

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 4, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

Absent: Rex Scott, Vice Chair

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Tucson Clean and Beautiful, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Adopt-A-Wash Program, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, Flood Control Ops Fund, contract amount \$60,000.00 (CT-FC-23-401)

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:26 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 4, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

Absent: Rex Scott, Vice Chair

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Melissa Cordero, Board Member, Tucson LGBT Chamber of Commerce, Marketing Manager, Sonoran Institute.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

4. Presentation of a proclamation to Victoria Altamirano, Sam Chia, Cytllali Gonzalez and Erin Knop, Pima County Health Department, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, June 4, 2024 to be: "NATIONAL SAFE DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Lee and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Chair Grijalva made the presentation.

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Stacey Brady, Director, CCFS, Jennifer Richardson, Assistant Director, CCFS, Jennifer Torchia, Deputy Court Administrator,

Juvenile Court, Presiding Judge Michael Butler, Juvenile Court, Stephanie Chavez, Casa Program Supervisor, Ron Overholt, Court Administrator, Superior Court, and Lisa Simpson, Director, Clerk of Superior Court, Juvenile, proclaiming the day of Saturday, June 15, 2024 to be: "FAMILY REUNIFICATION DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Lee and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Lee made the presentation.

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Tom Dang, Warning Coordination Meteorologist, National Weather Service Tucson; Mike Sagara, Public Information Officer and Regional Social Media Volunteer, and Michael Allen, Disaster Program Manager, Southern Arizona Chapter American Red Cross, proclaiming the week of June 9 through June 15, 2024, to be: "MONSOON SAFETY AWARENESS WEEK "

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Christy made the presentation.

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Sharon Fickes addressed the Board in opposition to Minute Item No. 26 and that the actions of the Board went above and beyond past County mandates.

Laurie Moore spoke about the low proficiency rates of students in Pima County.

David Sarando expressed his gratitude towards the Board and Pima County for the water provided to those in need who crossed the desert.

Laurie Cantillo, Chair, Humane Borders, indicated that approximately 200 migrant travelers passed away, each year, from thirst while traveling through the Sonoran Desert and thanked the Board for their continued support of Humane Borders.

Robert Reus stated that he wanted to present his critique when Supervisor Scott when in attendance so he would wait until the next Board meeting.

Steve Johnson expressed his concern with the corruption occurring in the Three Points area.

Cory Stephens spoke in opposition to Minute Item No. 19 and that it would incentivize more people to break the law. She stated that COVID no longer existed and opposed Minute Item No. 26.

Marcelino Flores, President, AFSCME, Local 449, thanked the Board for the creation of the Tribal Liaison position. He requested that the Extreme Heat policy be extended to all workers and asked that the Board create an Advisory Committee, led by Fatima Luna with the City of Tucson and Dr. Theresa Cullen.

Sharon Greene read an executive summary from Steve Kirsh and expressed her opposition to Minute Item No. 26.

Kirk Astroth, Humane Borders, addressed the Board in support of Minute Item No. 19 and stated that more than 4,000 people had died in the desert due to dehydration.

Terry Cignes expressed his opposition to the impact fee imposed on the residents of Three Points.

Sandra Tracy addressed the Board regarding the limitation of the zoning requirements, specifically, a rezoning ordinance that was passed in 1970.

Sarah Price expressed her opposition to Minute Item No. 19.

Doyle Taraba expressed his opposition to illegal border crossers and that the border needed to be closed. He stated that Board members violated their oath of office, with the gold fringe on the flags in the hearing room and that they should face a firing squad.

Joel Tiger expressed his frustration regarding the impact fee for Diamond Bell Ranch residents.

Barbara Johnson, Volunteer, Humane Borders, spoke in support of Minute Item No. 19 and stated that Humane Borders helped save lives.

Dave Smith addressed the Board regarding the proper implementation of programs to solve problems without any feedback mechanism.

Susan Taraba read a comment from Noami Wolf on COVID vaccines. She also questioned why the cartel did not provide the necessities for the individuals crossing the border.

Kathy spoke about having to move out of town due to shootings in her area. She stated that both her sons were fighting for the country and that she needed to take care of her family first.

Paul Stapleton-Smith thanked the Board and the County Administrator for their collaboration and continued support with County agencies regarding the Heat Ordinance.

Robert Robak stated that he was available to help the County in any way that he could and he spoke about how he and his wife had helped to adopt the EIC Eastern Arizona College in Thatcher.

* * *

Supervisor Lee expressed concern with the firing squad comment made by Mr. Taraba and felt threatened by that comment. She requested that the County Attorney's Office and the County Administrator provide an opinion on that and to move forward, as needed.

Supervisor Heinz stated that water in the desert and immigration continued to fall on the County since it was not being addressed at the federal level. He spoke about his experience treating people with heat exhaustion or watching someone die from heat exhaustion, and highlighted that many Border Patrol agents found individuals in the desert who had died from dehydration. He stated that his grandfather came through Ellis Island and he read the poem that was located at the base of the Statue of Liberty. He stated that the poem had been there for decades and reminded everyone to recognize their own humanity and compassion and to think about the effects that denying water had on people that were trying to escape from a place that could kill them.

Chair Grijalva stated the Board had created a system that allowed the public to attend meetings and be able to speak to the Board, but Board members did not need to feel threatened by comments. She stated that the firing squad comment directed at the Board was incredibly inappropriate and unsafe, and that the next time inappropriate comments like that were made, she would ask Security to escort the person who made those comments out of the hearing room. She stated that she was trying to be respectful to speakers and to also ensure that the hearing room was a safe place for everyone in attendance.

* * *

8. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Chair Grijalva and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent, to convene to Executive Session at 11:30 a.m.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:46 a.m. Supervisor Scott was absent. All other members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

10. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding an update on Arizona Citizens Defense League, Inc., et al. v. Pima County, et al.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Chair Grijalva stated that Dr. Paul Horowitz who served as Chair on the Board of Health recently stepped down. She stated that he served from May 1993 to May 2024 and thanked him for his 31 years of service. She also thanked Dr. Charles Geoffrion who was currently serving as interim Chair. She stated that the Board of Health had received various presentations that focused on major topics, such as vaping, tobacco and heat.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. Extreme Heat

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding response to and mitigation of extreme heat to ensure the health and safety of all Pima County employees, contractors and vendors and the development of a communications campaign to the general public to include the involvement of those impacted by any Pima County action.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that the Health Department had taken the lead on this issue, but that significant research had been conducted by working with business groups, community focus groups, labor unions, County employees, and directors on how the County could do better in the field, and review of existing administrative procedures to ensure appropriate modifications to recognize issues with the heat. She stated that this was a topic that came up periodically and Tucson natives were aware it had been hot for a long time, which included monsoons. She added that the Board had recognized the significant impacts of monsoons in the community and that it was a wonderful opportunity to recognize that there was an impact with heat for County employees. She stated that there were things the County could do such as, recognizing the time of day that employees came to work, providing work breaks and water. She stated that there would also be a communications plan, a campaign developed by the County's Communications Department, which had been used as an example by the City of Tucson. She stated that she would recommend any business in the community to do the same and provide information that could help employers with their workforce or with their clients and would encourage them to use and take advantage of information from County websites.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, explained that this work had been triggered by the discussions had with the Health Department and many other departments about what they were doing to help employees stay safe and help the community remain heat protected. He stated that the Board was aware that the

County had a long history of setting up public health infrastructure, which included collaborative cooling centers in association with the libraries and community partners and that it had been a good partnership. He stated that at the Board's direction they engaged with other jurisdictions, including the City of Tucson and the City of Phoenix (COP), to understand what it was they had done to mitigate the risk of heat both for their own workers, as well as for the community and that those conversations were going well. He stated that the heat workforce protection document being considered was about what the County had done with its own employees and how to set the standards. He stated that before reaching out to other employers and other community partners, they needed to get the County in order which involved public feedback from workers. He stated they had over 1,300 responses from a 7,000-person workforce and these were folks impacted by this issue on a daily basis and had dealt with the consequences of it. He stated that he felt optimistic with the feedback received from workers, partners, and other stakeholders, which had been incorporated into the administrative procedure as well as into future planning. He added that they did not have an ordinance for consideration, however, would continue with their due diligence and hoped to have something in the future when some of the outstanding issues were resolved.

Ms. Leshar stated that one of the concerns raised at the last Board meeting was that much of this had been built from a modeling of an ordinance that was passed by the COP and they had an office in place that dealt with heat and heat mitigation for about 3 years. She stated that County staff had communicated with COP to learn from them to determine what the best practices were and what they might have learned in those three years. She stated that as indicated by Dr. Garcia, they hoped in effect to walk their own talk and ensure they worked with County employees before moving forward with modifications to procurement codes and others in the future as it dealt with businesses that came into the community. She stated that if no specific action was taken, but at this point the administrative procedure was to go into effect, it was an administrative procedure that could be modified. She stated that part of the feedback heard today was that it needed to go further to other employees, advisory groups and committees to be included and ensure they were in place. She stated this would be used as a starting point and by no means an ending point. She mentioned that a comment received during a meeting in the focus groups with the business community was the desire to ensure there was one fairly consistent process or set of rules that went across the jurisdictions. She provided the example that if an individual drove a truck and dealt with services around the community, the need to ensure that individual driving between Marana, unincorporated Pima County, or in the City not be subject to a variety of different rules. She stated that they would continue to work with the Chamber of Commerce, other business groups and with fellow jurisdictions on one unified process.

Chair Grijalva stated that even though some employees worked in indoor environments that were already cooled, they still needed to get into the building and many employees were older. She felt that they also needed to consider the fact that heat exposure for long periods of time in a car that people were not drinking enough water and they were susceptible to other heat related illnesses. She stated that the

goal for this item was to protect the community to ensure that hospitals and health care professionals were not inundated with ill people because the heat snuck up on them. She commented that she had been at a service on Friday and had been outside for under 15 minutes and several people felt dizzy because they did not drink enough water and so it happened fairly quickly. She expressed her gratitude that the Communications Department created these items and asked if the Health Department could add a ticker on the website that showed when it would be a 100-degree day and to notify people to drink more water on these days and that this week was projected to be over 100 degrees every day.

Ms. Leshar replied that the 100-degree day started on this day and that there was a ticker the prior year that stayed up for 30 days and they recognized that it became less helpful, but that they would determine what was needed to modify it to provide different information every day that ensured recognition of hotter days and notified people to not go hiking.

Supervisor Christy stated that the overwhelming response he received from his constituents and from fellow residents of Pima County was welcome to summer, which had been ongoing for a millennium. He stated that he was shocked and surprised that the County did not have some sort of policies or regulations with its own employees to ensure they were protected, and it seemed hard-hearted for County employees not to have some sort of facilitation to work in the heat. He stated that this was how it worked with the County, that they would begin with installing and inserting regulations and mandates about heat-related situations to employees as employment practices, then extend them to contractors and suppliers and their employees that did business with the County and to require more mandates and regulations burdening their business with the County. He added that once it was implemented the County would then mandate it to all employers and businesses to insist and insert more regulations on private and small businesses in Pima County, similar to the COVID mandates. He stated that any responsible employer in the County recognized that there were heat issues and threats that could hurt their employees and productivity of their mission, whether it be in asphaltting, construction, roofing or any outdoor enterprise. He stated that his colleagues had received Tucson Asphalt's Heat Emphasis Policy, but he was certain that any responsible company, especially in the current worker shortage situation had a policy to protect its individual employees. He stated that the County did not need more regulations on businesses or suppliers with new insertions and burdensome regulations. He mentioned the protections of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and stated that it would be redundant. He stated that when he had a business he dealt with OSHA and they were very proactive in the whole issue of protecting employees which he found very beneficial because if an employer had an employee who got injured while on the job, that employee could not be productive in that business and would cost the employer money because of an injured employee. He stated there was no issue with any of this regulation or policy to include OSHA and to compare what was already in place with OSHA. He stated that there was a concern regarding whistleblower workers being retaliated against if they made any kind of a statement if heat mandates were not

being implemented by their director or their supervisor. He felt that it would open up the opportunity for lawsuits to the County, procurement issues, and the general business. He stated that he was also concerned with the County Administrator's Memorandum dated June 3, 2024, which had not been properly posted in time and according to the Clerk, it was posted at 1:00 p.m. the day prior, which were not in accordance with the proper posting procedures. He stated that as a result, the materials provided would require more time to discern what was being presented and to sift through the nuances and to recognize there were issues that needed to be addressed before it could be enacted.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of July 16, 2024, for proper posting of the County Administrator's memorandum as background information and to allow the public time to review the materials in the name of transparency and open meeting law.

Ms. Leshar clarified the item was informational only and there was no required action by the Board. She stated that the only thing going into effect would be the Administrative Procedure, which was approved by the County Administrator. She apologized that the materials were not provided earlier, but this was to begin a review process and indicated that they would begin to crosswalk other rules, review OSHA, and what other businesses had done, and planned to return to the Board at a future date if there was any action needed by the Board, such as adopting an ordinance.

Supervisor Christy excused himself for the misunderstanding and stated he had been prepared for action since the item indicated it being for discussion, direction, action.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that a motion had been made by Supervisor Christy and asked whether there was a seconder to the motion.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Supervisor Heinz commented that the Board has discussed this several times and that it was important to do so. He stated that he had treated multiple individuals who worked in exposed situations and they were drinking enough water, but only water. He stated that it was also important to include in the information and materials, to be careful with sweating of electrolytes and the need to replenish them and asked that this be incorporated into the materials.

Chair Grijalva asked whether the administrative procedures that Ms. Leshar referred to was for the heat related safety protocols. She stated that she wanted to ensure summarization of the changes or additions because there was an edited version included for the vehicle portion and questioned if the heat related policy was new.

Dr. Garcia concurred.

Supervisor Christy anecdotally provided an example of what might be something to consider in this issue with OSHA. He stated that they could come in and complete what they called a courtesy inspection of your business, where they would survey all of the situations that could possibly create hazards to employees, and would provide the recommendation to the owners of the business if items should be addressed in order to be in full compliance with OSHA. He stated that it was extraordinarily helpful and there was no penalty for this courtesy inspection and there were no ramifications or retribution. He added that they would return in 30 days to verify that action had been taken on the courtesy items and that it was very simple and nominal to resolve the corrections to ensure employees were not injured, no fines, or jail time and it provided the employer a whole new awareness of potential hazards to their employees, but there was nothing that had any kind of retribution to it or any kind of penalty and he suggested going this route and to let the businesses self-police themselves with no County regulations.

Chair Grijalva felt that it was important to implement the administrative regulations and she was aware that this was the first time that many were reviewing the details so if there were any other suggestions or additions, they could send those to Dr. Garcia. She stated for clarification that regulations were not something voted on by the Board, but was something that could be done administratively and any additions or changes could happen in that manner. She stated that if anything else like an ordinance or something else came forward that required Board approval, then the Board would take action on it at that time.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

13. Fiscal Year 2022/23 Audit Results

Presentation of Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23 Audit Results by the Office of the Auditor General for compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §11-661 and §41-1494. Staff recommends acceptance of the FY2022/23 audit results submitted by the Office of the Auditor General and approval of the Human Resources memorandum proposed in the separate agenda item demonstrating compliance with A.R.S. §41-1494.

Lindsey A. Perry, CPA, CFE, Auditor General of Arizona (AG), provided a slide show presentation of the County's audits. She reminded the Board that the Auditor General's Office was an independent office that provided impartial information to decision makers and provided specific recommendations to improve the operations of State and local governments including Pima County. She stated that her auditors followed a robust set of auditing standards including governmental auditing standards. She stated that they were here in accordance with State law which directed the County Board of Supervisors to present the audit results and any findings in a regular meeting without the use of a consent agenda and within 90 days of those reports' issuance. She stated that this was a great opportunity for

them to provide information, answer questions and review the reports for the County. She stated they would discuss three audit reports with the first being the County's Annual Financial Compliance Audit issued on February 29th, the second was the report on Internal Controls and the third was a Single Audit Report issued on March 28th. She stated that what was done in the past when issuing the reports was an email was sent regarding the reports including highlights of the things found and some snapshots of the County. She went over the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report and stated that it presented the County's annual financial statements and the AG's opinion on them. She stated that the financial statements were the objective of the audit which was to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole were free from material misstatement either due to fraud or error and issue a report that included their opinions. She stated that there was great news for Fiscal Year 2023 as they had reported an unmodified or clean opinion, which meant that the County's financial statements were reliable. She stated that the second report on Internal Control and Compliance would show their report on any findings and recommendations found during the course of conducting the audit on the financial statements and she was happy to report for Fiscal Year 2023, they reported no financial statement She stated that the Single Audit Report included their assessment of the County's compliance with federal program requirements over each federal program that they were required to audit and the objective was to obtain reasonable assurance about whether material non-compliance with these federal requirements existed, whether due to fraud or error and then express their opinion regarding the audit. She stated the report allowed the federal government to understand if the County had spent federal monies appropriately and within the compliance standards. She stated that federal law required the County to issue the Single Audit Report by March 31st, and she was happy to report that the County submitted its report on time, which helped the County to continue the flow of federal dollars to the County and they reported no single audit findings. She stated that they were aware that these reports could be very detailed and complex as there were hundreds of pages, but they also prepared the report highlights which was a two-page summary that included the County's largest primary revenue sources which provided a key picture as to what had been done over the last 10 years, including expenditure information. She stated that if there were any findings or recommendations in the report it would also include a summary.

Katherine Edwards Decker, CPA, Deputy Director, Financial Audit Division, explained that over the past five fiscal years, the County's primary revenue sources continued to be County property taxes, Federal and State grants and programs, Shared State Sales Tax and County Sales Taxes. She stated that three of the four revenues were consistently increasing over time with exception to the Federal and State grants program, which had increased right at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, mostly because more Federal aid started coming into the County, but it had started to level off in the past couple of years. She referred to the slide and stated the graph showed the primary expenses over the past five years, and that the four primary expense functions for the County continued to be General Government, Public Safety, Highways and Streets, and Health and Welfare. She

stated that General Government expenses increased \$51.5 million from Fiscal Year '22 to Fiscal Year '23 due to increased personnel costs and COVID-19 federal spending for General Government purposes. She stated that the County's Public Safety expenses increased \$20 million of which \$5 million was from a State funded hiring and retention incentive pay. She stated that health and welfare expenses fluctuated over the past few years and the current year's Highways and Streets expenses decreased by \$17.8 million as the County completed many large road repairs and maintenance projects in Fiscal Year '22 as compared to Fiscal Year '23. She stated that the County's overall total expenses increased by \$118.5 million from Fiscal Year '22 to Fiscal Year '23. She referred to the following slide and stated that the graph highlighted the five-year trend of revenues and expenses. She stated that the revenues exceeded the expenses over the past 5 years and that the County's net position, also referred to as reserves, had considerably been higher than its current revenues or expenses. She stated that most importantly, the County's overall net position increased by \$37.3 million in Fiscal Year 2023 and that the total net position was nearly \$2.5 billion. She added that it was important to note that not all of the net position balance was spendable as nearly \$2.5 billion was invested in capital assets, an additional \$28.3 million was for restricted purposes which left a negative unrestricted balance of \$282.4 million which was primarily attributed to the County's net pension liability which was \$538 million for Fiscal Year '23. She highlighted the County's Federal expenditures presented each year in the County's Single Audit Report. She stated that the four largest federal agencies the County received and spent money from was the U.S. Department of Treasury, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor, and Department of Homeland Security. She stated that it showed a substantial increase in Federal expenditures in Fiscal Year 2023 primarily due to COVID-19 pandemic monies that the County received and spent from the Department of Treasury, specifically for the Emergency Rental Assistance with expenditures at \$39.9 million in Fiscal Year '23 which represented a \$19.2 million increase from the previous year. She stated that the Department of Homeland Security expenditures also increased by nearly \$17.1 million from Fiscal Year '22 which was primarily associated with increased expenditures for the Emergency Food Shelter and National Board Program. She added that the Health and Human Services Federal expenditures decreased by \$11 million due to decreased funding and expenditures relating to COVID-19 Pandemic relief programs. She stated that there were no findings for their Fiscal Year '23 reports, however, noted that in the prior fiscal year there were two financial statement findings and one federal compliance finding. She stated that their auditing standards required them to follow-up on the status of these findings until they were fully corrected. She stated that the first financial statement finding was related to deficiencies noted in the prior County Administrator's retirement and return to work procedures, which had been fully corrected through the implementation of new policies and procedures. She stated that the second financial statement finding was related to the Procurement Department's lack of control verification over vendor information changes, which had been partially corrected as the County disabled the feature where the issue originally occurred and was working towards implementing a new financial system that management anticipated would fully correct the issue. She stated that as reported in the County's response in the back of their report,

County management expected to have those new controls in place once the system went live. She added that the federal compliance finding was related to subrecipient monitoring for the Emergency Food and Shelter National Board Program (EFSP) which had been partially corrected as the County had corrected the immediate issue relating to the subaward noted in their report last year, however, the County was still implementing a comprehensive system to improve subrecipient monitoring controls and management estimated that the issue would be resolved later this summer.

Supervisor Lee asked if the new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system would ameliorate the partially corrected Procurement and Subrecipient monitoring issues.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, replied affirmatively and explained that when the new ERP system went live on July 1st, they would be in full compliance, and the same was true for the subrecipient concern related to a contract with the City of Tucson, and the EFSP funding and the contract would shift again on July 1st. She stated that she could provide a report to the Board on its status and could work with the AG to mark off those boxes.

Supervisor Christy commented that the County had two unresolved situations and asked whether the assumption was that the County would resolve them, and the Board was being asked to vote to approve the findings even though they were not corrected.

Ms. Edwards Decker responded in the affirmative and stated that they would follow up on those findings in their Fiscal Year '24 audit report and would return to present whether they were fully corrected or if they remained in impartially corrected status.

Supervisor Christy stated that the County Administrator indicated that she assumed they would be corrected in the near future and that he felt very uncomfortable voting on assumptions in this manner to approve the entire audit when two outstanding situations existed. He stated that he would not vote to approve this when it came back to the Board, but believed it would be appropriate to vote on the approval of the audit when it had been corrected.

Ms. Leshar responded that this report was for the prior year's findings and there were no findings, and asked whether there was any additional information related to the two partially completed items.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that as part of the ERP implementation they considered the two findings from the AG in Fiscal Year '22 and made sure that the systems they purchased and implemented would resolve those technical issues. She stated that they planned to go live on July 1st and that she could report back to the Board at its second meeting in August as they would have gone through six weeks and should be able to determine with complete certainty that whatever issues were identified in the existing system had been corrected and no longer existed.

Ms. Perry stated that she understood Supervisor Christy's concerns and that they would begin to embark on the new audit in the next few months and that they would have a better idea of the County's movement towards correcting the findings. She added that they were not able to publicly present information that they had not released yet in a report, but offered to brief the Board in executive session if that would be helpful in the interim.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was just an old car dealer and he knew that if he was audited by the Internal Revenue Service, and they indicated that he owed some money on these items, and he assured them to approve his returns, but that he would provide the payment to them, they would assume he would provide payment, but he had difficulty with that assumption.

Chair Grijalva stated that she thought it was not uncommon to have findings and that she appreciated it was being monitored to resolve it, but that this was not a finding from this fiscal year, rather from 2022, and asked if this was correct.

Ms. Perry confirmed it was from the prior fiscal year and they were required to follow-up and would continue to do so. She stated that it would be ongoing, but this was the value they provided with the continued follow up, with the County's perspective which was in the report, and also when the County believed it would be implemented, and then a period of time was needed to show that it had been implemented to return and review.

Chair Grijalva commented that once it has been resolved, the Board would appreciate a memorandum or presentation to publicly indicate the issues had been resolved and hoped it would happen with the implementation of the new systems.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

14. Certification of Compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes

Staff recommends approval of the memorandum certifying Pima County's compliance with A.R.S §11-661(D) and §41-1494.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that this was a certification of compliance related to the Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) and that once the audit was accepted, it included language that stated the County demonstrated compliance with a section that prohibited employers from requiring employees to engage in, or use monies in training, orientation, therapy, etcetera, related to judgment or a variety of very specific language. She added that after the audit was approved, this item affirmed compliance with that action.

Chair Grijalva commented that she took issue with this because this was one of those writers that the legislature was adding on to several different A.R.S. codes that were conversations related to anti-Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and she did not think they should be placing these kind of writers on what was really a very basic approval of a certification. She inquired about the consequences if the certificate was not approved by the Board.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that A.R.S. §11-661(D) required that the Board demonstrated compliance with A.R.S. §41-1494 as the County Administrator detailed, and if the Board did not fulfill that mandatory action, the Board could be sued and face a mandamus challenge which could include Attorney's fees for the cost of initiating the lawsuit to comply with this mandatory statutory duty.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he did not understand the item.

Chair Grijalva explained that the legislature was adding §41-1494 which would prohibit employers from requiring employees to engage in or use public monies for training orientation and therapy which presented any form of blame or judgment on the basis of race, ethnicity, or sex. She stated that in her opinion, it was a way to oppose Diversity, Equity and Inclusion which was an issue that was happening at the State level.

Ms. Leshar stated that the County was required to have the audit results presented before the Board and approved. She stated that there was legislation that indicated that part of the posting of the financial statements, and with acceptance of those audit results, that the language must also be approved to have those audit results considered approved by the State of Arizona.

Supervisor Heinz questioned if the Board would be required to eventually certify compliance with every single statute and sub-statute in the A.R.S.

Ms. Leshar clarified that the Board would only have to certify compliance with those that were related to and linked to the approval of the audit.

Chair Grijalva questioned if this was linked this to the approval of the audit.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy to approve the item. The motion died for lack of a second.

No Board action was taken.

15. **Classification/Compensation**

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

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

2026/ Deputy Director Project Design & Construction/ 20 (\$117,545-\$176,318)/ 1/ E*

*E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the background material indicated the Project Design and Construction Department needed a new job classification for their deputy director position and that they were using the Facilities Management deputy director classification, which was not suitable for the responsibilities of the deputy director. He asked what would happen to the deputy director position in Facilities Management.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that about a year prior they had divided Facilities Management into two departments; Facilities Management, which focused primarily on the issues related to the maintenance of County buildings and Project Design and Construction, which focused on the construction of new buildings. She explained that when the new department was created, there was no deputy director position for that department and this would ensure that there was a deputy director position in both departments.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated the deputy director classification for Facilities Management would remain the same, however, the incumbent in Project Design and Construction would be moved into that deputy director classification.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification if they were hiring a deputy director for Facilities Management, once the current deputy director moved to the new department, at a salary level of up to \$176,000.00.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that there currently was a vacancy in the Facilities Management Department for a deputy director. He explained that the position existed but was not filled. He stated that there was a filled deputy director position in the Project Design and Construction Department who was under the Facilities Management deputy director classification.

Supervisor Christy commented that none of the positions were going away.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that was correct.

Supervisor Christy questioned why there was no economic impact if none of the positions would be going away.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that there was funding for both positions within the approved budget and there would not be any increased funding above what was already in the budget for both departments.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Scott was absent.

RECORDER

16. 2024 Primary Election - Early Ballot Drop-Off Sites & Emergency Voting Locations

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 26, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2024 Primary Election.

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

Gabriela Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder, explained that there was a few notable changes that she wanted to address, and the information had been included in the background material. She stated that she wanted to provide additional context for any community members listening in and that all the changes were positive. She stated that this would be the second time they would be utilizing the W. Anne Gibson Esmond Library in Vail, which was used in the 2023 Consolidated Election and since it was so successful in the 2023 cycle, they would extend the availability for an additional week. She stated that they would have two locations in the Vail and Sahuarita area, the second would be La Villita Community Center in Sahuarita which would also be open for two weeks. She stated that the Dusenberry-River Library on River Road would be hosting for the first time and the Valencia Library on Valencia Road would also be hosting since the Richard Elías-Mission Library was currently under construction. She stated that the background material included a very detailed document that listed the days and times, and it was important to note the dates and times of the closure. She stated there were some legislative changes that required them to be very meaningful about the hours that they would be open. She noted that their emergency voting hours would be from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., except for Monday, July 29, 2024, they would be open from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. She stated that was the majority of the changes, but they would have a total of 18 locations, with 17 of them being full early voting sites that would be operating from the 27th through to 6 days before the election, within that time frame, and they had one location, the Recorder's East Side office which would be a ballot drop-off location only during the duration of that early voting site and on Election Day.

Supervisor Christy asked if observers would be allowed during the election cycle, and if not, why.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded no and stated their policy remained the same. She stated that they would not have observers at the early voting sites, but would continue to welcome observers at the Country Club facility which was where ballots were processed.

Supervisor Christy asked why observers would not be allowed.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly stated there was a multitude of reasonings that she had previously gone through.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was asking because the election was coming and that the reason observers were not allowed should not be because of a space issue because the Elections Director always had enough space. He stated that a space issue had been the reason from the Recorder why she did not allow observers for the last three election cycles and asked why it had not been addressed.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that she had discussed this multiple times in previous meetings and that space was a factor in some locations, but that there were multiple factors with each of those locations and at the current time they were not changing their policy. She further explained that staffing was a factor since it required additional people, in addition to the observers, which would require additional training, policies and funding. She stated there had been a consistent effort for them to continue to welcome people to the ballot processing facility to show them how ballot affidavits were processed and that they recently had a public tour by welcoming members of the Election Integrity Commission to that location to discuss how the process worked, which included media. She stated that they were continuously providing information about the process that was being done and also maintained very private information from voters, unlike Election Day. She stated that early voting sites had limited information on Election Day and it was information received from the Recorder's Office, although not a full-blown voter record, but often the sites were utilized as an extension of the Recorder's Office that could include private information and personal identifying information from the voter that wished to maintain private.

