

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 Monday, August 21, 2023. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Sergeant Krygier left the meeting at 11:05 a.m. Deputy Aaron Cross resided over the remainder of the meeting as Sergeant at Arms.

1. CONDEMNATION RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 39, of the Board of Supervisors, sitting as the Board of Directors for the Pima County Flood Control District, authorizing the Pima County Attorney to condemn real property interests where necessary for the Ruthrauff Gardner Culverts Project in Section 21, T13S, R13E, G&SRM. (District 3)

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

2. CONVEYANCE OF DEDICATED DRAINAGEWAY

Staff recommends approval of conveyance of dedicated drainageway to the Town of Sahuarita (File: Sale-0123), for Valle Verde Del Norte located within Section 26, T17S, R13E, G&SRBM, Pima County, Arizona, no cost. (District 3)

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:19 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, August 21, 2023. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Sergeant Krygier left the meeting at 11:05 a.m. Deputy Aaron Cross resided over the remainder of the meeting as Sergeant at Arms.

1. GRANT ACCEPTANCE

Cox Communications Arizona, L.L.C., to provide for the Arizona Commerce Authority - Arizona Broadband Development Grant Program, \$2,500,000.00 Library District Operations Fund match/2 year term (GTAW 24-21)

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:19 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, August 21, 2023. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Sergeant Krygier left the meeting at 11:05 a.m. Deputy Aaron Cross resided over the remainder of the meeting as Sergeant at Arms.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Avery-Shalom Valencia, KEYS Research Internship Graduate.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. MOMENT OF SILENCE

Chair Grijalva observed a moment of silence for the passing of Pima County Sheriff's Department Deputy Matthew Salmon. She stated that he had been a dedicated employee who served the citizens of Pima County for over 16 years and offered condolences to his family.

5. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Christy stated that for the record Supervisor Bronson had announced well in advance that she would not be in attendance at the July 25, 2023 meeting and the agenda for that meeting date included the long-awaited Human Resources classification/compensation study with \$14 million in employee pay raises and

Supervisor Bronson had requested in writing a continuation of that item to the August 8, 2023 meeting, so that she could be present for the discussion. He stated that this was not an extraordinary request and felt that it had been summarily ignored and denied by Chair Grijalva and he believed that the proposed study had been placed on the July 25th agenda because Supervisor Bronson would not be in attendance. He indicated that he had voted in favor of the study with the majority of the Board in order to bring the item back for reconsideration on August 8th, to allow Supervisor Bronson the opportunity to engage in the discussion. He stated that the Chair displayed a pattern of brazen suppression of free discussion and debate during the August 8th meeting with her dismissal of discussion and that after the reconsideration request had been moved and seconded, she shut down objections and called for an immediate vote by the Board. He felt Supervisor Bronson deserved an apology for the disrespect the Chair had rendered her and that the Chair should stop being afraid of frank and open discussions.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Buck Crouch, United States Submarine Veterans, Inc. - Tucson Base, proclaiming the week of August 28 through September 3, 2023 to be: "UNITED STATES SUBMARINE VETERANS WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Hailey Torres, Grants, Contracts and Projects Specialist, Pima Council on Aging, proclaiming the month of September 2023 to be: "FALLS PREVENTION AWARENESS MONTH"

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

8. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Al Haase addressed the Board regarding Pride 23 and Democrats of Greater Tucson bookmarks that the Green Valley Public Library was allowed to hand out and commented libraries should be neutral public institutions.

Alex Tsaturov, representing Agave Ventures, stated that they currently owned a one acre parcel located on Forecastle Avenue and requested the Board's support with enforcing the original conditions of approval for their conditional use permit, and asked them to revoke the conditional use permit for the unpermitted AT&T cell tower located on the adjacent lot at Forecastle Avenue, due to non-compliance reasons.

Robert Reus spoke about the five most profound accomplishments by Thomas Jefferson during his presidency with regards to taxes, the economy and the national debt.

Cory Stephens suggested that a social worker coordinator or crisis intervention specialist be included with staff at the Transition Center located at the jail facility, to provide counseling services.

Shirley Requard expressed her concerns with the health hazards of 5G cell towers and indicated that HB3557 and HB4141 would strip local government of their regulating powers.

Carol Lindsey spoke in opposition to continued aid for asylum seekers and the money should be used for road repairs and maintenance.

Gisela Aaron expressed opposition to Minute Item Nos. 27, 28 and 55 regarding the renewal of existing and new 5G contracts.

Perry Daly, President, Pima County Probation Officers Association, spoke in support of Minute Item No. 17, Countywide Classification and Compensation Study, Phase 2.

Stephanie Kirk spoke in opposition to Minute Item Nos. 18, 26, 27, 28, and 55 and asked the Board to vote against these items.

J.P. Salvatierra referenced Powers for the People, an article in an Arizona journalism newsletter, created by Attorney and former legislator Pamela Powers, which discussed Proposition 208 where education funding had been stripped by the legislature. He also spoke about reinstatement of the fairness doctrine.

Ann Rose addressed the Board regarding the 2022 excess mortality data for Arizona and expressed her concerns with the lack of interest for discerning the truth about these deaths in Pima County by the Board of Supervisors and the County Board of Health.

Christine Bauserman spoke in opposition to Minute Item No. 24, and questioned whether vote centers saved the County money, why the University of Arizona needed another vote center and how many registered voters lived in the vicinity of the university.

The following speakers addressed the Board in opposition to Minute Item No. 4, Incorporate Vail Election:

- Ralph Schoneman
- Kathleen Favor
- Todd Ogiba
- Diane Feldmayer
- Katie Breeding
- Tim LaSota
- Rebecca Meyers

They offered the following comments:

- Petitions were not properly validated, should not have been accepted and should be denied by the Board.

- Pima County Elections Department was not consistently adhering to State laws regarding petitions.
- There were accounts of individuals being coerced and deceived into signing the petitions.
- Petitions and letters of opposition from hundreds of rural residents were sent to the Board and Incorporate Vail and had been acknowledged as received by the President of Incorporate Vail and then denied they were ever received when he met with residents in-person.
- The rural community was overlooked, disrespected and disregarded.
- Pima County would financially benefit if Vail became a town.
- The planning process should have involved input from the entire community, but the current movement intentionally excluded rural residents.
- The County assisted the fear mongering tactics of Incorporate Vail Arizona with their recent requests for the City of Tucson to take more land from the Vail area.
- Errors were found with the 2,058 validated signatures, along with dates and zip codes and the final report needed to be sent back for further review.
- They were told by the County Administrator's Office that the Board was not required to uphold Section F of Title 9, Article 1 of the Arizona Revised Statutes regarding rural land and incorporation.
- Rural community votes were not going to be heard and would be outvoted 10 to 1 by the master planned communities of Vail because no Wards or specific representation existed to protect the rural areas.
- The Board should protect the less populated areas from getting gobbled up by the densely populated urbanized areas.
- The Board's job was to decide whether sufficient support on a legal petition sheet existed prior to calling an election and the meets and bounds were not provided on the petition for verification of what the new community would be comprised of before it was signed, as required by Arizona Revised Statute 9-101.03C.
- The Board of Supervisors represented their constituents and were supposed to be for the people, not for the profit of the people. There was no proposed ballot measure included with the petition and it should have been deemed invalid.
- Proposed incorporation would save Pima County millions of dollars per year because County services would stop, but property taxes would continue to be collected.

* * *

Supervisor Scott asked staff from the Elections Department and the County Administrator's Office to address the concerns raised regarding the Vail election, including the boundaries of the proposed town, during the discussion of that item.

9. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:06 a.m.

10. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:26 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

11. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3), for legal advice and discussion regarding communication with the Federal Government.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. **Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety**

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained the Board had been provided with a report on August 18, 2023, and was willing to discuss the report at the pleasure of the Board.

Supervisor Scott expressed his gratitude for the memorandum and his excitement for the upcoming launch of the transition center in early September. He read from the memorandum and questioned whether concerns regarding risk and liability for employees could be addressed in consultation by the County Attorney's Office, and if not, asked how quickly alternative options be developed to ensure the achievement of immediacy and real-time referral to services. He added that he was extraordinarily concerned with the overall mission of the center.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, responded that staff continued to explore options, but there were current policies in place that prohibited transporting individuals in County vehicles. He stated that the issue remained a hurdle, but as they worked to resolve it there would be access to taxi and Uber services. He stated they were able to transport individuals through these means with the use of funds from the Justice Services Department and with the assistance from Hope Community Services. He added that the staff member from Hope worked at the modular and in support with jail staff to provide transportation. He stated they were working on a billing mechanism for transport services to align with the existing contract. He added that since the modular's official opening on July 14th, they had 108 engagements with individuals and approximately half of them had availed services. He stated that not all required transportation, but when necessary, they were accommodated with current accessibility through contracted services.

Supervisor Scott commented that maybe the issue was not as big a hurdle as he interpreted it to be from the memorandum and questioned if there was anticipation that transportation would become more of an issue as they moved into Phase 2.

Mr. Holmes responded that it was anticipated to become more of an issue in Phases 1 and 2 once individuals were made aware of services available to them and due to better connections being made. He stated that would be an issue to overcome. He added that two City of Tucson (COT) staff members would be joining, which presented another opportunity to benefit from the COT's current transportation resources. He indicated that once they were on board some of those issues would be resolved since the COT had already allocated staff to handle transportation matters in accordance with their existing policies. He stated that they would continue to explore the matter, especially with the anticipation that more individuals would take advantage of those services. He stated that they were currently under 50% of individuals who utilized services, some of them were reconnections with previous service providers, others were phone services and a magnitude of other services that would be tracked in more depth for reporting that could be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Heinz questioned whether there was language in statute that prevented the County from determining approval of transportation in this specific program and circumstances under these conditions.

Ms. Leshar responded that some of the liability was due to rules in place under the Finance and Risk Management Department and how it related to the driving of County vehicles for those services. She stated she would provide a summary of concerns to the Board.

Chair Grijalva commented that 50% of individuals being contacted and responding positively was a very significant number and an accomplishment for staff. She indicated that she had an opportunity to meet with the Navigators and questioned whether they were fully staffed.

Mr. Holmes responded that three out of the four positions were staffed. He indicated they were managing the staffing situation by utilizing the Justice Services leadership with no disruptions. He agreed that 50% was good, but believed it was crucial not only to accept the services, but the follow-through involved to result in changes of behavior. He addressed a concern voiced during Call the Public and stated that Navigators were people with lived experience, not social workers. He stated that different types of opportunities were needed moving forward into Phases 2 and 3. He indicated that being booked into the jail was equally important, especially for those individuals that served 1 to 2 days. He stated that the focus would be for the misdemeanor population that had no touch points with the system. He explained most of the individuals coming out of the pretrial pre-booking modular were for misdemeanor offenses and felony offenses were directly booked into the jail. He added these were touch points specifically with misdemeanor offenders, but also wanted to address the need for felony services.

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

13. Sheriff's Department Budget

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Sheriff's Department Budget.

Chris Nanos, Pima County Sheriff, apologized for the lateness of a letter he provided to the Board regarding his budget and stated the biggest concern with the budget was twofold. He stated that one concern was for existing expenses from January of the past year, which related to known occurrences, such as the \$336,228.00 benefits package for retention of second-year deputies that the state would not fund and would again be absorbed in his budget by October. He added that the Board had been aware of this expense prior to budget approval, but chose to not fund it. His second concern was the \$2.3 million supplemental package that was for inflationary costs. He stated that inflationary costs for the prior 2 years were projected almost to the penny and there was no reason to doubt the number was incorrect. He stated that it was clear those expenses were known and would be seen, and he did not understand why those costs had not been included. He stated that another concern was for the \$2.1 million in vacancy savings because his department had none. He explained that in 2021 when he took office, there were approximately 200 to 300 vacancies, but successful recruitment and retention had decreased that number. He explained that the department was hiring in great numbers and had told the Finance Department that their vacancy number would be less than 180, but that number was used to determine those costs. He stated that the department currently had 94 vacancies, half of the amount that was used to come up with the \$2.1 million budget. He stated that an additional concern was the hope to hire 50 or more Corrections Officers (COs) and 40 to 50 Deputies into the academy in October for which he had no vacancies. He stated he came before the Board and the County Administrator to help explain that there were no vacancy savings because they watched attrition rates, analytics and past trends and knew what was ahead of them. He further explained that attrition rates for the past 20 years had consistently remained at about 1 per week for Deputies and 3 per week for COs. He stated attrition rates were constantly monitored because of the challenge of being one of the few departments that performed background checks on every individual hired, which took several months to complete and additionally, 40 weeks of required training for Deputies and COs that needed to be completed prior to being deemed valuable to the department. He stated that prior to 2016, the Board and County Administrator had provided the ability to hire and have an investment for that pipeline when needed. He stated that since it took 40 weeks of training, he should be able to hire 40 people that were above and beyond his scope. He stated that in July 2016, the department had 1,686 employees and currently there were 1,430 employees. He indicated that he was not requesting the former, he was requesting the 1,490 the Board had provided, to be able to hold that number and never below. He explained that removing vacancies was like playing cat and mouse, as it could decrease 40, then increase 40, wait 40 weeks, decrease 40, et cetera. He stated that at this rate they never got ahead or stayed even and

reminded the Board that it was contingent on all 40 applicants making it through the process and passing the academy and probation, which was rare. He requested Board consideration to hire beyond 40 and be able to have 50 extra COs and Deputies. He stated they would not abuse the vacancy savings and would go strictly towards maintaining a desperately needed workforce.

Supervisor Scott stated that the Board had passed a policy in October 2022, prior to the start of the budgetary process which dealt with General Fund balance and vacancy savings, but found it odd that the Sheriff had not acknowledged the policy in his letter. He stated there was a process that department directors and elected officials could undergo to deal with this issue. He stated that this item was placed on the agenda so that Board members could hear from both the Sheriff's Finance staff and the County's Finance staff about their ongoing dialogue when monthly financial forecasts were being developed. He stated that it was indicated by all parties that the Sheriff's Department budget had been detailed for the Board in those monthly financial forecasts. He requested an explanation of how the policy could be used to address vacancy savings and how dialogue occurred between the parties.

Sheriff Nanos responded that the reason the policy was not addressed was because the letter was specifically directed toward the department's current budgetary position and how they would move forward for Fiscal Year 23/24. He indicated that his department were \$4.8 million in the red as they started the fiscal year due to the budget cuts. He felt that the budget problems were the result of staffing and labor force shortages and indicated he brought it to the Board's attention that morning. He added that it had been referred to in last October's policy only as a forecast of what would be seen in the next few weeks or months. He added that academies had been scheduled and planned and would have to be canceled if those vacancies or Position Control Numbers (PCN's) were not restored.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated Sheriff Nanos comments and that the October policy entailed means for both elected officials and department heads to address concerns they had with how vacancy savings were covered.

Sheriff Nanos responded they have had law enforcement exemptions because of the 40-week delay in processing onboardings due to the completion of academy training and background check requirements.

Supervisor Scott asked how the dialogue between both Finance offices occurred after each of the monthly financial forecasts were provided. He also requested an explanation of the October policy and the Contingency funds the Board had placed into the budget for inflation costs, which was cited in the Sheriff's memorandum.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that the policy was brought to the Board overall in regards to vacancy savings as an attempt to ensure every department was being budgeted the amount needed to operate their organization. She stated that many departments were using vacancy savings to accommodate for not understanding what the needs were for the operations and facilities portion of

their budget. She stated that their belief was that it was not transparent enough on what was needed because of the different allocations. She stated that as a result they looked at ways of removing the vacancy savings from the equation of being able to fund when additional positions were needed and allowed for the review of what those needs were. She indicated an additional piece was that it had resulted in an adjustment at the base of a 4% increase in the Sheriff's budget into the new year. She added that vacancies were being held whenever possible due to difficulties with filling positions. She stated that if a department removed a PCN it was a very complicated process to request a new one. She stated that with the current system they looked at positions that had been open for 365 days or potentially half a year and were reviewed to determine if the position was needed or if they could be removed, to better understand the budget of the organization. She added they also complimented the current system with an easier way to request new PCNs, when needed, for critical operations of the organization. She stated there had been a different way in how they reviewed funding vacancies to ensure positions that were needed were adequately paid for. She stated they were not using vacancy savings for overrides of budgets, but that it would come back to the Board. She added another issue was that the Sheriff's Department and others submitted a line item for inflation in last year's budget. She indicated that what was more important in the current adopted budget was an amount for inflation that was listed at the top of the budget so that a line item existed for inflation that could be used to supplement those costs for any department at any time. She stated that although some departments did not budget for inflation it would be the same across the board and wanted to ensure the County had an overall ability to adjust those allocations.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, explained that as part of the recommended budget, there was a line item for contingency provisions, one of which was \$5 million for inflation across all general fund departments, including the Sheriff's Department. She stated that as increases occurred, there was the ability to request from the Board that the money be moved to fund those increases to the Sheriff's Department. She indicated that another item in contingency was for the Sheriff's retention and recruitment stipend benefits for \$336,000.00, which had been budgeted because it would be paid based on who received the retention stipends and was dependent on employees that were still employed. She explained that it was an estimate budgeted within the overall general fund and they would plan for the October payments, request to move the money from contingency to the Sheriff to cover the expenses. She stated that her Budget staff had worked directly with the Sheriff's staff on an ongoing weekly basis regarding their forecasts and in anticipation moving forward. She indicated that the Sheriff had a large budget and it was known that their issues needed to be addressed. She felt that they had very open communication with the Sheriff's Department and had helped facilitate increases or modifications of Full-time Equivalent (FTEs) when requested. She added that the process discussed by Ms. Leshner regarding the modification of the requests for FTE's had worked well for most departments, but the overriding question became where it would be funded from. She stated this was particularly challenging for them because if they had no available vacant FTEs to allocate

towards that required funding it would be necessary to approach the Board once again to determine its source.

Ron Jee, Program Manager, Sheriff's Finance Department, responded that he concurred with Ms. Moulton on all her points and indicated they had a productive year of dialogue and discussion considering the challenges they faced. He stated that he greatly enjoyed collaborating with her team and stated that on matters concerning FTE's and PCN's they had been very effective in ensuring that they appropriately exchanged and reallocated resources so as not to misuse the PCN's at their disposal and indicated that a concerted effort had been made to address the issue within the past year following a decrease of approximately eight or nine FTE's. He explained there was a larger issue that was pointed out in the Sheriff's memo and although they appreciated that County Administration had set aside funds in contingency to cover benefit costs, inflation and other such items, there was an expenditure authority available for the County to pay for these items. He added that it was concerning that the funds were being kept in reserve and were never officially transferred to the Sheriff's adopted budget and in turn created a distortion of the financial results. He explained that their budget was not adjusted for these items and the actual costs associated with them would be recorded in their General Fund. He stated that the budget existed in one area and the actual costs existed in another, but would like them to be brought together so their budget reflected the actual costs. He stated that they had no intention of exceeding their budget, but acknowledged that those costs were a present reality due to inflation and the benefit costs for retention payments and those events would occur. He stated they wanted to look to create an adopted or revised budget that encompassed all those realistic and foreseeable events over the next 10 months. He extended his gratitude to Ms. Moulton, her staff and Division Managers, as well as those they had collaborated with over the course of many years to ensure the proper closure of their books.

Supervisor Scott stated that the comments being made reminded him of a discussion the Board previously had with the Sheriff that would be addressed the following month with a financial forecast. He stated that it would be a standing item on the Board's agenda, which staff and County Administration would let the Board know whether an issue surfaced with the monthly financial forecast that they had the ability to resolve or would make a recommendation to the Board if it was something the Board had to address. He stated it would ensure the issues were not only reported to the Board, but that Board would be asked to take action or would be informed on the action taken by County Administration as the issues arose.

Sheriff Nanos indicated that his issue was that the Board had shown his budget in a deficit because monies were being held aside to cover a known deficit and that made no sense to him. He stated it gave the Board the authority to criticize him for not meeting his budget, which had also happened at the prior Board meeting. He added that \$1.4 million was taken from his budget last year, they were in the red and when they asked for the monies, they were told that it was spent on affordable housing. He stated that his position was that the accounting of Mr. Jee and Ms.

Moulton was great and there was no conflict, but he felt that by holding some of the funds that was needed was like babysitting the Sheriff.

Supervisor Scott stated that the reason he started out his comments the way he did was because the Board and County Administration were carrying out the policy in place and he felt that much of the comments in the Sheriff's memorandum spoke to a misunderstanding or ignoring of the policy. He stated that it was unfair for the Sheriff to state that the Board was underfunding his department or criticizing him. He gave a reminder to everyone in the community that every pay raise increase for either new hires or current employees that was recommended to the Board by the Sheriff had been unanimously approved by the Board. He stated that the County Administrator had noted in her memorandum that the Sheriff's budget had increased by 4% this year. He stated that it appeared the Board had worked in partnership with the Sheriff and that his questions were designed toward moving forward together with no political or budgetary motives. He added that those characterizations did not stand up to scrutiny.

Sheriff Nanos stated that he hoped Supervisor Scott's statements were accurate about their collective presence, setting aside political partisanship to address the immediate concerns and well-being of the community. He stated that he needed capable staff to achieve that goal and indicated that when he took office in January 2021 and made a request for additional staff, his request was denied because he had several vacancies that needed to be filled. He explained those vacancies were about to be filled, but additional staff would still be needed. He stated that by October he would provide a letter or memorandum to the Board and would collaborate with Ms. Leshner on the matter. He stated he had a strong working relationship with Ms. Leshner and with the Board, but felt disheartened hearing others express surprise that he had not stayed within his budget even though the Board had been provided with monthly reports throughout the year and felt he was being attacked because of politics. He apologized and stated that he was not here for politics, but to fulfill his duties and ensure the safety of the community including those incarcerated at the jail. He explained that the high number of deaths in the jail was a matter of grave concern and should be no surprise that adequate staffing was directly related to the issue. He stated that considerable progress had been made with increasing staffing numbers along with commendable recruitment numbers and had caused other agencies to reach out and inquire about their recruitment strategies. He indicated that he genuinely appreciated the Board's willingness to collaborate with him and his department and asked for their continued support because he could not fulfill his responsibilities without the Board. He extended an apology to Supervisor Bronson for removing personnel from her area and indicated it was for the benefit of Supervisor Christy's area because his area had experienced a significant growth and the area where personnel had been removed was in decline. He stated that service calls in that area had decreased and decisions were based on analytics and data. He sincerely hoped they could forge a better working relationship in the future, one that surpassed the quality of past interactions.

Chair Grijalva stated that there was a line item in the Sheriff's budget for overtime and that in her first year in office there had been consistent requests for additional funds for different purposes. She questioned what impact the need for mandatory overtime had on his budget due to staffing shortages.

Sheriff Nanos responded that it had greatly affected their budget and explained that in previous years an average of \$2 to \$3 million was maintained for overtime expenses, but last year they had experienced a substantial increase to \$9 million which was primarily due to inadequate staffing. He stated staffing numbers were improving and the department had observed a downward trend in overtime expenses, but had not reached the desired level. He indicated that the influx of new personnel, including COs and Deputies being temporarily assigned to the jail had played a crucial role in achieving this progress and the increased staffing had also contributed to the overall safety and security of the facility.

Chair Grijalva questioned whether his staff turnover percentage was consistent and asked about the percentage number. She indicated that she was aware that the County had a high turnover rate.

Sheriff Nanos responded that on average over the last 10 to 15 years, they experienced 3 to 4 departures annually to alternative agencies due to compensation concerns or morale issues. He indicated that those numbers were diligently monitored and exit interviews were conducted to ascertain the underlying reasons and stated there was a great deal of anticipation about the implementation of the new pay study. He stated that he was hopeful that Phase 2 would be approved and would result in the stabilization of the situation and added that it was understandable that smaller agencies would always offer higher salaries because of competition against established entities, such as the County and the Tucson Police Department.

Chair Grijalva commented that his department was low on COs and asked whether a career pathway existed for those individuals who preferred to stay in the position and added that in past discussions, it had been viewed as an entry point to becoming a Deputy.

Sheriff Nanos responded that the department was excited about the CBIZ study and what it could mean for the employees and indicated that currently, only two opportunities were available for promotion which was the positions of Sergeant and Lieutenant and beyond that all promotions were made through appointments. He stated that the CBIZ study would introduce 11 distinct promotional opportunities for nearly every level, which was significant because it provided individuals with the realization that they were not confined to a dead-end job and there were various roles that could be pursued. He stated that they had been actively disseminating information about the study, but with some caution because the final decision was at the discretion of the Board.

Chair Grijalva commented that it was important that every employee understood their significant contribution to the overall system and how insufficient staffing had a ripple effect on the entire organization. She indicated that she was pleased to hear opportunities for advancement existed regardless of where they were in the department and questioned whether an internal process existed for appointments.

Sheriff Nanos responded in the affirmative and stated that appointments were set up through oral boards, tests, or executive reviews, but those positions and appointments were geared more towards executive staff.

Chair Grijalva stated that in the past funding for vacancy savings could be moved to other line items needed such as overtime.

Sheriff Nanos concurred and stated that it had been done in past years, but in the last couple of years vacancy savings had been used for hiring. He explained that if there were 20 positions available for COs but 30 were needed, he might take 10 Deputies to cover those other 10 COs and vice versa for Deputies. He indicated that they were constantly moving positions around and equated it to robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Chair Grijalva commented that a source of frustration that she felt was that in other County departments, except for elected positions, the Board's role was limited to the overall budget and had no influence over other matters. She stated that as the Board approved the budget and other supplemental requests that were received later was the only opportunity the Board had to discuss these issues. She stated that as the largest department in the County it was important for the Board to gain a better understanding of it and hoped it did not come across as an attack, but rather as a genuine attempt on her part to comprehend the intricacies of his budget.

Sheriff Nanos responded that one of the changes made this year was the elimination of budget hearings and stated he understood the rationale behind the decision, but would appreciate the opportunity to communicate with the Board well in advance of his budget presentation especially when submitting supplemental requests. He indicated that he was aware supplemental requests were seldom approved, which was a worrisome concern especially when proposals were presented to address the need for additional staff due to attrition rates or to address budget overruns caused by low staffing that would result in increased overtime expenses or the possibility to move funds due to the substantial costs of operating the largest motor pool that consisted of about one thousand vehicles and an air fleet that costed millions of dollars to maintain. He stated that he understood about the expenses associated with fuel and food, but indicated it was important to note one of his major concerns was the jail inmates who had to be fed. He stated he was grateful that staffing levels were moving up because they had remained stagnant for the past few years while the inmate population had continued to rise. He added that currently, he had 1,877 inmates and was projected to reach 1,900 by the end of the year, which was 10% above their actual capacity.

Supervisor Heinz stated that it was important to contextualize the matter and indicated that the facility had had a low of 1,303 inmates approximately two and a half years ago during the pandemic. He stated that various factors contributed to it, but the goal should be to maintain a population of around 1,300 to 1,400 inmates instead of being close to the nearly 2,000 currently being housed. He indicated that it was essential to motivate and perhaps utilize the power and authority of the Board to demand that all agencies and offices within the County contribute to the population. He added that the Sheriff was not responsible for the influx at the jail and felt the County Attorney, Adult Probation and Superior Court played a part. He stated that if there was an overage of overtime because of the increase in population, those different departments should pay for it. He stated that he was uncertain if it was lawful to suggest, but felt that by aligning and motivating everyone to focus on decreasing the population of the jail would help solve many problems and eliminate these discussions.

Sheriff Nanos responded that he did possess a certain degree of control over who was admitted into the jail by instructing his team to be mindful of the individuals being apprehended and the reasons behind their arrests, but indicated this was a small portion of the population and stated that the majority, approximately 90%, consisted of individuals charged with felony offenses. He stated that felony offenses did not qualify for citations and explained that among those cases, nearly one-third of the 1,800 were probation violations, and more than half of those violations were categorized as technical infractions such as testing positive for drugs or failing to comply with appointment requirements that breached the terms and conditions of their release, but did not involve breaking the law, but did result with the individuals being returned to custody. He stated he was presently witnessing a significant influx of inmates suffering with severe mental health conditions and indicated that his facility lacked the necessary resources and capabilities to adequately address their needs. He acknowledged that some inmates were exceptionally violent and should never be released, but indicated that a considerable number of incarcerated individuals were there because of drug addiction, drug abuse or minor offenses. He explained that he was not sure what they had done in the past, but he had tried to address these concerns by sharing almost the same letter Sheriff Napier had directed to all of the law enforcement leaders in the community during the pandemic, not once but twice and stated that he regularly engaged with the leaders of the law enforcement communities through phone calls, meetings and in-person to discuss these matters. He stated they shared his frustration and indicated that the court system was severely delayed due to the pandemic and although progress was being made in that regard, his latest report indicated that 89 individuals had slept on the floor due to overcrowding.

Supervisor Christy stated that it was noted that since Sheriff Nanos' letter had been provided to the Board two hours prior to the meeting, he had not had the opportunity to fully discern through it and stated that his questions were not meant to be political in nature. He read and referenced the letter and indicated that he had questions that raised other issues. He stated that it was his estimation of the letter that there was no question that the community was supportive of the Sheriff's efforts to recruit, train

and retain qualified Deputies and COs and that must be the number one priority. He stated that the Sheriff had the Board's support and had moved forward with his prior requests. He added that the tone of the letter indicated that the Sheriff felt that the numbers being shown were incorrect. He questioned who provided the numbers in the beginning and why the numbers were no longer correct. He stated that the Sheriff indicated the numbers were misrepresented and inequitable and that it appeared the Sheriff was requesting carte blanche of access to the County's General Fund, but that was not how it worked. He stated that he was happy to hear the Sheriff had worked closely with County Administration to ensure his budget reflected actual needs before budget adoption. He stated that the Sheriff's budget was passed and adopted, but there were ongoing issues and the letter indicated the numbers were incorrect prior and should not have been given credence. He stated that it should have been discussed and analyzed in the first quarter and questioned who was responsible for these overruns.

Sheriff Nanos responded that the overruns were forecasted to the Board of \$336,228.00 in benefits for retention and recruitment payments, but the Board had the authority to reject the retention money intended for his Deputies and COs that were in dire need of it. He stated that in March the Board had been made aware of that money during the budget planning, but it was not included in his budget and would still be deducted from his existing budget. He indicated that in his opinion, setting it aside separately in contingency was dishonest and gave the public the impression that he had a budget of \$159 million, but the \$336,228.00 would be taken and set aside and the Board would determine when it was needed. He stated that another aspect to consider was the \$2.1 million in vacancy savings was based on a two-month period of 180 vacancies in March and it was known by the Finance Department that within a week from that day, they had planned to hire approximately 80 COs and Deputies and indicated that number should have been reduced by half. He stated the Board provided him with a budget and informed him that all the funding was approved, but \$2.1 million in vacancy savings and \$336,228.00 for retention would be taken and set aside for contingency. He understood it was the Board's prerogative to transfer funds and retain them for those intended purposes because the reasons for approving those funds might not occur. He stated the problem with that scenario was that a supplementary package proposed last January had been rejected by the Board even though they had been cautioned that their budget would be in deficit and indicated he had planned on discussing the matter during the budget hearings. He explained that he took issue with the fact he was informed and scolded while he was on vacation for not being present to explain his budget, but indicated that he had never been contacted or was requested to be present. He stated he had little faith that if he left these issues unresolved as a marker for next May or June, he would again be told he had exceeded his budget and was informing the Board today that he had not been provided with sufficient funding and was underfunded by \$4.8 million.

Supervisor Christy commented that the Sheriff set his own budget, but his letter indicated that it was the Board who was taking and distributing funds as they deemed appropriate.

Sheriff Nanos responded that he was not setting his own budget if it was asked for and approved by the Board and indicated that the Board had not approved the items that he had asked for.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Sheriff had highlighted three areas; recruitment needs, the \$336,228.00 for retention, and the \$2.1 million for vacancy savings, but indicated that the biggest one had not been addressed. He stated this was perhaps the most adaptable in attempting to modify or handle and it was the \$2,325,000.00 for additional funding for operational supplies and services due to inflation that had not been approved and indicated those costs seemed to appear after the fact and were not taken into consideration from the beginning.

Sheriff Nanos responded that a supplemental package had been given to the Board in January, so he did not understand why Supervisor Christy referred to it as a subsequent submittal.

Supervisor Christy referred to the Sheriff's letter and read aloud "the County should officially vote to revise our adopted budget".

Sheriff Nanos responded in the affirmative and stated that it was due to the denial of the supplemental package. He stated to be present at this meeting and provide the Board with an update regarding his current budget going forward for 23/24 and indicated they had previously discussed 22/23 at a prior meeting. He added that if the situation remained the same, he would be \$4.8 million dollars in the red unless changes were made.

Chair Grijalva responded that no action would be taken today, but appreciated the Sheriff's attendance at the meeting. She anticipated having more discussions bi-monthly so that the Board could continue to stay informed and stated that at a minimum, a memo could be provided. She stated that a concern brought up by Ms. Leshner regarding the budget hearings for a two-minute presentation were very frustrating for most departments, which had met individually with each of the districts which could be done and was her preference.

Sheriff Nanos thanked the Board for allowing him time to discuss this issue. He stated that his current position was to inform the Board that his office was currently \$4.8 million in the red due to the unfunded items, but they would continue to adhere to the policy of providing monthly updates about their progress. He stated it was frustrating for his team to know this had been done last year and for several years they consistently shared monthly financial data. He stated there was never any indication that the information had not been received by the Board. He assured the Board they would be receiving the data because it was important that the Board saw the efforts put forward and how seriously they took their budget. He stated they wanted to remain under budget consistently, but they were faced with challenges. He stated he appreciated Supervisor Christy's questions and indicated that once

Supervisor Christy had a chance to digest the information, he could reach out to him with any questions for further assistance.

Supervisor Christy stated that the most important priority was ensuring public safety, and the Sheriff was the top Public Safety Officer. He stated that the Board should not have to be in a situation of wrangling over issues regarding budgetary matters and financial concerns, but to allow him to run his operation and protect the population. He added that this issue would sidetrack and deflect from the crime problem in Pima County, so if there was any way to work together to avoid these discussions, there would be open dialogue. He encouraged the Sheriff to continue working closely with the Finance Department and proactively anticipate and address potential issues that may arise.

Supervisor Bronson commented that as previously indicated, the Sheriff's Department was the largest expenditure for the County and the Board was not treating his department any differently than any other department in terms of adjustments being made during the budget process.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

14. Sewer System Revenue Obligations

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 40, of the Board of Supervisors, providing for the execution, delivery and sale of (a) sewer system revenue obligations in an aggregate principal amount sufficient to provide up to \$45,000,000 to purchase property constituting additions and improvements to the sewer system of the county, plus an amount to fund a debt service reserve account and plus an amount to pay costs of delivery, and (b) sewer system revenue refunding obligations in an aggregate principal amount sufficient to accomplish the refinancing of outstanding sewer revenue obligations being refunded thereby, to fund a debt service account and to pay costs of delivery; authorizing the execution and delivery of one or more obligation indentures in connection therewith and the execution and delivery of one or more purchase agreements providing for installment payments by the county for the purchase or refinancing of said property to be made from revenues of the sewer system of the county; and authorizing the completion, execution and delivery of all necessary or appropriate agreements or documents and the taking of all actions and matters in connection therewith.

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

15. **Certificates of Participation**

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 41, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the lease and lease-purchase back of certain real property, including buildings and structures, in order to finance and refinance projects for the county; authorizing the execution and delivery of amendments and supplements to a lease purchase agreement and a trust agreement and other necessary agreements, instruments and documents; approving the execution and delivery of certificates of participation and refunding certificates of participation to provide the necessary financing and refinancing therefor; and authorizing other actions and matters in connection therewith.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the jail was one of the collateralized buildings listed in the County Administrator's July 17, 2023, Memorandum and questioned how it was demonstrated to the bank issuing the Certificates of Participation (COP's) that the jail was in the condition it was supposed to be in when its degradation and deplorable condition had been repeatedly stated. He asked whether this was consistent with how COP's were issued and if the County would be liable for anything.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that the Adult Detention Facility had been used as part of the collateral for some time, but an assessment had not yet been done regarding its condition. She stated that various individuals had expressed their concerns about its poor state and those concerns were being examined, but the official report was still pending. She stated that during discussions with the Bond Council and other parties, it had been suggested that if at any point a comprehensive assessment revealed that the jail did not meet the standards or the value against which it had been collateralized, it would be brought back before the Board for discussion regarding alternative options.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the bank had accepted their word because no one had publicly or officially stated that the jail was in deplorable condition at this time.

Ms. Leshar explained that it had more to do with the value of the structures and facilities and although various sections of the jail had been reevaluated, until an assessment of its value was received regarding whether it truly was in a deplorable state or just required maintenance, the Bond Council and staff were confident that it could fulfill those requirements. She added if at any point staff believed that statement was not accurate or the evaluation was not properly assessed at the appropriate rate, the item would be brought back to the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the County would be contacted by the bank and if they would conduct their own inspection since no official statement had been made regarding its condition.

Ms. Leshar responded that she was unaware of the specifics of who would be evaluating the collateral and asked Ms. Moulton to provide further clarification.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management Department, explained that each year during the process of organizing the debt sale, the values of all the collateralized buildings in the pool were evaluated to ensure that there was more than sufficient capacity to cover both outstanding and new debts. She stated that although a decrease in the value of the adult detention center had not been considered, when combined with all of the other buildings in the pool, the County remained sufficiently collateralized. She added that the Finance Department had been exploring the possibility of including additional buildings within the collateral pool to account for potential scenarios, such as the need to sell a building or to enhance its value, based on the ongoing discussions surrounding the jail.

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

16. General Obligation Bonds

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 42, of the Board of Supervisors, providing for the issuance and the sale of Pima County, Arizona, General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2023, in one or more series; providing for the annual levy of a tax for the payment of the refunding bonds; providing terms, covenants and conditions concerning the refunding bonds; accepting a proposal for the purchase of the refunding bonds; authorizing and directing the refunding of certain outstanding bonds; authorizing the appointment of an initial registrar and paying agent for the refunding bonds; and approving and ratifying all actions taken in furtherance of this resolution.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

17. Countywide Classification and Compensation Study - Recommendations for Implementation of Phase 2

Staff recommends approval of the following:

1. A Compression Adjustment (25%/75%), as outlined in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated August 14, 2023, for placement of current employees within the range of their respective new salary grades at a cost of \$7.4 million;
2. A Retention Adjustment (3%), as outlined in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated August 14, 2023, for current employees whose combined Market Minimum Adjustment and Compression Adjustment are less than 3%, at a cost of \$2.5 million;

3. Make approvals for Phase 2 Compression and Retention Adjustments effective the pay period beginning September 10, 2023; and,
4. Change the A1 salary grade affecting 3115/Attorney classification to be identical to the A3 salary grade.

Cathy Bohland, Director, Human Resources (HR), provided a slideshow presentation regarding the recommendations for Phase 2 and a reminder of what the goals were for both Phases 1 and 2. She stated that a new architecture and salary structure had already been developed and staff had implemented a minimum market rate adjustment to ensure employees who were below the minimum salary grade were brought up to the new grade. She stated that at this meeting they would be addressing compression issues and retention of employees. She stated that \$14 million had been previously budgeted for the classification/compensation study, which was dedicated for salaries and employee-related expenses along with an additional \$5 million in contingency funds. She indicated that in her previous presentation Phase 1 would require \$9.5 million, but clarified that this amount included a combination of all funding streams specific to the General Fund which amounted to \$5.85 million. She stated that after adjusting the salaries of employees who were below the grade, the most significant changes could be observed in the first quartile where over 2,300 employees were brought to the minimum of the salary grade and the total number of employees affected by compression in the first quartile now stood at 5,127 and this was a crucial point to be kept in mind as the presentation proceeded. She stated that the proposed adjustments recommended by HR consisted of the minimum market adjustment that brought employees up to the minimum salary grade, with a compression or retention adjustment and the greater amount would be provided to the employee and no employee would receive less than a 3% increase, but no more than a \$15,000.00 increase. She indicated there had been inquiries about the rationale behind the 25%/75% pay progression model and provided an explanation of why this model was the most reasonable and consistent for current County employees. She stated that the examples were merely a strategy on how to position employees within a new classification/compensation plan and explained that 25% accounted for the employees' overall County experience, while 75% was allotted for their tenure in their current position and the sum of these two factors determined the recommended years of service within the current salary classification or just above the midpoint of the new classification. She stated it was important to note that a newer employee would not surpass a more senior or seasoned employee in the same classification. She provided another example of the 50%/50% model that caused something to happen that they did not want to happen. She explained that it would give a newer employee more compensation than a seasoned employee with longer years and as they looked at all grades it had the same outcome. She added that the midpoint of the range was typically for employees that were highly proficient in their position and had the preferred qualifications and a newer employee was considered to be learning the position. She provided an example for the 40%/60% model and it showed that the newer employees consistently jumped over a longer tenured employee. She reiterated that as they looked to place current employees, they wanted a model with consistent and reasonable results. She provided a final example for the 33%/66%

model and stated that the newer employee did not jump over the longer tenured employee, but employees with 5 years consistently jumped over a 7-year employee. She stated they felt the more reasonable one was the 25%/75% model. She added that there were limitations to the model that no employee would exceed the top of the 3rd quartile or an adjustment that exceeded \$15,000.00 due to budgetary constraints. She provided additional examples of compression adjustments. She stated that the new Law Enforcement classifications were placed into levels 1 through 3 for Deputies, Detectives and Corrections Officers and that their prior service would be credited at 100%. She stated that in lieu of a compression adjustment, a retention adjustment was possible, however, an employee could not receive both. She explained that if the combined total of the minimum Market adjustment and compression adjustment fell below 3%, the employee would receive a 3% adjustment. She stated that this would ensure that everyone benefited from the efforts of the study, and it was important for the County to retain talent and maintain the stability of the organization. She added that there were exclusions from pay adjustments, which included election workers, elected officials, and new hires (hired after September 10, 2022). She stated they would be carefully evaluated to ensure they were hired at the appropriate market rate and would provide the information regarding any necessary adjustments to the Board in January. She added that if employees received a pay adjustment after January 1, 2023, they would only be eligible for a compression adjustment and indicated that a few select employees, such as Correction Officers, had already received adjustments. She explained that employees receiving more than \$15,000.00 to get to the minimum Market were not eligible for a compression or retention adjustment and indicated six employees needed that adjustment to reach the new minimum salary grade. She went over where employees fell in quartiles after implementation of Phase 2 and stated it was significant because it aligned with the County's intended goal of progressing individuals through the salary range and subsequently presenting a proposal on how they would continue to advance in the future. She stated this served as a starting point and indicated a healthy position for the County at this time. She also showed a comparison to the years of service and job of the current population and indicated that it began to mirror and track the current employee population and this was also a positive outcome. She discussed that the projected General Fund cost for Phase 1 was \$5.85 million, Phase 2 for compression adjustment was \$7.4 million, and a retention adjustment of \$2.5 million, for a total amount of \$15.75 million. She explained the appeals process and indicated that an employee could file an appeal of their job classification if they believed they were not appropriately classified, which would be reviewed by a committee. She stated employees would need to submit a form to their supervisor and department head for input and then file it with HR by October 10, 2023. She explained that salary grade appeals or salary grade placements would be submitted by department heads and department heads could appeal both a job classification or salary grade placement. She added that those forms should be submitted by October 10th and would be reviewed by a different committee. She stated that dependent on Board consideration of Phase 2, next steps for Phase 3 would be to identify how employees would progress through their salary ranges. She stated a plan and budget would be needed for the next steps and could be based on performance,

evaluation, years of service, or a combination of items. She stated that HR needed to draft policies for Board review, which would include what the pay for new hires would be, promotion pay, and the use of special pay and job classifications. She indicated the policies would be presented to the Board in the Fall and that the current request was for approval of the four items listed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated August 14, 2023.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, indicated that as mentioned during the last meeting recommendations for Phase 2 would soon be presented to the Board and felt it was important to provide the Board with a full communications plan and that each time they provided more information to staff, many more questions were answered. She stated that if approved by the Board, she would provide an updated video of live townhall webinars for all employees to answer any additional questions. She stated there was a concern regarding the appeals process that they wanted to ensure they had adequate staff or people that had been working throughout the process with the various departments because the appeal window was short and wanted to assure that an employees' salary increase would not be delayed because of it. She stated that their hope was to have a hearing panel in effect that would be able to move quickly on appeals with the goal of everyone receiving a salary increase as soon as possible.

Supervisor Heinz stated he had reviewed all available scenarios regarding the credit for years of service or service in a particular position, but questioned whether a one third/two third or 40%/60% calculation had been considered.

Ms. Bohland responded that 40%/60% and 33%/66% were reviewed, which equated to the one third and two third scenarios.

Ms. Leshar responded that many different permutations had been reviewed during this process and the final recommendation was what was currently before the Board.

Supervisor Heinz commented that there were a lot of numbers to comprehend and requested a re-summarization of how those numbers were determined. He questioned how many employees would receive at least the 3% increase based on Phase 2.

Ms. Leshar responded that apart from those individuals who had already received salary increases which included election workers and a few other specific groups, all employees would receive at least a 3% increase. She explained what had been communicated previously, and was a prior concern, was for individuals at the top of their pay grade that might not be eligible for an increase. She indicated that those individuals would be targeted for the 3% increase. She stated that the intention was for this evaluation and adjustment process to occur annually, with each department being reassessed every two years to ensure the top of the pay range continued to progress without having to wait decades for any changes. She stated that the initial hope was that they had made significant efforts to ensure that anyone hired in the

past year was hired at a point that aligned with the purpose of this survey. She stated that they believed the majority of people hired were at that point and therefore would be consistent with where their colleagues were. She stated that an established appeals process would address any cases where someone who started within the last year had not received the appropriate raise could be reevaluated. She stated that another type of concern that would be reevaluated was the use of the hire date being used to evaluate when people moved forward and indicated that in the Library Department, due to the merger of the City and County libraries, the date those individuals began working for the County was used as their hire date. She stated that individuals who had worked for the City had earlier hire dates than were used and were being reevaluated for adjustments.

Supervisor Heinz commented that it appeared everyone would receive some form of compensation except for the categories explicitly mentioned. He questioned whether the six individuals that were potentially eligible for more than \$15,000.00, would receive the remaining amount at a future date. He added that those individuals had either been with the County for a considerable amount of time or were engaged in highly specialized tasks and felt that it was not fair to state that they did not deserve it.

Ms. Bohland responded that those numbers had not been examined, but indicated two of them went to Detectives, one was an Attorney, one was a Deputy Chief for an Elected Official and two others were from Information Technology. She stated a few had been long-time employees, but the others were for newer positions that were far below their salary grade.

Supervisor Scott stated he appreciated Ms. Bohland's efforts with reviewing the slides that showed the various percentages because they were the basis of most of his questions as the Board had also received emails from long-standing County employees expressing their concerns about unfair treatment. He stated that the way she explained it not only demonstrated that this was the most equitable arrangement, but it was also one that could be sustained over time. He stated both she and the County Administrator's memorandum had indicated that the cost to the General Fund was \$5.85 million and the total cost including all funding streams, was \$9.5 million. He inquired about the other funding streams.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, explained that the other funding streams were provided by other departments within the County. She stated those could be Internal Service funds, Special Revenue, or Enterprise funds such as the Library, which had its own taxing district or Wastewater, which had its own revenue stream.

Supervisor Scott referred to an area towards the end of the County Administrator's Memorandum regarding the remaining funding for Fiscal Year 2023/24 budgeted for employee appeals, identified pay adjustments for employees hired after September 1, 2022, and new hire compensation with the new pay philosophy of hiring above the minimum of the salary grade for qualified applicants and questioned when the

Board would receive additional information regarding the amount for these three items.

Ms. Leshar responded that part was in relation to the results of the appeals and other processes that had not yet begun and explained the only knowledge they had was that it was capped at what had been approved in this year's budget.

Supervisor Bronson questioned what it meant by capped for this year's budget and requested an amount.

Ms. Leshar replied that she referred to the recommended budget for this year, which indicated that the current budget included investments of \$14 million for implementation of the study, an additional \$5 million for changes for recruiting talent with a total approved \$19 million in this year's budget.

Supervisor Scott asked what more could County Administration do to solicit input from the departments regarding general concerns and reactions to the implementation of the class/comp study. He stated that sometimes people spoke louder as a collective rather than individuals. He added that individual concerns would be addressed through the appeals process for employees and department heads, but was interested in understanding the steps taken to evaluate the collective concerns within their respective departments. He stated it was important because the Board had received concerns from individuals claiming to represent their departments, which stated morale issues were linked to the implementation of the class/comp study.

Ms. Leshar responded that this process had taken approximately four years and through that time, staff had numerous discussions to try to balance all of the information from various individuals that included department directors and elected officials such as the Sheriff and Assessor. She stated concerns had been received from employees that their recommendations were not consistent with those made by their directors and those discrepancies needed to be reconciled.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated there had been active engagement with the directors in their areas and numerous conversations both as a team and separately had been held about how this study was going to capture a majority of the intended improvements, but specific areas would require further discussion and evaluation due to their unique aspects. He stated that all three Deputy County Administrators had been invited to participate in the appeals processes, something that they were enthusiastic about because of the input received from their directors and the diverse perspective they had from representing all three branches of the County. He stated moving forward would provide ample opportunity to assess ongoing needs in collaboration with HR and County Administration to provide well-founded recommendations to the Board about necessary actions that would subsequently need to happen.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that a significant part of their discussions and fluctuations surrounding them revolved around the newly received information, and if the Board approved this action, would result in new information being presented to employees that would subsequently lead to further discussions with their directors. He stated that they had a clear understanding of what had been echoed by the directors and the current situation within the ranks and indicated that they had engaged in conversations with employees and visited with different departments and had established connections with some individuals. He stated that they had consistently urged everyone to wait and observe the outcome of Phase 2 to determine whether other questions or concerns arose.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, stated Ms. Leshar had raised this matter consistently with department directors on at least four occasions during their meetings and had individually communicated with their reporting units. He stated a key message emphasized with his departments that this was a process that would require time to be fully implemented. He stated that they were entering a phase where refinements for specific and unique cases, and an example was the issue regarding the hires from the Library that were transferred from the City of Tucson and the Town of Oro Valley that required a solution. He indicated that what mattered most was that the Board's current action would be a historic step forward and would demonstrate its long-term investment to properly compensate employees which was a testament to their efforts in making Pima County a desirable employer.

Ms. Leshar commented that they had previously held a meeting with all departments, including row officers and the greatest concern presented at that time was how quickly Phase 2 would be implemented. She stated that their commitment was to immediately work on it and bring it forward as quickly as possible. She added that her hope was that it was shown that they worked on it quickly and brought it back. She elaborated on the Deputy County Administrator's comments and stated that the Board had led the effort over the last year to review other activities and elements that could be added for employees. She stated the Board had increased the number of vacation days, increased the number of days employees were paid when they were on leave, and added parental leave, et cetera. She hoped that it was an overall package combined with rightsizing the foundation of the compensation plan that would have a significant impact on turnover and vacancy rates.

Chair Grijalva stated that Phases 1 and 2 as currently laid out represented significant strides towards improving the County's employment structure and ensuring a more lucrative and equitable experience for employees. She stated that the 25%/75% ratio was an industry standard, but may not adequately compensate everyone given the size of their employee base and it should be acknowledged that promotion from within was encouraged. She stated that it was essential the County ensured fair compensation for promotion and indicated this aspect should be incorporated into the appeals process, allowing the opportunity for compensation review and reassessment for employees, particularly within the Library system. She

stated the Library employees had transitioned in 2006 and the Board had received communications from various employees including one who had dedicated 32 years to the Library, but had only received credit for 17 years. She stated it was something that needed to be done with the acknowledgement that Phases 1 and 2 were not the end. She stated that the HR policies needed to be revised with input received from directors and from the Meet and Confer employee groups so that the process was fair and equitable because the number of employees that stayed with the County long-term would continue to decline because people that sought opportunities wanted opportunities for advancement and growth, but also wanted to be acknowledged for their experience and historically this was something the County had not previously done. She stated that she hoped a portion of the upcoming policy revisions would acknowledge this fact and that promotions should be celebrated rather than punitive. She stated she appreciated the presentation of the different percentages, but noted that this information had already been distributed to employees and consequently would not be proposing any changes at this time. She stated all employees should have the opportunity to explore avenues for appeals if they could demonstrate the specific changes that had occurred, specifically, they should be able to compare their 3% increase to what they would have received if they had not been promoted at all. She felt that Phase 2 could not be the final step because of the potential compression that may result from the changes and those would need to be adjusted. She added that the Board had to commit to yearly review, which would include educational degrees or trades licenses required, and if it benefited the County, employees should be compensated for that. She stated there should be stipends and review of 5, 10 and 15 year service employees, which would be critical to retaining employees.

Supervisor Bronson stated she would vote against this item and wanted to highlight that her office had received a significant number of calls totaling more than 250 in relation to the confusion and lack of understanding of this study. She stated she was greatly troubled with the knowledge that some of the directors felt coerced into accepting this proposal and indicated she had a list of questions spanning three pages, but would address them in writing and requested a response from the relevant individuals within the HR and Finance departments. She stated she had reservations about the accuracy of the cost figures and was concerned that employees had not been provided with a comprehensive explanation of the impact that Phases 1 and 2 would have on their salaries. She stated that the unions, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees or Public Safety unions had not been given a fair opportunity to respond. She added that what concerned her the most was the short appeal window and indicated that some individuals had chosen to remain anonymous because they felt HR was not responsive in that process and felt it was not fair. She hoped that rather than enact Phase 2, the Board would allow County employees to be given clear before and after pictures of their salaries and allow unions to comment openly and without retribution on the Phases. She stated that she understood the slideshow, but may not agree with them and felt that some employees may not understand it. She stated that she agreed with Chair Grijalva's comments and felt that the people who benefitted the most were people in higher levels of pay compensation rather than

the individuals who had worked tirelessly on the frontlines during the pandemic. She stated that this was her point of view and she would be submitting her questions instead of discussing them further from the dais and requested that the appropriate department provide a written response, which should be distributed to the entire Board and made available on the County's website for access by all employees.

Chair Grijalva questioned the timeframe for appeals.

Supervisor Bronson indicated that it was approximately one to two weeks and started on September 11th.

Ms. Leshar concurred with Supervisor Bronson's statement and added that it was about a one month window in October. She stated that her hope was that individual salary increases would be implemented quickly and was a short window to prevent any delays from occurring within HR or the review committee for those appeals and indicated that the timeframe could be extended with a retroactive due date.

Chair Grijalva questioned whether an employee could still file an appeal if it was not supported by the director.

Ms. Bohland responded in the affirmative.

Chair Grijalva stated she wanted to clarify that director approval was not required to move forward with an appeal and questioned who would be representative on the committee because she believed it was important to have someone from County Administration since they worked directly with directors and employees. She stated this was not a perfect process and was important to be acknowledged and helping employees to understand this process should be supported by County Administration and the Board. She stated that if the item passed, she hoped HR and Finance would work together to get this information to all employees as soon as possible, so that it could be better understood.

Supervisor Heinz questioned how someone filing an appeal would hold up the implementation for everyone else.

Ms. Leshar stated that the concern was for a particular individual and how a long window for appeals might be viewed as a delay in the process of that individual receiving their salary increase. She stated it would not delay the entire process and was the reason for a shorter window, but could certainly be adjusted.

Supervisor Heinz commented that the increase could successfully be applied retroactively in a particular situation.

Supervisor Christy echoed and supported the comments made by Supervisor Bronson in regards to the concerns expressed about the complexity of the compensation plan and its confusing multi-phased implementation. He stated it would lead to misunderstanding and resentment within the County workforce and

commented about his past experience that dealt with pay plans and how sensitive they were, down to the ability to function in a working environment and the morale of the organization. He stated that after review of all aspects, he kept an old adage in the back of his mind, "The best pay plan is the pay plan that can be written on the back of a business card," and this plan was nowhere close to that.

Ms. Leshar clarified that if this were simply a pay plan, as was done in the past, that people earning X, received Y was less complex, but this was to revamp and understand the classification and compensation system that was the wireframe that everything could be built upon. She stated that she fully acknowledged the confusion and need for additional communication was something staff would continue to push.

Chair Grijalva stated that with the size of the County's organization it was not something that could be written on the back of a business card, it had to be fair and equitable, and she was glad they had an appeals process. She felt that a straight percentage increase was unfair and tended to further compress the salary scale. She stated in the past, both the current and prior Board had approved percentage increases, which ultimately penalized employees with lower salaries and benefited those with higher ones and this proposal aimed to address this disparity.

Supervisor Bronson expressed her concerns about elected officials, both for row officers and Board members and indicated that she did not want her office to participate in the pay plan. She stated that her staff was paid what she deemed appropriate because they worked non-stop 24/7 for a district that represented over 7,000 square miles of the entire 9,200 square miles. She believed that it was unfair for them to be subjected to the same regulations and added that it should also apply to elected officials and their respective staff. She gave kudos to the Board's Clerk, and expressed her belief that the Clerk was not correctly compensated under this pay plan. She emphasized that the Clerk's job involved working with five demanding individuals, which was not easy, and firmly believed that the Clerk was treated unjustly under the current pay plan.

Chair Grijalva commented that elected officials were excluded and would not receive any raises and stated that Board's staff had not fallen under any guidelines. She added that if it was within their respective budgets, the Supervisor determined their staff's salaries and she did not believe their staff would be included.

Ms. Leshar stated that all the County personnel had been under rules in the past regarding approval of the salaries and County Administration had signed off on recommendations for an individual made by a Supervisor within their organization.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the four recommendations. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Bronson and Christy voted "Nay."

PROCUREMENT

18. The Board of Supervisors on August 8, 2023, continued the following:

Award

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-23-209, Microsoft Corporation (Headquarters: Redmond, WA), to provide for a Microsoft master services agreement. This master agreement is effective August 8, 2023 to August 7, 2028, in the not-to-exceed contract amount of \$7,000,000.00 (including sales tax). Funding Source: IT Computer Hardware/Software Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology.

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

Supervisor Christy stated he had concerns with the language in the contract that gave the Procurement Director the authority to approve a \$7 million dollar contract and that this should not be done without proper consideration by the Board. He felt it was necessary to remove the involvement of the Procurement Director from the language in the contract.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Bronson to amend the contract and remove "or Pima County Procurement Director," and approve the item, as amended. Upon the vote, the substitute motion unanimously carried 5-0.

REAL PROPERTY

19. **Right of First Refusal Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 43, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing pursuing acquisition of the Rancho Seco in-holding property by exercising the recorded right of first refusal. (District 3)

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

20. **Condemnation Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 44, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the Pima County Attorney to condemn real property interests where necessary for the Sierrita Mountain Road: Hilltop to Viking Improvement Project in Section 13, T16S, R10E, G&SRM. (District 3)

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

21. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property to the Pima County Community Land Trust, located at 17 N. Linda Avenue, Tax Parcel Nos. 116-20-0050, 116-20-006A and 116-20-007A, in the amount of \$375,000.00. (District 5)

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

RECORDER

22. The Board of Supervisors on August 8, 2023, continued the following:

Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the amended Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the months of July and August 2022.

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

23. The Board of Supervisors on August 8, 2023, continued the following:

Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the months of September 2022 through June 2023.

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

24. The Board of Supervisors on August 8, 2023, continued the following:

Pursuant to A.R.S. §11-475.01, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund FY 2022-2023 Year End Summary Report.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Elections

25. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, contract amount \$230,000.00 revenue (CTN-EL-24-5)

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

Health

26. Arizona Board of Regents, The University of Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Applied Academic Public Health Partnership, extend contract term to 4/30/24 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-HD-22-59)

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

Supervisor Christy commented that the Health Department had recruited several epidemiologists to address the needs of underserved communities and he did not see the necessity to extend the contract to add a University of Arizona Public Health Scientist to the Health Department when so many had already been hired to accomplish that same mission. He indicated that he would be voting against the item.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Bronson and Christy voted "Nay."

Information Technology

27. Action Communications, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide a Rooftop License Agreement for Wireless Communications Facilities located at 33 N. Stone Avenue, extend contract term to 7/31/28 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$184,937.52 revenue (CTN-IT-19-19)

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

28. Civil Air Patrol, Amendment No. 1, to provide a Rooftop License Agreement for Wireless Communications Facilities located at 1249 Well Road, Ajo, AZ, extend contract term to 6/18/28 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-IT-18-187)

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

Procurement

29. DLR Group, Inc., to provide for Architectural and Engineering Services: Superior Court and Public Service Center Tenant Improvement Project (XSCPSC), Certificates of Participation Fund, total contract amount \$1,841,856.00/3 year term (\$613,952.00 per year) (CT-CPO-24-41) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

30. Professional Pipe Services, Inc., Amendment No. 4, to provide for conveyance system closed circuit television inspection services and amend contractual language, RWRD Obligations Fund, contract amount \$89,582.95 (CT-WW-21-396) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

31. M. Anderson Construction Co., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Manzanita Park Improvement Project (PMZSCR), extend contract term to 9/28/24 and amend contractual language, General Fund PAYGO (41.5%), Parks Renewal Transfer (38%) & other Capital Project (20.5%) Funds, contract amount \$1,100,000.00 (CT-CPO-23-162) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

32. RBC Capital Markets, L.L.C., to provide for municipal financial advisory services, Debt Proceeds Fund, contract amount \$400,000.00 (MA-PO-23-207) Administering Department: Finance and Risk Management

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

33. Achen-Gardner Construction, L.L.C., Borderland Construction Company, Inc., Ellison-Mills Construction, L.L.C., and Hunter Contracting Co., Amendment No. 4, to provide a job order master agreement: wastewater conveyance system and related facilities repair, rehabilitation and construction services and amend contractual language, no cost (MA-PO-22-35) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

34. Kiewit Infrastructure West Co., to provide for Design-Build Services: Sidestream Anitamox Process (3ANOMX), RWRD Obligations Fund, total contract amount \$1,150,652.68/4 year term (\$287,663.17 per year) (CT-WW-23-455) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

35. Borderland Construction Company, Inc., Hunter Contracting Co., and SMS Construction, L.L.C., Amendment No. 6, to provide a job order master agreement: wastewater reclamation facilities construction services and amend contractual language, no cost (MA-PO-20-215) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

Real Property

36. RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 45, of the Board of Supervisors, for the abandonment by exchange of a portion of Fountains Avenue for the fee dedication of other property as Pima County Road Abandonment No. A-0072, no cost/perpetual (CTN-RPS-24-15)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Christy to adopt the Resolution. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

37. Kenneth R. Kay and Karen Christensen, as Co-Trustees of the Kay-Christensen Family Trust, to provide Acquisition Agreement - Acq-1174 and Warranty Deed for 4.21 acres of conservation land for open space purposes, Tax Parcel No. 211-07-011M in Section 3, T14S, R11E, G&SRM, Pima County, AZ, NRPR Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$102,500.00 (CT-RPS-24-42)

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

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

38. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for provision of sewer services, no cost/20 year term (CTN-WW-23-196)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

Arizona Department of Economic Security, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the WIOA Title I Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth Programs and amend grant language, no cost (GTAM 24-9)

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

Supervisor Christy objected to the item.

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

40. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

United States Environmental Protection Agency, to provide for the FY 23 Air Pollution Control Program, \$570,923.00/\$781,000.00 PDEQ Air Fees match (GTAW 24-16)

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

Supervisor Christy objected to the item and stated that additional rulemaking was unnecessary.

Chair Grijalva commented that the purpose of the grant was to provide funds for efforts to implement air pollution control programs throughout Pima County.

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

41. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Title V Maternal and Child Health Healthy Arizona Families, extend grant term to 6/30/24, amend grant language and scope of work, \$230,738.00 (GTAM 24-11)

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

42. **Acceptance - Health**

State of Arizona, Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Arizona Parents Commission on Drug Education and Prevention, \$199,765.00 (GTAM 24-12)

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

43. **Acceptance - Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation**

United States Department of Interior/Fish and Wildlife Services, to provide for the Pima County Goff Pond Aquatic Habitat Enhancement, total grant amount \$25,000.00/5 year term (\$5,000.00 per year) (GTAW 23-140)

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

44. **Acceptance - Transportation**

State of Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management, to provide for the post-fire funding grant - Sunrise Drive at Esperero Wash Flood Mitigation Project, total grant amount \$3,341,983.00/2 year term (\$1,670,991.50 per year) (GTAW 24-5)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the purpose of the project was to mitigate the effects of the fire that had created the flood situation in the area where the County had purchased properties and questioned whether this particular project was above or below the acquired properties on Havasu.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded this was mitigation for the Bighorn Fire of 2020 and was downstream of where the Esperero Wash went under Sunrise Drive.

Supervisor Christy requested confirmation that this was south of or below those recently acquired properties.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott inquired if this was the same funding the County received to expand the capacity of stormwater conveyance on Skyline Drive.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether outdated culverts were being replaced with box culverts.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative and stated culvert crossings were being expanded to increase carrying capacity and allow more flows to pass through.

Supervisor Scott commented that he regularly drove on that section of Sunrise Drive and that it would be great if it prevented the closures that occurred after almost every heavy rainfall. He thanked both the Flood Control District and the Transportation Department for working together to apply for the grant.

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

45. **Acceptance - Transportation**

Arizona Department of Transportation, to provide for the Off-System Bridge Program Grant - Medium Wash Bridge Replacement, \$4,630,000.00/5 year term (GTAW 23-156)

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

46. Acceptance - Transportation

Arizona Department of Transportation, to provide for the Off-System Bridge Program Grant - Florida Canyon Wash Bridge Replacement, \$8,070,000.00/5 year term (GTAW 24-13)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

47. Hearing - Tax Levy Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 46, of the Board of Supervisors, for the levy of taxes for Fiscal Year 2023/2024.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that per statute, both the levy of taxes and the authorization for the delivery of tax statements must be approved by the third Monday in August.

Supervisor Bronson asked for clarification purposes whether these were ministerial acts by the Board.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Bronson stated she was uncomfortable with the adopted budget and would be voting in opposition.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Bronson and Christy voted "Nay."

48. Hearing - Tax Collection Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 47, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the delivery of tax statements and the collection of the 2023 taxes.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing and adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Bronson stated she would be voting in opposition for the same reason she specified in Minute Item No. 47.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Bronson voted “Nay.”

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

49. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 249668, Andrew Keith Sproul, One Stop Market, 15390 W. Ajo Highway, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, 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.

50. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Bobby Retz, Westin La Paloma, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, September 2, 2023 at 9:00 p.m.

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

51. Hearing - Agent Change/Acquisition of Control/Restructure

Job No. 252799, Andrea Dahlman Lewkowitz, Westin La Paloma Resort & Country Club, 3600 + 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, Acquisition of Control.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, 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

52. The Board of Supervisors on July 25, 2023, continued the following:

Hearing - Rezoning

P22RZ00011, MARTINEZ JOSE & CORDOVA TONATAZIN - E. CATALINA HIGHWAY REZONING

Tonatazin Cordova requests a rezoning of approximately 3.61 acres (Parcel Code 114-52-036A) from the SR (Suburban Ranch) to the CR-1 (Single Residence) zone. The site is located south of the T-intersection of E. Catalina Highway and N.

Catalina Way, addressed as 9680 E. Catalina Highway. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property for Low Intensity Urban 1.2. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Tronsdal was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

IF THE DECISION IS MADE TO APPROVE THE REZONING, THE FOLLOWING STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED:

Completion of the following requirements within five years from the date the rezoning request is approved by the Board of Supervisors:

1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Transportation conditions:
 - ~~A. The existing driveway/access point to Catalina Highway shall be closed off and no longer utilized at the time of development.~~
 - ~~B. A 1-foot no access easement will be required along the Catalina Highway frontage.~~
 - ~~C. The site shall be limited to one, shared access point on Kleindale Road. The location and design of access point shall be determined at the time of building permitting.~~
 - ~~D. A shared access easement for legal access between the properties is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.~~
 - E-A. The property owner(s) shall accept responsibility for the maintenance, control, safety and liability of privately owned roads, drives, physical barriers, drainageways and drainage easements.
3. Environmental Planning condition: Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner 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. ~~Prior to issuance of the certificate of compliance, the owner shall record a covenant, to run with the land, memorializing the terms of this condition.~~
4. Cultural Resources condition: In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
5. Adherence to the sketch plan as approved at public hearing.
6. The owner shall install riprap along the northern boundary of the property adjacent to Kleindale Road.
- ~~6-7.~~ 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.
- ~~7-8.~~ The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act: "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(l)."

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P22RZ00011, subject to standard and special conditions.

53. **Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

P23CA00003, THORNYDALE RANCH, L.L.C. - N. THORNYDALE ROAD PLAN AMENDMENT

Thornydale Ranch, L.L.C., represented by The Planning Center, requests a comprehensive plan amendment of approximately 5.14 acres (Parcel Code 225-33-068C) from the Low Intensity Urban 1.2 (LIU-1.2) to the Community Activity Center (CAC) land use designation. The site is located on the west side of N. Thornydale Road, approximately 600 feet north of the intersection of N. Thornydale Road and W. Magee Road, addressed as 8101 N. Thornydale Road, Section 30, T12S, R13E, in the Tortolita Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Maese was absent) to recommend an AMENDED APPROVAL TO NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVITY CENTER. Staff recommends APPROVAL TO COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER. (District 1)

Kimberly Ogden addressed the Board in opposition to this item and stated that a petition had been provided regarding this objection. She stated this was a small parcel of land that consisted of approximately five acres and most of the surrounding area was residential with a daycare to the north of the parcel. She stated that the intention to switch the area from residential to commercial was a bad one because it was a highly congested area and indicated that individuals were forced to make numerous U-turns in areas that lacked streets in order to get into the daycare. She stated that very few residents found it easy to exit their homes and another business in that area there would make the situation more difficult. She stated that housing seemed to be in demand as new houses were quickly sold and indicated that there were several available storefronts near the area that had unoccupied space and she failed to understand why there was a need for another business within this small area that was surrounded by residential properties.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Bronson to close the public hearing. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott asked for an explanation as to why the Planning and Zoning Commission had voted unanimously to approve this as a Neighborhood Activity Center (NAC) as opposed to staff's recommendation, which was a Community Activity Center (CAC).

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that this was a request for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and clarified that it was not a rezoning of the property, but was the first step for the applicant to be able to request a rezoning. He explained this was a request to transition from Low Intensity Urban 1.2, which was primarily residential, to the CAC and indicated that during the

hearing conducted by the Commission and by input from the area residents, the Commission recommended the NAC as a resolution to address the concerns that were raised by residents. He added that this designation had a lower intensity than the CAC and the Commission believed that the NAC was a more appropriate designation even though staff had recommended the CAC.

Supervisor Scott requested clarification whether the Commission had unanimously approved their recommendation.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr. responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether the actual rezoning would be brought forth to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Board for approval.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr. responded in the affirmative.

It was then moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P23CA00003, with the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation for Neighborhood Activity Center.

54. **Hearing - Type II Conditional Use Permit**

P23CU00006, TRAILS ASSOCIATES, L.L.C. - E. BENSON HIGHWAY

Trails Associates, L.L.C., represented by The Planning Center, request a Type II Conditional Use Permit for outdoor RV and boat storage in accordance with Section 18.07.030Q of the Pima County Zoning Code in the GR-1 (Rural Residential) zone, located on Parcel No. 141-24-0180. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

Standard Conditions

1. Adherence to Pima County Zoning Code Section 18.14.030.B.26.

Special Conditions

1. The existing driveway connection to the eastbound frontage road (E. Benson Highway) shall be used only as follows: a) as an entry and exit for trash pick-up and removal, as well as for all emergency-service, fire, and police vehicles; and b) as an exit-only drive for private vehicles. No entry via this driveway for private vehicles is allowed.
2. Adequate signage shall be provided on the gate to indicate no entry by private vehicles.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P23CU00006, subject to standard and special conditions.

55. **Hearing - Type III Conditional Use Permit**

P23CU00007, AMERICAN INVESTMENT MARKETING GROUP, L.L.C. - W. VEGAS DRIVE

American Investment Marketing Group, L.L.C., represented by Declan Murphy, requests a Type III Conditional Use Permit for a wireless communication facility (Parcel Code 209-29-032A) in accordance with Section 18.07.030.H. of the Pima County Zoning Code in the GR-1 (Rural Residential) zone, generally located on the south side W. Vegas Drive near the intersection of W. Vegas Drive and S. Alice Vail Lane, addressed as 12025 W. Vegas Drive. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Maese was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. The Hearing Administrator recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 3)

Standard Conditions

1. Adherence to all requirements of Section 18.07.030.H and Section 18.07.040.A.4 (General Regulations and Exceptions) of the Pima County Zoning Code.

Special Conditions

1. The new top height of the tower structure, and the top of its antennae array, shall not be more than the requested eighty feet (80').
2. The tower shall be camouflaged as an old-style water pump. As such, it shall have a lattice-style base, with a windmill "pump" feature atop. The windmill appurtenance can extend beyond the eighty foot (80') tower height.
3. The entire lattice tower, antennae array, all associated exterior cabling, and windmill shall be painted a brown or rust color.
4. The tower, its antennae array, and its associated on-the-ground equipment area shall be located on the property as shown on the submitted set of construction drawings.
5. The eight foot (8') tall wall surrounding the on-the-ground equipment compound shall be painted a similar brown or rust color as the tower; the gate of the compound shall be painted the same brown/rust color.
6. Review and approval by the Regional Flood Control District is required at the time of development.
7. A Floodplain Use Permit and as-built plan are required for all structures, fencing and mechanical equipment.
8. A sign shall be posted at the construction site for the entire duration of construction, providing the surrounding property owners with contact information for the applicant or for the appropriate construction manager. This shall provide the neighbors with a point of contact in the event that questions or issues arise during the construction process.

Supervisor Bronson inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P23CU00007, subject to standard and special conditions.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

56. **Proposal for Restoration of State Funding for Full-Day Kindergarten in Public Schools to the 2024 Pima County Legislative Agenda**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Proposing to add restoration of state funding for full-day kindergarten in public schools statewide to the 2024 Pima County

Legislative Agenda. The Legislature cut state funding back to only half-day kindergarten coverage in 2010. Public school districts must pay the other half since that action took place. If full state funding were restored, school districts would more easily be able to increase funding for the Pima Early Education Program. (District 5)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 3-2 vote, Supervisors Bronson and Christy voted “Nay,” to approve the item.

ELECTIONS

57. Incorporate Vail Election

RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 48, of the Board of Supervisors, calling an election on November 7, 2023, on a petition to establish the Town of Vail.

Supervisor Christy requested that the County Attorney define what the role and authority of the Board was and what the role and authority of the County Recorder was in this matter.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, explained that the Board’s role was essentially ministerial, which was to call the election after a review of the signatures was conducted. He stated that the role of the Recorder and the Elections Department was to conduct the review of signatures. He indicated that the specific differences between the roles of the two departments would be best answered by the Recorder or the Elections Department.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, responded that the Elections Department’s role was as a filing officer that served in place of the Secretary of State for initiative petitions. She explained because they served in the same capacity as the Secretary of State, they followed the same guidelines and indicated that the role of the Recorder was to verify petition signatures and ensure the validity of the signatures.

Supervisor Christy asked what was concluded by the Recorder’s Office.

Ms. Hargrove responded that they had validated the petition signatures and determined that there were enough qualifying petition signatures.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification whether the Recorder had confirmed that the signatures were legal and valid.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative.

Jeremy George, Deputy Director, Elections Department, responded that during Call to the Public an individual had mentioned Title 9, which governed local municipalities and indicated there was a statement within it that stated the petition must clearly and concisely state its purpose and be in the prescribed format, signed,

and verified, as was commonly required for initiative petitions. He explained that this had led them to Title 19, which governed the criteria that the Secretary of State considered when reviewing initiative petitions. He indicated they had followed those guidelines, as well as the guidelines from the Election Procedures Manual and the Secretary of State's Published Initiative and Referendum Guide and added that it was important to note that a municipal incorporation petition was not the same as an initiative petition and certain aspects would not apply. He stated that the Statutes Selection Procedures Manual referred to the Secretary of State's capacity that dealt with statewide initiatives and referendum measures and since this was a county municipal level issue, some of the items in the statutes would not be relevant to the County. He stated that in terms of their department's specific process, the Incorporate Vail Arizona group submitted a total of 223 petitions on August 8th and each petition had been accompanied by a detailed description of the meets and bounds of the area described with a map. He explained that each petition was timestamped and the additional pages were removed. He stated they began reviewing the petitions in accordance with Title 19, which entailed reviewing various elements. He stated each petition sheet was double-sided, the front contained the signatures, and the back side contained the circulator's affidavit. He explained that they started with checking the back side to ensure the following elements were included: the affidavit, the county's name was listed in two separate areas, the circulator's printed and signed name, the circulator's residence address, and the notarization of the affidavit and added that they verified the notary's name, signature, and the validity of their commission. He stated that they then checked the notarization date, which had to be later than all the signature dates on the front page and lastly, verified that the serial number, which was assigned during their initial application, was printed at the bottom right-hand corner of each sheet. He stated that after examining all those details located on the reverse side, they proceeded to inspect the front side and indicated that the top section had to include a description of the petition and additionally, there needed to be a designated area which indicated whether the circulator was compensated or had volunteered their services. He stated that they verified that this was properly marked and confirmed the presence of the serial number on the front side of the petition and ensured that the serial number was accurately listed. He explained that once this evaluation was completed, any sheets containing incomplete or missing information were eliminated and out of the initial 223 submissions, 10 were excluded for various reasons, typically due to missing details on the affidavit page, such as the circulator's name, county, or address, and indicated 213 were moved forward. He stated they assigned a numbering sequence from 1 to 213 to each of the valid petition sheets and commenced the review of each individual signature line, not for signature verification or voter registration status because that was the role of the Recorder's office, but for the purpose of ensuring that every line had been completely filled out. He stated that the voter had to provide their signature, first and last name, residence address, and the date they signed the petition, and that date could be no earlier than July 11th, which was the date the Board authorized the circulation of the petition, and it could be no later than the date it was notarized. He stated blank lines were struck along with any lines missing information or ones that did not list the residence address or those dated before July 11th or after the

notarization date. He stated each page could not have more than 15 signatures and any pages with more than that were struck. He explained they counted the valid signature lines and wrote that number at the top of each petition sheet and finally tallied them up and resulted with 213 accepted petitions with a total of 2,542 signatures. He indicated they had provided the organizers with a receipt that contained this information and then forwarded those petitions to the Recorder's Office.

Supervisor Christy asked whether at that point of the process, the petitions were passed onto the Recorder's Office with the understanding that the Recorder stated the process, and the petitions were valid.

Mr. George clarified that the Recorder's Office reviewed the signatures and had validated 2,058 of the 2,542 signatures that were sent by the Elections Department.

Supervisor Christy asked the County Attorney to describe the term ministerial.

Mr. Brown responded that ministerial meant the Board did not have discretion in the matter and once the review was conducted it was the duty of the Board to call the election.

Chair Grijalva read a portion of the memo the County Recorder had sent to Director Hargrove regarding the results of the signatures. She stated that during Call to the Public many speakers spoke about some of the inconsistencies, as indicated and it appeared the Board had no discretion at this point.

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

Supervisor Scott commented that there had been many concerns expressed about the proposed town's boundaries at multiple meetings and stated that several people indicated that their area should not have been included. He questioned how that was determined and how or if those concerns were addressed.

Nicole Fyffe, Senior Advisor, County Administrator's Office, responded that incorporations and processes were not a frequent occurrence for the County, so when providing guidance to the County Administrator and the Board regarding the next steps, she usually depended upon three factors, the first being the County Attorney's Office, the second was her interpretation of the statutes, and the third was the Municipal Guide to Incorporation in Arizona. She stated that the guide was published by the Arizona League of Cities and Towns and was often consulted by both the petitioners and those who opposed incorporation as a point of reference. She read one of the sentences from the guide, which she felt summed up the process that stated, "The final determination of whether an area considering incorporation is a community and urban in nature rests with the jurisdiction of the Arizona courts, as a result, the County Board of Supervisors may determine that a community exists which is urban in nature but this determination is subject to review

by the Arizona courts.” She stated that she did not believe this was a question before the Board or under the Board’s purview.

Supervisor Scott asked for clarification purposes whether the Board’s ministerial function was to call the election, since 1,537 signatures were required, of which 2,058 were validated, which was well above the number needed, and if there were people within the boundaries that were defined in this election that felt they should not have been, they had the opportunity to redress with the courts.

Ms. Fyffe responded in the affirmative.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

58. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Emergency Eviction Legal Services - Emergency Housing, American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund, contract amount \$650,357.28 (CT-CR-24-46)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that he had issues with low-barrier housing and felt that this item did not warrant support. He indicated this item concerned legal services for emergency evictions and did not understand the emergency since those services ended on May 11th. He asked if migrants and evictees were currently housed together at the Comfort Suites and inquired about cost savings between the Knights Inn and Comfort Suites. He inquired if any attempts had been made with the hotels to negotiate rooms rates paid by the County and if the transfer was for those who faced eviction or had already been evicted and if there would be co-mingling with migrants.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that the purpose of the agreement was to relocate participants of the Emergency Eviction Legal Services Program from the Comfort Suites to the Knights Inn, which was recently acquired by the City of Tucson. She stated that this would result in a change in the nightly room rate and there would be cost savings of approximately \$900,000.00. She indicated that the rates had been competitively bid and were not subject to the procurement process, but had been negotiated from \$104.00 to \$34.00 per night. She added that this agreement was for the transfer of individuals who were being evicted or faced eviction without any co-mingling with migrants.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

59. Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. Pima Vocational High School Board

- Appointment of Jimmy Hart, to fill a vacancy created by Albert Garcia. Term expiration: 7/31/26. (Committee recommendation)
- Reappointment of Donna Ruthruff. Term expiration: 7/31/25. (Committee recommendation)
- Reappointments of Dalila Perez and Mary Fellows. Term expirations: 7/31/26. (Committee recommendations)

2. Workforce Investment Board

- Appointment of Jordan Utley, representing Business, to fill a vacancy created by Steven Hosseinmardi. Term expiration: 9/30/25. (Staff recommendation)
- Appointment of Deborah Bright, representing Business, to fill a vacancy created by Daryl Finfrock. Term expiration: 9/30/24. (Staff recommendation)
- Appointment of Ian Roarke, representing Education and Training; Higher Education, to fill a vacancy created by Dr. David Doré. Term expiration: 9/30/25. (Staff recommendation)

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

3. Special Event

Laura Gallegos, Santa Catalina Catholic Church, 13480 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, September 16, 2023.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

4. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

MDN Parks, L.L.C. \$1,838.26; Alyssa Stewart \$1,500.00; SJM Premier Medical Group, L.L.C. \$264,534.20; TALANI BERTRAM \$40.80; NORMA A. MENDEZ \$795.01; Anthony William Zinman \$218.05; JIM CLICK FORD, INC. \$33.36; Berry Best Phlebotomy Training, L.L.C. \$3,000.00; LUIS GUTIERREZ \$100.00; MARK RESNICK \$11,308.00; RICHARD MARCOS YSMAEL \$5.97; Sedona Springs AZ, L.L.C. \$1,640.00; Humphrey &

Petersen, P.C. \$1,117.50; Mini Miracles, Inc. \$175.00; Sharp Electronics Corporation \$212.95; GUST ROSENFELD, P.L.C. \$38.20; GUST ROSENFELD, P.L.C. \$255.20; GUST ROSENFELD, P.L.C. \$300.00; DAVID QUAN \$55.00; Law Office of Dan South, P.L.L.C. \$9,896.00; AZ Tierra Ridge, L.L.C., d.b.a. Tierra Ridge Apartments \$4,079.57; CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT \$3,478.29; GUST ROSENFELD, P.L.C. \$126.10.

SUPERIOR COURT

5. **Hearing Officer Appointment**

Appointment of Hearing Officer of the Pima County Superior Court to fill a vacancy created by Lee Ann Roads:

Michelle Metzger

TREASURER

6. **Request to Waive Interest**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$4,606.21.

7. **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 \$54,299.01.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

8. Minutes: June 20, 2023

* * *

60. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:19 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK