

## **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 15, 2020. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:                Ramón Valadez, Chairman  
                             Sharon Bronson, Vice Chair  
                             \*Ally Miller, Member  
                             \*Steve Christy, Member  
                             Betty Villegas, Member

Also Present:        Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
                             Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
                             Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
                             Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisors Christy and Miller participated remotely.

### **1. RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION**

Staff requests approval of a Riparian Habitat Mitigation In-Lieu Fee Proposal in the amount of \$2,665.00 for placement of a garage at 11155 E. Golf Links Road, located within Regulated Riparian Habitat classified as Xeroriparian Class C Habitat. (District 4)

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

### **2. Amendments to the Multiple-Species Conservation Plan (MSCP)**

Staff recommends approval of the Amendments to County Conservation Land Master Covenant; District Conservation Land Master Covenant; District MSCP Master Covenant; and County MSCP Master Covenant as presented, to encumber new properties, remove and re-apply Covenants to align with current County and District ownership and create a new exception to explicitly allow maintenance of watercourse flow carrying capacity on properties encumbered by the Covenants.

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

Supervisor Miller inquired about the three plans, the County Multispecies Conservation Plan, the Flood Control District Multispecies Preservation Plan and County Conservation Lands, and asked how they differed.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that there was one plan, the Sonoran Conservation Plan. He indicated that there were components of that plan that qualified for the Endangered Species Act Section 10 Permit. He stated that the restrictive covenants arose from the requirements of the Section 10 Permit that lands had to be encumbered for conservation purposes. He indicated that both the Flood Control District and County had contributed lands. He stated that the Flood Control District primarily contributed flood prone and riparian areas that had been acquired. He indicated that the County placed restrictions on lands that may have been acquired through open space acquisitions. He stated that this item appeared twice on the agenda and the purpose of this item was for modification to the covenants and restrictions for the Flood Control District Lands. He indicated that the Board would also be considering the remaining County properties that had been encumbered through restrictive covenants. He stated that from time to time modifications were made to conservation lands, by adding or removing lands, as long as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service agreed that it did not impact the ability to continue with the Section 10 Permit. He added that 2,017 acres of land was being added and 230 acres of land was removed. He stated that modifications were made to the County's management practices which allowed for maintenance to be performed on those Flood Control District lands that had been included in the restrictive covenant.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether the various property deeds were recorded to indicate that these lands were to be preserved in perpetuity with the understanding that they could be periodically evaluated.

Mr. Huckelberry responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether changes to the County's Section 10 Permit mitigation had to be approved by the Arizona State Land and Trust.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that the State Land Trust and the State Land Department were not part of the Section 10 Permit. He stated that the only approving authority was the federal government, through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Supervisor Miller asked whether the Arizona State Land and Trust reviewed the Flood Control District and the County's Conservation Lands.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that the County partnered with a nonprofit and Arizona Land and Water Trust provided a review and approval.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether this information was available for the general public's review. She also asked if the process was enumerated in the County Code.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that there was an enabling document that explained the process. He indicated that the document detailed changes made, the ability to make changes periodically, and conformance to conditions as they change in the future.

Supervisor Miller inquired whether that information was available on the Flood District's website.

Mr. Huckelberry indicated that he would confirm its availability.

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

## LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 15, 2020. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:                Ramón Valadez, Chairman  
                             Sharon Bronson, Vice Chair  
                             \*Ally Miller, Member  
                             \*Steve Christy, Member  
                             Betty Villegas, Member

Also Present:        Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
                             Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
                             Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
                             Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisors Christy and Miller participated remotely.

### 1. **CONTRACT**

Sahuarita Water Company, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide for Sahuarita Branch Library lease located at 725 W. Via Rancho Sahuarita Road, extend contract term to 12/31/21 and amend contractual language, Library District Fund, contract amount \$1.00 (CT-LIB-15-481)

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

### 2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

---

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

---

CLERK

## **ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES**

The Rocking K South Community Facilities 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 15, 2020. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:                Ramón Valadez, Chairman  
                             Sharon Bronson, Vice Chair  
                             \*Ally Miller, Member  
                             \*Steve Christy, Member  
                             Betty Villegas, Member

Also Present:        Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
                             Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
                             Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
                             Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisors Christy and Miller participated remotely.

### **1. ORDER AND CALL FOR ELECTION**

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - RK5, of the District Board of Rocking K South Community Facilities District ordering and calling an election with respect to increasing the rate of levy of an ad valorem property tax attributable to the operation and maintenance expenses of the District.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, indicated that this had been previously presented to the Board on two occasions. He stated that originally the Electors did not cast their votes and on the second occasion the proper advertisement was not published. He added that those corrections had been made.

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

### **2. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

---

CHAIRMAN

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 15, 2020. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:                Ramón Valadez, Chairman  
                             Sharon Bronson, Vice Chair  
                             \*Ally Miller, Member  
                             \*Steve Christy, Member  
                             Betty Villegas, Member

Also Present:        Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
                             Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
                             Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
                             Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisors Christy and Miller participated remotely.

### **1.     MOMENT OF SILENCE**

A Moment of Silence was observed by those in attendance.

### **2.     PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **3.     POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

Supervisor Villegas commented on her last official meeting as the District 5 Supervisor. She stated that it had been an honor and pleasure to represent District 5 and Pima County.

Chairman Valadez conveyed his gratitude to God, his wife, family, and County staff for their support over the years during his service as the District 2 Supervisor.

### **4.     CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Katrina Quijada addressed the Board regarding the mental well-being of students and athletes across Tucson. She expressed concern with the rise in depression and suicide among those individuals. She asked that sports, education and mental health not be politicized.

Andrew Skaggs spoke to the Board regarding mental health, the effects of COVID, football and interscholastic sports. He asked that the County reconsider suspending high school sports.

Paula Walton addressed the Board regarding the County's recommendation to suspend high school athletic events. She stated that she was an advocate for the kids and indicated that this was adversely damaging their mental health.

Dru Heaton expressed concerns with the COVID-19 mandates and the preservation of civil liberties.

Peter Norquest addressed the Board regarding COVID-19 caseloads, suicide rates, business closures, unemployment, mental and psychological stress, quality of life, deficit education and the enforced authoritarianism manipulation in Pima County.

5. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Chairman Valadez and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 9:22 a.m.

6. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 9:41 a.m. All members were present.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

7. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Kohl's Inc., et. al. v. Pima County, Arizona Tax Court Case No. TX2020-000945.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated the County Attorney's Office sought direction on whether to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Villegas and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

8. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding whether to join an amicus brief in support of the City of Boca Raton, Florida and County of Palm Beach, Florida in Otto et. al. v. City of Boca Raton et. al., United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit Case No. 19-10604.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the County Attorney's Office sought direction on whether to join an amicus brief, at no cost to Pima County, in support of the City of Boca Raton, Florida and the County of Palm Beach.

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Villegas and carried by a 3-2 vote, Supervisors Christy and Miller voted "Nay," to approve filing an amicus brief in support of the City of Boca Raton, Florida and the County of Palm Beach, Florida.

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

### **9. Medical/Dental Insurance for County Employees - Fiscal Year 2021/22**

Staff recommends approval of the following:

1. Medical premium equivalents as detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated December 15, 2020.
2. Continue offering up to \$35 per pay period for participating in the HLPD program.
3. Continue current dental premiums as detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated December 15, 2020.
4. Continue County HSA contributions as detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated December 15, 2020.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, indicated that annually the Board approved the contracts for Employees Health Benefits and the rates and premiums needed to maintain the Health Benefits Trust Fund. He stated that utilization had increased by approximately 11.48%, which had caused the rates to be increased. He indicated that his recommendations were that the rates be increased, and that the County's HSA contributions remain the same, \$2,000.00 for employee plus spouse, and employee plus family, and \$1,000 for employee only. He indicated that those contributions were deposited by the County into the employee's account for the High Deductible Health Plan. He stated that the dental rates would remain the same for both plans and the County would continue to provide an incentive, up to \$35 per pay period, towards reducing the premiums paid by County employees. He added that the net result would be an increase of \$4.37 – \$7.77 in employee deductions.

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

## **CLERK OF THE BOARD**

### **10. Petition for Relief of Taxes**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Apostolic Assembly of the Faith in Christ Jesus, Inc., has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of Real Property taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2018, 2019 and 2020 for Parcel Nos. 138-19-114C, 138-19-114D and 138-19-114K.

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



**11. Petitions for Redemption of Property Tax Exemption Waiver**

Staff recommends approval of the petitions for redemption of property tax exemption waivers.

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

**COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

**12. Pima County Workforce Investment Board Memorandum of Understanding and Infrastructure Funding Agreement**

Staff recommends approval of the revised Memorandum of Understanding and Infrastructure Funding Agreement between Pima County, Pima County Workforce Investment Board and the ARIZONA@WORK Pima County One-Stop required workforce partners.

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

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**13. Final Plat With Assurances**

P20FP00006, New Tucson, Unit 7, Lots 160-165. (District 4)

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

**FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

**14. Quarterly Report on Collections**

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending September 30, 2020.

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

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

**15. Classification/Compensation**

The Public Works Administration requests approval to create the following new classification, associated costs will be borne by the department from within its current budget:

Class Code/ Class Title/ Grade Code (Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code  
2318/ Engineer II/ E3 (\$58,926-\$90,022)/ 2/ E\*  
\*E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

**16. Classification/Compensation**

The County Attorney's Office requests approval to create the following new classification, associated costs will be borne by the department from within its current budget:

Class Code/ Class Title/ Grade Code (Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code  
7319/ Chief Deputy County Attorney/ U6 (\$103,459-\$202,696)/ 1/ E\*  
\*E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

**REAL PROPERTY**

**17. Amendments to the Multiple-Species Conservation Plan (MSCP)**

Staff recommends approval of the Amendments to County Conservation Land Master Covenant; District Conservation Land Master Covenant; District MSCP Master Covenant; and County MSCP Master Covenant as presented, to encumber new properties, remove and re-apply Covenants to align with current County and District ownership and create a new exception to explicitly allow maintenance of watercourse flow carrying capacity on properties encumbered by the Covenants.

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

**REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION**

**18. Pretreatment Settlement Agreement**

Staff recommends approval of the following proposed Pretreatment Settlement Agreement, RWRD Enterprise Fund:

Busy "D" Pumping, Inc., Case No. C2020-D-001. The proposed settlement provides that Busy "D" Pumping, Inc. will pay a penalty of \$4,550.00 for violating the Industrial Wastewater Ordinance.

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

## **FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

### **19. Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 123575, Gerald Joseph Kertesz, Barnyard Crafthouse and Eatery, 11011 E. Tanque Verde Road, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

Gerald Joseph Kertesz, applicant, addressed the Board seeking approval of his liquor license application.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

## **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

### **20. Hearing - Modification (Substantial Change) of Rezoning Condition**

#### Co9-02-01, SWINDELL - CARDINAL AVENUE REZONING

Request of Daniel L.L.C., represented by Declan Murphy for T-Mobile/TowerCom, for a substantial change of Rezoning Condition No.11 which requires adherence to the revised preliminary sketch plan and limits the use of the property to modular/manufactured and building sales, CB-1 zone retail uses, and the storage of goods accessory for retail businesses to allow an 80-foot monopole cell tower with an equipment area. The 1.79 acres property is zoned CB-2(H) General Business Zone (San Xavier Environs Historic Zone) and is located at the northeast corner of Los Reales Road and Cardinal Avenue, addressed as 7251 and 7285 S. Cardinal Avenue. On motion the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Becker was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 5)

- ~~1. Submittal of a development plan if determined necessary by the appropriate County agencies.~~
- ~~2. Recording of a covenant holding Pima County harmless in the event of flooding.~~
- ~~3. Recording of the necessary development related covenants as determined appropriate by the various County agencies.~~
- ~~4. Provision of development related assurances as required by the appropriate agencies.~~
- ~~5. Prior to the preparation of the development related covenants and any required dedication, a title report (current to within 60 days) evidencing ownership of the property shall be submitted to the Development Services Department, Document Services.~~
- ~~6. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.~~
7. Transportation conditions:
  - A. Provision of necessary improvements to Cardinal Avenue and Los Reales Road, if determined necessary by the Department of Transportation.
  - B. The property owner(s) shall accept responsibility for the maintenance, control, safety and liability of privately owned roads, parking areas, drives, physical barriers, drainageways and drainage easements.
  - C. Only one access point on Cardinal Avenue and only one access point on Los Reales Road shall be permitted for the subject property. The location and design of any access shall

- need the approval of the Department of Transportation prior to the issuance of building permit(s).
- D. Internal access shall be provided within the site for future connection(s) to adjacent properties.
82. Flood Control condition:  
Drainage shall not be altered, disturbed or obstructed without the written approval of the Flood Control District.
93. Wastewater Management condition:  
The property owner(s) shall connect to the public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by Wastewater Management at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan or request for building permit.
104. Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation condition:  
The property owner(s) shall dedicate 15 feet for recreational trail purposes adjacent to the right-of-way along Cardinal Avenue.
115. Adherence to the revised preliminary development plan as approved by the Board of Supervisors at public hearing. The use shall be restricted to modular/manufactured home and building sales; retail uses as allowed in CB-1 zoning and storage of goods as accessory to retail businesses (~~attached exhibit "B"~~); and a maximum 80-foot in height cellular monopole tower plus associated equipment.
126. Environmental Planning condition:  
Under no circumstances shall the following exotic plant species be planted anywhere on the site:  
Fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum*)  
Buffelgrass (*pennisetum ciliare*)  
Johnson grass (*Sorghum halapense*)  
Giant reed (*Arundo donax*)  
Common crabgrass (*Digitaria sanguinalis*)  
Pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*)  
Red brome (*Bromus rubens*)  
Mediterranean grass (*Schismus spp.*)  
Tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*)  
African sumac (*Rhus lancea*)  
Russian olive (*Rhus lancea*)  
Salt cedar/Tamarisk (*Tamarix pertandra* & *T. ramosissima*)  
Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*) excluding sod hybrid Bermuda  
Lovegrasses (*Eragrostis spp.*) excluding Plains lovegrass (*Eragrostis intermedia*)  
African rue (*Peganum harmala*)  
Iceplant (*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum*)  
Arabian Grass (*Schismus arabicus*)  
Natal Grass (*Melinis repens* (= *Rhynchelythrum repens*))
137. The owner(s) shall meet the following requirements of Drexel Heights Fire District; the location of the fire hydrant shall be relocated near the existing sales building, indicated on the revised sketch plan. The owner(s) shall supply the equipment and the necessary supplies to extend the 8-inch main from Cardinal Avenue. The owner(s) shall supply and install either numbers or letters of the alphabet on all the buildings for easy identification during an emergency. The owners(s) shall provide Knox Box's at both entrances for fire department use during an emergency and provide keys necessary to gain access to the fenced property and buildings.
8. Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*) from the property. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.
9. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding Proposition 207 rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To

the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. §12-1134(I).

10. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services Department, indicated that this request was for a substantial change to modify rezoning conditions to allow for a cell tower to be located on property that was currently zoned CB-2. He stated that due to existing rezoning conditions associated with this property's CB-2 rezoning it triggered the need for this request, even though the CB-2 zone would have allowed for placement of a cell tower. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission and staff recommended approval, subject to modified standard and special conditions. He indicated that the property was outside of the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System, and the tower would be situated at least 100 feet away from the nearest home. He added that the applicant had requested a gap in coverage and that the tower would be constructed in a co-locatable manner, which would reduce the need for additional towers in the area by other providers.

Declan Murphy, T-Mobile/TowerCom, indicated that Mr. Swindell, the property owner, had informed his neighbors about the project and that no negative feedback was received. He stated that the site would be disguised as a broad leaf tree and would be able to handle additional carriers.

Mr. Poirier indicated that one protest was received from an adjacent property owner.

Supervisor Villegas inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Villegas, seconded by Chairman Valadez and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve Co9-02-01, subject to modified standard and special conditions, as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission and by Staff.

## 21. **Hearing - Modification (Substantial Change) of Rezoning Conditions**

Co9-83-08, SPEER - ORANGE GROVE ROAD REZONING

Co9-93-08, SOUTHWEST FOOD SYSTEMS, INC. - ORACLE ROAD REZONING

Co9-00-35, SOUTHWEST FOOD SYSTEMS, INC. - ORACLE ROAD NO. 2 REZONING

Request of Quick Trip Corporation, represented by the Planning Center, for a modification (substantial change) of the following rezoning conditions from three rezoning cases on one parcel of land addressed as 401 W. Orange Grove Road.

- No. 15 (Co9-83-08), No. 11 (Co9-93-08) and No. 9 (Co9-00-35). These three rezoning conditions prohibit the use of an Automated Self-Service Car Wash. The request is to modify the conditions to allow an Automated Self-Service Car Wash.
- No. 19 (Co9-83-08), No. 8 (Co9-93-08) and No. 10 (Co9-00-35). These three rezoning conditions require adherence to the May 21, 2010 revised

preliminary development plan. The request is to modify the revised preliminary development plan to change the use and demonstrate the Automated Self-Service Car Wash use.

- No. 22 (Co9-83-08), No. 12 (Co9-93-08) and No. 13 (Co9-00-35). These three rezoning conditions require a 10-foot type "D" bufferyard adjacent to the streets, the south and west boundaries. The request is to modify the required 10-foot wide bufferyard "D" along the west boundary of the property to allow a minimum 5-foot bufferyard "D".
- No. 23 (Co9-83-08), No. 13 (Co9-93-08) and No. 14 (Co9-00-35). These three rezoning conditions limit the height of the buildings to 15-feet, excluding the parapet for the CB-2 use. The request is to modify the conditions to allow for a maximum building height of 23 feet and allow architectural elements to be a maximum height of 30 feet.
- No. 24 (Co9-83-08), No. 14 (Co9-93-08) and No. 15 (Co9-00-35). These three rezoning conditions limit the hours of operation for the CB-2 use of a car wash in conjunction with vehicle sales and rental. Car wash hours of operation are limited to 7:30 a.m. through 6:00 p.m. Sales and car rental hours of operation are limited to 8:00 a.m. through 9:00 p.m. The request is to modify the hours of operation for an Automated Self-Service Car Wash from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. with the exit tunnel open to the north or east.
- No. 18 (Co9-83-08). This rezoning condition requires that the south 25 feet of the subject property to be graded downward to the level of the adjacent property and landscaped with decomposed granite and low water use vegetation. The request is to strike/remove this condition.

The approximately 1.64-acre property is zoned CB-2® (General Business-Restricted) and is located on the southwest corner of W. Orange Grove Road and N. Oracle Road. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 7-0 (Commissioners Bain, Cook and Hook were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

At the request of the applicant and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

## **22. Hearing - Rezoning Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - 97, Co9-98-28, Howell - Sandario Road No. 2 Rezoning. Owners: Mark and Mary Lou Wright. (District 3)

Supervisor Bronson inquired if anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Chairman Valadez and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Resolution.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

### **23. Hearing - Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2020 - 43, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Air Quality; amending the Pima County Code by amending Title 17, Chapter 17.14, Sections 17.14.080 and 17.14.090 to modify open burning permit fees and clarify terms of residential, construction, and agricultural open burning permits.

Supervisor Bronson inquired if anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Villegas to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance. No vote was taken at the time.

Supervisor Villegas asked why a cap was placed on residential properties, while there was no cap on commercial burning. She also asked what went into that decision.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, Public Works, responded that the frequency of various applications were reviewed and historically the volume of residential applications was by far the larger volume. He indicated that there was an expiration limitation on the commercial permit based on the date on the application and the permit would be issued for a shorter-period-of-time and the time frame could not exceed 90 days. He added that the applications provided staff with information regarding what was being burned and the dates of the burn, which then allowed them to perform inspections as the activity was occurring. He stated that there was no guarantee that the commercial permits would be issued for the 90-day duration.

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

## **TRANSPORTATION**

### **24. Hearing - Traffic Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2020 - 44, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; regulating parking on Summit Street in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 2)

Chairman Valadez inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **25. Naming of Sahuarita Library**

Discussion/action regarding the naming of Sahuarita Library. (District 3)

Supervisor Bronson indicated that her office had received inquiries regarding the naming of the new Sahuarita Library and whether public input had been received. She provided staff direction that the community be engaged and encouraged to provide recommendations for naming the library.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, acknowledged the direction and indicated that there was still time for the process to be defined and presented to the Library Advisory Board and the Library Director.

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

### **26. Telecommuting and Virtual Meeting Policies**

Discussion/action regarding Pima County employees and the County's telecommuting and virtual meeting policies. (District 5)

(Clerk's Note: See attached verbatim Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on this item. Verbatim was necessary due to the nature and evolving circumstance related to COVID-19.)

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

### **27. Naming of the Fountain in the Courtyard of the Pima County Historic Courthouse in Honor of F. Ann Rodriguez**

Staff recommends that the fountain in the courtyard of the Historic Pima County Courthouse outside the office Ms. Rodriguez ably led for decades be named in her honor and that staff be directed to install the appropriate signage on the fountain.

It was moved by Chairman Valadez and seconded by Supervisor Bronson to approve naming the Historic Fountain after F. Ann Rodriguez. No vote was taken at this time.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, indicated that the Board was provided a memorandum depicting the virtues of the retiring County Recorder, F. Ann Rodriguez. He stated that Ms. Rodriguez spent most of her career in what she referred to as the "Pink Palace," which was the Historic Courthouse. He added that it would be fitting if the Board considered naming the Historic Fountain in her honor for her years of service.

Supervisor Bronson expressed her gratitude to F. Ann Rodriguez for her exemplary services and for improving the Recorder's Office.



Chairman Valadez conveyed his gratitude to F. Ann Rodriguez for conducting herself with honor and integrity.

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

F. Ann Rodriguez, County Recorder, expressed her appreciation for dedicating the fountain in her honor. She added that she had admired the fountain since she was a young child growing up in Tucson and that this was very meaningful. She expressed her gratitude to everyone that had placed faith in her by continuing to elect her as County Recorder. She thanked Mr. Chris Roads for his 20 years of service alongside her.

#### **RECORDER**

28. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the month of November, 2020.

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Chairman Valadez and unanimously carried by a 5-0, to approve the item.

#### **TREASURER**

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

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$21,803.04.

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

#### **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

#### **COUNTY ATTORNEY**

30. Hecker & Pew, P.L.L.C., Amendment No. 8, to provide for Paradigm DKD Group, L.L.C. Litigation - Assessor, extend contract term to 12/12/21 and amend contractual language, FN-General Contingency Fund, contract amount \$25,000.00 (CT-FNC-21-195)

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

31. Arizona Superior Court in Pima County, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Supportive Treatment and Engagement Program Court Diversion Specialist and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-PCA-21-200)

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

## **GRANTS MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION**

32. Fourth Avenue Foundation, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the COVID-19 Back to Business Initiative and amend contractual language, U.S. Department of Treasury, Coronavirus Relief Fund, contract amount \$5,000.00 (CT-GMI-21-187)

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

33. Ajo Center for Sustainable Agriculture, Amendment No. 1, to provide for COVID-19 Emergency Relief Program, extend contract term to 12/31/20 and amend contractual language, U.S. Department of Treasury, Coronavirus Relief Fund, contract amount \$150,000.00 (CT-GMI-21-126)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

34. Arizona Board of Regents on behalf of the University of Arizona, to provide for a Grant-in-Aid Indian Gaming Revenue Funding Agreement, 12% Gaming Revenue Sharing Grant Fund, contract amount \$1,000,00.00 (CT-GMI-21-249)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

## **HEALTH**

35. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide for repayment of COVID-19 testing expenses and amend contractual language, contract amount \$2,000,000.00 revenue (CTN-HD-21-38)

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Villegas to approve the item. No vote was taken at the time.

Supervisor Miller commented that the total amount for this contract was \$4,000,000.00 with the added amendment.

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

## **PROCUREMENT**

36. Cellco Partnership, d.b.a. Verizon Wireless, Amendment No. 4, to provide for wireless services, equipment and accessories, extend contract term to 3/31/21 and amend contractual language, no cost (MA-PO-16-257) Sheriff

It was moved by Supervisor Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Villegas to approve the item. No vote was taken at the time.

Supervisor Miller commented about two previous amendments that had brought the total of the contract to \$7.5 million, but which was now being revised down to \$3.75 million in total.

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

37. Cellco Partnership, d.b.a. Verizon Wireless, Amendment No. 5, to provide for wireless services, equipment and accessories, extend contract term to 3/31/21 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$375,000.00 (MA-PO-16-316) Information Technology

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

#### **REAL PROPERTY**

38. Friends of Robles Ranch, Inc., d.b.a. My Friend's Closet, to provide for a lease agreement at Robles Ranch Community Center located at 16150 W. Ajo Way, no cost (CTN-PW-21-50)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

#### **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

39. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

Arizona Department of Housing, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Funding Agreement for Weatherization Assistance Program - Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and amend scope of work, \$77,128.00 (GTAM 21-54)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

40. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Drug Court (Pima County Problem Solving Courts Initiative), no cost (GTAM 21-58)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

41. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

Arizona Office of Attorney General, to provide for the Victims' Rights Program, \$169,600.00 (GTAW 21-92)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

42. **Acceptance - Criminal Justice Reform Unit**

Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration GAINS Center for Behavioral Health and Justice Transformation, to provide for the 2021 Sequential Intercept Model Mapping Workshops, no cost (GTAW 21-97)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

43. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for the Arizona's Prescription Drug Overdose Prevention Program, \$822,416.00/2 year term (GTAW 21-91)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

44. **Acceptance - Health**

Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for the pedestrian and bicycle safety related materials and supplies, \$6,755.00 (GTAW 21-96)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

45. **Acceptance - Public Defense Services**

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children & Families, Children's Bureau, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Title IV-E Federal Foster Care, \$431,037.49/\$2,043,747.06 General Fund Match (GTAM 21-55)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

46. **Acceptance - Public Defense Services**

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children & Families, Children's Bureau, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Title IV-E Federal Foster Care, \$278,390.15/\$1,335,787.58 General Fund Match (GTAM 21-56)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

## **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

### **47. Corrections Officer Retirement Board**

Appointment of Alma Hayes, to replace Michael Escobar. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (Committee recommendation)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

### **48. Outside Agency Citizen Review Committee**

Appointment of Trish Hastings-Sargent, to replace Noé P. Mayotte. No term expiration. (District 3)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

### **49. Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee**

Appointment of Scott Kolt, to replace John Lynch. Term expiration: 3/1/21. (District 3)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

### **50. Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**

Reappointment of Jerrie Jean Lamb. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 4)

It was moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

## **FRANCHISES/LICENSES/PERMITS**

### **51. Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 123017, Alexander Ruiz Majalca, Jr., CSRaceWay, 4300 E. Los Reales Road, Tucson, Series 6, Bar, Person Transfer and Location Transfer.

Supervisor Bronson inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Chairman Valadez and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Miller was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

### **52. COVID-19**

Discussion/Direction to Staff/Action regarding COVID-19 related items, including the following:

- Mandatory Curfew at 10:00 p.m.
- Penalties for Violating the Mandatory Curfew
- Update on Vaccination Plan

(Clerk's Note: See attached verbatim Minute Item No. 52, for discussion and action on this item. Verbatim was necessary due to the nature and evolving circumstance related to COVID-19.)

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **53. Approval of the Consent Calendar**

Upon the request of Supervisor Villegas to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 6 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

It was then moved by Chairman Valadez, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

\* \* \*

## **PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR VILLEGAS**

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **Procurement**

6. Maximus Health Services, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Contact Tracers, extend contract term to 7/5/21 and amend contractual language, no cost (MA-PO-20-226) Health

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

Supervisor Villegas recommended that the Health Department and Maximus utilize local numbers or caller ID when contacting individual for contact tracing purposes.

Chairman Valadez made a friendly amendment to the motion that local numbers be utilized.

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

\* \* \*

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **Community and Workforce Development**

1. SER - Jobs for Progress of Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide for Youth - Workforce Development Services, extend contract term to 12/31/21, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$147,582.02 (CT-CR-21-226)
2. Tucson Youth Development, Amendment No. 3, to provide for Youth - Workforce Development Services, extend contract term to 12/31/21, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$149,149.97 (CT-CR-21-230)

### **Procurement**

3. **Award**  
Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-21-94, Diamondback Police Supply Co., Inc. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ) - Group A, Point Blank, and RG Beck AZ, Inc., d.b.a. TYR Tactical, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Peoria, AZ) - Group B, TYR Tactical, to provide for body armor. This Master Agreement is for a term of five (5) years in the shared not-to-exceed amount of \$3,075,600.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Sheriff.
4. **Award**  
Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-21-95, Group 1 - OEM: Rasix Computer Center, Inc., d.b.a. Academic Supplier (Headquarters: Chula Vista, CA) and Group 2 - Remanufactured: B2B Supplies USA, L.L.C., d.b.a. Printing Supplies USA, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Plainsboro, NJ), to provide for OEM and remanufactured printer and fax toner cartridges. This Master Agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the shared annual award amount of \$301,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: County Attorney.

5. Kimbrell Electric, Inc., Mountain Power Electrical Contractor, Inc., and Sellers & Sons, Inc., to provide for park lighting installation and repairs, Various Funds, contract amount of \$2,000,000.00 (MA-PO-21-83) Public Works
6. Maximus Health Services, Inc., Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

### **Transportation**

7. Perimeter Bicycling Association of America, Inc., to provide for reimbursement of traffic control expenses for 2021 El Tour de Tucson, contract amount \$250,000.00 revenue (CTN-TR-21-40)

### **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

8. **Acceptance - Health**  
Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Bridges to Wellness (B-Well) and amend grant language, \$9,106.01 (GTAM 21-51)
9. **Acceptance - Sheriff**  
State of Arizona - Department of Public Safety, to provide for the AZDPS Border Strike Task Force: Prosecutorial and Jail Expenses, \$166,666.66 (GTAW 21-86)
10. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**  
Arizona Companion Animal Spay and Neuter Committee, to provide for the Arizona Companion Animal Spay and Neuter Committee Community Cat Spay/Neuter Project \$10,000.00 (GTAW 21-93)
11. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**  
Arizona Companion Animal Spay and Neuter Committee, to provide for the Arizona Companion Animal Spay and Neuter Committee Public Spay/Neuter Services, \$10,000.00 (GTAW 21-94)

### **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

12. **Workforce Investment Board**
  - Appointment of Karen Molina, representing Business, to replace Willette Diggs. Term expiration: 9/30/23. (Staff recommendation)
  - Appointment of Irisbeth 'Iris' Matheny, representing Business, to replace Cristina Castro-Harrington. Term expiration: 9/30/22. (Staff recommendation)
  - Appointment of Peter Loya, representing Business, to replace Deron Johnson. Term expiration: 9/30/21. (Staff recommendation)



- Appointment of Trish Muir, representing Workforce; CBO, to replace Fabian Sanchez **Sandez**. Term expiration: 9/30/21. (Staff recommendation)
- Appointment of Abra McAndrew, representing Balance of Local Workforce Development Board Membership, to replace Jan Leshner. Term expiration: 9/30/21. (Staff recommendation)
- Appointment of Paul Stapleton-Smith, representing Workforce; Labor Org. Rep. nominated by Local Labor Federation Subcategory Rep. (Organizational change) Term expiration: 9/30/22. (Staff recommendation)

## **ELECTIONS**

### **13. Precinct Committeemen**

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

#### RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY

Crystal Zevon-038-GRN; Daniel Aguilera-191-GRN

#### APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Sally M. Forzano-012-REP; Erika L. Wofse-012-REP; Alexia R. Wacks-039-REP; Ginger L. Castle-079-REP; Kyle J. Vilaubi-081-REP; Tamara B. Holley-172-REP; Sandra S. McPherson-174-REP, Stefanie N. Demple-176-REP; Alan D. Vasey-199-REP; Christopher R. DeSimone-212-REP; Joseph M. Holden-218-REP; Ismat Abuhlimeh-224-REP

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **14. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

Guenevere Dawn Nelson-Melby \$3,198.00; MEB Homes, L.L.C. \$999.00; Pacific Office Automation \$2,250.00.

## **RECORDER**

15. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the months of June, July, August, September and October, 2020.

## **RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

16. Minutes: November 10, 2020

\* \* \*

54. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

## BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### 26. Telecommuting and Virtual Meeting Policies

Discussion/action regarding Pima County employees and the County's telecommuting and virtual meeting policies. (District 5)

#### Verbatim

---

RV: Chairman Valadez  
SB: Supervisor Bronson  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
AM: Supervisor Miller  
BV: Supervisor Villegas  
CH: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
AF: Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
JL: Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator

---

RV: Meeting is called back to order. We are on Agenda Item No. 5, Telecommuting and Virtual Meeting Policies, Supervisor Villegas.

BV: Yes, thank you Chairman Valadez. I put this on the agenda because I had received several emails and calls, actually to talk about employees who were having some issues with being at work with the transmission so high. I thought it was a good time for us to discuss what it is that we should do because the transmission rates are high and they continue to be high and we are telling, you know, as many people as we can to stay home. If you can work from home, you know, we are advising people to stay home. I thought it was a good time for us to think about our employees and figure out the best and safe way for them to still have their job, still get a paycheck but be as safe as possible. I know that Mr. Huckelberry has prepared some reports and I have read those reports and I am sure that he wants to explain them, so I will let him explain them and then we can continue to have the discussion in which direction to go. I added the virtual meeting because this is my last meeting, I think, unless we have an emergency meeting before the end of the year. I want to say it has been challenging being here, but for me, I have felt pretty safe until recently. I do not go anywhere anymore unless it is here. I was going to recommend for the future, for those of you that are staying on, for us to look at or for you all to look at the possibility of virtual meetings and which would be the best way to handle them and what platform would be the best one. I see, you know, I listen to the City of Tucson meetings, they seem to go pretty well. I think the biggest issue that I have is that we cannot have Call to the Public virtually and so that prevents a lot of people from speaking out. Sometimes it is really hard to hear, you know it is the muffled noise and if we were all virtual, or if you were all virtual, it might clearer for people during this time. I do not think it should last longer than it has to, but that is

just a recommendation from the virtual, why I included the virtual meeting policies in there as well.

SB: Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Villegas?

RV: Supervisor Bronson.

SB: You mentioned that City of Tucson does not have Call to the Public when they are in the virtual mode. I would then direct a question and I like the idea of going virtual, provided our I.T. staff, we have sufficient resources. In terms of Call to the Public, is there a legal issue with not having Call to the Public? Or, you do not have to answer it now, I am putting you on the spot. Just I would be appreciative if you could research that. I thought we had to, by Statute, have a Call to the Public but perhaps I am mistaken.

RV: If I may, part of that issue, I think and Andy you can correct me and jump in if you would like. Part of the issue is because we are under an Emergency Declaration at the time we were able to not necessarily have a Call to the Public, but it was something that was fundamental to what I believed was a Public Meeting. So when I became Chairman, shortly thereafter, I reinstituted the live meetings with the Call to the Audience because of my belief the public should always be able to either attend or comment on the business of the public. But I believe under the Emergency Declaration that we were under earlier as well as the Emergency Special Session does not legally require. Is that correct Andy? Or Counsel?

AF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and also Supervisor Bronson, the Statute that sets Call to Public does make it optional for the Public Body to either have a Call to the Public or not. Obviously, there are items for which there is a right to a hearing or to speak, independent of the Call to the Public Statute. So but obviously, there is, as you mentioned Mr. Chairman, a policy decision to make with respect to how important it is for the Board to hear from the public in Call to the Public but from a legal standpoint it is optional, whether or not to have that specific segment of the meeting.

SB: Thank you for the clarification.

RV: Any further discussion?

BV: I do not know if this is the proper time to hear from Mr. Huckelberry regarding the telework and the plan. I think that is part of this discussion and I know that is on Addendum 2. So I am not sure what the...if we need to...

RV: Mr. Huckelberry, would you rather have that discussion there and obviously we can take action under that item or you would like to have it here?

CH: With regard to the virtual meeting?

RV: Virtual meeting and the telecommuting, right?

BV: Telecommuting.

CH: Telecommuting is fine. Let us have it here.

RV: Okay.

CH: Because I think it sets the stage where we are going, I believe.

BV: Yeah.

RV: Please proceed.

CH: I sent a note yesterday and to the Board and we have been working on what we call a stay-at-home plan for employees for about ten days now. It is one of those things that is fairly hard to do. We have asked each individual department to provide a plan, because we cannot close a lot of offices by statute, we have to stay open, we have to continue to provide services and businesses. It is how we can do that is the trick. Some of that can be accomplished by telework and if we look at our past telework and what we have been doing in telework it has been about 50% of the employees involved that are in the legal system. In that legal system, it is fairly easy to continue to do telework so I do not think that is the issue. Where we basically have difficulty is associating with direct delivery of services, a sheriff deputy is an example or a correctional officer or a transportation worker or a wastewater worker or even our own payroll staff, you know. We have to continue to meet the payroll needs of the County employees. So we will have to have some employees in the facility. What we have done with the stay-at-home plan, which is I think, you know, it is kind of, is working in the teleworking process, is talk about trying to implement it starting the December 21st through basically January, I believe the 9th or the 10th, which is a three-week period. What we find typically is during the season with Christmas and New Year's, we have a lot of employees taking leave anyway. So, I think, and the goal is to depopulate the buildings. To get employees, you know the few that have to be there and in the case of, say, field workers, obviously, we have to patch potholes during this period, but do we have to have seven crews? Can we do it with four crews? So those are the individual decisions being made by the departments that are then reviewed and approved by appropriate Deputy County Administrator. We also are cognizant that if you are not at work, you have to take some type of leave. There are some employees who have lots of leave and there are others who have little. So what we have also told Department Directors to do is to, if you have two employees that can do the same job, one has a lot of leave and one has very little leave. Let us encourage the one with a lot of leave to be

the one to take this period off and use their leave banks. So these plans are due at 5:00 tonight and we will be implementing them on Monday. Obviously, teleworking works into it. Teleworking will continue to be provided. It just simply is that there are certain tasks and jobs that cannot be provided by telework and we just need to recognize that. I think the other issue is we cannot artificially close buildings, simply because state law requires our buildings to basically be open and available for service. We can do that service and we probably will by appointment, by basically meeting the person there and escorting them in. So we will be taking additional protective measures in this process. I think that is, you know, our report, and again, as these plans are starting to come in, we have looked at several of them. The Library one looks pretty good and so I think we will basically be able to accomplish depopulating facilities and simply for about a three-week period. I give you an example of a library plan. They are really talking about closing all the libraries except one, having a group of employees provide again the services that they could do remotely or do over the phone so they are not many people in the library building itself. And we have about, I think there is 14, 15, 13, 30? Yeah.

RV: 14.

CH: 14. Let me let Deputy Leshner talk.

SB: Your sign language I am not quite getting.

CH: We have a number that are providing food supplemental services. Meaning that we also have the Food Bank connected to the library providing food. So those will be, you know, continue to be operated. As they do food we are thinking that maybe those libraries that, where there is food distribution they could also do curbside service. Ms. Leshner anything more?

RV: What was the number you were trying to tell us?

JL: Mr. Chairman it was 1, 3 for 13, but from your side it probably looked like 31, I am guessing.

BV: I have a question.

RV: Supervisor Villegas.

BV: Thank you, Chairman Valadez. Mr. Huckelberry, with this plan, well let me I have a couple of questions but with the food distribution. I saw in the newspaper that the Food Bank is closing for the holidays. Is there any way that our employees could maybe step in? They are trying to give their volunteers a break. Is there any way that, because people are going to need food during that time and that is concerning. Is there a plan?

- CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Villegas, I think I had Ms. Leshar talked to the Food Bank this morning because we saw the same thing and we are a little concerned with the 13 sites we have, so let me let her expound.
- JL: Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Villegas, I have not yet had a chance to speak with the Food Bank but saw the same article. That is why we immediately began to work with the library, to see if we could keep the 13 sites open at the libraries to then fill in that gap between what looks like Christmas to New Year's, which I think is a significant time. I understand the burden that has been placed on the Food Bank, but it is a good time for us to look at picking that up. We are also looking for example, whether or not the individuals who have been working at the library could assist with contact tracing, things of that nature. How can we plug them into other vital services at this time?
- BV: Right, I think that would be really good for employees in the plan, for Appointing Authorities to look at whether, if there is not enough. If, I do not want anybody to have to take leave especially during this time without pay. I do not want to look at, without knowing that, you know, when I look at the plan. That is a real concern to me in trying to approve, if you are asking us to approve that plan. Not knowing whether that is going to create someone to go without pay during this time. When we know that the Health Department needs help, we know that now our Food Bank needs help. I think we can make it work where no one should have to go without pay.
- CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Villegas, that is exactly our goal as well. Ms. Leshar.
- RV: Ms. Leshar.
- JL: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Villegas, just as an example, out of the first 14 plans that I have reviewed, it ends up with about 275 employees continuing to work and about 250 out on some sort of leave. What we are accomplishing is significantly limiting the number of people within the building, and coming into the building but also provides through pandemic vacation, sick leave, time to move out. We do have some that may, particularly in the library, which was one of the areas where we had furloughs before that we are looking to connect them with critical services such as the contact tracing, Food Bank services, et cetera.
- BV: Is that a guarantee that nobody will leave without, nobody will be without pay?
- CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Villegas, it is a guarantee that we will do everything in our efforts to not have that happen. The issue is can I guarantee one person will not be available to either do Food Bank or contact tracing or any other service? I cannot tell you until we get all the way through all of these. The goal is to have no one go without a paycheck.

RV: Supervisor Villegas.

BV: When I read the plan I am not comfortable and now we are not. We are kind of going to the plan and not the telework, but if the plan is a separate item that we are going to vote on today. I would want to have more concrete language in there about making sure that, you know, people have the choice of working elsewhere so they do not lose a paycheck during this time, if possible. Then going back to the telework, I think that there are, I would hope that the appointing authorities look at those options as well. That their supervisors look at, you know, sometimes I have been thinking about different types of work out there where things can be done at home, even from the perspective of, you know, and we do a lot of it already with our housing, you know. People are not coming in, everything is being done by phone anyway. And then when they do have to come to bring items, paperwork, if they do not have a computer or something. You know, those are things that there will be a few people there to take those items. I am sure that in every department there are jobs that can be done through telework. I think the other issue that you brought up, Mr. Huckelberry, is the lack of broadband, the lack of internet in some of our employees. You know, I think that could be, that could be an issue and if there is anything that we can do from our end, to make that easier for people. I know that we do have, we have, you know, our I.T. Department. So that, and possibly there are computers out there that you know that we can provide. But, again, if they do not have the broadband, that could be an issue and I understand that. I am just, I just want to make sure, you know, I do not know what the plans look like. You probably have not had a real chance to really look at them yet, the ones that you received. I would want to make sure that the appointing authority or the supervisor, whoever is preparing this plan has a good concept of what can be done at home and what cannot be done at home. You know by an employee from their perspective.

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman, what we will do is you know summarize these plans and probably get just a summary to the Board and answer the basic question that you asked and before it takes effect on Monday. We will just, to show you how complicated this can get, I mentioned earlier, 50% of the teleworkers are mostly Attorneys either County Attorneys or Public Defenders or Support Staff for those. I had a conversation, the Presiding Judge called me yesterday and his comments to me were, he may actually also do something very similar in the courts. So now, if we significantly reduce what happens in the courts, what happens to those teleworkers that are, you know, basically dominant in supporting the court system? That is the kind of complications that we get into.

BV: You are talking about evictions?



CH: No, no, it is just the Superior Court, you know, and so there is, you know, the Public Defender and a Prosecutor assigned to all cases and all of a sudden if they have no trials, no motions, no this, no that. Now what happens? So, there is the complicating factor.

SB: Why is that? Excuse me, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. Why is that complicating? I mean what is complicated about it. I am trying to understand. I mean if there are no cases to be heard, then that is a good thing? Is it at least at the moment since we are encouraging telecommuting? Or, I hope we are going to be encouraging it in a greater degree. So, I am not sure, what, how, perhaps you can enlighten me what you mean by complication.

CH: Sure.

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Bronson, the complicating factor is if I have prosecutors and defenders telecommuting and basically inputting into a legal proceedings that is no longer existing. Now what are they doing?

SB: Well, whether they are here or telecommuting, they are doing nothing because there are no cases. So, I am not, again I do not see your point. I mean, you want to fire them or...

CH: The point is, I do not know what they are going to be doing.

BV: I am sure they have a lot of paperwork to do. They all have way over the amount of cases, I would think.

SB: And that is not their fault. If there is nothing to prosecute, nothing to defend, because there is no action in court. I do not, well, if you are talking about productivity whether they are here or they are working telecommuting they are not going to be productive because there is no, there are no cases.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Bronson, then those who have nothing to work on telecommuting can use their leave.

SB: I do not think that is fair.

RV: Or Mr. Huckelberry, like all the other employees are they eligible to work on the services that you discussed before?

CH: Mr. Chairman, the employees that are basically directly delivering services are not.

RV: Okay.

SB: I am really not comfortable with any of this.

BV: Yeah, I do not...

AM: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Miller.

AM: This sounds like we are going to have a lot less need for employees as we reduce services. In Mr. Huckelberry's memo, he talks about, we will not have the transportation needs, et cetera that we need. It sounds like, you know we are going to have to consider the fact that we are going to have a need for fewer employees. Has that been addressed and has anybody thought about that?

SB: But, Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Miller, but it is fewer employees during the time of COVID. When we get back to business as usual, if we get back to business as usual. Why are we penalizing employees who through no fault of their own have no caseloads?

AM: Well, I guess as I look at it, it is the same thing for the private businesses that we are going to impose a shutdown on. It is no fault of their own. It is no fault of their employees that they have been hit and told to shut down without any consideration and I think that is on the agenda today. We are doing it to them. We have to look at ourselves because without the tax base, without these people working, we are going to have less dollars. We want to keep things all the same and keep our employees employed and keep paying them, but we are expecting the business community, all of these small businesses. They cannot afford to pay their employees, so they have to do layoffs. Well if they have to do layoffs, we will collect fewer tax dollars. And if we are collecting fewer tax dollars, we are not being realistic if we are not considering this, with this memorandum is talking about a serious shutdown. I would like someone to address that and let us know what is the plan and how do we support our own employees keeping them employed doing nothing. While we are forcing others to lay people off, because they do not have the luxury of just increasing taxes or collecting taxes and paying salaries. They are stuck with the revenues that they get from their business and we are talking about shutting them down. That is the hypocrisy in all of this.

RV: Other comments?

AM: I would like the County Administrator or someone to address that, please. I did not just say that for the sake of saying it. If I am wrong, please explain where I am wrong and how we will do this and how we will also make sure that the business community can still afford and our residential community can still afford to pay the taxes to keep people employed doing nothing.

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Miller, I assume you are speaking of the issue of mandatory curfew, which would go into effect at 10 p.m., and the primary impact, would be on those businesses that are essentially restaurants/bars, predominantly bars in the evening. There are probably, if you look at the number of establishments, less than 15% of the total base. You are restricting typically about 3 to 4 hours depending on when the bar closes, versus, and so that is the, it is shortening the time period. That is what the process of curfew will do.

AM: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Miller.

AM: But we are also restricting businesses from functioning at full capacity during normal hours and according to this memo, it says this, when you said effective at midnight that is midnight on the 21st according to the memo. Is that correct? But we are also restricting the ability for business operators to function as normal all day long, during normal hours where we are restricting the size of events and all that kind of thing. I think we realistically we have to look at this, we cannot pretend that there is nothing going on in the private sector that does not impact Pima County because those are the people paying the salaries of the County employees. It is that tax base and that tax base is shrinking and I suspect it is going to shrink even more because of these restrictions and these shutdowns, people cannot stay in business. Pima County is a service-oriented economy and always has been for a very long time. That impacts us far worse than a manufacturing-based Economy such as Maricopa County has. I think we need to look at the realistic impacts on our economy versus other economies that are not so focused on service industry.

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, I think the issue that is important is that the County has not placed the restriction on the occupancy of residential, of restaurants. That is the Governor's Proclamation.

BV: I think the...

SC: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Hang on. Did you have something Supervisor Villegas, and then Supervisor Christy.

BV: Yes, thank you Chairman Valadez. What I can say to Supervisor Miller is that the reason that, what we are trying to accomplish is transmission. This virus is real and by having businesses open. We are allowing businesses to stay open, maybe at a different capacity but it is still about the transmission of this

virus in order to keep people alive. We need to make sure that we are doing all we can from our employees all the way to the corporations who unfortunately, you know we are in this bind. This is not something that any of us want, but this is what we have been handed. We have to look at this from the perspective of life and death and long-term effects from this virus. So, I do not think that comparing the two you know, having business as usual makes any sense if we are trying to stop the spread of this virus, for one. What we are trying to do to employees that are public servants, we are trying to keep them from, I mean, we had how many? How many people were contracted the virus, County employees? I know I saw that somewhere.

CH: Yes, Mr. Chairman...

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Supervisor Villegas, this last week it was 60 employees, the previous week was 38, in total since March I think it was 353.

BV: That is a lot of employees for Pima County. When I first came on it was pretty low. So we have a problem. We have an issue that we have to address. We have an obligation to protect our employees.

AM: Mr. Chairman?

RV: If you are to that point Supervisor Miller? But Supervisor Christy is next otherwise? So Supervisor Miller is it to that point?

AM: Yes, it is, it is to that point. I was the one who was speaking and then Supervisor Villegas was allowed to interrupt. I would like to respond to that. That does not address my question. Nobody is questioning that the virus is real or not real. What I was speaking about is the fact that we are going to have a lot of employees who are doing nothing as that was discussed earlier and they are going to, and we are going to have to make a decision, do they continue getting paid? Or do they, or do we have to downsize our staff? Just like the private sector is having to do. Their employees are impacted too. This is not just affecting County employees. You distinguish them as public sector as if the public sector employee is more valuable than a private sector employee, which I find very disturbing. They are all valuable, all of these employees. We do not want anyone to get sick. However, we have to look at the reality that as the private sector is forced to shut down, whether to diminish capacity or through just shutting down after a certain time of day. We are going to have less revenues to be able to support the staff that we currently have. We are not being realistic if we do not look at that and address it and I hope that someone is looking at that so we do address it. I just wanted to make that point. It is nothing about who gets sick, who does not get sick. No one wants anyone to get sick but at the end of the day, we have to weigh the tradeoffs here and we have to evaluate those. Thank you.

- RV: Now to that point, let me go ahead and try to clarify a little bit. What we were talking about in terms of the nonessential employees earlier, is that the discussion we have been having with Mr. Huckelberry and Ms. Leshner is an employee who does not have any role to play or in their normal practice of their employment, does have the ability to then go and provide one of the services. Part of what I think where we went a little bit off track is because part of the discussion went to, if Superior Court then closes down or minimizes its operations, it now affects the lawyers and ancillary staff at both the County Attorney and the Public Defender's Office. So if we, if those lawyers are willing, if they do not have anything to do to then work in the service-oriented abilities we are proposing for other employees then they could get paid as well. Mr. Huckelberry.
- CH: Mr. Chairman that is essentially correct. I think I may have started this by talking about the courts. But I think these employees are budgeted full-time and throughout the year, so there is no issue now. The issue will come is that as we begin to look at, and I think that was Supervisor Miller, our revenues next year when we structure our budget. If they are substantially less, then, yes, we have to do something to curtail our operations. We do not know that yet and the only point I think that I was trying to make is that there are things that are interrelated in our system. Where one could have an effect on the other and we just have to understand that. That is all I was trying to point out and I think you are correct is that we have a number of employees during this period that traditionally are going to be on leave anyways because they want to be on leave. We want to encourage those employees to take leave. There are employees as we begin to depopulate buildings that might not have enough leave and we will do our best to place them either in contact tracing or in any other county job so that they continue to be paid. That is in summary what we, that is the goal and that is what we will accomplish.
- RV: Supervisor Christy.
- SC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit concerned that we are kind of mixing up some agenda items here. We are talking initially about telecommuting and virtual meeting policies and I think the curfew issue has crept into the discussion and it needs to be dealt with on a more significant level separately. But to Supervisor Miller's point, there is going to be a reduction in revenues to the County to support employees and services and it is very important from a business perspective and I had to go through this numerous times over the years in the County. I am sure it has to recognize that this situation exists now. That if there are less requirements for employees, i.e., less work for employees to do, then we have to look at reducing the number of employees. It is not rocket science. It is a business rule that when business slows down and seems to be in a situation where it is not going to come back any time soon. A business has to look internally and try to justify the number of employees. I am hoping that the County is doing exactly that. If there is no need for whatever reason, for employees to be employees, then there is a need to reduce the number of employees. It

has nothing to do at this point with telecommuting or any kind of meeting policies or anything of this. It is a matter of proper management of our income versus our expenses and the largest expense that you have in any kind of organization be it private or public, is employees and we need to look at the justification of carrying so many employees when their services are not or no longer required. I would hope that maybe we could go on to give the County Administrator direction to make sure that all aspects of needs versus number of employees are being analyzed, and if there is an ability to reduce costs as a result of lost revenue, that those reduced costs are taken. Also, I would like to hopefully maybe segregate the discussion to the second addendum on the curfew issue and not to confuse everything that we seem to be getting confused at this particular point. Thank you.

SB: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Bronson.

SB: I want to thank you for your earlier comments regarding telecommuting and who can and who cannot. To Mr. Huckelberry's point and I guess I was not making myself as clear as I should have been. My concern, I mean if the courts make it, it is not only the courts, it is not only Public Defense, it is not only the County Attorney, it is the entire Criminal Justice System that is going to be impacted by this, rather immediately. At least what we think the time period that we are looking at three to four months? So, I think we need to be a, I am really going to use this word, a little judicious and a little more analytical in how it is affecting the whole Criminal Justice System. Because once we take people offline and once we recover, if we recover from COVID quickly, if the vaccine becomes available. It is going to be interesting to see how we get the system back up and functional. That whole Criminal Justice System. That was my point with the issue of telecommuting.

RV: Alright, any other comments on this one?

SC: One quick question Mr. Chairman.

RV: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Some weeks ago I asked that Mr. Huckelberry, his thoughts on when restrictions on businesses and other entities might be lifted and I suggested maybe after the holidays or after the New Year. I believe Mr. Huckelberry's response was that things would not be removed or lifted probably to the summer of 2022. Now that there is a vaccine coming out, and it was more apparent in the last couple of days, that it is going to be utilized as opposed to when I first posed the question to Mr. Huckelberry. Mr. Huckelberry, are you standing by your original prognostication that the impositions on businesses will remain effect until 2022? Or has the vaccine introduction changed your mind on that?

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, I think what I said is that it could be as late as 2022, and it could be as early as the summer of '21, if in fact, we can deploy a vaccine sufficiently into the number of individuals within the community to achieve what was the public health officials call herd immunity. I think you know, the earliest is probably sometime in the late spring of '21, maybe early summer of '21.

SC: Mr. Chairman.

RV: Alright Supervisor Villegas, did you have something else?

SB: I think he just blipped off.

BV: I just want to go back to, I think we need to take one item at a time and for the telework, telecommute, I would like to make a motion that all employees who are technologically able to telecommute should be allowed to do so with permission of their appointing authority.

SB: Second, you making a motion?

BV: I am making a motion.

SB: I will second that.

RV: Mr. Huckelberry, how does that differ from the current policy?

CH: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is different.

BV: Well, when I read it, there, Chairman Valadez.

RV: Supervisor Villegas.

BV: When I read it, it says that it only applies to people that are 65 and over, have compromised medical conditions, take care of someone with a compromised medical condition or have school-aged children, which are all good reasons. But I think we need to look even more broader than that. I think we need to look at anybody that can telecommute, that has the ability to telecommute, or telework should be able to do so and if they have the work, the workload that provides them that opportunity.

RV: You know, on the surface, it sounds decent, but Mr. Huckelberry, what, who can take advantage of it, and who cannot?

CH: Mr. Chairman and I think when you look at the people who are telecommuting, it is even broader than the list, the list is a must-telecommute. The other is if it is available then they can telecommute. So we have a

number of telecommuting that are probably not even on the list. I think the folks who cannot take advantage of it are obviously are the correction officers our Sheriff's Department law enforcement officers, our transportation workers and our wastewater workers. It is those employees typically are not going to be eligible or able to telework.

RV: What is your best guess at this point?

SC: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Excuse me, Mr. Christy and I will go ahead and get you afterwards.

RV: What is your best guess in terms of the number of who can, how does this change the number of people who can telecommute?

CH: Mr. Chairman and it, right now we have about, I think, 20%, 10% to 20% of the workforce telecommuting and I do not think it changes much. Because again those who can probably already are. I think it is really trying to figure out how you know. You know the issue is you have to have as we said a piece of equipment. You have to have the internet connection. You have to have all of those things that an employee who and then there has to be a judgment by the department head as to whether the employee can telecommute or not. Those are, at this point, unknowns but I doubt it will change very much at all.

RV: Alright Mr. Christy.

SC: Mr. Chairman, just in addition to being County Administrator, Mr. Huckelberry, you are also what I would consider the general manager of the County's workforce. Do you see any changes necessary in the policy or do you think that it is covering all the aspects of it as it is, in your mind do you, do you feel that it needs revision, or do you think it is working out in its current manner?

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, I believe it is adequate now. I believe that in the policy, there is some language that talks about unusual circumstances can be brought to the attention of Administration and we deal with them on a case-by-case basis.

SB: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Bronson.

SB: To your point about who is affected with the telecommuting. I think it is basically going to be mostly the white collar workers, which I think is what you were alluding to but, you know, we still have issues with some of the blue collar workers, but to not try to assist where we can. I think is, it would be negligent on our part. We would love to help everybody and perhaps with the



new Administration in D.C., in January, we will get some more C.A.R.E.S Act money or possibly some relief. So again, we are all in a state of limbo pending much of what is going to be happening in D.C., that is frankly beyond our control. What we can control, I think we should try to control.

RV: To that point, I am trying to gauge what kind of equality issue we really have and are creating and that is the concern of my point.

SB: Okay, again, that goes to the point I made with Mr. Huckelberry earlier. I think you made a similar point, we need to do some more analytics to understand how this is affecting us. Meaning the Pima County region not just Pima County Government.

BV: Yeah.

RV: Supervisor Villegas.

BV: Chairman Valadez, I agree, I think this needs more. I mean, I would like to have all the employees surveyed with the same question. You know and really see whether or not they feel they can do their job at home first of all and if they have the resources, if they have the equipment, if they could do their job at home, you know, would they be able to? Do they have the broadband? Do they have the computer and all of these things? Because I have a feeling that there are a lot of jobs that can be done by telework at home. My real objective is to try, as I am sure with the Administration is to really try to stop the transmission and the only way to do that is to stop the exposure and the only way to do that is to have less people in the buildings. So this is what I am trying to get at, but at the same time we know that our Health Department needs a lot of work, a lot of support and our community needs a lot of support and a lot of work. So there is options for people to be maybe even in an outdoor environment to do things, so that they are not in the building. But as far as the telework, I think that, I honestly believe that there is, that it does not just affect the white-collar, that there are blue-collar workers out there that would be willing to telework and are able to telework. But we do not know that if we have not asked them, and if we have not asked their supervisors.

RV: Alright. Any further discussion?

SC: Mr. Chairman, I am just curious. Is there a plan or a policy or an approach that we are supposed to vote on that is before us or is this basically just pretty much a freewheeling discussion?

RV: It is a discussion, sir.

BV: Well I do have a motion.

RV: But there is a motion on the floor on the telecommuting.

SC: Could you repeat the motion?

BV: So my motion is to, for all Pima County employees who are able to telecommute, should be allowed to do so with permission of their Appointing Authority.

RV: Anything else, Supervisor Christy?

SC: Nope. Thank you.

RV: Any further discussion on the motion?

AM: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Miller.

AM: Did we not say that is the current policy? Did Mr. Huckelberry answer that that is what the current policy is? It is that it is between the employees and their supervisors to determine if they are able to telecommute. I just want to be clear, because my understanding is this is the current policy.

RV: I believe and I will let Mr. Huckelberry answer this as well, but I believe the issue there is that the language is a little different, but the practice is fairly similar, Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Miller the policy says you must allow an employee to telework if they meet these conditions. You must. If the employee can work telecommuting and this occurred, even before we had COVID, they were allowed to telecommute with their Department Director.

RV: Any further discussion, Supervisor Miller?

AM: No, thank you Mr. Huckelberry.

RV: Supervisor Bronson.

SB: No.

RV: If not, the motion before us is as Supervisor Villegas just read it. All those in favor, please signify by saying Aye.

SB: Aye

BV: Aye.

RV: Aye.

RV: All those opposed please signify by saying Nay.

SC: Nay.

AM: Nay.

RV: By your vote of 3-2, motion carries.

DRAFT

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

### 52. COVID-19

Discussion/Direction to Staff/Action regarding COVID-19 related items, including the following:

- Mandatory Curfew at 10:00 p.m.
- Penalties for Violating the Mandatory Curfew
- Update on Vaccination Plan

#### Verbatim

---

RV: Chairman Valadez  
SB: Supervisor Bronson  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
AM: Supervisor Miller  
BV: Supervisor Villegas  
CH: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator  
FG: Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services  
JC: Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board

---

RV: Addendum Item No. 2.

CH: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, we have provided you a brief memorandum I have handed you out a chart and it gives you the basic status of where we are in the number of infections and the what we call the infection rate per 100,000 population. As you can see, it is charted by the week since inception of the time in which we began to first have cases in March to the last two days. The colors on there are those colors that are promulgated by the Arizona Department of Health Services with regard to when it is safe, in the green, when you should use caution, in the yellow, and when you should take action to protect yourself, in the red. As you can see, we are as of today, we had 798 new cases bringing a total of this month to 14,387. We are just halfway through the month and we recorded 17 deaths today. That gives you the situation that we find ourselves in. One of the things I think that the Board did last, with Special Meeting on December 4th, was to look at what other measures we could take. Including, I think, the one that was mentioned by the Chairman, was the issue associated with voluntary curfew versus mandatory curfew. We then set out to actually gather data and information with regard to what establishments were complying with the volunteer curfew and which were not complying. We had a number of our County Health Inspectors and other trained inspectors do what we call observations, Friday night and Saturday night. Which is to determine whether an establishment is open or closed, and if open what is the population or the number of individuals in the establishment. The findings I think are just summarized. I

can give you much more detail by the end of the week because as you can imagine, coalescing and combining, and analyzing data is a significant task. But it tells us that 15% of the establishments were noncompliant, mostly bars or the bar/restaurant combination. That basically a restaurant earlier in the evening, that turns into a bar late in the evening. Those are the major what would say, noncompliant with the voluntary curfew. You can say, well, that means that, you know 85% were compliant. Well 85% were compliant, but it also means that a very large number of those that we reviewed and these are the ones that have licenses and permits with the County Agency, the County Public Health Agency, are not going to be open anyway at ten o'clock. The best example is the breakfast places or the places that cater to lunch or some other activity and typically close. So we will try and whittle down out of this group with regard to percentages. How many were closed anyways because their business is going to be closed at ten o'clock regardless of whether or not there is a curfew and whether or not it is voluntary or mandatory. So what we have prepared for your consideration is a Resolution that basically enacts a mandatory curfew. It talks about the curfew being lifted when the number of infections fall below 100 per 100,000 and I believe that was what was discussed at the last Emergency Meeting of the Board. Finally, it enacts penalties and the penalty for a noncompliant business is that the County Public Health Agency can either suspend or revoke their operating permit or license. The subject of doing that will be at the discretion of the Public Health Official and it will depend on the severity of the infraction, if it occurs. All of those businesses that were identified as not observing the voluntary curfew will be advised that if the Board adopts a mandatory curfew, we will advise them of that and advise them of the penalties and ask for their compliance and that is the end of our report.

SC: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Christy.

SC: I have several questions if I may, thank you. Mr. Huckelberry, are you aware of the memorandum that Carla Blackwell sent around to employees asking for volunteers on Friday?

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, I am aware of it because I have seen it. Yes.

SC: Was that, did she do that in your direction?

CH: Yes.

SC: Was that in conjunction with the Chairman? Did he have prior knowledge to it?

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, he did not.

SC: Okay, a couple of questions I have here, the surveillance that was conducted on these businesses. What was the breakdown between those businesses being surveilled in the City of Tucson and Pima County?

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: I do not have those numbers exactly, but if you give me a second.

SC: But there were businesses being surveilled in the City of Tucson as well?

CH: Yes, there were. Anyone who has...

SC: So we do not know...

RV: Mr. Christy would you like him to answer your question? Or would you like to move on to the next question?

SC: I will be glad to have him answer the question, thank you.

CH: Aw, yes. Probably several hundred.

SC: In the City of Tucson?

CH: Yes.

SC: Okay. And out of the violators that you have described or those that were creating the problems you described, what percentage of those would you say were in the City of Tucson versus Pima County?

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, approximately the 15% that is in the memorandum.

SC: Okay. And City of Tucson has a mandatory curfew at this time and you found violators in the City of Tucson. What kind of enforcement was addressed by the City of Tucson on those violators, in the City of Tucson?

CH: Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Christy, that was an issue that we will address with the City because we do not know, if they had any enforcement actions. Our observation was related to could we have an effect on a business that we regulate through our food and health code? And those are the businesses that were selected.

SC: Alright. So we do not know what kind of enforcement, if any, was conducted by the City of Tucson on those businesses that were outside the curfew?

CH: That is correct.

- SC: Do you have any idea, off the top of your head, what it costs the County to hire the surveillers on Friday and Saturday nights and their expenses involved?
- CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, no I do not.
- SC: Okay. Is it not the judgment of the Health Department and other health officials that one of the most significant areas of COVID transmission is gatherings in people's private homes?
- CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, if I can give you some statistics, because we have finally been able to obtain them in the last month with regard to case investigation and contact tracing. If you will indulge me, I will read those off to you.
- SC: Sure.
- CH: We just got them this morning. The team over the last month, about 30 days, has interviewed 3,273 individuals. Of those interviewed, they were asked a series of questions. Were you near someone with COVID? What was your activities? What was occurring? Of the ones responding, 51% or 1,654 responded that they had a close contact with a known or suspected COVID positive individual. Then the next question talks a little bit about work and were you working or attending work and they responded 61% said they were. Of the ones who were working, 46% said a broad range of very differing occupations and settings. 21% were healthcare related, 14% in an office setting, 12% in a school or daycare and 5% in a correctional. That is working. Then the question asked did you visit a restaurant? Did you visit a bar? Of the respondents, 26% said yes they did. That is 858. Then the next question talks about I think your last question of 10 or more. And 15% of the respondents said yes, they had attended a gathering of 10 or more people at the time of which they were probably infected. 54% of those responding said it was a party or private venue. 28% were attending a religious service and 15% and, again, attending an event of 10 or more, attended that event at a bar or restaurant.
- SC: Okay. My question and my point is, if we force a mandatory curfew at ten o'clock. First of all, it is going to wipe out a whole chunk of very significant business for the employees and operators of the bars and restaurants. Secondly, if people do not have a place to go at ten o'clock or are not allowed to remain at the establishment there is a very good possibility that there could be a movement to say, "Hey everybody come on over to my house, we will continue the party here." So there are as you point out a very large percentage of operators who are following the COVID protocols and regulations and doing everything in line with making sure that there is no COVID transmission according to the guidelines, yet there is a small amount that are not. But would it not be wiser to allow the businesses that are

practicing the good protocols of safety to allow them to remain open so that the clientele can be monitored there with the safety protocols established by the operators. Rather than shutting out the clients to go somewhere else, is that not a dangerous situation?

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Christy, I guess that depends on your perspective. You know, our view was that we first had to determine and I think this is based on the Board's discussion and primarily the Chairman on December 4th. Whether or not there was a reason to believe that there was significant compliance with the voluntary curfew. The data that we obtained based on just our observation of two nights would indicate that there is a significant non-conformity to the voluntary curfew. Therefore, the mechanism that may be available to encourage, or request, or require a curfew would be to change it to mandatory and to establish a penalty that the County can actually enforce. So that should provide an incentive to comply with the mandatory curfew. Very often, we get criticized by and this includes the industry. Where we have the good actors complying and the bad ones not and not doing anything about the bad actors.

SC: Okay. If you will bear with me just a couple more instances here. It seems to me that we are going into this curfew issue with a lack of a great deal of pertinent information. We do not know what kind of enforcement was exhibited by the City of Tucson with its own mandatory curfew. We do not know how many of these violators really exist. You say somewhere around 15%. We do not know how many businesses or operators were between the City of Tucson and Pima County. So there is quite a bit of information here that we are going into this Resolution that does not provide any kind of basis where we need to make a valid decision. We do not know what the City of Tucson did as far as enforcement. We do not know the breakdown between the City of Tucson and Pima County and we do not know the percentage of violators that really would have been affected by this, as you point out, they may serve breakfast and not be open at these times. These I think, are very significant items that we should have in front of us, before we make any kind of a judgment that really has an impact on the restaurant and the bar owners in this community. They have already been completely ravaged by this whole issue of County proclamations and procedures as well as the COVID issue itself. And now we are going to add another one of a mandatory curfew and I would like to point that the Tucson Metro Chamber and the Arizona Restaurant Association both are against a mandatory curfew. It would seem to me that those that are complying with all of the regulations of the current COVID strategy to operate their business should be allowed to stay open so long as they practice what they have been practicing. And a very small amount of those who are taking advantage of the situation should be dealt with separately, rather than painting a broad brush on every operator in Pima County. Particularly when we do not know what the breakdown is of the enforcement as well as the amount of those who are actually in violation. So,



I would like to have that kind of information before this Board is forced to make some sort of a Resolution on such an impactful issue as a mandatory curfew. I think that sums up my questions for now Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your patience.

RV: Other questions or comments?

AM: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Miller.

AM: First of all, I was forwarded a copy of Ms. Blackwell's memorandum by a member of the public. I find it very disturbing that we just voted in an Emergency Meeting to impose a voluntary curfew and then we send out people to investigate businesses like we are the gestapo without even informing anyone on this Board. Every single one of us should be very disturbed. The County Administrator authorized this without any one on this Board having knowledge. I understand that Mr. DeBonis developed the list of businesses to investigate. I think the Board deserves, I am going to be gone after today, but I think the Board deserves to know how was that list developed? How? You know, what criteria were used to come up with that list? I think the Board deserves to know as Supervisor Christy requested, is how much did we pay these employees? We are complaining we do not have money but we are paying overtime, mileage and paid time off for the salary employees. What really bothers me, it was just a week before that the curfew was voluntary. Then we sent people out in the dark of night as if we are the gestapo to spy, literally spy on businesses because that memorandum did not say you go in, you announce who you are, that you are an inspector with Pima County, and my understanding is, it was any employee that volunteered. Not trained inspectors, based on that memorandum. You sneak around and you take pictures from the outside. What are we dealing with here? You people are frightening, and the community should be frightened that you are doing this in the dark of night. This is not the Pima County I moved to almost 30 years ago. This is gestapo tactics and we are a service-oriented town. This virus, I mean as far as I know, the virus does not go, "Hey, I am going to go home after 10, or I am going to be out carousing after 10 and I am going to start infecting people up until 10, we are all good." This is insane and to think that the virus will not affect people between the hours of 5 a.m. and 10 p.m. and then after that we all have to lockdown. I do not know who came up with this science. But I would love to know who came up with this as the criteria. I would like to know how we came up with, "If it is after 10 p.m. then we need to start citing people, because that is when the virus is most active." I would like an answer to that question. I would like an answer to all of these questions. I am sure I will not get it. But I hope that the Members of this Board, Supervisor Christy and Supervisor Bronson and all the new members start demanding more transparency from this Administration. We are finding out that all kinds of things are going on behind closed doors. Last meeting, the Board approved only informing the Chair of

Economic Development issues. Then today, we have this, that no one knew, not even the Chair. People need, in this community should be demanding more and something has to be done about this. This is just wrong! It was voluntary as of the 4th. How do you know these businesses did not understand it was voluntary and were closing up at 10:30 because we ran a little late or we had some good business and we want to make sure that, you know, we stayed open until 10:00 and then they were closing up? No one knows this. I think all of these, without going in there and discussing it with the business owners, it is really unfair and I think this whole thing, this whole, quote investigation/study. You are saying you found 15%. Well, 15% of what? 300, 400, 500? How many businesses? No one knows. No one can provide that information. I agree wholeheartedly with Supervisor Christy that it is premature to make a, to take a vote today without having that information available, but I am sure it will not make any difference. Thank you.

RV: I have a couple of comments here and Mr. Huckelberry, if you could answer a couple of questions. At this point, you say 15% of those businesses that we license were out of compliance. How far out of compliance, was it 10:15, 10:10?

CH: Mr. Chairman, I think it was, you know, significantly after that, 11:00, 11:30 and some of the bars were pretty crowded. I think the, and one of the answers to Supervisor Miller's question, is that curfews were basically just another layer of what we call mitigation strategies. Wearing a facemask is a mitigation strategy and so as you fail to control the virus, you up the mitigation strategies. So this is one of the additional mitigation strategies that is trying to find the peak of the curve and so it is again, it is an option of the Board.

RV: And we heard 15% of those businesses that we license, but the truth is how many of the businesses that were licensed are typically closed prior to even 9:00?

CH: Mr. Chairman, a significant number and that is that we will sort out so that then, you know, you will see the percentage of the businesses that could be open become a lot larger in the, in the noncompliant percentage.

RV: Mr. Huckelberry, we actually got this sheet here and I want everyone to see this. This was June and July when we were concerned about the peak. This is where we are at today. We are not only in the deep red, we are at almost 1,300 per 100,000 people on a seven-day rolling average. You know I take such numbers very, very seriously. I mean obviously we were concerned about what our mitigation strategy was in June and July when it was 305 on a seven-day rolling average per 100,000 people. We are almost at 1,300 per 100,000 people on a seven-day rolling average. That is over four times as high. Look if nothing else that tells us very, very clearly that what we have been able to do is not working. And in order to keep our community safe we have to try other things. Supervisor Miller, are you still on the line?

AM: Yes.

RV: Okay. I was just making sure, sorry. So what that tells us is very, very clearly what we have been doing has not been working. What it also tells us is that part of the discussion that we had a week and a half ago, where we said that we were going to try this voluntarily curfew and part of the discussion, we had members that wanted to go mandatory. What I said was I am not willing to go mandatory today, but if we find substantial noncompliance, we will revisit that issue. Today, we are revisiting the issue. 1,300 positive cases out of 100,000 people on a seven-day rolling average. Four times as much and as high as it was in June and July. At what point is it enough? Truthfully, look, these are not standards, these are not things that we want to do. As we heard from one of my colleagues just a few moments ago. Nobody up here wants to do any of these and we take this very, very seriously. In spite of the allegation that we do not. We take this incredibly seriously. This is my last board meeting and 17 years on this dais. This is not the last action I wanted to take. But I do it very, very seriously and with a lot of care and thought. Other questions or comments?

SB: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Bronson.

SB: You said what I wanted to say, and you said it much more eloquently than I could have. You will be missed. We will miss your voice come January and I certainly wish you well in your new endeavors, but I concur with everything you said. We are taking this seriously, the numbers speak for themselves, this is about saving lives, it is about protecting those at risk and to do anything other than adopt this curfew would be a dereliction of duty.

RV: Supervisor Villegas.

BV: I will just add the same, you are going to be missed. But I know that you are not done, I am sure you are going to be doing good work elsewhere. I also concur with everything that you said. I just want to add that when I came on to this Board, because my good friend and Supervisor Richard Elias had died. One of the things when I talked to his wife, that she told me is he did not die because he had COVID, but he died because of it. Because he knew what was happening and he was having a really, really hard time with it. So that was only when we were at 29. I cannot even imagine where we are today and how difficult these choices are. As I said before nobody wants to make them, but we cannot live in our bubbles. We cannot, we are responsible for Pima County residents, all of us, every single one. We have to do what we can, we are the Public Health Authority for this region. We have to depend on our experts, our experts Dr. Garcia and Dr. Cullen, who provided us this information. Who have worked with these situations before. Dr. Cullen worked with Ebola, her background is very much experienced in

these types of issues. We need to listen to her and we need to listen to Dr. Garcia. So I, we do not have a choice, we have to stop this spread and we have to do whatever we can. We have tried, we have done a lot of volunteer items that we have talked through over the months. We are doing, we are going to the extremes because we do not have any other choice and that is all I will say. Thank you.

SC: Mr. Chairman?

RV: Supervisor Christy.

SC: How many COVID transmissions have been reduced in the City of Tucson since they went into a mandatory curfew on December 4th?

RV: Before we address that, I mean that is something you cannot answer. but Mr. Huckelberry, would you give it a best shot?

CH: Mr. Chairman, I do not think you can answer it because again as I stressed, this is a layered mitigation strategy and it takes two weeks to become, to even see any change in given that the community spread is so wide at this point in time. It is an impossible question to answer.

SC: Along those same lines, I would like to quote Mr. Huckelberry who just spoke that there are a number of items that he says quote, unquote "needs to be sorted out" and this is again reflective of my objection to the mandatory curfew. As there are numerous, numerous situations, numerous topics that need to be sorted out and to put this Resolution in this form and without those things being sorted out. I think is a disservice to the community.

RV: Mr. Christy, I have a question for you. How would you stem this disease? How would you stop the spread of this disease?

SC: Well, I certainly would do everything I can to follow the protocols that have been instilled in us from day one; wash your hands, social distancing, do not go out if you do not have to. If you are sick, stay home, and if you have symptoms of any sort, not only do not go out to work and stay home but be tested. Do not go into situations that could cause you to spread the disease to other vulnerable communities. I have been following and I still believe that they are good recommendations that this County has installed and has been putting out. Whatever happened to the education element that the County was so proud of? All the things that I just mentioned were part of the education. So I would continue those types of things and until you have the science that tells me or the community that you can have a mandatory curfew at 10:00 and it will guarantee that it will stop the spread of COVID. I am very, very skeptical and I believe the original mandates and instructions and recommendations that I just rattled off still should be followed and still should be in place. That is the best way to deal with these things rather than trying to try to sort out issues or mitigate issues that we do not know anything

about or have no knowledge of and we have data that we have not collected yet. Yet expected to make an informed decision before us today. That is how I would do it.

RV: With all due respect, Supervisor Christy those are still in place. Let me show me the chart. Please look at where my finger is. It is not working.

SC: Would the amount of testing have anything to do with that?

RV: No, sir.

SC: No, okay. Thank you.

RV: With that, I move the approval of Resolution Number 2020-98.

SB: Second.

RV: Any discussion?

SB: Roll call, please.

RV: Roll call.

JC: Supervisor Bronson?

SB: Aye.

JC: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

JC: Supervisor Miller?

AM: No.

JC: Supervisor Villegas?

BV: Yes.

JC: Chairman Valadez?

RV: Aye, by your vote of 3-2, motion carries.

(Clerk's Note: Board Members returned to this item after initial discussion.)

BV: Are we going to do an update on the vaccination plan?

RV: That was part of the Addendum, Number...

BV: We did not do it, okay. I guess...

RV: We could.

CH: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, it is very, very simple. Just read the attachment that is attached to memorandum from Dr. Garcia. The vaccines have arrived at TMC and the Banner System and the first vaccinations will be given to healthcare workers on Thursday.

BV: Okay.

SB: Mr. Chairman, there have been several inquiries in terms of the, what we have just adopted, the Resolution we just adopted on curfew. What are the penalties for noncompliance?

RV: You had asked me also when it takes into effect? It goes into effect tonight.

SB: Right.

RV: It stays in effect every evening until the infection drops below 100 per 100,000 people on a seven-day rolling average. Mr. Huckelberry, if you could answer the other questions. The penalties.

BV: Penalties.

CH: The penalty is a discussion that says that for a business that we regulate, simply meaning that we provide a license or a permit to be in business, it could result in the suspension or the revoking that license or permit.

SB: But there is no...

SC: Mr. Chairman?

SB: There is no monetary penalty?

CH: There is no monetary penalty and the decision is made based on the Public Health Official.

SB: Thank you.

RV: Supervisor Christy.

SC: So the enforcement will come from the Department of Health?

RV: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Yes.

SC: Thank you.

RV: Alright. Supervisor Villegas.

BV: Thank you, Chairman Valadez, last time. I just wanted to ask a question on the vaccine because I have had a couple of emails/texts come to me regarding when the essential service employees. The lower, you know, income employees would be vaccinated, since it is not real clear, is it on the, I thought I saw it was on the second column, right? I do not have it in front of me, but...

RV: Dr. Garcia.

FG: Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Villegas, it kind of depends. If you have healthcare, if you have essential workers like Environmental Health Services folks, like folks doing reception and that are actually working in hospitals, then they actually are part of that group that gets early access to it. The rest of the essential worker population accesses this, typically in Phase 2, which we anticipate will be in the early Spring.

BV: Okay, alright. That should answer.

FG: I am sorry. In Phase 1B and that should be in one, two, three, before March.

BV: Okay. That is what I thought I remembered seeing it on the second column, but it was not real clear as to who exactly those essential workers were. So would those be the grocery store or would it be others aside from grocery store? The people that provide services that we need.

FG: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Villegas, we have a whole list and I can give you. It has a lot of detail.

BV: Okay.

FG: It is from the Federal Guidance and it includes a variety of folks who work for instance for our utilities and for our infrastructure and that provide a lot of services that cannot be provided other than in person.

BV: Would our Constables be under law enforcement?

FG: Mr. Chairman and Supervisor Villegas, the Constables fall under law enforcement.

BV: Alright. Thank you.