Supervisor Christy commented that if the Elections Department could accommodate this situation, certainly the Recorder's Office could, and pointed out that not allowing observers led to mistrust and perhaps this was one way to overcome that mistrust.

Chair Grijalva stated that she appreciated the policy and that it could be very intimidating to have someone standing in the room staring at them and that she had been to voting sites where the design was to intimidate, to stand outside right over the threshold and to holler at people when they came up and she did not feel that was a healthy environment. She appreciated the extra information that people were coming to these emergency voting sites in case there was an issue where they did not receive a ballot or needed to provide more information, and she felt it was understandable.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Scott was absent.

TRANSPORTATION

17. Exemption of the Valencia Road: Mission Road to Camino de la Tierra Project

Staff recommends exemption of the Valencia Road: Mission Road to Camino de la Tierra Project from Ordinance 10.56.070, to permit the use of a Categorical Exclusion (CE) document. (Districts 3 and 5)

Chair Grijalva asked staff to provide an explanation of this item so that the public understood that the County was not trying to get out of an environmental impact.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that the County had an Ordinance and within the Ordinance when the County worked on roadway projects, they had to do an environmental mitigation assessment report and that was required by County Code. He stated that on the Valencia Project, they received a \$20 million raise grant to construct the project and they had environmental requirements. He stated that in the case of this project it was called a categorical exemption and it was a similar process and document that would be prepared for adherence to the federal funding requirements. He explained that they would be doing the same things, but did not want to duplicate and do both of those things which was why they were requesting a waiver of the County EMAR requirement that was included in the County's Code. He stated they would do all the same required environmental clearances.

Chair Grijalva clarified that it was the federal process versus the County process and the County's process would not fulfill the requirements of the federal process.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative. He stated that they would not accept the County's report or process.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Behavioral Health

18. CODAC Health, Recovery & Wellness, Inc., d.b.a. CODAC, Amendment No. 6, to provide for the medical forensic examination and evidence collection for victims of sexual assault, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$6,000.00 (CT-BH-20-268)

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

County Administrator

19. Humane Borders, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for water distribution services in the remote areas of Pima County, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$30,000.00 (CT-CA-23-378)

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

Forensic Science Center

20. Apache County, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for medical examiner services, contract amount \$150,000.00 revenue (CTN-FSC-24-182)

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

Information Technology

21. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Rooftop License Agreement for Wireless Communications Facilities, extend contract term to 4/15/29 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$5,344.08 revenue (CTN-IT-19-177)

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

Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation

22. Arizona Game and Fish Department, to provide for fence installation and surveys at abandoned mine features at Tucson Mountain Park, General Fund, contract amount \$48,723.00 (CT-PR-24-458)

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

Chair Grijalva clarified that this was for 15 abandoned mine sites that would be fenced in and made safer.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Scott was absent.

Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security

23. Southern Arizona Rescue Association, Amendment No. 1, to provide for provision of equipment, supplies and training for Search and Rescue Operations, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (CT-OEM-23-413)

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

Procurement

24. **Award**

Award: Multiple Master Agreements, to provide for Sodium Hypochlorite 12.5%. Master Agreement No. MA-PO-24-194. This master agreement is awarded to Vendor No. 1 for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$1,590,000.00 and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Master Agreement No. MA-PO-24-195. This master agreement is awarded to Vendor No. 2 for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$123,200.00 and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: WW Ops Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

Group A - Bulk

Vendor No. 1/Primary - Hasa, Inc. (Headquarters: Saugus, CA)

Vendor No. 2/Secondary - Hill Brothers Chemical Company (Headquarters: Brea, CA)

Group B - Totes, Drums and Carboys

Hill Brothers Chemical Company (Headquarters: Brea, CA)

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

25. **Award**

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-24-174, Carbon Activated Corporation (Headquarters: Compton, CA) - Primary, and Norit Americas, Inc. (Headquarters: Horsham, PA) - Secondary, to provide for activated carbon and turnkey change-out services. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the shared annual award amount of \$1,060,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Wastewater Operations Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

26. **Award**

Award: Purchase Order No. PO-PO-24-28, Truck Builders, L.L.C., d.b.a. Chef Units (Headquarters: Houston, TX), to provide for mobile medical vehicle. This contract is for a one-time award in the discrete amount \$313,582.64 (including sales tax). Funding Source: GMI-FRF Public Health HD OT2126 Mobile Health Vehicle Fund. Administering Department: Health.

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

Supervisor Christy commented that a van with a 50-inch TV sounded extraordinary. He stated that shortly after he took office during his first term Pima County decided to close the Health Center in Green Valley. He stated they had heard of several issues with the Green Valley hospital closure and that many of the residents in the area felt that they did not have adequate medical care. He stated they also felt as if they were going to be pressured into taking the COVID vaccine. He asked if COVID-related vaccinations were going to be the only services offered on this device.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, clarified that the Health Department operated four mobile medical units and that they provided a range of services, but did not all provide the same services. He stated that some provided Title 10 family planning, contraception, STI screening, some provided oral health and dental exams for children, and some provided vaccinations. He stated that this particular van would be more flexible in the types of services it would provide to the public. He explained that the reason a new mobile was needed was because the others were old and were no longer reliable. He stated that the goal was to be able to have a presence in communities, such as Green Valley, Amado and Arivaca.

Supervisor Christy requested assurances that the van would be meeting in Green Valley.

Dr. Garcia responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy asked if it would include rural Pima County, such as the Reddington area.

Dr. Garcia stated that they had not yet programmed exactly where it would be, however, the point for these vehicles was to be able to extend their services to parts of the County, whether geographically or within the bounds of any particular jurisdiction that was needed.

Supervisor Christy asked what was urban Pima County.

Dr. Garcia clarified that it was the incorporated jurisdictions.

Chair Grijalva asked if this was to replace one of the four vehicles that was currently in the Health Department.

Dr. Garcia responded yes and they would be retiring one of the vehicles.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had seen the Health Department at several community events and highlighted that the mobile clinics provided various services which included flu shots and blood pressure checks. She expressed her frustration over hearing others take out one piece of the services that was offered when there were comprehensive services depending on the events, and they were very flexible. She emphasized her gratitude for the access the mobile units allowed for the Health Department to be able to go into areas that were underserved and did not have access, such as Green Valley. She wanted to make sure they said that unspecific services would be provided, however since they were not in charge of organizing the schedule of the mobile units, they did not know where they would be.

Supervisor Heinz stated that in many clinics, monitors were used for telemedicine items or for calling family members through zoom when they were unable to be present. He stated that with the way medicine was going this was something that was incorporated into many bricks and mortar clinics and he did not view it as a problem, but would have if the monitors were absent.

Supervisor Lee stated that in Ajo, the Desert Senita Community Health Center was open Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and if someone arrived at 5:01 p.m., they were out of luck. She stated that she would love to see County Administration explore ways that they could be able to serve that community. She understood that it would be tough due to Ajo being three hours away, however, she would love to see the services that were being provided here also be provided in the Ajo community. She stated that having mobile clinics that went to Ajo and at some point if they provided services after 5:00 p.m. would be wonderful for the community.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Scott was absent.

27. Origami Risk, L.L.C., Amendment No. 5, to provide for risk management information system, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$11,500.00 (MA-PO-15-41) Administering Department: Finance and Risk Management

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

Supervisor Christy stated that Origami Risk was supposed to be completed as a contractor in 2022 and then had been given contract extensions. He asked if the vendor was going away or if they were part of ERP, due to ERP's delay in going online.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that she was unsure, but believed that they would be going away. She believed that this was one last contract amendment period, but did not know whether the services that would be provided by the company, which was more data assistance as it dealt with some of their lease properties for the risk management perspective. She stated that she did not believe that it would be covered by the new ERP as part of that service and asked staff if there were any concerns if they were to delay the item until June 18, 2024.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, responded that he did not know the terms of the contract or whether a delay would cause a problem.

Supervisor Christy asked that the item be continued until the County Administrator had the opportunity to provide that information.

Ms. Leshar concurred.

Chair Grijalva hoped that there would not be any major issue continuing the item.

Chair Grijalva withdrew her original motion and at her request, this item be continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 18, 2024.

28. Senergy Petroleum, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for motor vehicle fuel, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (MA-PO-24-154)
Administering Department: Fleet Services

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

29. Flyers Energy, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for motor vehicle fuel, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (MA-PO-24-155)
Administering Department: Fleet Services

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

Real Property

30. Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., to provide for a Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use License for Public Utility Facilities, no cost/25 year term (CTN-RPS-24-181)

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

Recorder

31. Town of Marana, Amendment No. 1, to provide for election services, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (CTN-RE-22-91)

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

Supervisor Christy indicated that these were no cost contracts that were provided by the Recorder to these jurisdictions. He stated that the Elections Department received revenue from the same jurisdictions and asked why the Recorder's Office did not.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the amendments had to do with the change in the date of the primary election. He stated that there was no cost for these particular amendments and that they were merely changing the date for the primary election due to the change in State law.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the primary election was originally scheduled to be held on August 6, 2024 and had been changed to July 30, 2024.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Scott was absent.

32. Town of Oro Valley, Amendment No. 1, to provide for election services, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (CTN-RE-22-92)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 31, for discussion related to this item.)

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

33. Town of Sahuarita, Amendment No. 1, to provide for election services, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (CTN-RE-22-93)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 31, for discussion related to this item.)

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

34. City of South Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide for election services, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (CTN-RE-22-94)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 31, for discussion related to this item.)

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

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

35. Town of Oro Valley, Amendment No. 3, to provide for wastewater billing and collection services, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$440,000.00 (CT-WW-21-367)

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

36. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for developing the framework of a collaborative Wastewater Service Agreement, RWRD Sewer Revenue Fund (Project No. 3SHWRF), contract amount \$125,000.00 (CTN-WW-24-186)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

37. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to provide for the Pima County Voluntary Lawn and Garden Equipment Emissions Reduction Program, \$50,000.00 (GTAW 24-145)

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

38. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Family Health Partnership, d.b.a. Affirm Sexual and Reproductive Health, to provide for reproductive health services, \$531,250.00/\$750,000.00 Patient Fees, Third-Party Payers, In-Kind, and Health Special Revenue Fund Match (GTAW 24-153)

At the request of staff and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

39. **Acceptance - Health**

Early Childhood Development and Health Board / First Things First, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the child care health consultation, extend grant term to 6/30/25 and amend grant language, \$808,350.00 (GTAM 24-87)

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

40. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 285391, Austin Sotelo Navarrete, Tres De Corazones, 3210 S. Dodge Boulevard, No. 2, Tucson, Series 4, Wholesaler, New License.

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

41. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Taylor Cooley, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. Saint Andrews Drive, Tucson, June 22, 2024 at 9:15 p.m.

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

Supervisor Heinz stated that with the exception of holidays, he would continue to vote in opposition of fireworks permits since the Board still had no assurances regarding the wind speeds and timeframes for when fireworks could be conducted, and there were problems with fireworks that were disruptive to the community. He stated that with the exception of one holiday, he did not see the need for fireworks and that Supervisor Scott had historically agreed with him on this matter.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," and Supervisor Scott was absent.

42. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

John Lashley, Tucson Speedway, 11955 S. Harrison Road, Tucson, June 29, 2024 at 9:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 41, for discussion related to this item.)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," and Supervisor Scott was absent, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

43. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Chris Klok, Forty Niner Country Club, 12000 E. Tanque Verde Road, Tucson, June 29, 2024 at 8:45 p.m.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 41, for discussion related to this item.)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," and Supervisor Scott was absent, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

44. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Troy Finley, Tucson Country Club, 2950 N. Camino Principal, Tucson, July 4, 2024 at 9:00 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

45. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Taylor Cooley, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. Saint Andrews Drive, Tucson, July 4, 2024 at 9:15 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

46. **Hearing - Bingo License**

24-02-8046, Erica Holbert, Rocking K South Master Homeowners Association, 12620 E. Old Spanish Trail, Tucson, Class A - Small Game.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

47. Hearing - Code Text Amendment

ORDINANCE NO. 2024 - 8, of the Board of Supervisors, amending Ordinance No. 1990-110 and Ordinance No. 1993-001 relating to County government administration; amending Pima County Code, Title 2, Chapter 2.12 to authorize the County Administrator to pursue claims up to one hundred thousand dollars in anticipated and documented value, and to add a requirement for the County Administrator to provide the Board of Supervisors with annual reports regarding claims pursued pursuant to the ordinance.

Chair Grijalva stated this item would amend the County ordinance related to County government administration authorizing the County Administrator to pursue claims of up to \$100,000.00, it was already included in board policy and questioned whether this was to codify it in the County Code.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that this would provide explicit authorization to the County Administrator to pursue claims on behalf of the County that were up to \$100,000.00.

Chair Grijalva 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 Ordinance. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy read from the background material and asked when the Board had previously authorized delegated legal authority to settle claims up to \$100,000.00, and why it was currently needed. He stated that it seemed to be a replication of what already existed.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had the same question.

Mr. Jurkowitz explained that in the current County Code, the Board delegated settlement authority of claims against the County with various tiers up to \$100,000.00 with the last amendment a couple years ago raising it from \$50,000.00 to \$100,000.00, otherwise, every single claim settlement would have to come to the Board of Supervisors for approval. He stated this would be the reverse, that if claims brought upon by the County against individuals that owed the County money, it would provide the County Administrator with parallel authority to pursue claims up to \$100,000.00, which would avoid every single action they wanted authorized, on behalf of the County, to the Board for approval and that it had never been explicitly stated anywhere.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Scott was absent.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

48. Campbell Avenue Trailhead

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the staff decision to close public access to the Campbell Avenue Trailhead, and the removal of associated parking spaces. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy read from a constituent's email as follows: "As an avid hiker, I was very dismayed to find out that the Director of Natural Resources, Victor Pereira, made a recent decision to close the existing Campbell Avenue Trailhead and remove the parking spaces for that trailhead. I understand this was done in violation of the existing County Trail Access Plan and with no discussion or input from stakeholders, such as Southern Arizona Hiking Club or Pima Trail Association as well as without the approval of the Board of Supervisors. I believe this decision needs to be reconsidered." He stated this boiled down not to the justification by the Director to close the trailhead and the parking spot, but basically that the Board had to take action to create this trailhead and questioned how staff could act to close a trailhead without Board direction.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that the action that people had been describing relating to the creation of the trailhead had occurred in 1976 and subsequent to that time, a variety of issues related to the master plan, the use of County trails, etcetera, had come before the Board. She stated that multiple modifications to the use of the trailheads had occurred since the action taken in 1976 and continued discussions that occurred consistent with Board action. She stated that the takeaway from this was that the County could do a better job with public participation and in outreach to ensure that people were aware of those decisions being made and they had already begun discussions to review how that occurred, why it occurred and how it was consistent with Board policy.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that there was a series of plans that had been adopted over decades by the County, particularly the Board and those plans were living documents or Master Plans. He stated for example, in the last 5 years the County expanded trails by over 75 miles and those actions did not return to Board. He stated that staff was examining those various documents to review the implementing provisions to ensure that nothing was done inappropriately other than what Ms. Leshner indicated with the lack or need for greater public engagement in that process. He stated that he envisioned they could provide a report to the Board through the County Administrator that included the history of the various iterations of adoption of plans, the authorities that were contained within the plan both from a department operating standpoint, and anything else that might surface and require action by the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked whether there was a possibility that the Campbell Avenue Trailhead could be reviewed and be determined retroactively to remain open and would not need to be closed.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that he did not expect that to be the outcome and that within the Master Trails Plan there were provisions that adopted standards for safety and access. He stated that there were a couple of elements of this particular trail, one being that it provided unauthorized access into the National Forest Service Areas, and also, the topographical features of the trail did not meet the County's standards and could not be made to meet the standards because of the steep change in elevation that existed along the trail. He added that there were legitimate factors that warranted the removal of the trail from the trail system which would be outlined for the Board.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had received a memorandum about this and that they also received calls in her office from constituents that were upset, but she understood all the reasons for the closure. She stated that a better job of outreach to the community could have been done since it was something that the County supported and was very unnerving to many people that there were parking spots one day, then they were gone the next day.

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

49. **Affordable Dwelling Insurance in Wildfire Prone Areas**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding correspondence sent to the Arizona Dept. of Insurance and Financial Institutions Director as to the actions that can be taken to address the lack of access to affordable dwelling insurance in wildfire prone areas throughout Pima County. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy expressed his excitement that the Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions Director would be coming before this Board at its next meeting, but commented that there might have been some misunderstandings about what the Board intended as far as requesting Board support through the Chair regarding other Elected Officials, particularly the Governor. He stated that he reviewed a draft letter that he assumed was the one that was referred to by the County Administrator, at the first meeting in May, that the Board asked her to send and then the second meeting in May, the Board further elaborated and he read from that transcription. He stated that they waited for that letter based on the unanimous authority given by the Board to the Chair, that she write a letter to Governor Hobbs and to the legislature on the Board's behalf. He respectfully requested that the Chair revisit writing the letter to Governor Hobbs as was requested by the Board so that it was on behalf of the Board as a whole. He stated that he had thought about writing a joint letter with Supervisor Lee, but then Supervisor Scott also had input, and three members could not do it at the same time so naturally they looked to the Chair for leadership on this position, to use the influence of the Chair on behalf of the Board. He stated that the letter the Chair sent did not show that it spoke on behalf of the Board.

Chair Grijalva stated that she believed that Administrator Lesher had drafted something and that it should be out soon. She added that a letter like this should be sent by the County Administrator's Office on behalf of the Board, but that she would move forward and draft a letter and it would be sent to all district offices as a draft for their input.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

50. Legal Asylum Seekers

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding future federal funding opportunities in support of legal asylum seekers.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, explained that as discussed in the past there were a variety of tranches of dollars that were available and the Federal government was moving those dollars out in various Notice of Funding opportunities, and the next one was due on June 13, 2024. She stated that they had reviewed over the last year, and as stated in her memorandum, the County had received about \$98 million since 2019, to run the program. She stated that the Board had previously walked through the timeline, and they thought funding would get them through March of the current year, and they were able to receive from the next tranche of funding, about \$21.7 million that would enable them to continue. She stated that they were currently projected to get through the end of the calendar year, December 31st with an asterisk because it was known that at some point, there would be an executive order from President Biden that could impact the border. She stated that they tentatively thought they could stretch those dollars farther, however the question that arose as they looked at the final tranche of dollars, which was anticipated to be \$340 million nationwide, the concern was that it was nationwide and expanded to communities that were eligible for those dollars. She stated that previously there was a situation where entities that received funds before were eligible, but that other communities across the country that might not be border communities but had seen individuals seeking asylum arrive in their communities and requests had been made by New York, Boston, Chicago, Atlanta, and others to access the dollars. She stated that no grant could be larger than \$34 million and with it being scattered amongst and between all the 50 states, she would be stunned if the County received \$34 million. She stated that their request had been to continue to go after the \$21.7 million, accept it to provide the opportunity to work through the end of the calendar year to transition out of the business to work with their partners in the philanthropic community, other agencies, etcetera, so that they were no longer in the business as soon as this tranche of money ran out. She stated that historically they requested more, and had, and were able to operate for another couple months, and then returned and received more money and operated for another few months. She stated that the Board would consider staff's recommendation to not submit a proposal for the next tranche of money which would be due on June 13, 2024 and to use the remainder of the almost \$22 million to get through the end of the year and to work with all of their partners, the non-governmental organizations (NGO), philanthropic, state, other local jurisdictions,

County, and tribal nations to find a path forward to transition out of this business. She added that she had assured other jurisdictions that it was not the County's desire to simply drop the baton on the ground but to ensure they had the next several months to pass the baton to the next runner and their concern historically had been with the humanitarian effort and the impact on the community. She stated that the County remained the only jurisdiction in the United States that had not seen street releases and the number one goal was to ensure that it remained the effort, and reiterated the desire was to work through the next many months to transition out and to not apply for a portion of the next grant opportunity.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he was aware that there were Shelter and Services Program funds that were directed to border counties without it being a competitive process and there were separate funds that were competitive. He asked for clarification if the \$340 million that New York, Atlanta and Chicago could apply for was competitive.

Ms. Leshar responded that the next round of grants was fully competitive and for example, what the County recently received was partly non-competitive and had been eligible to receive the dollars because historically the County had received them.

Supervisor Heinz stated that in his discussions with the Governor's Office about this over the past couple of days, he understood they were becoming a fiscal agent for Maricopa County, Yuma, other parts of the State, but did not necessarily feel comfortable stepping up and taking over the County's operations. He stated that he concurred with that because they had not done it before, but the County had done it for years, and as Administrator Leshar mentioned, Pima County was the only community to not have any significant street releases and had done it well. He stated that he would not like the County to go past June 13th because it could not be undone and then not receive another \$4 to \$12 million more. He stated that it was not known how much was needed dependent on how the executive order was enforced, the \$21 million might last two and a half years, which was also dependent on the flow of migrants. He stated that it sounded like they needed a year to take over the rest of the State and become the fiscal agent to get everything operationally together. He added that hopefully by the end of Fiscal Year '25, the baton could be fully passed and that the recommendation was not to move forward, but he felt that they should not leave any dollars on the table because they could be left in a situation where the County was still stuck doing it, and they did not get any additional money to do it, and then that would potentially come out of the General Fund.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had the same concern and that she had talked to anyone that would listen at the Federal level about what would happen if street releases occurred in Pima County. She stated that she was very clear on what the budget capacity was in the County, and the understanding that the City of Tucson also had their own financial strain. She stated that initially, she thought the proposal from the State would include everyone, but that was not the case, it was only for

Maricopa and Yuma, so it left out Cochise, Santa Cruz, and Pima. She added that the assumption was that the County would submit a request for its own funding. She stated that before they heard from the State, the County was at the capacity to submit a grant application. She questioned whether one could be submitted if staff had the capacity, and if the County was awarded funds, the Board could determine whether to accept the funds or not based on what the landscape was, she asked if this was something that could be explored.

Ms. Leshar replied that up until recently they moved forward as if to go after the grant because they were not completely aware of what the dollars and capacity might be. She stated that they began to work with the State to help them write their grant and she was aware that representatives of the Governor's Office had contacted Board members, but they had not been beneficial conversations, so perhaps there was additional information to be gleaned. She stated the currently conversation was whether it was worth it to apply, and if the County received it, having the options to decline or keep an option open down the road. She stated that their concern had been, the County continued to wind down and ramp up, and wind down and ramp up, and that what they indicated previously was that they were moving towards a process of ramping down at the end of these dollars and they were in the process of finding new vendors due to changes with the primary vendor and what that might look like was not clear, but it would be possible to submit the grant.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the County was trying to get out of the business of sheltering asylum seekers, why prolong the inevitable. He stated that it seemed like they would be accepting a grant only to not accept a grant in the near future. He questioned what the awful consequences of street releases were because these folks were only here for a better life and continually heard that they were innocent hardworking folks that were coming over, asked if everybody was scared of them and why not end the program.

Ms. Leshar replied that the concern with street releases was that the number of individuals that had been released by Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) to County facilities fluctuated greatly with some being 1,100 or 1,300 individuals per day, and as previously mentioned, the average period of time for them being here was about 72 hours and that included families and children. She stated that the concern had been that CBP identified the Greyhound Bus Station as the location so whether people were good, if you had 1,100 people per day dropped at the Greyhound Bus Station there would be potential issues in the area because there were no services being provided for those individuals. She stated that 1,100 individuals who might be dropped at the station without the benefit of what the Federal government had been able to provide to the County for, which was for water, food and shelter.

Supervisor Christy asked whether street releases posed a risk to the community.

Ms. Leshar stated that street releases could pose a risk to the individual released as well as everyone else, and the primary concern was with the individuals being released at the facility with no water, no shelter and no food.

Supervisor Heinz stated that the healthcare and medical practices were different, but the County had already done this and felt it was in the best interest of the community, of the Board, and of the individuals being talked about to have a warm handoff to the State. He stated that he believed the Governor and her advisers when they indicated that her goal was to have the State become the fiscal agent and operationalize it statewide. He stated that a transition period was in order, but they could not close their practice and just stop taking care of patients, they had to help transition them to someone else to get that care and those services. He reiterated that he knew that it was not that same type of relationship, but saw it that way, so he supported submitting an application in parallel with the State and they were vocally supportive.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had a concern that Pima County, individually, would put in a proposal while the State of Arizona was putting in their own proposal, but the State's proposal was not going to cover Pima County and if the County did put in for these funds, and perhaps the funding they currently had would extend until December and they were still in limbo of when to cut off services. She stated that if the County did not have any influx of any other funding that would be definitive, but as what was stated several times having 1,100 people dropped off in the middle of downtown Tucson became a City of Tucson and Pima County problem, people would still need to be transitioned to where they would go, but there would be no system.

Supervisor Christy commented that it would become the State's problem.

Chair Grijalva stated that it would become everyone's problem because if there were 1,100 people sitting on the side of the frontage road on I-10 that was a safety issue, and the County had to be responsible. She added that the reason why none of it seemed scary was because the County has been able to avoid it and other communities had not been able to. She stated that when these services were provided and allowed for transition of people to get to their final destination easier, they were not in the communities for an extended period of time and not becoming a responsibility that the County and City governments were going to have to be responsible for. She stated that there was no way to avoid the responsibility to the safety of the community and the safety of the people who sought legal asylum if they were left in the middle of an uncovered parking lot for an extended period of time in the hot weather. She stated that she understood the desire of the administration and staff to transition to somebody else, but at the current time no one else stepped up. She added that she would like to at least ensure that the County provided some sort of safety net for the community in order to at least apply for the funds, and then if things changed at the border and if it was not a service the County needed to continue, the \$21 million left was significant and a determination

could be made on whether to accept the funds or not, but that she would advocate to apply for the funds.

Supervisor Christy questioned what action needed to be taken.

Supervisor Lee stated that she supported moving forward with it and a determination could be made, if awarded, but until the State agreed to being the County's fiscal agent, she did not want to wait for the outcome.

It was moved by Supervisor Lee and seconded by Supervisor Heinz, to move forward with applying for the grant, and if awarded, the Board would vote on whether to accept the funds or not. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva stated that she appreciated the work done by Grants Management and Innovation and the Office of Emergency Management, and that it was a huge drain of resources for staff, so she understood the desire to transition. She stated that her concern was that if there was an NGO that was prepared to be able to submit a proposal in nine days the County could work directly with the NGO, but she did not think it would happen in time to at least access funding.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Scott was absent.

51. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval of the Consent Calendar

Upon the request of Supervisor Lee to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 1 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

It was then moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Scott was absent, to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR LEE

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Pima County/City of Tucson Outdoor Lighting Code Committee**
 - Ratification of appointment: Rob East, to fill a vacancy created by Sharon Bonesteel. Term expiration: 3/4/28. (City of Tucson recommendation)
 - Ratification of reappointments: Dennis Coon, Buell T. Jannuzi and Craig Barron. Term expirations: 8/7/27. (City of Tucson recommendations)

Supervisor Lee stated that this was a joint committee between the County and the City of Tucson (COT), and that they were reviewing the Code for revisions regarding dark skies. She stated that she wanted to appoint Alex Zimmerman as the Electrical Engineer representative to serve on the committee, but the COT needed to vote on and approve Mr. Zimmerman's appointment before this Board could take action on his appointment to the committee. She requested that the County Administrator work with the COT to get the approval of Mr. Zimmerman's appointment. She stated that Mr. Zimmerman was a Principal Engineer with Zona Technical Engineering and he had been recommended by Mr. Conrad, who she had asked for a recommendation to the vacancy.

Chair Grijalva asked if that was a request for the County Administrator.

Supervisor Lee responded yes.

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Pima County/City of Tucson Outdoor Lighting Code Committee:**
(PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
2. **Pima County Fair Commission**
Appointment of Sheena Conner, to replace Marvin Selke. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (County Administrator 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**
Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Gym & Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, August 10, 2024.

ELECTIONS

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY

Raoul Garza-036-REP, Caitlin Watters-104-REP, Kendel Bowers-107-REP, Angel Sanchez-128-REP, James Barton-147-REP, Carolyn Wuertz-158-REP, Charles Anzalone-164-REP, Tamara Holley-172-REP, Craig Donovan-184-REP, Rafael Ihly-229-REP, Rafael Bayze-252-REP, Lou-Ann Preble-262-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Cynthia Breikreitz-009-REP, Crystal Flores-011-REP, Steven Loster-014-REP, Helen Hritz-017-REP, Raoul Garza-055-REP, Deborah Pierson-069-REP, Keith Lowrie-069-REP, Dana Goodge-073-REP, Frederick Bledsoe-096-REP, Elizabeth Olsen-103-REP, Jane Weiss-107-REP, Anita Meneses-113-REP, Donna McFadzean-127-REP, Jonathan Amengual-166-REP, Beth Pendolino-166-REP, John Pendolino-166-REP, Craig Donovan-217-REP, Alexandra MacPherson-Munro-223-REP, Thomas Holz-227-REP, Brenda Lynch-252-REP

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

- 5. Minutes: March 19, 2024
- Warrants: May 2024

* * *

52. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:26 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK