provide the mobile distribution on the same footprint and location where their current location was in Marana. She explained that after discussions with the Town of Marana and the City Mayor, they made the decision that it was a good partnership opportunity with the Sahuarita Food Bank to be able to take on continued operation of the Marana location. She stated that they initially had a plan in place to move to a more mobile distribution model and had partnerships aligned with that plan including their partnership with the Marana Family Resource Center, to ensure they were able to distribute the Emergency Food Program Assistance Boxes and operate their pantry. She stated that they were also working with other local pantries to be able to increase those services as needed. She stated that they welcomed new partners to ensure they met the communities where they were. She explained that their mission and goal was to be able to support and provide support in communities so they could serve their own communities. She explained that the communities knew what was needed and the Community Food Bank could not be in all five counties at the same time, serving all the different various needs of each community due to them being very distinct and different depending on the region. She went over the services that would be continued in Marana, which included the Family Resource Center partnership with the school district and the Child Nutrition Program. She stated that the Child Nutrition Program provided summer breakfast programs for rural communities, and they enhanced the program in the past summer and moved towards a model to ensure that all rural sites were able to provide more access. She stated that it was challenging in rural communities for people to get consistent breakfast services and meals that they normally got during the school year. She added they also changed the model so that they could deliver food or individuals could pick up food once a week for the entire week versus having to come multiple times throughout the week. She explained that they tried to cut down on the challenges, barriers, high cost of transportation and access that rural communities faced. She stated that they would continue with their mobile distributions in Avra Valley and Picture Rocks. She stated that they had a wonderful experience at an event at both locations where they received feedback from the community acknowledging that it was helpful to have them so close in proximity to their homes and the ability to tap into the new resources and communities. She stated they had

new volunteers that were from each of those communities that were able to give back to their own neighbors and be a part of the process. She stated that they were trying to tie them to other senior meals services and ensuring it was accessible and aligned with the hours of distribution when school was released. She stated that they would learn as they moved forward in order to be impactful and as relevant to people as possible. She stated that three different areas focused on to help end hunger and poverty were health and food, education and community development.

Supervisor Chirsty stated that the presentation showed the immense need in the community and the persistence that it maintained itself and the costs involved. He stated that the food bank was continuously looking for donations and volunteers and questioned why the Community Food Bank Southern Arizona had made a \$50,000.00 political donation to a political campaign.

Ms. Chavez responded that was before her time as CEO and could not answer why that had been done, but stated this was not something they would currently do. She added that their Board made a very clear resolution that indicated that was not how their money would be spent moving forward.

Supervisor Scott thanked Ms. Chavez and the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona for working closely with the Town of Marana and the Marana Unified School District to determine the areas of need. He stated that he appreciated Mr. McKinney for being present and working with outstanding organizations. He asked what the Community Food Bank and their colleagues would determine to be measures of success for the new methods of distributing food in and around the Town of Marana.

Ms. Chavez explained that there was a number of people that may have a Marana residency that would drive to the Tucson Country Club location or the Green Valley location because they had a different model of distribution and they also saw an increase going to ICS. She stated that their idea was that people would go where it was closer, where it was more convenient and where they were able to get their needs met, which was their measure of success. She stated that they would track their numbers to be able to determine need. She stated that with the Sahuarita Food Bank taking over the day-to-day operation of the Marana Food Bank Resource Center, they could review those numbers because they would continue to supply the communities with the Emergency Food Relief Programs. She stated that through their annual surveys as well as their client voices and community engagement, they hoped to continue to receive feedback from the community to really continue to learn what was best going to serve the communities.

Supervisor Scott asked how they would maintain ongoing communications with town officials, both Town Manager and Mayor and Council in terms of how they assessed the needs of their constituents.

Ms. Chavez answered that they had not been a part of those discussions to set those measurements and/or goals. She explained that they previously worked with them when they provided notice of their plans for the transition. She stated that they

had since started working closely with Sahuarita Food Bank, but were more than happy to stay engaged and figure out ways at which their data points could help.

Supervisor Scott asked if there was anything the Board could do, especially through the auspices of community Navigators from Community and Workforce Development, to be of assistance or support to these new arrangements.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that there were ways to support them, and she would pledge that County staff work together with all the food banks on how the County could become engaged and involved.

Supervisor Scott requested updates be provided to the Board when more information and data was available.

Chair Grijalva stated that the presentation highlighted the need and that it was staggering that there had been a 25% increase since July of this year. She added that it highlighted the urgency for the Board and the food bank to work together and collaborate to help the families and communities. She explained that there had been a continual demand for services that had increased. She thanked Ms. Chavez for working with other food banks in the community and for clarifying any misconceptions.

This item was informational only. No Board action was taken.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

9. Medical and Dental Insurance for County Employees - Fiscal Year 2024/25

Staff recommends approval of the recommendations detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated December 5, 2023.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, provided a presentation and stated this item was regarding medical and dental fees for employees for the following year and also included the healthy lifestyle premium discounts. She explained that the background materials indicated significant increases in costs for medical and pharmacy services, and as a result, a proposed increase in what employees would pay was recommended. She went over the 2024 proposed medical rates for the employee portions per pay period, which were reviewed and proposed by the health trust. She added that about 10 years ago, the County became self-funded, and it has been managed as such since then. She stated that the dental program did not include a proposed increase. She explained that individuals had an opportunity to participate in a variety of healthy living opportunities that offered points to receive premium discounts depending upon the number of points received or the number of activities completed. She explained that the current program offered a maximum discount of \$35.00 per pay period and they would like to increase that amount to \$50.00 due to the increase in health benefit costs. She explained that participation required going online periodically and monitor a variety of healthy lifestyle choices, exercise active activities, etcetera, to achieve a healthy lifestyle, which was believed to decrease

the actual cost of an individual employee to the healthcare system. She added those who participated in the healthy lifestyle plan for the reporting year of March 2024 through February 2025 would be effective in July 2025. She explained that the fourth element of the recommendation was to continue the County's HSA contribution provided each year to employees for a period of time, so they could develop their health savings account which was part of the high deductible plan. She stated the County had provided this for many years and proposed to continue the \$1,000.00 for an individual and \$2,000.00 for the family allocated to these individuals in their health savings account on a bi-weekly pay period basis. She reiterated the four elements for consideration were an increase in lifestyle points, increase in medical premium equivalents, continuation of HSA contributions and continuation of the same dental premiums with no increase.

Chair Grijalva asked if the increase from \$35.00 to \$50.00 would be per pay period or per month.

Ms. Leshar responded it would be per pay period.

Supervisor Christy stated that his office had been told by County employees that whenever there was a wage increase it was followed by a benefit cost increase. He asked how he should respond to those employees.

Ms. Leshar responded that she could re-review the data from the past five years for increases to health premiums yearly, however, there had not been increases to employee pay. She stated that she would provide a side-by-side comparison to the Board, but they were separate activities. She explained the Board had approved a variety of ways in which to increase salaries, whether it be by a 1% increase for all employees or \$1,000.00 per person. She added that the Health Care Benefits Trust Board (HCBTB) had made recommendations regarding the amount of the fees. She stated they were separate processes and had no purposeful or thoughtful connection between the two activities and she needed to review it historically to show whether they may have aligned.

Supervisor Christy appreciated Ms. Leshar's offer, but it was not necessary however, he would refer those types of calls to the County Administrators' Office.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was helpful to note that the current rates versus the proposed rates and the County portion was also increasing. She explained that the cost for health care was increasing, and Pima County had some of the lowest rates for the types of benefits offered. She stated that she recommended employment with the County because it was a wonderful place to work and with good, affordable benefits compared to others which were more significant. She stated that the presentation highlighted how the County's contribution had also increased.

Ms. Leshar explained that 86% of health care provided to every employee at any rate was for the employer portion.

Supervisor Heinz stated the County had done an amazing job for the past two years to implement the new compensation package to bring it closer to the private sector to retain talent and to respect all the hard work contributed by County employees. He asked if they could go back to the drawing board and provide more options or scenarios because he felt it was unsustainable for the County. He stated that when the compensation and salaries started to align more with private sector numbers, then more could be borne by employees instead of the County. He asked if the County would continue to need to increase costs \$5 to \$6 million yearly. He reiterated that the plan was not sustainable and he supported the County covering as much of the costs as possible, but the County also had to be responsible and continue with road repairs, affordable housing and the Prosperity Initiative.

Chair Grijalva stated that she respectfully disagreed because the County completed a classification and compensation package that put employees where they were supposed to be and she would hate for the County to put more burden on employees to offset it. She expressed her appreciation that increases were continuing and the idea of increasing the wellness points and encouraging employees to participate to make them healthier and utilize less benefits. She stated that she could support moving forward with the proposed rates and possibly additional discussions if needed for adjustments. She added that she had received calls from employees opposed to an increase for the proposed nominal amount.

Ms. Leshner explained that the rates and proposed recommendations came from the HCBTB, whose members were appointed by Board members to review data. She stated they had been trying to find a balance of how to ensure they had a four-month reserve in the funds to keep the minimum amount off the backs of the employees. She explained that if the Board were to adopt the proposed recommendations, the HCBTB could be directed to discuss increased rates or a variety of models and since the County would not increase the healthy lifestyle points until the next fiscal year in 2025, they could come back next year with different models.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the following recommendations and as detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated December 5, 2023:

1. Increase offering up to \$50.00 per pay period for participating in the HLPD program beginning in the reporting year March 1, 2024 through February 28, 2025, effective July 1, 2025, as detailed in Table 2
2. Medical premium equivalents increased as detailed in Table 3.
3. Continue County HSA contributions as detailed.
4. Dental premiums as detailed in Tables 4 and 5.

No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz inquired about the top three pharmaceutical expenses.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that he did not have the

information at this time, however, psychiatric medications, chronic disease medications and anti-neoplastic, as well as those kinds of medications that were immune system modulating were always the County's top expenditure categories for pharmacy, which had been a consistent trend for the last five or six years.

Chair Grijalva stated that pharmaceutical costs had increased significantly. She added that her children's allergy medication now had a cost and previously had not.

Supervisor Scott stated that the reserve kept in the HCBTB was a minimum of four months of projected claims and expenses. He asked why the HCBTB decided on a four-month reserve.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would provide the Board with more information, but recalled that one of the concerns was that the County had to provide general fund dollars to right side the funds. She explained that there had not been a specific amount that was determined by the Board and had fluctuated in ways that made it uncomfortable and as they worked with CBIZ and their consultants, they arrived at the four-month recommendation.

Chair Grijalva stated that with the County moving to a self-insurance model with the trust it probably saved money and was able to keep a robust coverage because other plans considered in the past were incredibly expensive and reduced the number of benefits and she was glad the County had moved to that model.

Supervisor Scott commented that as they ensured the reserve stayed at that level which he thought had led to a 10% or 11% increase, and the other half was due to higher claims in the medical and pharmaceutical realms, and the concern that the County's overall population was aging, which had also been heard during the classification and compensation study, he would also like to know whether the County anticipated higher claim trends to continue moving forward.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 4-0.

10. **Prosperity Initiative Report and Proposed Board of Supervisors Policy**

Staff recommends the following:

1. Acceptance of the Prosperity Initiative Report.
2. Adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy No. E 36.2 - Reducing Generational Poverty and Improving Individual and Community Wealth.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that this item had extraordinary results and incredible effort done for over a year, which involved individuals working with the community and meeting with all the incorporated jurisdictions, letters had been received from businesses and philanthropic groups and others discussing this issue. She added that over the last year the Board had received quarterly reports and she introduced Bonnie Bazata and Nicole Fyffe who had led those efforts on the incredible work done.

Bonnie Bazata, Community and Workforce Manager, Community and Workforce Development, provided a slideshow presentation and stated that historically Pima County had high rates of poverty and across the United States (U.S.) children were disproportionately affected by poverty. She explained that there were many that showed how poverty impacted the community, but the Child Opportunity Index showed a deeper and more pervasive problem, which used 29 different indicators for child development and well-being. She stated that a research group called diversitydatakids.org mapped 100 metro areas in the U.S. and Tucson was in the bottom 10 for areas of low opportunity and for the concentration of children in the areas. She stated it was important because high poverty neighborhoods contributed to the conditions that made it more difficult to break the cycle. She stated that on average, a child who grew up in a low-income family experienced worse outcomes than a child from a higher income in virtually every area and research had shown that the weight of causal evidence indicated that income poverty itself caused negative child outcomes especially when poverty occurred early in childhood and/or persisted throughout a large portion of childhood. She explained that there was clear research that investing in children gave the County the strongest return on investment. She explained that they used the materials from the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) because of their high standards for reviewing research and recommending policies. She stated that they particularly drew from their report, Reducing Intergenerational Poverty, which they defined as a situation in which children who grew up in families with incomes below the poverty line were themselves poor as adults. She added that among U.S. children born in 1980, one-third of children living in low-income households remained in low-income households in adulthood, and twice the 17% rate found among adults in their 30s who did not grow up in low-income households. She explained that to break the cycle NASEM recommended research indicators that the County also adopted that looked for policies that would improve earnings for parents or for their children as adults, reduce expenses, create opportunities to build and protect assets and improve health and educational attainment. She referred to the slideshow and stated that while it showed that White families were the largest group in poverty, families of color, particularly Black and Native Americans stayed stuck in poverty for generations at a higher rate than White families. She added that this racial disparity showed up across almost all measures reviewed and reflected historic impacts and ongoing racial discrimination in the U.S. She explained that the County needed to move the needle on poverty by going upstream and their approach was often focused on alleviating suffering and there was no argument to reduce those efforts, but if they were able to prevent poverty it would aid the transition for individuals and families and addressed structures and systems in the community, they would have a much better chance of lifting more families out of poverty and reducing the need for those alleviation measures, which was the emphasis on the Prosperity Initiative. She extended her appreciation to City of Tucson Councilmember Lane Santa Cruz who helped launch this effort by inviting her to the Mayor and Council in April 2022, to discuss poverty as the County was emerging from the pandemic. She stated that the Council unanimously voted to have a joint City/County task force and in June of that year the Board considered it, asked for more details, and then came back in November with a plan, which was approved. She explained that the plan was to work regionally to develop a set of policies that would guide long-term efforts to

reduce poverty, improve opportunity and create community wealth. She stated that they were mandated to find evidence-based research that often showed causality, which was a very high bar that would have short and long-term impacts. She explained that the idea was that each local government could adopt or adapt policies that best fit their community circumstances and so they formed a working group that had met monthly with the City and County taking a lead role. She thanked Liz Morales, Assistant City Manager and Allison Miller, Housing and Community Development Office, City of Tucson, who were deeply involved in the effort along with many other City staff. She also thanked the many County staff and departments that participated, with leadership from Nicole Fyffe and also representation from the City of South Tucson, the Towns of Marana, Sahuarita and Oro Valley, as well as the Tucson Indian Center. She explained that because the Initiative was so heavily research-based they brought in two University of Arizona researchers with significant and diverse experience on poverty issues, Dr. Brian Mayer, and Dr. Keith Bentley and thanked them for their support and contributions. She stated the community was rich with experience and insights and they needed to draw on leadership, practitioners and people with lived experiences. She stated that the United Way and Social Venture Partners (SVP) were two organizations that played important roles in the development of the three policies. She explained that her team had met with more than 750 people, in 180 meetings, and had about 70 people locally, as well as State and National experts review and respond to the policies, and they were presented to 12 commissions and councils for their critical feedback. She stated that they also reviewed over 330 research articles, reviewed 33 national policy centers and incorporated information from Jim and Shirley Kaiser's Very Important Opportunity Report and as drew heavily from NASEM as well as Harvard's Opportunity Insights. She stated that they had to find policy that fit their toolbox and much of the research on poverty reduction had application only for state or national level so they had to look at what would work at the local level. She explained they developed 12 guiding principles and highlighted those that focused on whether the policies would target the parts of the community with the greatest need, whether it addressed and mitigated historic inequities, whether it applied both to urban and rural areas and if there were any unintended consequences that the County could anticipate at this stage. She stated they found research and developed 13 policies in three areas: Education, Critical Family Resources and Asset Building and infrastructure Priorities. She stated that they also developed three cross policy strategies important enough and intersected significantly enough with most of the policies that they deserved this special designation. She explained that in the area of Education, they proposed two policies that increased access to quality early childhood childcare and education, and that increased pathways to post-secondary education specifically through the use of children's savings accounts. She further explained that in the area of Critical Family Resources, two were in Housing that increased housing mobility and opportunity and that improved housing stability. She stated two were health related that reduced unintended pregnancies and increased access to health insurance and reduced medical debt. She thanked Kim Van Pelt from the Pima County Health Department for her hard work with these two policies. She stated that the following two were for digital inclusion and workforce that would expand broadband services and address barriers to digital inclusion and prioritize workforce development for underserved

population. She stated that the last five policies were in the category of asset building and infrastructure priorities to improve financial capability, support small businesses, prioritize transportation options to connect disadvantaged communities to jobs and resources to improve job quality for low-income workers and lastly, improve quality of life and opportunity in high poverty areas because the neighborhoods had causal effects on children's long-term outcomes. She explained that the three cross policy strategies would center a two-generation approach, address climate resilience and environmental justice, and prevent and reduce crime. She explained that these positions were researched in depth and placed in the report, which were listed in the Summary and the longer technical briefs in the Appendix. She stated that the 16 areas overlapped and would have a synergistic effect and research showed that bundling policies offered some formidable advantages over an individual program approach and could be much more effective. She stated that the policies together would give the County a strategic framework that would do four important things, guide resource allocation decisions across departments and time, align and better coordinate resources for greater impact, guide grant decisions and make the County more competitive and help identify where they could employ new strategies for greater impact. She stated that if the policies were adopted they would focus on the second phase of implementation, which was to recommend and propose five steps; the first being to scan, analyze, and realign local government operations and investments to best implement the policy with guidance from multi-departmental teams and they met with the Finance Department to discuss how the County could set up a financial tracking system. She stated the second step would be critical to develop metrics to measure impact over time with the acceptance by Urban Institutes Mobility Action Learning Network along with 26 other cities and counties across the country for a year-long technical assistance program to help the County focus on measuring impact, and work with the University of Arizona, which had pledged more faculty and students to work with the County and also look at current metrics and dashboards that were being used as well as how other communities were measuring impact. She stated the third step would be to continue to encourage a regional approach for implementation by regularly engaging with participating local governments and would continue to encourage partnerships with the Tohono O'odham Nation, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Native American organizations and community members because it was known that Native Americans were disproportionately impacted by poverty, but had their own priorities, resources and approaches that the County could support and learn from. She stated that the fourth step was community engagement and support for the development of a multi-sector community-based effort that would run parallel to the Prosperity Initiative, where representatives from business nonprofits, education, philanthropy, and the faith community, as well as neighborhoods and unincorporated parts of Pima County could more widely participate and innovate. She explained that it would take more than government to significantly move the needle on poverty, but government investments could spur public and private sector action. She stated that the final step would be to review policy areas with the Board on a bi-annual basis and report annually on progress. She stated that as Raj Chetty, Harvard Economics Professor, highlighted and showed the importance of the Prosperity Initiative, stated, "The main lesson of our analysis is that intergenerational mobility is a local problem, one

that could potentially be tackled using place-based policies that strengthen economic growth rather than focusing on the individual.” She stated that there was already a significant cost of poverty both to those experiencing it as well as to the wider community, many of the policies had a high return on investment which meant implementing them could be a sound, fiscal decision and was the right thing to do. She indicated that Ms. Leshar had compared the Prosperity Initiative to the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, which had taken two decades to be fully implemented, and as a result, the County’s landscape would be protected for generations to come. She stated that the Prosperity Initiative gave the County an opportunity to be architects of change in a different way for generations to come and asked the Board to imagine the difference the County could make for children and families in 5, 10 or even 20 years and therefore recommended the Board accept the Prosperity Initiative Report and adopt Board Policy No. E 36.2.

Chair Grijalva stated that many of the County’s community partners had let the Board know how invested they were and she was appreciative of the outreach done and for meeting with all supervisorial offices. She stated that this was a very transformational piece of policy that the Board would implement, if approved, and felt it could be a game changer for the County in the same way as the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan.

Supervisor Scott asked if the Board could receive additional details on the partnership that the County would have with the Urban Institute and the Aspen Institute. He stated that although the Board would receive bi-annual updates on the overall progress of the Prosperity Initiative, he requested more regular updates on the work being done with those two entities.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would provide updates on those reports.

Ms. Bazata responded that with the Urban Institute, they had a team comprised of County/City, and three key nonprofit partners, which were the Tucson Indian Center, SVP, and the hope of United Way to be the core team and would continue to engage with everyone else involved in the Initiative as they learned and brought things back from that. She explained that the kickoff would begin in January with the four tracks that could be chosen. She stated they chose the track for measuring impact and would focus their efforts in that area. She stated they were just starting to learn the terms of what the partnership would look like, but they would have a full year of investment to learn more about how the County could best implement these policies and in particular focus on measuring impact. She stated that the Aspen Institute partnership came from SVP that had developed a relationship that focused on the two-generation approach, and they looked forward to learning along with SVP on Aspen Institute’s knowledge and experience because they had a very strong network across the country of organizations, like SVP that were using this two-generation approach.

Supervisor Scott appreciated that they would be working with the Urban Institute on measuring success, and it would be hard to pick a line from the 300 page report that was the most compelling and important, but he had found one. He quoted the line

and stated that he was eager to hear about the partnership with the Urban Institute and what was learned from the other 20 municipalities and counties that would be working with the County to help in terms of measuring success. He requested clarification on what was referred to in the report as priority-based budgeting and how that might be part of the County's implementation steps and how it correlated with the proposed policy.

Ms. Bazata responded that they had met with the Finance Director to discuss priority-based budgeting and Finance had a software program system that would allow them to tag different types of spending within departments that would begin to show what investments the County made over time. She stated that once the upfront work was done to determine what needed to be tagged starting in early 2024, they could then generate reports relatively easily from that.

Supervisor Scott requested additional information on the work the County's Grants Management and Innovation (GMI) Department had in finding more grant opportunities as mentioned in the supporting documents, how it tied into the Federal mandates of the Justice 40 Initiative and how GMI would be working in support of the Prosperity Initiative. He stated that the Board received a presentation at the beginning of the meeting from the Chair and several of the members of the Small Business Commission (SBC) during their annual awards and it was important for the public and the media to know that the SBC unanimously voted in support of the Prosperity Initiative, and they were made up of appointees from each of the supervisorial districts. He stated that the Board also received a letter from the Greater Tucson Metro Chamber of Commerce in support of the Prosperity Initiative and there was a significant number of speakers during Call to the Public who spoke to how this was an economic development measure.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to accept the Prosperity Initiative Report and to adopt Board of Supervisors Policy No. E 36.2. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that he was proud to vote in favor of these items so that the County could move forward with the Prosperity Initiative and these endeavors may be the most significant actions the Board had undertaken as a County government. He stated the challenge of addressing generational poverty which had so many individual and social costs should be a priority at all levels of government and the Board should insist that the County's colleagues at the state and federal levels do their parts to take on all the dire needs and profound concerns associated with generational poverty. He stated the policies came about as the result of extensive and ambitious work led by County staff and thanked the County team that went into creating the Prosperity Initiative and that this was the beginning of a very long and arduous journey. He thanked them for providing the documents to each district office to offer feedback and suggestions for revisions and he was grateful to see his suggestions that dealt with a more fulsome explanation of the three cross policy strategies and the policy addressing college and other postsecondary educational and training opportunities incorporated into the final draft. He stated there were several implementation steps that he suggested revisions and was glad to see them

included. He stated that it was apparent with the implementation steps that the Prosperity Initiative would be a central guiding focus for all the work the County did in the budget and in the monthly financial reports the Board received, and the public would see an emphasis on the values and priorities embedded in the policy document. He stated that it would chart the work the County did within county government and with partners in other jurisdictions based on these policies. He stated that the outreach done within the private and nonprofit sectors would continue so that this work always retained its necessary community wide scope. He added that the public served would rightly expect that they would be able to point to the tangible results of the efforts and the Aspen Institute assistance in determining the metrics for measuring the County's progress had long championed one of the cross policy strategies for the two-generation approach. He explained that one of their standards was to "foster evidence and innovation together" and the people the Board represented would expect them to be true to this standard especially if the Prosperity Initiative was to be so central to everything the County did as a local government. He stated that the Prosperity Initiative represented much more than the Board adopting a set of policies and the means of implementing them, it was a moral undertaking and if the County did it right, it could help to improve the lives of thousands within the community, especially children. He stated the Board should enact the policies, get to work and keep the focus on those who would benefit most from their efforts.

Supervisor Christy stated that he heard how far-reaching this Initiative was, it would involve every aspect in every corner of Pima County and would touch the lives of hundreds of thousands in some way, shape or form. He stated that the Board could discuss what the costs might be at another time, but it was something that would affect every part of the County and every Supervisorial District. He stated that the Board heard terms like, set of priorities, set of policies, community guidelines, a realignment with local governments that just enhanced the fact that this was such a far-reaching pervasive program much like the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan took 20 years before it came to fruition. He stated that the Board had forgotten that there was no representation for 200,000 taxpayers of Pima County in District 3 due to the vacancy to be held accountable one way or the other on this far-reaching communitywide, countywide initiative with no representation and was a form of disenfranchisement and the Board should not act on it until the replacement had been seated and the people of District 3 were represented.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy to postpone the item until the District 3 Supervisor vacancy position was filled. The substitute motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Grijalva stated that this was a historic moment for Pima County and the Prosperity Initiative policy called for collaboration of stakeholders and community to embrace this two-generation approach to reducing poverty. She explained that with it the County could create better opportunities and improved outcomes for working families and it would help create a more thriving community for all. She stated that having represented the County's largest school district for 220 square miles would have a huge impact to so many of the most vulnerable that lived in poverty. She

appreciated Supervisor Christy's concerns but thought that the remaining Board members could not hold up what needed to be done because of the vacancy on the Board. She stated that if they moved forward with postponement they would not be able to introduce it again until January and it was a project that had been going on for a year and Supervisor Bronson had an opportunity to provide feedback and she believed that any input from the Board was incorporated into this document.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

ATTRACTIONS AND TOURISM

11. Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy No. D 31.2, Review of Requests and Monitoring of Contracts for Discretionary Funds Allocated to Outside Agencies for Attractions and Tourism.

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

Supervisor Christy stated in the background material indicated no additional fiscal impact was anticipated, but also indicated that Attractions and Tourism should be funded for the staff needed to review proposals and prepare recommendations, to write and monitor contracts and perform other duties related to the program. He stated there was no physical impact on one hand, but should be funded for a host of other functions and he requested clarification.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the Board may want to consider Minute Item Nos. 11 and 13 together and that Minute Item No. 13 was a revision to the Board policy regarding the review and request for the monitoring of outside agency funds that would sunset at the end of this year, so it required changes and at the same time, it was recognized that the Attractions and Tourism Department also allocated outside agency funds every other year, as well as Community and Workforce Development (CWD). She stated that Attractions and Tourism had been in the business of doing the same sort of work that was done by CWD and wanted to provide the Board with the same overview of the Board policy governing Attractions and Tourism. She stated that currently there were staff in the department that reviewed and worked with the Outside Agency Citizen Review Committee (OACRC) and provided staff functions. She explained that the adoption of the board policy did not increase any of the costs, but simply provided a board policy and direction for something that had been occurring and under the guidelines provided by the board policy for CWD and wanted to ensure that both were governed.

Supervisor Christy asked what problem was being solved for both policies.

Ms. Leshner answered that it had been thought by the Board historically that there needed to be board policy governing how staff made decisions and recommendations related to the use of outside funds. She explained that there

could be an excess of \$3 million and the policy that had been in place for a long time under CWD and would be sunseting at the end of this year. She stated that the problem they believed was being resolved was that the Board historically hoped to have some policy guidelines/direction over how outside agencies were processed by County staff and that the policy would not sunset. She explained that when the County recognized several years ago that Attractions and Tourism broke off and was separately handling outside agency funds while being governed by the other policy, but did not specifically have one, so they were trying to solve it with the addition of a new board policy.

Supervisor Christy asked what was wrong with the sunseting of the policy.

Ms. Leshar responded that the policy was governing how staff moved through the process to receive, evaluate, and make recommendations about outside agencies to the Board. She explained that if it were to sunset there would not be any board policy or board direction regarding how outside agencies reviewed those dollars. She stated that would be a policy decision of the Board if they chose to let a policy expire and sunset, it would then be up to County staff to make determinations the County needed to provide those recommendations to the Board.

Chair Grijalva made a friendly amendment to the motion to include the approval of Minute Item No. 13 with this item. Supervisor Christy accepted the friendly amendment, as the seconder to the motion.

Supervisor Christy asked if the process required periodic reviews.

Ms. Leshar responded that there were two buckets of dollars, one for Attractions and Tourism funding and the other for CWD funding and the current process was that each had a cycle of two years that occurred every other year.

Supervisor Christy asked if that process came to the Board.

Ms. Leshar answered in the affirmative and stated that the outside agency met annually, one year they reviewed CWD bucket of dollars and made recommendations to the Board and the following year they reviewed Attractions and Tourism funding and made those recommendations to the Board. She stated that the process of how the OACRC was established and moved through the process and worked with the community to make recommendations to the Board, it was what was governed by the policy that was set to sunset. She stated that it was a policy decision of the Board if they chose not to have a policy regarding that matter.

Supervisor Christy stated that he believed there should be a sunset element to the policies and it should remain and not being removed as it was in Minute Item No. 13, and that this policy should come back to the Board for periodic review, but it seemed like the County wanted to remove that.

Ms. Leshar stated if the Board wanted to add a sunset date for both of the policies that would be a policy decision.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the Board had the option to look back at this policy and decide whether it was working or not working. She stated that the whole process by which the Board appointed people to be on the OACRC to review funding was the policy that was sunseting.

Supervisor Christy commented that the policy had been established since 1991.

Chair Grijalva asked if the Board wanted to make the decisions on what organizations were going to be allocated funding. She stated that the grant review process went to the OACRC and she would not want to change that because those representatives were community members appointed by the Board. She felt that they had done a good job reviewing many grants and wanted the process to continue and this was to ensure that they continued to have an outside agency committee that reviewed the funding.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

12. One-Time-Only Outside Agency Award Request for Fiscal Year 2023/2024

Staff recommends approval of a one-time-only award increase of \$21,510.00 to Youth On Their Own (YOTO Stipends Program) in the Youth, Young Adult and Family Support Service category.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

13. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. E 36.1, Review of Requests and Monitoring of Contracts for Discretionary Funds Allocated to Outside Agencies for Economic Development, Health and Social Services.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 11, for discussion and action on this item.)

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

14. Final Plat Without Assurances

P23FP00012, Uptown, Lots 1, 2, 8, 10, 13, 20, 23, 26 and 29. (District 1)

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

15. Justice of the Peace - Judicial Productivity Credits

In accordance with A.R.S. §22-125, the Supreme Court has provided the Judicial Productivity Credits for Fiscal Year 2023. Staff recommends approval of the salary adjustments for the Justices of the Peace, effective January 1, 2024, as listed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated November 13, 2023.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

16. Quarterly Report on Collections

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending September 30, 2023.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

PROCUREMENT

17. The Board of Supervisors on November 21, 2023, continued the following:

Contract

ADP, Inc. (formerly ADP, L.L.C.), Amendment No. 11, to provide for HR/Payroll, benefits and eTime management, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (MA-PO-13-202) Administering Department: Human Resources

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

Supervisor Christy stated that he had asked for the continuation of this item because he felt the contract was not posted properly due to the redactions it had initially included and that issue had been addressed, but he was confused on the scope of work. He indicated that the commencement date was November 21, 2023, but it also stated that the work was completed by ADP in September and asked why it was being brought before the Board now and why it was retroactive to November when the scope of work was supposed to begin in July and September.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded this was a no cost amendment and it would have been timelier in November when it was first brought before the Board. She explained that this was to include language in the contract for additional items of work that was done by ADP.

Supervisor Christy commented that ADP was a vendor and asked if they had not been paid for work they completed and this contract would take care of that.

Ms. Leshar responded that ADP had been paid for the work they had done and this was a no cost amendment that amended the contractual language. She stated this contract began in 2013 and included various amendments and ADP had been consistently paid.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 4-0.

REAL PROPERTY

18. Conveyance of Dedicated Drainageway

Staff recommends approval of conveyance of dedicated drainageway to the Town of Marana, for Ina Road to the Cañada Del Oro Wash located at Section 6, T13S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 3)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

County Attorney

19. Tucson Unified School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for firearm safety at TUSD schools, no cost (CTN-PCA-24-77)

Laura Conover, Pima County Attorney, stated that this was an intergovernmental agreement between the County and Tucson Unified School District (TUSD). She thanked Chair Grijalva for taking the lead in the last couple of years with helping the County Attorney's Office to expand and ensure a more impactful gun lock program by getting the County into the Crossroads of the West where they had been tabling at gun shows and that allowed them to distribute 18,000 gun lock handouts last year and over 13,000 as of the third quarter of the current year. She thanked TUSD Board Member, Jennifer Eckstrom, for her idea in reaching out to the County Attorney's Office to start a gun lock education campaign at TUSD and provide every TUSD School with 10 gun locks, each school would know how to strategically and intuitively hand out those gun locks and to have the highest impact when talking about children accessing firearms in the area of either crime or suicide.

Jennifer Eckstrom, Board Member, TUSD, stated the idea was to ensure that there was safety in community households with guns and that kids were safe because far too often kids brought guns to schools and if they did not have the lock on that gun then there could be tragedy.

Dr. Gabriel Trujillo, Superintendent, TUSD, thanked the Board for that historic vote on Minute Item No. 10 and that it was a tremendous blow against childhood poverty, not just in TUSD, but throughout Pima County. He stated that poverty did not have a time clock and it did not wait for anyone. He explained that far too often the school

district dealt with the unfortunate business of long-term suspensions and expulsions because of children and young people's unauthorized access to firearms in the home due to lack of education and awareness on behalf of the adults in the home. He stated that sadly and tragically, they sometimes saw injuries and even fatalities from students and students' loved ones and family members because of the irresponsible handling of firearms that were loose and available in the home largely because of education and information not being widely available. He stated that through the partnership with the Pima County Attorney's Office and the support of the Board a real difference in the lives of young people and children was being made by promoting safe and responsible storage of firearms throughout TUSD, the City of Tucson, and the County.

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

Chair Grijalva asked how the gun locks would be distributed or advertised within TUSD.

County Attorney Conover responded that the gun locks were not a giveaway, but included an important conversation and investment in time because often it was not the gun owner who came to grab the gun lock, it was a family member who knew that the gun owner needed to be locking up their gun. She stated their focus was to make the impact better because they wanted it used and the education campaign component at TUSD was going to be critical in how it was available through the Counselor's office, through parent-teacher nights, and in identifying in each individual school where the risk was so that it would have the greatest impact in the homes that needed it the most.

Chair Grijalva stated that an earlier speaker indicated that the program would track gun owners. She asked whether the County was tracking gun locks, if they were collecting addresses and if they knew where these gun locks were going. She stated that she wanted to ensure they cleared up any misinformation.

Ms. Conover responded that this was a pilot program that was approved at TUSD and they would be tracking how many were dispensed to each school and schools that requested additional gun locks. She stated that to get the greatest impact and to have the gun lock used, it needed to be a delicate confidential private conversation with the requester and that was how they could get the locks into the home and get them in use.

Supervisor Christy asked why only ten locks would be given to each TUSD school and stated if it was a robust program every kid would be sent home with a gun lock. He asked who decided which ten children received gun locks, what was the method of criteria for distribution and who would be qualified to receive one of the ten per school for the entire school program. He stated that he received numerous letters from constituents that pointed out that they thought this was political grandstanding.

County Attorney Conover responded that saving even one child's life was worth it and she was willing to take any criticism solely because any criticism was worth saving the life of even one child.

Supervisor Christy asked what the criteria were for the recipient receiving a gun lock, how was it going to be monitored as success, and what were the metrics that the County could point to. He did not understand why each school would only receive 10 gun locks since there was a huge school population.

County Attorney Conover responded that when it came to criteria, it was provided as requested by the schools and that was where the process would start. She explained that if a home requested a gun lock it meant there was a willingness and an engagement to want to handle the firearm more safely. She stated that there was no end to the volume they could and should do as the County had a proliferation of firearms and firearm offenses and crimes that occurred. She stated that the County was 20% down on homicides from last year and 35% down from the year before, but that only gave them the bandwidth to dig into the non-lethal firearm events that occurred last year and very carefully track that data. She stated that in her office she was most often on the receiving end when a file was opened, meaning harm had already occurred out in the community so anything they could do to intervene and interrupt violence at the outset that was where they wanted to be. She explained that the data was very clear, especially in the teenage community, and especially in the last three years, suicide, suicidal ideation, and suicidal tendencies were through the roof and if a gun was properly stored and locked in the home that could be enough interruption on that dark day for that kid to save that child's life.

Supervisor Christy asked if 10 locks per school would achieve that result.

County Attorney Conover stated she had no idea what ten locks would do because it was a pilot program, and it was important to track the flow of requests coming in, but would be prepared to resupply more if 10 gun locks were not enough at a particular school.

Supervisor Christy asked who paid for the gun locks.

County Attorney Conover responded that proper use of the taxpayer dollar was always first and foremost and important and this was an appropriate use of the Anti-Racketeering Revolving Fund.

Supervisor Scott asked what information or training was provided to Principals and other school staff in terms of providing information to parents about the gun locks and the procedure for dispensing them.

Dr. Trujillo responded that TUSD featured the region's only Armed School Safety Force comprised of 20 highly trained former law enforcement experts, many of them retired from Arizona Department of Public Safety, Tucson Police Department (TPD) and other law enforcement agencies. He explained that these individuals were experts in the use of these locks, and they would be a big part of the training

component when parents requested the locks. He stated that TUSD had School Safety Officers that served designated schools throughout the district, and they would take the lead on the training. He stated that in terms of promotion of the opportunity to use these locks, if the item passed, they would use all of their social media platforms, school websites and their school Community Liaison positions, which were positions that interfaced directly with the public that would make this opportunity available to parents in the community, that way any parent could request the lock and once requested, they would utilize School Safety Officers to interface with the inquiring parent to ensure that the parent understood how to operate the lock, safe usage of the lock, as well as other highly effective firearm safety tips that TUSD School Safety Officers were excited to share with the public.

Supervisor Heinz stated that this was excellent program and suspected the uptake would be more than 10 gun locks per school and asked if the Board could anticipate some feedback as to how things were going and how many were being distributed.

Ms. Conover answered that she would be more than happy to report back on the program.

Chair Grijalva hoped it was successful because the County had other districts and if this was something that was promising in TUSD, the County could expand to other districts.

County Attorney Conover stated that TUSD was the first district to come up with the idea and had the request and she hoped the program was successful.

Supervisor Scott asked what the criteria for success of the pilot program in TUSD would be to cause her to then reach out to some of the other County school districts. He stated that given the role that Dr Trujillo had in mind for TUSD School Safety and knowing that most of the other County districts did not have a School Safety Department, he asked how the same type of training could be provided in those other districts.

County Attorney Conover replied that they did not need to wait to measure success and that reaching out to the other districts to inform them that that they had launched this program was a good idea. She explained if one lock saved one life then their efforts were worth it, especially when it came to children who should not have access to these firearms. She stated that it was incumbent upon them to work with each school district separately, with professional Counselors and School Resource Officers, but other school districts may take a different role on who messaged and reiterated that they had found that confidential private delicate conversations was how to get it done.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had overwhelmingly heard from TPD and Deputies in the Sheriff's Department that their greatest concern was the access to guns from young people and it was very scary and something that had resulted in tragedies all over the nation. She hoped that it was incredibly successful and thought it was something that Dr Trujillo could take to the Arizona Superintendents Organizations

and the other National organizations that he was a part of because it was something that every community dealt with.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 4-0.

Facilities Management

20. Dave Eckenrode, d.b.a. Daveck Properties, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide a lease for Adult Probation West located at 3781 N. Highway Drive, extend contract term to 12/31/27 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$516,325.96 (CT-FM-18-14)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

Procurement

21. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-203, Amendment No. 2, Airwave Communication Enterprises, Inc. and Arizona Emergency Products, Inc., d.b.a. American Emergency Products, to provide for emergency code equipment parts and services. This amendment adds two (2) additional contractors, Lamoine Waterhouse, d.b.a. Complete Auto Restore, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ) and The Specialist on Oracle, Inc. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ) to this contract as backup providers. No cost. Administering Department: Fleet Services and Sheriff.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

22. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-18-349, Amendment No. 7, Senergy Petroleum, L.L.C., to provide for gasoline, diesel and diesel exhaust fluid. This amendment extends the termination date to 2/29/24. No additional funds are required. The cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$12,478,384.58 remains the same. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

23. Brown and White, Inc. and Canyon Fence Company, Inc., to provide for a job order master agreement: fencing services, Various Funds, contract amount \$750,000.00 (MA-PO-24-70) Administering Department: Facilities Management

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

24. Arizona Communications Experts, Inc., to provide for Pima County Elections 114SM Fiber Connection (CLMP24) Project, American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State & Local Fiscal Recovery Fund, contract amount \$953,809.00 (CT-IT-24-246) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

Supervisor Christy questioned the use of ARPA funds to establish a connection between the Sheriff's Department and the Elections Department. He also asked about the need for the Elections Department and the Sheriff's Department to be connected when both divisions had their own purpose.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, responded that this contract established fiber for the County to own and that currently the County leased fiber in those two areas. He stated that owning fiber also increased redundancy and explained that there was a time when the County had fiber that was cut out in that area so this contract supported a lot of the work where the County had some issues with leased fiber.

Supervisor Christy asked what the basic driving purpose was to have a connection between the Sheriff's Department and the Elections Department.

Mr. Holmes responded that it was strictly for redundancy purposes.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that in the last year or so County Administration had sent out a note about the Abrams building losing all connection. She explained that the County had a couple of instances where there was encampments with some vandalism, some fires and washes that caused the fiber line to be destroyed and that the County lost connection with the Abrams building. She stated that the Sheriff's Department facility was across the street from Abrams and so the County wanted to establish a County owned fiber connection for that department.

Supervisor Christy asked if the County did not own and maintain their own underground fiber.

Mr. Holmes responded that the County owned the majority of fiber, but that the actual connection had not been owned by the County and this would give the County ownership of that fiber.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 4-0.

Real Property

25. Lazy C. Water Service, to provide for a Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use License for Public Utility Facilities, no cost/25 year term (CTN-RPS-24-71)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

26. LS Cattle Company, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Sands Ranch Management Agreement (File LCP-0085), extend contract term to 12/15/28 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-RPS-24-72)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

27. Robson Ranch Quail Creek, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide an agreement for Effluent Reuse, extend contract term to 11/25/43 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$10,320,000.00/revenue (CTN-WW-22-19)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

28. **Acceptance - Behavioral Health**

Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Amendment No. 1, to provide for improving substance use disorder treatment and recovery outcomes for adults in reentry and amend grant language, no cost (GTAM 24-34)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to approve the item.

29. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the EPA-R-OAR-CAA-23-09 Clean Air Act/Inflation Reduction Act Funding, extend grant term to 6/30/25 and amend grant language, no cost (GTAM 24-30)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the item.

30. **Acceptance - Grants Management and Innovation**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security Federal Emergency Management Agency/Grant Programs Directorate, to provide for the Fiscal Year 2023 Shelter and Services Program (EMW-2023-SP-05067), \$12,093,182.00 (GTAW 24-39)

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 in March 2022 the Board was told that there would be at least \$12 million from the Government that would last from now to March or until it ran out, then the County would need to use the General Fund. He stated that to date, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds were used. He stated that it indicated that the Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) had new funding and inquired about the federal taxpayer money that was supposed to take effect on January 1st.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that a memorandum was provided to the Board and the County had been operating under the Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP), which would be ending in December and the County would then transition to what the Federal Government currently called Shelter and Services Program (SSP). She stated that the difficulty with the new SSP money was that it was much less in numbers of real dollars, and it was much more limited in what the County believed it could pay for. She stated that as the funding had decreased, the County also seen a significant increase in the number of individuals that were brought as legal asylum seekers into County facilities. She stated that her memorandum stated they thought it would be May, then it became April, then March, and that it may be February or into March when the County would have to cease the program. She stated that the \$12 million from EFSP that the County thought would last through December would probably not make it that far because the County was seeing an excess of the number they had previously seen. She explained that as a result, the County would be transitioning to the SSP dollars and would backfill that bucket. She explained that there were two programs that both came through FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and CBP, which was one of the most active of the seven larger agencies that were within DHS.

Supervisor Christy commented that the County would still have an issue with running out of money.

Ms. Leshar answered in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy read the purpose in the background materials and questioned why non-citizens would be received for a temporary period of 45 days. He thought they were only here for a couple of days.

Ms. Leshar responded that the average was 72 hours for all legal asylum seekers and what was listed in the materials and in the memorandum were significant changes happening in the Federal Government and as they began to make a variety of amendments to their processes with CBP and FEMA, and how the White House and everyone was funding the program. She reiterated the County had a 72-hour average and would look to CBP and the DHS to amend that. She stated that they were not aware of what those amendments would be and previously this was a program that had been funded by federal dollars and that when those dollars ran out that would be the end of the program. She stated that the County had no General Fund dollars that had been allocated to the program following the end of the federal dollars. She stated that the County was concerned about being in the

red approximately \$1.2 million, but the SSP dollars that the County would receive could backfill that bucket so that there would not be a requirement for the General Fund to pay those dollars.

Supervisor Christy commented that the County would be in the red \$1.2 million, but the County spent \$4 million per month.

Chair Grijalva asked if it was \$3.1 million.

Ms. Leshar explained that as things moved quickly they had spent \$2 million per month, then it increased to \$3.1 million per month and current projections were in excess of \$4 million per month. She stated that there had been concern if \$12 million would last if the County spent \$3 million per month and at a \$4 million burn rate, that was a different concern and situation. She stated that the concern had always been that any dollar spent be either provided upfront by the federal government or be reimbursed and that the County would not be dipping into the General Fund.

Supervisor Christy inquired why the County was buying the Drexel facility.

Ms. Leshar responded that this had been a very fluid situation and as the dollars decreased the County ensured that every dollar was used and spent in the most cost-effective manner. She explained that the purchase of that facility with \$3.5 million of assistance from the State, was cost-effective because the cost to purchase that facility was \$3.1 million rather than being in excess of \$50,000.00 or \$75,000.00 per month that the County had paid in rent. She stated that the facility was an asset that the County could sell should the program come to an end.

Supervisor Christy stated that the County was purchasing the Drexel Road facility and had \$12 million to last or until the County had to go into the General Fund. He stated it was a tenuous situation and asked if it would be better to say that the County was out of the business and to send them elsewhere.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had gone to Washington, D.C. to request additional assistance and some sort of policy change because the County had taken on a federal responsibility. She commented that what Supervisor Christy had suggested would happen fairly soon, the County would be out of the business since it could no longer be supported and the County could see street releases in the middle of Downtown Tucson, Cochise and Santa Cruz Counties, and in communities that did not have the capacity to support any sort of process and that would be when everyone pointed fingers at each other to blame fault, but the County had taken on the responsibility since 2019, to provide a humanitarian and safe process.

Supervisor Christy stated that it had been a mistake for the County to take on that responsibility.

Chair Grijalva disagreed with Supervisor Christy because street releases would result in individuals that wandered around the community that did not understand

where to go, did not speak English and increased tents all over the place. She stated that the County had not seen street releases in Tucson, but there had been an occasional release in Nogales of 100 people and then shortly thereafter a bus from Casa Alitas provided by the County picked up those people. She stated that none of those communities dealt with anything like what the County would have to deal with.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was on the previous Board and at that time the Board could not wait to get federal money to facilitate this migration so that was a mistake and acknowledged that it caused problems that the County was paying for and now everyone was saying it was a federal problem and inquired why it had not been a federal problem in 2019.

Chair Grijalva responded that it was still a federal problem.

Supervisor Christy stated that the County should have said it was a federal problem and not taken the money.

Chair Grijalva stated that Pima County had the capacity to do it and the prior and current Board had continued to approve funding to provide the services. She stated that it could become an issue, as she stated in D.C., that there was a majority to accept the funding, but once there was no funding the County would have to use General funds and that was when the conversation would be different. She anticipated to have that conversation shortly.

Supervisor Christy commented that it was federal funds, but it was taxpayer monies and they could be bussed to Phoenix.

Chair Grijalva rebutted passing on the burden to another County.

Supervisor Christy stated the Board had taken on the burden themselves and should not have done that in 2019.

Chair Grijalva stated that a majority of the Board thought differently and the 45-day window was true for all of the other cities and that migrants came to Tucson and then left shortly after. She explained that Pima County was not their final destination, they went to cities that were absorbing all of the migrants that went to different communities. She stated those cities also tapped into the same funding source and they only had a window of 45 days in order to receive any resources they could to provide settlement funds. She stated that one conversation she had in D.C. was perhaps to move the funds from this location, so it did not look like Pima County and other border communities were in competition with the other cities that were receiving settlement funds and that they were differentiated from this funding source to more like Office Refugee Resettlement or other places. She explained that there was not much willingness in D.C. in order to accommodate Pima County. She explained that she met with every representative that oversaw and had a responsibility to Pima County, which included the White House, DHS, Department of Labor, and all of our elected representatives and every one of them was trying to

negotiate something on the Senate floor and she hoped they found a solution because, if not, it would become a bigger emergency.

Supervisor Christy paraphrased a famous Chicago cleric in this context, "Pima County's chickens are coming home to roost."

Chair Grijalva responded that when there was no more funding it would become everyone's responsibility.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

31. Acceptance - Grants Management and Innovation

Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs, FY23 2023 Border Security Fund, to provide for the Pima County Drexel Congregate Facility, \$3,100,000.00 (GTAW 24-79)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the item.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

32. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 263166, Jui Hui Kuang, Mr. An's Teppan Steak & Seafood, 6091 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

33. Hearing - Type III Conditional Use Permit

P23CU00013, TIN CUP PROPERTIES, L.L.C. - S. BROADMONT DRIVE

Tin Cup Properties, L.L.C., represented by Ross Guenther, request a Type III Conditional Use Permit for a Marijuana Product Manufacturing Location, in accordance with Sec. 18.43.030.B of the Pima County Zoning Code, on property at 3450 S. Broadmont Drive, in the CI-2 (General Industrial) Zone. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 7-0 (Commissioners Maese, Cook, and Gungl were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. The Hearing Administrator recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 2)

Standard Conditions

Compliance with all specialized requirements enumerated in Section 18.51.030.B.19 of the Pima County Zoning Code.

Special Conditions

1. This conditional use permit approval is for a marijuana product manufacturing location as permitted per Section 18.53.030.A (General Industrial Zone) of the Code. No other nonresidential or commercial conditional uses other than the above are authorized of implied.
2. This marijuana product manufacturing facility shall be operated in substantial accordance with the business operations, floorplan, and other particulars as described in the applicant's submitted narrative materials, including the parameters and policies for odor mitigation as described in the applicant's narrative under its Item 2.f..

Supervisor Heinz inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Chair Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 4-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P23CU00013, subject to standard and special conditions.

CONSENT CALENDAR

34. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz, and carried by a 3-0 vote, Chair Grijalva was not present for the vote, to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety.

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**

Appointment of Julia Date, to fill a vacancy created by Norma Niblett. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 1)

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

2. **Special Event**

- Aaron Michael Cooper, International Sonoran Desert Alliance, Parjaro Street, Ajo, December 2, 2023.
- Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of St. Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, Gym and Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, February 10, 2024.

3. **Temporary Extension**

06100203, Jeffrey Craig Miller, Hot Rods Old Vail, 10500 E. Old Vail Road, Tucson, January 18-21, 25-28 and February 1-2, 2024.

ELECTIONS

4. Precinct Committeemen

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Dawn Barkman-009-REP, Patricia Wilkinson-046-REP, Madeleine Beiser-096-REP, Leslie Call-127-REP, Terry Chick-127-REP, Barbara Hall-163-REP, Daniel Seifried-172-REP, Tracy Seifried-172-REP, Monica Hills-178-REP, John Holley-184-REP, Sean Makens-195-REP, Neville Campbell-213-REP, Faith Partington-218-REP, Jeanne Cates-229-REP, Raymond Cossette-252-REP, David Thomas-146-LBT

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

David Ladow-012-DEM, John Ling-012-DEM, Gretchen Winters-012-DEM, Cynthia Daulton-013-REP, Harry Denton-092-REP, Andrew Dockery-106-REP, Scott Parfrey-127-REP, Thomas Campbell-158-REP, Duane Janssen-165-REP, Patti Julagay-175-REP, Monica Hills-177-REP, Julie Harrod-184-REP, Edna Eavenson-208-REP, Stephen Eavenson-208-REP, Robyn Nicholson-212-REP, Leonor Peterson-214-REP, Douglas Everett-241-REP, Faith Bright-262-REP, David Thomas-060-LBT, Sue Ann Christenson-146-LBT

SUPERIOR COURT

5. Judge Pro Tempore Appointment

Appointment of Judges Pro Tempore of the Superior Court for the period of November 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024: Hon. Susan A. Kettlewell (Ret.)

TREASURER

6. Fill the Gap

Staff requests approval of the annual certification, as directed by A.R.S. §42-2421, that the five percent set-aside "Fill-the-Gap" funds in the amount of \$1,067,913.89, be transferred to the Local Courts Assistance Fund for supplemental aid to Superior and Justice Courts for processing of criminal cases.

7. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Tax Lien Capital Investment Club \$856.40.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

8. Minutes: September 19, 2023
Warrants: November, 2023

* * *

ADJOURNMENT

35. As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:52 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK